

# January 2017 Midtown Planning Group Meetings- Integrated Summary

Midtown in Focus

January 16, 2017, 6:30 – 9:30 pm &

January 23, 2017, 6:30 – 9:00pm

North Toronto Library, Gwen Liu Meeting Room

40 Orchard View Blvd

## Overview

On Tuesday January 16 and January 23, 2018, the City of Toronto hosted two update sessions for the Midtown Planning Group as part of the City's ongoing study in the Yonge-Eglinton area, Midtown in Focus: Building a Liveable Yonge-Eglinton. The purpose of the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting was to provide a briefing and solicit feedback on the Infrastructure Assessments underway as part of Midtown in Focus, including Community Services & Facilities, Transportation and Municipal Servicing (water, wastewater and stormwater). The purpose of the January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting was to present and discuss the Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan Policies and Proposed Parks Plan.

Approximately 30 people attended each meeting, including members of residents' associations, Business Improvement Areas, active transportation organizations, sports groups, and others (see Appendix - Participant Lists).

This integrated Summary reflects the feedback received from people who attended both briefings, and includes questions asked (and responses received).

**Tuesday January 16.** Councillor Josh Matlow opened the meeting with welcoming remarks, after which Nicole Swerhun reviewed the proposed agenda. Following the welcoming remarks and the agenda review, the City and their consultants provided an update on the status and schedule of Midtown in Focus and delivered presentations on Community Services & Facilities, Transportation, and Municipal Servicing. The Community Services & Facilities and Transportation presentations were followed by small table discussions and plenary report backs. The Municipal Servicing Presentation was followed by a plenary question and answer period.

**Tuesday January 23.** Councillor Christin Carmichael Greb provided welcoming remarks followed by a review of the proposed agenda. Paul Farish, City of Toronto, presented an overview of the Proposed Secondary Plan Update endorsed by City Council in December 2017 for further consultation. Corinne Fox, City of Toronto, and Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, gave a presentation on the Proposed Parks Plan for the Yonge-Eglinton area. Both presentations were followed by small table discussions and a plenary report back.

At both meetings, participants had the opportunity to share feedback during the small table discussions and after each meeting by email. Following the meetings, the City shared the meeting materials by email with participants to assist with providing additional feedback. This summary integrates the feedback received during and after both meetings.

Matthew Wheatley, Ian Malczewski & Nicole Swerhun from Swerhun Facilitation prepared this Meeting Summary and shared it with participants for review prior to finalizing it.

## Key Themes in Feedback Received

The following 10 key themes are derived from feedback shared during and after the two meetings. These key themes should be read in concert with the detailed summary of comments and questions that follows.

1. **Ensure the plan is enforceable with the development industry, use strong and prescriptive language in the policies**
2. **Protect and expand office space to provide more opportunities for residents and others to work in the area.**
3. **Transit capacity needs to be increased to support the existing population as well as expected population growth.**
4. **Increase the size and number of parks in the area.**
5. **Provide a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists.**
6. **Ensure traffic is not pushed on to local streets.**
7. **Increase and improve access to local libraries.**
8. **School capacity is a significant issue; the area needs more schools.**
9. **Maintain and protect space for human services, especially for: the homeless; refugees, seniors; and individuals with mental illness.**
10. **Ensure there is sufficient water infrastructure to support the cumulative impacts of ongoing development.**

Several participants also said they appreciate the efforts the City and the community continue to put forth to make Midtown a more livable place and complete community.

## Questions of Clarification

Following the presentations, participants asked questions of clarification. Responses from City Planning and their consultants are noted in *italics*. The questions and responses are organized below under the topics discussed at the two briefings.

### Community Services & Facilities

- **Can you briefly comment on urgent needs related to community services and facilities from the City's perspective / where do you see the biggest gaps?** *Through work in earlier phases of Midtown in Focus, including meetings with this group, we identified specific needs in each sector. These were reported to and endorsed by City Council in mid-2016. What emerged from this assessment is that there are gaps in all sectors. The CS&F Strategy being developed now is specifying priority projects and strategies to expand capacity in unique context of an infill environment.*
- **How are community amenities leased by the City secured?** *They are typically secured through Section 37 as a community benefit operated by the City or leased out through its below-market program. For new spaces, we would want to make sure they are large enough to ensure they can be leased out, e.g. nothing under 20,000 square feet.*

*Councillor Matlow – We are looking at City space, podiums, and opportunities to partner with school boards to find community space.*

- **I am nervous about infill in the community, is there anything being done to protect the unique character of small homes?** *This will be discussed at the meeting next week, when we talk more specifically about policies in the Proposed Secondary Plan.*

