

## **Harbord Village Residents' Association Board Meeting**

**Tuesday, February 15, 7:00 pm**

**by Zoom call**

### **APPROVED MINUTES**

**Attendees:** Gina Buonaguro, Kerry Clare, Simon Coleman, Sue Dexter, Anne Fleming, Karen Laurence, Susan McDonald, Cathy Merkley, Lena Mortensen, Christian Mueller, Jane Perdue, Nick Provart, Gus Sinclair, Robert Stambula

**Regrets:** Elizabeth Chen, Frank Davis

1. **Chair's Welcome:** Anne called the meeting to order at 7:09.
2. **Approval of Agenda:** Gus asked to add an item on the fall candidates debate under Other Business. Gus moved adoption of the agenda, seconded by Jane. **Agenda adopted.**

### **3. College St. Upgrade**

**3.1 SSC College St. Upgrade Report.** Nicole summarized the Safe Streets Committee analysis of the City's proposal and Bob's counter proposal (report attached)

**3.2 Planning and Development Committee College St. Upgrade update.** (see speaking notes attached) Bob reviewed current developments in three areas 1) consultation with an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party, 2) reply to and engagement with the city, and 3) comments on the SSC report.

Nicole defended her committee's report, pointing out that it was based on North American best practices in terms of bike safety and pedestrian safety and was well footnoted.

Bob responded that the HVRA proposal was a broad stroke response to the city's proposal without having any detailed plans from the city to work from. He pointed out that the HVRA plan addressed all the SSC safety concerns as well and in many cases better than the city plan.

Sue said the issue is that we do not have very much time, and the point of Bob's proposal was to present the city with a simpler plan which would be easier for the city to say yes to, while leaving open the possibility of more upgrades in future.

Kerry asked if the phased proposal allowed for the safety features the SSC was concerned about to be added eventually, and Anne said yes.

Nicole reiterated the SSC view that it would be better to get the city's proposed safety feature with TTC construction this summer rather than holding off hoping for a better development at some point in the future.

Gus suggested that, in the interests of getting through the rest of the agenda, the board should now vote on Bob's motion.

The full motion is in the speaking notes attached. Bob moved: **Be it resolved that:** HVRA calls on the City to accept our proposals for the College Upgrade, for a better bike land (straight, barrier protected and raised), expanded not contracted sidewalks, more greening and public realm improvements, and a thriving Café To program; and, For clarity, we prefer delay, if needed to implement our proposals, rather than accept the decades-long harm imposed in the constraint -burdened City plan. Gus seconded. Vote: 9 in favour, 1 opposed, 3 abstentions. **Motion passed.**

**4. Approval of the January 18<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting Minutes:** Gus moved, seconded by Susan. **Motion Passed.**

**5. Business Arising from Past Minutes**

**5.1 CNOY:** Karen said, in the interest of getting through the agenda, she would send an email update on the HVRA fundraising efforts on behalf of the Fort York Food Bank

**5.2 Snow removal:** Gina asked whether HVRA should still be delivering flyers asking people to shovel their walks, given that the city is now responsible for clearing them but is doing a very poor job. Cathy quoted a December 3<sup>rd</sup> media posting online from the city: "While the sidewalk clearing services expanded over the winter, the city continues to ask residents and business owners to be good neighbours when it snows and clear the sidewalks around their homes and businesses following each snow fall." The city is doing a post mortem on the snow clearing process in March. The HVRA will send a letter outlining the many problems experienced in HV. In addition, Cathy said she would get on to the councilor's office to get clarification of whether or not residents are still required to clear their walks, so that this information can be published in the Spring newsletter. Cathy also brought up the problem of speed bumps in the neighbourhood extending the full width of the street and blocking water flow when there is a melt. Cathy will also bring this up with the councilor's office.

## 6. New Business

**6.1 Knox Church Development:** Sue said there are no new developments here. Knox acknowledges that HVRA has not given any opinion on its incomplete application to make changes to its property. We are waiting for the Knox application to the city and the process that will follow.

