

Chorley Park Trail Design Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1

Tuesday, October 14, 2014

BMO Atrium

Evergreen Brick Works, 550 Bayview Avenue

3:30 – 7:30 pm

MEETING SUMMARY (UPDATED)

This was the first of three meetings that will be held with the Chorley Park Trail Design Stakeholder Working Group. In total, 28 of the 30 Working Group members participated, along with 12 others, including staff from the City of Toronto, the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, the Independent Facilitation team, as well as observers (see Attachment for the meeting agenda and Attachment for the participant list).

*This draft summary was written by Nicole Swerhun and Reka Sivarajah, who are providing independent facilitation services to the Working Group. It is written to reflect the main points raised during the discussion, and is not intended as a verbatim transcript. A draft of this summary was shared with participants for review before being finalized. **Please note that the draft summary overlooked comments related to accessibility issues that are now incorporated in this final summary (see bolded & italicized text on page 3 under accessibility).** If you have any questions or comments, please contact Reka Sivarajah at rsivarajah@swerhun.com or (416) 572-4365. You may also download this final summary on the City's Chorley Park [webpage](#).*

SITE WALK

The meeting began with a site walk that lasted just over 1.5 hours. The purpose of the walk was to:

- Build a shared understanding of existing conditions
- Experience different trail conditions (slope, width, ground cover, erosion, connections, etc.)
- Seek feedback/have discussion along the way about what Working Members and City staff like/don't like/observe about the different conditions, and how they may relate to the new connection being considered

Discussion during the site walk was informal with comments, questions and observations coming from Working Group members as well as City and TRCA staff. A summary of the discussion at each of the seven stops along the route is included as Attachment 3.

OVERVIEW OF THE WORKING GROUP

Following the site walk, Facilitator Nicole Swerhun opened the meeting by:

- Introducing the role of the independent facilitation team and their experience in helping encourage constructive discussion that seeks to find common ground among participants with a range of perspectives and priorities;
- Reviewing the background and purpose of the working group (noting that additional detail is available in the Working Group Terms of Reference as well as in the "Note from the Facilitator" distributed at the meeting and included here as Attachment 4);

- Emphasizing the important role of the City and TRCA in actively contributing to Working Group discussions.

Nicole also provided a brief overview of the agendas for each of the three Working Group meetings, including:

| Working Group Meeting | Proposed Purpose/Focus of Meeting |
|-----------------------|--|
| Meeting 1 (Oct 16) | To identify key factors to consider when designing a future trail connection between Chorley Park, the Beltline, and the Don Valley Brick Works Park, prioritizing these factors, a discussion of objectives/principles to guide the design of the trail, along with identification of options to be explored in Meeting 2 |
| Meeting 2 (Nov 13) | To share and discuss what people like/don't like about different potential trail connections, and to identify and explore opportunities to resolve differences |
| Meeting 3 (Nov 27) | To refine trail design concept(s) emerging from Meeting 2, and to share and discuss what happens next |

DISCUSSION – KEY FACTORS TO CONSIDER WHEN DESIGNING THE TRAIL

Participants identified a number of key factors to consider when designing the trail. The left column in the chart below identifies the factor to consider and the column on the right describes the discussion around each factor.

| Factor to consider | Discussion Summary |
|---|--|
| Who the trail is being designed for – the range of users <u>Note:</u> At least one participant suggested replacing the word “trail” with “connection” to ensure stairs are also open to being considered as part of the solution | <p>There was considerable discussion regarding what type of users the trail should be designed to serve, and general recognition among participants that different trail solutions would likely be required for different users.</p> <p>There was general support and no objections raised to the trail being designed for the following primary users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • able walkers/runners • children • families with strollers • dogs on leash <p>Some participants felt that the trail design should be determined primarily by those who currently use the trail (i.e. local residents). Some expressed concern that the trail construction is being driven by a commercial interest at the Brick Works to draw more visitors to the site. Others didn't feel that a distinction between local and citywide users was necessary.</p> <p>There was also general support for the idea that the trail should <u>NOT</u> be designed to accommodate fast cyclists or skateboarders (though depending on the surface of the trail, it was acknowledged that it can be difficult to completely prevent access by these users).</p> |

Additional discussion is required around the degree to which the trail should be designed to accommodate two user groups – cyclists (mounted and potentially cyclists towing children) and those with accessibility requirements (people in wheelchairs, using walkers, other mobility devices).

