

**Port Lands Planning Framework  
and Port Lands and South of Eastern Municipal Class EA**

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and  
Land Owners and Users (LUAC) Advisory Meeting #3**

**Tuesday, May 20, 2014  
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310  
7:00 – 9:00 PM**

**Meeting Summary**

**1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction**

Liz Nield, Lura Consulting, began the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee (LUAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She noted that this was a joint meeting of the two committees and that the main purpose of the combined meeting was to present an emerging land use strategy for the Port Lands for discussion and feedback. Ms. Nield noted that the draft minutes from the last SAC and LUAC meeting were available for review and feedback by committee members. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions of SAC and LUAC members and staff from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto and TRCA.

A copy of the agenda is provided in Appendix A. A list of SAC/LUAC members who participated in the meeting is included in Appendix B.

**2. SAC & LUAC Briefing**

A presentation by Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, City Planning Division provided a detailed update on the planning process for the Port Lands Planning Framework and outlined the emerging land use strategy for the Port Lands. She provided a handout to SAC/LUAC members, which included key aspects, illustrations and maps from the proposed land use strategy. She added that City staff intend to report on strategy development to the City's Planning and Growth Management Committee meeting in June.

**3. Facilitated Discussion - Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice**

Following the presentation, SAC/LUAC members provided feedback on the emerging land use strategy. The discussion centred on the following discussion questions:

1. Thinking about the proposed land use strategy...
  - What do you like?
  - What concerns do you have?
  - What would you change and why?
2. Do you have any other advice or suggestions for the project team?

Below is a high level summary of the feedback received during the facilitated discussion. Appendix C contains a summary of questions of clarification from committee members and answers from City staff, as well as a more detailed summary of SAC/LUAC feedback.

### **Positive Feedback from SAC/LUAC Members – What They Like**

#### ***About the Land Use Strategy***

- Strategy is comprehensive, based on detailed information and attempts to balance existing conditions/uses with long-term future plans
- Level of detail is good
- Vision is “very progressive”, “magnificent”, “great”
- Overall flexibility of strategy to adapt over time as market conditions evolve
- Overall focus on mixed-use development
- Connectivity throughout the plan
- Concept of the film studio cluster and creative district
- Strategic land reserve
- Mixed-use vision for Villiers Island
- Consideration of commercial traffic
- Green space south of Unwin remains untouched
- Strategy includes consideration to straighten Unwin Avenue
- Pedestrian and cycling network links to various green/open spaces
- Green space located along the turning basin

#### ***About the Planning Process***

- The process has slowed down; time is being taken to collect and analyze the necessary background data and information
- More inclusion of market-oriented and economic-related information
- Focus on compatibility of industrial uses with other uses; good that compatibility analysis is being undertaken
- Inclusion of PPS guidelines and principles
- Land ownership has been reflected in the strategy
- Good explanation of why decisions have been made and rationale for proposed future directions
- Proposed design charrettes to flesh out additional aspects of the strategy over the summer

#### **Concerns about the Land Use Strategy**

- Too much focus on the “golden ticket”/“magic bullet” idea of protecting land for a future Olympics, World’s Fair or similar large event
- Concern that compatibility/buffer studies will slow the process down; concern that this may also preclude creative examination of compatibility and achievement of overall vision
- Many unknowns and challenges associated with relocating the waste transfer facility
- No mention of how repurposing the Hearn will fit into the strategy

- Concern that film studios should be incorporated as part of a mixed use strategy and not as an isolated cluster on their own; building more film studios is not the answer
- Concern that this a very long-term planning process and what is missing is an elaboration of compatible land uses to deal with market forces
- Approach to green network/connectivity/ecological concept is “minimalist” and needs to be expanded
- Concern that there may be too much flexibility in the strategy (e.g., South of Eastern Strategic Direction could have an impact on the future of the Port Lands)
- Concern about the financial shortfall and the potential impact on strategy implementation

