

Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study

Local Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 7, 2018

6:30-9:00pm

Scarborough Civic Centre

Room M41/42

Meeting Overview

On Wednesday, February 7, 2018, City Planning staff hosted a meeting of the Local Advisory Committee (LAC) for the Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study. The mandate of the LAC is to provide a forum for feedback, guidance and advice to the Project Team at key points during the public consultation process.

The purpose of the LAC meeting was to set the context with Phase 1 process and results, review and discuss the Phase 2 approach, and review and discuss the Preliminary Development Alternatives.

The meeting began with a welcome and introductions by City of Toronto staff. This was followed by a presentation by the consultant, SvN, which included the following topics:

- Review of study process
- Phase 1 results including key findings, key messages from the Visioning Workshop, draft Guiding Principles, and draft Vision
- Introduce the approach for Phase 2 including developing and evaluating Development Alternatives
- Introduce Preliminary Development Alternatives

Following the presentation, there was a facilitated discussion with the following focus questions:

1. What are your thoughts on the Phase 1 Results (draft vision and draft guiding principles)? Do you have any suggested refinements?
2. Does the Phase 2 Approach seem clear? Is there any additional information that could be added to make it clearer?
3. Are the differences between the Development Alternatives clear? Do you have any suggested refinements to clarify or strengthen the Development Alternatives?

Finally, the meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps.

Summary of Feedback

Questions and comments from LAC members are included in regular font.

Responses and comments from the City and consultant team are included in *italics*.

Please note that this summary is not intended to be a verbatim transcript.

Question 1: What are your thoughts on the Phase 1 Results (draft vision and draft guiding principles)? Do you have any suggested refinements?

- When we did the Visioning Workshop there were many different pictures that were meant as an aide in the discussion – if I knew that was going to be a component I would have brought my own pictures because there weren't any pictures at the meeting that included/expressed my vision.
- For the pictures at the Visioning Workshop, the names of the categories didn't always match with the pictures provided.
- I am from the Wexford Residents Building (nursing home/seniors home). We have to rebuild within the next 8 years and we need land. When this closes the community will be without a nursing home for seniors. I'm not sure if you are looking at multi-residential housing through this process.
 - *SvN response: Yes, this is something we are looking at.*
 - *City response: As part of this process we are looking at community service facilities, including what the need is now and what the potential need will be based on future growth and an aging population. While at the City we're not in the business of directly providing land for a specific use. We do look at identifying what is needed and will be needed to help facilitate a process of providing space. One of the main aims of this process is to put in a framework so that everyone knows what is expected.*
- Warden Ave, being in-between a subway and LRT, has a lot of vacant land. We need to think about how to use these lands properly. This land is well connected to transportation, including two major transit stations (subway and future LRT). The Warden corridor has a lot of volume going through. We are focusing so much on Eglinton, we should also be focusing on Warden.
 - *SvN response: The TMP is looking at a broader area. We are looking at impacts in the broader area, but not looking as much at development potential beyond the Secondary Plan Study Area.*
- Regarding the process graphic from the slide show, I may not have understood it before I signed up for this process but it would have been helpful to see this graphic at the start of the process, at the first public meeting. Additionally, it would have been helpful to see an example of a final report from another area to help understand how the process could unfold. I came across the O'Connor report online. Seeing a report like this would have been helpful.

Question 2: Does the Phase 2 Approach seem clear? Is there any additional information that could be added to make it clearer?

- Since we are already getting an LRT, this has already been decided. But I heard a number once that we would not get a LRT stop unless there were 100,000 people, can you speak to that?
 - *SvN response: From the Province's perspective, one of the new provincial policies states there is a minimum density target of 12,500 people and jobs combined within 500m of a station. This is a minimum. There is some flexibility in the way the City can apply this policy, i.e. the City can average it along a line / corridor. For Golden Mile there are 5 stops across the entire corridor and the City can decide how to average the number out along the whole corridor.*
 - *City response: Figuring out this average is ongoing at the City.*
 - Concern that Golden Mile could be the high-density area to average out other low-density areas.
- Is there a general accepted mix of different types of uses – residential, economic, industrial, etc.?
 - *Response: There isn't a ratio per se, but part of this study is to match with our economic study that is looking at what we should have to provide a healthy balance of different uses.*
- *City comment: In terms of transportation, we are also thinking about how to improve the pedestrian and cycling environment (active transportation) throughout the area.*
- There were no specific comments on the clarity of the phase 2 process.

Question 3: Are the differences between the Development Alternatives clear? Do you have any suggested refinements to clarify or strengthen the Development Alternatives?

