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MEETING OVERVIEW

On November 2, 2016, the City of Toronto hosted ConsumersNext Community Meeting 4 from 5:00 – 8:30pm at the Radisson Hotel Toronto East, 55 Hallcrown Place. Over a 100 people participated in meeting, including residents, employees from businesses located in the Study Area, and commercial land owners. Councillor Shelley Carroll and a member from her office also attended.

This was the fourth and final community meeting held over the first three phases of the study. City staff committed to coming back to the community during Phase 4 to discuss implementation. The purpose of Community Meeting 4 was to share and discuss the preferred development scenario, supporting transportation, servicing and community infrastructure directions, and economic potential findings. The feedback from this meeting will be used to help refine the preferred alternative.

Study Process Graphic

The meeting started with an open house during which participants could view display panels and engage in one-on-one discussions with members of the study team. The display boards outlined the ConsumersNext’s findings related to each of the study’s “building blocks”, including public places, built form, transportation, community services & facilities, economic potential and water infrastructure. Part way through the meeting the format shifted to an overview presentation. At the request of several participants, the overview presentation was followed by questions and plenary discussion. Following the questions and plenary discussion, participants had a second opportunity to view the display panels and have one-on-one discussions with members of the study team. The facilitation team and City staff let participants know they could share any additional feedback by November 16, 2016 — feedback submitted after the meeting is summarized beginning on page 6.
SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Feedback about Process

Meeting purpose and format

- Several participants raised questions about the purpose of the meeting and shared concerns that the open house format was not conducive to the community hearing each other’s perspectives. Melanie Melnyk from RE Milward, part of the project team, said the purpose of the meeting was to listen to participants’ feedback on the preferred scenario.
- Some participants said the project team has done a good job listening to the community and explaining the study in a way people can understand it.

Armenian Community Centre meeting

- There was a suggestion for the City to host a separate meeting to discuss concerns and interests raised about and on behalf of the Armenian Community Centre. Others felt all concerns should be discussed at the community meeting.

Councillor representation

- It was suggested that the two local councillors should be present for these discussions.

Previous summaries

- Some participants said they had not received previous Community Consultation summaries. Previous consultation summaries can be downloaded via the links below:
  - Planners in Public Spaces #1 (June 2015)
  - Community Consultation Meeting #1 (July 2015)
  - Local Advisory Committee #1 (September 2015)
  - Community Consultation Meeting #2 (December 2015)
  - Local Advisory Committee #2 (April 2016)
  - Planners in Public Spaces #2 (May 2016)
  - Community Meeting #3 (June 2016)
Feedback about Proposed Solutions

Traffic and Congestion

- Participants said traffic is already bad in the area and felt that the proposed solutions will make it worse: more development will create more traffic. There was a suggestion to introduce/improve traffic light coordination along Victoria Park Ave and Sheppard Ave. Another suggestion was to add a traffic light on Hallcrown Place and Consumers Road.
- Participants raised concerns about traffic and parking around the Armenian Community Centre. They said dropping students off at the A.R.S School takes up to 25 to 30 minutes in the morning and afternoon. Since the community welcomed many Syrian refugees, there are even more students going to the school now — which means there are even more cars picking up/dropping off kids. The high volume of people that go to church also results in a lot of traffic and a lack of parking. Many people get ticketed when visiting the Community Centre because of a lack of parking.
- Participants said they would like to see the Study consider traffic and parking impacts on the east side of Victoria Park Avenue; people who cannot find parking west of Victoria Park are looking on the east side, which has led to increased traffic and less parking.

Recognizing and respecting the Armenian Community Centre

- Participants said that the Armenian Community Centre has been recognized as playing an important role in developing and supporting the community (and city and country), especially by taking in many Syrian refugees and accommodating them in the school.
- Some participants felt the Community Centre’s current functions, such as hosting events, weddings, festivals, etc. should be considered. Participants said these events generate noise, sometimes late at night, and should be protected. Participants also raised concerns that the Community Centre is being “cornered” and will be in the “shadow/cut off” by the new development at 2450 Victoria Park Avenue.

