



## **Yorkdale Shopping Centre Block Master Plan & Yorkdale Transportation Master Plan**

### **Local Advisory Committee Meeting #4 - Minutes**

**Tuesday April 13, 2020**

**WebEx Meeting**

**6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the Block Master Plan and receive input from committee members. Also, to provide an update on the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and receive feedback on the TMP short list of potential solutions, detailed evaluation criteria, and partial evaluation of some solutions.

#### **The meeting agenda included:**

**6:30 p.m. Introductions and Review of Agenda**

**6:40 p.m. Block Master Plan Update**

**7:20 p.m. Transportation Master Plan Update & Final Mobility Solutions Short List**

**7:50 p.m. Transportation Master Plan Detailed Evaluation Process and Evaluation Criteria**

**8:25 p.m. Next Steps & Wrap Up**

#### **1. Introductions and Review of Agenda**

The meeting was facilitated by Stephanie Gris Bringas, City of Toronto. Each member introduced themselves.

Note: The discussion captured is summarized below. Questions are noted with a "Q", comments with "C", answers with "A", and action items with "Action."

#### **2. Block Master Plan Update**

Guy Matthew presented the update on the Block Master Plan.

The discussion is provided below.

**Q:** Has COVID and the current situation informed decisions?

**A:** The current situation has not affected parkland and roads directly. There may not be a direct role but COVID has certainly given everyone pause for thought in terms of the importance of green space and outdoor common areas for community. It has made people more appreciative of outdoor space, and in a high-density area you need to be more cognizant of giving plenty of options for outdoor space. It has had a positive, indirect effect on the plan.

**Q:** Has Oxford voted against the idea of the bridge to Dufferin via mall construction? Or is that undecided?

**A:** The idea that Yorkdale needs to have an address on Dufferin still holds. The east-west corridor inside the mall that runs past the front of Holt Renfrew is to be extended out into the parking lot in front of Joeys and will continue west in a straight line out to Dufferin. This may be more of an outdoor space that is to be either partially covered or open, that would lead out to a plaza, which would be an arrival point, point of address, or point of orientation for Yorkdale on Dufferin. It may not be a fully enclosed mall. It may possibly be an open arcade or partially covered outdoor space. A connection is key. It will be engaging and connect with the existing corridors inside the mall.

**Q:** The 20-storey building at the Allen Express and bus terminal area, is that on top of what is there?

**A:** That would involve removal and building on the location of the 6-storey office building that is there now.

**C:** That new building would be an office, not residential.

**Q:** The 29-storey building on Dufferin overshadows the park that is there. Could extra density not be picked up at another building further north, to leave the area more open?

**A:** Shadowing and impacts on the park is something to look at. Are you suggesting that the building disappear entirely?

**C:** No, put a mid-rise building. The density lost there can be picked up further north. There is no sunlight for three quarters of the day at Dufferin and Lawrence because of the height of the buildings, so the 29-storey building will create overshadowing.

**C:** I'm suggesting that the tower that has 29 floors can alternatively be made in line with the 17-storey building. The density that is lost can be added to the north-west corner near Highway 401. The 12 floors lost from the 29-storey building can be spread among three other buildings.

**C:** Get rid of the building, as the footprint of the building is going to be a tall, needle-like building. Removing that building from the plan and setting it up as parkland and then redistributing the units will allow for a more cohesive look.

**Q:** Why is the height being distributed there? Why could it not be a 10-storey building or why could it not be eliminated completely with heights being redistributed? What is the significance of the 29-, 28- and 30-storey buildings at the highway?

**A:** The park is a good size and is quite substantial. The shape is favourable, and we like that it has a sense of enclosure to it, in the sense of having the 12-storey building to the south and the north side building. It is a hectare of park in front of Restoration Hardware. It is a well-defined park or square. That was the thinking behind what is seen today.

**C:** In the plan there is a circular form that extends from the north-east corner of Yorkdale, around and then down to the south-west corner. That's an idea that David Pontarini came up with: a notion of creating something iconic – a crescent – something that would be very different from anything that currently exists in Toronto.

