

**Port Lands and South of Eastern Planning Studies
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting 13-2 – Summary**

**Monday February 3, 2014
City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, Committee Room 4
7:00 – 9:00 PM**

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, began the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and also led a round of introductions of SAC members and staff from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto and TRCA. Ms. Nield reviewed the meeting agenda and reminded SAC members that a key role of the committee is to provide feedback and guidance to the project team throughout the study, particularly ahead of community consultation meetings. Ms. Nield also reviewed the SAC mandate and responsibilities with members, which is to help the project team: understand community perceptions of the draft plans and alternatives, prepare for community consultation meetings (CCM), and spread the word about the project. Ms. Nield also reminded SAC members of the CCM on Thursday, February 13, 2014.

A copy of the agenda is provided in Appendix A. A list of SAC members that participated in the meeting is included in Appendix B. Questions of Clarification posed by SAC members are provided in Appendix C.

2. SAC Briefing

The purpose of the second round of consultation was to discuss and collect feedback on the options for land use, transportation and municipal services developed by the City, Waterfront Toronto and Dillon Consulting.

A presentation by Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, City Planning Division, Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto, and Ann Joyner, Dillon Consulting reviewed the Port Lands Planning Framework and South of Eastern Transportation Servicing Master Plan with SAC members and included:

- Emerging Vision and Objectives;
- Land Use Options for the Port Lands, and;
- Transportation and Servicing Alternatives.

It was noted that the presentation will be available online at www.portlandsconsultation.ca following the February 13, 2014 community consultation meeting.

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

SAC members provided the following feedback and advice after the briefing:

Presentation

- Reduce the amount of information to be presented - focus on the planning options and provide enough context about each to enable participants to provide substantive feedback.
- Clarify the presentation narrative.
- Replace the first image of the slide deck with one that speaks to the project area (e.g., river).
- Use lessons learned from local examples to inform the study (e.g., Thorncliffe Park)
- Highlight the existing uses in the Port Lands that will likely be there in perpetuity.
- Use different colours in the slide deck – it’s difficult for someone who is colour blind to distinguish the colours currently being used.

Planning Options

- Replace the suggested commercial strip on Leslie Street with parks or greenspace.
- Include more parkland and greenspace in all of the planning options. Green space is also needed to provide green infrastructure and reduce dependency on centralized water/waste water management systems.
- Protect the waterfront.
- Be clear about what is a restriction (e.g., hydro towers, dock wall) and what is an assumption.
- Be visionary and creative, and continue to focus on sustainability.
- Consider options to reuse the shipping channel in the event shipping becomes redundant.
- Explain that each precinct will have its own vision, character and identifying quality – don’t want the Port Lands to be entirely uniform.
- Highlight what is unique about the Port Lands and how those characteristics inform the planning options.

Transportation

- Clarify how connectivity between the Port Lands and South of Eastern will be improved.
- Reconsider the proposed modal split – the percentage for active transportation should be higher.
- Consider showing the transportation options only as panels at the public meeting to condense the presentation.
- Include “complete streets” in the transportation options.
- Display the complete trail system.
- Use different colours to distinguish features in the transportation network and use arrows to indicate which routes continue off the slide.
- Include options for travel by water.

Heritage

- Recognize First Nations heritage in the Port Lands redevelopment (e.g., art work, greenspace).
- Recognize other forms of heritage (e.g., built, cultural) in planning options.

Employment

- Protect employment lands in Port Lands for employment uses through zoning and other planning tools (i.e. do not introduce sensitive uses like residential that would negatively impact operations).

A more detailed summary of the feedback session (including questions and answers) is provided in Appendix C.

4. Proposed Format for Upcoming Community Meeting

Ms. Nield informed SAC members of the upcoming community consultation meeting scheduled for February 13, 2014 at the Fire Academy, 895 Eastern Avenue. Ms. Nield briefly outlined the format of the meeting which will include an open house and presentation as well as several opportunities to ask questions of clarification and provide feedback.

5. Adjourn

Ms. Nield thanked SAC members for providing feedback and assured them that the project team will revise the presentation based on the comments and suggestions raised at the meeting. Ms. Nield also informed SAC members that the project team is canvassing for SAC members for each specific initiative. Ms. Nield then thanked the project team and SAC members for attending and adjourned the meeting.



