

Port Lands Acceleration Initiative

Public Consultation Round 3

ATTACHMENTS

- ATTACHMENT A.** Feedback from Completed Table Discussion Guides
- ATTACHMENT B.** Feedback from Completed Individual Discussion Guides
- ATTACHMENT C.** Feedback from Other Written Submissions

ATTACHMENT A.

Feedback from Completed Table Discussion Guides

1. What do you think about the current findings and recommendations?

- the amount of public space is seen as a positive aspect of the land development
- the current findings and recommendations are seen as being the better option when compared to the previous one
- if density doesn't increase in the new plan than green space should be increased in its stead
- more information on the pros and cons of each option, there is not enough background rationale given
- widen green areas, would like to see more green space
- activities for older people in the green space
- a mix of uses in the green space
- better utilize the waterfront land on the south with activities
- allotments in the developments
- new findings respond well to comments from previous meetings
- impact of Lafarge continuing operation amongst development
- support for some industrial uses staying, but apprehensive about a conversion to a knowledge based economy
- seems to make sense
- plans to outer harbour
- like to see some possible time lines
- comfortable with the strategy
- like the river R.O.W
- more details on planning transit
- phase 1 should start soon
- need more details
- density reduction given large developable parcel
- realignment doesn't depend on change
- boundaries of space, same size
- phasing
- density change only if green space is decreasing → this shouldn't happen
- like the division that creates a boundary between film and lands west
- like the fact that flood protection is paramount
- green space needs to support recreation activities
- would like to know what the model is for development changes
- phasing makes sense, it's huge area and can't be done all at once, especially because of upfront costs
- phasing also has a lot of construction over time which might have negative impacts over time
- how will transit come in, is it in developments?
- Would like more information in the phasing; what does it entail?
Big focal pieces, communities?
- Will developers be doing the first phase?
- How will the development begin? What is the preferred starting point for built form?
- Don't feel it is further ahead than before → the process is not moving quick enough and

there is concern that the method will change again

- One would like the original 2-Realignment
- Another would like the preferred 4WS → recognizes that you need some development and that it would pay for other uses
- There are different overflows with the two options, it's difficult to determine how those flows will work
- Realigned seems to make sense because it is true to the previous plan, which was a good one
- Like the phases because they would be easier to finance
- 5 phases seems like a reasonable number (10 phases would be too many)
- Like the meandering river as opposed to the first option of using Keating channel, which is already failed and not working
- Creates green space, which is good
- Funding is a major concern that has not been addressed
- Don't want the city going into debt to pay for this development but there is also concern about selling out to developers
- I can understand why TIF and Group Finance don't work but maybe some sort of bond
- Not sure if the public sector can finance it, but the private sector would be able to for sure
- Timeline: Talk about phases but how long is each phase?
- Concern about what sort of skyline this creates
- Like the original plan better because of quality of park
- Presentation was mainly on flood protection
- Folks are more interested in plans for the entire Port Lands
- Current findings didn't address land use
- Another individual answered that the council first needs to decide which way to go with respect to flood protection before anything else is decided
- Technical issues were reviewed by TRCA experts and their recommendation is accepted
- 5 phases is more cost effective than the 3 phases with respect to the 4WS Realigned vs. 4WS Preferred
- also allows time for new ideas
- I'd like to see them get moving on it
- Transit seems to be an afterthought here
- Hydro, sewage are also not there yet
- Why is transit addressed only at the end?
- Does not take into consideration importance of mouth and naturalization → this is one of only 3 river mouths in the city
- Should not leave river channel and flood plain to the last phase as it relies on money for development infrastructure that may not arrive
- Why not begin with the flood plain?
Requires decision of eventual/potential development
- Do natural mouth instead
- Re: preliminary phasing; where is the money for the flood plain coming from? Guarantee that
- What about a World Heritage Site?
- RE: Original environmental assessments dealing with water cleaning and use of wetlands, are these going to be applied?

- Are there any cultural/arts venues to be built in conjunction with the area? Perhaps something with a relevance to naturalization
- Design looks like it was done by accountants, boring and way too many start lines (pragmatic = boring)
- Cost of land remediation lacking
- Lacking integration (too many independent precincts)
- The picture is still hazy
- Mouth of river is restricted
- Realignment of Commissioners ST doesn't work for canal type atmosphere
- Too many phases, completion is a concern
- Phases 4 and 5 are only \$15 million
- "common place" 4WS Realigned
- Revised 4WS has more potential, developed than Original Revised 4WS
- What about value? In terms of value a little diamond has more value than a lot of coal
- The Original 4WS plan – the value of the land to sell is exquisite
- Everything is being done later, instead of left in the plans
- 4WS Preferred is the interesting one
- 4WS Realigned is the Wal-Mart
- The mouth is being left – it may never happen
- 5 phases is too many
- Lafarge has been around since 1927, the river mouth is never going to happen
- Don't believe the river mouth is ever going to happen, acceleration in earnest will never happen with Lafarge in the space
- The value of the land would be higher with the original plan; it has more green space, it was like a jewel
- "the mouth" is disappointing
- the Preferred version is interesting, the new version is a "Wal-Mart" version
- it's like putting a glove on something as opposed to structuring something
- too many phases
- number of loose ends are unbearable – too many things are left "to be determined" in the future
- the original plan was approved by council, and we are changing things now
- is there a hidden agenda re: transformational initiative?
- There's no public trust the process has been tainted
- The planners see concrete plans and it scares them
- Why did they reject a beautiful plan for an ugly plan?
- Naturalization aspect not clear, not addressed this evening
- What % of government funding will come from each of the 3 levels?
- Percentage of private funding to government funding for project not clear
- How much space will be needed for the PanAm games and how will the Port Lands be involved?
- Have owner's of industrials site been contacted or consulted?
- Where will the working ports actually be located?
- How will construction affect local businesses, ie: sailing, etc...
- How will it affect the water quality and biodiversity?
- Heritage buildings

- **Preserve green space and allow for more along Cousins Quay**
- **Waterfront and edge water green space needs to be deeper**
- **Polsons Quay should have more parkland and less condo developments and high density housing**
- **Revised 4WS concept, not enough green space along the waterfront areas**
- **Don River would be much improved with more riverside park space**
- **Natural habitat areas for wildlife along the river**
- **4WS Preferred is a better more interesting, less linear**
- **More natural line of the river, with a wider mouth and better location of parkland on Cousins Quay**
- **How will the market support the development in its entirety when we have already been advised that the market isn't there**
- **How do we protect the plan, in the next 100 years, given it can be influenced and changed by politics**
- **Especially considering that there is no market now and in the next 20 years 100-200 acres will be developed**
- **Already well documented issues with industrial uses in the area; Riverdale / Carlaw**
- **South Riverdale Community Health centre, should outreach to them?**
- **Need justification of the example industrial operations such as the Lafarge on being essential to the city**
- **Would like to see data or information on this**
- **Why do they need to stay?**
- **If the industrial will remain, make their operations integrated with the overall vision**
- **Look at the aesthetics of how the industry uses fit in**
- **Can the industrial operations provide both education and drama to the future patrons or residents and the area**
- **Example: Sugar Beach patrons can observe the operations of the Redpath refinery**
- **Could the Lafarge operation provide this as well? Could they provide interpretation centres to patrons/residents to understand their operation?**
- **Well thought out/balanced approach, generally**
- **Some general confusion about the amounts of park space in the two options 4WS + 4WS Preferred**
- **Some discussion of a loss 40 acres of green space between the two options**
- **Some clarification: actual loss was 20 acres**
- **Why was the block bounded by Leslie/Commissioners given up for development?**
- **Waterfront secretariat staff clarified that there were a number of users there already (Canadian Tire, Post Office, Hydro) concrete works, that are not likely to relocate**
- **Prefer to compare images to compare the 4WS Preferred to 4WS Realigned**
- **What is the small green area going to be?**
- **Would like green space to connect across the ship channel as a bike trail**
- **Ship/bridge channel can have pedestrian friendly path**
- **Can the curvature of the grading be increased on the channel?**
- **There are a significant departure from the EA findings**
- **Naturalized area in favour of mixed-use development**
- **Not a refinement but a rewrite**
- **The refinement is a procrastination**

- An unnecessary paranoia for flooding, an over concentration on the flood plain
- Should expropriate more land for development
- Loves the public consultation process; sees sufficient substantive changes
- Believes expropriation should be a last resort
- Get rid of heavy industry so the space becomes more appetizing for developers (no noise, pollution or ugly visuals)
- 4WS Preferred is the better option over 4WS Realigned
- 4WS Preferred allows for a more naturalized channel, is visually more appealing and allows for a larger river and mouth
- In 4WS Realigned channel is more man made/industrial with a narrower mouth
- The study process seems to be operating in a political vacuum → this may be intentional
- Fundamental requirements of EA was to naturalize the don; the 4WS Preferred does this, the 4WS Realigned does not
- Do not agree with the recommendation for 4WS Realigned
- Frustration due to moving away from the original plan to the 4WS Realigned
- The reasons for moving away from the original plan are not clearly outlined
- What are the cost implications of the original vs the 4WS realigned
- There has not been any conversation about wildlife impact
- Has the public's input been considered in planning, if so, where?
- Need to see more information regarding infrastructure, planning, housing, shopping
- The impact of this on traffic management
- How does this plan impact other projects such as the Queens Quay and East Bay Front?
- Frustrated → looked at the mouth of the Don River years ago to devise a plan, now we are going to a 4WS Realigned
- Why can't we still proceed with the original plan? Why was the option 4WS selected? What are the deciding factors? (asked during Q&A by Jack)
- Feeling like we are going through a similar "Transit City" process
- What disadvantages are there, if any, the selecting the 4WS Realigned approach vs the 4WS preferred?
- Participants would like to see a chart that presents a comparison; advantages vs. disadvantages with cost comparisons
- How does this portion fit into the "bigger picture" other areas of the Port Lands (taking into account the los of wildlife?)
- Participants feel a lot of the input gathered at other meetings has not been incorporated into tonight's session
- Need more clarity on transit infrastructure improvements and investments (ie: roads/transit)
- A plan should be developed to give participants a better idea of the overall connections
- Need to see design schemes to provide a better understanding of traffic implications, public realm plans, transit/road improvements/investment, shopping/business
- Will completion of this project adversely affect the completion of other waterfront projects?
- Like the new phasing opportunities
- Moe info needed on transit plan impacts
- Concern about funding for the "transformational" initiative; where does this money come from?