**C:** A crescent of that form needs to have a continuous frontage or an edge to define it. We have created a 4-storey podium that is consistent in height that is going to lead all around with the

residential towers coming up above that. The more that we trim the crescent back, the less that that gesture starts to make any sense. It is important for the community that is going to be coming to visit Yorkdale and the new community of residents who will live here, to really feel that they are somewhere with a strong sense of place. That is a challenge with the 401 running immediately to the north. We are consciously trying to create a buffer and edge along that.

**C:** The height of the buildings that are being proposed along Dufferin are consistent with the heights of the buildings on the other side of Dufferin. If you go down to Dufferin and Lawrence, you will see another 30-storey tower and 18-storey tower. A number of tall buildings at that intersection are consistent in terms of the heights that we are looking for at Yorkdale.

**C:** The individuals who are familiar with Dufferin and with the Yorkdale frontage will know that there is an existing truck tunnel that leads to the underground. The building that is being proposed to the south of the truck tunnel creates an edge to the park that we see as one that contributes to the liveliness of the park with potentially outdoor restaurants and terraces.

**C:** So there would be the building rather than the truck tunnel, as the edge of the park, which would not contribute to the life of the park. On Dufferin it is an important consideration because there is not a lot north of this, once you get to the 401. The liveliness would be there throughout the whole year.

**C:** It was suggested that liveliness could further be imposed without the 29-storey building. The Dufferin and Lawrence precedent is probably one that is not worth emulating. I would like to see some of the shadow models when we get further along. The intentions are good, but 29 storeys and 27 storeys is a little off, structurally and visually.

**C:** The shadow studies that were produced will be looked at. Nothing alarming has come out of them thus far. We will look again and deal with any issues related to shadow.

**Q:** Have there been any projections as to who is moving into the residential units? Would it be families, or younger individuals who will be having families soon? If so, what is the status of childcare centres and recreation facilities?

**A:** There is a community services study that Urban Strategies has been looking at, but Parks, Forestry & Recreation hasn't identified the need for a community centre this far. There is definitely space within the podiums to provide community spaces and daycares. We can accommodate these things within the development, they just need to be identified. The City has put out the Growing Up urban design guidelines which contemplate that 25% of new development units be 2- or 3-bedroom units. However, there would be no control over whether a three-bedroom unit would be occupied by a family or three university students living together. The idea would be to provide units with a range of sizes and typologies to accommodate families in the future.

**Q:** Would you go as far as to zone some of those areas for community purposes only and not just commercial?

**A:** We are not writing zoning policy right now; we are only writing Official Plan policy. We can write Official Plan policy that talks about identifying needs. We do not want to write policy that is so tied down that, 10 years from now, things have not changed. We look at policy that looks at providing community services and provide that unit mix, but we will not get specific because of the length of time over which the site is being built.

**Q:** Has any thought gone into what will be built first?

**A:** The general thinking is to start at the Dufferin end because it is a more natural place to connect to the shopping centre. We want to make sure that, as we build, there are strong connections back to what is already on site. Things can change, and it could be that, in the north-east corner of the site where there is a cluster of buildings, maybe there is a situation where that is an opportunity to also build in an earlier phase. There are a variety of different phasing plans in the works.

**Q:** Where does the Cartwright re-alignment fit? Is that prioritized?

**A:** The re-alignment of Cartwright will probably happen when the Dufferin Park gets built. We want that park to be built during the first phase. The green space must be built in concert with the development of the first tower.

**Q:** Are these units available for purchase? Or are these rental units?

**A:** The vast majority would be rental units, as it fits our mandate as a company that pays pensions. We need to have a continuous revenue that comes from rental units.

### **3. Transportation Master Plan Update & Final Mobility Solutions Short List**

Gary Papas presented the update on the Transportation Master Plan.

The discussion is provided below.

#### **Short List of Potential Transit Solutions**

**Q:** The idea of 'zero-cost' improvements was mentioned previously, one of which would be to run a pilot to have the Dufferin bus loop into the mall, pick up people at Shoppers Drug Mart, and exit back to Dufferin, rather than having people walk out to Dufferin. Has this idea been considered?

**A:** The City raised the idea of diverting a bus from Dufferin into the mall site with the TTC. Dufferin is a priority corridor and diverting a bus off route causes inefficiencies. A pilot would be a good idea, assuming that sufficient infrastructure is in place. The hope is to have Oxford build the mall out as close to Dufferin so that there is a better relationship between Dufferin and the shopping mall.

