

City of Toronto Taylor Massey Creek Sub-watershed Master Plan Update

Community Meeting Summary Report

Prepared by Lura Consulting for:
The City of Toronto
June 2017



This report was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing independent community consultation services as part of the Taylor Massey Sub-Watershed Master Plan Update. The report presents the key outcomes from the June 21, 2017 community meeting, and is not intended to provide a verbatim transcript. If you have any questions or comments regarding the report, please contact either:

Julia Murnaghan

City of Toronto
Environmental Specialist
Parks Forestry and Recreation
416-392-0440
jmurnag@toronto.ca

or

Alex Lavasidis

Lura Consulting
416-536-0184
alavasidis@lura.ca

Table of Contents

1. Project Background.....	1
2. Community Meeting.....	1
3. Summary of Participant Feedback.....	2
Question and Answer Session - Feedback.....	2
Open House Stations - Feedback.....	3
Station #1: Geomorphic Characteristics.....	4
Station #2: Recreation and Trails.....	4
Station #3: ELC Classifications.....	5
Station #4: General Ecological Descriptions of Study Area.....	5
Station #5: Biodiversity.....	5
Station #6: Guiding Principles and Objectives.....	6
4. Next Steps.....	6
Appendix A – Public Consultation Notice.....	7

1. Project Background

Building upon the existing [Taylor/Massey Creek Geomorphic Systems Master Plan](#), the updated Taylor Massey Creek Sub-Watershed Master Plan Update will be a sub-watershed scale plan for the preservation, improvement, on-going and future management, maintenance, and public use of the parkland within Taylor Massey Creek sub-watershed. The Master Plan will be developed through effective consultation with the community and stakeholders, and it will consider the study area's diversity of features and functions and their interconnectedness, including natural areas, park infrastructure, recreational amenities, trails, stormwater facilities, and other utilities.

This Master Plan is the second of three steps in the Taylor Massey Creek planning process, as approved by [Parks & Environment Committee](#) on June 22, 2015 and City Council on July 7, 2015. Based on preliminary discussions with stakeholders, the Taylor Massey Creek planning process has been divided into three phases: Status Report, Taylor Massey Sub-Watershed Master Plan Update and Taylor Creek Park Management Plan. This community meeting is part of Phase Two, the Taylor Massey Sub-Watershed Master Plan Update.

2. Community Meeting

The Taylor Massey Creek Sub-watershed community was invited to participate in a public meeting to review the opportunities and constraints and help develop guiding principles for the Master Plan Update. The public meeting was held on Wednesday June 21st, 2017 from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm at Our Lady of Fatima Catholic School, 3176 St Clair Avenue East. The community meeting was widely publicized through email distribution of a notice to the project mailing list, promotion on the City's website, social media, and promotion through City Councilors' offices. Additionally, approximately 6 participants commented they attended the meeting based on meeting notices in parks. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix A.

The purpose of the community meeting was to:

- Introduce the Master Plan Update and provide an overview of the project;
- Discuss guiding principles, opportunities and constraints;
- Gather information about the characteristics of the site; and
- Highlight next steps in the project.

A drop-in open house was held at 6:30 pm. Participants had the opportunity to visit six stations which contained maps and prompting questions to illicit feedback about various aspects of the Master Plan Update. A copy of the maps at each station can be found on the City of Toronto website <http://bit.ly/TaylorMasseyMP>. Members of the Schollen & Company Inc. project team and City staff were available to answer questions informally and respond to feedback.

At 7:00 pm, Susan Hall, Lura Consulting, welcomed attendees and reviewed the agenda for the evening. Julia Murnaghan, City of Toronto, followed with an overview presentation about the Master Plan Update. Finally, Mark Schollen (Schollen & Company Inc.) and Sarah Mainguy, (North-South Environmental Ltd.), provided a review of the project to date, key background analysis, and explained the current stage of the process. Presentation slides are available on the City's website at <http://bit.ly/TaylorMasseyMP>. A question and answer period followed the presentations.

Following the question and answer session, participants were encouraged to visit the six topic-specific stations covering different aspects of the Master Plan Update and provide their feedback. Participants were encouraged to provide additional comments were encouraged following the meeting. In total, 33 people signed into the community meeting.

3. Summary of Participant Feedback

The following provides a summary of all feedback received through the question and answer period, idea ranking sheets and notes on the station maps.

Question and Answer Session - Feedback

The following provides a summary of the feedback received during the question and answer session. This is not meant to provide a verbatim transcript.

