

Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study

Local Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, June 5, 2019

Meeting Overview

On Wednesday, June 5, 2019, City Planning staff hosted a meeting of the Local Advisory Committee (LAC) for the Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study (GMSP). 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.

Those in attendance included City staff, consultants from SvN Architects & Planners and HDR (consultants for the Transportation Master Plan), Councillor Gary Crawford and Deputy Mayor Michael Thompson. The meeting was attended by 19 members of the LAC.

The first part of the meeting was an open house where attendees had an opportunity to view display boards and ask questions of staff and consultants. A presentation was also given by the consultants which included the following topics:

- Review of study process
- A summary of the proposed infrastructure improvements (Big Moves)
- A draft final demonstration concept showing how the principles of the Secondary Plan can be achieved
- Proposed character areas envisioned by the Secondary Plan
- A summary of how the Secondary Plan can be implemented
- Next steps for the Study

Following the presentation, there was a discussion based on the following discussion questions:

1. Do you have any suggested refinements to the Draft Final Design?
2. Do you have any suggestions on how to present the Draft Final Design at the 4th Community Consultation Meeting?

The discussion session is summarized in the section below.

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 provided for information purposes only. It is not intended to be a verbatim transcript.

- Were new LAC members added, since the expansion of the study area, to represent North York & East York?
 - Yes.
- Is the West Park / Meadoway character area showing redevelopment of buildings along Craigton?
 - *Yes, it's showing potential redevelopment over the long term.*
 - *The realignment would align Craigton and Ashtonbee to provide another east-west connection.*
- What will be considered in the Environmental Assessment (EA)?
 - *This would be a 5-stage municipal class Environmental Assessment with the following stages:*
 1. *Identify problem*
 2. *Identify and assess alternatives*
 3. *Alternative design concepts for preferred solution*
 4. *Environmental study report*
 5. *Implementation*
 - *There is public consultation throughout this process.*
 - *The Transportation Master Plan completed as part of this study counts as phases 1 and 2 of the EA. Future phases still need to be conducted at a later date.*
- Have you accounted for the possibility that everyone will still own and use a vehicle?
 - *We recognize that vehicle ownership is high in this area, but there is a shift in behaviour.*
- It's difficult to cycle here. It seems like cycle lanes dead end here.
 - *The plans only show the study area, but there are plans for cycle lanes along Eglinton (entire corridor was identified as part of the Eglinton Connects study) and Victoria Park.*
- For tower heights in the demonstration plan, is the height shown the total height or just the tower portion (not podium)?
 - *The total height is shown.*
- I'm happy to see extra roads being put in. However, there are new north-south streets and it looks like those streets will funnel traffic onto Eglinton to go further east.
 - *Mitigation will be required to manage traffic. We hope that the realigned O'Connor will help with this. That is why holds on development are needed until infrastructure is in place.*
- Would building extra roads encourage driving and counter the shift to transit?
 - *We expect to see a shift to transit but recognize that people will still drive.*
- I thought all parking was going to be underground. You mentioned on-street parking. Where would you put on-street parking? On arterial or side streets?
 - *We're looking at on-street parking for arterial roads and local streets, potentially on Golden Mile Blvd or Ashtonbee. We are also looking at Rideshare and how to manage the curbside.*
- With regards to your question on how to present the draft final design at the community consultation meeting, some of the boards and presentation slides appear more controversial

than others. For example, showing the O'Connor conceptual alignment options encourages discussion & feedback, while showing the maps with the preferred design makes it seem like it's been decided already.

- You should have more panels.
- Need to address connections to outside of the study area, especially north of the hydro corridor.
- I was at the community meeting for the O'Connor development proposals (1861 O'Connor & 1460 Victoria Park). Those plans don't seem to reflect these plans you presented today.
 - *We have been in contact with those applicants and North York staff so they are aware of what is proposed in this study. The expansion of the study area boundary earlier this year has helped with this communication. Please note that the exact alignment of the reconfigured O'Connor Drive is still to be determined.*
- What has been proposed in current development applications has higher densities than what is shown here.
 - *We acknowledge that. It may be possible to achieve higher densities depending on what benefits are delivered. Transportation capacity would also need to be addressed.*
- There are no pictures in the slides that shows buildings that are 30 storeys or higher, while these are proposed in the plan.
- The plans don't look like there is accommodation for retail, especially large format retail, and community facilities. The plans show Privately-Owned Public Spaces (POPS) but don't show the large footprints of these facilities.
 - *We anticipate that large format retail will remain in the short/medium term, and potentially even the long term. We also anticipate some of them may be incorporated into the bottom of buildings with a smaller footprint. This is a very urban plan.*
- With regards to development phasing (how much development can occur prior to the implementation of key infrastructure), are these for each block?
 - *Yes.*
- At the community consultation meeting, you might get some questions about how Bill 108 might impact community facilities.
 - *To date, we have no direction on what else to go on and this current plan is based on parkland dedication rates in place at the time. Right now, we will continue with business as usual.*
- The 3D rendering helps with the presentation, but I agree with the previous comment about showing pictures of higher buildings.
- With regards to communication, I don't like to hear people say "you'll never see this" for a long term plan. It doesn't encourage participation.
- Does the City of Toronto own any land in that area?
 - *The City only owns Eglinton Square Parkette and the connection to the Meadoway. What is shown as parkland dedication on the plans will eventually become City land.*
- Is there no place for a community centre?

- *Various community services sectors have been involved in this process and have provided comments. The approach for community recreation centres is to enhance the existing centres and not build a new centre.*
- I think the community recreation centre approach needs a whole other presentation. People will want to know what's "in it" for them. They are concerned about how they will live and play.
- In the slide, it says we "need to incentivize developers". That means trade-offs – is this necessary?
 - *Based on our past discussions with landowners, we do think there is room for discussion and negotiation.*