**C:** Between Bathurst and Dufferin on Ranee Avenue, a suggestion would be a monorail.

#### **Solution 19**

**Q:** Regarding the Ranee bus service proposal, is a bus being proposed to go from Bathurst to Dufferin? Ranee is the only street that connects Dufferin and Bathurst Street and is used as a short cut for people driving and is usually full of cars.

**A:** It is more about improving bus service routing. There is only a small section of Ranee that has bus service now. It is the 109 bus that runs from Flemington Road up to Neptune Drive. It is really about creating an east-west connection between Dufferin and Bathurst. But those discussions will have to happen with TTC.

#### **Short List of Potential Active Transportation Solutions**

**Q:** On the map it says 'planned active transportation'. What does this mean?

**A:** The solid green lines are existing trail systems. The dotted-hatched line is what has been proposed or recommended through other completed studies. There is also policy and other guiding documents, like the Cycling Network Plan, which identify proposed cycling infrastructure across the city.

### **Solution 25A**

**Q:** To add a sidewalk to a residential area, I think you need a certain percentage of homeowners on a street to be in favor, is that still the process?

**A:** No. Transportation Services has delegated authority to put sidewalks on various types of streets. City staff will follow up to clarify this.

**C:** There are requests for sidewalk installations at the north/east corner of Lawrence and Keele. Due to COVID measures, staff will conduct site visits once safety protocols allow.

**A:** Typically, sidewalk requests through a Councillor's office go to the district manager for Transportation Services Issues Management. For North York District, the manager is Dan Clement.

### **Post-meeting note:**

*On Local roads, Transportation Services has delegated authority to install sidewalks:*

- a) where they are missing, on either one or both sides of the road as part of road reconstruction*
- b) where accommodation for a person or persons with a disability, as defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code, is identified.*

*The City's Missing Sidewalk Installation Policy specifies that, for Local roads, staff will evaluate, prioritize, and propose the addition of missing sidewalks, and make recommendations on missing sidewalks for consideration by City Council on an annual basis. Public consultation is not a part of this process, but when a new sidewalk is planned, City staff are required to consult with adjacent property owners as part of the design process to minimize impacts to property.*

### **Short List of Potential Road Solutions**

#### **Solution 2B**

**Q:** Regarding the Rustic connection (solution 2B), have you looked at tunnelling under the Barrie GO rail corridor? Or is an overpass the only option?

**A:** When looking at potential grade separations, we look at both underpass and overpass. The issue with connecting Cartwright to Rustic is that the latter is at a higher elevation. An underpass would result in quite a "climb" to meet Rustic. In order to meet the grade at Rustic with an underpass, it would likely be further west of where we are showing with an overpass – resulting in more property impacts.

**C:** Area residents will not support the Rustic connection. Would you have to expropriate the homes that only have access on Rustic?

**A:** Expropriation is the last resort; we would work with property owners to come to an agreement, if property needs to be acquired.

**Q:** Is Floral Parkway (solution 21A) an active transportation (pedestrian and cycling connection) only, whereas Rustic could potentially be an auto connection (2B) or active transportation connection (21B)? Would the two solutions for Rustic potentially be carried forward at the same time or is it too early to discuss?

**A:** In terms of auto connections over the Barrie GO rail corridor, both Rustic/Cartwright and Floral/Bridgeland were looked at, and Floral was screened out. Rustic has been short listed for further evaluation, however there are concerns with that solution from a policy and traffic infiltration perspective. In terms of the TMP process, staff make recommendations, but it is City Council that approves those recommendations. We understand Councillor Nunziata is not in favor of any new auto connections on Rustic or Floral.

### **Solution 13**

**Q:** With solution 13, is there a hybrid solution that keeps the loop? People often make an illegal left turn onto the South Service Road. What ends up happening is the following: As you are coming southbound on Dufferin, you are allowed to make a left turn into the ESSO gas station. So people make a left turn, loop around, and then come back to access the mall. There needs to be something to block that. Can we retain the south bound entrance (McAdam loop) and add a southbound left turn too? A suggestion would be to align that ramp and put a left turn lane there, or have the South Service Road go straight out to Dufferin. People are making the left turn regardless – what if we legalize it by putting in lights? People making the turn because they do not realize the proper way to come in is by the loop.

