

Midtown in Focus – June 2017 Open House Summary
Yonge-Eglinton Growth, Built Form, and Infrastructure Review
June 3, 2017
9:30am – 2:00pm
North Toronto Collegiate Institute, 17 Broadway Avenue

Overview

On Saturday, June 3, 2017, the City of Toronto hosted an Open House and Workshops at North Toronto Collegiate Institute as part of the Midtown in Focus planning study. Approximately 185 people participated in the event.

At the Open House, City staff presented emerging elements of a new plan for Yonge-Eglinton for discussion with area stakeholders. The Midtown in Focus team anticipate presenting a draft plan to City Council at the end of 2017.

The Open House consisted of a number of display boards, which provided information about the work being completed as part of the Midtown in Focus planning study. City staff members as well as their technical consultants were on hand to share information and listen to feedback. Participants were also encouraged to provide feedback on the display boards using sticky notes.

The Workshops consisted of 3 concurrent discussions focused on specific character areas within the Yonge-Eglinton Centre, Davisville Neighbourhood, and Midtown Villages. Each workshop was an hour-long and was hosted twice. Each workshop included a presentation about the overall make-up of the area, built form and public realm issues addressed through the study and the emerging built form vision, followed by a table work session for participants to provide feedback.

Matthew Wheatley, Ian Malczewski, and Khly Lamparero of Swerhun Facilitation prepared this Open House Summary, which was reviewed and finalized by City staff.

Key Themes

These key themes are drawn from the feedback participants provided on the display boards, in the feedback forms and by email following the meeting. They are meant to be read in concert with the more detailed summary of feedback below.

The expected population growth will require additional community services & facilities and parks & open spaces. Participants indicated that the area needs more schools, community centres, and designated space for recreational activities and that these facilities need to be delivered in advance of or in parallel with further development. Participants also felt that accessibility for people with disabilities should be improved in existing buildings offering community services and well-designed in any new buildings.

Construction impacts need to be monitored and mitigated. Participants expressed concerns about the number of development projects occurring at one time and their cumulative impacts, including: noise and traffic congestion; reduced space for pedestrians; and increased stress for residents. They suggested the City do more to stagger development projects and enforce existing by-laws that are meant to mitigate impacts.

Tailor the built form vision to fit the area's existing character and minimize impacts on public spaces.

Participants supported features in the character areas that expanded sidewalks and greenery, minimized shadow impacts from new development and provided space for local businesses in the Villages and community facilities across Midtown.

Improve and expand space for pedestrians and cyclists. Participants expressed a desire for an expanded and safer pedestrian environment. Participants suggested fixing damaged sidewalks and widening sidewalks in high traffic areas; installing more traffic lights and pedestrian crossings at busy intersections; and ensuring there are safe places to walk around construction sites. Participants also showed support for increased bike lanes and routes in the area, both along east-west roads and north-south.

Increase transit service in the area. Participants noted that the subway is overcrowded and suggested raising awareness of existing bus service; adding bus service; and introducing an express subway service during rush hours.

Detailed summary of feedback

The feedback below is organized under the following themes: built form, community services and facilities, municipal services, transportation, heritage, parks and open spaces, and other feedback. The built form section includes feedback participants shared on the built form boards in the Open House, verbally in the three built form workshops, and in built form worksheets. The remaining sections include feedback shared on the boards in the open house and in the general comment sheets. Some participants also provided feedback by email following the meeting, which has been integrated into the summary and appended.

Built Form Feedback

At the Open House, the City presented illustrative future development scenarios for 23 subareas or "character areas". The scenarios demonstrated the possible physical form of Midtown's neighbourhoods in the decades ahead and the implications of recommended planning policies. The Workshops involved a focused presentation and discussion regarding specific character areas within the Yonge-Eglinton Centre, Davisville Neighbourhood, and Midtown Villages.

Using the information from the open house boards as well as the overview presentation and materials provided in each workshop, participants shared feedback about what they liked regarding the emerging direction and suggested changes. Participants also shared feedback about what they liked and suggested changes to the Davisville public realm vision, and suggested additions to the Midtown Villages' distinguishing features.

General Built Form Feedback

- Provide a clear explanation as to how the future density for Yonge-Eglinton was chosen and if there is an opportunity to influence the anticipated density as well as the physical details of the built form.
- Participants said they would like the area to be friendly for families, children, youth, old people, and people with disabilities; not just singles and childless couples.

- Participants expressed concerns about the disruptive impact of developments for the community. They would like developments to be slowed down and not happen all at once.
- Participants expressed concerns about the shadow impacts of the proposed high rise developments on schools in the area.
- Participants suggested implementing green roofs on new developments (note: the City requires green roofs on new commercial, institutional and residential development with a minimum Gross Floor Area of 2,000 m²).

FEEDBACK ABOUT YONGE- EGLINTON CENTRE

The Yonge-Eglinton workshop included seven future character areas, including Redpath Park Street Loop; Erskine & Keewatin; Soudan Neighbourhood; Mount Pleasant Station; Yonge-Eglinton Crossroads; Montgomery Square; and Eglinton Greenline. The feedback shared is summarized below.

