

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

**Monday February 3, 2014  
City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, Committee Room #3  
8:30 – 10:00 AM**

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

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, began the Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee (LUAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions of LUAC members and staff from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto and TRCA. Ms. Nield reviewed the meeting agenda and reminded LUAC members that a key role of the committee is to provide feedback and guidance to the project team ahead of public meetings, and reminded them of the community consultation meeting on Thursday, February 13, 2014.

Toronto City Councillor Paula Fletcher, Ward 30, also welcomed LUAC members. She reminded the LUAC of other projects (e.g., Gardiner East EA, Downtown Relief Line EA, etc.) that will influence and inform the long-term development of the Port Lands. Ms. Fletcher thanked the LUAC members for participating in the meeting and noted she is interested to hear what they think of the presented land use options.

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

## **2. LUAC Briefing**

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

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

It was noted that the presentation will be available online at [www.portlandsconsultation.ca](http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca) following the February 13, 2014 community consultation meeting.

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

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

- Provide more information about the economic rationale for each option.

- Explain the difference between industry types and employment land use designations (e.g., creative industries vs. industrial uses).
- Provide more information about the evaluation criteria that will be used in the study (e.g., infrastructure costs).
- Explain the role, function and potential of the Port Lands Ship Channel in more detail.
- Maintain the private right of way and access routes of existing industries and businesses in the Port Lands.
- Explain that the transportation options are still highly conceptual at this time.

#### 4. Proposed Format for Upcoming Community Meeting

Ms. Nield informed LUAC members of the upcoming community consultation meeting scheduled for February 13, 2014 at the Fire Academy, 895 Eastern Avenue. Ms. Nield briefly outlined the format of the meeting which will consist of an open house session followed by a presentation and facilitated round-table discussion.

#### 5. Upcoming LUAC Meeting Dates

Ms. Nield thanked the project team and LUAC members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

**Next LUAC meeting: April 2014**



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

**Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee (LUAC) Meeting – 13-#2**

Location: City Hall, Committee Room 3

Monday February 3, 2014

8:30 – 10:30 am

**AGENDA**

**Purpose:**

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

- 8:30 am**      **Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**  
Liz Nield, Facilitator, Lura Consulting
- 8:40 am**      **Upcoming Community Meeting**
- 8:45 am**      **LUAC Member Briefing – Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto & Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto**
1. Emerging Vision and Objectives
  2. Land Use Options for the Port Lands
  3. Transportation and Servicing Alternatives
- 9:25 am**      **Facilitated Discussion – LUAC Questions, Feedback and Advice**
- Questions of clarification
  - Thinking about the material presented and the main topics covered in the presentation:
    - a. What was one thing you liked?
    - b. What is one thing you suggest we change?
- 10:25 am**      **Next Steps and Closing Remarks**
- 10:30 am**      **Adjourn**

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### LUAC Meeting List of Attendees:

- Canadian Salt
- Natalie + Guerrieri
- Cimco Refrigeration
- Mayfair Clubs
- Tribal Partners
- First Gulf Don Valley
- Toronto Port Lands Company
- Smart Centres
- The Kirkland Partnership Architecture / 309 Cherry
- H & R Development
- Fasken Martineau
- Scott Burns Planning Consultants

## Appendix C – LUAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

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

**Q. In addition to the various inspirations presented, what is the economic basis for some of the options? Particularly, what is the demand for film studios and other comparable spaces considering current proposals such as the Unilever site? Also, would creative industries include opportunities for residential development (e.g., non-traditional, studio type of living)?**

**A.** The economic rationale would be completed during the implementation phase. The implementation criteria encompasses a number of considerations. We kept it simple for the purposes of this presentation. Implementation will look at the transportation and servicing analysis completed by Dillon Consulting. For instance, the land use options will be dependent on our ability to deliver the transportation and servicing network. The other aspect is the marketability of the land use options. The question is if there is more significant intensification in the South of Eastern area, how does that impact employment in the Port Lands area and vice versa? We are considering that in the evaluation of the options. We are looking for feedback from this group and the public on the creative industry and whether it makes sense to have such a large creative industry cluster in the Port Lands. Is there a demand for it? Is it better suited elsewhere? We would like to know what you think.

**A.** To answer your question about creative industries, we are not necessarily anticipating residential mixed in with the creative industries. You can see in the various land use options, some have more of a mixed-use community surrounding it while some have less. Those land use options illustrate what could be happening to the north with the Unilever site for example.

**C.** The economic basis will drive the land use options and should be considered before implementation. Be creative with the creative industry category. It would be a shame if we fell into traditional land use categories.

**Q. Is this presentation going to be made available to us?**

**A.** The presentation will be made available on the project website after the public meeting on February 13.

**Q. How is the South of Eastern meeting February 18 different than the round tables on February 12?**

**A.** The roundtables are for land owners and business owners, and the February 18 date is for the general public.

**Q. Regarding the transportation and servicing plan, what consideration was given in terms of the active applications in the area (e.g. Smart Centres site)? I don't see any consideration of what we are proposing there in your transportation options. Can you clarify what creative industries are compared to employment designations?**

**A.** The South of Eastern study is specific to the area south of Eastern Avenue which is designated as employment land in the City's Official Plan. A provincially mandated review of the City's employment areas is ongoing. The South of Eastern study is looking at types of industries and uses that are achievable and desirable for that particular area. We refer to a creative industry district in the Port Lands because of the Pine Wood Film Studios, which serve as the heart of the area being studied. It is something we can build on. We have not specified uses that would be considered within the district, but we are interested in uses that have synergies or mutual benefits with the film industry such as offices or artist studios. In terms of the Smart Centres site, we have taken that into consideration in the transportation and servicing alternatives that have been presented. We are taking a look at the concept plan that you

submitted. The potential north-south connections through the site are in recognition of private connections on the site.

