



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

Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee Meeting #4

**Wednesday, November 4, 2015
Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street
8:00 – 10:00 am**

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, welcomed members of the Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee (LUAC) and thanked them for attending the meeting. 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, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Dillon Consulting and Public Work. Ms. Nield reviewed the meeting agenda and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain feedback on the emerging vision for the Port Lands.

A copy of the agenda is provided in Appendix A. A list of organizations that participated in the LUAC meeting is included in Appendix B. Questions of Clarification posed by the LUAC and a more detailed summary of the discussion are provided in Appendix C.

2. Process Update and Presentation

Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto, Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto and Adam Nicklin, Public Work provided LUAC members with an overview of the work completed to date, the format of the upcoming public consultations and the emerging vision for the Port Lands.

The presentation will be available online at www.portlandsconsultation.ca following the November 14, 2015 open house and information session.

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

Following the presentation, LUAC members addressed the following discussion questions:

1. What do you like about the emerging vision?
2. Has anything major been missed or of concern to you?
3. What refinements would you suggest ahead of the upcoming public consultations?

A summary of the feedback and advice is provided beginning on the next page. A more detailed account of the discussion can be found in Appendix C.

Emerging Vision

- The Emerging Vision recognizes various businesses that currently operate in the Port Lands.
- Committee members also liked:
 - The intent to support a diversity of uses in the Port Lands (e.g., residential, commercial and light industrial uses, and open space).
 - The initial breakdown of the precincts into sub-districts.
 - The Emerging Vision has not changed significantly since the last meeting – good to see that a consistent vision is now starting to take hold.
- Committee members also raised concerns about elements of the Emerging Vision which are summarized by theme area below.

Emerging Land Use Direction

- *Industrial Uses*
 - Need to better recognize and celebrate the current industrial uses in the Port Lands and the role they play in city building.
 - Consider the impact of introducing new uses (e.g., residential, recreational) in the Port Lands on existing industrial uses.
 - Consider non-residential uses as a buffer between industrial and residential uses on Polson Quay.
- *Film, Media and Creative Uses*
 - Consider how economic changes to the film industry over time may impact the development of a Film, Media and Creative cluster.
 - Reconsider the creation of a single-use Film, Media and Creative cluster by allowing a variety of ancillary uses to support the development of a dynamic mix of uses.
- *Biodiversity*
 - Re-consider the greenway proposed south of the Ship Channel as it may lead to compatibility issues with surrounding industrial uses (e.g., increased dredging, less space for existing uses).
 - Consider the cost of maintaining the network of greenspaces.
- *Ship Channel*
 - Ensure the current function and use of the Ship Channel as a turning basin is considered in the Emerging Vision.

Transportation and Road Network

- Address concerns about truck routes and access throughout the Port Lands, particularly on Unwin Avenue. Concerns were also raised about the proposed Marine Hub and how it will impact truck routes to existing industries.
- Consider the impact of the proposed Broadview Extension alignment on adjacent properties and potential transit stops and address concerns raised about the proposed alignment (e.g., creation of a “dead zone”, odd shaped blocks, technical impacts to the rail embankment, and awkward intersections and angles).
- Reconsider the alignment of the east-west road proposed south of Commissioners Street.

Upcoming Public Consultations

- Refer to industrial uses as industrial uses instead of “artefacts”.
- Emphasize that there are active industrial uses in the Port Lands.
- Clarify that there is still a lot of work to be done on the Broadview Extension and its alignment.
- Make it clear that there will be more consultations as work on other components of the Port Lands continues (i.e. this is not the “final” round of public consultation).

Case Studies

- Consider including case studies of ports with a history of heavy industry.

4. Adjourn

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



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

Land Owners and Users Advisory Committee (LUAC) Meeting #4
Waterfront Toronto Offices, 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310 – Main Boardroom
Wednesday, November 4, 2015
8:00 – 10:00 am

AGENDA

Meeting Purpose:

- Present the emerging vision for the Port Lands, including land use direction, preferred street network and urban structure, as well as the direction for other key elements like built form, biodiversity and sustainability.
- Obtain feedback from the LUAC ahead of the upcoming public consultation meetings in mid-November.