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

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting – 13-#2

Location: City Hall, Committee Room 4

Monday February 3, 2014

7:00 – 9:00 pm

AGENDA

Purpose:

- Present land use options and parks and open space opportunities for the Port Lands, and the transportation and servicing alternatives.
- Seek feedback on material presented in preparation for the upcoming community meeting.

7:00 pm Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions

Liz Nield, Facilitator, Lura Consulting

7:10 pm SAC Mandate and Responsibilities

7:15 pm Proposed Format for Upcoming Community Consultation Meeting

7:30 pm SAC Member Briefing – Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto & Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto

1. Emerging Vision and Objectives
2. Land Use Options for the Port Lands
3. Transportation and Servicing Alternatives

8:15 pm Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions, Feedback and Advice

- Thinking about the material presented and the main topics covered in the presentation, what feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the material in preparation for the upcoming community meeting?
- Thinking about the material presented and the main topics covered in the presentation:
 - a. What did you like?
 - b. What do you suggest we change?

8:55 pm Next Steps and Closing Remarks

9:00 pm Adjourn

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting List of Attendees :

- Martin Prosperity Institute
- Don Watershed Regeneration Council (DWRC)
- Toronto Green Community
- Friends of the Spit
- Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
- Cycle Toronto
- West Don Lands Committee
- Walk Toronto
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
- Toronto Historical Association
- Redpath Sugar
- Toronto Industry Network
- University of Toronto
- Film Ontario
- Waterfront Action

Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

A summary of the discussion following the SAC Briefing is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

Q. What happens to the transfer station in Option 4?

A. The transfer station would be relocated to another site.

Q. Has there been a study on Thorncliffe Park? It is a great example of mixed-use development in Toronto. What were its successes and failures? We're moving into a similar vision for the Port Lands that was used in Thorncliffe's development. It would be beneficial to learn from that example.

A. We can look into that.

C. A lot of information was covered in the presentation. I don't feel like I can make a choice or provide feedback on the land use alternatives. You need to give people something to take away, especially with information on the planning options, this would give them the chance to review the alternatives and provide comments or submit comments at a later time online. I'd also like to suggest that the very first picture at the beginning of the presentation should be the Don River since it's the heart and soul of the area. Over the years that is what people will continue to care about.

Q. None of the land use options provide details about parkland. I think parkland has been left out of the planning options. The four options are too prosaic; you are also asking people to comment on them in a limited time.

A. Part of the conversation that we are trying to have is to convey that different land use options would generate different parkland options. Industrial land uses would require less parkland, while residential uses would require more.

C. Those are odd assumptions. People view the Port Lands as a giant park. This is a visioning time, I'm not seeing the vision here.

A. The alternatives do show Lake Ontario park, which we are not revisiting as part of this process, and other opportunities for other parks and open spaces are included as a separate slide. This is the approach we decided to take.

C. I agree that this is development or business as usual. We need to start looking at water treatment infrastructure and how we are going to reduce our dependency on a centralized system. There is not enough open space in the alternatives. They are all road – there are no trees and no greenspace that would afford opportunities for stormwater management, recreational amenities or the considerations Dillon referred to in the forward movement toward sustainability. There needs to be way more open space.

C. The existing uses that are realistically going to be there forever should be highlighted. This is a long term plan with a 30-50 year horizon. No thought has been given to the potential reuse of the Ship Channel in the event shipping becomes redundant. It could be repurposed as a potential recreational feature.

C. I can't imagine any useful feedback with respect to the land use alternatives presented because there is too much information to consider. There was not enough context to think about the particular options. Potential residential areas are important, but what are the implications for infrastructure and servicing? What's imagined for those commercial lands? I can't picture it, so I don't know how I could

contribute to this discussion in a useful way. There needs to be a high level planning framework with clear ideas about servicing. There is too much to cover in one meeting. The other thing to consider is ensuring that transit planning and land use planning are integrated south of Eastern Avenue to create connections with the residential area north of Queen Street East. I don't understand why that's not happening. Why is all the employment concentrated south of Eastern Avenue? Would anyone living north of Eastern Avenue walk down into the Port Lands – I'm not sure those connections are being created. I suggest working on the narrative of how the options are presented.