What participants liked about the emerging built form visions

Redpath Park Street Loop. Participants generally liked that the plan is more cycling friendly. One participant shared that they love the plans for Broadway Ave. They also mentioned that they liked the idea of more greenery in the area.

Erskine & Keewatin. Participants indicated that they liked that both the north and south sides of Keewatin Ave were marked as “neighbourhood” rather than “apartment”.

Mount Pleasant Station. Participants liked the attention to shadow impact in the area.

Yonge-Eglinton Crossroads. Participants liked the proposed built form heights in the area. Some participants indicated that they liked how there is greater height near major transit stations and gets lower as it moves away from the station. One participant said they love the Eglinton Connects streetscape.

Montgomery Square. Participants shared support for the proposed transition from Duplex Ave and side streets between Yonge St and Duplex Ave. Some indicated that they liked the low-rise form and public space in front of Montgomery Ave and Yonge St.

Eglinton Greenline. Participants liked the proposed setbacks because they increase pedestrian space, provide a reasonable amount of light and space at ground level, and create space for trees, benches, and cyclists.

Suggested changes to the emerging built form visions

Redpath Park Street Loop. Participants said that Redpath Ave is currently not pedestrian-friendly due to poorly maintained sidewalks. They suggested that the sidewalks be at least twice as wide because it is too narrow for the volume of pedestrian traffic. Other participants suggested combining the parkette spaces into a larger green space and increasing greenery in the area. One participant said that there should be better pedestrian access to the park from Broadway Ave and Roehampton Ave. Some participants shared concerns about shadow and wind tunnel impacts of high rises in the area. There was a suggestion to build more mid-rises instead of high-rises.

Erskine & Keewatin. Participants shared concerns about the impact of high-rise developments in the area, including: not having the community infrastructure and facilities to support the additional occupants coming from the new towers. Some felt a 35-storey tower on Erskine Ave next to John Fisher Jr Public School is inappropriate. There was a suggestion to create a route that is easier for people to walk/cycle north from Keewatin Ave without having to go to Yonge St or Mt. Pleasant Rd.

Soudan Neighbourhood. Participants expressed concerns about shadow impacts and would like the proposed 60-degree setback angle changed to 45 degrees. There was a suggestion to protect Eglinton Junior Public School from shadow impacts of new developments.

Mount Pleasant Station. Participants shared concerns about the proposed height of new developments in the area. Participants were particularly concerned about the 20-storey building proposed near Eglinton Junior Public School because of the potential sun and shadow impacts on the school yard. There was a suggestion to include bike lanes on Mt. Pleasant Rd and mandate new developments include both indoor and outdoor cycling parking.

Yonge-Eglinton Crossroads. Participants indicated that they would like to have a mix of low and mid-rise buildings suitable for mixed-use because it makes for a good neighbourhood. They also provided specific suggestions, including:

- Buildings on the side streets should not be higher than 8 storeys;
- Create stricter guidelines for heritage buildings to honour the look and integrity of the buildings;
- Prevent contemporary designs for higher floors when the ground floor building design is older (e.g. the post office at Montgomery Ave and Yonge St);
- Improve pedestrian space and add bike lanes to accommodate movement in the area;
- Access for cyclists turning onto Yonge St should be considered when the Eglinton Green Line is created;
- Add affordable housing in the area.

Eglinton Greenline. Participants said that east-west cycling infrastructure on Eglinton Ave needs to be considered to accommodate the anticipated increase in population density (note: separated bike lanes will be installed on Eglinton Avenue across Midtown as part of a reconstructed Eglinton).

FEEDBACK ABOUT DAVISVILLE NEIGHBOURHOOD

The Davisville Neighbourhood workshop included four future character areas, including: Davisville Apartment Neighbourhood; Merton Street; Davisville Station; and Mount Pleasant South. The feedback shared is summarized below.

What participants liked about the emerging built form visions

Participants liked the midrise vision in the area, particularly providing space for smaller stores and independent retail in the area.

Suggested changes to the emerging built form visions

Participants provided a number of specific suggestions for the Davisville Neighbourhood, including:

- Future development projects should have a lower maximum height and 45-degree angular plane to allow more light on the street;
- Spread density throughout the neighbourhood and include 3 to 6 storey walk ups;
- Alternate tall buildings with low-rise on opposite sides of Yonge St to maintain sky view and avoid creating a wind tunnel; and
- Connect Eglinton Ave and Merton St by expanding Cowbell Lane with a pedestrian route/walkway.

What participants liked about the emerging public realm vision

Participants also said they like that the emerging vision is looking at ways to facilitate movement north and south between Davisville Ave and Mt. Pleasant Cemetery.

Suggested changes to the emerging public realm vision

Participants suggested more open space and schools in this area. They also said that there should be less shadow impact on schools, particularly its open spaces.