8:00 am **Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**
Liz Nield, Facilitator, Lura Consulting

8:10 am **Process Update and Presentation** – Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto; Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto; Adam Nicklin, Public Work

- Process Update and Upcoming Public Consultations
- Placemaking in the Port Lands: The Emerging Vision

9:00 am **Facilitated Discussion – LUAC Questions, Feedback and Advice**

9:00 am What do you like about the emerging vision?
9:15 am Has anything major been missed or of concern to you?
9:30 am What refinements would you suggest ahead of the upcoming public consultations?

9:45 am **Wrap-up and Next Steps**

10:00 am **Adjourn**

Appendix B – List of Attendees

LUAC Meeting List of Attendees:

- 16 Munition Street
- 300 Commissioners Street
- 33 Villiers Street
- Belleterre Real Estate Partners
- CanRoof
- CastlePoint Numa (309 Cherry Street, 475 and 495 Commissioners Street and 75 Basin Street and 225 Commissioners Street)
- Compass/Sifto
- CRC
- Dufferin Concrete, CRH Canada
- Essroc
- First Gulf
- Johnston Litaviski
- K + S Windsor Salt Ltd.
- LaFarge/Holcim
- Rose Corp.
- Scott Burns Planning
- St. Marys/CBM
- Telesat

Appendix C – Questions of Clarification and Detailed Summary of LUAC Feedback

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

Questions of Clarification

Q. The examples from New York City and Amsterdam shown in the presentation do not have a history of heavy industry to make a true comparison to the Port Lands. I am concerned about the compatibility of the proposed greenway south of the Ship Channel with the surrounding industries. Is the greenway needed for flood protection if the mouth of the Don River is being re-naturalized? The turning basin has a function and is used by vessels that come into the port – I hope that is being considered.

A. The Navy Yard in DUMBO, New York City does have heavy industry near it. There are lots of other examples that could be highlighted instead if it is helpful. Dockside Green, Victoria, for example, has similar aggregate uses that are located the same distance away as the Ship Channel. In this case, non-residential uses provide a buffer at the water's edge, with residential uses located further back. The greenway south of the Ship Channel is not for flood protection; it is intended as a connection between the area north of the Ship Channel and Lake Ontario Park for biodiversity to filter through. We are cognizant of how the turning basin is currently being used and how it may be used in the future. Through our conversations with the Harbour Master, we understand there is some flexibility for uses on the sides of the Ship Channel.

Facilitated Discussion

1. What do you like about the emerging vision?

C. I like the fact that the emerging vision has taken our property [33 Villiers] into account. I also like the open space and that the vision aims to support diversity in the Port Lands. There are 30 different companies in our building. We are also surrounded by many different businesses (e.g., heavy industry, TV production, animation). I am pleased to see that the existing companies in the Port Lands are reflected in the emerging vision.

C. I like the fact that you have started to explore breaking down the precincts into sub-districts.

2. Has anything major been missed or of concern to you?

C. There is still uncertainty about the future of the area captured within the oval [on slide 50] as well as the uses on Villiers Island and Polson Quay. My understanding is that future work is needed to resolve land use compatibility issues, but it is unclear at this time how or when that will take place. In principle, intervening non-residential uses would be a reasonable solution to buffer industrial uses and should be explored on Polson Quay, rather than relying on noise or air quality studies. Industrial uses should be thought of less as “artefacts” and more as industrial uses. The terminology “artefact” conjures a negative response.

C. I agree that “artefact” is the wrong vernacular. Lafarge has been there for 80 years and intends to be there for another 80 years. The vision should recognize and celebrate Lafarge's role in city building

in the Port Lands and elsewhere in the GTA. The presentation did not provide details about the road network or address the fact that our trucks will be land locked. Was there an industry representative on the Biodiversity Group?