C. Creative industries can be dealt with more specifically in the South of Eastern Strategic Direction. As you are evaluating Pinewood, I see the revival of the studio centre shouldn't be considered any differently in terms of synergies or other uses based on the employment uses we are proposing.

**Q. What are the evaluation criteria being used in the internal review of the options? I have specific comments relating to the expansion of uses at the Pinewood Film Studio. If you look at examples across North America, the film industry is snagging and not pursuing stand-alone uses, it is trying to establish mixed-use hubs around creative industries. To limit the type and amount of uses is problematic to the future of the industry.**

A. Some of the land use options depicted the Pinewood Film Studio as the centre of a creative hub, with different amounts of what we refer to as the mixed-use communities. There are three different options for how much creative industry versus how mixed use could be developed. The mixed-use anticipates more than residential uses and includes options for synergistic uses based on how the area could evolve.

A. Land use options have to take into account two key things: 1) can we find a suitable place for the relocation of the waste transfer station, if not, it has to be maintained, limiting the ability to introduce residential uses into the area. We considered both of these points in each of the options, and is why in this particular option (Option 1) there is not a lot of residential development proposed; and 2) The other aspect is dealing with the overhead transmission wires. Whether that's feasible or cost prohibitive will impact the options to relocate those uses and introduce more sensitive uses. We have assumed the relocation of the waste transfer station and the overhead hydro wires in some of the alternatives. We are taking a look at land use compatibility as part of this exercise.

C. My first question was specific to infrastructure costs required for the Port Lands. Have you taken that into account in terms of criteria?

A. Yes, it is one of the criteria. The Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) included a market report. Everything we are doing now is building on the work that was completed during the PLAI. What we are suggesting is consistent with the direction from that report and the direction of that market study. It seems like the feedback we are receiving indicates we need to be more specific about the considerations we are using as part of the "Implementation" evaluation criteria and how the options will be evaluated.

C. You did quite a good job explaining the complexity of the project. The land use options are promising because they made something of the Ship Channel. I would like to see the Ship Channel recognized as a living artifact. Explain in more detail what the Ship Channel is and what it can do. Once that is fully understood it can be used to inform several issues (e.g., bridges, infrastructure, transit, land use intensity). I also suggest not treating the four options as structurally broken, because they aren't.

**Q. How are the locations of the Broadview extension a driver of the north-south connections, and is high order transit being considered for the four to six lane cross-section?**

A. The purpose of the Broadview extension between Eastern Avenue and Commissioners Street is about 1) access to the Port Lands, 2) local access for the Unilever site, and 3) to create opportunities to provide transit connections. There are a lot of constraints in that area in terms of crossing from Eastern Avenue to Lake Shore Boulevard (e.g., distance, under or over the rail line berm). From our feasibility review, we have determined there are ways to cross over or under the rail berm, but they require specific design considerations. What is driving the location of the connections, at Bouchette Street for example, is whether the connection with Lake Shore Boulevard is over or under, which also hinges on the results of the Gardiner East EA. Saulter Street provides another opportunity to improve connectivity with the Port

Lands. The connection there could be located under the Gardiner Expressway, there is room for it there, but the issue is what you can actually do. There are a lot of technical issues to be addressed. The framework of alternatives has considered all these technical issues.

**Q.** Can we take a closer look at the local streets?

**A.** The local streets that were shown are conceptual, we are not dealing with them at this level. Local streets are being addressed in precinct planning exercises and other planning work underway in the South of Eastern area.

**Q. After April you will be presenting an amended secondary plan to Council, is that correct?**

**A.** No, we would be putting forward a report with the Port Lands Planning Framework document making recommendations for direction to proceed with planning tools, Official Plan amendments and any other *Planning Act* mechanisms that we would introduce.

**Q.** Is the intention to produce an amended secondary plan?

**A.** Yes, absolutely. We are waiting for the Don Mouth EA to be submitted to the MOE for final approval. Once that process is underway we will bring forward the amendments that we would be contemplating.

**Q.** Can the precinct plan be processed in parallel to that?

**A.** In the report that would go to Council at the end of May, the plan would be to bring forward the preferred plans for those precinct areas. In the new year of 2015 we would bring forward the final precinct plan as well as any implementation mechanisms associated with them.

**Q.** Would that include the zoning bylaw?

**A.** Amending the by-law hinges on us being able to work with the province in dealing with the Special Policy Area.

**Q. Basin Street is a private right of way west of Bouchette Street. It needs to remain private to protect security and access to Pinewood Film Studios. It's something that we'd like to work with you on.**

**A.** Absolutely. We did allow for a 23m right of way through that site if the secured perimeter is no longer there. We are looking at alternatives to extend Basin Street across, but this is an environmental assessment and we do have to look at all the alternatives, but we are also looking for feedback on the alternatives.