- What are the blue arrows on the map?
 - *SvN response: Open space connections.*
- It would be helpful to layer onto this the 500 m radius you mentioned because the focus of that is the LRT stops which is really important.
- I like the gateway option. For a neighbourhood, it is nice to have a defined entry and exit. Did you give any thought to having mini-clusters going east and west?
- On the western gateway, I know the first thought is you are entering from Eglinton. Also part of this gateway is coming up Victoria Park and O'Connor. Gateway should also include these entry points.
- For Alternative C, the clusters are not along Eglinton. Why are they not centered around Eglinton?
 - *SvN response: This is something we could look at in this study.*
- As part of the Visioning workshop you had a lot of frontages along Eglinton. I'm wondering why you would have low-rise along Eglinton. Also wondering how having the high-rise further to the back would affect the new policy of no net shadow on the public realm.

- *Response: Pink on the maps represents low to mid-rise. Along Eglinton this could be up to 12 storeys.*
- Do you have a number of storeys/height for the high rise?
 - *Response: Not at this stage.*
 - It would be good to have a sense of this before the end of the study.
- I understand there is no way for anyone to get off public transit between Birchmount and Warden. Did you take this into consideration?
 - *Response: Correct, there is no planned stop between Birchmount and Warden. The planned distance is 500m. There is a plan to have supplementary bus service to provide local access and connections between the LRT stops.*
- Do the Blue lines emphasis walking paths, and the black lines emphasis driving?
 - *Response: Black lines would be either dedicated pedestrian connections or vehicle connections.*
 - Speaking on behalf of the residents, we don't want to generate more vehicle traffic into the community south of Eglinton, but we would like to have a pedestrian connection through the community.
- I'm surprised to see high density in the south west area because currently it is primarily single residential homes.
 - *City response: Keep in mind that these are medium to high density.*
 - Even with medium density I think there would be opposition.
- Are all 3 development scenarios expected to have the same amount of density and just concentrated in different areas or different amounts of density?
 - *Response: We do have minimum targets. We are going to try and keep some consistency between the options, but they won't be exactly the same. The modelling between the built form and transportation will be iterative. Understanding these models will help us refine the density.*
- There are multiple high-rises proposed by developers. What is the point of going through this? We can't stop developers from building high-rises.
 - *City response: That is in effect the planning process. If you have a property owner and community with a different vision it has to be addressed through council and ultimately the OMB (Ontario Municipal Board). Right now, we don't have any defined plans for this area. We are working on defined plans. We have property owners with a vision for their properties and we are developing a vision for the area. We don't know where we will meet. Three of the landowners have OPA applications, and we have commented on these to say that we want these to advance with the study. One of the developers has submitted a rezoning application – they are a little further along. They have put in an application. Our position is that we cannot make a decision until we work through this process. Currently it is not deemed complete (there is missing information). Once it is deemed complete, we will have to start the process of reviewing it. Any property owner can appeal to the OMB. Once an application has been submitted there is a time limit to review the application. Once the time has expired any landowner can appeal to the OMB*

to have them adjudicate and make a decision. One of the landowner has appealed to the OMB because the City has not made a decision.

- Will you let us know when this hearing is so we can appear at it?
 - *City response: The Board will give notice within 120 meters. We are still at the pre-hearing stage currently. When we do get appeals it doesn't necessarily mean that it will go to a hearing. First it goes to a pre-hearing. The City's challenge is to show that a fulsome planning process (e.g. a secondary planning process, what we are doing here) should take its course so that everyone is subject to the same context.*
 - Tall buildings go against what makes the Golden Mile special with open spaces. There are studies that tall buildings don't help create community. In colder countries such as Canada, it doesn't make environmental sense to block out the sun and create shadows.
 - *Response: When we come up with the massing we can have a more informed discussion about this.*
 - Alternative C – I would like to see the LRT stations more directly reflected in these options, it is such a huge investment from the province.
 - You also need to think about the scale that is being shown and make it clear.
 - Alternative B – I'm concerned that it doesn't create density around the other LRT stations.
 - *Response: The medium density outside of the central area could be up to 12 storeys. Going forward, we will need to explain the density in more detail.*
 - After the meeting, let me know if the community can do anything to help argue the point that the development that has been appealed to the OMB should be looked at in the context of this plan, not in isolation.
 - We don't want it to become "us" and "them" (existing residents versus new residents). The Central Hub alternative looks like it would create an "us" and "them". The ones that have more walking paths look like it creates more options for everyone to connect to the surrounding communities.
-

Next Steps

- We are going to the Design Review Panel on Feb 24.
- At the next Community Meeting, we will be seeking feedback on evaluation framework and development alternatives.
- At the next TAC & LAC meetings, we will review the evaluation framework and engage in the selection of a preferred development alternative.
- The background report will be posted soon to the website. We encourage you to continue to visit the website to get updates on the process.
- We are going to Scarborough Community Council with a status report on Feb 21st. This is an information report to say that we are moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and explain the key findings from Phase 1.

Question: Will we be able to see the refined alternatives before the DRP.

- *Response: No, we are not refining the alternatives before the DRP meeting. This will be the first time we are going to the DRP and will be explaining the approach.*

Question: Do we get a picture of those 3 models tonight?

- *Response: We can post the LAC component. Keep in mind this is a very high level, first blush of how to differentiate all of the opportunities into different scenarios. These alternatives don't get down into the details.*