A. Yes, a representative from the Portlands Energy Centre was on the Biodiversity Group.

Q. How will the Broadview Extension continue over the Ship Channel – would it be a lift bridge?

A. Yes, it would be a lift bridge to maintain the shipping function.

C. My understanding is that the area north of Commissioners Street (between Logan Avenue and Leslie Street) will be transformed into a modern warehouse and light media district. I am concerned about this as the area is currently occupied by heavy industry.

A. That Planning Act recognizes existing land uses. The objective for that particular area over the long-term is light industry. We are not saying that you have to leave; we are simply providing more direction for the future as existing uses change.

Q. The emerging land use plan includes a “Maritime Hub” area south of the Ship Channel. Can you clarify what a “Maritime Hub” is (e.g., amenity area, destination)? In terms of transportation, the vision is that trucks will travel south on Cherry Street to Unwin Avenue – how will trucks pass through the Maritime Hub?

A. Unwin Avenue would still be a working street that accommodates truck traffic as it does today. There are also a lot of recreational users that use the same route. The Maritime Hub is a name we came up with to reinforce port activity. There is an example from North Shore, NY that has lots of parks and open spaces that are heavily used by people that are adjacent to active port uses. We saw it as an opportunity to put some development (e.g., restaurants) along Cherry Street south of the Ship Channel. The intent was to put the permissions in place for commercial or employment uses to allow that type of activity to happen and to support existing port functions.

C. When this is presented to the public, it should be emphasized that there are existing industrial uses in the Port Lands. Over time there may be a movement toward light industry, but that there are currently heavy industries in the Port Lands.

C. I like that the plan recognizes that we are there. I work for an industry (aggregates) that people need, but that nobody wants to be near. It should be recognized that as more people move in and begin to use the area, the number of complaints increase and that is when conflicts start to happen.

A. We genuinely did try to recognize industry in the vision. We are now aware that the term artefact is something we should not use. The majority of the images shown during the presentation that were taken during the charrette were of active industrial uses – they are valued.

C. I like that the plan has not changed significantly since the last meeting. The mix of residential and over time light industrial uses make sense, recognizing that there are challenges by the presence and location of existing industrial uses. There appears to be a huge focus on the film industry. There is already a large concentration of film industry uses in the Port Lands; as this plan is implemented over time, changes to the film industry’s economic model should be considered. Many of the existing industrial users have been there longer than the film industry which should also be considered. The cost of maintaining the greenspace network should also be considered (e.g., drought tolerant plants).

A. In terms of the greenway there are two options – maintaining the space or not maintaining it. Tommy Thompson Park, for instance is not maintained, celebrating a more natural network. We are exploring

whether there is a different way to celebrate wilderness in the street - not necessarily no maintenance, but low maintenance.

C. The current plan for the Broadview Extension is driven by flawed assumptions. The main challenge relates to flood protection - as Broadview Avenue continues south of the rail embankment it creates a dead zone, sterilizing most of the First Gulf site. One of the assumptions is that there is no higher order transit at that site. If there is no transit station there we don't have the infrastructure needed to support the development of a major employment node with higher order uses than industry. That is the first fundamental problem we have. The second relates to the technical challenges of going under the rail embankment. We have raised concerns about some of the assumptions and were informed that they would be further analyzed in Phase 3 of the EA. We do not think they are viable solutions and may worsen the dead zone. The proposed alignment creates a number of odd shaped blocks and awkward intersections on our site but south of Lake Shore Boulevard as well. When we brought these concerns forward, we were told that there are other reasons for this particular alignment. It may be fine to strive for an alignment that creates a view corridor to the Hearn, but in order to achieve it existing rights-of-way and proposed plans are being disrupted. We do not think this part of the plan is ready to proceed to next phase of EA.

A. Broadview Avenue is a very challenging connection. The proposed alignment is not just about the Hearn stack and aims to achieve a number of different objectives. We have a meeting set-up to discuss the concerns you have raised.