- Concern that park appear smaller
- More clarification needed on parks, stats and “natural” areas; what are the statistics of the new proposal
- Concern about east Port Lands; how does this large area redevelop? How is it integrated with redevelopment in Carlaw, south of Eastern
- Question of where the additional costs of land clean up with additional development area?
- Clarify the soft and hard infrastructure required in each phase (including capital and capacity)
- I quite like it
- How much will the Realigned 4WS impact the start of construction, it’s difficult to say
- Get initial R.O.W to northern/southern most limit of river alignment
- Pleased at 4WS Realigned, prefer river and riverbank channel
- Encouraged by Option 4 for transformational use
- Reservation with toying with residential; does that put the public at risk; for example another Sunrise explosion or chemical haze
- Seems lack of understanding of current industrial usage
- Good compromise
- Borrow against potential tax revenues
- Tax increment financing
- Private companies, potential philanthropic investment
- Nice to have planning done
- More emphasis on the transit situation
- How much public access?
- Would prefer frequent and rapid bus transit to begin with, similar to transit to York university
- Concerns about engineering of water channels on floodplain, particularly whether channel features will be natural or artificial.
- River corridor protection legislation must be guaranteed and invoked early in the project to protect natural areas and environmental integrity
- Phases are a great idea
- Maintainability incorporated in development plans
- Lack of clarity regarding what is lost with the 4WS Preferred proposal and the 4WS Realigned
- Loss of connection to the city by the removal of a bridge over Keating Channel at Munition Street like previously proposed
- Like the greenbelt to the lake in the 4WS Realigned
- Feel there is more commercialism driving development
- Feel that the angle of the river is too sharp and would like a consultant to have another look to confirm that the flood plain is stable
- Maintain focus on the river as the centre piece
- Reduce parkland ?
- Change the units from previous presentation (acres to Ha)
- How to prevent pollution from coming to the mouth of the Don
- No talk of clean/green issues
- Seems logical
- Balanced approach, seems more workable/reasonable

- 4WS is Preferred because it is more pragmatic and because it makes use of the Lafarge slip
- like the idea of continued access to and the current port use
- agree with reconciliation of port uses and not turning it totally residential
- glad that we're not maximizing condo development
- would like see plans for a wildlife corridor
- would like to keep the potential for a transformative initiative; it's important
- seems more financially feasible to develop the lands between Cherry St and the Don Roadway
- not compromising too much on the original option
- not taking the cheapest way out, which is a good thing
- environmental standards kept
- sustainability → keeping standard; ie: when Stockholm lost its Olympic bid but kept the village
- buses vs. rapid transit → if buses start LRT will never come
- boring → lack of boating docks, presentation was visually lacking in appeal, everything will be reduced so would like to start with higher standards
- re-route of river vs channel
- the film area isn't developed enough
- how to plan when you don't know what you are tying into
- big issue: why buses? Attraction of development = LRT
- influence of Lafarge → what is their impact? Can we relocate them?
- Water space information
- Phasing is a reasonable approach if it means more work can be started/underway sooner
- 4WS Realigned appears less naturally nice but we can appreciate it's important for shipping infrastructure (wall)
- 4Ha less green space, but this is not necessarily park space/public space
- 4WS Realigned still has park space
- concern still losing natural green space at the mouth of the river
- attractive
- need quality of design ensured
- would like to see public access to the water's edge
- would also like, public parks and spaces and not just commercial but mixed use neighbourhoods there
- looks great
- The plan is closer to Ken Greenberg's work; which is an issue because more phases=more time
- How much money are they saving through phasing
- Would like to see more specific numbers on cost
- Hanging a lot of phasing, bit o a shell game
- No similar comparison model
- Why excitement over 4Ha more; we already have a huge area, do we need more parkland?
- Wasn't the mission to speed up the build out?
- There is still a 30 year build out timeline
- Plan is optimized from a business perspective
- Now a small centralized neighbourhood parkettes
- Like the perimeter path, like Centre Island

- **Need some small parkettes for kids or seniors with mobility issues but they could be attached the open space along the river**
- **The river needs more of a sweep**
- **Too focused on developing land when the focus should also consider permaculture, and how global warming will affect the production of foods**
- **No details on soil contamination, very helpful to know if more of an agriculture approach will be embedded**
- **A ratio of the number of private sectors should be controlled because it might not be a good idea to have all development when there is so much already in the city**
- **Something should be done to consider relocating the Hearn plant; which allows too much hot water to spill into Lake Ontario**
- **Current zoning plan based on the flood in the 1950s may be over exaggerated (there are options at the table against this point which recognize the need for flood control)**
- **Not enough concern in regards to global warming**
- **Adjusting the channelization of water is great, but development should cater more to agriculture and keeping it natural**

2. Do you have any suggested refinements to the current findings and recommendations?

- Add more culture for more permaculture, and sustainable and organic foods
- Follow current studies at U of T regarding permaculture
- Take advantage of the location and access of water to produce homes that generate their own water, heat from solar panels and sustainable all around
- A sustainable requirement should be enforced in the Port lands
- Improve the river alignment, modify the tight curve
- Need an interactive process for consultation
- Widen at the river mouth
- How much money is being spent on additional phasing
- Need a higher level of refinement on development blocks, instead of blobs, show more detail
- Need more details on potential financing, others are being discarded like TIFs
- Yes, we agree that there is a need for an interim report to city council
- Put numbers on the phases
- Fine with 4WS Realigned
- Want to see more details on the design work, it all depends on these details
- Would like to see quality of design
- Cousins and Polson quays, could a signature piece of architecture be there?
- Signature piece must be public access and not a private condo on the waterfront
- How can the public use the Cousins and Polson quays earlier?
- Would like to see connections for pedestrians, bike or transit, for example at Cherry St.
- Would like to see more public park space on the ends of the quays, including Esrock Quay (over time)
- Would like to see more residential/neighbourhood on the developable land, versus a go kart, golf course or casino
- Want to keep some naturalized edges and see design details of the river and natural areas
- Allow public access to the views
- Overall, with the development opportunity the key is to have better public access to the water
- Set high standards
- Don't let budget dictate
- Comments from developers have too much influence and use scare tactics
- Praise of the facilitation process
- Show alternative international examples of transformational initiatives
- Including brief into on the "big picture" of other adjacent Waterfront Toronto projects
- Link Carlaw and Broadview to Cherry Beach Park and extend across the shipping channel
- Reserve key sites for transformational initiatives
- Will there be a process to review phased development and incorporated lessons learned from earlier phases?
- Where is the vision? Public real plan
- Transitional buses are disheartening
- More detailed information on how to handle pollution from getting into the Port Lands

- Return to more wetlands along the river lands as part of the Revised 4WS plan
- Focus more on naturalized environment
- Provide a map online of the land ownership for stakeholder reference
- Come up with a plan that is government change proof
- Provide timely reports for stakeholder reference and comment
- Bring Michael Van Valkenburg back to consult on the river naturalization
- Would like to see more information about potential transit plans
- Allow for institutional use
- Consider long term Port Lands and lake usage that will influence development
- Remember that the Port Lands fronts a lake
- A slide showing existing and industrial use would be helpful
- An understanding of the risk to public safety from existing use (is there a risk of another Sunrise explosion, for example)
- Clarify the park land / natural area statistics
- Clarify environmental remediation methods
- Would like to see higher-order transit, in addition to LRT; including regional rail stations and subway like Canary Wharf in London
- How will transit be phased with development phasing (including operation)
- Also water-based transit should be included (ie: ferries, water-taxis)
- There should be a pedestrian bridge to the Toronto Island
- Transit infrastructure in the upfront phases needs to be more than just buses!
- Can there be a university campus in the Port Lands?
- Need to develop a transit/roadway infrastructure plan indicating linkages, connections, gaps to be illustrated on a laser area map showing impacts, if any
- Participants want to know who will make the final decision on the final plans to go forward
- Will measures be put in place to ensure that plans/directives agreed upon during this administration remain in effect?
- When will the planning go into action? Discussion being had and findings presented; it needs to be put into action
- Participants do not want discussions to continue without end
- Indicate the impacts minor or major, if any, to the other areas of the waterfront and immediately surrounding areas (ie: traffic, parking impacts, pedestrian impacts)
- An overall plan encompassing design, costing information, impact on other initiatives and timelines
- Need clarification on “who will be making the final decision,” in other words, would a change in political administration have an impact on the road map for this project
- It was difficult to understand why one option was better than the other, why was the Realigned option better/easier to phase?
- We would like to see more information on this point
- More information needed on transit plans in this area
- Loss of parkland is problematic, creates more development land but lost park land
- The infrastructure cost noted does not specify if this cost deals with the improvements to the floodplain issue as well as providing for increased development/density of these lands
- Should expropriate more land vs. Expropriation as a last resort
- Get rid of heavy industry so the space becomes more appetizing for developers (no noise, pollution or ugly visuals); these are not compatible uses