**6.2 Leaf Blower Ban:** Anne asked if HVRA should be a signatory to the Deer Park Resident's Group letter to ban gas-powered leaf blowers. Susan moved that we join; Gus seconded. **Motion passed.**

**6.3 Potential Spring Art Crawl in Association with Harbord BIA.** Anne reported that around the time of the Fall Fair, Neil Wright of the HBIA, suggested it would be good to have an outdoor spring event. This will probably happen in May. Anne will let the board know more when there is more to know and asked that anyone interested in helping out let her know.

**6.4 Possible Speakers for the Spring General Meeting and Beyond:** The GM is three meetings from now so if anyone has any ideas, please let me know. Jane suggested Todd Irvine, an arborist, might be interesting. Anne suggested that if not for the GM, maybe HVRA could sponsor educational webinars and also possibly bring speakers into the board meetings if there are subjects the board wants to know more about.

**6.5 HVRA Transparency and Accessibility:** There have been comments that the board is secretive and people don't know what is going on, so are there ways that we can let people know what is going on? Kerry said, returning to the last point, could we have a speaker talking about mediation or how community members can establish more effective communication with the board and vice versa. This idea was very well received. Simon suggested that community members could sit in on the board meeting. Gus confirmed that our board meetings are public; anyone can attend. Susan suggested that the eblast could be posted to the Friends of Harbord Village Facebook page. Anne agreed that posting links to the eblasts and newsletters to the FHV Facebook page would give people who are not members of HVRA access to what is happening in the association. The question was raised of when we will meet again in person. Anne suggested we address this issue at the next meeting.

## 7. Committee and Area Rep Reports

**7.1 Treasurer's Report** (Lena) Lena said because it was already so late, her reports could be presented at the next meeting. People can review the budget and financial statements beforehand.

**7.2 SSC February Report:** Kerry said there were a couple of questions from the February report that the SSC would appreciate answers to. The first question is: does the board support the SSC drafting a letter to the city about snow clearance issues. Cathy wondered whether there would be overlap with the letter the board was going to write to the councilor's office. Kerry asked that Cathy communicate with her on this matter so that she can let the SSC know what the board is doing there. The second question was about delivery bikes. They wanted to know whether a letter had been sent to the Bloor St. BIA about this problem. Anne said the letter had not yet been sent. She suggested that she and Kerry have a discussion about this after the meeting to determine how to best move forward here.

**8. Other Business:**

**8.1 FoSTRA All-Candidates meetings:** Gus said that FoSTRA sent around a survey soliciting questions from all RAs to be asked of candidates in the upcoming provincial election. Gus said that HVRA has been holding all-candidates meetings here for 20 years, and we do not want to have a meeting where the questions are potted. We take questions from our people, people who are at the meeting we do not want questions coming in from somewhere else. We are planning to do an all-candidates meeting again this year, though it may be virtual. Anne said we could respond to the FoSTRA survey to give them an idea of what our priorities are, without using their questions.

**8.2 March Break:** Gina pointed out our next meeting is scheduled during March Break, so did we want to change that date. Anne, said she would send a poll to find out which will be the best date.

9. **Adjournment:** Thanks were given to everybody by everybody for all the hard work we do as volunteers. Karen moved the meeting be adjourned. Karry seconded. **Meeting adjourned at 9:12.**

## February 15, 2022 College Street Upgrade Report

### A. Independent Third Party (ITPs)

ITP validation is an effective tool to test ideas and gain support. Following our January meeting I reached out to a major cyclist advocacy group (MCAG), the Little Italy BIA and restaurant/cafes in our segment of College. Anne joined me for a Zoom with the MCAG.