Additional comments

Some participants indicated they would like to see a designated cycling lane along Davisville Ave and Mt. Pleasant Rd. They suggested adding off-street parking and turning on-street parking into bike lanes.

FEEDBACK ABOUT MIDTOWN VILLAGES

The Midtown Villages workshop included five future character areas, including: Yonge South Village; Mount Pleasant South Village; Bayview Village; Eglinton Way Village; and Yonge North Village. The feedback shared is summarized below.

Participants in the Midtown Villages Workshop generally said they would like to see a greater diversity of stores by having additional small, ground-level retail spaces to preserve the villages' character. Participants also suggested creating a gateway to let people know they are entering the villages.

What participants would like to add to the Villages' distinguishing features

Eglinton Way Village. Participants showed support for more small storefronts in the village.

Yonge North Village. Participants generally wanted to have smaller commercial space at the ground level to have more varied stores and preserve the village character. Other specific suggestions included:

- Preserve the old North Toronto centre from Roselawn Ave to Saint Clements Ave;
- Architectural material used in new developments should reflect the character of adjacent buildings; and
- Minimize large retail signs and the use of digital signs.

Yonge South Village. There was a suggestion to increase and improve public space in the area, including adding more plants, improving maintenance, and adding benches to increase opportunities to sit and meet people. There was another suggestion to keep apartments above small shops.

Mount Pleasant South Village. There were suggestions to have small storefronts with recessed doorways in the area and add more "bump outs" for seating, planting, and patio opportunities.

What participants liked about the emerging built form visions

Participants generally liked the 45-degree angular plane at the back of properties for the Yonge South Village, Mount Pleasant South Village, and Bayview Avenue Village.

Eglinton Way Village. There was support for the setbacks generally; some said they would like to have larger setbacks.

Yonge North Village. Some participants liked the Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) in the area.

Suggested changes to the emerging built form visions

Eglinton Way Village. Participants said that they would like to limit the store size at ground level to encourage similar storefront establishment and presence of village character. Some participants suggested leaving sidewalks clear for pedestrian traffic and snow plowing.

Yonge North Village. Participants generally wanted wider sidewalks and patios that do not interfere with pedestrian traffic. They also provided more specific recommendations, including:

- Increase the proposed 1.5m setbacks at 2 storeys to 3m;
- Have 5.5m side setbacks for heritage buildings;
- Add more benches and garbage cans along sidewalks; and
- Turn some streets to one-way to relieve congestion

Yonge South Village. Participants said that they would like to maintain and improve the diversity of shops/restaurants in the area. There was also a suggestion to increase the setback at the front of properties beyond 1.5m. Participants also suggested expanding the designation of the Heritage Conservation District to preserve heritage buildings on Manor Rd and Belsize Dr down to Millwood Rd.

Mount Pleasant South Village. There was some opposition to developments over eight storeys in this area and suggestions to increase setbacks at the front of properties beyond 1.5m. There was also a suggestion to make sidewalks wider near Eglinton Ave.

Bayview Avenue Village. Participants suggested increasing the setback at 2 storeys from 1.5m to 3m and prohibit balconies.

Other Built Form Comments about the Midtown Villages

- There was concern about losing the village look, neighbourhood feel, and tree coverage of the area when developers purchase detached homes and replace them with stacked townhouses.
- There was a suggestion to give notice to Leaside residents for the next round of consultation given the inclusion of the east side of Bayview Ave in the study.
- There was a concern regarding the use of intrusive lighting.

Feedback about Community Services & Facilities

Schools. Many participants expressed concerns regarding schools in the area not being able to adequately accommodate students due to being at or over capacity. Several participants indicated the need for more schools and to accommodate the growing population. Some participants recommended “vertical schools:” schools located on upper apartment floors.

Community centres and libraries. Several participants identified the need for more community centres and better programming to support the current and growing population living in the area. Participants also identified the need to make the library friendlier for all users. One participant suggested creating cozy reading corners and having three times as many computers.

Recreational spaces. A number of participants expressed a need to have designated spaces for recreational purposes, such as tennis and basketball courts. Some felt that the tennis courts in Eglinton Park are not well-used and suggested that an alternative use be identified.

Accessibility. Participants suggested improving accessibility in new buildings with more elevators and escalators. Participants also suggested renovating older buildings to make them more accessible.

Municipal Services

Waste management. Participants said the waste management system needs to be improved.

Water pressure. Some participants expressed concerns about reduced water pressure resulting from increased population.

Street maintenance. Some participants felt there needs to be improved street maintenance, including improved/increased snow removal and better cleaning of sewer grates during heavy rainfall and storms.