#### Municipal Servicing

- **Are the sanitary and storm sewers separated everywhere?** *No, they are combined in some areas in Midtown.*
- **You said that applications must show adequate servicing; will this apply to new condo applications while the Secondary Plan is being completed?** *The requirement to show a functional servicing report is an existing procedure within the City's development review process. Each application has to show their impact on the system. Applications may be modified or development permissions may be held to ensure adequate servicing is available. As part of this study, we are looking at cumulative impacts as well as what else might be needed into the future.*
- **If there isn't adequate infrastructure for a development, does this mean you'll stop the application?** *We can put in holding provisions that stop development until the infrastructure to support the development can be built.*
- **It seems that all developments are assessed in isolation; at what point are they looked at cumulatively?** *We are using this study to look forward to cumulative impacts. So far, this study has confirmed that currently we are in a pretty good place in terms of municipal servicing.*
- **What is "fire-flow"?** *Fire-flow refers to the water pressure required to put out fires.*
- **Understanding that development up to 2016 has been taken into account, what volume of new development have you studied in relation to servicing?** *The present population and approved developments were modelled in the first phase of the assessment. The second phase analyzed the impacts to servicing capacity resulting from the projected population growth to 2051.*
- **What time frames are you using for your models? Hopefully you are modelling 100 year storms, not just a typical day.** *We are following our stormwater guidelines for 2 year and 100 year storms.*
- **In reference to the 2 and 100 year models, you mentioned maps showing the flood areas; will these maps be available online?** *Preliminary maps will be available at the February 10<sup>th</sup> Open House. The maps will also be available as part of the final assessment report.*
- **Will the City start requiring developers to cap unused laterals (pipes that convey wastewater or stormwater from buildings to the City's sewer mains)?** *The City requires the disconnection and replacement of sewer service connections as part of building demolition and new construction. Note added after the meeting: Toronto Water reported to Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) on February 27, 2018 concerning the Feasibility of Ensuring the Disconnection of Sanitary and Storm Laterals at Time of Demolition in response to a motion by Councillor Christin Carmichael Greb. The Council decision and staff report (including a summary of existing policies and recommendations) can be found here: <http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2018.PW27.4>*

## Proposed Secondary Plan Policies

- **Where would Toronto Community Housing fall under this?** *We have housing policies for the City as a whole as well as specific policies in the Proposed Secondary Plan related to affordable housing and a mix of unit sizes. Investments in Toronto Community Housing and other affordable and supportive housing are decided on at the system-wide, city-wide level; however, these should be priorities in Midtown if Council and the community support them.*
- **How are developers reviewing / receiving the Proposed Secondary Plan?** *We have a developer specific meeting planned in early February and have had a few requests from different developers for meetings. We don't have a full picture of their response yet but we know that now that we have a detailed vision on paper it is influential for development. Even if developers don't agree with everything, they are getting on board with what is on paper.*
- **I really commend the work that has gone into this plan but worry if much of the land has already been bought up, what is the point?** *The amazing thing is that just when you think there aren't any more development sites, developers still buy and redevelop on sites we didn't think were feasible development-wise. There is a lot of scope for further development in Midtown. The proposed planning framework is influential in the review of applications today and it will set the direction for development going forward. The plan is also very important in terms of the infrastructure investment priorities it identifies (e.g. priority park sites, cycling network improvements) and the tools it establishes to guide their delivery.*
- **Can developers use other tall buildings as a precedent for future applications?** *The more this plan shows linkages to provincial planning policy and to this 4 to 5-year planning process, with extensive consultation, the stronger the plan will be. These will both be stronger than a precedent argument. We also need to demonstrate that we are allowing for intensification in appropriate areas; no longer will it be a question of precedent, rather a question of what is needed and appropriate.*
- **The southwest quadrant of the TTC block is designated a Special Planning Area — should this be a Major Transit Station Area that the City should be developing a plan for?** *This area is designated a Special Planning Area in terms of building height and massing because the City is a large landowner of this property and is influencing the planning for that block. If the City wasn't a significant landowner, we may have taken another approach. The proposed policies discussed tonight will have an impact on the plans for that site.*
- **Why is the delineation/width of the Roehampton secondary zone not the same on the south versus north side?** *The built form is different on each side.*
- **How does the City track live-work data / how do we know how many people live and work in the area?** *The City undertakes an employment survey every year. There is also commuting and other employment data collected through the census and travel surveys. We have some data and know that only about 10 – 15% of people both live and work in the study area. It isn't possible to ensure/compel people to live where they work, but there are ways to encourage and support this concept.*

## Parks Plan

- **When will the City-wide Parkland Strategy be finished?** *It is anticipated to be complete in the second quarter of this year, 2018.*

- **What are the units of measure on the map that are referring to the provision of parkland?** *It is park area per person in square metres, which is based on a 500-metre catchment area.*
- **What do the “greenways” refer to?** *They refer to public realm plans in the 2014 Midtown in Focus: Parks, Open Space and Streetscape Plan. Their purpose is to preserve the landscaped openness characteristic of the neighbourhood whenever a site is redeveloped.*

## Feedback on Community Services & Facilities

Following the Community Services and Facilities presentation, sector representatives from the City and their consultant team provided detailed briefings at small tables on key considerations for five topic areas: libraries, schools, recreation, child care and human services. After the briefing and a short discussion with participants, the sector representative moved to a new table and repeated their briefing. This occurred five times allowing all participants to receive a briefing on each topic area. Following the five rotations the sector representatives provided a report back on the discussions at their tables.

Participant feedback is organized below by each of the five topic areas, under common themes that emerged from the discussions and feedback shared in writing during and after the meeting.

### Libraries

**Increase and improve access to existing library space.** Participants said that limited hours, a lack of parking, and limited locations act as barriers to access. Participants suggested making existing library space more inviting and opening more small satellite locations to make it more convenient to visit a library. There were some differences of opinion about locating satellite locations in condos. Some said it could improve access for teens, seniors and mothers with babies; others said libraries in condos don't look or feel like they are open to everyone.

**Modernize library facilities and programming.** Participants said existing libraries need more computers and technology to better respond to the way people currently consume information, especially young people. Participants also suggested increasing the types of programming and space offered, e.g. music, theatre, cultural events, and photography classes.

**Northern District branch.** Participants suggested expanding the library to the second floor to increase available space. Some said the area needs a library the size of the North York Central branch. There was also a suggestion to provide a theatre space on the second floor.

**Mt. Pleasant branch.** Several participants felt the Mt. Pleasant branch is too small. Some participants suggested moving the Mt. Pleasant branch into the Regent Cinema. There was also a suggestion to turn the Mt. Pleasant branch into an arts space.