#### 1. The MCAG:

- a. Were surprised that the City added cycling to the College Upgrade.
- b. Would have not “blinked” if nothing was added to the TTC work.
- c. Have “equity” concerns given the massive inadequacy of cycling infrastructure throughout the City.
- d. Believed that staff tried to do something but were burdened by the constraints of the TTC schedule and limited funds.
- e. Had proposed something akin to our proposal to City Staff.
- f. Agreed that a first hurdle was to “do no harm”, not achieved by the City.
- g. **Found our proposal superior in every aspect to the City plan: the bike lane, pedestrian and public realm impacts, place-making and future-proofing**
  - i. Future-proofing: Does the nature of the plan permit or detract from further change leading to a superior plan.
- h. Recognized that the City plan blocks the second lane for the patio season while ours has only lane 24/7.
- i. Suggested that some defending car traffic will use streetcar impacts as a proxy for their concerns.

#### 2. Little Italy BIA/HV restaurants & Cafés

- a. The BIA could not publicly speak about the project (being a child of the City)
- b. They relayed that member businesses were very upset the CaféTO changes in the City plan, to move them from laybys to the second traffic lane. They agreed to share my contact info to members. No contacts were made
- c. I contacted 1 café (reached a partner) and 1 restaurant in HV. The partner was aware of the change, was very concerned, but was clearly more worried about staying open another week to divert any effort elsewhere. The restaurant was not responsive.

## **B. Responding to Counsellor Layton's Call for Flexibility**

### **Modifying/Phasing our Proposal: Future-Proofing.**

The MCAG saw our proposal as superior not just on the direct elements but because it “did no harm” and was future-proof. Meaning that phasing of our work did no harm to future phases leading overall to a superior project. It also did no harm to CaféTO, the sidewalks, and public realm/greening opportunities, as the City plan does. They saw the City plan as second-best and very unforgiving to any possible improvements.

### **Phase I**

Take quick inexpensive steps not linked to the TTC Schedule & funding needs:

- ✓ install curbstones to separate the bike lane from the laybys;
- ✓ move parking and use laybys for CaféTO, the public realm
- ✓ convert the 3.3m second vehicular lane into a curbstone-framed buffer zone for the bike lane and 2.2m parking spaces (the standard on Bloor and Harbord)

At near negligible cost, over any weekend with some paint and curbstones, our proposal could be operational. A straight and barrier protected bike line, CaféTO remaining in the laybys and that space available for public realm use, bike racks, planters, benches etc. It also allows savings to be redirected to critical cycling infrastructure deficits across the City or quicker action on phase II.

### **Phase I Includes Other Work Not in Dispute:**

- ✓ Safety Improvements to the TTC stops
- ✓ Raised sidewalks over all side streets
- ✓ More work/focus to ensure safe transition into and through major intersections

During phase one, real time impacts on the TTC and traffic can be measured.

### **Phase II & more**

When funds are available:

- ✓ Laybys can be filled in
- ✓ Raise bike lane
- ✓ Fill buffered zone
- ✓ Plant trees & build planters & public realm improvement into the former laybys
- ✓ Green flanking properties

### **TTC**

The City is waiting for a report from the TTC. They are concerned about impacts on the street schedule.

We have noted that:

- ✓ The existing bottleneck in Little Italy is a permanent issue. Any slowdown in HV has no impact with that bottleneck just a few blocks west of use.
- ✓ The City Plan puts CaféTO in their temporary rush-hour lane anyway, so for 6 months of the year, the City plan had the same impact as ours.

- ✓ Our phased approach allow real time data to be collected to assess TTC and traffic movement and the change of traffic patterns. Commuters may well avoid rather than be attracted to commuting through College in HV.
- ✓ We will reply to TTC matters when their report is shared.
- ✓ Consider Mitigating options: No left turns, dedicated right hand turns, stops after intersection

### C. Next Meeting with the City

- A meeting with the City to reply to our December 17<sup>th</sup> proposals was scheduled for March 14<sup>th</sup>. It was cancelled since the TTC did not meet the delivery date for its report to the City.
- Feb 22<sup>nd</sup> is the revised date. In advance, we will issue our phased approach.