Transit

- Several participants repeated their preference for an extension of the Sheppard subway considered over an LRT. As at other meetings, City staff and the consulting team said that the Study is agnostic on transit technology; the plan has been developed to support either LRT or subway. Decisions about transit modes are made by City Council, not City Planning.
- Some participants said they would like to see the planned underground portion of the LRT extended east along Sheppard Avenue to minimize impacts on traffic. They felt a street level right-of-way for an LRT would make traffic worse, noting Highway 7 as an example.
Parking

- There was a suggestion to introduce sustainable parking materials to increase absorption of water and reduce runoff and flooding. Edward Gardens was suggested as an example to consider.

Highway Ramps

- Some participants said they liked the proposed realignment of highway ramps to improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. Others said they would make traffic even worse in the area and didn’t think the amount of pedestrian and cycling traffic warrants the realignments.

Safety

- Participants were concerned about extending Hallcrown Place between the church/park and school. Children would need to cross traffic to go between church/park and school.
- There was a suggestion to install traffic control measures at Consumers Road and Hallcrown Place to increase visibility.

Importance of Measuring Impacts & Growth

- Participants said it will be important to clearly show how the impacts of the preferred scenario are being measured.
- Others said they are concerned about the level of growth projected for the area and want further consideration given to safety, parking, traffic, and infrastructure before growth occurs.

Electricity and water infrastructure

- Participants said they want to understand steps being taken under this study to prevent brownouts (which have occurred in the area) and flooding (which occurred last winter and caused Hallcrown Place to be closed). City staff replied that the City has engaged Toronto Hydro to make sure the plan is considering the area’s energy needs.

Retail & Commercial Development

- Participants said the area needs a larger grocery store and suggested the City find ways to entice people to build retail in the Business Park. Melanie Melnyk from RE Milward said that the City cannot require specific tenants (like grocery stores) to occupy a building, but it is encouraging them by requiring the kind of floorplate (square footage) that a grocery store might need.
- Some liked that the preferred scenario could spur development and attract infrastructure investments.
- Since it sometimes takes a long time for the City to review development applications — around 3 years — some developers opt to develop condos instead of offices, which are more profitable and can recoup the costs associated with the long review time.
Mixed Use and Housing Mix

- Some said there should be a variety of housing types and sizes, including units large enough for two and three bedrooms.
- Some participants said they liked the proposed mixed use. Others raised concerns, suggesting there would likely be conflicts between current occupants and new residents.

Parkland and Open Space

- Participants said they liked the additional parkland, conservation of land, and greening of streets being proposed in the preferred scenario. There was a suggestion to make pedestrian access to public parks a priority.

Feedback about the Strategic Directions

During the Open House participants had the opportunity to identify the Strategic Directions they considered most important. The Strategic Directions were grouped under the study's Guiding Principles, which include: (1) Define + Enhance Places and Liveability, (2) Connect + Move, and (3) Support + Promote Business. Participants placed dots next to the Strategic Directions they felt are most important. See Attachment 1 for a picture of the board used at the meeting.

The feedback below describes how participants in this activity prioritized the Strategic Directions.

Define + Enhance Places and Liveability

- The greatest number of dots were placed next to:
  - Use new streets and connections to help create smaller development blocks.
- Some dots were placed next to:
  - Greening of streets to improve the pedestrian experience and create streets that are places in their own right;
  - Secure multiple new public parks along with a series of connected and publically accessible open spaces;
  - Use specific building performance standards for the Mixed Use Districts to ensure new development is appropriately scaled for their context;
  - Create community nodes where people can access services/facilities in proximity to transit; and
  - Enhance existing community infrastructure within walking distance of ConsumersNext study area.
- There were no dots placed next to:
  - Use flexible approaches to built form in the business park so new buildings support public realm.

Connect + Move

- The greatest number of dots were placed next to:
  - New grid street network to improve mobility for all users.
- Some dots were placed next to:
- Balanced mix of land uses to promote shorter trips and encourage active transportation; and
- Improved pedestrian and cycling connections to Wishing Well Park at Victoria Park and Highway 401.

- A few dots were placed next to:
  - Improved pedestrian and cycling connections at Highway 401 and Sheppard Ave East;
  - Improved access and integration with regional transportation options; and
  - Pre-LRT and Post-LRT transit integration.