A. The area south of Eastern Avenue is designated as employment land in the City's Official Plan. No residential uses are contemplated for that area. The City recently completed a provincially mandated review of employment areas across the city and maintained it as an employment area.

A. There is a small pocket of residential development in south of Eastern Avenue, it could be useful to highlight the pocket or refer to it during the presentation.

C. I'm worried that we're setting ourselves up for the same scenario that's happened at King Street and Spadina Avenue due to lack of investment. What is the narrative and vision connecting South of Eastern to the Port Lands?

A. The connections are really what we are looking at in terms of the transportation connections to allow the people who live north of Eastern Avenue to make their way down to the Port Lands. That could be achieved through parks and greenspace connections or smaller streets. Right now what you see are large blocks, but as we go forward and redevelop the area we will be looking at streets.

C. Nobody wants to use the north-south connections.

A. What I'm hearing is that whatever we do in the South of Eastern area, even if it is maintaining an employment area, we should be creating destinations that draw people through an attractive mix of uses.

C. The film, television and interactive video game industry is the second largest employer in Toronto. We work very hard to protect employment land uses for our employees. Option 1 considers increasing creative uses in the Port Lands, but our sector operates more like light industry. We work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, require hundreds of parking spaces, and trucks stopping and starting – we don't want residential uses introduced beside us. If you want to hang on to this industry in the City of Toronto, don't zone them out of the existing land uses. They will move to other cities or provinces. We're not being invited into the space; we're already in the space often with long-term leases. Don't push those jobs out of the space.

Q. How do you envisage south of Commissioners Street as a live/work area compared to Leslie Street? Roncesvalles Street and Port Credit were shown as examples in the presentation.

A. The vision for Leslie Street is to be developed with low-rise office buildings like Chorus Quay. The frontage on the site is narrower may not accommodate taller or large buildings.

Q. It was mentioned during the presentation that some of the north-south street connections would be going over or under Lake Shore Boulevard – could you clarify this?

A. That was referring to Broadview Avenue crossing the rail corridor embankment not Lake Shore Boulevard. The new connections would have to go over or under the rail embankment.

Q. The idea of connecting an existing neighbourhood with a new one is not reflected in the transportation plan. What about the idea of creating complete streets? We have to rethink transportation given the high cost of fuel. Ten percent for active transportation is too low in terms of modal split. There also needs to be street calming features. Can you explain the 20/80 split?

A. It's a combination of service and urban design considerations. What we are showing in the alternatives is from a servicing perspective. We are identifying options and assessing which ones are more effective to serve automobiles and transit. The split you saw is going to generate trips, the question is how are by car and how many are by transit. That split you saw is indicative of a highly urban area in Toronto.

C. The vision should be 30 percent for active transportation. I thought this was a vision for sustainability.

A. We can go back and review the mode split being suggested for active transportation. The intention is to provide choices on all new streets so that they are complete streets. We can go back and look at that and assess whether or not 10 percent achieves that.

C. Identify the function of the roads, and the services needed to support that function. What does land use look like? There's a functional perspective about what is needed.

C. Complete streets road may require a wider footprint.

Q. A large volume of traffic moves through the system (i.e., Lake Shore Boulevard and Eastern Avenue), are you taking into consideration that volume as well?

A. Yes, we are assessing the complete system.

C. I find this to be a "tsunami" of information. I don't think you will be able to get fulsome feedback. It's going to be hard for the general public to understand what is being presented. The integration of the South of Eastern area into the Port Lands is driving the framework of the land use options. It's important to understand that while considering the criteria that would be applied to the various land use options, it would be wise to schedule a workshop beyond one public meeting to help people understand the material. You could also put the materials online to give people additional time to consider them more thoroughly before providing comments. Also, I want to add that I do not understand the Leslie Street commercial area south of Commissioners Street. The only way I can see it working is if there is something to draw or attract people further into the Port Lands.

Note: A workshop was organized for March 5th to ensure participants were provided with additional time and opportunities for comment.