- Q. Where does Taylor Creek start? Is Edwards Gardens part of the system?
- A. No, Edwards Gardens is not part of the system, it is in a different watershed. Some creek names in the area have changed, or vary depending on who you speak to, so you may be familiar with the area under a different name. The historic creek names were Taylor Creek in old Toronto and Massey Creek in Scarborough, named after the local families. This study is looking at the character of the creeks and how they are being used.
- Q. Will there be a central website to follow progress on the Master Plan Update?
- A. Yes there is a website, <http://bit.ly/TaylorMasseyMP> and the email address to send feedback to is taylormasseymp@toronto.ca.
- Q. You mentioned in the presentation that the 401 blocked the headwaters of Taylor Massey Creek. Are the two ponds at Terraview-Willowfield to make up for that?
- A. Yes, when the 401 was built, approximately 16 ha of headwaters were diverted to Highland Creek. The highway truncated the Creek and diverted Highway 401 runoff into Taylor Massey Creek. The Terraview-Willowfield ponds were made to hold runoff and improve water quality.

- Q. Were those ponds as effective as anticipated?
- A. TRCA monitors the system, it is a tricky design. There is also a subsurface filtration bed that takes combined sewage effluent and filters it. TRCA monitors the water quality downstream and it has improved. There are also fish in the lower pond, which is a good sign.
- Q. Can you confirm that all the runoff from Highway 401 goes into the Creek at Terraview-Willowfield? There should be a way to correct that.
- A. Stormwater from a section of the 401 goes into the creek. We have to remember this was 1960 technology. That water is now treated. The Terraview Park pond has a pretreatment pond to capture pollution and treat that water.
- Q. It seems odd that you can take Wishingwell Park and divert it over a hill to Highland Creek. When the 401 was only 4 lanes, there was a culvert that drained differently. How does the water get over there now?
- A. There is a large stormwater pipe that takes water over to the North side of the 401. It is within the Ministry of Transportation right of way.
- Q. Are there any other sources of water, both rainwater and wastewater, being added to Taylor Massey Creek, which is already receiving water from the 401?
- A. Current watershed boundaries are fixed, therefore you would have to bring additional lands into the watershed to add more water to Taylor Massey Creek. Along the sub watershed boundary, if a development occurred, it could potentially shift water from one sub watershed to the other, but it would not make a major difference into the total amount of water that flows into the Creek.
- Q. Is it possible to get an update on the state of Combined Sewage Overflows (CSO)? Could the Terraview-Willowfield model of stormwater ponds and subterranean filtering be a solution to CSO problem?
- A. Those technical questions are best addressed at the stations in our next activity.

Open House Stations - Feedback

During the open house, participants could visit each station and answer the questions posted using an “Idea Ranking Sheet”. They could also rank and comment on ideas posted by fellow participants. Additionally, participants could leave notes on the map at each station. Project team members were present at each station to answer questions.

The following provides a summary of the feedback received during the open house session at each station, including feedback from “Idea Ranking Sheets” and input provided on maps.

Station #1: Geomorphic Characteristics

1.1 Do you have anything to add or change to best define the geomorphic characteristics of the site?

One participant suggested efforts be made to divert water from Maryville Park, which is often marshy. Another participant disagreed and suggested the area be left wet.

1.2 Which of the issues most concern you and why?

Participants were most concerned about erosion control, maintaining the integrity of the Creek, and diverting Highland Creek to restore the Taylor Massey Creek Headwaters. Other concerns centered around stormwater management including flood prevention in backyards and basements, stormwater cooling, and changing the location of stormwater tanks.

Station #2: Recreation and Trails

2.1 What trails do you use most frequently?

No feedback was provided.

2.2 Are there connections you would like to see improved or enhanced?

Many participants want a connection from Taylor Creek Trail to Warden Woods through Dentonia Golf Course, especially to connect the cycling network.

Some participants suggested installing new infrastructure including new resting and seating areas, street level crossings, and metal boardwalks, while other participants suggested operationalizing existing infrastructure including water fountains and washrooms.

There was division amongst participants over suggestions to keep certain trails natural rather than paved, to continue to allow exploratory or unmarked trails, to install trails through hydro corridors, and to allow off-leash trail use.

Many participants support keeping the wet crossings at Taylor Creek Park.

Other suggestions include naturalizing portions of the Creek, extending the trail network, and closing certain segments of trail to allow for naturalization.

2.3 Are there access points you see as problematic and why?

Many participants view the encampments in the Creek being used as housing as problematic and would like to see those housing needs addressed.