- Retain public meetings/involvement and incorporate more public presentation
- Concern that the refined plan is too far of a departure from the plan that came out of the EA Process
- Get on with the project
- Would like more planning/design
- What would you do to make this more implementable?
- There needs to be further clarification on the timelines; when does it start and end? How long anticipated for each of the phases?
- The work on the Port Lands needs to be integrated with the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan
- Transit seems to be a real afterthought in this exercise
- Stage 5 requires Lafarge removal
- Concerned that we will never get the development as proposed if Lafarge stays
- Need to show how the proposed naturalization will happen as planned when such elements remain
- The more complete the natural element (ie: the river and its inputs) the better the impact on the developable lands and increased land values
- Need all levels of government involved in the EA process, need the federal and provincial govt's at the table
- Feels Original plan is compromised to accelerate the plan
- Would like to go back to the Original 4WS plan
- Port Land and river mouth matters
- Want parkland connectivity not little pockets
- Phasing, not clear as to what each phase consists of and the logic behind it
- Reserve quays for parkland, green space and cultural venues such as open stages
- Lots of venues for families and the public to enjoy the outdoors
- Lots of playground areas for kids, creative gardens, wide boulevards areas to sit and relax, quiet areas
- Features to draw the public, ie: a contemporary art museum
- Wants to see more naturalization!
- Maintain heritage
- The transformation is the river Don
- The naturalization of the river should be the main event, as it was planned initially
- The consensus: the Original 4WS was much better, we should go back to it. The 'mouth' looks much better; it has to look more natural and more aesthetic
- The Revised plan is ugly
- No subway, LRT is good
- No casino!
- Waterfront needs to be accessible to the residents of Toronto, we already have a lot of private land
- Focus should be on the architecture that is appropriate, that includes humans and human interaction with nature within an urban area
- The port is not important to Toronto, it should not remain there
- We should celebrate the lake and its uses, focus on the history and development of the city
- One example would be a history/heritage centre that can exist with residential use; it would draw tourists
- Restore the promontories, widen the mouth of the Don as it enters

- Go back to the Original 4WS Preferred.
- The final mouth should look more natural; in the revised plans the look at the mouth is ugly
- Naturalization – people would rather be beside a park than a parkettes in Scarborough
- No subways
- No casino
- No ferris wheel, no roller coaster
- Ensure waterfront is accessible to all the people of Toronto, would like to see public ownership
- Focus on the architecture of the Port Lands, the tail is waving the dog
- The Original concept by designers was an urban estuary, without flow from the filtration plant
- Phases 4+5 should merge with phase 3
- Real feedback at the design level
- Solid transit plan, fully integrated in each of the phases
- Make the river the transformative force !
- How does the modified proposal address climate change and natural water cleansing?
- What can't we have the same ratio of recreation/naturalization/research that we will have in Lake Ontario Park, in the Port Lands?
- Why slow down and look for money for infrastructure when we may never get development, why don't we do something like Lake Ontario Park?
- Guaranteed different modes of transit/active transportation is essential, including bikes and walking; perhaps along the rail corridor?
- Take into consideration the time required for infrastructure
- Rather refer to it as green space, whether it is parkland/floodplain etc...
- With a reduction of 4Ha of parkland that sounds like a reduction in green space → an increase in hard surfaces
- The plan for transit should be from the very start
- All infrastructure should be planned now and not done afterwards
- How does this tie into the 2015 PanAm transit and other developments?
- This area will require a lot of infrastructure upgrades → ie: old, wake drainage system
- How does it fit with other developments such as Front St. Transit?
- Leslie St Spit needs a continuous connection (including the island) with the Don Valley for wildlife migration
- If green space includes large sports facilities, this could be jeopardized
- Prefer passive recreation in a wilderness strip
- We need a commitment to transit as part of this
- Need to maintain open public access to the lake
- Wants to know that the casino will not be included in the plan for the Port lands
- What's going to happen to the overall area with respect to zoning?
- Keep the ship channel
- Urban sustainability: not being addressed in the Don Lands area
- In future zoning; would like to see urban sustainability to be reflected for the entire subject area
- Urban sustainability: perhaps a special district as a specific zone for the Port lands
- Zoning: make it a car-free and walk-able community
- Minimal road infrastructure for cars

- Even make small parts of the Port lands car-free
- For the future: map with specific sites and labels showing what's there; ie: Hope Depot, Lafarge
- Legends for red and yellow areas
- Land ownership should be illustrated on a map
- We already have AGO, ACC, ROM, and the Opera house initiatives at the port lands
- Why spend millions of dollars when we can plant trees to drink up the water
- Transit plans should be prioritized; it should be the catalytic development
- Look at using some sort of BOND; many similar international projects are paid for with bonds
- Limited in learning about the planning of the spaces
- Provide a commitment or a better idea of how many years are within each phase?
- Is there overlap with phases or do they have to be back to back?
- Should address max-height
- Decisions on location of roads, developments and size, shape and location of park will have significant impact on the ability to create a working neighbourhood, including a quality clean park and the ability to put in taller buildings
- Land use planning tests should be connected to the process
- Keep the mouth of the Realigned version and the body of the Preferred with the angled spillway
- Angled spillway in the 4WS Preferred creates better development land
- Transit has to come, roadways must be designed for transit, cars, pedestrians and cyclists,
- Keep development beside roads instead of parks
- This seems vague → not enough examples of height restrictions, densities, and what other cities have done
- What kinds of designs, perhaps it is too early, but that should be explained
- How does this section fit into the rest of the Waterfront Master Plan?
- Ed more information to allow for more understanding/visualization of what it will look like
- Would be a useful tool to be able to visualize what it could look like
- What are each of the parcels going to look like?
- The website shows design concepts and general plans → it should provide more concepts here
- Mixed-use (as on the website) is a good concept, but not described here – it would help to make a connection
- We would like more world examples of such a large area
- Move boundaries to keep same park space
- Keep green space
- Green space makes the area developable
- Community needs supports for green activity/recreation and community gardens
- Focus on waterfront activity
- Show diversity of naturalized spaces (ie: beach, meadow, park, forest)
- Would like to see more of the above diversity; there is a need for trees and a wildlife corridor
- More clarity, specifics of transformational initiative, it could impact planning
- LRT shows more dedication and connection, especially in relation to “transformational initiatives”

- **Bus stops are not adequate**
- **There is no reason to develop the land to the extent that is proposed**
- **Higher development charges on land**
- **Development density should be lower**
- **We would like to see a mixed use ratio of residential and commercial properties, while keeping with the neighbourhood character**
- **We feel that low rise housing is best with the commercial on the main level**
- **Increased transit infrastructure and frequency of service is important to maintain the sustainability of the area**
- **We are concerned with the phasing approach**
- **We would like to see a commitment to complete all 5 phases within a given time frame to ensure its completion**
- **We would also like to see the development of bike lanes, walking paths, etc.. to promote healthy lifestyles and active living and a safe public environment**

3. Other Feedback

- We have concerns over funding and the lack of commitment from reliable sources
- No casino. Anywhere on the waterfront
- Original Preferred drawings were missing a bridge and other details too on a wildlife corridor
- I came to voice my opinion about a casino. Toronto does not need a casino anywhere. Especially in the Port Lands or on the Waterfront
- 1st timers could really use quick overview of the lands – if you're going to talk about a space make sure you illustrate it. Perhaps a labelled map available for folks to refer. We didn't know where the places/spaces were
- too much information at one time
- handouts would be useful with supportive information; more than one per table
- a package to take home and read with more technical information on how the Preferred method was reached; otherwise we must go home and look on the website. We feel the material should be provided here as well
- as mentioned in #2 participants felt more detailed concept plans would have been beneficial to this discussion
- would like to know timelines on how this is all progressing
- Casino – could be acceptable at the CNE, but not in the Port Lands which is a family area; who would want to live across from a casino?
- Question: detailed planning of zoning: will that come with a reopened EA or as part of another process
- Answer: This EA is only for flood control. Future EA for the north part may be re-opened and could look at this
- Hard copy of the presentation was well used
- See the 2nd question for input on maps for future meetings
For future: we would like a map with specific sites and labels showing what's there. For example, Home Depot and Lafarge. Also, legends would be helpful for the red and yellow areas. Also, land ownership should be illustrated on a map
- We need to minimize motor vehicle traffic
- Not much mention of transit or roads to support housing
- The cutback in green space makes it hard to trust the city, we need it mentally or otherwise
- What uses are proposed for phases 1 + 3?
- What are the impacts of having industrial (south of the ship channel) so close to a residential area (north of the ship channel)
- If necessary, have totally sustainable; our 1st choice is all naturalized
- No casino!
- Professional input – consultation re: river naturalization and design
- Would like to know a timeline
- which level of government has responsibility for these consultations and to the completion of this project?

ATTACHMENT B.