**Add a library in the Davisville Area.** Participants said the Davisville area needs a local library.

### Schools

**Capacity is a significant issue.** Participants said that existing schools in the area are near or at capacity. Participants said the City should work closely with school boards to ensure the number and location of

schools keep pace with growth. Some participants said they want to see specific locations identified in the Secondary Plan.

**Co-locate schools with other community services and facilities.** Participants suggested co-locating schools with childcare, libraries, etc. Participants also suggested expanding the hours school facilities can be used by the community.

**Ensure schools locations are safe and accessible.** Participants said locations near parks/open spaces and that are walkable and accessible by bike and transit should be prioritized. Some said they don't like the idea of kids going to school directly beside condo buildings. *The sector representative said: building new schools must also include consideration of indoor and outdoor recreation space.*

**Increase funding opportunities for schools.** Some participants said the Toronto District School Board needs to be able to access funds from development charges. Others said developers should be required to build / provide school spaces.

### Recreation

**Expand recreation facilities and space through co-location.** Participants suggested finding ways to co-locate recreation space in other facilities such as churches, schools, future Metrolinx transit stations, and condo podiums. Participants also said that requiring facilities in new developments/condos (e.g. pools) will not be enough to accommodate future growth.

**Locate new recreation facilities in areas of highest growth.** Participants said areas east of Yonge St and north of Eglinton Ave are experiencing the most significant growth and are underserved by recreation facilities.

**Other location considerations.** Participants said walkability and the role of recreation facilities as critical infrastructure for emergencies should also be considered when determining future locations.

### Child Care

**Location is critical to the success of childcare facilities.** Participants said that childcare facilities should be located close to transit, green spaces, schools, and high concentrations of families with children. Participants also said that child care facilities should have space for pick-up and drop-off and also be accessible by bike and by foot. Some participants suggested putting childcare in schools that don't already have it. Others said new office buildings should be required to have childcare facilities. Some said the Canada Square site would be a good location for a childcare facility. *The sector representative said: there are opportunities to work with school boards due to funding from the Province.*

### Human Services

**Maintain and protect existing services and space.** Participants said there is a need for policies that protect existing services and space to ensure they aren't squeezed out by future developments.

**Communication and awareness are important.** Participants said it will become increasingly important for agencies to raise awareness of the services they offer in the area, especially as the area continues to grow vertically.

**Increase co-location of multiple human services.** Participants suggested locating multiple services close together or even within the same facility. There was a suggestion to develop a cluster of services around the SPRINT Supportive Housing site on Merton St.

**Specific services required.** Participants identified specific segments of the population they feel require additional services and facilities in the area, including: the homeless, refugees, seniors and individuals with mental illnesses.

## Feedback on Transportation

After the Transportation presentation, participants discussed transportation challenges as well possible solutions at small tables. City staff and their consultants facilitated the small table discussions and provided a report back on the conversations. Participant feedback is organized below under common topics that emerged from the small table conversations and feedback shared in writing during and after the meeting.

**Expanding and improving cycling infrastructure in Midtown.** Several participants said the area needs more dedicated bike lanes to make cycling safer, especially for north/south travel. A number of participants discussed at the meeting and shared support in writing after the meeting for the idea of creating a “Midtown Loop” that proposes to create a connected cycling network, including adding bike lanes on Yonge St. and Mount Pleasant Road. Participants also suggested installing additional bike parking, improving wayfinding for cyclists, and adding rest stops for cyclists along Yonge St. Some participants said that traffic calming measures for vehicles should not impede cycling.

**Improving the pedestrian environment.** Participants shared suggestions they feel would help make the area more pedestrian friendly and safe, including: installing a pedestrian scramble at Yonge & Eglinton; pedestrianizing Yonge St between Montgomery Ave and Soudan Ave; requiring a 2-metre minimum sidewalk width in construction zones; implementing 30 km/h speed zones in high pedestrian traffic areas; improving traffic warning signs and pavement markings around school areas; and reducing street furniture that interferes with pedestrian space, especially during construction.

**Transit issues and improvements.** Participants raised concerns about the subway being at or over capacity with some saying that the Relief Line will do little to alleviate capacity issues. Some participants suggested giving buses priority on Yonge St and implementing bus rapid transit in the area. Others suggested using “microbuses” for shorter trips. Participants also said prioritizing design that encourages forms of active transportation could help reduce congestion on transit. There was a suggestion to hold development until the capacity issues on the subway are dealt with.

**Traffic Patterns and congestion.** Some participant said they don’t want more traffic shifted on to smaller residential streets / “into people’s backyards”. There was a suggestion to implement congestion pricing in the core of Midtown. Participants also said construction makes traffic significantly worse and makes it difficult for residents to get around. There were suggestions to exempt local residents from left turn restrictions and restrict truck movements.

**Parking.** Some participants supported removing parking on main streets/avenues. Others said if parking is removed from main streets it should be replaced with parking on adjacent side streets, especially near commercial areas. There was a suggestion to require new developments to supply public parking.

**Consider impacts of autonomous vehicles.** There was some discussion about the future of autonomous vehicles and possible impacts.

## Feedback on the Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan Policies

Following the presentation, MPG members participated in small table discussions where they identified strengths of the plan and proposed improvements to the plan and policies. The feedback shared is organized below under common strengths and suggested improvements that emerged from the small table discussions and from feedback shared in writing during and after the meeting.

**Support for the recognition of the local context of different areas.** Participants said the context sensitive planning that considers the nature and complexity of the various character areas is a strength. Participants also liked the delineation of Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). Some participants said the Secondary Zones identified in the plan should have more context-specific policies, not blanket policies.

**Support for the connection between infrastructure capacity and development.** Participants said they were pleased to see efforts made to link development to the infrastructure capacity for the area. Some said this link needs to be even stronger with an explanation of how the City will determine if adequate infrastructure is available.