**C:** It seems redundant to have two access points to the mall at the same location. We need to consider improving signage/wayfinding to the McAdam Loop.

**Q:** People are making that turn illegally, so make it a legal turn. There needs to be reinforcement that Cartwright is not the entrance. Create an option that says 'retain plus change' for solution 13. Do you have that scenario?

**A:** We have that scenario because, if we retain the loop, that provides the free flow access into the mall. By putting a signal in the vicinity of the South Service Road that allows southbound lefts you are confusing people because you're telling people that they can get into the mall by making a southbound left, but you can also get into the mall making a southbound right. In addition, the southbound left would result in queuing along Dufferin.

**C:** A suggestion would be to do a count and figure out how many people are doing that illegal turn. Why not introduce both, monitor it, and if it turns out that people aren't using that southbound left turn then get rid of it. If MTO will get annoyed with a lot of queuing, you need to study the problem more to see what the current flows and biases are.

**C:** The biggest problem of the loop is the signage. You do not know you are making the right until you are at the loop. So, either cars are crossing over lanes to get to the loop, or making the illegal left turn. If you put another light to make the left legal, it means that you will have a light there, and a light at Yorkdale, and another light at Ranee. That short stretch of road will be a 10-

minute drive on a good day. I would suggest putting a bigger sign that would allow for the loop to be more efficient.

**A:** Noted.

### **Solution 8**

**Q:** Where is the on-ramp being proposed? Would it be in the park?

**A:** The proposed change is to re-align the ramp to the west of the park.

**Q:** Right now, to get onto the eastbound 401, you have to go through Yorkdale to go east and westbound. Are you still on the Yorkdale side, or on the Baycrest Park side?

**A:** That ramp re-alignment is on the east side of the Allen road, west of Baycrest Park.

**Q:** Will people still be able to access the on-ramp from Yorkdale Road and Yorkdale Mall?

**A:** Yes.

**C:** That is a significant left-hand turn to the on-ramp.

**C:** There would be a traffic signal controlling the northbound off-ramp from Allen Road. There was one lane that allowed continuous flow. The existing left hand turn lane would be controlled by a traffic signal. There would then be another lane that crosses over the northbound direction that continues along Allen Road. Picture the westbound travel lane, it would continue contraflow and then would have free-flow access to the ramp.

**Q:** What is the timing of the Varna Road extension? I thought it has not been authorized yet, because at the last meeting regarding the park, we were advised that the plan is 20 years down the road.

**C:** We are unsure of the timing. The road re-alignment was proposed in the Lawrence Allen Secondary Plan, which is really a notional line on the map. To date, there has been no Environmental Assessment beyond the secondary plan/TMP, completing phases 1 and 2, similar to this study, but we would need to evaluate all the alternatives and where the alignments would be. It hasn't been identified in any capital budget, so in terms of its status it is only at a policy level and timing is to be determined.

### **Solution 32**

**Q:** With solution 32, was there any insight into widening Dufferin to create more space to merge into the HOV from the 401 eastbound off-ramp?

**A:** We have looked at modifications to the southbound curb lane, and the two options we have explored either prioritize transit/pedestrians/cyclists, or prioritize cars.

**A:** Some time ago, MTO was looking at the design of the off-ramp to the Bridgeland intersection. They assessed a T-intersection with a signal, but the resulting delays and queuing on the off-ramp was not something MTO would support.

**Q:** Did that include widening Dufferin, or just the re-alignment of the ramp?

**A:** It was just the re-alignment of the ramp.

**C:** The intent was to make the ramp more of a “T”, to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists, and to give more frontage for the Holiday Inn site.

**Q:** Coming off and T-ing onto Dufferin would require a traffic light?

**A:** Yes. They did some analysis with a signalized intersection and MTO noted that there would be quite a lot of queuing spillback onto the ramp, and it might even spill back onto the 401 main line. That was the rationale for not having a signal. They were okay with a stop sign but not a signal.

**Q:** What about getting rid of the off-ramp completely? You would just not get off the 401 to Dufferin. The 401 does not need to be a cloverleaf at every intersection, and it is not. If we were to eliminate it completely, Dufferin would get a nice break.

**Q:** How would the people in the area be expected to get home? If I cannot get off at Dufferin, then the next exit would be Yorkdale or Allen Road.