- **CYCLISTS** – Some Working Group members had safety concerns about accommodating mounted cyclists on the trail (though there were no objections to accommodating dismounted cyclists). Others felt that it would be possible to design the trail to accommodate mounted cyclists in a way that is compatible with other users. Design ideas included: a narrower trail (since wider trails encourage faster cycling); and/or bollards or speed bumps to slow down cyclists; and/or through signage, communication and trail “Code of conduct”. **There were no objections raised to further exploring these ideas to see if common ground could be found among Working Group members.**
- **ACCESSIBILITY** – There were few members of the Working Group during the meeting that were vocally advocating for a trail design that accommodates wheelchair/walker access. ***The specific concerns raised with respect to accessibility issues (as they apply to persons with different degrees of disability) included: the biggest challenge for disabled persons is getting up the hill, not getting down; stairs are problematic; and other entrances to the ravine trail path (e.g. Roxborough and Mt. Pleasant) are more accessible for disabled walkers and they have flat approach to the ravine (similarly, the Brick Works provides accessible paved path to the ravine trail).*** There were a few that focused on the importance of rest areas along the trail to accommodate users who need break while climbing up or down the hill (able bodied people as well as those recovering from/dealing with health issues). City staff explained that the City of Toronto has Accessibility Guidelines that must be considered, and that the Province has also developed accessibility requirements (AODA – Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act) that will become law in 2016. On the site walk, it was explained that the asphalt-paved trails at the Brick Works do not all provide the same degree of accessibility. The group agreed that **it will be important for City staff to share the guidelines and/or requirements** they are responsible for following with respect to disability, and the degree of flexibility that is considered reasonable when working within these guidelines/requirements. See “Next Steps” in this report for the Action Item related to this.

| | |
|---|---|
| Safety | There was support for ensuring the trail design is safe. |
| Choice - What other options are available for people who want to connect between Chorley Park, the Beltline and the Brick Works | <p>CHOICE ON THE CHORLEY PARK TRAIL – Some participants suggested the analogy of ski hill when considering the trail, and design the connection so people have a choice about whether to take an easy, moderate, or difficult route from top to bottom.</p> <p>CHOICE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD – Several people indicated that there are many other routes for people to travel between the neighbourhood at the top of the hill around Chorley Park and the Beltline and Brick Works. Many feel these options should inform the design of the Chorley Park trail. There was an</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>interest in having the City come to the next meeting with a map of the area that indicates the other connections.</p> |
| Ability to retain the natural setting and preserve natural beauty | <p>Retaining the natural setting is a high priority for Working Group members, the City and the TRCA. There were different perspectives on what is considered natural, with some indicating that it's fine to leave nature "as is" and to let the area evolve on its own.</p> <p>Other Working Group members, as well as staff from the City and TRCA, are interested in removing invasive species and managing the vegetation to support healthy functioning of the local ecosystem (to help move it toward the state it was in before "man intervened").</p> <p>Participants agreed it is important for the City and TRCA to share the guidelines and requirements that influence their approach to forest management, including where there is flexibility and discretion in how the guidelines and requirements are met. Additional information that would be helpful includes (but isn't limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species at Risk Act • Fill regulations of the TRCA • Ravine and Natural Feature protection bylaw <p>It was also suggested that tree canopy preservation should also inform the trail design, and the physical footprint required to construct the trail should be minimized.</p> |
| Cost | <p>There is interest in understanding the cost of different trail designs, including the capital costs to construct the trail as well as ongoing maintenance and operational requirements. Things to consider here include: durability/longevity of the design and materials used.</p> |
| Surface Materials | <p>There was considerable agreement that the surface of the trail needs to be stable and be able to remain stable. Suggestions to explore included (but aren't limited to): tar and chip (similar to bumpy asphalt); Geoweb – product that includes recycled plastic screening. City staff indicated that some products are more susceptible to being damaged by frost.</p> |
| Fencing/Retaining Walls | <p>It is important to discuss the requirement (as per Ontario Building Code and other regulations) and desirability of fencing and retaining walls, including the materials used for these structures.</p> |
| Topographic limitations | <p>It was suggested that topographic limitations be considered when designing the trail, including what is possible given the current steepness/grade of the slope (which influences the number of switchbacks required)</p> |
| Drainage and runoff | <p>Participants talked about the impact that drainage patterns can have on the trail, and some suggested options for using drainage solutions to help achieve other objectives for the trail (e.g. use drainage ruts to slow down bikes).</p> |
| Seasons | <p>There was general agreement that the trail be designed for use in spring, summer and fall. The City confirmed that they would not be providing snow removal on the trail. At least some participants indicated that with a warm winter it may be that the trail is also used during the winter.</p> |
| Hours of use | <p>There was general agreement that the trail should be designed for daytime use only (i.e. n lighting would be considered).</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Impact of parking | There was general agreement that the trail design should limit the impact of parking in the neighbourhood around Chorley Park. |
| Connectivity | It was suggested that the connections at either end of the trail will be important to discuss and may inform the design of the trail. |