2.4 Are there informal access points that should be considered in the plan?

Participants suggested or inquired about formalizing multiple access points including Glenwood Crescent, Massey House, south of Woodbine Church, and south of St. Clair (on the east side of the Creek, north of Firvalley Woods).

Station #3: ELC Classifications

3.1 What additional wetlands should we map?

One participant suggested creating a strategy for maintaining and enhancing wetlands in the Creek.

3.2 Where are the areas of particularly dense spring flowers?

A large patch of Bloodroot was identified at the Rexleigh access point, however it was noted this was being overrun by Garlic Mustard.

3.3 Where are the concentrations of non-native invasive species?

A high level of Phragmites was identified in a small pond, east of Bryant Park on the north side.

3.4 Do you have anything to add or change to best define the ecological land classifications of the site?

No feedback was provided.

Station #4: General Ecological Descriptions of Study Area

4.1 What other ecological characteristics should be included?

Through discussion with the project team, a participant suggested that a narrative about the devastating effects of Hurricane Hazel on the Taylor Massey Creek system would be worth considering, as much of the landscape in the ravine today has evolved as a direct result of the impact from that event.

4.2 What are your areas of interest within the study area?

Many participants were interested in the state of forests and trees in the Creek and suggested a sustainable forest plan for particular sites.

Other participants were interested in Creek naturalization.

Cultural heritage was also a topic of interest. One participant noted that the Creek was historically used by the Wendat community. Another participant noted that the old railway line that ran up the Creek and onward to Lindsay, Ontario (called at one point “The Milk Run”) would be worth exploring as a cultural heritage feature.

Station #5: Biodiversity

5.1 Do you have anything to add to the biodiversity information shown?

Many participants commented that they enjoy seeing a diversity of wildlife in the Creek. Using the maps available, participants provided a wide range of information on the flora and fauna sightings in the Creek. This included mapping sightings of Butternuts, Ash, Heron, Green From,

Red Fox, Muskrat, Deer, Groundhog, Star Nosed Mole, Eastern Milksnakes and more. An additional suggestion was made to expand the study area to include pockets of high flora biodiversity.

5.2 Where are critical wildlife habitats that you know of? (Note which species)

A number of critical habitats were identified, including habitat for Snapping Turtles, Herons, Owls, Bats, Deer, Hawks, Mink, Muskrats, Coyotes, and Salmon.

5.3 Other

Participants also provided feedback that addressed the category of biodiversity broadly, rather than answering one of the questions posed by the project team. This feedback included suggestions for stricter restrictions on dogs to protect wildlife, increasing biodiversity, removing invasive species, selecting more suitable species for plantings, increasing educational signage about wildlife, and increasing overall awareness of the impact humans have on wildlife in the Creek.

Station #6: Guiding Principles and Objectives

6.1 Reviewing the guiding principles and objectives for the Master Plan Update, do you have any suggestions or changes to enhance the guiding principles and objectives?

Participants suggested including more education about natural heritage and Indigenous histories in the Creek through multiple pathways, and to change the overall principles to better reflect the Truth and Reconciliation recommendations.

One participant also suggested devising a strategy for resolving potential conflicts between principles.

6.2 Which guiding principles are the most important and why?

No feedback was provided.

4. Next Steps

The project team will consider all feedback received in order to refine Master Plan Update. The next steps will include:

- Refinement and finalization of base mapping, end of June;
- Development of a Draft Master Plan, July to August;
- Stakeholder and Public Engagement Sessions to illicit feedback on the Master Plan, September to October; and
- Refinement and finalization of the Master Plan, December 2017.

Please visit <http://bit.ly/TaylorMasseyMP> for more information as the process moves forward.

Appendix A – Public Consultation Notice



PUBLIC CONSULTATION

TAYLOR MASSEY SUB-WATERSHED MASTER PLAN UPDATE

The City of Toronto is updating the Taylor Massey Creek Sub-Watershed Master Plan. Our goal is to achieve a balance between the enhancement and management of ecological, recreational, cultural, functional, and social uses and needs. The community is invited to review the Opportunities & Constraints and help develop Guiding Principles for the Master Plan Update.



**Wednesday,
June 21st, 2017**

**Start Time: 6:30 pm
Presentation: 7:00 pm
Q&A Session: 7:45 pm
Adjourn: 8:30 pm**

**Our Lady of Fatima
Catholic School,
3176 St. Clair
Avenue East**



Interpretation services may be arranged in advance of the meeting date.

**For more information,
please contact:**

**Julia Murnaghan, Natural
Environment Specialist
Parks, Forestry and
Recreation
416-392-0440
jmurnag@toronto.ca**