**Support for the focus on complete communities.** Participants appreciated the focus on creating complete communities and supporting livability in the policies.

**Maintaining the character of existing retail.** Some participants raised concerns about new retail not aligning with the character of older retail and said they would like to see policies that promote unique mom and pop specialty stores.

**Support for new street and pedestrian connections.** Several participants supported the proposed new street and pedestrian connections. There was particular support for mid-block connections, with some saying even more are needed.

**Strengthening the proposed policy language.** Participants suggested making the language more prescriptive to make it more likely that the policies will be enforceable. There was particular concern around the use of the word “encourage.” Participants also said it will be important to provide clear definitions and more detailed information/numbers to provide greater clarity and certainty.

**Support for non-residential uses with greater variety of office sizes.** Participants showed support for requirements for non-residential uses in the area, especially those that allow for more people to live and work in the area. Participants suggested requiring more office space and a variety of office sizes to discourage big box stores and encourage a mix of independent businesses.

**Planning for housing affordability.** Some participants showed support for the focus on housing affordability with a mix of housing types. Some said there should be greater focus on affordable housing and additional space/allocation for Toronto Community Housing in the area.

**Building heights and density.** There was a range of opinions and comments related to building heights and densities. Some participants raised concerns about tall buildings and suggested 30-storeys be an absolute maximum. Others said the maximum densities should be defined in the plan. There were



concerns that tall buildings would reduce sunlight and create windy streets. There was also concern that tall towers are more concentrated on the east side of Yonge St. Participants also said they would like to see more transition from smaller up to tall buildings. There was a suggestion to integrate the height descriptions associated with the MTSA boundaries in one map/diagram for easier interpretation.

**Greater focus on schools and school related impacts.** Participants said the area needs more schools and would like to see this need identified in the plan, with specific locations. Participants also said they would like to see more focus on increasing green space and reducing shadows around schools.

**Consistent heritage protection.** Some participants said that heritage protection should apply regardless of the location, even for properties that are located in intensification areas.

## Feedback on the Proposed Parks & Public Realm Plan

After the presentation, members of the MPG participated in facilitated discussions at small tables where they used a large map to share feedback on the proposed Parks and Public Realm Plan. In addition to general comments, participants placed different coloured dots and sticky notes on the map to share specific comments. They used green dots to identify proposed new or expanded parks they think will address gaps and improve access and functionality, red dots to identify proposed new or expanded parks they do not agree with, and yellow dots to identify additional locations for a new or expanded parks. The feedback shared is organized below under general topics that emerged as well as location specific comments shared on the maps.

### General Comments

**Significant support for new, expanded and improved parks in Midtown.** In general, participants supported directions and efforts to acquire and expand parkland, enhance existing parks, connect parks via public realm improvements, and improve existing parks and public spaces. Participants also said the City will need to be creative in finding space for new parks and public realm. There was agreement among some participants that the best way to get necessary parkland in the area will be to take down houses in strategic locations.

**Additional connections through the community.** Participants said there is a need for more formalized pedestrian routes that connect parks and Privately Owned Publically Accessible Spaces (POPS). Participants also suggested using more signage and wayfinding to improve pedestrian routes.

**Mixed opinions about proposed subway decking.** Some participants supported the idea of placing decking over the subway tracks to provide additional space for park, public realm improvements, and off-street bike lanes. Others raised concerns about the cost and feasibility of doing this, with some suggesting the funds could be better spent elsewhere. Some participants suggested exploring options to expand existing roads/bridges above the tracks and create larger setbacks on east-west side streets. Some suggested using additional space to provide low-rise community services and facilities.

**Need for additional/expanded park land acquisition tools.** Some participants said they're concerned that existing parkland acquisition tools will not provide adequate park space. There was support for the City's forthcoming changes to the parkland dedication rate to address parkland deficiencies. There was also a suggestion to explore options for acquiring land from churches in the area.

**Ensure parks and the public realm are truly public.** Participants said that parks and public spaces, especially in front of developments, are not always used to their potential because people think they are private. They said they need to be designed and signed so it is obvious they are for everyone. Participants also said they want to see more POPS in new developments.

**Planning for youth / teenagers.** Participants noted that teenagers were not at the meeting but need to be planned for. There was a suggestion to consider a skateboard park in the area.

**Concern about small parks/parkettes.** Some participants said that some of the proposed parks/parkettes are too small and they would rather see larger parks instead of small, scattered parkettes.

#### [Location specific comments provided on maps](#)

#### **Green dots – support for proposed new or expanded parks that will address gaps and improve access and functionality:**

Using **green dots**, participants expressed support for the City’s identified new or expanded parks at:

- Mount Pleasant and Merton
- The subway decking from Duplex to Berwick (comments included “love this!” and “elegant creative solution to green challenges in the area”)
- The southeast corner of Montgomery and Duplex — “need a show stopper here.”
- The north side of Soudan between Yonge and Mount Pleasant
- The northeast corner of Castlefield and Duplex
- The east side of Duplex north of Soudan

Using **yellow dots**, participants suggested additional locations for new or expanded parks. The suggested locations and a summary of related comments are included below.