### D. SS Committee:

#### Are Reported Safety Issues Covered:

- College Street between Spadina and Manning is currently a wide street with four lanes of often very aggressive traffic. **HVRA calms traffic with 2 24/7 lanes, unlike the City that has not 4 rush hour lanes during the non-patio season.**
- There is only a painted line to protect cyclists from that traffic. This is a situation which scares many potential riders, thus preventing fuller use of the bike lanes. **HVRA proposes raised, barrier separated lanes like the City.**
- Cars entering or leaving the parking bays must cross over the bike lane, increasing the risk of collision. **Covered by the HVRA and City proposals.**
- Because the bike lanes are also narrow, cyclists must enter the vehicular lanes in order to pass other cyclists, to avoid cars in the act of parking, and to get around vehicles that illegally park in the bike lane (which is very common since there is no physical barrier to prevent it). **A raised barrier separated bike lane proposed by the HVRA and the City addresses this.**
- Pedestrians on College are also exposed to aggressive traffic as they traverse intersections. Of the 20 people seriously injured or killed between Manning and Spadina from 2010-2020, all the serious injuries occurred at intersections. The two fatalities happened at midblock locations.
  - **We asked the City how their design was informed by these events – there was no reply.**
  - **Aggressive driving is best addressed by the HVRA plan with only 2 24/7 lanes.**

#### Are Issues Missing from Our Proposal?

- The SS Committee noted missing elements to our proposal. This is an overall design proposal and does not address items not in conflict: For example we have clearly voiced support for these items thus adopting them into our plan:
  - TTC stop safety improvements, and
  - raised side-street crossing (at all streets – the City excludes Lippincott & Borden even though they best fit their metrics for these improvements), and

- it's acknowledged that the blending of both the general City or HVRA plan (covering 90% of Manning to Spadina) needs careful attention to ensure safe transition into and through major intersections.

#### Is there Sufficient Space?

- Yes. The Committee did not take into account the space saving in the HVRA plan, i.e. the second travel lane is currently 3.3m while parking only requires 2.2m (as on Harbord and Bloor). Saving go toward the barrier separating parked cars from the bike lane or a combination of that and the bike lane itself.
- Consider Bloor street bike lane in HV. In an originally 4 lane road, it has 2 24/7 lanes, parking, and a bike lane. How can College, originally at 6 lanes not easily fit a similar design with room for a separation barrier as we propose.

#### Straight or Weaving Bike Lane: What's Safer?

- Our cycling advocacy group consult judged the HVRA proposal superior for every individual element and overall. A better bike lane, impacts on sidewalks, greening, the public realm, place-making, and future-proofing. They did not judge a weaving lane safer as the Committee suggests.
- A weaving lane moves cyclists out toward traffic, just the buffer disappears and where traffic may turn right towards cyclists inviting safety risks.
- A straight lane is more predictable and does not suffer the risks of the weaving lane.

#### How Does the Borden Bike Crossing Interface?

- Overall design elements must be settled first.
- The City plan has been debated with HV neighbours outside of this process.

#### What about CaféTO:

- The SSC recognized the material shortfall in the City Plan for CaféTO on College; i.e. put it in the middle of the road, but only suggested that there must be better options. Let's remember that the HVRA proposals keeps them where they been, in laybys for phase I and on the expanded sidewalks in phase II.
- Within the City Plan, there are no better options. As a result its plan faces the same issue of having 1 24/7 lane for cars and the TTC for the 6 months of patio season, having the same impact as the HVRA proposal.

#### No Reason for Delay:

- HVRA earned citywide praise for its College Street revitalization project in 2000-2004 and earned a City Design award. That success was expected to remain for 50 years. It is short sighted to accept a rushed and funding constrained plan that falls so short – and to have to live with it for decades.
- It concedes hard fought gains of the landmark Revitalization Project. We “risked” the impact of delay then and succeeded then.
- Our phasing proposal gets the fundamentals done now, at a savings for the City, with the decorating later. No real risks.