- There were no dots placed next to:
  - Innovative mobility plan including eco-mobility hubs throughout business park.

### Support + Promote Business

- The greatest number of dots were placed next to:
  - Invest in the public realm, transit and transportation infrastructure to increase connectivity and walkability.

- Some dots were placed next to:
  - Encourage additional amenity through greater land use flexibility for retail and restaurants; and
  - Provide financial support for retrofits of existing office space and other leasehold improvements to support job growth.

- A few dots were placed next to:
  - Explore a local business association to promote the business park, manage travel demand and establish branding/marketing material
  - Continue City’s IMIT program to offset tax differential with potential enhancements to attract new office development; and
  - Use planning tools that ensure an efficient approval process but provide flexibility for the various building needs of businesses.

### Feedback submitted after the meeting

After the meeting, participants shared additional feedback via email. This feedback is summarized below.

### Addressing current problems

The study area is already experiencing some challenges (like traffic and periodic flooding). Rather than focus on developing this long-term plan, the City should explain what it is doing today to provide solutions to these issues. Demonstrating an ability to address challenges could help build confidence in the City’s ability to address long-term challenges. Changes proposed for the long-term should minimize impacts on existing neighbourhoods and residents today.

For example, streets in the study area were recently closed twice as a result of flooding. The study team should explain how it has looked into this flooding and what it is proposing to address it (along with solutions for water, wastewater, and stormwater capacity).
The post-meeting feedback also identified construction as having an impact on the area’s traffic and safety. Recent asphalt work on both Victoria Park and Sheppard has resulted in reduced lanes, blocked pedestrian access, and traffic back-ups. There should be better notice and communication from the City about the purpose and schedule of these disruptions.

**Traffic, transit, and transportation**

The study needs to explain how it is considering parking and traffic issues in the area. Some feedback suggested the City consider consolidating parking standards for retail, employment, institutional, and residential uses. Other feedback expressed concern that Sheppard is not wide enough to support an LRT without making traffic worse.

The post-meeting feedback included mixed opinions about HOV lanes. Some said that the construction of HOV (and LRT) lanes would create years of disruption; other feedback suggested widening Sheppard and adding HOV lanes on both sides to make more space and reduce the impact on traffic. If these HOV lanes are enforced with fines, police, and cameras, there may be a reduction in car use and increased bus use, which could diminish the need for a costly LRT or subway.

It is important that traffic data informs decisions about residential development in Mixed Use areas so that City Planning understands the impact this development might have on employment or business uses. New development should be compatible with existing uses, especially the Armenian Community Centre. There was some support for the new proposed road north of the Armenian Community Centre and the proposed reconfiguration of the 401 ramp. Widening Hallcrown should be on the radar, as should improving safety on Hallcrown to prevent and reduce accidents.

**Safety**

Future parks and green spaces should be designed with children’s safety in mind. Lanes and intersections should be designed to optimize efficiency and safety, especially near schools, where speed bumps, crosswalks, and turn restrictions could calm traffic and improve safety.

**Built form**

Some post-meeting feedback said the built form policies were moving in the right direction. Some offered additional feedback about the built form directions:

- Where buildings face onto Consumers Road, built form policies should be reconsidered to ensure compatibility with the heights of other buildings on that road. New developments should be based on 1 – 1.5 times lot coverage for the next 10 – 20 years.
- There was some support for low-rise built form next to the church and mid-rise development fronting on to Victoria Park. Taller buildings should be located as far north as possible and oriented towards Victoria Park. The height of these tall buildings should be limited to ensure compatibility with the height of nearby buildings.
- There was some concern with mid-rise building setbacks, the location from which tall building angular plane policies were taken, and the potential for density limitations in the Secondary Plan. Specific suggestions to address these concerns were to: remove the
maximum 11 storey height limit on Victoria Park (which could still provide 4 hours of sunlight on Victoria Park); use the closest Neighbourhoods-designated property east of Victoria Park to determine the 45-degree angular plane; reduce the mid-rise building setback to 0 where a 4.8 metre sidewalk zone can be achieved without the setback, and; remove density limitations.

