

# Chorley Park Trail Connection Concept - Design Principles and Elements

(Text-only version)

Beth McEwen

Manager, Forest & Natural Environment Management

Tel: (416) 397-4006

[bmcewen@toronto.ca](mailto:bmcewen@toronto.ca)

January 4, 2016.

Below is a summary of the final plan for the Chorley Park Trail Connection.

These 20 design principles and elements are an outcome of public consultation along with clarified City requirements. The principle sources of public input included a formal Chorley Park Trail Design Stakeholder Working Group (2014-15), and a public meeting with people with disabilities (January 2015). Full details from all consultations are on the project web page: [toronto.ca/chorleytrail](http://toronto.ca/chorleytrail)

## Overall Plan of Proposed Chorley Park Trails Connection Concept

- Switchback trail with 5 switchbacks.
- 2.0 metres wide paved trail, with 5 resting area "bump-outs" at 3.5 metres in width
  - Retaining wall 2 stone high on approximately half the length, all on downslope.

- Retaining wall 3 stone high on 3 short segments at corners, on down slope, fencing provided in these lengths
- Also a natural surface footpath alternative trail south of the switchback.

Further details in the next sections.

## 20 Design Principles / Elements

### 1. Provide a reliable trail connection.

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

### 2. Design should be friendly for pedestrians of all ages, families with strollers, and dogs on leash.

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

### 3. Discourage fast cycling or skateboarding

Source: Working Group recommendation

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

Signage will ask cyclists to dismount and prohibit skateboarding

### 4. Retain natural setting.

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

Planting and effective forestry management will be applied to compliment this plan.

### 5. Limit the impact of parking around Chorley Park.

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

No new parking opportunities are proposed by this project. City Transportation Services can take actions if parking issues are raised in the future.

## **6. No lighting to be installed.**

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #1.

This compliments existing plans for this section of the Belt Line Trail.

## **7. Retain a natural surface footpath in the forested area of the slope (providing an alternative option to the asphalt switchback trail).**

Source: Working Group endorsement.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3.

Provides a rustic woodland trail experience similar to existing conditions, as requested by many community members. Connection is short, steep, narrow, mostly built on the natural soil base and features historic underpass and flagstone stairs. It provides an adjacent, alternative route to the accessible switchback trail.

## **8. Install a switchback trail that is as universally accessible (barrier free) as possible.**

Source: City requirement under policy and Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).

Note: If the City is to build any trail connection at this location it must include an accessible option at this location. A running slope of 6.1% average, 6.8% max is the most gradual grade feasible, which is appropriate to minimize barriers. This also meets working group requirement #2 of being suitable for families with strollers.

## **9. Create an accessible connection between the top of the trail and the sidewalk, travelling southwest along the slope ridge connecting to the existing driveway.**

Source: City requirement, following advice from people with disabilities.

Note: To meet accessibility requirements, the switchback trail needs to connect to a sidewalk (which connects to a TTC bus stop on route 82, i.e. on Glen Rd). This requirement was accepted without protest by the Working Group at meeting #3 and the southwest connection was the group's preference. The surface of this top trail must be stable and edge detectable, but not necessarily asphalt.

## **10. Switchback trail surface will be asphalt.**

Source: City requirement based on staff and consultant professional opinion.

Note: Asphalt has been determined to be the only surface option to meet the criteria of safety, accessibility and low maintenance on this slope.

### **11. Switchback trail width will be 2.0 metres (experience of 1.6 metres).**

Source: Compromise: Working Group recommends minimal width; Staff require wider for safety.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #2 and #3.

2.0m (plus 0.3 to 0.6 m gravel shoulders) is the minimum width staff will accept for safety and comfort on this slope. See letter from Manager of Pedestrian Projects. With expected encroachment of vegetation into the shoulders, the experience of the path width will be about 1.6 m.

### **12. Reduce trail length where possible.**

Source: Working Group preference.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #2.

In detailed design the City will seek feasible opportunities to reduce the length of the asphalt switchback trail, while still maintaining a gradual slope (6.1% average). Moving the top entrance of the switchback further south will be a priority option to investigate.

### **13. Shift Belt Line Trail west (uphill) and introduce bioswale to improve stormwater management.**

Source: Working Group endorsement.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3.

Reduces puddles, ices and ruts in the Beltline Trail and also decreases overall length and number of switchbacks from five to four.

### **14. Minimize visible retaining walls.**

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #2 & #3.

This will be accomplished by situating the retaining wall on downward slope where it can be obscured by vegetation, and by use of grading to minimize height of retaining walls.

Alternative materials for retaining walls will be explored and possibly used for limited sections in the lower area where they are more visible. To be determined in detailed design.

## **15. Include shortcut stairs from top park (but not any other locations).**

Source: Staff recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3.

Four possible locations for shortcut stairs were identified. S2, S3 and S4, were each not supported by over 66% of participants. S1 received 12/22 (54%) non-support, which is less than 66% required for a Working Group position. S1 will be considered in detailed design to be included unless the accessible entrance to the switchback can be moved significantly further south, making the convenience of the shortcut stairs much less beneficial.

## **16. Stone is the strongly preferred material for any stairs.**

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3

## **17. Include five resting areas, with seating where possible.**

Source: Working Group recommendation and advice from people with disabilities

Note: Rest areas were recommend by Working Group meeting #2 and Accessibility Meeting.

At Working Group meeting #3, eight possible locations for passing/resting areas were presented; most if not all could accommodate some seating. Recognizing working group preference for minimizing trail footprint, final design will have only five rest areas (on the corners and in the middle of longest straight length).

## **18. For seating, a standard City bench is preferred, but stone would be acceptable.**

Source: Working Group recommendation

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3

## **19. Minimize extent of fencing.**

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #2.

Fencing / railings will be limited to those locations required by building code (e.g. drop-off greater than 1m) and where essential for accessibility (e.g. along stairs)

## **20. Where required, wood is the strongly preferred material for fencing and railing**

Source: Working Group recommendation.

Note: Outcome of Working Group meeting #3

## **Final Note**

The City will do its best to meet Working Group recommendations, with the understanding that all options being presented will be constrained by technical feasibility, legal requirements, available budget and permitting (e.g. tree impacts, TRCA fill regulations). These and other construction specifics will be determined during detailed design.

END