

Focus Group Summary: Resident and Community Associations

Queen's Park North Revitalization

Community Engagement Phase 3: Setting the Direction

March 17, 2026



Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Meeting Summary 2

Next Steps 8

Introduction

On March 17, 2026, the City hosted the third focus group with representatives of Resident and Community Associations via Zoom. The meeting was part of Phase 3 (of 3) of the community engagement process to help inform the Queen's Park North Revitalization.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide updates on the City's process, review feedback from the recent meetings (November 24 focus group, March 5 Community Meeting, March 10 Executive Committee deputations, and March 11 Design Review Panel), share and seek feedback on the draft design concept and core elements, and provide inputs to the Advisory Group Terms of Reference. Key points shared by participants and project team are summarized below.

Attendance

Participating organizations: Annex Residents' Association, Bay Cloverhill Community Association, Federation of South Toronto Residents Association, Grange Community Association, Harbord Village Residents' Association, Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association, Friends of Queen's Park North.

Queen's Park North Revitalization Project team: City of Toronto, Janet Rosenberg & Studio, Third Party Public.

For more information about the project and to review summaries from previous community engagement activities, visit the project webpage:

toronto.ca/QueensParkNorth

Meeting Summary

This summary was written by Third Party Public and was shared with participants in draft before being finalized.

Big picture takeaways from the City's overview points and responses

- **Community feedback at the March 5th community meeting and March 10th Executive Committee meeting was expected, timely, and taken seriously.** The feedback was well-timed and appropriate for the stage of the project. The design materials presented on March 5th in this third phase of engagement were intentionally issued as a draft, not as a finalized proposal. The feedback is an important and necessary part of the process.
- **City staff have not finalized their position on the draft park design.** The project is still evolving. City staff emphasized that nothing is settled and that they will demonstrate how the design is changing in response to community feedback, Design Review Panel comments, and ongoing technical reviews and due diligence work.
- **Council and the community will see different levels of detail.** When the design concept goes to Council (following the May 6 Infrastructure & Environment Committee meeting), Council will be asked to consider a concept-level plan, not detailed design specifications (e.g., pathway widths or precise dimensions). City staff and the Project team continue to collect and analyze detailed technical information (tree-by-tree impacts, feasibility studies, servicing, dimensions, and operational considerations) and are committed to sharing that information with the community, so impacts are clearly understood. Some of this information will be available before May 6th and work will continue in parallel as the design development work continues.

Participant feedback

Big picture takeaways from participant feedback	Parks & Rec response
<p>A. The overall project timeline should be driven by readiness of the design to move forward rather than a fixed date. It was flagged that on March 10th Councillor Fletcher said the timeline for reporting to Infrastructure and Environment Committee is not fixed and could be May or June. She said that she would not like to see the project come back without first resolving key issues to avoid another list of negative deputations.</p>	<p>City staff agreed that it's not productive to advance a report if key issues remain unresolved.</p> <p>May 6 remains the current target for reporting back. There is a momentum behind the project that is expected to continue.</p> <p>Staff emphasized the significant care and effort being applied by the project team to address concerns, particularly those related to design and forest considerations.</p>
<p>B. It is crucial that the community see a Forest Management Plan (FMP) first in order to provide informed feedback about the elements being proposed by the City.</p> <p>Trees are the defining feature of Queen's Park North and the most important element to protect in the design. There was concern that it is unreasonable and unfair for the City to ask community members what they would like to see in the park when the City has not presented the analysis on the impact on trees.</p> <p>The FMP will help the community understand where there is space for different elements without damaging trees. For example, the size, exact location, and tree removals required to support the commemorative garden</p>	<p>Very extensive arborist, ecological, and tree inventory work has already been completed – it was the first thing that the design team did when work started in 2024 and it has informed every step of the work since then.</p> <p>The City and design team are working with Urban Forestry to confirm the scope of a Forest Management Plan. The City will engage with the community in the development of the FMP and illustrate the potential impact of the proposed design on the trees, including individual trees. If previously completed background work, studies and analysis informing the FMP have not yet been made public, the City will share them.</p> <p>Expectations for the FMP may be too high – the project team already has a wealth of information and we have been doing the</p>

