

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

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #5**

**Wednesday, March 29, 2015  
Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street  
6:00 – 8:00 pm**

**Meeting Summary**

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

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, welcomed Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members and thanked them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions of SAC members and staff from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto and Urban Strategies Inc. Ms. Nield reviewed the meeting agenda and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to present and discuss the updated vision and key directions for the Port Lands Planning Framework and Villiers Island Precinct Plan, as well as outline next steps in the project process and opportunities to comment on the proposed Official Plan Amendments.

A copy of the agenda is provided in Appendix A. A list of SAC organizations that participated in the meeting is included in Appendix B.

**2. Process Update and Presentation**

Project team members provided the SAC with an overview of the work completed since the November 2015 consultations in three presentations, listed below, and also outlined the next steps in the study process:

- Port Lands Planning Framework – Vision  
Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto
- Port Lands Planning Framework – Key Directions  
Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto
- Villiers Island Precinct Plan  
Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto, and Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies Inc.

The presentations were posted online at [www.portlandsconsultation.ca](http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca) following the meeting.

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

Following each presentation, SAC members were given the opportunity to ask questions of clarification, provide comments, and discuss the material. A summary of the facilitated discussion that followed each presentation is presented below. A more detailed account of the discussion can be found in Appendix C.

#### ***Port Lands Planning Framework – Vision***

- Commended the work completed to articulate the vision for the Port Lands more clearly.
- Clarified the Broadview Greenway as an opportunity to create linkages to parks and open spaces.
- Clarified that the vision for the Port Lands is to create a place along the waterfront for all Torontonians.
- Discussed whether a critical mass of residential units is needed to attract people and animate the Port Lands.
- Confirmed that alternative approaches to stormwater management will be used in the Port Lands.

#### ***Port Lands Planning Framework – Key Directions***

- Agreed that the Framework represents excellent planning work.
- Clarified the potential routes to get aggregates to market.
- Identified the need for more details pertaining to water transit (i.e., ferries).
- Discussed the need to maintain flexibility to enable a critical mass of residential development in the Polson Quay and South River districts.
- Suggested including a public marina to animate the Port Lands in the short-term.
- Raised the need to prioritize higher order public transit in the Port Lands and consider the need for parking facilities.

#### ***Villiers Island Precinct Plan***

- Agreed the revised Precinct Plan is an improvement and has the potential to become an international gold standard development.
- Clarified the modal shift numbers presented in relation to achieving climate positive goals.
- Commended the use of buffers and greenspace throughout Villiers Island.
- Discussed the process to determine options for MT35.
- Discussed how affordable housing will be incorporated in the Precinct Plan.
- Commended revisions to the Precinct Plan that create a sense of place (e.g., relocating density and retail uses, buildings centred on courtyards, etc.) and create conditions to attract people.

### 4. Adjourn

Ms. Ritz informed SAC members that the project team will be reporting to the Planning and Growth Management Committee of Toronto City Council on May 31, 2017. She invited SAC members to review and provide comments on the draft Official Plan policies by April 12, 2017, and noted that the draft policies and meeting materials will be circulated via email to SAC members and posted on the project website ([www.portlandsconsultation.ca](http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca)) after the meeting.

Ms. Nield 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**

Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street Suite 1310 Boardroom  
Wednesday, March 29, 2017  
6:00 – 8:00 pm

**AGENDA**

**Meeting Purpose:**

- Present and discuss the updated vision and key directions for the Port Lands Planning Framework and Villiers Island Precinct Plan.
- Brief members on next steps for the Port Lands plans and policies, including opportunity for comment on proposed Official Plan amendments.

