

The concept plan for Grange Park is well liked however we would appreciate if the following points would be considered as the plan is revised during the detailed design phase.

1.0 Integration of adjacent space

1.1 Grange Road / Daycare drop-off - Is the concept flexible enough to respond to the future redesign of Grange Road? If Grange Road is redesigned as a woonerf, how would the park integrate itself into it?

1.2 Butterfield Park connection- The plan does not seem receptive to any future link between Grange Park and Butterfield park. Is the current concept able to adapt to provide a meaningful connection between these places?

Desire lines: Does the concept support pedestrian circulation from Butterfield Park to the NW corner of Grange Park?



2.0 Desire Lines

2.1 South-West corner towards Grange Road / John Street

Pedestrian and cyclist flow will likely degrade the sod as people will attempt to maintain their route from the south west entry across the southern end of the park. Perhaps a smaller path serving this desire line can be considered. (LINE B)

2.2 North West Corner towards OCAD

The connection between the NW corner of the park and access to OCAD may be interrupted by the southern playground. This point is related to the connection between the park and Butterfield Park. (LINE A)

2.3 Eastern End of Stephanie Street towards park Existing well-worn desire path can be used as guide to formalize a path there. (LINE C)



3.0 Main Paths

3.1 Median The trees in the center paths will be experienced as obstacles during peak times. Having one path with an adequate width versus 2 paths plus tree growing space will reduce the amount of paving and improve circulation. The current width of the pathway at the western side of the circle works quite well.

3.2 Feature at node We look forward to an exploration of a feature (Eaton fountain for example or sculpture) positioned at southern end of the circular lawn where the five paths converge.



4.0 Site Lines

4.1 From SW corner to SE corner

There is a significant sight line that should be considered when locating the large shade trees in the southern portion of the great lawn. The view is of the downtown skyline which is a rare sight in most Toronto parks. See below



5.0 Water Feature

Questions regarding the usefulness, maintenance, and sustainability of a splash pad water feature suggest that perhaps a reconsideration of this program element is necessary. Perhaps the tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars could be applied to higher end materials elsewhere on the site such as playground equipment or seating.

The water feature associated with the stairwell at in front of Grange House seems superfluous, perhaps a smaller fountain towards the south pathway node might be a more meaningful gesture.

6.Slate Walls

The current location of slate walls is where people often sleep or hide from view. If walls are to be present perhaps consider them quite low or perhaps tilted ground planes.

7.0 NW Entry

Since this area was not discussed very much at the public meeting it is hard to understand what the programming intentions are here. The massing of tables and what looks like trellises present an institutional aesthetic that can be potentially intimidating when a large group of people are using this space. We look forward to a more detailed expression of this area that respects the arrival experience.



8.0 PAVING

While the alternating paving bands and sod are graphically quite interesting, we question if this will impare the health of the adjacent sod. If the granular sub-base of the paving bands eats away at the available soil volume of the sod and if the sod is stressed from being under a shade tree, its health and long term success might be compromised.