DISCUSSION – OPTIONS TO EXPLORE DURING MEETING #2

Participants requested that the City bring the following to Meeting # for review and consideration:

Look at the existing conditions in two different ways:

1. Removing the liabilities and doing n further work o the trail
2. Upgrading what’s there now to address the liabilities

In addition, all participants (including Working Group members as well as City and TRCA staff) will consider options they would like to share and discuss at Meeting #2. For the City, these options may include (but not necessarily be limited to) options that have previously been shared with the community and/or new or modified options. For the community, this may include one or more option(s) being developed through the leadership of the Friends of Chorley Park and/or trail ideas developed by others for the Working Group and the City and TRCA to consider.

WRAP-UP AND NEXT STEPS

Nicole wrapped-up the meeting by thanking participants for the good discussion, and reviewed the following action items:

PROCESS RELATED

1. The **Facilitation Team** will distribute the draft meeting summary for participant review within a week of the meeting.
2. The **Facilitation Team** will organize a follow-up meeting(s) of the Client Team for the Working Group (which includes leaders of resident groups financially contributing to the process, as well as the City and TRCA staff) at least once between Meeting 1 and Meeting 2 to ensure materials are prepared for discussion at Meeting 2.
3. **Working Group members and City/TRCA staff** to share information from Working Group meeting # with the organizations they represent, and bring any additional feedback/thoughts to Working Group meeting #2.
4. Nicole also indicated/encouraged **all participants** to the extent possible, to share information with Working Group members prior to Meeting 2 so people can reflect on the materials prior to discussing them at the meeting.

DESIGN RELATED

5. **City staff** to share key design-related information with the Working Group, ideally well in advance of the next meeting. This includes:
 - The City of Toronto’s guiding principles for accessibility, the 2016 AODA requirements, and some type of description of the degree of flexibility that is considered reasonable when determining how to accommodate these principles and requirements.
 - City and TRCA guidelines and requirements that influence their approach to forest management, including where there is flexibility and discretion in how the guidelines and requirements are met. Additional information that would be helpful includes (but isn’t limited to): Species at Risk Act; fill regulations of the TRCA; Ravine Natural Feature protection bylaw, and Building Code.
6. **Working Group members and City/TRCA staff** to develop trail options for consideration at Meeting 2, including (but not limited to) different potential trail routes, surfaces, widths, and options for landing/resting areas. Other design elements to be considered include: drainage, safety and amenity features and how to encourage good use (and decrease user conflicts) – signage, culture, and communications.
7. **City** to bring a map of the area that illustrates the other options available for connecting between the neighbourhood around Chorley Park and the Beltline trail and Brick Works.