Transportation Feedback

Pedestrians. Participants said that providing better and safer sidewalks for pedestrians is a priority. Specific suggestions to improve the pedestrian environment, included:

- Fix damaged sidewalks;
- Widen sidewalks in high traffic areas, especially near Eglinton Subway Station;
- Install a Pedestrian Scramble at Yonge St and Eglinton Ave;
- Install traffic lights at Redpath Ave and Broadway Ave;
- Ensure there are safe places to walk around/near construction sites; and
- Add locations for pedestrian drop-offs and pick-ups

Transit. Several participants raised concerns about overcrowding in the Eglinton Subway Station. They noted that residents have to wait for multiple trains to get on the subway. Participants suggested introducing an express train or increasing subway service during rush hours. Others felt that buses in the area have capacity and convenience to accommodate transit riders and this should be advertised more. Other suggestions included: increasing service on the 14 and 33 bus routes; making the TTC 100% accessible, and; operating service along Eglinton 24 hours/day.

Cycling Infrastructure. Participants provided several cycling-specific suggestions, including:

- Create bike lanes with physical barriers;
- Increase cycling routes and bike parking along east-west corridors in the area;
- Install a dedicated bike lane on Yonge St; and
- Add a signed bike route on Bayview Ave and Erskine Ave.

Participants also commented on the impact of wind tunnels in the area due to high-rise buildings, noting that high wind speeds pose safety concerns for cyclists. Some felt that bike lanes can be problematic because they can make it difficult for Wheel Trans to safely make pick-ups and drop-offs.

Traffic. Participants said that accessing Broadway Ave and Cowbell Lane has become increasingly difficult because it is congested with construction trucks. Some participants suggested installing left turn lights along Mt. Pleasant Rd at Moore Ave and Blythwood Rd to address vehicle backlogs and dangerous turning movements. Participants also shared that the traffic lights at Roehampton Ave and Eglinton Ave are confusing and difficult to navigate. They suggested adding an advanced green at for cars turning left on to Eglinton Ave.

Parking. Participants said it is difficult for people visiting or working in the area to find on-street or visitor parking and felt that it will become even more difficult with more people coming to the area to live and work.

Heritage Feedback

Heritage Protection. Some participants wanted assurances that heritage buildings and small businesses will not be forced out of the area by new developments. Participants were especially concerned that what happened to the Bank of Montreal building could happen to the Capitol Theatre (note: the Capitol Theatre at 2490 Yonge Street was added to the City's Heritage Register in 2016). Participants suggested the City introduce stronger guidelines regarding building over heritage buildings. There was a suggestion to have tours to promote the heritage sites in the area. There was another suggestion to designate the four-storey building beside 101 Erskine Ave.

Parks and Open Space Feedback

Participants said that more parks and public spaces is a priority to support the needs of the community with the increase of condo development in the area. Specific suggestions included:

- School yards should be publicly-accessible open spaces;
- Add more sitting areas along sidewalks, parks, and inside Yonge & Eglinton Centre;
- Add more trees in the area, particularly along Mt Pleasant Rd, Roehampton Ave, Eglinton Ave, and Merton Ave;
- Add more dog off-leash areas, particularly in Eglinton Park;
- Preserve the greenspace at Church of the Transfiguration;
- Create bike lanes with better connections to community parks, such as Eglinton Park, Sherwood Park, Mount Hope, and Mt. Pleasant Cemetery; and
- Add more public art in the Yonge South Village area.

Other Feedback

Process. Several participants thanked City Planning for coming out into the community to share this work. They also provided some process suggestions, including:

- Add more street names on the informational boards
- Provide seating in all rooms;
- Ensure everyone can hear the presenters, especially in larger rooms;

- Improve image projection of presentation slides in workshop rooms;
- Have materials available online before the meeting;
- Use language that is more accessible and understandable for all participants; and

Some participants requested a site visit of the Mt. Pleasant and Eglinton quadrant between City Planning staff, councilors and representatives of the community to discuss the site further.

Development. Many participants mentioned that construction in the area has been very disruptive to the local community. One participant suggested reducing the number of projects happening at the same time to allow residents and users to have a more normal day-to-day life.

Noise control. Many participants said there is a need for better enforcement of bylaws to improve noise control around multi-year condo construction projects. They said noise pollution is stressing residents.

Next Steps

City staff and their consultants thanked participants for attending the open house and workshops and sharing their feedback and indicated that the feedback received at the Open House and Workshops will inform the draft plan being presented to City Council in late 2017. They also stated that there will be additional engagement activities in the coming months and that a summary of the feedback received at the event will be prepared and made available on the project website.

Appendix A. Participant list

City of Toronto

City Planning Al Rezoski
City Planning Alex Teixeira
City Planning Ann-Marie Nasr
City Planning Carla Tsang
City Planning Cassidy Ritz
City Planning David Driedger
City Planning Diane Ho
City Planning Diane Silver
City Planning Eddy Lam
City Planning James Parakh
City Planning Jamie McEwan
City Planning Kirsten Stein
City Planning Laura Pfeifer
City Planning Leo Desorcy
City Planning Paul Farish
City Planning Samira Behrooz
City Planning Tamara Anson-Cartwright
Parks, Forestry & Recreation Rob Gibson
Toronto Water Shad Hussain

City Councillors

Councillor Christin Carmichael Greb
Councillor Jaye Robinson
Councillor Josh Matlow