**A:** If we were to eliminate the Dufferin off-ramp, it would result in significant queuing at the Yorkdale off-ramp.

**C:** That scenario that should be investigated: how does eliminating that off-ramp, which frees up Dufferin a little, along with some other options, how does that play out?

**A:** A lot of the cars that now use Dufferin, they are going to start using the Yorkdale off-ramp and loop back to get to Dufferin, and there is going to be a lot of heavy queuing on the main line.

**C:** Reduce some of the hotel frontage to accommodate the five thousand units and widen Dufferin.

**C:** Policy direction must be looked at. If we are looking to expand the corridor, we need to look at all road users, not just motorists.

**C:** Increasing the cross section would make it a longer trip for pedestrians who are crossing Dufferin, requiring the need for longer green lights and proper crossing times, which start affecting traffic flow on Dufferin.

**C:** For an additional 3.3-metre-wide lane, it adds five extra seconds to pedestrian crossing times

**C:** There was traffic study for Dufferin. The proposed plan was to add one lane northbound and one southbound, prior to the condos. But widening Dufferin Street was eliminated. If adding one



lane would alleviate traffic, now is the time to do it. Adding an extra lane and expanding would help, regardless of the pedestrian crossing time.

**A:** There are two pinch points that would need to be considered: one is at the 401 underpass, the other is the Dufferin bridge over the McAdam loop. Both would need to be widened to accommodate an extra travel lane.

**C:** Consider a bi-directional auto lane, like the one on Jarvis.

**C:** If the five seconds ends up squashing the extra lane, then use the extra lane and make it a dedicated cycle path that connects to the Kay Gardner path or the North Park cycle path. The extra lane could serve multiple purposes.

**C:** Accommodating additional travel lanes will be a challenge because of the space.

#### **4. Transportation Master Plan Detailed Evaluation Process and Evaluation Criteria**

Gary Papas presented the Detailed Evaluation Process, Draft Evaluation Criteria and the Preliminary Future 2041 Evaluation.

The discussion is provided below.

##### **Partial Evaluation of Solutions 1A and 2B**

**C:** From Wilson going to Lawrence, all the lights should be synchronized to allow traffic to flow.

**C:** The modelling shows that getting onto the 401 at Keele for a quick exit to Dufferin in no way improves the usage of the 401. In this scenario (2B), neighbourhoods are being asked to share the burden of alleviating traffic. If the City is asking residents to help out to improve things, there should be an incentive that makes it appealing to them.

#### **5. Next Steps & Wrap Up**

Stephanie Gris Bringas presented the next steps and adjourned the meeting.

##### **Attendees**

##### **Local Advisory Committee Members**

Diane Ascenzi  
Derik Chica  
Gianfranco Cristiano  
Melissa Haber  
Nick Murdocca  
Vince Pugliese  
Robert Ramlall

Regrets: Paolo Falsetti  
Absent: William Adler, Mirella Rosati

##### **Oxford Properties**

John Filippetti, Vice President, Design & Innovation, Oxford Properties  
Sarah Smith, Development Team, Oxford Properties  
Davin McCully, Urban Strategies  
Michel Trocme, Urban Strategies  
Jim Gough, WSP  
Ismet Medic, WSP

#### **Transportation Master Plan Project Consultants - HDR**

Carl Wong, Project Manager  
Laura Chong, Project Coordinator

#### **City of Toronto**

Stephanie Gris Bringas, Senior Consultation Coordinator, Public Consultation Unit  
Gary Papas, Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services  
Guy Matthew, Senior Planner, City Planning  
Diane Ho, Senior Transportation Planner, City Planning  
Al Reszoski, Manager, Community Planning (North York), City Planning  
Dawn Hamilton, Manager, Urban Design, City Planning  
Nima Arbabi, Transportation Planner, Transportation Services

#### **Councillors**

Daniel Kolominsky - Councillor Mike Colle, Ward 8 Eglinton-Lawrence  
Corrado Olmi - Councillor Frances Nunziata Office, Ward 5 York South-Weston  
Councillor James Pasternak, Ward 6 York Centre  
Hector Alonso, Planning and Development Advisor, Office of Councillor James Pasternak

Minutes taken by Hanna Sahib

## **Yorkdale Shopping Centre Block Master Plan & Yorkdale Transportation Master Plan**

### **Local Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – Appendix A Additional Comments from Local Advisory Committee Members**

The comments below were provided by phone and email during the comment period following the meeting on April 13, 2021.