ATTACHMENT 1: AGENDA

- 3:30 pm** **Site walk**
Meet at Evergreen Brickworks and bring good shoes and clothing for walking around the area. The walk will include Working Group members, City of Toronto staff and the Independent Facilitation Team. The objectives of the walk are to:
- Build a shared understanding of existing conditions
 - Experience different trail conditions (slope, width, ground cover, erosion, connections, etc.)
 - Seek feedback/have discussion along the way about what Working Members and City staff like/don't like/observe about the different conditions, and how they may relate to the new connection being considered
- 5:00** **Return to Brickworks**
- 5:15** **Overview of the Working Group**
- Background & Purpose of the Working Group, including role of the City
 - Overview of Agendas for all 3 meetings, detailed review of agenda for Meeting 1
- 5:30** **Discussion Part 1 – Key Considerations when Designing the Trail**
1. What are the key factors that need to be considered when designing a future trail between Chorley Park, the Beltline, Moore Park Ravine and the Don Valley Brickworks Park?
 2. Are some of these considerations of higher priority than others? If so, which ones and why?
 3. What do you see as the objectives of the proposed trail?
 4. What principles should guide the design of the proposed trail?
- 6:45** **Discussion Part 2 – Options to Explore**
5. What options for design of the trail would you like to see explored in Meeting #2?
- 7:15** **Wrap-Up and Next Steps**
- 7:30** **Adjourn**

ATTACHMENT 2: Participants

Working Group Members

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Jackie Currie | Bennington Heights Residents Association |
| Lyndsey Gott | Cycle Toronto - Ward 27 |
| Sue Arndt | Evergreen Brick Works |
| Jean Anderson | Friends of Chorley Park |
| John Duras | Friends of Chorley Park |
| Kathleen Hanly | Friends of Chorley Park |
| Charles Hanly | Friends of Chorley Park |
| John Routh | Friends of the Don East |
| Kim Barwise | Governors Bridge Ratepayers Association |
| Jeff Hanemaayer | Governors Bridge Ratepayers Association |
| Michelle Gradish | Gradale Academy (<i>may need to find replacement for Michelle</i>) |
| Don Cameron | Moore Park Residents' Association |
| Chris Lowry | Moore Park Residents' Association |
| Normunds Mierins | North Rosedale Residents' Association |
| Lewis Reford | North Rosedale Residents' Association |
| Karen Bowles | Rosedale United Church |
| Don Hogarth | South Rosedale Ratepayers' Association |
| David Townley | South Rosedale Ratepayers' Association |
| Margaret McRae | Toronto Field Naturalists |
| Michael Black | Walk Toronto |
| Mary K Armstrong | Representing myself / my family |
| Ted Ball | Representing myself / my family |
| Nicole Bryck | Representing myself / my family |
| Heather Cartwright | Representing myself / my family |
| Michael Derblich | Representing myself / my family |
| Edward Freeman | Representing myself / my family |
| Nicholas Lynch | Representing myself / my family |
| Emma McInerney | Representing myself / my family |
| Kate Timms | Representing myself / my family |
| Geills Turner | Representing myself / my family |

Observers

| | |
|-------------|---|
| John Taranu | Cycle Toronto |
| Bryn Barron | Landscape Architect (from Strybos Barron King Ltd) working with Friends of Chorley Park |
| Polina Barn | Ryerson University Urban Planning Graduate Student |
| Julia Smith | Ryerson University Urban Planning Graduate Student |

Other participants

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Beth McEwan | City of Toronto, Manager, Urban Forest Renewal |
| Scott Laver | City of Toronto, Supervisor, Natural Environment & Community Programs |
| Wendy Strickland | City of Toronto, Natural Environment & Community Programs |
| Jennifer Hyland | City of Toronto, Cycling Infrastructure & Programs |
| Jason Diceman | City of Toronto, Senior Public Consultation Coordinator, Public Consultation Unit |
| Dave Rogalsky | Toronto & Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), Senior Manager, Resource Management Projects |