**Land use, retail, and redevelopment**

Post-meeting feedback included requests for clarification and additional suggestions:

- There was a request to confirm that the study was not going to propose changes to the land use designations on Map 19 of the Official Plan.

- The City should fast track development that provides supermarkets, retail, professional services, entertainment, daycare, schools, and private schools (especially on the first 6 floors of a new building). One way to fast-track that development would be to provide a tax abatement to those developers. It is important for people to be able to window shop, people watch, and sight-see in the study area.

- Any future development at 2450 Victoria Park Avenue should be a mix of office and commercial units.

- Support for the new green space beside the church. This green space should run along the south side of proposed new road to create a buffer between the church and the road and to provide direct access to this space.

- More detail is required to understand the impacts of the district boundaries on 279 and 285 Yorkland Boulevard.

**Feedback about the Armenian community and Armenian Community Centre**

Much of the post-meeting feedback focused on the role, importance, and needs of the Armenian community and Armenian Community Centre. Specifically:

- The plan should explain how it is considering the operations of the Armenian Community Centre; many are concerned that new residents nearby might prevent the on-going operations and financial health of the community centre (by complaining about noise from events, for example).

- The plan should consider the social and cultural significance of the Armenian Community Centre lands and the ongoing operation of this facilities including rentals and festivals. New development should demonstrate consideration of the social and human impact of new development on existing communities and neighbourhoods.

- The Community Services and Facilities inventory should be revised to indicate the daycare, school, library, and auditorium as community services and facilities (in addition to the church and community centre).

- The plan should consider the future development of the Armenian Community Centre lands — there is a concept for a mixed employment / commercial building on these lands, including office, medical, and hotel uses.
Process

Post-meeting feedback shared suggestions about process, including:

- City Planning should tour the Armenian Community Centre to see the extent to which it is used.

- Consider creating a Community Advisory Committee to facilitate communication between the City and the community, especially around the timing and construction of new roads.

- Prominently display summaries and detailed feedback from this meeting and previous meetings on the ConsumersNext website. Append anonymized, raw feedback from post-meeting emails and letters.

- Explain how feedback from previous meetings has been considered in the plan (such as feedback to improve pedestrian safety, make connections between existing and new buildings, and improve pedestrian paths and sidewalks).

- Future meetings should include an opportunity for people to speak in public — not just in one-on-one conversations.

- Concern about the lack of notice for the Official Plan Amendment application for 2450 Victoria Park Avenue — notice of this application should be on the project website, in emails, and in printed newsletters from Councillors. It is also frustrating that the proposed built form for 2450 has been incorporated in the ConsumersNext plans even though there has been no formal submission or application to the City; it gave some the impression that the City was “testing” the community’s acceptance of this application.

NEXT STEPS

The feedback shared by participants at Community Meeting 4 will be used to help develop policy during Phase 4, Implementation. The City will hold a Public Meeting in the spring of 2017 prior to seeking Council approvals.
## Attachment 1: Strategic Directions Activity Station Board

### Define + Enhance Places and Liveability
- Define the identity of the Consumers Road area and promote quality of life for residents, workers, and users with high quality streets, parks, and open spaces.
- Locate and align buildings at appropriate scales to support and create active edges to public spaces and provide a welcoming environment.
- Use new streets and connections to help create smaller development blocks.
- Growing of streets to improve the pedestrian experience and create streets that are places in their own right.
- Secure multiple new public parks along with a series of connected and publicly accessible green spaces.
- Use specific building performance standards for the Mixed Use District to ensure new development is appropriately scaled for their context.
- Use flexible approaches to build around mixed businesses.
- Create community nodes where people can access services/facilities in proximity to transit.
- Enhance existing community infrastructure (i.e., libraries and child care) within walking distance of ConsumersNext study area.

### Connect + Move
- Create balanced transportation options to get to and move through the business park, surrounding area, improving connections for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders.
- Balanced mix of land uses to promote shorter trips and encourage active transportation.
- New grid street network to improve mobility for all users.
- Improved pedestrian and cycling connections at Highway 404 and Steeles Avenue East.
- Improved pedestrian and cycling connections to: Victoria Park and highway 401.
- Improved access and integration with regional transportation options.
- Innovative mobility options including community bike share throughout business park.
- Pre-LRT and Post-LRT transit integration.