- Pottery Playground & Mission Playground – create entrances to Mt. Pleasant Cemetery
- John Fisher Junior Public School – Expand the greenspace around the school
- St. Clements & Yonge Parkette – Open up the parkette and expand the space
- Glebe Manor Square – One suggestion to expand squares for multi-use purposes. Another suggestion to redirect funds for squares to buying homes between Maurice Cody Jr Public School and Manor Rd for a park
- Yonge & Roehampton – Create a park for residents east of Yonge St.
- The northwest corner of Yonge & Berwick – Create midblock pedestrian connections
- The northeast corner of Yonge & Soudan – Include green space future development at this corner
- East of Yonge and south of Balliol – Create formal connector routes between Soudan and the Beltline
- Bayview & Millwood – Buy unused hydro house on Millwood and make it into a park
- Bayview & Eglinton – Protect the northwest corner for public square or public realm
- Mt. Pleasant & Merton – Opportunity for a dog park
- The east side of Mt. Pleasant between Soudan and Hillsdale – There is a privately-owned funeral home with a contemplative garden area.
- Mt. Pleasant & Davisville – The existing parkette “needs some love”

- Sherwood Ave from Sherwood Park to Yonge – Create a greenway to connect Sherwood Park to Yonge
- Millwood and Belsize (centre of block) – Provide a connection between Millwood and Belsize
- 505 Balliol St. – Suggestion to buy property and turn into a dog park
- The northwest corner of Mt. Pleasant and Soudan
- Castle Knock & Roselawn
- Soudan & Cleveland

Using **red dots**, participants identified disagreement with the City's identified new or expanded parks. The locations and a summary of related comments are included below.

- The southwest corner of Bayview & Roehampton – The proposed park is too small, suggest expanding Charlotte Maher Park instead.
- Yonge & Roselawn – The proposed park is too small.
- Eglinton park expansion (east side of Eglinton Park) – It will be too expensive to purchase the land required for the expansion.
- Subway Decking – The resources required could be better spent on providing TCHC housing.

#### **Other location specific comments:**

**June Rowlands Park.** Participants said the park needs better drainage as it currently floods. There were suggestions to add a running track between the baseball field and playground, repurpose the change rooms to a community centre space, and improve southern side of the park facing Mt. Pleasant.

**Yonge & Eglinton.** Participants said this area needs a bigger park and requested the southwest corner include lots of greenspace. They said there is a unique opportunity to create a large multiuse park, cultural area, and walkways with connections to the subway and nearby parks/greenspace.

**Sherwood Park and ravines.** Participants said the park has an ancient wood lot, one of only three in the city, and should be better protected. Participants also suggested upgrading the Strathgowan Hill trail. There were also suggestions to improve connections between Sherwood Park, Mt. Hope Cemetery, and the ravines with better wayfinding, improved trails, and increased awareness.

**Eglinton Park.** There was a suggestion to provide a space for dogs to run that is large enough to accommodate dogs and not interfere with residents/other users. There was another suggestion to balance active sports (like soccer) with other park uses. *The City said there is a Master Planning process underway for Eglinton Park and participants can share park-specific suggestions through that process.*

**Howard Talbot Park.** Participants suggested enhancing opportunities for views from Bayview.

## Other thoughts and comments

**Hold a water and wastewater specific MPG meeting.** There was a suggestion to consider holding a dedicated MPG meeting specifically to address water and wastewater issues, particularly since there are experts in the community who have detailed knowledge on the topic. Some specific issues participants were interested to know more about include safety and flood plans, security of ground water, and if and how historic buildings/homes would be protected.

**Use the Midtown Planning Group list to help get the word out.** There was a suggestion to raise awareness of future consultation activities by emailing promotional materials (e.g. a poster) to the MPG contact list that could be printed and distributed in elevators of buildings.

**Good level of consultation.** Participants said they appreciate the level of consultation undertaken as part of this process.

## Next Steps

City planning staff thanked participants for their feedback and continued participation in the process. They said feedback shared during and after the meeting will help the City refine the Proposed Secondary Plan as they move towards a final plan in May of this year. City Staff also reminded participants of the February 10<sup>th</sup> Public Open House. Ian reminded participants to share any additional feedback by January 30<sup>th</sup> and said that an integrated draft summary of the two meetings would be circulated to participants in the coming weeks.

## Appendix A. Participant lists

### January 16 MPG Participant List

#### **City of Toronto & Consultant Team**

**Councillor** Josh Matlow  
**Councillor Jaye Robinson's Office** Joanne Urea  
**City Planning** Matt Austin  
**City Planning** Leo DeSorcy  
**City Planning** David Driedger  
**City Planning** Cynthia Owusu-Gyimah  
**City Planning** Paul Farish  
**City Planning** Diane Ho  
**City Planning** Eddy Lam  
**City Planning** Jamie McEwan  
**City Planning** Laura Pfeifer  
**City Planning** Cassidy Ritz  
**City Planning** Kirsten Stein

**City Planning** Nigel Tahair  
**City Planning** Alex Teixeira  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Lora Mazzocca  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Daryl Starkman  
**Toronto Children's Services** Ann Pagnin  
**Toronto Public Health** Barbara Johnne  
**Toronto Public Library** Penny Griffin  
**Toronto Water** Vicky Shi  
**Mobycon** Justin Goulding  
**Stantec** Francois Tomeo  
**Stantec** Rod McPhail  
**WSP** Sal Marrelli  
**WSP** Harshad Shetye  
**Swerhun Facilitation** Nicole Swerhun  
**Swerhun Facilitation** Matthew Wheatley

#### **Midtown Planning Group**

**Arris** Terry Mills  
**Lytton Park Residents Association** Arlena Hebert  
**Lytton Park Residents Association** Linda McCarthy  
**Midtown Hub** John Hiddema  
**Oriole Park Association** Daryle Hunt  
**QuORA** Diana White  
**QuORA** David Ticoll  
**Resident** Betsy Kikuchi  
**Resident** Rosemary Corbett  
**Resident** Dyanoosh Youssefi  
**Resident** Joan Bennett  
**Resident** Paulette Haynes  
**Resident** Heather Crawford