Independent Facilitation

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Reka Sivarajah | Swerhun Facilitation |
| Nicole Swerhun | Swerhun Facilitation |

ATTACHMENT 3: Summary Notes from Site Walk

Information shared and observations raised during the walk included:

Stop 1 – At the bottom of “the hill”

- Members of the Working Group said that the path on the hill represents the “desire line” and reflects people’s interest in getting from the top to the bottom of the hill directly. The hill is used by people walking, runners, and some use it to toboggan (which some consider safe and others do not).
- City staff estimated that the hill had about an 18-18.5% grade, (potentially steeper slope) adding that to meet accessibility standards today a trail needs a maximum grade of 10%. Staff also noted that the trail currently follows the water and sanitary line to the Brick Works. They also noted the pile of dirt at the bottom of the trail, which has eroded off the trail and slid downward.

Stop 2 – Partway up the hill to look at existing asphalt trail and forest

- The City shared their observations, including:
 - When the asphalt path was originally built it would not have met today’s accessibility standards;
 - The purpose of forest restoration is to establish native species which are key part of the food chain for insects, birds and other species (and which do not thrive on non-native species);
 - Regardless of whether the City chooses to make changes to the vegetation in the area, there will be changes in any case due to tree removal(s) required due to Emerald Ash Borer and trees dying from natural causes, and the impacts of non-native species in the area (e.g. non-native species have a different role in the ecosystem - attract different insects, influence the food chain etc.);
 - There are big red oak trees in the area, and trail restoration shouldn’t impact those; and
 - The City’s approach to forest management involves identifying small patchwork sites.
- Participants in the Working Group shared their observations also, including:
 - strong interest in understanding what guides the actions of the City when it comes to both forest restoration as well as accessibility. For example, there’s interest in knowing if there are any “must have” requirements related to forest restoration, and the degree of flexibility/discretion that exists when striving to meet those requirements. The same holds true for accessibility.
 - Many participants felt that nature is able to “engineer itself beautifully” and as a result there is significant interest in understanding the City’s motivations for any intervention and the degree of flexibility that can be considered.
 - photo was shared of Government House, and one participant noted that this area has been shaped by dramatic engineering efforts that went into building the house and also into grading/shaping the beltline trail.

Stop 3 – At the top of “the hill”

- The City indicated that Chorley Park and the hill are part of the North Rosedale Heritage Conservation District;
- Participants in the Working Group shared range of perspectives on trail access and use, including:
 - Chorley Park is regularly used by the local community;
 - There’s feeling that the trail is used most often during early mornings and on weekends;
 - There is limited use at night because the trail is not lit;
 - “The hill” trail is not the only way to get down the slope, there are 2 other access points
 - Perhaps it isn’t reasonable for the trail to accommodate all users when there are other access options available;

- Reminder that one Working Group member is disabled and therefore was unable to participate in the site walk;
- Note that people access the Chorley Park trail connection by bus, by car (and parking on adjacent streets), and others access and travel the existing trails by bike; and
- Thought from at least one member of the Working Group that if the Chorley Park trails were improved there would be a significant increase in their use by people travelling the Beltline Trail.
- The Facilitator noted that key responsibility of the Working Group will be to ensure the design of the trail is informed by where people come from to access the trail, when people access the trail, and whether the trail is intended to serve local and/or citywide users.

