



MINUTES

Queens Quay Working Group Meeting #5

Held on November 4, 2010

Waterfront Toronto

6:00-8:00pm

Attendees:

Members:

- Clay McFayden, cycling advocate
- Kelly Gorman, 260 Queens Quay
- Julie Beddoes, Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association
- Braz Menezes, York Quay Neighbourhood Association
- Pam Mazza, Toronto Island Community Association
- Vicki Barron, Waterfront Regeneration Trust
- Laura Feltz, 250 Queens Quay
- Jennifer Chan, constituency assistant to Councillor Vaughan
- Blair Keetch, PawsWay
- Kevin Currie, Waterfront Business Improvement Association
- Robert Zeidler, Brookfield Properties Corporation
- Helder Melo, Harbourfront Centre
- Tammy Thorne, cycling advocate
- Andrew Judge, Redpath Sugar Ltd.
- Ritu Gupta, WaterClub Condominium Corporation
- James Russell, 33 Harbour Square
- Tom Davidson, constituency assistant to Councillor McConnell

Regrets:

- Anna Propanou, Toronto Island Community Association (represented by a delegate)
- Ulla Colgrass, 55 & 65 Harbour Square
- Bob Rasmussen, 65 Harbour Square
- Yvonne Bambrick, Toronto Cyclist Union
- Dennis Findlay, WaterfrontAction
- Rick Rabba, Rabba Foods
- Brian MacLean, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association
- Sylvia Pellman, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
- Robert Sherrin, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
- Cindi Vanden Heuvel, Mariposa Cruises

Advisors and Observers:

- Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
- Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto
- Samantha Gileno, Waterfront Toronto
- Adam Nicklin, West 8 +DTAH
- Tanya Brown, West 8 +DTAH
- Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Dave Madeira, Waterfront Toronto
- Melissa Horwood, Waterfront Toronto
- Chris Ronson, Waterfront Secretariat
- Elsa Fancello, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Jelle Therry, West 8 +DTAH
- Harold Sich, ARUP

Agenda:

1. Welcoming remarks
Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
(Information sharing)
2. Introduction and report back
Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
(Information sharing/feedback required)
 - a. Review agenda
 - b. Draft meeting minutes from Oct. 19th
 - c. Review comments/issues matrix
 - d. Updated meeting working schedule
3. Report back from design team on questions/comments received
Jelle Therry and Adam Nicklin, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing/feedback required)
4. 2 month outlook
Jelle Therry, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing)
5. Next steps
Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
(Information sharing)

Minutes:

1. Welcoming remarks

Chris Glaisek welcomed the working group and thanked them for their participation and feedback on the Queens Quay revitalization initiative. Chris noted that based on the feedback received, this meeting would be less structured than previous meetings held and is meant to address specific issues/topic areas that require more clarification and information. He also noted because sometimes there will be shorter periods between meetings (re: two weeks between formal and informal meetings), the design team will likely be unable to comprehensively respond to the comments raised but will give additional information for discussion. Chris also took the opportunity to introduce Dave Madeira, a senior construction manager at Waterfront Toronto, who will be working on the Queens Quay revitalization project.

2. Introduction and Report Back

Pino welcomed the working group members and reviewed the agenda of this less formal working group meeting. Pino provided a quick summary of the minutes from the October working group meeting and the issues/comments matrix (both documents are posted to the working group's webpage). He asked if anyone had any comments on the documents and noted that comments/revisions to the documents should be circulated to Pina PMallozzi@waterfrontoronto.ca.

Question/comment: On the issues/comments matrix, in the streetscape design section, my comment that I raised at the last meeting was not captured. Please note that Robinson Crescent was not included in the schematic design for Queens Quay.

Response: Noted.

Pino reviewed working schedule and suggested that the December working group meeting be rescheduled to December 14th, since the scheduled December 21st (third Tuesday of the month) is quite close to the winter holiday break. It was agreed that the meeting would be rescheduled to the earlier date.