**Sherwood Park Residents Association** Ben Daube  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Andy Gort  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Al Kivi  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Jane McKinnon  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Jane Auster  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Margaret Walker  
**The Eglinton Way BIA** Sheliza Esmail  
**Toronto Catholic District School Board** Tomasz Oltorzewski  
**Uptown Yonge BIA** David Jubb  
**Walk Toronto & Cycle Toronto** Michael Black  
**West Keewatin Neighbours** Jane Fitzwilliam

## January 23 MPG Participant List

### **City of Toronto & Consultant Team**

**Councillor** Christin Carmichael Greb  
**City Planning** Julie Bogdanowicz  
**City Planning** Leo DeSorcy  
**City Planning** David Driedger  
**City Planning** Helene Iardas  
**City Planning** Cynthia Owusu-Gyimah  
**City Planning** Paul Farish  
**City Planning** Jamie McEwan  
**City Planning** Cassidy Ritz  
**City Planning** Diane Silver  
**City Planning** Alex Teixeira  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Danny Brown  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Diana Chang  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Corinne Fox  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Robert Gibson  
**Parks, Forestry & Recreation** Dessislava Simova  
**Swerhun Facilitation** Ian Malczewski  
**Swerhun Facilitation** Matthew Wheatley

### **Midtown Planning Group**

**Apple Tree Markets** Chris Trussell  
**Arris** Terry Mills  
**Eglinton Park Dog Off Leash Association** Edward  
**Eglinton Park Residents Association** Lancelyn Rayman-Watters  
**Eglinton Park Residents Association** Karen Barker  
**FoNTRA** Geoff Kettel  
**Midtown Hub** John Hiddema  
**North Toronto Soccer Club** Doug Blair  
**QuORA** Diana White  
**QuORA** David Ticoll  
**Resident** Betsy Kikuchi  
**Resident** Doris Low  
**Resident** Blaine Little  
**Sherwood Park Residents Association** Ben Daube  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Andy Gort  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Al Kivi  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Jane McKinnon  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Sharon Mourer  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Amelita Isaac  
**South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association** Babedra Sivasambo  
**The Eglinton Way BIA** Sheliza Esmail  
**Uptown Yonge BIA** David Jubb  
**West Keewatin Neighbours** Jane Fitzwilliam

## Appendix C. Briefing Agendas

### January 2018 Midtown Planning Group Briefing 1 Infrastructure Assessments

Midtown in Focus

January 16, 2018, 6:30 – 9:20 pm

North Toronto Library, Gwen Liu Meeting Room

40 Orchard View Blvd

#### Meeting Purpose

To provide a briefing on the Infrastructure Assessments being developed alongside the Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan, including: Community Services & Facilities; Transportation; and Municipal Servicing.

#### Proposed Agenda

**6:30 Councillor Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review**

Nicole Swerhun, Swerhun Facilitation

**6:40 Overview Presentation**

Paul Farish, City of Toronto

**6:45 Community Services & Facilities Presentation**

Kirsten Stein, City of Toronto

**7:05 Community Services & Facilities Discussions & Report Back**

- Libraries
- Schools
- Recreation
- Child Care
- Human Services

**7:55 Transportation Presentation**

Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto & Francois Tomeo, Stantec

**8:15 Transportation Workshop & Report Back**

**8:50 Municipal Servicing Presentation**

Vicky Shi, City of Toronto  
Questions of Clarification

**9:15 Wrap-up & Next Steps**

**9:20 Adjourn**

Maps used at the meeting will be emailed to participants the following day to assist with providing feedback after the meeting.

#### Background Materials:

1. Midtown in Focus Proposals Report:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-108408.pdf>
2. Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-108435.p>

# January 2018 Midtown Planning Group Briefing 2 Secondary Plan Policies and Parks Plan

Midtown in Focus  
January 23, 2018, 6:30 – 9:00 pm  
North Toronto Library, Gwen Liu Meeting Room  
40 Orchard View Blvd

## Meeting Purpose

To provide a briefing and seek feedback on the Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan Policies and Proposed Parks Plan.

## Proposed Agenda

- 6:30 Councillor Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review**  
Ian Malczewski , Swerhun Facilitation
- 6:40 Proposed Secondary Plan Overview**  
Paul Farish, City of Toronto
- 7:15 Proposed Secondary Plan Discussion & Report Back**
- 7:50 Parks Plan Presentation**  
Corinne Fox, City of Toronto  
Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto
- 8:10 Parks Plan Workshop & Report Back**
- 8:50 Wrap Up & Next Steps**
- 9:00 Adjourn**

## Background Materials:

3. Midtown in Focus Proposals Report:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-108408.pdf>
4. Proposed Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-108435.pdf>

Maps used at the meeting will be emailed to participants following the meeting to assist with providing feedback after the meeting.



## Appendix F. Written feedback submitted after the meeting

### Submission #1 from a representative of Oriole Park Association, January 22, 2018

Thank you for the material from last week's Planning Meeting. I know that a lot of work has been done relative to the Midtown Focus and there is significant planning underway for the issues that will arise as a result of the development. I attended the overview session in the fall prior to the presentation to the city councillors and also the meeting last Tuesday. One issue that I feel also needs to be included in the planning is **Emergency Services** (specifically Police and Fire). A significant increase in population will create a need to have additional police resources. In brief discussions with police officers in the neighbourhood, they have mentioned that when you change a district from primarily residential houses to an influx of high density, high rise buildings it also creates major impacts to the police and fire interaction. Essentially high rise buildings with elevators, underground parking, and multiple entrances present additional challenges to emergency services and this will be compounded with increased population.