### Support + Promote Business
- Enhance the area’s attractiveness as a place to do business, by encouraging more complementary uses for workers and residents, and ensuring a robust system of transportation choices and City services.
- Encourage additional amenity through greater land use flexibility for retail and restaurants.
- Provide financial support for retention of existing office space and other small business improvements to support job growth.
- Invest in the public realm, land, and transportation infrastructure to increase connectivity and walkability.
- Explore a local business association to promote the business park, manage travel demand and establish branding/marketing materials.
- Continue City’s MTI program to offset new development potential enhancement costs to direct new office development.
- Use preserving tools that ensure an efficient approval process but provide flexibility for the various building needs of businesses.
Attachment 2: Transcribed Written Feedback

At the meeting participants were given worksheets with three questions, including: (1) What do you like about the preferred scenario; (2) What refinements (if any) would you suggest; and (3) Which of the proposed strategies would you identify as a priority?

The worksheets received have been transcribed and included below; they are numbered for ease of reference only. Questions left blank are indicated by “no comment”.

**Question 1: What do you like about the preferred scenario?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.          | • Go Bus loop  
              • Sheppard 404 expansion bridge to accommodate pedestrian/cycling traffic.  
              • Realignment of Victoria Park/401 ramp, with new road. Needed pedestrian link to Wishing Well Park  
              • Diagonal Pedestrian path to Victoria Park/Sheppard node |
| 2.          | No comment. |
| 3.          | • The preferred scenario has a lot of problems as it was presented. I have a real big issue with the ‘TRAFFIC’ that is already a huge problem as is. I bring my kids to school every morning to the A.R.S. School 45 Hallcrown and the traffic is so that it takes us at least 20 minutes to get out of school from Hallcrown to the 401. I have a real issue with the proposed plan because if there is going to be mixed use (until now it was only commercial) then there will be a greater problem with the growth. I don’t think the growth has been measured properly – the residents of the houses will complain about noise, congestion, etc. |
| 4.          | No comment |
| 5.          | • As part of the committee I think you all did a great job in taking our views.  
              • One suggestion I’d like to make is we need to consider seriously the issue of transit. We must support finishing the subway from Fairview Mall. Certainly that will take care of the traffic problem that we are concerned about. Thank you. |
| 6.          | • In the preferred scenario I like the concept of additional parks for conservation of land for future generations. Also the idea to add different types of transportation. |
| 7.          | • I like the recognition of parks, landscaping and open areas. For our own sustainability in future years it should not be over looked or overridden by traffic supporting development. Sometimes the best development is no development. |
| 8.          | No comment. |
| 9.          | • It will spur development and attract infrastructure investments, more people in the area and more activity. |
| 10.         | • The additional roads and connectivity within the areas.  
               • The addition of nodes and parkland and mixed use. |
| 11.         | • Public transportation – east/west is required now! |
| 12.         | No comment. |
| 13.         | No comment |
| 14.         | No comment. |