Stop 4 – Existing wooden staircase

- City staff observed that there is almost no ground cover vegetation in the area and that the bottom one-third of the staircase needs to be restored. They also indicated that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) typically requires any paths to be no closer than 25 metres from a butternut tree (referred to as the “tree protection zone”) but the City got approval from MNR for 15 metres for this trail. If the City decides to remove the existing asphalt trail in this area, they would do the work by hand for the benefit of the butternut trees.
- TRCA staff provided more information on the butternuts, indicating that there are 18 trees in total, 9 of which are infected and non-retainable under the Butternut Health Assessment protocol. Neither the City nor the TRCA have any intentions to remove any of the butternut trees based on their status as retainable or non-retainable. The location of the parent butternut tree is unknown.
- Participants expressed an interest in knowing more details about the flexibility of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources when working in areas with butternut trees, and the Facilitator suggested that one option might be to invite an MNR representative to a Working Group meeting.

Stop 5 – West switchback trail (Brick Works)

- The City explained that this trail was built years ago and is 2.5 metres wide. The old alignment of the original trail is still visible (see space between trees). The trail has a standard asphalt finish and has armor stone at the bottom of the path (which is 2-3 stones high).

Stop 6 – East switchback trail (Brick Works)

- The City explained that this new switchback was built this summer to address erosion and concerns about impacts on vegetation from many fall line trails. The new trail has an average 12% grade. The fence still needs to be installed, and interpretive signage as well.
- At this stop participants discussed:
 - The importance of ensuring compatibility between different trail users;
 - The importance of having a code of conduct to guide users of the trail – so that calls to Bylaw Enforcement Officers and/or the police are not required to manage responsible use of the trail (many referred to the cyclist that passed by the group at this stop); and
 - That skateboarders would be drawn to any asphalt trail, even if it isn’t designed for them (one participant encouraged people to see the skateboard scrapes on the new path).

Stop 7 – Fall line trail restoration

- The City pointed out a fall line trail that is being restored (currently fenced off to prevent access and seeded as part of re-vegetation). They also estimated the downhill portion of the asphalt-paved trail connecting to the Brick Works (this portion is not a switchback) to have approximately 10-12% grade.

- Some participants remarked on the loss of informal trails for children to climb and explore, while others (including a representative familiar with Brick Works summer camps for kids) explained that use of the informal trails was not encouraged.

Attachment #4: NOTE FROM THE FACILITATOR

TO: Chorley Park Trail Design Stakeholder Working Group & Participating City and TRCA Staff
FROM: Nicole Swerhun, Independent Facilitator, Chorley Park Working Group
DATE: Tuesday, October 14, 2014
RE: **Preparing for 3 Working Sessions:** **Tuesday, October 14, 2014 (3:30 – 7:30 pm)**
Thursday, November 13, 2014 (6:30 – 9:00 pm)
Thursday, November 27, 2014 (6:30 – 9:00 pm)

This *Note from the Facilitator* provides: a brief background to the Chorley Park Trail Design Working Group; a summary of the range of perspectives and priorities that have been expressed to date regarding the proposed improvements to the trail connection between Chorley Park, the Beltline Trail and Don Valley Brick Works Park; and a suggested structure and approach to the three Working Group meetings for consideration by all participants.

1. Background to the Chorley Park Trail Design Working Group

A range of perspectives exist regarding the need to improve the Chorley Park trail connection to the Beltline Trail and Don Valley Brick Works Park.