#### **Recommendations for Improvement and Next Steps**

- Illustrate the green corridor/network connections to Lake Ontario Park and Tommy Thompson Park; existing parks to the south need to be clearly identified on all plans
- Locate employment intensive uses adjacent to proposed transit hubs
- As part of compatibility analysis, consider buffers around waste transfer facility
- Incorporate what was presented for Villiers Island Precinct Plan last week in strategy
- Show connectivity between roads/transportation facilities in the Port Lands and communities to the north
- Consult with film studio operators about appropriate inclusion of studios as part of future mixed use development
- Need to strengthen the green network/connectivity/ecological concept component of the strategy
- Elaborate on the compatibilities of the land uses (i.e. create a longer list of uses to clarify what the mix could be in order to address market forces over time)
- Undertake proper modelling studies to fully understand compatibility of uses
- Aim high with the vision and building standards to ensure future development meets the most progressive standards
- Establish a realistic timeline that recognizes there likely won't be a market for a large amount of residential development in the area for decades
- Consider using a vacuum waste collection program that takes waste to a central Energy From Waste (EFW) facility
- Incorporate statistics on the Port usage from the Toronto Port Authority into analysis of future port and land uses

#### **4. Adjourn**

Ms. Ritz encouraged SAC and LUAC members to provide any additional comments and feedback on the draft land use strategy by early next week. Ms. Nield thanked SAC and LUAC members for attending and providing their input.



**Port Lands Planning Framework  
and Port Lands and South of Eastern Municipal Class EA**

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and  
Land Owners and Users (LUAC) Advisory Meeting #3**

Location: Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

7:00 – 9:00 pm

**AGENDA**

**Meeting Purpose:**

- Bring SAC and LUAC members together in a joint meeting to provide a detailed update on the planning process and next steps; and
- Present an emerging land use strategy for the Port Lands for discussion and feedback.

**7:00 pm      Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**  
Liz Nield, Facilitator, Lura Consulting

**7:10 pm      Process Update and Presentation – Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto & Amanda Santo,**  
Waterfront Toronto

- Process Update and Next Steps
- Proposed Land Use Strategy for the Port Lands
- Upcoming Workshops/Charrettes

**7:50 pm      Facilitated Discussion – SAC/LUAC Questions, Feedback and Advice**

1. Thinking about the proposed land use strategy...
  - What do you like?
  - What concerns do you have?
  - What would you change and why?
2. Do you have any other advice or suggestions for the project team?

**8:55 pm      Wrap-up and Closing Remarks**

**9:00 pm      Adjourn**

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### Participating Organizations:

- 33 Villiers Street (Cherry Beach Sound Ltd)
- 440 Commissioners
- Castlepoint
- Chai Poultry
- City of Toronto
- Code Blue/West Don Lands Committee
- Corktown Residents and Business Association
- Cycle Toronto
- Don Watershed Regeneration Council
- First Gulf
- Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
- LaFarge
- Sherwood Park Residents Association
- Toronto Green Community
- TRCA
- Toronto Port Lands Company
- Toronto Real Estate Board
- Toronto Region Board of Trade
- Waterfront Action
- Waterfront Toronto

## Appendix C – Questions of Clarification and Detailed Summary of SAC/LUAC Feedback

A summary of the questions and answers and discussion following the SAC/LUAC briefing is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

### Questions of Clarification

**Q. Will the compatibility analysis include night clubs? They are louder than many factories.**

**A.** MOE doesn't address night clubs because it's not an industrial use, but we will take note and look into it.

**Q. You mentioned you had discussions with Metrolinx about a GO connection. Where exactly would that connection be?**

**A.** It would be here (point to map). In order to have the connection, a few changes would be required. Metrolinx would need to electrify the line and in order to do that they would need to have both local and express routes. We will continue to work with Metrolinx on the feasibility and location of GO connections.