Big picture takeaways from participant feedback

Parks & Rec response

<p>is important to understand before support can be determined.</p> <p>If this information is shared and shows no impacts on trees, “I think you would have overwhelming support.”</p>	<p>work to ensure we have the best plan to keep the trees alive and to deal with long-term sustainability and succession.</p>
<p>C. Clarity is needed on the timeline for completing the Forest Management Plan (FMP). Participants are ready to engage constructively on design elements immediately once the forest management analysis is complete and impacts and opportunities are understood. Current discussions are circular without it. Timing on when the FMP and supporting information will be available was asked, so the conversation can move forward in a meaningful, evidence-based way.</p>	<p>There are ongoing discussions regarding the development of the FMP and updates will be provided as soon as they are available.</p> <p>The City committed to having a more detailed discussion on the FMP at next week’s Trees & Nature Focus Group.</p> <p>The City and JRS team committed to sharing existing information related to the tree inventory and analysis work with the community before the design goes to the Infrastructure and Environment Committee on May 6 for consideration.</p>
<p>D. Concern about over-programming the park and strong opposition to the tree walk was reiterated. It was reiterated that the Executive Committee, some members of the DRP, and the community expressed concern that the draft park design may be too busy and over-programmed relative to its size and character. This includes opposition to the tree walk’s scale, dominance, and impact on heritage. Would the City consider not proceeding with the tree walk if it is found to negatively impact trees?</p>	<p>The purpose of the tree walk is to focus on educating and celebrating the trees. If the tree walk negatively impacts the trees, it defeats the purpose and will be reconsidered.</p> <p>The same materials shared with the public on March 5th were also shared with the City’s Design Review Panel on March 11. DRP members shared support with conditions. These conditions included investigating a forest management plan and considering the amount of programming in the park.</p>
<p>E. Will the same logic applied to the tree walk also apply to the café? Is the café being pursued because it</p>	<p>Staff have received Council direction to explore food and beverage opportunities in parks, not to mandate a</p>

Big picture takeaways from participant feedback

Parks & Rec response

is City policy? Or could it be removed if analysis shows it is not appropriate for the park?

café. The café is subject to ongoing feasibility work, including determining the appropriate scale to ensure it is both low-impact and financially viable. The proposed facility would also include public washrooms and staff space to support park maintenance. The current location in the heart of the park was selected to minimize tree impacts as there are no mature trees.

The goal is to strike the right balance in the park overall between maintaining the park as a place of respite while also ensuring it serves the broader city and is a place people would want to linger.

F. Questions and concern about the size, location, and scale of café/washroom.

It's important to be clear on the size of the proposed café/washroom building. There was interest in seeing the City explore alternatives such as a kiosk model rather than a sit-in café and potential separation of the building elements into different structures so that no one structure is too large. There were also suggestions to consider alternative locations (including the southwest corner of the park and by the Museum subway entrance) and different configurations (including stacking the uses on into 3 floors with the washroom and staff space on first floor, café in middle floor, and an observation deck on the top floor).

The current proposal for the building in the heart of the park is 3,000 sq ft in total, which includes 1,200–1,500 sq ft for a sit-in café, and additional square footage for the washrooms, and staff space.

The scale and configuration of the building is still under review.

Consolidation of the café, washroom, and staff space was intended to reduce overall impact. **The team will explore alternatives for the café/washrooms, including other potential locations.**

The City committed to sharing the café feasibility work with participants.

Big picture takeaways from participant feedback	Parks & Rec response
<p>G. Concern that the hiring of a dedicated Executive Director could drive unnecessary park “animation.”</p>	<p>The Executive Director position is critical to providing the level of care and intentionality the park needs to ensure its health for decades to come, including connecting the dots between the City, University, and stakeholders and to supporting increased maintenance and long-term stewardship. The role is not there to produce large events, encourage large crowds, or overuse.</p>
<p>H. Request for clearer integration of Indigenous design.</p>	<p>Active engagement is underway with Six Nations, the Mississaugas of the Credit, the Huron-Wendat, and urban Indigenous communities through Indigenous Sharing Meetings, and substantial input has been received.</p> <p>Indigenous-informed design elements may not yet be fully visible, as these conversations are still evolving and have not reached a stage where design outcomes can be finalized. City staff are intentionally avoiding assumptions about how Indigenous nations wish to represent themselves and are committed to creating space for this input to be reflected in both the physical design of the park and in long-term stewardship and relationship-building. This work is important for the Mayor, Councillor Fletcher, Councillor Saxe, and the project team.</p>
<p>I. Integration with University Park is important. The placement of elements in Queen’s Park North should consider the eventual creation of University Park. Locating elements (such as café/washrooms) at the southwest corner of Queen’s Park</p>	<p>The Queen’s Park North team has been working closely with the University Park team. University Park is on a much less certain timeframe. The City is working to ensure planning for Queen’s Park North will not undermine University Park.</p>

Big picture takeaways from participant feedback

North would result in them eventually being more central to the entire area once University Park is created.

Parks & Rec response

The University of Toronto is a very important voice in the process. **The City will invite U of T representatives to join future meetings for transparency and alignment.**

Next Steps

City staff and JRS committed to the following next steps at the meeting:

- 1. The City will engage with the community in the development of the FMP and illustrate the potential impact of the proposed design on the trees, including individual trees. If previously completed background work, studies and analysis informing the FMP has not yet been made public, the City will share them.**
- 2. The City committed to having a more detailed discussion on the FMP at next week's Trees & Nature Focus Group.**
- 3. The City and JRS team committed to sharing existing information related to the tree inventory and analysis work with the community before the design goes to the Infrastructure and Environment Committee on May 6 for consideration.**
- 4. The team will explore alternatives for the café/washrooms, including other potential locations.**
- 5. The City committed to sharing the café feasibility work with participants.**
- 6. The City will invite U of T representatives to join future meetings for transparency and alignment.**

The City thanked participants for their time and continued engagement. Third Party Public committed to sharing a draft summary of the discussion with participants for review before it is finalized.