Participants

Janet Allan	Sarah Bradley	Stuart Cooper	Andrew Ferancik
Zaheed Ali	Janet Bruch	Heather Crawford	Valerie Fisher
Emily Anderson	Lorena Canales	Rich Crosland	Carole Forde
Aleksander Askovic	John Carey	Cindy Crunkshank	Andrea Freeman
Jane Auster	Anita Cargron	Ben Daube	Howard Freeman
Alan Barry	Steve Centre	Kathy David	Birgina Froman
Geri Berholz	Vera Centre	John Dean	Hashem Ghadak
Harry Berholz	Szuwen Chang	Marcello Di Taranto	Alan Gill
Michael Black	James Chung	Juan Vanderky	Alice Gomes
Doug Blair	Zora Cmojacki	R Varacalli	Sue Goodwin
Carlo Bonanni	Anne Coates	Christine Doyle	Judah Gould
Sarah Bradley	Tom Cohen	Chris Dunn	Andy Gort
Delsia Brideau	Monique Conrad	Diane Emanuel	Paula Greco
Elanor Brown	Valary Cook	Annie Eng	Heather Green
Fred Bourgase	Alissa Cooke	Vicki Fecteau	Barry Gula

Katherine Hamale	Al Kivi	Bogdan Petrescu	Natasha Thexton
Samar Hamid	Ben Klar	Anne Plolivier	Brent Thomas
Lisa Harrower	Ronald Krolenan	Lancelyn Rayman-	David Ticoll
Ron Hart	Shelley Lee	Watters	S Towers
Arlena Hebert	Andre Le Roux	Steph Rickard	Chris Trussell
Shirley Hall	Philip Levine	Chadda	Steve Tsimikalis
John Hiddema	Joanne Leznoff	Taylor Robers	G Tuffin
Dana Hopson	Blaine Little	Paula Salvador	Mary Urpee
Jacque Hoormueg	Jeffrey Lin	Anthony Sam	Juan Vanderky
Dan Hoorucoes	Connie Liu	Soma Sarkar	R Varacalli
Y Hong	Desiree Liu	Sarah Scott	J Vaughan
Olivia Huong	Doris Low	Gauran Seetharam	Maurice Wager
Eugene Hung	Ming Lu	Matt Segal	B Walker
S Hutton	John Maitland	Perry Serre	Doug Warren
Christine Inglis	Chris Macgowan	Joy Seth	Ian Watson
David Jackson	Mason	Barb Sheriff-Scott	Lilian Wells
Lily Jung	Seboua March	Julien Simoes	Bernard West
Corrine Kagan	Lynda McCarthy	Vicky Simon	Joanne West
Ira Kagan	Ian McGugan	Peter Sperdakis	Diana White
Jordan Kanp	R McKermer	Naomi St. John	Lynn Wolverson
Maureen Kapral	Doreen Menaker	Leighanne Stone	Tom Worrall
Lisa Kelleher	Terry Mills	J Takahashi	Dalton Wudrich
Carolyn Kennedy	Lynda Moon	Bernard Tam	Ben Xing
John Kennedy	David Morse	Deborah Tam	Fong Yan
Lori Kerr	Sharon Mourer	Thomas Tam	Bonnie-Sue Young
Geoff Kettel	Christine Nakatsu	Susan Tang	Jose Yow
S Kettle	Chris Nurmi	Elizabeth Taylor	
Ann King	Erica Pallotta	Christine Terashita	
Margaret King	S Pellier	Drew Thexton	

Consultant Team

Perkins + Will Paul Kulig

Perkins + Will Shaimaa Atef

Swerhun Facilitation Ian Malczewski

Swerhun Facilitation Desiree Liu

Swerhun Facilitation Khly Lamparero

Swerhun Facilitation Matthew Wheatley

Appendix E. Written Feedback Submitted after the Meeting

- Response #1, June 3
- Response #2, June 3
- Response #3, June 5
- Response #4, June 8
- Response #5, June 14
- Response #6, June 15
- Response #7, June 15
- Response #8, June 17

Response #1, June 3

I attended the Mid-Town in Focus Meeting today at the North Toronto Collegiate Institute. I looked at all the storyboards (very nice, but more street names would help) and waited for the workshops. Signed the registry and put on my name tag. There was a speech by Councillor Matlow in the cafeteria. Because of my hearing impairment, I did not get a single word of it. That cafeteria is a BIG room and BIG rooms are tough for me. I waited for the workshops and wanted to participate in the villages workshop. There was a gentleman at the front talking when I walked in. Not really sure what he was saying. Amazing how BIG those classrooms are! It would have been fun to participate but I thought I might be better off sending in a comment instead of taking up a seat and shouting "Eh?" for 45 minutes.

I noticed one of the topics is "Erskine and Keewatin". I live at 135 Keewatin so I thought I'd put in my two cents...