**C.** This comment is regarding the solid waste transfer station. At risk of alarming people from South Riverdale, why don't we just have vacuum waste collection from all the construction sites and take it to a central energy from waste plant? This could contribute to Port Lands energy needs. This is done in many other places and could be an improvement to the quality of the Port Lands. This is something that we should make a target.

**Q. Are the different uses equally employment intensive? Why not put the employment uses adjacent to where we think the transit hub will be? This will mean there is less traffic travelling into the Port Lands. If employment lands are located at the farthest point of the precinct, people will be more likely drive, increasing traffic. Not everyone who lives there is going to work there so it makes sense to locate the employment uses near the transit hub.**

**A.** We did identify a second transit hub at the intersection of Commissioners and Bouchette. This is a good point and I'm sure the transportation experts would agree with you to a certain extent. This is something that we are planning. We are going to take a look at where certain land uses will be and what transit is associated with that. We will be doing a more detailed modal split analysis for the entire site area as part of next phase.

**Q. How much are we worried about the PPS buffers? They look a bit concerning to me as setbacks from several of the industrial uses. If we move the transfer station and de-classify it as heavy industry surely that would make a big difference, but still the international examples presented seem to have much smaller buffers than what the Province requires at this point. Is this something that we can negotiate?**

**A.** Those are the minimum separation distances, but you can do a more detailed study and if that study shows smaller buffer requirements, than those can be used. We are going to do a more detailed study to help us determine the buffers required. We know that there are many different ways to address the impacts, but we did want to look at what the guidelines originally say so that we can take that into consideration.

**Q. What is a community hub? How is that playing into the long-term vision for the entire precinct, especially in terms of the buffers around land uses?**

**A.** We don't know at this stage what the community hub would be. That would be something that we would try and sort out through precinct planning as well as through the next stage. That is something that feedback and suggestions will be welcome on as well.

**Q. The reason that I ask is because a lot of the land use decisions have been made based on establishing appropriate buffers from the waste transfer station, but if the waste transfer station moves, does that impact the overall land use across the precinct?**

**A.** Yes and I would suggest that was reflected in the presentation. If the waste transfer station remains, the ability to get mixed-use residential in this area would be much more limited.

**Q. Did Solid Waste Management Services give you the timing of their EA and possible relocation options? And while they are doing that, will you be looking at the D-6 guidelines and determining whether it's appropriate to locate residential next to the station?**

**A.** They have retained a consultant to do their long-term waste management strategy for the city, and that process is already underway. That strategy will inform anything that happens with waste transfer facility here. The EA will be initiated following a decision from Council. They have identified that it would be a challenge to move the facility, so in the interim we won't be suggesting that you can put residential uses next to the waste transfer station until a decision has been made that it can be relocated.

**Q. In the interim are you going to determine if it's appropriate to have residential next to the station at the 300m buffer?**

**A.** We could. We didn't think about that, but we could consider that. One of the challenges is the location within the precinct. We need to consider the odour and truck traffic associated with the transfer station.

**Q. Are you simply dismissing it as an impossible idea? The plants in Sweden don't require a lot of truck traffic because the waste is used. I wonder how big of a buffer they need.**

**A.** That is something that would have to be explored through the EA, but it is something that we can relay to them. They would have to look at a number of different alternatives and different types of technologies. Doing something that is sustainable and great for the environment has been a cornerstone of the Port Lands plan from the beginning.

**Q. Port uses are essential for the planning of the area, but having them the way that they are right now is not necessarily right. Are there statistics about port usage? For example, where does traffic go? Where does traffic come from? Can this be fit into the overall discussion, instead of just assuming that the port uses should be retained as they are right now?**

**A.** What we are saying is that we don't want to retain the port uses as they are right now. We do have information on the tonnage and types of cargo coming into the Port from the Toronto Port Authority over the last 10 years. Last year, there was 1.1 million tonnes of cargo, not including sugar (mainly salt and concrete materials). The other aspect to consider is that we have to get in and out via the St. Lawrence River Seaway and that limits the size of vessels. For instance, we can't have the large container ships, because they are too big and the Seaway isn't deep enough. So we are limited to Great Lakes shipping to a certain degree. That isn't necessarily a bad thing because we do already get a lot of product via the Great Lakes. It is also important to note that the Port is seasonal, operating from March to September.