**E. Board Motion:** (subject to final edits when minutes are approved)

Whereas on December 17, 2021, HVRA identified significant shortfalls in the City's overall design proposal for the College Street Upgrade and its consultation process. And whereas:

- We find that constraints (timing & cost) on City staff to work coincidentally with the planned TTC construction on College, have been fatal to their efforts to improve College between Manning and Spadina;
- Our proposal is supported by PARA and a major cycling advocacy group in Toronto as superior to the City plan, and has now been phased to address scheduling and cost concerns;
- The City proposal locks out future improvements, while our phased proposal is future-proof, not excluding improvements but facilitating them;
- Phase I immediately achieves almost all bike lane improvements without reducing sidewalks, gutting CaféTO and locking out future greening and public realm improvements as in the City plan;
- Phase I is not bound to the TTC construction schedule and at materially less cost than the City plan, allows savings to be redirected to critical cycling infrastructure deficits across the City, or quicker action to implement Phase II; and
- At modest cost, our phased plan allows real time data to assess impacts on traffic patterns and TTC schedules.

**Let it be resolved that:**

- HVRA calls on the City to accept our proposals for the College Upgrade, for a better bike lane (straight, buffer-zone protected and raised), expanded not contracted sidewalks, more greening and public realm improvements, and a thriving CaféTO program; and,
- For clarity, we prefer delay, if needed to implement our proposals, rather than accept the decades-long harm imposed in the constraint burdened City plan.

The SafeStreets Committee has reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to College street by the city, and the modifications to that plan proposed by Bob Stambula to the board in December. The December minutes note that several board members abstained because they felt that they did not have enough information, so we hope that this might clarify matters for them.

Currently there are a number of important safety issues along College:

- College Street between Spadina and Manning is currently a wide street with four lanes of often very aggressive traffic.
- There is only a painted line to protect cyclists from that traffic. This is a situation which scares many potential riders, thus preventing fuller use of the bike lanes.
- Cars entering or leaving the parking bays must cross over the bike lane, increasing the risk of collision.
- Because the bike lanes are also narrow, cyclists must enter the vehicular lanes in order to pass other cyclists, to avoid cars in the act of parking, and to get around vehicles that illegally park in the bike lane (which is very common since there is no physical barrier to prevent it)
- Pedestrians on College are also exposed to aggressive traffic as they traverse intersections. Of the 20 people seriously injured or killed between Manning and Spadina from 2010-2020, all the serious injuries occurred at intersections. The two fatalities happened at midblock locations.<sup>1</sup>

The city has proposed to address these deficiencies by:

- Calming vehicular traffic by reducing College from four lanes of vehicular traffic to two, with two lanes of parking during most of the day. During rush hours the parking lane would become an active lane
- Making the bike lanes safer by raising them, moving them away from the active traffic, and widening them to allow passing and create a buffer zone to prevent door slamming from parked cars. With this design, it will be more difficult for motorized vehicles to park illegally in the raised cycle tracks, which will also improve safety for cyclists.
- Protecting pedestrians by reinforcing traffic calming at some of the intersections by building raised crossings at some of the side streets along College (these have been shown to work very well and calm both vehicles and bike traffic).<sup>2</sup>
- Also protecting pedestrians by including curb bulb-out extensions at all possible intersections, further calming traffic
- Protecting TTC users as they get on and off the streetcar by building longer loading platforms (for the new longer streetcars), although this eliminates 19% of the parking spots.

Although the HVRA's report asserts that "what the City has proposed falls short and benefits cars over the public realm" we respectfully disagree. Taken together, these measures benefit cyclists, pedestrians and

---

1 see College Street Upgrades, p. 26 <<https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/97ea-college-stakeholder-public-consultation-pdf>

2 see <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-design-guide/street-design-elements/vertical-speed-control-elements/>

TTC users at the expense of motor vehicles. The plan is consistent with the City's Complete Streets Guidelines,<sup>3</sup> TransformTO,<sup>4</sup> and Vision Zero.<sup>5</sup>

The HVRA has proposed that the city should:

- enlarge the sidewalk into the present parking bays, creating a better space for CaféTO to operate and wider sidewalks for pedestrians
- have raised bike lanes that run straight in a straight line along the (now straight) sidewalk curb
- reduce all vehicular traffic to one lane (streetcar and vehicles)
- have permanent parking in a lane between the bike lane and the vehicular traffic

The SafeStreets Committee fully agrees that the City's proposal fails to create a safe space for CaféTO to operate. Having servers and patrons regularly cross the bike lane to access it is an accident waiting to happen. The City must find an alternate approach to CaféTO for this section of College Street. It is not clear that this would require the sidewalk space to be increased, however. CaféTO operates on Bloor street, which already has a narrower sidewalk, without utilizing the roadway. A solution will require wider consultation with the street's restauranteurs.

The problem with increasing the sidewalk space is that a corresponding amount of roadway must be lost. It is not clear that sufficient space would remain for the lane of active traffic, the streetcar islands, the lane of parking, and a raised bike lane wide enough for passing (and not getting doored). This google streetview image suggests that there is not:



3 The policy is articulated in *Toronto Complete Streets Guidelines*, p. 8 <<https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/906b-Chapter-1.pdf>>

4 Especially pp. 65-66 <<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2021/ie/bgrd/backgroundfile-173758.pdf>>

5 <<https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/streets-parking-transportation/road-safety/vision-zero/vision-zero-plan-overview/>>

Moreover, straightening the bike lane would remove a number of the safety elements of the design. A winding bike lane is actually much safer for all the road users. Bulb outs and chicanes (features that force users to swerve instead of going straight) are intentional features.<sup>6</sup> A winding bike lane requires cyclists to travel at slower speeds, which is important for an area with many different types of users such as College Street. Some members of our community have repeatedly expressed their fear of cyclists travelling at dangerous speeds in the new bike lanes. The reason the city plan incorporates these features is to mitigate that. Losing the bulb-outs at intersections and chicanes is not an improvement.

To be clear, we are focusing on the safety aspects of the plan. It is up to the board, and ultimately the City, to weigh safety against other factors. Some people may feel that the benefits of a larger sidewalk in the HVRA plan outweigh increasing the safety of the bike lane.

We do not understand why the HVRA's proposal rejects allowing rush-hour traffic in the lane devoted to parking. Bathurst is a major arterial so reducing all vehicles to the streetcar lane between Spadina and Bathurst seems problematic.

The HVRA proposal also omits several key safety improvements that we brought to the board, namely:

- need for improved lane differentiation through the hazardous intersection of Spadina and College
- encouraging the maximum number of raised pedestrian crossings for the streets connecting to College
- reviewing how the planned Borden St. bike crossing will interface with the planned lanes on College and with the existing streetscape

SafeStreets agrees that the city's plan does require further refinement, especially in how CafeTO is to be operated. However we disagree with the statement “And if delay is required to do this, so be it. It’s the price of an authentic consultation.” The city's proposal is tied to the already scheduled streetcar roadwork that will start in a few months time. We fear that if these improvements are not tacked on now, it will be years before there is another chance.

---

<sup>6</sup> There’s a nice summary of current best practices here: <<https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-design-guide/street-design-elements/>>



The voice  
of our  
community

## Join the campaign to ban gas-powered Leaf Blowers!

February 8, 2022

To: President, Harbord Village Residents' Association

The pollution and noise from a gas-powered leaf blower are health hazards. Now, at last, Toronto is taking it seriously. In the next few months Councillors will debate a sensible transition to ban the use of gas-powered leaf blowers and garden equipment. The campaign is gaining momentum because of Councillor Mike Layton's request to the *Municipal Licensing Standards* for a report to ban leaf blowers as part of an update of the noise bylaw.

The climate crisis makes this urgent. Major cities in North America have banned leaf blowers and we need to ask ourselves – is it worth the environmental and health risk when there are cleaner alternatives such as electric blowers, and of course, the rake?