Feedback from Completed Individual Discussion Guides

1. What do you think about the current findings and recommendations?

May 24th

- I'm concerned that a lot of the emphasis of justification have been focused on the Realigned 4WS, I feel that the Original plan would have been phased and could be staged; for example, spill way, followed by raising the Don Roadway and the Polson and Cousin Quays will still be able to develop quickly. This could all be done within the original
- I don't find the modification of 4WS to be minor, What I do see is "increased land for development" making large square/rectangular blocks which are ugly.
- Do we really need 4 more hectares of development when we already have so much
- I'm very concerned with the 5th phase especially the southern side of the river as it's now closer to LaFarge and therefore we are dependant on their 'generosity' or the future need to expropriate these lands at a much higher cost to the public purse
- Precincts – there always would have been "precinct" planning, so don't claim the Realigned Plan allows for Precincts, that is dishonest
- Although I think we've learnt a lot I don't believe all the 'justifications' for the Realigned plan and suggest that we could do this all with the original 4WS
- I think that Waterfront Toronto has done a great deal of work and should be commended
- However, there is not enough parkland on the Cousins and Polsons quays and I think Waterfront Toronto should have included this option
- The existing allocation of parkland adjacent to the water is insufficient. The comparison to other local parks is apt because it demonstrates the inadequacy of what is being proposed for waterfront parkland.
- This should be much larger than local-park-sized
- In the last consultation, we were told 40 acres of parkland/green space was reduced to 20acres so it wasn't clear how this new design compares
- More development space does not mean realizing more value from the land – the Original 4WS would create more value in less land
- 4WSR is banal, boring, watered-down etc...
- putting the river mouth into the LaFarge slip is a travesty – it's changing an existing structure instead of starting from scratch, which compromises quality and potential.
- If LaFarge can stay as long as they want, the river mouth – the most important part of re-naturalization of a river that's been channelized for 100 years – will never happen
- I don't want a river that is "efficient" I want one that is beautiful and spectacular
- Did nobody know the TPA existed until now? "finding" that there's a working port on the Port Lands is simply an excuse for removing the promontories
- The 'transformational use' is the river
- Its intended as the catalyst for development – we don't need another catalyst
- Link to south waterfront
- Decreased green space
- Mixture of industrial and green
- The findings are largely silent on the issue of housing affordability and pays far too little attention to housing needs of families with children
- Supportive of transformational initiatives but with such uncertain funding, I question how

possible it is

- Somewhat supportive of the 4WS Realignment
- Do not agree with a BRT as transit, would much prefer an LRT
- Would prefer the most public space possible regardless of cost
- Could more park space be used to leverage higher land prices and therefore more tax revenue?
- Casino is not a transformational initiative, in my opinion
- Revised 4WS: “greater development potential” but what about value; a diamond can be small but still be worth a lot, a chunk of coal can be big, but still of limited value in comparison
- A hectare in Manhattan doesn’t equal the same amount of money for a hectare in Hoboken
- Let’s not undervalue the potential of the Port Lands by being penny wise and pound foolish
- This whole process is done in bad faith; the catalytic event should have been the transformation of the Don; then you polish the jewel and they will come. Build out of the land
- They see concrete; the transformation is the River. The Port Lands were built to be an Industrial city 100 years ago; the transformation of the Don was supposed to be the main event – they are watering it down and it will never happen
- When I want to go to Cherry Beach, make it possible to get there
- Not buying into it
- We need something more compelling
- The Port Authority was never voiced before; now we are hearing how important they are
- Don Roadways Film – we talked about 2 other areas for the film area – now all of a sudden we are talking about Film Industry. The technology has changed so much; are we investing in yesterday’s future?
- The Port Land has done nothing but just sit there
- The area was supposed to be indestructible to pollution – in a plan 50 – 100 years ago
- This is all land fill on the land; the engineering land cost is going to be outrageous. A better plan would tell how much, so we can get private input. It can be very expensive due to the land fill
- They have some ideas about 4WS, the market will decide which idea is more valuable
- Question the quality of the development area in the new version
- Best view is private?
- Development blocks seem to have worse road access
- Limited development potential because taller buildings will shade the park
- In the new version, the park is along a major street and will make the park less usable and more polluted
- I’m glad that the PLAI responded to the concerns of the attendees at the last public meetings
- Disingenuous to keep campaigning a flood protection plan, when one has been decided. If anything, compare only current “urban planning” to prior “urban planning” (eg: Lower Donlands Framework Plan)
- I’m pleased that the 4WS option has been retained. The modifications maintain the principles of the original option and I am glad it can be phased over 5 stages to help spread out the cost
- It meets the goals of flood protection and more phases allow for acceleration of flood

protection and development and naturalization

- I liked the original meandering river and I hope the final design allows the river to meander
- I like the lowering of the total cost and the improved development blocks that can be released in phases
- We like increased phasing of plan to better match unlocking of land with development
- When will we see transit plans for the Port Lands?
- Looking into transformative initiatives in the form of a cultural mega-project, but where is the money?
- Size of buildings be restricted
- Would like to see accessible bathrooms, more women, bike/bixi
- 4WS Realigned – what will be the real naturalization?
- 4WS preferred – taking not gridded edges, edge condition should be a blur
- Promontories; why can't there be a phased natural promontory
- Has phasing been suggested to keep the promontory?
- 4WS Preferred – have to look at the business
- phasing is a much more sensible approach it is more likely to get done
- it would be desirable to have the actual mouth more natural and a less formal park development
- transformational initiatives (sure) focus more on naturalization
- I C → high line NY
- Good that we have a boardwalk
- Right angle of first bend. Revised
- A map of previous land ownership for stakeholder reference
- Come up with a plan that is government proof
- Set date well in advance so everyone can come for the public meeting

May 25th – June 8th

- Why is 4WS realigned easier to phase than 4WS preferred?
- Concern about the funding
 - As it is a major issue/risk of City “selling out” in order to move process forward i.e. developers
 - This should not increase City's debt
 - Need to develop a vision for the planned usage and ask developers to build to it → not to their agenda
- Flood protection and containment in three channels makes sense
- Generally comfortable with findings
- Like the approved plan and want to get it moving

2. Do you have any suggested refinements to the current findings and recommendations?

May 24th

- Reduce the amount of park space adjacent to major roadways
- Development blocks should be adjacent to roads for access
- Must consider the skyline view from the lake; will lower buildings close to the water, higher buildings further away
- Consider shadow impacts on park, which could limit development potential
- Also consider view from park out
- Green corridor all the way through is a good thing with this new 4WS revised proposal; the other had a chink in it and wasn't a through corridor
- More detail on what is included in the infrastructure development
- Transit needs more detail
- Can park space from the development process be consolidated?
- Will it be natural or a more formal landscape?
- Grid use - have a grid with original
- Needs some reflections; aesthetic; monotonous fabric
- River overall level looks very rigid
- Transit seemed like an afterthought
- Increasing visualization
- The relationship between the meander of the river needs to mirror the landscape /landform
- Address the disconnect between the built edge and the water's edge
- Connections to existing trails and parks
- Can the precinct system be harnessed for other planning such as safety services or community resources?
- What about increased water transit options as water-taxis, zip-boats, TTC ferries, etc...
- Can the working port be moved? If not, how will they be folded into a largely residential and service, commercial city
- When the ocean level rises (which will happen within the timeframe of the Port Lands development) there will be a lot of refugees globally, is that coming issue factored into planning?
- Is there any planning to include the optimization of solar energy?
- Show us a map of essential uses, please. I don't understand how these industries affect the planning and phasing of the Port Lands; especially the LaFarge plant – what's that all about? Why is it essential?
- It would be nice to see transit planning revisited within the Revised 4WS plan
- Please keep up the comparisons to the 4WS "preferred" so that we could understand the proposed changes better
- Public has to participate in any future design process
- Go back to the preferred plan
- LaFarge integration does not seem possible
- The Port is not important for Toronto, nor is the Port Authority
- What about a Great Lakes Museum use of the area

- This is a historical place for us to focus on, in the City of Toronto
- There is no cultural hub for even the First Nations of this country
- We want parks along the port
- Would a pedestrian bridge to Toronto Island be possible?
- Use of a hallmark event (ie: the Olympics or World Expo) as a transformational stimulant; it could mobilize funding from upper levels of government, bring tourism, business revenue etc...
- Potential development acceleration also would strongly support this
- It would be inspiring if the city and Waterfront Toronto would direct far more energy than they are now to thinking how the Port Lands can be used as a means of addressing the needs of families with children and particularly to such families who also have low incomes
- Has either the city or Waterfront Toronto actually made any effort to understand what families with children actually consider important regarding their housing needs?
- I emphasize families with children because these families are already being squeezed out of the downtown neighbourhoods
- The Port Lands provides an opportunity to counter balance the trend towards singles and couples dominating the downtown
- The entire process we've been through was tainted from the beginning and has been conducted in a way not conducive of building trust
- There was never any indication at these meetings that you've heard or incorporated any of the comments/concerns/recommendations from the previous public meetings – it just seems like you're selling us the same bill of goods in a different way and with more details
- Restore the promontories
- Bigger mouth of the river
- Privilege re-naturalization, not flood proofing
- No casino on the Port Lands
- We want more and better consultation, which means allowing the public to work on the plans and contribute actively, not just be told what you've done – ie: how the original plan was done
- I think there should be no development on the quays
- These should be reserved for park and a transformational public building that would be low rise and set back from the water on Cherry St.
- there should be a great playground with swings and shade and places for kids to kick a ball around
- a transformational building might be a Toronto Museum of Modern Art
- A transformational use might be an amazing playground for all ages
- Spend more time and energy at really looking at the phasing with the Original 4WS
- Spend more time on explaining why some of the financial options are being thrown out
- In total, we want more details on how this will be financed
- Include more details on TTC (transit) infrastructure; don't reduce the connection to the city
- More of the green space needs to be considered next to the River and the park around it
- Parks have value that cannot be ignored and the value of this has not been looked at
- Thus I'm suggesting/recommending that we evaluate/value the importance and wealth gained long term by park land