Q. I'm assuming the different precincts will each have their own vision, we don't want the Port Lands to redevelop in a uniform way. Surely each precinct will have its own local street and central plaza, something that makes that area special. I also don't understand the Leslie Street commercial area, no one would use. I want to add that catalyst uses (e.g., entertainment uses and residential uses) sometimes make uncomfortable neighbours.

A. I'm hearing the comments about the Leslie Street main street. The thinking behind it was to provide something that would animate the frontage while people are crossing into the Port Lands.

Q. Why do you need to animate it?

A. It's a long stretch. I've walked it. It felt like a long distance which required something to encourage or draw people into the area. That said, there are some vacant lands in that area - what do you think should go there?

C. Park Land. We've been asking for parkland going back 20 years. It's about the greening of Leslie Street.

C. Keeping things as wild as possible coming out of the Leslie Street spit is important. I want to emphasize that to the City and Waterfront Toronto.

C. You've done a great job making an impossible set of compromises. There are few challenges to consider: 1) Be realistic, this is an environmental assessment process, and 2) Be visionary (we're talking about 50 years into the future). Also, be clear about what a restriction is and what an assumption is (e.g. port space, salt, etc.).

C. You may want to consider showing the transportation component of the presentation on panels during the open house – there's not enough time to review them in depth. I didn't hear much about the isolation of this neighbourhood from transit point of view. It doesn't fit the transit grid very well, so it's hard to drive, walk, or transit from Queen Street down into this space. I would like to see that addressed. Also, I'd like the major and minor streets to be identified more clearly. There's a really impressive park trail system along the perimeter of Tommy Thompson Park that wasn't included in the renderings. Show more colours on the diagrams to separate out what is proposed or existing (i.e., cycling network). For trails or routes that disappear off page include arrows to indicate they continue.

C. We're at least 50 years away before anything we are discussing here will be achieved. Would caution that too much is being pushed into one presentation. Maybe it needs to be broken down and considered over a series of meetings. Maybe we can't do the decision-making in such a short series of meetings, and maybe we don't need to. Also, it's difficult to discern some of the colours, especially for someone who is colour blind. You also need to give people more time to review and understand the material – don't force it all into one presentation or meeting. That said, you've done an enormous amount of work and I do appreciate.

C. I have a few comments from a First Nations perspective. What I am hearing is that heritage matters. This is our land, and it's been built over. Everyone in the city is now worried about their built history. We as First Nations are asking for recognition. You have to consider our perspective by law, whether its green space or art work. It's time for recognition for our side of things. Also, there was no mention about how the waterfront is going to be protected. Are the MOE and Waterfront Toronto going to protect the waterfront? I don't understand how these options protect the water. There are things here that are not going to move. How do you get creative about a brick wall? Keep in mind people want to keep what they know. We're planning for something that is 30 – 50 years down the road. Who are we building this for? We need to start making changes and protect the heritage that is important people. The only thing I heard mentioned about heritage was the Hearn. I'm sure that people who live near here want to preserve something. We were promised by Waterfront Toronto that we will get some kind of recognition here.

C. As part of narrative of the land use options you should talk about all of them at the same time in order to compare them in terms the number of jobs, residences, etc. they provide. What is unique about the Port Lands? Lake Ontario Park is unique in terms of what it brings to the city. Highlight the relationship of the natural features (e.g., Cherry Beach, river mouth, Ship Channel). What's missing from the presentation is the case for each of the options.

A. The beginning of the presentation sets the stage and highlights the existing conditions and constraints. This is followed by the land use options. Should we set the context at the beginning, or talk about them as we present the land use options?

C. However you do it, there needs to be more discussion about the land use options. Highlight the unique opportunities about these lands. The first image is generic, tweak it to be emblematic of the Port Lands. The image could be anywhere, not Port Lands.

C. I like the comment about who are we building this for. Protecting the water is important. I agree that some of the images need to be changed and that restrictions vs. assumptions should be clarified. I don't think any organization that holds public consultation in Toronto is transparent about how comments are received and analysed. Suggest that you highlight why you have picked certain comments [referring to slide with summary of feedback].

C. Consider including a different kind of transportation map. The feature most people are interested in down here is the waterfront. Include a map of the Port Lands showing routes of small water craft. It could offer another option to enhance connectivity between the Port Lands and the city.