**Q. Do we already have the statistics?**

**A.** We would have to check with the Toronto Port Authority to see if we can release their statistics regarding tonnage.

**Q. During the talks with Metrolinx for the GO Station did you talk about a commercial hub there?**

**A.** We have talked about having a transit hub at that site. It is outside of our study and is part of a separate study happening for the relief line. GO would also have to initiate their own study. It is an idea that we are putting forward, and the concept is to have multiple modes.

**Q. How is the film studio precinct plan process integrated with this process?**

**A.** Land use is really important in the precinct plan. We are still moving ahead in developing street and block concepts, but we are waiting until we have some endorsement on the land use direction before we move forward with the precinct plan.

**Q. Do you think it will move forward through the summer for the film studio precinct?**

**A.** We are still working out those details, but ideally we would like to.

**Q. Lake Shore Boulevard acts as a barrier and a lot of the planning here is about connectivity. Did we consider reducing the grand boulevard to an ordinary avenue?**

**A.** In the past couple of meetings we have had we have presented hand in hand with the Transportation and Servicing Master Plan EA that is underway so you really got to see the relationship between the land use plan and the connectivity from the Port Lands to the north. Tonight we really wanted to focus on the land use plan, in part, because we need this land use plan in place before they can move forward with their EA. That is why tonight you didn't see a lot about those connections and about infrastructure and transportation. Lake Shore, to a certain degree, will also be informed by Gardiner EA.

## **Detailed Feedback Summary**

### **1. Thinking about the proposed land use strategy...**

- **What do you like and why?**

**C.** I like the concept of the film studio and the creative district. This is an area that is growing in the Toronto economy and has broader implications than just film. If you look at studies that have recently been done by the City of Toronto, a lot of this kind of development is happening along the southern region of the City.

**C.** I really like the fact that you have slowed down and are going much deeper into the questions that are puzzling us. Looking deeper into some of the industrial issues, and commercial and business opportunities that are there is a good idea. At other meetings we are getting into good discussions about environmental issues and natural habitat issues that mean a lot to me, which I appreciate. What I see here has a lot more substance than what we have seen in the past.

**C.** I agree and would like to compliment the project team. This presentation is more market-oriented and economic specific. I am also happy to see there is a focus on industrial compatibility. All these aspects had to be considered in this area and they were demonstrated in this presentation.

**C.** I really like the strategic land reserve from a real estate perspective. Land is finite resource and you need to use it wisely.

**C.** It is essential to get all the background data done before any detail planning is done. That is something that was missing previously. It is great that the process has slowed down and we are taking the time to look at the background information, because without that we are going to get it wrong.



C. I like the idea about planning for the future. For example, the CNE is getting built up and might need more space.

C. Great job. I like the connectivity as a whole. We are going to have some challenges moving forward and transitioning from where we are today to where we want to be, but we are making some headway.

C. We are private land owners and are down there every day. We are supportive of everything you guys are doing. This is very exciting because not much is around us right now. We would like to thank you for honouring your word and showing us as private lands on the map. Please continue to do so.

C. I have been coming to these meetings for 32 years. This is the most detailed work of all the years. You are actively trying to achieve a balance in order to accommodate the present and the future, as well as different public and stakeholder opinions, and I don't know how you can do much better than you have done. I think you have done a marvellous job and I am really happy with the detail.

C. I am hearing that we have come a long way and it sounds good.

C. I agree that you have done a lot of work. Tonight is much more informative for us, and you have provided more of an explanation about why you have made your decisions.

C. I am really impressed and it is great to be included in this thinking. It helps us understand the decisions being made. I am happy about the charrettes.