May 25th – June 8th

- Possible purification of storm water runoff
- Density vs. green space – how much is really needed
- Concerns from reduced park land
- Landmarks could attract tourists but deter residents (e.g. Guggenheim)
- Improve presentation – Should introduce concepts at the start
- Funding – will there be updates at the next meeting
- Timeline – phase lengths, what are they? Merging of phases?
- Revised option – green space and roadways?
- Concern about the transit plan and integrating higher order transit into a transit system with relief for downtown core
- The Port Lands is a people place for the City of Toronto and sports plays a role in development of city youth
- Based on tonight's discussion the development of two rugby fields located in Lake Ontario Park
- Walk ways and bike paths linking the city and transit allowing the work force direct access to work
- Many of today's youth would rather take a bus than drive or purchase a car

3. Other Feedback

May 24th

- There are serious issues about the relationship between the built edge and the water's edge
- Naturalization is the underlying comment, but it not just about the river, it's the relationship of urban fabric and the river; 4WS Realigned has this disconnected
- The built edge should, to any extent, mimic the meander of the river
- Realigned mimics Keating Channel morphology, River should govern the built edge
- This can be done with respect to keeping the +4Ha of realigned plan; maybe with a loss of only 0.5Ha
- Going backwards from the vision of a naturalized Port Lands with the 4WS Realigned; progress made with the 4WS Preferred is lost; go back to the 4WS preferred
- Toronto is a becoming a global city and it is imperative that we take the necessary steps of creating a sophisticated and fresh Port Lands that blurs the edge between city and water; 4WS Preferred achieves this
- There has been a lot of great and important information gathered but the elephant is still in the room
- The 'City' is still trying to maximize the value of their (our) lands for development rather than realizing that these lands should be used for accommodating the river in the best format possible
- When will City Hall stop trying to maximize the financial benefits for the NOW without looking ahead to the value for the city as a whole in the future
- Short term gain should never deny making this river the jewel in the city's crown
- Clarify parks/natural areas statistics between options
- We like the phasing plan, manageable pieces but transit needs to be phased in as well in the early phases; not just buses
- Would like to see another Union station, new ferries, bike path network
- Advanced planning ideas such as zoning/building codes to optimize solar energy
- Green space only on the quays
- Someone said that the 4WSR is a reasonable memory" of 4WS – this doesn't say much
- Please consider how the proposed area would be linked in the south to the Cherry Street Beach and in the north to the PanAm village and to the west to the expanding Harbourfront
- It should be done in a bike and pedestrian friendly manner
- No casino; it's not compatible with a healthy neighbourhood

ATTACHMENT C.

Feedback from Other Written Submissions

I think all the work that has gone in by so many applaudable and thank you.

I suspect it is early days but I'm hoping that transit is being considered. Parking in the area is limited and expensive and I visited the area already developed last summer by walking from Harbourfront but who is going to do that if they don't have a car. No doubt this is being looked at and I know it is not priority at the moment but I'm hoping it is definitely on the agenda. Harbourfront is a prime example. Parking is so expensive that unless you could get there by transit it would not be the centre of activity that it has become. Thanks for all the hard work

Sincerely

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.

Good Morning

I was one of many who attended the public meeting at the Convention Centre and I left with a few questions.

For a number of years, one of the most important aspects of the Portlands was a desire to restore the river and the land to higher land uses from the industrial users of the past.

If we look back, the Portlands was developed in the best way at the time. Having said that, over time we have learnt the best solution to improving water quality is to use nature. All the improvements technology help but nature is still the best and way out in front. In trying to improve the quality of the Don River and the Lake, the use of marshes is important.

In the preferred option, there is less marsh, is the remaining the minimum required? does the task of improving the quality of the Don River get harder or easier?

If the quality is harder, I would think it would be difficult to justify people buying properties to over the Don River and Lake Ontario if the water quality does not improve. For one of the things the new residents will do is to push council to spend money, lots of it, trying to improve water quality (pay me now or pay me later).

If the preferred option does what the original plan was suppose to do, at a greater than minimum standards then I can support it. If not, let nature help, and if that requires more land so be it.

In the presentation, it was mentioned debt financing or the issuance of bonds was not an option. It seems to me, Waterfront Toronto is essentially a City of Toronto project, if the City of Toronto and its credit facility does not back the bonds, that was short sighted on the part of the governance of the corporation.

There has been a lot of very good work by Waterfront Toronto and this portion is not going to be done in years but decades, unless Toronto receives the Olympics or some similar sized event. Given that Toronto is not on the list for 2016, decades is more likely. Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: June-07-12 10:34 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: "Transformational" initiative

Hi [REDACTED]

I'm sure that you have many things to keep you busy but I am concerned about an idea was promoted that the Waterfront Portlands could have some "transformational" effect on the City of Toronto.

Mentioned were: [REDACTED] but TORONTO has:

- Sydney Opera House - the new Four Seasons Centre
- Bilbao Gallery - newly renovated A.G.O. - same architect Gehry
- Boston Museum - recently " R.O.M.
- [REDACTED] - recently built new Ballet School

We have the Air Canada Centre
and Rogers Centre

SO, what scares me (and why I am putting this in writing) is that someone might just be proposing a "fantasy / transformational" CASINO for somewhere on the Toronto waterfront. CNE i.e. These guys will not give up easily !!!

(I heard the announcement that a casino will NOT be built at Ontario Place.)

Casino promoters suggest a row of glitzy hotels. 5 or 7 Star (of course) But wait !!!

We have the new Ritz Carlton, Trump International, Four Seasons and soon, the new Shangrila, most within walking distance of the business district and arts venues.

Do we need another 3 or 4 flashy hotels away from the centre of town (at say the C.N.E.) and blocking the waterfront?

I said that the kids coming out of high school and university cannot afford to own a car and want to live downtown anyway.

Mr. Campbell said (with his usual grace and smile) that the kids probably gamble.

Sure, but guess what? They will be sitting in their waterfront condos, looking out at the islands, and gambling with their thumbs.

They don't need to be in a closed hall for hours on end, said casino taking up precious waterfront land. I am suggesting that before "CASINO ROW" is built, it will be OBSOLETE.

The most "transformative" thing could be that the Portlands are not Flash and Dash, but a classy residential precinct like say the Annex or a medium-rise Rosedale.

THAT kind of restraint, along with some friendly restaurants, near the water, would really impress future visitors.

i.e. what we did NOT do.

I felt that the "Transformative" feature came too late in the proceedings to receive sufficient attention.

After I reminded our table of the arts and sports facilities which are still new and and asked "What, then "transformational", a young man suggested that we could design some really classy street car stations / stops. Of course, they should all be.

It is understandable that Mr. Dwight Duncan is a supporter of a mile long row of glitzy casinos/ hotels/ shopping strips.

He comes from Windsor and the Detroit River is the ONLY significant feature of the landscape.

I know. I was born close by.

But the Toronto waterfront is NOT the Detroit River.

Do we need another 3 or 4 flashy hotels away from the centre of town (at say the C.N.E.) and blocking the waterfront?

Well, I wish everyone the best.

Protecting against a 100-year flood is \$\$\$\$\$

Cheers, ████

I attended the meeting on May 24 at the Convention Centre.

I was very disappointed in the overall direction that Waterfront Toronto seems to be proceeding.

If it hadn't been for the last paragraph at the end of the presentation, "transit" would not even have been mentioned. That's a far cry from the original declarations of "transit first". It appears that it's transit whenever or whatever!

The changes to the mouth of the Don River, originally, were great, well accepted and the people were looking forward to the start of this project. It too, has fallen by the wayside.

Although not a part of the Port Lands, the Queens Quay East light rail line and the alterations to the highly inefficient Union Station streetcar loop also seem to have fallen off the earth.

Have the buffoon brothers from City Council taken over control of the Waterfront Toronto?



Portlands Acceleration Initiative
Public Consultation Round 3-Public Meeting May 24 2012

Discussion Question #1: **What do you think about the current findings and recommendations?**

I am in total disagreement with the findings and recommendations submitted at the May 24th meeting and strongly believe that we should revert back to the preferred 4WS plan. My objections to the current Waterfront Committee findings are based on the following reasons:

1)The preferred 4WS design was selected by a jury in 2007 as the one which best addresses the objectives of providing a naturalized mouth and creating a comprehensive plan for addressing urban design,transportation,sustainability and other ecological issues. The jury went on to say that the winning design demonstrated the winning team’s detailed understanding of soil conditions and remediation, engineering requirements and land ownership issues to produce a plan that is cost effective and achievable.The jury’s conclusions were confirmed by the Royal Architecture Institute of Canada in 2008 when the 4WS preferred plan won the 2008 award for “Sustainable Development”.

The recommended 4WS Realigned is an inferior plan. Its total area is 4.1 hectares less; it features 3.7 fewer hectares of park space; it features 4.6 fewer hectares of flood plan; it eliminates the promontory parks at the mouth of the Don River. In essence, in the 4WS Realigned plan, the mouth of the Don is not much different from the current mouth which turns 90 degrees into the Keating Channel. The river still features a 90 degree turn augmented by narrow bands of parkland and flood plain along each bank.