- 6:00 pm**      **Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**  
Liz Nield, Facilitator, Lura Consulting
- 6:05 pm**      **Port Lands Planning Framework – Vision**  
*Facilitated Discussion*
- 6:40 pm**      **Port Lands Planning Framework – Direction**  
*Facilitated Discussion*
- 7:20 pm**      **Villiers Island Precinct Plan**  
*Facilitated Discussion*
- 7:55 pm**      **Wrap-up and Next Steps**
- 8:00 pm**      **Adjourn**

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### SAC Meeting List of Attendees:

- Corktown Resident & Business Association
- Cycling Toronto
- Friends of the Spit
- Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
- Toronto Field Naturalists
- Transit Advocate
- West Don Lands Committee
- Sherwood Park Residents Association
- Toronto Island Residents Association
- Ward 30 Bikes

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

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

### **A. Port Lands Planning Framework - Vision**

#### **Q. What is the Broadview Greenway?**

**A.** There is an opportunity at the southern edge of Broadview Avenue to create linkages to parks and open space.

**Q. [Referring to Slide 5] One of the first slides suggested that the Port Lands will be a playground for three million residents and the broader city; this did not resonate with me. This is not the vision I had in mind for the Port Lands.**

**A.** The intent is to create a place along the waterfront for all Torontonians. We do not expect three million people to live or be in the Port Lands at any given time.

**Q. There does not appear to be much housing proposed in the Port Lands. More housing is needed, particularly during earlier phases of redevelopment, to attract people to the area. This approach was used in the development of the West Don Lands and supported the creation of a lively community. What proportion of the Port Lands will be used for housing?**

**A.** We will be presenting the proposed locations for residential land uses in the next presentation. I cannot speak to the proportion of land designated as residential, but I can tell you that 10-15 thousand units are proposed for the Port Lands. To give you a sense of the market rate of absorption, it will take 20-25 years to build out five thousand units on Villiers Island alone. It will be difficult to develop units up front without a major event such as the Pan Am Games, which catalyzed development in the West Don Lands.

**Q. What about CityPlace or Liberty Village?**

**A.** CityPlace is a 10-15 year old plan. It took time to build out. We have heard similar comments before and have considered them in the land use plan. It is possible to create a vibrant place without residential development; it just needs to be done carefully. It will be a challenge, but also something interesting to observe as work on the Port Lands continues.

**Q. I like the idea of Broadview Avenue being a green connection. Is there an opportunity for other north-south connections to act as greenways and manage stormwater (e.g., bioswales, ponds)?**

**A.** Water as a resource played a major role in the design of streets in the Port Lands. A longer version of the presentation will be circulated to committee members, which includes slides depicting the different types of street concepts and channels (i.e., bioswales).

**C.** There is a need to move away from burying pipes and stormwater management infrastructure under streets.

**A.** That is exactly what is being proposed under a section of Commissioners Street – it will be the first time the City uses this kind of approach to manage stormwater. In other areas where there is limited permeability, there is a need for a hybrid system.

**C. I want to apologize for my earlier comments – there is a lot I really like about the vision (i.e., strong sense of place). I can see that a lot of work has been done, and it has been done well.**

A. This work responds to an earlier comment about the need to articulate the vision in a better way.

## **B. Port Lands Planning Framework – Direction**

**Q. Has consideration been given to getting aggregates to market?**

A. Most businesses will likely use the Caroline Avenue Extension to access Lake Shore Boulevard and connect to other routes.

**C. The work completed includes excellent detail on land use planning; water use planning should be strengthened (i.e., ferries). The entire waterfront in Vancouver is served by waterfront transit. With this kind of expansion, there is going to be a need, and demand, for water transit. More information is needed to clarify the intent of the Maritime Hub.**

**Q. I am concerned that the Framework does not include a critical mass of residential units. The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan called for approximately 40,000 units, the majority of which were expected to be in the Port Lands. I am particularly concerned about Polson Quay – this is the first time I have heard that the whole district will not be residential. It has been iterated several times that Polson Quay should have a significant amount of residential units to create an animated and lively community. How prescriptive will the land use direction be in terms of supporting residential?**

A. Based on the results of the Noise and Air Quality Feasibility Study, it is challenging to identify more residential on Polson Quay and South River due to the proximity of Lafarge and adjacent port uses. The Framework does not preclude more residential development in these areas, but does state that more study is needed (i.e., mitigation). There is more than enough residential proposed in the Port Lands for the next 20-30 years. We do want to encourage activity in the Port Lands now and are encouraging uses to be adaptable (i.e., rationale for Regeneration Area zoning). Over time many of the uses could morph into something else.