- **The City of Toronto in partnership with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)** identified a need for improvements to the trail as early as 1999, and the City developed more detailed design ideas over the last two years. The City has indicated that:
 - the existing footpaths, broken asphalt trail and deteriorating timber staircase are not safe for public use;
 - rehabilitation of the existing infrastructure to bring it up to standard and make it safe for public use is not possible at its current location because of the potential construction impact on the endangered butternut trees (which are protected under the Ontario Endangered Species Act) as well as other important native trees;
 - existing footpaths, trail and deteriorating timber staircase will be removed and converted to a natural forest condition;
 - the existing network of numerous informal footpaths is harming the quality of the local forest environment, inhibiting healthy ground cover and contributing to erosion of the hillside; and
 - the proposed new trail was designed to sit within primarily previously disturbed areas as a multi-use asphalt trail, 3 metres wide with an average 6.8% grade and 5-6 switchbacks, including three potential connections through Chorley Park to the street and two connections to the Beltline Trail.
- **The community** has provided a range of feedback to the City's proposed design for the Chorley Park. While there were some participants in the process to date who have expressed support for the proposal, the bulk of the feedback came from those with concerns, including:
 - concerns regarding the necessity of the trail improvements, given connections in the area (e.g. Moore Avenue, Milkman's Lane, Roxborough and Mount Pleasant, etc.);
 - concerns regarding the proposed design of the trail, including the trail route, surface, width, number of switchbacks, connections, accessibility/grade, access points, armour stone retaining walls, fencing, etc.);
 - the scale of the City's proposed design was seen by many as too overwhelming and would spoiling the natural beauty of the area;
 - concerns regarding parking, traffic, and the consultation process; and
 - an interest in seeing the base assumptions regarding the trail design be reconsidered, and a new trail design developed through a series of charrette-like working sessions held in collaboration with the community.

In response to these concerns, local resident leaders and the City of Toronto (staff and the local Councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam) came together to create the Chorley Park Trail Design Working Group as a forum for a diverse group of stakeholders to discuss, explore, and find common ground regarding key elements of the Chorley Park trail connection.

2. Summary of the range of Perspectives & Priorities

Based on the notes from the June 9, 2014 public meeting on the Chorley Park trail connection, as well as follow up conversations with residents and City staff, the points below reflect the range of perspectives that have been raised to date regarding the trail, including key design elements:

- **Trail type:** The City has proposed 3 high-level options to date, including closure of the existing trail, creation of a new trail (4 options were presented), and creation of a staircase with a bike trough. Some participants in the community have suggested maintenance of the existing trails as another option they would like to see considered.
- **Trail route:** Options for new trail routes explored to date include a new trail with 3-5 switchbacks. There has been interests expressed by some in the community to see improvements made to the existing trail routes (in their current location).
- **Trail width:** Options proposed by the City to date have considered trails that range in width from 2.1 metres (for the staircase) to a range of 2.5 – 3 metres for a switchback trail. Public participants have indicated a preference for much less than 3 metres.
- **Trail surface:** Asphalt is the only trail surface considered to date by the City. Some in the community have expressed support for asphalt, while others are interested in anything but asphalt (because of concerns it will be icy, will fall into disrepair, it's too unnatural, it will generate increased runoff) and would like to see woodchips and/or compacted granular surface considered.
- **Trail grade or trail slope (which is a key factor in determining accessibility):** The City has proposed options that consider a 6.8% - 8% average grade for the new trail. Community participants are interested in understanding the degree of accessibility that needs to be provided by this trail connection, including those that are interested in maintaining a steeper, unpaved trail.
- **Trail connections:** The City has identified potential for 0-3 connections through Chorley Park to street and 1-2 connections to the Beltline Trail.
- **Retaining walls, fencing and railings:** Retaining walls, fencing and railings have been included as elements of some of the City's proposals to date. There have been concerns expressed by many in the community about these elements, and an interest in exploring options to minimizing and/or avoiding these while meeting trail safety standards.
- **Planting:** The City has committed to protecting existing butternut trees, as well as planting a minimum of 400 trees and shrubs. Many in the community have expressed interest in seeing the area maintained as naturally as possible.
- **Costs:** The community has expressed an interest in understanding the costs associated with changes to the trail, including the relative capital, operating and maintenance costs of different options. The community has also expressed an interest in understanding the source of funding for trail improvements.
- **Other issues raised include:** Some in the community have expressed interest in: maintenance of the unofficial toboggan run; the potential for lighting; and signage options. Concerns related to traffic in the area are being investigated by Traffic Operations and are outside of the scope of this project. Any concerns identified with parking can be evaluated.