#### **Roads**

##### **Solution 1A. New north-south road, Caledonia Rd to Wilson Ave, crossing Hwy 401**

**Q:** This option presents a viable option that offers widespread community benefits. With options #1A and #1B not quite aligning with a straight Caledonia Rd northbound route, would the property to the west of the rail tracks and north of the 401, on which currently a concrete company is operating, offer an alternative and more straight connection? Plus it would offer property repositioning opportunities?

**A:** It is an interesting concept but it would not be assessed as part of the Transportation Master Plan. If solution 3C is recommended but ultimately rejected by MTO, this would be worth considering through the future Alternative Design phase (Phase 3) of the Environmental Assessment process, following the completion of the TMP. Nevertheless, there is still an issue of impact to residential neighbourhood west of the tracks.

##### **Solution 1C. New north-south road, Bridgeland Ave to Northgate Dr, crossing Hwy 401 (Screened Out, Carried forward as Active Transportation Option #22)**

**Q:** Would it be possible to extend Dufflaw Rd north of Orfus Rd, up to Bridgeland Ave and under the 401 to align with Northgate, as another possible north-south route option?

**A:** Through the Dufferin Street TMP (associated with the Dufferin Street Secondary Plan), staff identified a potential north/south street just west of Dufflaw Rd. If, and when, this potential street is further investigated through an EA, having a continuous alignment from Dufflaw could be considered.

##### **Solution 2A. New east-west road, eastern limit of Floral Pkwy to western limit of Bridgeland Ave, crossing Barrie GO rail corridor (Screened Out, Carried forward as Active Transportation Option #21A)**

**Q:** Was there a reason why this option was abandoned?

**A:** From a policy perspective, we wanted to minimize impact to the stable residential neighbourhood west of the GO line. Since Floral Pkwy's street classification is "local street", adding more volume poses a safety risk. The increased usage at the intersection of Floral/

Keele would also require a signal, which would result in an off-set intersection and two signals closely spaced. This would add delay to northbound, southbound, and eastbound off-ramp movements. In addition, this option would conflict with option #3C.

**Solution 2B. New east-west road, eastern limit of Rustic Rd to western limit of Cartwright Ave, crossing Barrie GO rail corridor**

**C:** This option does not support the Master Plan objectives and will have destabilizing effects on the local stable neighbourhoods. Unless option #3C enables southbound access to Caledonia Rd, Solution 2B will only add more congestion to Dufferin St.

**Solution 3C. New off-ramp, Hwy 401 eastbound to Bridgeland Ave**

**C:** This option is not a community sensitive solution and the benefits would be minimal. The proposed traffic will continue to flow towards Dufferin, which is not a benefit.

**Q:** Is it possible to reconfigure the existing eastbound on-ramp from Keele St to the opposite side in order to create space and enable a Caledonia Rd off-ramp?

**A:** This is an interesting concept worth considering if MTO rejects solution 3C due to on-ramp/off-ramp spacing. Aside from modification to the on-ramp to permit northbound left turns, the existing signal phasing controlling the Keele/401 intersection would also need to be modified. Changing the signal phasing and the conditions of the on-ramp access could result in long queues. The GO buses use the Keele eastbound off-ramp and on-ramp as a queue jump lane, so this would need to be taken into consideration.

**Solution 4A. New off-ramp, Hwy 401 westbound Express to Dufferin St**  
**Solution 4B. New off-ramp, Hwy 401 westbound Collector to Dufferin St**

**C:** These options would not offer an overwhelming benefit over the challenges and congestion they would cause on Dufferin St.

**Solution 5. New north-south road, Yorkdale Rd to Billy Bishop Way, crossing Hwy 401 (Screened Out, Carried forward as Active Transportation Option #23)**

**Q:** About connecting Yorkdale's North Service Rd to Billy Bishop Way on the north side of the 401, how would this happen? The 401 is almost at the same grade, would it need to be a below-grade tunnel or above-grade bridge?

**A:** The auto connection initially proposed (Solution 5) has been screened out for the grade reason you mentioned. We did carry forward the pedestrian and cycling connection, which would be above grade. Matching grades without impacting Yorkdale Rd/ Billy Bishop can likely be achieved by switchbacks.