**C. I think it would be one of the most desirable sites in terms of residential development (e.g., views to the City). The Regeneration Area zoning is not adequate to support that; a stronger vision is needed for that land.**

A. Precinct plans will still need to be developed for Polson Quay and South River. A key issue is the need to address the air and noise quality issues from industrial uses.

**C. If these areas will not be developed for a long time, the plan should focus on developing a vision of what they could be.**

A. A well-defined public realm and street network enabled other waterfront communities to develop as envisioned. Once a street network is in place, these areas can evolve into other uses, regardless of the market absorption rate. In the meantime, we want the right mix of uses to develop. The comment we will take back with us is the need to maintain flexibility in these areas.

**C. The ideas to animate the Port Lands in the short-term are great. There was no mention of a public marina in the Framework. A public marina would be a real catalyst for the Port Lands and could also generate positive PR.**

A. That is a great idea, thank you.

**C. Public transit should be prioritized before any other development, starting with higher order transit regardless of density, not buses. Where are people who come in from outside the Port Lands going to park their cars? Is it possible to incorporate a parking structure as part of a development? Precinct**

**planning in terms of density and building heights will change over time. Consideration should be given to control architecture to ensure diversity.**

### **C. Villiers Island**

**Q. The modal shift numbers appear to be dramatic.**

**A.** Fairly aggressive modal shift assumptions were built into the plan. The conclusion is that shifting modes is not sufficient to reduce carbon emissions; it will also require shifting to electric cars.

**C.** It is clear that the team listened to the feedback they received in the past and put a lot of effort into revising the plan. This is cutting edge planning that could become a gold standard internationally. I like the approach presented regarding density and green space – it is positive. The buffer between commercial/industrial and residential/commercial uses is also positive. My only complaint is that there is not enough greenspace, but I will always say that. There is an opportunity as the area changes to increase the buffer between the Port Lands and Tommy Thompson Park.

**Q.** I understand that there has been an incredible amount of work – this is very exciting. I hope Villiers Island becomes a demonstration project. How will affordable housing be incorporated in the plan? Is there going to be a discussion about how much of MT35 will be preserved – there are already many industrial/heritage uses in the Port Lands.

**A.** Options for MT35 will be reviewed as part of the park design process. It is listed as a heritage building and therefore certain steps and processes must be followed to make any changes. The design of the park will require engaging a heritage consultant to complete a heritage impact assessment, and include extensive public consultation.

**A.** There is an opportunity to come up with a creative solution (i.e., green edge and maintaining important history).

**Q.** It may be important history, but is it necessary to retain all of it?

**A.** We are not suggesting that we need to keep it all. In terms of affordable housing, the draft Official Plan policies do not preclude mixed-market housing. We are exploring the possibility of cross subsidization between market rental and moderate rental. It does not have to be embedded in policy, but there is a need to ensure policy does not preclude it.

**Q.** The changes to the Villiers Island Precinct Plan (i.e., relocating density and retail uses) are a huge improvement. I was worried that the uses were scattered, resulting in a sense of placelessness. The revised plan also creates a contrast between urban and green. I like the buildings centred around court yards – it is a pleasant way to live and can encourage higher density. Developers should be required to build around court yards.

**A.** The intent of the design was to create a procession of experiences from the street to the building. We will look at providing more direction for future development.

**C.** I really do like the changes presented for Villiers Island. It makes a lot of sense to have a gradual transition from the park in the south to the Keating Promenade in the north. Animating both sides of the Keating Channel is import. Very nice work.