The motion will be debated at Toronto City Council, and we are actively seeking support. **Will you please discuss with your Board and sign on with our initiative?**

We need your help.

Thank you,

Chris Keating, [chris@hvq.com](mailto:chris@hvq.com)

Chair, Noise and Pollution Action Committee, Deer Park Residents Group Inc.

**JOIN the "GAS BUSTERS"**

## SafeStreets February 2022 report

### Ongoing business:

- Still waiting on completion of parts of Brunswick/Borden counterflow (raised intersection at Borden & Ulster and the installation of bike crossing at College has been tied to College St. renewal, see below, in 2022)
- Still awaiting painting of stop lines at signalized intersections where they are absent
- Waiting to see how the somewhat improved one way marking at Sussex and Robert is affecting the wrong way driving issue (relying on those residents to let us know)

### New Stuff:

1. **Report on the HVRA position on the College St project:** We're reattaching the report so it can get appended to the minutes. As of Noon Monday we have received no questions -- the SSC Chair is happy to attend the meeting if the board does have questions. **We hope that the board will keep us informed of their negotiations with the city and if there are any modifications to what they are asking the city.**
2. **Issues with snow clearance:** There have been lots of justifiable complaints about the way the city handled the snowstorm last month. In particular it has been noted that, in addition to clear failures, there were some systemic issues that lead to impassible sidewalks and dangerous roads:
  - The Brunswick bike lane was never plowed, and instead served as a place for the street plow to dump the snow from the road. The street plows appear to have completely ignored the contraflow lane's existence rendering it unusable
  - The pattern and timing of sidewalk plowing was utterly chaotic, so it was impossible to predict which blocks might be passible for pedestrians
  - Plows clearing the street dumped large quantities of frozen snow on cleared sidewalks, rendering them impassible to pedestrians, in several locationsSafeStreets would like to draft a letter for the HVRA to the Councillor, the Mayor, and Transportation Services articulating some of the ways in which they need to improve snow clearance. **Does the board support our drafting such a letter?**
3. **Continued Concern about flagrantly illegal behaviour of delivery bikes:** We have not heard back from the board about the letter we asked be sent to the Bloor St. BIA last summer, so presume that there was no response. Delivery eBikes are routinely using the sidewalks on Bloor and

College, and to a lesser extent elsewhere. Although it is already completely illegal, it is clear that the police will not do anything about it. If the businesses that employ them cannot be made to care through the intervention of the BIA, perhaps we could exert some pressure for the municipal government to hold the delivery services in some way culpable? **Does the board have any ideas about strategies to curb this?**

## **AREA REPORTS**

### **SE REPORT**

A resident raised a concern about the proposed Knox Church Spadina/Harbord corner proposed development, and HVRA has confirmed that this proposal is still in the development phase with nothing yet decided or approved. Lack of snow removal on sidewalks and streets in the SE continue to plague both pedestrians and drivers with lingering ice. Her Father's Cider Bar patio is happily back in operation.

Gina Buonaguro

### **NW REPORT**

- Community Swim has returned to Central Tech running Sundays from 1-3.
- New business! Hoagie Station has opened on Bloor just west of Brunswick.
- Community concerns about ongoing construction at 201 Brunswick Ave, with records showing repeated failed inspections and now a zoning review.
- Concerns about failure to plow Brunswick Contra-flow Bike lanes—snowing is being plowed onto bike lanes

Kerry Clare

### **NE REPORT**

Excavation and shoring work for the Spadina-Sussex residence and for the new rental building at 666 Spadina continue. The crane foundation was recently installed at 666 Spadina.

Dog issues continue at the Robert St. field. U of T put up No Pets signs recently, but the one at the south entrance was removed after 2 days (it was affixed with zip ties). U of T police have said they will begin enforcing the No Pets rule (for field cleanliness reasons - kids from nearby schools use it; it's also stipulated in the OMB settlement for the Spadina-Sussex residence that the HVRA was party to) notwithstanding renegade attempts to "allow" pets again by someone removing the No Pets sign.

Nick Provart