You'd have to be deaf dumb and blind not to know developers are salivating to move the zoning boundary that now runs along the Erskine back property line. Sometimes I think I can hear them at night – even with my impairment! I imagine this is why there is even a topic labelled "Erskine/Keewatin". Seriously, Mr. Farish, why is that a topic for discussion when none of the other zoning boundaries are? So far this line has held thanks to Councillor Jaye Robinson but this makes me wonder why it is on the table still. It baffles me further because Councillor Robinson fought the "Density Creep" stacked townhouse project just down the street. Can you please comment?

There is a line in one of the storyboards I saw at the Saturday morning meeting that talks about affordability. Keewatin Ave is more than a height boundary. It is an affordability alcove. There are four 1960s low rise apartment buildings on this street: two on the south side; two more on the north. This provides 500 people with reasonably priced rental accommodation.

Is there any way to access the comments that will be on record regarding this particular subject of discussion? Please let me know. I tried to comment online but it didn't seem to work for me. Anyways, as regards that question sheet, here are my responses for the "Erskine & Keewatin" row of the comment spreadsheet...

1. What do I like about the emerging built form vision? I LOVE that all of Keewatin (North & South side) was marked as "Neighbourhood" rather than "Apartment". Please do keep it that way.
2. Is there anything you would change about the emerging built form vision? If so, what would you change and why? If things stay the way I understand them, the only change I would make would be to somehow make it easier for people to walk/cycle north from Keewatin without having to go to Yonge or Mt. Pleasant.
3. What do you think of the illustrative built form scenario? I wish I could comment but I guess I missed this board. If things could stay the way they are now, I'd be happy. Sooner or later the apartment buildings will age beyond sustainability. What happens then, I do not know. Right now Y&E has undergone an astonishing transformation. Maybe it's time for some other part of the city to grow. Try to catch a southbound train at Eglinton in the morning rush hour. It's full before it even gets to Lawrence!

The meeting seemed very well organized. On site staff were very good. Well done, I think.

[Response #2, June 3](#)

Thank you all for today's Open House. I've attended the Midtown Y/E in the past as a member of EPRA. However, today I was most interested in Davisville Village as I am now living in an apartment at Balliol and Pailton overlooking Merton and the cemetery. Here are 3 ideas which I hope might be incorporated into future planning.

1) High rise buildings on Yonge St...consider alternating tall buildings with low rise on opposite sides of Yonge in order to maintain sky view and avoid the tall buildings facing each other and creating a wind tunnel and dark corridor as we now have on Yonge south of Eglinton.

2) Connect Cowbell Lane behind Minto along behind Art Shoppe. Continue the alley across Hillside to Manor Rd. which then connects to Tullis behind the Yonge St. stores. Pedestrians may then walk south from Cowbell Lane, down Tullis to Belsize. Opposite Tullis on the south side of Belsize is a walkway between the houses to Arthur Meighan Residence and Davisville school on Millwood. One can now walk through the garden walkway at Arthur Meighan from Millwood to Davisville. On Davisville where you exit is a Crosswalk which takes you through the apartment buildings to Balliol or left to Pailton. The short 1 block on Pailton finishes at a crosswalk on Merton right at the walk through to the Belt Line and Mt. Pleasant Cemetery. This route exists from the Belt Line, up Pailton to Davisville, across to Arthur Meighan, through their gardens to Millwood, crossing to the walkway between houses to Belsize and up Tullis to Manor Rd. All that is missing is the connection behind the stores at Manor Rd. north to behind the Art Shoppe then connecting to Cowbell Lane to take one from Merton to Eglinton without walking on Yonge. Easy fix as 3/4 of the route already exists.

3) As mentioned to Leo, planting of large shade trees which can grow to a three or four storey height on Davisville, Balliol and Merton would be an asset. The pretty decorator trees do not provide shade for pedestrians in spring and summer.

[Response #3, June 5](#)

An excellent plan well presented by your staff. The construction phase has been very disruptive to the local community, and continues to be so. I suggest that the number of projects in progress at any one time be reduced to allow the residents and users of the area to lead a semi normal way of life.

Keep up the good work to involve and inform the community.

[Response #4, June 8](#)

Here are a few comments that I received at the Midtown in Focus Open House that can be added to what you have in your notes/from the boards:

- The secondary plan boundary should be redrawn moving the eastern boundary to the area between Mount Pleasant Rd and Bayview Avenue (where there is currently a boundary line)
- Cowbell Lane is a corridor used by residents – at the moment development is using the lane for construction equipment and impeding the use as a laneway and access point.
- There is a lack of safety on the street and sidewalk near construction projects on Yonge Street
- There is a lack of enforcement of noise/vibration bylaws

- The intersection of Blythwood and Mount Pleasant has no turn signal to support turning which creates a backlog of vehicles and dangerous turning movements. Lots of vehicles stop in the crosswalk which makes it dangerous for pedestrians.
- Not opposed to development but want to retain the character of the area
- Excited to see OMB reform – needs to be a way to give the City more teeth when dealing with developers
- Nice to see when spaces and facilities can collaborate and do double duty in the area (e.g., North Toronto Collegiate Institute allowing community use of the field when not in use by the school)
- Green spaces and community facilities are very important for families and children – need to find more.
- Right now Bloor St has big issues with accessibility. There are no elevators at Bay station, there are few places to stop on the street for drop-offs and pick-ups. Don't allow this to happen to Eglinton – make sure sidewalks are wide enough, with opportunities for drop-offs etc. Cycling is good but need to design to avoid collisions with pedestrians and those with low mobility.