3. Suggested Structure and Approach to 3 Working Group Meetings

All three meetings of the Chorley Park Working Group are proposed as interactive discussions that get information flowing between all members of the Working Group as well as participating staff from the City of Toronto and the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). The following framework for the three meetings is proposed, based on the Terms of Reference for the Chorley Park Trail Design Working Group*, as well as past feedback from the City and the local community regarding the Chorley Park trail connection. This framework is designed to be flexible to respond to the evolving needs of the Working Group, and will be revisited and refined as necessary as discussion unfolds.

** More details are available in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Working Group, which were developed by the City of Toronto in consultation with North Rosedale Residents' Association, South Rosedale Ratepayers' Association, Moore Park Residents' Association and Friends of Chorley Park.*

Working Group Meeting 1 (Tuesday, October 14, 2014)

Key information to share

- Site walk to review existing conditions, different trail conditions (ALL)
- Background and purpose of the Working Group, including role of the City and TRCA (ALL)
- Proposed approach to three meetings, including proposed agenda for Meeting 1 (Facilitator)

Key feedback sought

- What Working Group members, the City and TRCA like/don't like/observe about different trail conditions (during site walk)
- What are the key factors to be considered when designing a future trail connection between Chorley Park, the Beltline, and the Don Valley Brick Works Park?
- Are some of these considerations of higher priority than others? If so, which ones and why?
- What do you see as the objectives of the proposed trail?
- What principles should guide the design of the proposed trail?
- What options for design of the trail would you like to see explored in Meeting 2?

Working Group Meeting 2 (Thursday, November 13, 2014)

Key information to share

- Design options for the proposed trail, and how they respond to the objectives and design principles identified during Meeting 1 (from the Working Group, City staff and/or TRCA)

Key feedback sought

- What do you like about the options shared?
- What don't you like about the options, and why?
- Are there opportunities to refine the design concept(s) in a way that finds as much common ground as possible among different priorities and perspectives of the Working Group, City and TRCA?

Working Group Meeting 3 (Thursday, November 27, 2014)

Key information to share

- Refinement(s) to trail design concept(s) emerging from Meeting 2 (Working Group, City, TRCA)
- Additional information/considerations, if any, to inform design and construction

Key feedback sought

- Are there any outstanding issues to address before finalizing the design concept? If so, what are they? And what suggestions do you have, if any, to address the issue(s)?
- What information would be helpful to share before moving forward with detailed design and construction?

Role of the Independent Facilitator

To supplement the Working Group approach outlined in the Chorley Park Trail Design Working Group Terms of Reference (TOR), the following additional information describes the Independent Facilitator's proposed approach:

- **Agendas:** The Independent Facilitator will work with the City and resident leaders to develop agendas for the Working Group meetings, including the suggested facilitation approach, as well as information to share, suggested discussion focus, and feedback sought.
- **Meeting summaries:** A draft summary of each Working Group meeting will be distributed within 4 days following the meeting, for participant review. Comments and/or suggested refinements will be sought within one week, and the meeting summary will then be finalized and posted on the City's website.
- **Approach to discussion:** The Independent Facilitator will use a combination of small group and full room discussion, as appropriate, to enable meaningful and constructive contributions by all. Ideating may be used during meetings (paper) and/or after meetings (online members-only survey).
- **Decision making:** As Facilitator, my experience is that group discussion is best served through a consensus-based approach where participants openly discuss ideas, perspectives and viewpoints, and seek to develop common ground and narrow areas of disagreement to the best of their ability. Where differing viewpoints and opinions exist, these will be documented in the Working Group meeting summaries. If voting is required, the TOR identifies a vote of 77% acceptance (e.g. 23 out of 30) Working Group members constitutes acceptance of a recommendation.
- **Role of the City and TRCA:** The TOR clearly states that the Working Group is an advisory body to the City of Toronto, and that it is the City that remains responsible for the final decisions on design and implementation. It also notes that the City and TRCA are not members of the Working Group. From my experience, effective communication between Working Group members, the City and TRCA will be critical to achieving a successful outcome to the Working Group process – success is a design concept for the Chorley Park trail connection that the Working Group, the City and TRCA are all able to live with.