

Further to our initial summary of Sept. 16, 2013, and the focus group and public meetings since, here is a brief summary of our community's view on the Carling-Preston Public Realm and Mobility Study. We can recommend the plan as outlined, but with some significant reservations.

We appreciate the commitment of the consultants and the planners on presenting some very constructive and interesting ideas for the Carling-Preston CDP Public Realm and Mobility Study. We also appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process. Many of the proposed plans, if enacted, will be positive enhancements to our neighbourhood:

- treatments to make Carling Avenue a boulevard with segregated pedestrian and cycling lanes along with a treed median;
- an expansion and rehabilitation of Ev Tremblay Park (subject to building over the O-train or buying the Beechgrove Apartment property) and the calming of Champagne;
- succession planting of large tree species in places where appropriate (assuming the City modifies its planted species policies and developers allow for proper setbacks for placement and growth);
- "woonerf" style street treatments for the small streets running off Preston Street;
- the contiguous MUP from Carling to Beech Street parallel to the O-Train (assuming it doesn't become a justification for "mews" on the eastern side);
- the development of small "parkettes" in the few areas where they are possible (such as the triangle lot at the south-east corner of Bayswater and Sherwood);
- the pedestrian/cycling bridge from Hickory over the O-train to Adeline (assuming it doesn't become a car bridge, which most residents oppose);
- the enhancement of the cycling routes and pedestrian facilities throughout the area;

However, it appears that most of the public realm and mobility improvements are dependent on the City getting Section 37 money in exchange for increased heights.

While we support intensification (heights up to 14 stories), we believe our neighbourhood is being over-intensified. Many of the residents, given the trade off, would rather have less intensification and fewer improvements. Some believe the current funding formula is a "perverse incentive" for residents; without the City spending its own money, the process of improvements to public realm and mobility becomes dependent on height and development. A Faustian bargain, if you will.

Also, while it is nice to have an opportunity to talk about changes and improvements to parks, bike paths and street-scaping, many residents feel that they haven't had an adequate opportunity or a proper forum to participate and comment on the things which directly impact the neighbourhood as the intensification proceeds. Namely: height, density, built form, wind/shade/noise/snow effects and traffic impacts. There is a serious need to transition from height down to the stable (mostly) 2-story neighbourhood. Also, during the initial phases, there was talk of an area-wide traffic study. One has not been conducted and the neighbourhood has reservations about how the City plans to accommodate the possible addition of 1500+ cars in the developments on Champagne Avenue, without flooding local residential streets with more cars; these streets are already subject to a lot of cut-through commuter traffic. The sum of the all the individual site plan traffic studies is inadequate.