[Response #5, June 14](#)

I attended the meeting on June 3rd but had to leave the discussion session when the planner at my table stated that more tall buildings reduce the strong winds one resident complained about.

I would like you to move the eastern boundary of the focus area to Mt. Pleasant Road. The neighbourhood east of Mt. Pleasant are stable single family dwellings and would like to remain that way. I live on Fairfield Road which is one of the most desirable residential streets in Toronto.

Your focus is on the very high rise buildings which should not be allowed east of Mt. Pleasant even on Eglinton Ave. The existing buildings are too high as it is.

The Park Loop you propose along the boulevard of Roehampton and Broadway is a pie in the sky idea. If you look at the current condition of the boulevard along Roehampton, it in no way nearly resembles the pictures you show. Who is going to maintain the Park Loop. The boulevard was damaged in front of 299 Roehampton when 305 Roehampton was built and was never repaired. There is a pile of gravel and broken glass, an area that was dug up and never restored, gravel covering the damaged patio slabs on the boulevard and broken sidewalk all caused by the building of 305 Roehampton. I have complained several times about it through 311 and through the councillor's office and nothing is ever done.

The Park Loop extend east of Northern Secondary School but over half of the block is a decrepit concrete retaining wall, not green and with no potential of being green at all. The park loop should be shown along the Mt. Pleasant in front the Northern Secondary School.

The development in the Yonge Eglinton area is totally out of control and there is a long way to go to catch up on the amenities in the area. With the additional building of the Crosstown, the area has become unlivable. I need steel toed boots and a hard hat to walk in the area. The asphalt on Roehampton Ave. from Yonge street to east of Mt. Pleasant has been totally destroyed and is not slated for repair. The street and sidewalks are covered with gravel and dirt.

The Places to Grow Act does not work in the Yonge- Eglinton Area and the area should be removed from the act.

Response #6, June 15

EPRA has been following the process with great interest, and we see a great deal to commend in what you are doing. The plan has a lot of good in it and you have invested an enormous amount of talent and labour. We appreciate the attention to tower-separation, set-backs, streetscapes, width of sidewalks, good interface to neighbourhoods (permit me to growl at 90 Egl West, not your fault, and a fine example of bad interface).

We look forward, over the next while, to your findings on the mix of services and activities. At present, your reports address the important subject of built form.

A goodly number of EPRA folk were at the most recent Open House at North Toronto Collegiate, and we had intense conversations with assorted staffers and planners.

Let me raise some issues.

1. Setbacks and the feel of streets:

One conversation, and here Naomi St. John was especially keen, had to do with how residential properties meet the street. As I remember, she was concerned that the greenery be real and that the trees not be the silly ornamental wee trees that grow head-high, but rather serious shade trees that give real shade. They need room enough to grow and flourish.

Naomi and I were also keen to mandate sufficient separation between ground-level housing and the sidewalk, so that the inhabitants will be willing to raise the blinds. When a house or townhouse or apartment is flush with the street, down come the blinds, with good reason as the occupants feel too exposed. One sees this effect wherever buildings are too close to the sidewalk, at Neon on Duplex at Orchard View, or at the rather pleasant townhouses on Duplex north of Berwick. An especially dramatic case is the condo at 30 Roehampton, where the shades are all snugly down. The streetscape effect is somewhat deadening, especially where, as at 30 Roe, all the shades are identical and featureless. It is worth noting that lace curtains feel like a coy expression, partly shy, but in dialogue with the world. A blank wall of blank shades is anti-Jane Jacobs and totally disengaged.

We cannot mandate shades. Or maybe Design Review can raise the issue with developers. But MiF can ponder the dialogue between setbacks and the use of windows.

2. Those Midtown Fringe Areas

Midtown Fringe areas appeared on several of the posters shown at Northern.

I have not tracked them all on your big web page.

Built Form posters: Page 3: E1 9Henning) and E2 (north of OVB, east of Duplex) has them in orange on maps

Midtown Villages posters: p. 6 again shows these designations, again in orange on maps.

There was another poster which caught my eye but I have not tracked down on the web pages. There one saw images of four-storey walk-up apartments on Helendale and Montgomery. There are already two such older buildings of the sort, on Duplex, facing the tower at 500 Duplex. EPRA is worried by the prospect of losing the present two-storey and three-storey houses to further apartments or to stacked townhouses. It changes the neighbourhood feel, reduces tree cover, increases lot-coverage, and undermines the neighbourly feel. And it sets a precedent for creeping change reaching deeper into the neighbourhoods across Duplex further north and west. We know that Henning and lower Edith fended off a move by a developer to buy up all the little houses and to double the density. We would lose our village look and undermine the social web that makes our neighborhoods lively and supportive.