C. I would also like to emphasize the continued existence of heavy industry in the Port Lands. The team should re-consider the greenway south of the Ship channel as it may lead to compatibility issues with surrounding industrial uses. The industries that are there now are losing valuable space; it is becoming more difficult to continue operations in the Port Lands. Will the greenway affect the frequency of dredging needed to maintain the required depth of the Ship Channel (i.e., more sediment)?

A. The plan for Lower Don Lands will decrease sediment by allowing water to continue to move. The greenway north of the Ship Channel is envisioned as a more natural wetland which will also be used as a conduit for flood water in the event of a large storm.

C. Is the greenway south of the Ship Channel truly needed then?

A. South of the Ship Channel, the greenway is not for flood protection. There are a number of reasons for the greenway, one of which is to provide a corridor for biodiversity to pass through between the Lower Don Lands and Lake Ontario Park.

C. There is already a lot of greenspace south of Unwin Avenue; industry also needs space.

C. In regards to the application made at 475 Commissioners Street, there was a comment made earlier that the FedEx facility is not compatible with sensitive land uses such as residential. I would like to clarify that the FedEx facility that was located at 215 Lake Shore Boulevard was relocated to the Port Lands because of the changes currently taking place in the area (i.e., precinct plan implementation). I do want to clarify that the uses are compatible. In terms of the Film Studio Precinct, the land use direction is moving backward rather than forward. That sector depends on relationship building and proximity to the right mix of uses. Research shows that they want to be part of a place not an employment park. For instance, we are looking at allowing other ancillary uses on the Pinewood Toronto Studios site to create a dynamic mixed-use place. We do have concerns about allocating approximately 60 acres for one use, and think that it will halt the positive change that has been happening in the area. I would also like to echo the comments made earlier about the alignment of the Broadview Extension, which would cut through some of our secured film studio properties. We are supportive of the effort to create a north-south link as it would benefit the entire neighbourhood,

however there is still a lot of work to be done and missing information at this point in the process. In terms of refinements to this presentation, I encourage the Project Team to make it clear that there is still a lot of work to be done in terms of the Broadview Extension.

A. I understand there are concerns about the Broadview Extension. There are a few things that we would like to point out. We are excited about creating a north-south linkage back into the City. There is a 200 m grid being applied to support transit along Commissioners Street, which is where intersections will be added. Bouchette Street will likely be the strategic link to the Broadview Extension. The bridges, where they are needed, cannot be located closer than 400 m. The blocks created are big enough to be court yards, the angles are about 70 degrees and developable.

C. The alignment is less of a concern than the angle created which does not allow two signalized intersections east of the Don Roadway which we need to manage forecasted demand. Under this alignment, the spacing you talked about would result in one intersection at the Don Roadway, one at Broadview and one at Carlaw Avenue, which does not provide our site with the needed traffic capacity. We prefer a situation with intersections at Saulter Street and one at Bouchette Street. Why is the alignment being shifted west south of Commissioners Street?

A. The issue is the hydro transfer station which would have to be re-configured even if the alignment was at Bouchette Street. Another issue is the infrastructure that is on the south side of the Ship Channel. There are limitations as to what can be done to extend Broadview Avenue into the Port Lands. We will create protections to add bridge connections, using some of the lessons learned while planning for Carlaw Avenue. We are also looking to create connections in areas that are gated off or currently secured perimeters (e.g., hydro).

C. In this scenario there is no public transit station in the area. Our plan is basically the opposite of this; it concentrates development around a transit station. This alignment sterilizes the land around the transit station would be.

A. This is just for demonstration purposes. We agree that development should be at a higher density near transit and decline as it moves away from transit.

Q. Why did the notice go out stating this as the final consultation?

A. It was drafted with the idea that this would be the “final” round of consultations as part of this stage of work on the planning framework and infrastructure EA. There will certainly be more consultation when it comes to the Official Plan policies as well as future phases of planning for the Port Lands.

C. The way the information was presented did not suggest that there is more work to come. It is important to reiterate that there will be more consultation on other components of the Port Lands.