Representation from 53 Police Division was at our Homeowner Association's Annual General Meeting in November and concern was expressed that there has been little consultation with them regarding what they will need to deal with major changes planned for the neighbourhood.

As such, I would suggest that you should schedule meetings with the Emergency Services to learn their needs and include those requirements as a part of the Midtown Plan.

### Submission #2, January 27, 2018

I am a resident of midtown and I am expressing my support for an idea called the Midtown Loop. It would place protected bike lanes on Yonge, Mt. Pleasant, Davisville, and Erskin Ave.

Yonge, Mt. Pleasant and Davisville are wide enough to accommodate bike lanes. Davisville is already in the 10-year bike plan and there will be lanes on Eglinton after the Crosstown is completed. This loop would provide a safe way to get to shops and restaurants along these corridors. Since bike lanes were installed on Bloor I have shopped and dined much more often than I did when the street was too dangerous for cycling. I expect the same will happen if we get protected lanes on these streets.

### Submission #3, January 28, 2018

#### 1. Growth and Infrastructure

Need to be clear that no project can go ahead without supporting infrastructure. We have already seen Cowbell Lane closed for a year due to flooding when Minto Towers were built. Just south of us in the Deer Park ravine, there has been erosion in the banks on which several

homes are built and overflow on the Yellow Creek due to insufficient sewage protection in the north from where the water flows.

With the number and size of projected projects underway and the abundance of underground rivers in this midtown area it is highly likely that more flooding could occur.

## 2. Parks and Public Realm

Much thought has been put into the proposed plan and we have seen several parkettes approved in this area. We need to focus on increasing their space as the opportunities arise and consider developing another major park in the midtown area.

The current practice of developers buying parkland in other areas as they say they don't have enough room to put the required park/public space on the midtown property they are developing needs to be stopped. All new development should have parkland on site as a prerequisite. No swapping!

Should consider fencing off an area in all large parks for toddlers as they have done at Withrow Park. It protects young children from more aggressive older ones and also dogs!

As an aside to that we need more enforcement of on leash areas. I walk through the parks and ravines regularly and never go out without seeing people with unleashed dogs running where they shouldn't. When I've spoken to the city I've been told there is only one bylaw enforcement officer. We have to realize how frightening running dogs can be to toddlers, their nannies and people from other countries who are not used to this.

## 3. Built form

We are overdeveloping the midtown area. The building heights and densities are far too high particularly as they border small single and semi-detached homes, totally overshadowing them. Disappointing to see recommendations of heights from 30 to 48 stories between Yonge and Mt. Pleasant on Eglinton plus the approved monstrous 70 storey building at SW corner of Y and E. It does impact on views and shadowing for the streets south with their smaller homes. I think quality of life of existing residents needs to be considered not just how many buildings at unrealistic heights can be crammed in.

When individual plans are approved there needs to be appropriate setbacks from the front. This should be expanded to cover all sides of a high-rise and include its base. The existing situation at the Brownlow site where the small-town homes built by the same developer have only been given a 5 metre space between them and the tower is totally unreasonable. Not good planning.

## 4. Community Services and Facilities

The same principle should be applied as for infrastructure. No building permit if there are not adequate services and facilities especially schools and community centres. Basically, we do not

have enough elementary schools in our area right now. How can the city possibly approve ANY NEW proposals until this is resolved!

## 5. Transportation

Crowded streets are already a problem in this area. Any new traffic planning should ensure that east west residential side streets are not used to take pressure off North South corridors. There are many children in this neighbourhood and busy traffic is not for them. Also, 30K speed limits in these areas should be rigidly enforced.

### Submission #4

I'm writing to ask you to help improve cycling infrastructure in Midtown Toronto by supporting the proposed Midtown Loop. The arterial roads in Midtown are currently not ideal for cycling, so many people in the area are reluctant to cycle because they don't feel safe. With more and more people moving into the area, it makes sense to give people options for transportation that are efficient, healthy, safe, and sustainable. Residents of Midtown, as well as visitors from nearby areas, will frequent local businesses if they are easier to access, and considering the average distances between residence and shopping destination, cycling is often the best choice of transportation for most people.

Since both Mt. Pleasant and Yonge are wide streets, there is lots of room to add bike lanes or cycle tracks in most areas and still retain street parking. The recent changes to Bloor Street are a testament to the viability of this option.

Having a Midtown Loop with bike lanes would also link to existing routes such as the Beltline Trail and Mt. Pleasant Cemetery, which would encourage people to take advantage of the growing cycling network for their commute to work, recreational cycling, shopping, or meeting friends. With the Eglinton Crosstown coming in the next few years, the whole area could be transformed into an exciting destination for people arriving on foot and by bicycle.

I do most of my shopping and errands by bicycle and am comfortable cycling on the road alongside cars. However, many people are not comfortable doing this and so they drive instead, even if it's just a short drive and parking is a pain. With the new plans for Midtown, it makes good sense to provide bike lanes so that more people will choose to cycle instead of drive. To cite the Bloor bike lanes again, the numbers and anecdotal evidence both show that more people will cycle if there are designated bike lanes.

Thank you.

### Submission #5

Having lived in midtown for 3 years, the future of midtown is very important to me.

As the population of the neighborhood grows, a really important feature of the Midtown Plan needs to be safe cycling. There are so many destinations within the midtown area, that a local resident rarely needs to leave to run most of their weekly errands. However, there are many destinations which are beyond a reasonable walking distance (more than 15 minutes). Cycling needs to be a viable and safe alternative to enable more Midtowners to shop locally, and do so without using their cars.

In terms of traveling east/west within the Midtown in Focus study area, there are already several safe cycling options on quiet neighbourhood streets. Also Eglinton and Davisville have both been approved for future bike lanes through Eglinton Connects and the 10 year cycling network plan respectively.