C. I love the concept of having residential in the film area and really love that you have recognized that south of Unwin is completely green, and will remain green.

C. The general land use strategy looks quite good. I like the attempt to maximize mixed-use and balance these areas with the industrial uses. I notice that the performance standards still to be developed so more detail will come in the future.

C. I am encouraged to see the compatibility analysis laid out in the slides. I know that the PPS was recently updated; however it's nice to see the principles reflected in the presentation.

C. I like what I see with regard to the pedestrian and cycling network that would link to various open spaces. This seems to be a very pleasant environment for someone travelling in something other than a motor vehicle.

- **What concerns do you have? What would you change and why?**

C. I don't see you making much use of Lake Ontario Park and Tommy Thompson Park. They need to be better connected to the area.

C. I am concerned about this idea of the 'golden ticket', such as the Olympics or World Fair unlocking the Port Lands. We need to start doing things today, and start planning for a vibrant urban destination now.

C. I am supportive of the mixed-use vision on Villiers Island, but I have some concerns about timing. How will the noise and air quality study play out with the precinct planning process?

C. In terms of the film studio precinct, we have some significant concerns that they can grow about 50 thousand square metres on that site. Being able to support the entire area is problematic. We know that the film studio needs to be embedded as part of a mixed-use community. People do not want to be based out of an employment type environment. They want to be part of something vibrant, active and urban. In order to do that, you need a real true mixed-use plan that is blended and integrated.

C. My concern is related to one of the basic principles, which is 'to create network of green corridors'. That seems to be a minimalist approach. The connectivity is almost missing and seems to be dependent on utilizing the street right-of-way. There is no ecological concept here. We still have a number of opportunities, as you said in your presentation, along the ship channel. I would like to see the principle expanded and better imprinted into this whole exercise.

C. This is a very long-term process. The ones that I have been involved in before have had to have flexibility. What is missing here is an elaboration of the compatibilities of land uses. A longer list to clarify what the mix could contain in order to deal with market forces at play is required.

C. You have done a great job. I do have some concerns about flexibility. I think infrastructure will be a challenge for a number of different reasons. I am happy to see commercial traffic is being looked at. I am pleased with the amount of detail. I am concerned about the transfer station and challenges associated with that. We have done a lot of planning for that area and I think it hinges on the relocation of the waste transfer station.

**Q. I am concerned about the area south of the ship channel. There is a lot of talk about repurposing the Hearn and that has not been mentioned tonight. How does this fit in? There are a lot of Port uses south of ship channel, so how will the Hearn fit in? It certainly won't be compatible unless you do something more exciting. Also, the relationship between that area and park below needs to be further developed.**

A. That is one of the reasons why we want to hold the design charrettes. The purpose of the charrettes will be to explore those types of issues in more detail.

**Q. Can the issues around Lake Ontario Park be straightened out?**

A. It will be an uphill battle, but we will try.

C. I want to congratulate you on amount of detail included. I also picked up on the island straightening and am happy that it is actually being verbalized. In terms of the timeline, we have to keep in mind that most of us at this table are not likely to walk along the future plans illustrated on these papers. We need to keep that in mind and remain flexible, because who knows what we are going to be moving around in, what kinds of transit we will have, and how we are going to deal with our waste and energy sources in the years to come. Trying to plan for residential in this area is a challenge because it will be decades before there is going to be a market for a large amount of residential development here. We have to be flexible in the uses and build into the program how the uses are not going to negatively impact the future uses. The uses need to be flexible from short-term, to mid-term, to long-term. In the long-term we will want to have residential so that we have people living here. We will need to draw people to want to live here. Let's keep a realistic timeframe as we move forward.