2) As an attendee at each of the three public input meetings, I was acutely aware of two concerns expressed by the participants:

- a) The realigned plan sacrificed some of the best features of the naturalized river mouth
- b) The realigned plan was being proposed on the basis of a faster time-line

Outside of making some minor tweaks to the green space along the river banks, I don’t feel the Portlands Acceleration Committee gave much credence to these concerns. **From my perspective, it appears from the outset that the 4WS realigned plan was a “fait accompli” regardless of what the public might think.**

3) **The Portlands Acceleration Committee never provided the public with a detailed comparison between the 4WS preferred and the 4WS Realigned plans.**Specifically, there was no direct comparison of the anticipated time frame for each of the 5 phases of the realigned plan vs. the 3 phases of the preferred plan along with a comparison of the anticipated cost of each phase in each plan. This information is vital in deciding if it is worthwhile to adopt the realigned plan on the basis of time line for implementation and total cost.

4) The key findings seem to be characterized by the conclusion that costs could be reduced and implementation time saved by adopting the 4WS Realigned plan. Somewhere in the presentation material, it was mentioned that the 4WS Realigned plan would reduce costs by \$175M.Based on a

projected 20 year time-line, one needs to ask the question: *“is it worthwhile to accept a plan that is 2nd best in exchange for a possible annual cost savings of approximately \$8.7M?”*

I recently attended a U of T School of Architecture lecture given by John Raulston Saul and Mark Kingwell on the prevalence of a neo liberalist philosophy in today’s society. In the lecture, they lamented the fact in today’s society, one tends to value everything in terms of its usefulness or its monetary cost. In terms of the Portlands, you can’t quantify in a monetary sense the public benefit of enjoying a feature such as the promontory park.

5) The reasons given for advocating the 4WS Realigned over the 4WS preferred are dubious at best.

a) The promontories are said to give navigational risks and loss of dock wall.

Why weren’t these listed as problems when the jury picked the 4WS preferred plan as the winning plan in 2007?

b) Maintaining the Lafarge slip for the life of the Lafarge plant wasn’t listed as a concern when the winning design was selected in 2007.

Why wasn’t the Lafarge plant identified as a “show-stopper” when the jury picked the 4WS preferred plan as the winning design in 2007?

Couldn’t the City come to an agreement with Lafarge to relocate at some time within a set time frame (i.e. land exchange at the east end of the ship canal)?

It’s my impression that Waterfront Toronto has not historically taken an aggressive stance in promoting its goals for waterfront development. A prime example of this reluctance is the lack of suitable public transit serving the East Bayfront. Originally, Waterfront Toronto called for improved public transit (i.e. LRT service along the eastern section of Queen’s Quay) to be in place before development commenced in the area. Today, we have significant development underway with no suitable public transit planned for the immediate future.

c) The 4WS Realigned has a 4 hectare increase in developable land and its phasing characteristics would facilitate the phasing in of the improved development blocks

How important are these facts when there are so many other parcels of land under consideration for development in the West Don Lands, East Bayfront and Keating Channel precincts?

Wouldn’t the acceleration of any development in the Portlands possibly cannibalize development in these other areas?

Would developers be willing to invest in these additional 4 hectares if good public transit is not in place?

I've heard some rumours that the units in The Monde(East Bayfront) are not selling quickly.
Is this an example of the adverse affects of poor public transit on development potential?

Discussion Question #2: Do you have any suggested refinements to the current findings and recommendations?

a)In your recommendations to the Toronto Executive Committee and then to the City Council, you need to include the following:

An enhanced comparison of the 4WS preferred and 4WS realigned plans to include the following additions:

- i) The anticipated time-lines for each of the 3 phases in the 4WS preferred and the 5 phases in the 4WS realigned plans
- ii) The anticipated cost of each of each of the 3 phases in the 4WS preferred and the 5 phases in the 4WS realigned plans

As a city councillor, I would want to see this data in any comparison to make a valid decision as whether to proceed with the 4WS preferred or 4WS realigned on the basis of overall cost and time for implementation.

b)You need to recommend to City Council that they press the Province and Metrolinx to include public transit projects in the waterfront area(including the Portlands) in their list of priority projects that will be funded over the 25 year Metrolinx time frame.

[REDACTED]

Planners and Engineers can produce wonders for humanity to marvel at. Nature can produce birds and bees and butterflies.

Without the birds, bees and trees we can not enjoy life, we can not live.

Room for nature needs to be a guiding Principal within our plans. A natural canopy, including fruit and nut trees, must be maintained between Tommy Thompson Park and the Don Valley wilderness. A continuity of nature must be maintained for nature to survive to its fullest opportunity.

Such a canopy as well can be a joyful pleasure for pedestrian and cycling pathways within lakeshore views and weather all year round as well as a conduit for the flow of nature. Trees host living ecologies for our appreciation. After soaking up the summer sun, trees have one huge byproduct, fresh oxygen, much needed in this otherwise proposed toxic environment.

What type of E.A. is proposed to study the impact of the proposed development upon the residential areas immediately north of the Portlands and west, both within the natural airflow pattern? Both these communities have invested a quarter century in cleaning up the Portlands toxic industries that impacted human health, especially children and seniors.

Then there are the butterflies, the Monarch especially. After crossing the lake on their northern migration this area has been a much needed way-station to continue their life cycle. This area will be rapidly devoid of the milkweed unless we plan otherwise.

Last century while sitting on the porch with the last resident of the Ashbridge's Estate, she spoke of being a little girl marveling in the spring and fall when the sky would be dark in full sunlight due to the flocks of migrating birds that could also be heard all night while they fed in the rice and marsh lands all along the north shore. Now there are 2 or 3 small Vs quacking by as they struggle across the lake without these historic beds to rest in.

We can marvel at our monumental deeds, nature needs room for its own marvels, we can not live a good life without both.

Mr. David Kusturin
Chief Operating Officer,
Waterfront Toronto

Dear Sir,

Thank You and Mr. David. Dilks LURA/SWERHUN Facilitation Team for your warm reception Thursday evening.

The presentation of the comparison of 4WS and the preferred option for the flood plane was informative in its explanation, and was understood by the audience.

The financing required based on the information is both complicated and complex and requires careful long term considerations This I do not envy but will be worked out over time.

Based on the situation presented would it be possible to have two rugby fields located near Cherry Beach or the park area. The fields are needed because of growth in population and would be used every day of the week.

Now that 7 aside rugby is an Olympic Sport played in London the waterfront is an ideal playing and training location for Provincial and National events, I would be happy to answer any questions in the next meeting in July 2012.

Sincerely




23 May 2012

Re: F.O.L.D Friends of the Lower Don


- Haven't met for some time.
- Started in 2002 (approx.)

The Future of the Lower Donlands Will necessitate Constant Vigilance: so that we not to encroach on the Greenspace.



- I Meeting place (? every 2 months) in a public place - not in a home
City Hall / coffee shop / or _____
- II there should be a steering ctee, and General members
- III Councillor support is viable
- IV Not become a bureaucracy.

Sincerely,
and good luck!



not definite

* recommend that first gathering meeting be at Front Door of City Hall 6:30pm June 21st
(Go into Cafe on the Square, first floor, if open or _____)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- chair/facilitate negotiations
- Aboriginal land/pollution claims
- co-management advisory services

John Campbell: President/CEO
Waterfront Toronto
Ste. 1310, 20 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2N8

Neutral Community Facilitator
Waterfront Toronto Consultations
Ste. 308, 720 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2R4

Re. Don Mouth Naturalization: Preferred 4WS (May 24th, 2012 Public Meeting)

The so called "Port Lands *Acceleration* Initiative" ("acceleration" being a sugar-coated word for Ford Intrusion/Ford Bullying) is having a damaging impact upon Toronto's unique opportunity to undo decades of damage to a once significant waterway, namely the Don River and more importantly the naturalization of its mouth.

I note with each proposal from Waterfront Toronto in recent months, what appears to be "industrial creep" into the originally expansive plans for the mouth of the Don. All participants in the 10+ years of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Process are aware of the source of this industrial pressure/creep, on Don Mouth diminishment.

My area of concern is the area previously referred to as "the new delta and wetlands habitat". I note from comments of Waterfront Toronto officials at the May 24th Public Meeting, the area is being further compressed/collapsed.

QUESTION: in recent years I had the sense there was to be a "SPILLWAY" running from the Preferred 4WS Don River redirection (west) scenerio, south to the Ship Channel. The most recent publication (May 24) shows lands classified as, "open space". Is "open space" in fact a spillway? **Will open space be classified a wetlands/ marshlands as should be the case or will this be simply parkland?**

Maximization of Public Access/Public Usage Lands:

As I've pointed out in previous submissions to Waterfront Toronto in the past decade, I've had the somewhat unique experience of interacting with the new immigrant communities through the first Miller campaign for mayor. **Until that period, I was unaware of how critical Toronto's Waterfront and Islands are to new Canadians.** Many of us who grew up in Toronto (I'm 74) assume that Muskoka, the Kawarthas, Temagami, Algonquin Park, Killarney Park etc. are readily accessible. Not so for many new Canadians as any excursion to the Waterfront or Islands makes clear.