3. The Capitol Theatre

Cultural Heritage section: page 4 of 4 shows the old Capitol Theatre as an example of heritage. We are pleased to see it there and want to be sure that the final draft of the MiF legislation makes it hard for an owner (currently Madison) to demolish it or trivialize it (via facadism) in the course of a development. The developer has bought most of the Green P lot there, and has ambitions. Not all ambitions are bad, but we want to see a solution that keeps the important elements of the historic building intact. The recent disaster of the Bank of Montreal building alerts us to the fragility of our historical fabric. So we hope that the final report has teeth and claws and that it protects this old theatre.

4. Sound: noise mitigation.

A fine public health issue. We see much attention to light and air. How do we mitigate noise?

5. Light and light pollution: there is light-noise, from stupid and intrusive lighting. We hope that intelligent, good lighting is on the table.

6. Art and interesting streetscapes: As always I bang the drum for an interesting public realm where both children and adults will find their surroundings stimulating and fun. The image of the public realm always looks a little staid. Can we mandate the equivalent of the Eaton Centre fountain, where stuff happens?

[Response #7, June 15](#)

However, I would have liked you to mention that office space replacement should be commensurate with the increase in density. In other words, offices shouldn't just be replaced in the same quantity as existed before a new build if the number of occupants in the building and the area at large, has increased.

[Response #8, June 17](#)

Thanks for the extensive work so far on the MIF initiative and for your efforts to continually engage the community.

As you mentioned in the note below, you requested further comments, and in this note we would like to **focus primarily on built form in the Mt Pleasant/Eglinton quadrant**. Separately, we will forward some other comments.

Some of these comments might be repeats from input provided at earlier workshops, but since they aren't reflected in the displays at the MIF Open House, we aren't yet sure whether they were accepted and will be reflected in future built form proposals.

Although in principal we appreciate that higher density development will occur surrounding major transportation nodes, it happens that the SW corner of the Mt Pleasant/Eglinton intersection houses the very large and important Eglinton Junior Public School. It's obvious to us that high density development and junior public schools with playgrounds require careful co-existence. The fact that the playground provides for much needed park space during after school hours makes this an even more precious resource for the area.

From the observations below, it would appear that the presence of the school has not been properly considered in the proposed draft built form for this quadrant. As currently proposed the Eglinton Junior Public School will be surrounded by tall buildings, be perpetually shaded and have a number of tall building ramps, immediately across from the school entrance and playground.

From your display boards:

1) F3.EGLINTON GREENLINE : “ ... and then gradually rise again [from Redpath] towards Mount Pleasant Core” - Eglinton/Brownlow (SW corner) showing a 31 storey development (across the street from the main school entrance and the playground).

2) C3. SOUDANNEIGHBOURHOOD :

Brownlow Ave – west side... immediately south of the above mentioned building in 1), an allowance for a 22 storey development (currently townhouses) is shown, which again will project a significant shadow onto the school property. Together, 1) + 2a) will add a significant amount of traffic immediately opposite the main entrance and playground of the school (since ramps will be located on the interior streets).

3) D3.MOUNTPLEASANTSTATION :

a) Mt Pleasant Rd – westside and south of Eglinton (currently an older strip mall and a Dollarama Store). You have shown 2 taller buildings of approx 20 storeys, rising in height from the corner of Soudan/Mt Pleasant Rd towards the corner of Eglinton/Mt Pleasant Rd (and towards a 30 storey proposed height for a development on Mt Pleasant Rd at Roehampton), appearing to ignore the presence of the Eglinton Junior Public School. Those buildings will create significant shadows onto the school property. In addition there is no detail re. setbacks and step back regulations for this block.

We are also concerned with the 30 storey tower at Mt Pleasant Rd and Roehampton, almost immediately adjacent to the Northern Secondary School and also showing poor transition to the neighbourhood to the east.

b) SE corner of Eglinton/Mt Pleasant .. mention “incorporating a tower with contextual height...”. We would like to understand in more detail “contextual height”, since this will be the first tower on the east side of Mt Pleasant (and along Eglinton East of Mt Pleasant till the Eglinton/Bayview intersection). Again, the tower has the potential to create shadow impacts on the school as well as on the residential neighbourhood to the east.

In addition (not directly affecting the school) ;

4) C3.SOUDANNEIGHBOURHOOD :

NE corner of Soudan and Brownlow – showing a 19 storey building, similar in height to a contentious OMB approved development of 19 storeys at 11 Lillian Ave with a 60 degree angular plane from the low rise residential neighbourhood to the south. Similar to the 18 Brownlow Ave development, there exists a tall apartment building immediately to the north of this site in such close proximity (only 56 metre between 56 metre space between the existing 55 Brownlow tower and the Soudan lot line (has to accomodate 25 m tower separation and a 10 metre OPA 289 setback from Soudan).

Could we request a site visit of this area between City Planning, our councillor and representatives of the community at your earliest convenience to discuss further ?