**C:** Eliminate access along North Service Rd unless they are signalized. At times, north/westbound vehicles attempt to enter the mall by illegal left turn, holding up traffic and creating unsafe driving conditions.

**Solution 6A. New on-ramp, Dufferin St northbound to Hwy 401 east Collector (requires realignment of Yorkdale Rd)**

C: This option has numerous benefits.

**Solution 8. New on-ramp, Yorkdale Rd (TTC Entrance) to Hwy 401, new alignment to accommodate planned extension of Varna Rd (Carried Forward)**

C: The lights at Yorkdale Rd and connection to 401 eastbound/westbound and Allen are highly problematic. They restrict traffic from making turns and allow only four cars to get through.

Q: Would it be possible to remove the signals at the underpass and instead have a stop sign or yield for pedestrians sign? Signals, if any, at this location should allow time for a minimum of 10-15 cars to make right turns and the lights on the other side of the underpass should be synchronized accordingly to allow traffic flow.

A: This intersection currently operates at capacity, even with a signal. Signals offer better operational flexibility and performance because timing can be controlled by demand, and cars are not constantly stopping. Because this intersection provides access to the mall, the TTC passenger pick-up and drop off, access to the 401 eastbound, and access to the GO Bus Terminal, it needs a signal to control moves. There is also a dual southbound left turn, which cannot be controlled by a stop sign. Given the demand of this intersection, we understand Oxford has a full-time paid duty officer to ensure illegal moves/turns are minimized.

**Solution 9. Yorkdale Rd extension, connecting existing eastern limit (at TTC station entrance) to planned extension of Varna Rd (Screened Out)**

Q: Could there be a middle turning lane added along South Service Rd?

A: Yorkdale South Service Rd is a private street, so the City has less influence on the design of this road. If Oxford were to provide a continuous left-turn lane, it would either come at the cost of planned pedestrian/cycling facilities, or would require acquisition of the residential properties to the south.

**Solution 32A. Hwy 401 eastbound off-ramp to Dufferin St: Open curb lane (ramp traffic required to yield/stop) (Carry Forward)**

C: This offers the best solution.

**Intersection Improvements**

**Solution 10. Intersection improvement, Yorkdale Rd and Dufferin St, allow southbound left for vehicles (currently just transit) (Carry Forward)**

C: This is already happening.

A: The southbound left turn exists today, but is strictly for buses. Through the quantitative assessment, we will be able to determine whether a protected phase can be added to the signal to facilitate this move for private automobiles as well. The key is determining the northbound operational impact of removing green time, and reallocating to the southbound left turn phase.

**Solution 13A. Intersection improvement: McAdam Loop at Dufferin St – Do Nothing**

**Q:** The McAdam Loop does not offer the types of benefits the area needs. As such, #13A is preferred. It cannot be emphasized enough that there should be no Cartwright connection to Yorkdale. What is the logic of the connection at Cartwright? Are people from the west side expected to walk east? Or is this about moving people from Yorkdale across Dufferin? The problem is the spillover to residential areas.

**A:** We carried forward a number of options for the loop (#13A, B, E, and F) for further consideration and analysis. From a policy perspective, and to be consistent with the Dufferin Street Secondary Plan, there is some merit to connecting Cartwright to Yorkdale. I trust your concern is about minimizing the number of cars using Cartwright to access/exit the mall. There are a number of measures the City can implement to discourage this. For instance, we can add certain restrictions to the signal: during the morning peak period, we can prohibit eastbound through traffic, and in the evening peak period, we can prohibit the westbound through traffic. The signal is more about giving pedestrians and cyclists safe and convenient opportunities to cross Dufferin Street.

**Q:** How about re-establishing the eastbound Dufferin ramp into Yorkdale and eliminate the existing South Service Rd connection to Dufferin? Vehicles often make illegal left turns here, which also holds up traffic and creates unsafe road conditions. The pedestrian connection can remain as a gateway point to the site with better lighting and open space.

**A:** In general, the City is trying to eliminate this type of intersection or driveway and replacing them with 'normalized' intersections, in order to improve safety for people walking and cycling.

**C:** The community hasn't forgotten the fight against the density of the condo development at the corner of McAdam and Dufferin. There is no visitor parking and now there are parking issues. It's a mess.