The Ford's may want to maximize industry in the Portlands; unfortunately they have a limited, selfish vision for Toronto's future. Waterfront Revitalization and specifically the Naturalization of the Don Mouth, are too important to the city going forward for generations. **Waterfront Toronto has an historlcal opportunity; don't blow it by bending to selfish politicians.**



comparison of 4ws preferred and 4ws realigned

→ SUGGESTED HYBRID OPTION

- ① 4ws preferred ~~East~~ of Cherry St
- Arched spillway
- Roadway away from park



4WS Preferred
Promontory Parks Total 8.7 Ha



4WS Realigned
Promontory Parks Total 7.7 Ha

- ② 4WS REALIGNED West of Cherry
- More efficient
- less costly
- ~~July~~ ~~revised~~
- Good to use what is already there.

Michael West #3

Notes to this feedback submission

I think the 3rd presentation of Waterfront Toronto is an improvement over the previous one in terms of visioning, but main focus is still on 1st phase of Don River Flood Plan. My PowerPoint submission here is an attempt to showcase a broader scope of envisioning a maximum potential. The proposal has been filed in the 2nd feedback, but this has been revised and combined two into one presentation for the 3rd round feedback submission.

Exercise of this proposal is to stimulate public discussion in a broader sense to garner better and grander scale of visioning. I tried a holistic approach to address multiple issues cities facing these days not only in Toronto but around the world. Waste, pollution, congestion, crime, infrastructure service, employment, urban ecology, and so on have been centered on cities where problems are concentrated.

Since the industrial revolution in the Western civilization, fossil-based economy has rather created mounting problems that permeate every sectors of society in financing, environment, food security, geopolitics, cultural and social autonomy, even world peace in spiraling instability. We need to search for a new paradigm shift in the approach to solution – bold and creative. Test it through public engagement with this proposal tabled here. It can be started at academic level where high-minded scholars and engineers who can head their minds together to look at the opportunity that the Port Lands development may present itself for a better future for our children.

There is a possibility that this proposal may be disseminated and organised for charrette by people from academia to business to NGOs to public service to create a platform that can be presented to the City officials for a reference or an adoption. It could be realistic in points of 21 century technology development, job creation, financial reward, or cultural aspiration, but more importantly financially viable through public and private sector participation, locally and internationally. Toronto could be a centre of attention where world leaders may visit to see what Toronto has in store.

Harry Ha with Sandy Smith and Lloyd Helferty

Port Lands
Public Consultation
Round 3

Feedback Submission
- Design Proposal -

1st Presentation

USSD TORONTO

Urban Sustainability Special District,
Toronto

Port Lands, what you can dream of

June 2012

Description of Port Lands Development Idea

1000 acres of waterfront property for development, the size of downtown Toronto.

A rare opportunity to showpiece of Toronto in what it can be.

A city within a city.

That has never seen it before so beautiful, so vibrant.

Beholden by other waterfront cities.

By tourists and Torontonians alike.

No more jungles of concrete, asphalt, and high-rises.

No more dead streets off-hours and weekends.

All walks of life come and find his own place to mind his business

Yet they come and mingle together as they please.

Art, culture, science, technology, entertainment, in high intensity

Yet all are intertwined with green, parks and trees, flowers and water.

See the connection to nature right where they work.

Yes, even urban farmers grow foods for children to see where their foods come from.

Urbanite grow their own food too.

Right in their back yard and rooftops.

It is a test bed of urban sustainability from waste management to green energy.

Where waste turn to energy, where people see value in energy and conservation.

Torontonians are blessed with water and water fronts.

Water edges are where life meets and life begins.

Full of life , in repose and excitement, is lined along the water edges.

With restaurants of international gastronomy,

With aquatic museums and science museums and sport museums . . .

Everything is laid in balance.

All in human scale.

Small is beautiful.

See each other eye-to-eye and connect each other.

Soothe your soul.

One feel a place to stand no matter who you are, what you have, what you do not have.

It's a place of destination being civic, civil and civilized, for you came to the New Portlands.

Problems in Urban Sustainability

UN and C40 Cities define Urban Sustainability Problem:


Finding job	→	Harder
Energy consumption	→	Increasing as demand goes up
Water consumption	→	Increasing and polluting
Producing waste	→	Mounting and disposal cost going up
Cost of food	→	Going up
Quality of food	→	Going down
Cost of healthcare	→	Going up
Cost of fuel	→	Going up
Air quality	→	Getting worse
Urban population	→	Accelerating
Cost of infrastructure	→	Up to the roof
Traffic congestion	→	Getting worse
Income disparity	→	Gaps getting bigger and bigger

The Natural City: Re-envisioning the Built Environment

Edited by Ingrid Leman Stefanovic and Stephen Bede Scharper
Professors of University of Toronto

- Urban and natural environments are often viewed as entirely separate entities — human settlements as the domain of architects and planners, and natural areas as untouched wilderness. This dichotomy continues to drive decision-making in subtle ways, but with the mounting pressures of global climate change and declining biodiversity, it is no longer viable. New technologies are promising to provide renewable energy sources and greener designs, but real change will require a deeper shift in values, attitudes, and perceptions
- how to integrate the natural environment into healthy urban centres from philosophical, religious, socio-political, and planning perspectives, recognizing the need to better link the humanities with public policy.


The New Portlands
USSD Toronto would be
the New Gateway to Toronto
by reviving historic waterways
of Lake Ontario →



Don River Flood Plan




Section View



Don River

High water level
low water level




Section View
above

USSD Toronto

New Port, Toronto?


12 Cluster Communities



Intensive urban agriculture at CUS-T (Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto) – see next Slides.

The clusters can be formed by different interest, different background, special purpose, or professional diversity, and yet all linked together for harmonious co-habitation.

Suspended LRT Transit Loop linking the 12 communities and maximizing electrification of personal and public transportation system




USSD Toronto

Ultra-light Suspended Electric Monorail Cars
(USSD Monorail Technology, Metrolinx?)

New Port, Toronto?

Network of Green Space of public amenities throughout the district

Network of continuous nature's green space with urban agriculture



Built-up waterfront parks


Intensive urban agriculture at CUS-T

Tommy Thompson Park

Contact to nature in every day life in urban environment is important to keep balance in one's life.

Street Grid for social, economic and cultural activities


Give street a life.



Pedestrian streets where social, commercial and cultural activities occur spontaneously and casually, supporting local autonomy and character development.

Civic Centre Amenities for cultural enrichment

International
in characters




Theaters
Cinemas
Aquarium
Performing art
Museums . . .
in multiple,
smaller scale,
and diversified.

USSD Toronto

New Port, Toronto?

Entertainment and cultural events and enterprises can find accommodating spaces in main streets.



Moderating Residential Building Height

Limited density restriction within the district with built-in sustainability protocol

Schools here



H: High over 20 stories
M: Medium under 8 stories
L: Low under 4 stories




Sustainability protocol may apply to medium and low density housing. Its protocol is recommended to high density housing north of the district

Maintaining Industrial Area

taking advantage
of the ship channel

Environmental Technology

- R&D
- Industries




Energy Internet Incubation District

taking advantage of Ontario's Fit-In-Tariff program, the most advanced forward-looking energy policy in North America

Energy Internet Technology

- R&D
- Industries




Every building becomes mini power generating station.

A series of industrial longhouses will accommodate a massive energy storage system, taking advantage of Smart Grid and Ontario FIT program to kick start evolution of Energy Internet.

Amalgamation of thoughts

with urban sustainability protocols permeate in every sectors and levels in the USSD.



Urban Sustainability Special District

USSD Toronto that would allow new idea, new practice to take root right in Toronto to make cities environmentally sustainable, and socially and culturally equitable supported by public policy and environmental technology.

Toronto can take steps to call Port Lands, a parcel of land over 1000 acres, Urban Sustainability Special District (USSD), the first its kind in the world.

Thereby Toronto can lead a role to address the issues in the global climate challenge and in urban livability and sustainability with nature and humanities.

The Golden Opportunity

This simple exercise is to stimulate to open up the golden opportunity in developing the last piece of land mass that Toronto inherits. In moulding our future, we can find high minds in foresight and in emerging green technology right in GTA where higher institutions like University of Toronto, York University and Ryerson University can be found in close proximity without looking a far. We have this precious chance for not let it pass into oblivion in the norms of lassie-faire approach. Toronto can map as a leader for the world cities in challenging the mounting issues of global climate change in which cities are big part of the cause.

Hope can be within our reach.

Thank you,
Harry Ha, architect
harryha@sympatico.ca,
June 2012

With
Sandy Smith, PhD, Dean and Professor, Forestry Dept., University of Toronto, and
Lloyd Helferty, Technologist, President, Biochar Ontario

Next:

A possible development proposal

2nd Presentation

CUS-T

**Centre for Urban Sustainability
of Toronto**

With Intensive Urban Agriculture

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto (CUS-T)

A Centre for Urban Green Infrastructure
Implementation in Food Security,
Energy, Environment
and Social Innovation

Problems in Urban Sustainability

UN and C40 Cities define Urban Sustainability Problem:

Finding job	→	Harder
Energy consumption	→	Increasing as demand goes up
Water consumption	→	Increasing and polluting
Producing waste	→	Mounting and disposal cost going up
Cost of food	→	Going up
Quality of food	→	Going down
Cost of healthcare	→	Going up
Cost of fuel	→	Going up
Air quality	→	Getting worse
Urban population	→	Accelerating
Cost of infrastructure	→	Up to the roof
Traffic congestion	→	Getting worse
Income disparity	→	Gaps getting bigger and bigger

A Key Question

- **How can we create farms in our cities in order to reduce transportation costs and energy consumption?**
- **96% of North America's food has traveled 1000 miles and requires 1 gallon of fossil fuel for every 100 lb being transported.**
- **Today, over 500 million kilograms of food crops are imported from the United States alone to meet growing demand of Toronto.**
- ***[Is this sustainable? – the ultimate question]***

- Challenge 10 Food Not Crude Charrette, MOVE: The Transportation Expo 2012 Toronto

Expanding Urban Sustainability

- One of the ways to address these problems may be found in “Food Mileage”. So, Urban Farming will be looked at its sustainability in this proposal.
 - Because food production and distribution in urban environment is complex and intricate in maintaining it in ways that are environmentally sustainable, it requires leadership in research, education and support.
 - Hence, **Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto** is proposed here for an avenue for its leadership role to address and tackle issues beyond food mileage for its sustainability.