**Q. I have one comment around noise and air quality assessments that overlap with the Cousins Quay (Villiers Island) precinct planning area. I had the opportunity to attend the meeting last week on that**

**precinct planning area and I did not see anything similar discussed in that presentation. What is the tie in? How do the two processes work together?**

**A.** This type of detail will come as part of the City's study of noise. The results of the study will get embedded into precinct plan. We are still doing all of these studies together. Keep in mind that the hatched area on the map represents the air quality and noise assessment zone and is not the buffer zone. It is an area that requires further study.

**Q. The level of detail is very good, it is very thorough. From the financial side, you mentioned that there was a bit of a shortfall, and I am curious to learn how the shortfall will impact potential land use strategies?**

**A.** I don't think that it necessarily does impact the land use strategies. There was a shortfall before, there is still one today. It is about looking at a variety of different sources to make up for that shortfall. That includes looking at public/private partnerships, which is why the land owners group was established. Waterfront Toronto is looking to the province and federal government, but we need to get the EA approved before we can look for funds. That being said, there are a number of different ways that we are looking to make up the shortfall.

**C.** I appreciate the hard work. I think existing parks should be quite clearly identified to the south. It would also be helpful to see an overall plan that depicts the connectivity to everything north (i.e. showing the relationship to transit, to Lake Shore, to Cherry, and to future Broadview). It would be good to have an overall map that identifies those specific items and their impacts on land use.

**C.** I am concerned about the approach in linking environmental considerations and assessments of air quality and noise with the precinct planning process. I think the guidelines in the PPS is going to be hugely instructive to ensure compatibility can be achieved between different uses. The guidelines affect both industry and industrial development. The guidelines recognize that it is not a one size fits all solution. What I don't want to see is the potential of the Port Lands disregarded because we take a broad brush approach to land use compatibility. For example, you really can't understand the impacts unless you are modelling what the development will look. How are you doing to conduct those studies? Are you actually going to model developments and massing in the precincts? If you don't do that the studies are useless. You won't be able to really understand how the two uses will work together. It would be a shame to turn down a vision, because we have not modelled this properly. We don't want to preclude a magnificent vision because we haven't approached it properly in terms of the study. We have to consider what massing studies are going to be done to see what mitigation measures might be required on both sides of the fence.

**C.** I have a concern about the film studios. I heard you say 'more studios, more studios, more studios'. I caution using the approach 'build it and they will come'. I encourage this group to talk to Revival, Cityspace, and Castlepoint very seriously about how our business works. Just building more studios is not the answer. It is about a mix of spaces and the quality of these spaces. Examples of parks that did not work include: Techno Park in Montreal, park in Spain, and Chicago. We have to be really careful. While the film board is telling you to build more studios, their offices are located in a mixed-use area. You need to listen carefully to the operators and how their business works.

**C.** I like the detail and the vision: it is very progressive. I was apart of initial unlocking report and I can see we are building on that. I am also concerned about the 'magic bullet' events like Olympics. The result of those events are supposed to bring you the legacy items like the Don River, and water's edge promenade, but we are getting closer to those without these 'magic bullets'. These 'magic bullets' have

tended to sterilize these opportunities. We need to stop relying on these 'magic bullets' and move forward with the resources at hand. It seems like we are getting much closer to that. These are important legacy builders and I don't think we should be relying on these big events to move the city forward in city building process. I am really excited about the direction we are heading.

**C.** I keep hearing the reference to the waste transfer station as being a question about whether it's going to be residential or commercial uses. That type of facility that has air quality issues has sensitive uses around it already (i.e. parks, roadways). If you are serious about the vision for the entire precinct, it's not about just residential, it's about moving forward with a better community – both for people that live there and work there. The waste transfer station is not about residential versus commercial, it's about the past and the future and it's about an underutilized space. If you want to create a higher better order of place, then the option to move the facility has to be seriously considered.

**C.** We shouldn't just be building the way we build things now. Let's have in 20 years time, people from Europe showing pictures of Toronto as a way of how to build things. This is a special opportunity and we need to aim high.

**C.** I like the idea of bringing the green space to the west side of Leslie and along the turning basin.