**Question 2: What refinements (if any) would you suggest?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | • Shuttle to Oriole GO station (only need 5 per rush hour)  
• Extend underground portion of LRT to Victoria Park so that traffic congestion is not worsened by removal of 2 lanes. (Ideally, a subway extension, but underground LRT would also accomplish this).  
• Traffic control to Consumers/Hallcrown Intersection. Can include yellow/red beacons to increase visibility around “blind corner”. |
| 2. | • There needs to be more discussion between transit planners and ConsumersNext planners. Ingress/Egress to the business park from Sheppard and exit to Sheppard from the business park will be disastrous because of the dedicated ROW. Not allowing for left hand turns. This will end up making congestion much worse. |
| 3. | • I would like to suggest that the City reconsider this growth plan and think about the extra traffic, infrastructure problems and safety issues.  
• Adding more people, more car, more businesses will create a kind of chaos that will be disastrous. There are only two exits from this area. I am not quite sure whether the smaller roads proposed will actually be allowed to be added.  
• I would strongly recommend that the City reconsider this plan and do some more studies before they start to build anything.  
• The plan has to be reconsidered, growth has to come only after very serious consideration has been given to safety, traffic issues, parking issues, congestion, infrastructure, etc. |
| 4. | I’m concerned because:  
• 1. Traffic is already more than its capacity.  
• 2. Sewer system failed last year, therefore it is not capable to take more.  
• 3. It will not be a safe community with these changes.  
• 4. The Armenian Community serves not only the immediate community but the whole Canadian Community at large.  
• 5. The Armenian Church was built by one of the most prestigious architects “Robbie” (the dome builder) which gives pride and beauty to the neighbourhood, cannot be obstructed/blocke with big buildings.  
• 6. The Armenian Community’s theater is the one that serves North York. It’s ideal. Not only will Armenian-Canadians not be able to use the facility but the whole dance/choir communities.  
• 7. Do not clip the wings of this community because you will be clipping the wings that serve Canada.  
• 8. The proposed exit from Hallcrown to Victoria Park is suicide street. It’s already a very dangerous area, it’s a collision #1 in the Province.  
• The process of these “phases” are not productive, who is listening to the community’s concerns. If neighbourhoods are not heard, then, do not hold meetings. |
| 5. | No comment. |
| 6. | • Refinements I would suggest is to understand the function of the existing community instead of looking to benefit the business people more. |
| 7. | • What about sustainable parking? I recognize you are incorporating greenery but what about absorbable asphalt. Like the sustainable parking at Edwards Gardens / Toronto Horticultural Gardens. It allows absorption and minimum run off which would reduce flooding which has been an issue. |
| 8. | • The traffic on Victoria Park and Sheppard has already reached saturation and the significant increase in residents and commercial units does not make sense, regardless of new arterial roads, nodes, etc. The bottle necks and backlog of cars will |
be disastrous. The number of units (residential/commercial) has to be significantly limited.

9. • Need City investment to make it happen faster.

10. • In the absence of the LRT I would readdress what you are doing at Sheppard and DVP / Victoria Park and 401 – The current gridlock in the am/pm will only get worse. • Housing at the last meeting a unit was described as 70 square metres. This is a one bedroom (bedroom + den). The talk was to a housing “mix”. The plan needs to pre-zone to ensure 2 and 3 bedroom units (a good percentage in the 1000 and 1200 square footage. It should be a minimum of 40% +/- If it’s pre-zoned this way the land values will find their own “value” that reflects the density and unit size. The values will be higher than today anyway so nobody loses. You must have family housing as there are no options in the area – short of ground oriented at a huge premium and affordability is tough.

11. • With the increase possibly to 18,000 it is essential that public transportation along Sheppard Ave be improved with LRT or subway. More busses will not help; in fact, they will complicate the present problem. LRT or subway on Sheppard is needed to connect with Agincourt GO Station to allow local residents and 905 residents the ability to travel east and west!

12. No comment.

13. • Don’t put a high-rise in the corner of Consumers Road and Hallcrown.

14. • Enable the office buildings along 404/401 should be allowed to redevelop to mixed use.

Question 3: Which of the proposed strategies would you identify as a priority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>• Increased number of roads. • Underground rapid transit. • Increased parking with intensification. • Toronto Hydro capacity/reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The proposed strategies I would identify as priority would be: pedestrian access to healthy scenic habitat in the form of public parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A priority strategy I know you have tried to incorporate is listening to the community itself. I know you have had public meetings, you encourage their emails but they don’t feel you hear them. As one person mentioned the community is more than the buildings and the proposal, it’s the people. Perhaps take away all the displays and just have an open forum and let them be heard again. They know change is coming. They just need to be heard (even if you heard it before).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>• 1. Incent development in the area through financial incentives. • 2. Invest in road building per proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>• Roadwork and connectivity asap. This will start the change much sooner and allow the rest of the nodes, etc. If the roads are built the development will come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>- Public Transportation on Sheppard east and west is required before any of this development happens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. | - Co-ordination of Traffic lights on Victoria Park and Sheppard.  
    - Adding additional traffic outlets without proper light syncing would be a disaster.  
    - Will the LRT at Victoria Park. |
| 13. | - The small street that goes from Hallcrown to Victoria Park. |
| 14. | - Transportation and access in and out of the park. |