However, there are few safe cycling options for traveling North/South within midtown. Since there are a significant number of destinations along Yonge and Mount Pleasant, these street are both great candidates for safe cycling infrastructure. They are also both continuous making it easy for Midtowners to cycle quickly and directly through the area. I also understand that both of these streets have very wide curb to curb distances which would mean that bike lanes could be added without removing parking or a lane of travel.

I strongly urge you to include safe cycling infrastructure on Yonge and Mt Pleasant in your Midtown plan.

Thanks

#### Submission #5

First of all, I believe that most of the attendees felt that the topics up for discussion were very relevant and important.

However, it was perhaps too ambitious to cover so much material at one meeting, especially since it was only the first time that most of the topics were introduced to the group. As a result I felt that the presentations didn't leave enough time for Q and A and the workshops were too short and didn't leave enough time for well formulated comments and recommendations.

Although there is an opportunity to participate in several similar workshops at the Feb 10th Open House, I would recommend that at least one more Midtown Planning Group meeting be held for these topics after the Feb 10th Open House.

I don't have any comments to provide on the Community Services and Municipal Servicing presentations other than not getting enough info or discussion time to provide feedback.

I did spend time on providing comments re. the transportation assessment as per the attached file and in a summary below:

I felt that the scope of the transportation assessment was too narrow by only focusing on the local transportation network. The elephant in the room is the subway transit capacity and you

can't assess local transportation without factoring in subway transit availability (the more constraint transit is, the more pass-thru and Study area car trips). I did suggest a short subway relieve line to run from Eglinton via Davisville (make use of a widened trench) and then slightly westward south to cross the Bloor line at Bay and hook up with the University line at "Museum" or "Queens Park". Alternatively, an express bus route down Yonge Street with it's own dedicated lane (during rush hour).

The assessment also did not consider the impact of changing transportation models such as e-commerce deliveries, ride hailing, connected and autonomous vehicles.

Unfortunately, the MIF plan does NOT envision a major expansion of local office space, which could have alleviated some of the transportation pressures.

I felt that the "Place-Making Moves" were a good way to accommodate growing pedestrian traffic in the high growth apartment neighbourhoods to get to transit (but then .. no capacity?).

Regarding cycling, I can see benefit in providing dedicated bike lanes to travel from home to work (down Yonge?) and laying out bike routes in the Study area to navigate our neighbourhood (to cut down on local car usage), but I don't see a lot of use for residents riding their bike to the subway to get to work. All the high density neighbourhoods will be within a 15 minute walk from a subway or LRT station. By the way, I don't think Dutch cycling culture easily transfers to a Toronto environment and even if cycling (to work) were to grow significantly, I suspect that the growth in transportation needs will far exceed the cycling volume to be created (electric assisted bikes might provide a boost for cycling).

In terms of Midtown (intersection) congestion, there will be a number of rush hour bottlenecks at major north-south and east-west crossings and at some busy points inside the apartment neighbourhoods (mostly in the Roehampton and Soudan apartment neighbourhoods, such as Cowbell Lane), that will need resolving.

## Submission #6

### **MIDTOWN LOOP**

Goals of the study include:

- the "prioritizing active transportation and transit"; and
- "identification of local pedestrian and cycling network connections"

The 10 Year Bike Plan envisions bike lanes on Eglinton Ave. and Davisville Ave. These are essential to make east-west travel safer for cyclists. However, as the attached map makes clear, a stronger need is to connect the dense nodes at Yonge/ Eglinton and Yonge/ Davisville – which entails creating safe cycling infrastructure for **north/ south** travel. It is essential that the Yonge Street Corridor Study result in bike lanes on Yonge Street in the study area. Likewise, bike lanes should be built on Mt. Pleasant from St. Clair all the way (at least) to Eglinton Ave.

The resulting rectangle would form a “Midtown Loop” that connects dense population centres to main street shopping on Yonge Mt. Pleasant and Eglinton.

High order bike lane design is appropriate, using Dutch best practices (which are the gold standard, worldwide).

## **PARKS**

Parkland provisioning is low in most of the Midtown study area. The creation of small neighbourhood parks fulfills certain functions, such as providing playgrounds for children or space to walk dogs. Unfortunately, the Midtown does not have any truly large, destination parks that can provide an immersive experience for families who may want to spend a significant amount of time in green space. To access these, it is necessary for Midtown residents to travel further afield.

I would therefore recommend that Objective #4 “Connect” be expanded to include connections to destinations such as Sunnybrook Park and Cedarvale Ravine. Eglinton Connects will provide good LRT and cycling connections. I believe that it is appropriate to direct some Section 42 reserve funds contributed by condo developments in Midtown to facilitating these connections – in particular, enhancing links between the Crosstown LRT transit stops and bike lanes and destination parks.

## **LIBRARIES**

Just as it is recognized that increased parkland provisioning is essential to keep up with the burgeoning growth of the midtown, so we should be adding to the number of libraries. If we do not, then the Midtown will eventually have far fewer libraries per capita than neighbourhoods that are undergoing a decrease in population. I contend that the TPL’s stable branch number policy is mistaken, and is not appropriate for a metropolis that is growing as rapidly as Toronto. The best location for a new library would be Yonge and Davisville.

Also, the Mt. Pleasant branch is too small and should be moved to a larger site in the same locale – perhaps in the podium of a condo building.



### Submission #7

Are safety and flood plans included in the Midtown Plan?

Is the security of ground water included?

Are historic buildings/homes protected?

I think we are fairly high, but there are springs and rivers in the area. There are homes that were used in Pears Brick Co. Also, the area was part of the native farming village.

I hope you are doing well. Thanks for all your work.