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto

In the given site of the closed Hearn Generating Station, there could be two sites.

Site 1 : the old Hearn Generating Station

Site 2 : A 38 acres lot taken from vacant land adjacent to the Station for the Centre.

- The site is a gateway to Port Lands and Tommy Thompson Park from Leslie Street

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto

Vision:

It will be a central hub of Urban Farming for GTHA as a means to address urban sustainability in the region. The Centre is to advocate, promote and accelerate urban and local food production to meet 30% of produce consumption in the region by 2040 in an environmentally sustainable and equitable way possible along with other issues like air pollution, solid waste and congestion from the region of Greater Toronto Hamilton Area.

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto

Programs that can be found in the Centre:

1. Complete carbon-negative operational technology can be viewed.
2. All the responsible farming techniques applicable in cities can be taught.
3. Public and private financial support and services will be in.
4. Research and government institutions can be located.
5. Business organisation for urban sustainability can be housed.
6. Spaces for fresh food production on site in the field and plots will be allocated for vegetables, herbs, berries, fruits and nuts plus egg and fish.
7. Spaces will be provided for indoor as well as outdoor functions and activities to facilitate venues and programs including school educational programs.
8. A permanent waste stream management system will be set up on site .
9. Wholesale food terminal for local farmers will be incorporated on the site.
10. Regional environmental assessment in real-time will be broadcasted.

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto

Objective of the Centre in meeting the target:

- Runs on carbon-negative system for the Centre, requiring no municipal infrastructure support,
- Supports all the urban spaces available in the cities to produce fresh food in the empty spaces - roof tops, backyards, community gardens including indoors for urban farmers,
- Knowledge and technical/financial support can be learned and acquired from the Centre,
- Attracts business as well as tourism and learning as a recreational and educational place to visit all year around – a weekly destination for people in the region,
- Helps build an infrastructure to meet 30% of produce consumption for GTHA urban population by 2040, and
- Sets an example for other C40 Cities to implement.

CUST-T , The Centre


Why Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto?

In light of issues in urban sustainability and quality of life in cities, the Centre would play a central role to foster an infrastructure in urban farming and its supply chain for urban food security. Its mandate would encourage the farming practices as environmentally responsible and ecologically equitable to address issues for energy and pollution. The Centre would take advantage of its unique geographical and historical location to facilitate and to educate business and public at large, and accelerate local food production for local market to meet 30% of produce demand by 2040.

Proposed Site at Port Lands and Tommy Thompson Park, Toronto




The GTHA Region



The two sites in the Port Lands, Toronto

The two sites has
connections to

1. Ship Channel
2. Port Lands Harbour
3. Rail line



CUS-T/CUS-YYZ
Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto
Site 2, 38 acres
Port Lands, Toronto



Ship Channel

1. The Terminal

rail

Urwin Ave.

2. The Centre

3. The Field


The Centre
in three parts:

- 1. *The wholesale food Terminal*
- 2. *The Centre buildings*
- 3. *The Agricultural Field*

Urwin Ave.

Port Lands
Harbour

BIOchar
ONTARIO




CUS-T/CUS-YYZ

Centre for Urban Sustainability of Toronto

Site 2, 38 acres

Port Lands, Toronto



Approach to the site

Access to the site




1. Leslie Street leading to Urwin Avenue



2. Existing railroad track






3. Ship Channel



4. Port Lands Harbour

The Terminal

for local produce wholesale and distribution




NORTH WING CROSS SECTION




WEST ELEVATION


EAST ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION



GROUND FL PLAN

The Centre and The Field


for a hub of Urban Farming and Urban Sustainability (11s)

- A. The Centre
- B. Farmhouse
- C. Farmers Markets

Green and Fresh:

- 1f. Vegetables
- 2f. Herbs
- 3f. Fruit trees
- 4f. Nut trees
- 5f. Berry bush
- 6f. Egg Farm
- 7f. Fish pond
- 8f. Honey bees
- 9f. Mushroom
- 10f. Greenhouse/ aquaponics
- 11f. Rooftop greenhouse
- 12f. Edible flowers

On-site fresh produce can be organic. Its site sets in a pleasing pattern of landscaping throughout.




Green and Sustainable:

- 1s. Grey water treatment pond
- 2s. Waste mgt and power plant
- 3s. Anaerobic Digester
- 4s. Composter
- 5s. Vermi-composter
- 6s. Water treatment and storage
- 7s. Solar panels
- 8s. Wind turbine
- 9s. No blackwater sewage
- 10s. Storm water cistern


11s. The entire site runs on carbon-negative energy system. No utility hook-up is required except electric power line for Ontario FIT Program.

A. the Centre Building the Great Meeting Place


Invest in the Future for industry, business and governments for urban sustainability





Second Floor




Roof Deck Greenhouse open to atrium




Ground Floor



Front Elevation




Cross Section




Longitudinal Section



In the Field




2s. Waste Management / Power Plant of an industrial unit




Egg Farm:
no feed additives,
free roaming,
natural light


6f. Egg Farm



10f. Greenhouse/ Aquaponics



mezzanine floor





B. The FARMHOUSE

ground floor


***Biochar:** soil decontaminant, moisture holder, soil nutrients modulator, carbon sequestrator, water purifier, aerator, by-product of biomass energy generation, and lasting 100s years. Biochar is a powerful tool to apply for remediating ecological degradation and climate change.




Waste Stream Management



4s. Composting (thermophilic)




9f. Mushroom





5s. Vermi-composting

3s. Anaerobic Digester

Beekeeping



8f. Honey



1s. Greywater Treatment

Note:
 Structures 4s, 9f, 5s and 1s have sloping roof facing south with solar panels.

Scenario A

CUS-T unique features of the Development that would:

- run on complete close loop system in energy and waste management,
- require no service infrastructure like water, sewage, garbage or gas, except electric power line and road (Urwin Av.) diversion,
- sell excess electric power of green energy to grid (Ontario FIT Program),
- revive ship channel traffic by boats and ships on Ontario Lake like old times for goods and people for business and tourism,
- revive railway service to Port Lands for some industries and tourism,
- serve as a gateway to Tommy Thompson Park naturalisation with more trees and new direction for Port Lands development,
- demonstrate power generation technology from waste biomass,
- provide testing ground of biochar for ecological climatic remediation,
- stimulate employment and new social innovation,
- accelerate urban and local food security mandate of 30% by 2040, and
- act as a central innovation hub of urban ecology and sustainability.

Scenario B

Cost sharing of the development under mandates

- UN, the World Bank and C40 Cities: 50%
- City of Toronto: 10%
- Province of Ontario: 15%
- Federal Government: 15%
- Industrial Partners: 10%

Scenario C

Revenue and Risk sharing of the operation

- CUS-T Management: 40%
- City of Toronto: 10%
- Province of Ontario: 10%
- Federal Government: 10%
- Industrial Partners: 30%

We need eco-economy that fosters both worlds, man and nature, and that promotes peaceful co-existence for our future generations now.



**JUNE
2012**

do you think about the current findings and recommendations; and, Do you have any suggested refinements to the current findings and recommendations? The key themes that emerged in response to these focus questions are listed in the full report. Feedback following in the attachments to this report.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

- Several meeting participants were pleased to see that the new design was a response to feedback from previous rounds of public consultation.
- Suggested public consultation process refinements included: improving the communication of information about public meetings (e.g. banner on City of Vancouver website); providing visualizations (e.g. floodplain) in presentations; and providing meeting summaries in a more accessible format.

RIVER ALIGNMENT

- Many participants felt that the new design had lost the character of the original 4WS - that it was uninspiring, too pragmatic, and that the pendulum had swung too far towards a more pragmatic alignment.
- There was also some appreciation of 4WS realigned, with it being described as pragmatic in its use of the slip and accommodation of port uses, and that it seemed similar to the original 4WS.
- There was interest in continuing to refine realigned 4WS with the help of participants. A number of refinements were suggested, including: addressing the sharp bend in the river as it moves from south to west; adjusting proportions so that developable land is the same as in the original 4WS; and ensuring that naturalization is present "in more than name only".

PARKS

- There was both concern about the reduction in park space and a desire for clarification on the exact reduction (e.g. 40 acres vs. 4 hectares). It was clarified that the exact reduction is 4 hectares.
- There was also some concern that any planned park land may be compromised as it is implemented over time, so it is important to ensure land is reserved and parks built as early as possible.

**NO, NO, NO,
PLEASE GO BACK TO
THE OLD ORIGINAL
PREFERRED PLAN!**