**C:** Improve the visibility of the McAdam Loop signage and locate it to overtop of the road.

**C:** Traffic flow control (of traffic accessing Yorkdale from Dufferin) should only be signalized systems. Traffic control by other means often creates unsafe conditions and driver confusion.

**Solution 13D. Intersection improvement: McAdam Loop at Dufferin St – maintain McAdam Loop for vehicles exiting the mall to Dufferin only (remove southbound on-ramp lane); new signals at Yorkdale South Service Rd/ Dufferin/ McAdam Loop (Screened Out)**

**Q:** This option has the potential to work. However, why is it important that Yorkdale has another outlet at this specific location? What other alternatives are there?

**A:** This option is a variation of the outlet that would avoid left turns for exiting vehicles from Yorkdale heading south on Dufferin.

**Solution 13E. Intersection improvement: McAdam Loop at Dufferin St – maintain McAdam Loop and southbound on-ramp; new 4-way intersection with signals at Yorkdale South Service Rd/ Dufferin/ McAdam Loop; retain northbound right-in to South Service Rd; add westbound right-out (Carry Forward)**

**C:** This option will complicate an already complicated traffic area. The intersection at Ranee/ Dufferin/ Bentworth is already very dysfunctional. This concept has many of the elements that would make it similarly dysfunctional.

**Solution 13F. Intersection improvement: McAdam Loop at Dufferin St – maintain McAdam Loop and southbound on-ramp; new 4-way intersection with signals at Cartwright/ Dufferin/ Yorkdale (Carry Forward)**

**Q:** The concept of having potential parkland looks good. However, there are many elements to consider, such as tunnels, overpass safety, visibility and safety, and snow plowing. The small green space would be surrounded by traffic. Who would be responsible for the maintenance and safety of the park?

**A:** It depends on ownership. If the park is owned by the City, then it would be maintained by parks. If it were owned by Oxford, and transformed into a Privately Owned Publicly-Accessible Space (POPS), then Oxford would be responsible for the maintenance.

**Other Comments**

**Public transit improvements**

**C:** Integration of public transit should not undermine the importance and priority of moving and navigating traffic whether pedestrian, barrier free, cycle, car, shuttle, public transit or other. Yorkdale's perimeter north and south service roads can be a viable public transit service option with at least 2 pick-up/drop-off stops for each length of footage. Smart, smaller shuttles may offer future opportunities. However, the internal road network is not extensive enough to support this efficiently right now. While efforts to develop and support public transit initiatives should always be sought and encouraged, vehicular means of travel will most likely be the preference and dominate so long as the infrastructure is in place to support it.

**New/improved pedestrian and cycling connections**

**C:** Mechanical and/or covered walkways should be considered.

**C:** New or improved pedestrian and cycling connections should be developed only if and when there is a well-designed and safe network that can support it.

**Yorkdale Shopping Centre Block Master Plan**

**C:** Based on the built form modeling, and even with removing the four proposed towers, the model and site appear extremely dense, especially in the northern half of the site. Side profiles and elevations with reference to scale along Dufferin St and along the service roads would offer valuable information and reference.

**C:** Given what is proposed, the North Service Rd will no longer see the light of day. The southwest corner of the site is a gateway of sorts and should provide a much lower transition to the neighbouring community. Setbacks along Dufferin St should also be more than they are to support and enhance a much more open concept at the Dufferin St address and the Yorkdale main entrance.

**Q:** As proposed, only 10% of the site is open space. Where and how will the community benefits be fit into this Master Plan?

**A:** Identified community benefits can be incorporated into planned buildings, parkland is separate from community benefits.

**C:** It's going to be a disaster to bring thousands of people into the area. I have no problem with development itself, but we need to be careful with this scale of development. I'm not concerned about congestion but about scale and crowding. We're bringing a small Ontario town into basically a block.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Natural Environment**

**C:** Consider the impact to sight lines and visibility

#### **Technical (including Transportation)**

**C:** Consider the impact to existing stable neighbourhoods

#### **Economic**

**C:** Consider the ability to support and enhance surrounding neighbourhoods and their stability and vitality, not only to support but to thrive

#### **Cultural / Social**

**C:** Consider the impact to community identity, improvements, restorations and renewals, including beautification and enhancements in the surrounding community