3. Report back items

Pino introduced the full list of report back items and highlighted the items that would be discussed at the Nov. 4th working group meeting. He reviewed how report back discussion will be structured (short presentation by design team; followed by discussion). He noted that after the discussion of the five items scheduled for this meeting, Waterfront Toronto will review the remaining items and note when they will be discussed with the working group in the coming months. He also mentioned that he will try and limit discussion to approximately 15 minutes per item in order to have time to cover the agenda. However, he suggested that for items requiring more time, the working group can decide to either continue the discussion or request that the item be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

The complete list of report back items, were presented as follows:

- Spadina/Queens Quay northbound signal for cyclists
- Extension of MGT
- Time required to cross Queens Quay
- Curb radii and routing
- Storm drain location
- Crossing at the mixed zone
- Tree species/planting
- Ground floor animation strategy for the north side of Queens Quay
- York Pier/Slip access and Bay/Queens Quay intersection: ferry terminal access, airport shuttle stop and proposed removal of turning movement at Harbour Square
- Curb management: layby locations, parking strategy, bus management plan report back
- Street furniture, including Bixi bike coordination

- Wayfinding and signage strategy
- Integration with TTC repair works

3. Report back from design team on questions/comments received

Jelle reported back on several of the questions and comments that were raised at past meetings and/or through email correspondence.

The following report back items were presented:

- Spadina/Queens Quay northbound signal for cyclists
- Extension of Martin Goodman Trail
- Time required to cross Queens Quay
- Curb radii and routing
- Storm drain location

Spadina/Queens Quay northbound signal for cyclists

At the last working group meeting, Jelle discussed the intersection of Spadina Avenue and Queens Quay. Specifically, he reviewed how cyclists and pedestrians will cross the street, recognizing that the intersection is a 'T.' From that discussion, working group members suggested a few design refinements for how cyclists will cross the street, heading northbound. Jelle reviewed how cyclists will cross this T-intersection and presented a few suggestions to promote clear and safe crossing for cyclists. The suggestions include introducing a timed crossing signal for both pedestrians and cyclists, chevrons on the roadway and signage to remind motorists to share the road (specifically for the west side of Spadina Avenue).

Extension of Martin Goodman Trail

Jelle also reported back on the extension of Martin Goodman Trail. Jelle reviewed potential proposals for extending the Martin Goodman Trail westbound. He reviewed some space constraints with extending the trail to Bathurst Street and presented a potential design solution for extending the Trail to Dan Leckie Way; however he noted that the proposal still needs much further refinement and City review.

A discussion followed on the two above items.

Question/comment: At the Spadina Avenue/ Queens Quay intersection, it is important to ensure a continuous pedestrian realm is created. This intersection, specifically the north side of Queens Quay, west of Spadina Avenue, currently presents challenges to cyclists. Are there opportunities to introduce a bike trail? This could present a dangerous situation for cyclists, especially cyclists with a trailer with kids.

Response: Unfortunately at this time there is no additional space to introduce a formalized cycling facility for the 30 to 40 metres, westbound from Spadina Avenue. However, it is important to note that the situation has been improved and more space than currently exists has been provided.

Question/comment: There are significant safety issues for cyclists heading westbound. Can you work with the City to find a solution?

Response: The situation is no different than today. We are in ongoing discussions with the City to improve the situation as much as possible.

Question/comment: I am pleased that there are plans in place to extend the Martin Goodman Trail to Dan Leckie Way. I understand that there are still outstanding issues that need to be resolved in order to extend the trail to Bathurst Street. Hopefully we can find a solution.

Question/comment: I am concerned with the minimum width of sidewalks being suggested.

Response: The sidewalks will be 1.7 metres wide in this area.

Question/comment: Where and how will the promenade finish at the western edge?

Response: We are proposing that the promenade transition south towards the water's edge.

Question/comment: The proposed intersection design at Queens Quay and Spadina Avenue is quite good. I feel that this now addresses my concern around northbound cycling traffic. I would suggest that a 'sharo' be provided west of Spadina Avenue and that the chevrons be moved to the middle of the lane in order to clearly highlight that vehicles need to share the road.

Response: Noted.

Question/comment: I am not comfortable with the narrow width of the Martin Goodman Trail along the south side, west of Spadina Street. Is it possible to introduce a vertical buffer/post, in order to create a better sense of security?

Response: Understand your concern but a vertical buffer/post creates a new obstacle for cyclists. We would be concerned that cyclists would collide with the posts, creating significant safety concerns.

Question/comment: Are there opportunities to better integrate cyclists into traffic, especially in busy periods?

Response: We are still exploring potential options with the City.

Question/comment: Is it possible to take some space from the Music Garden in order to expand the Martin Goodman Trail along the southern side, west of Spadina Avenue?

Response: A wall currently exists along the edge of the Music Garden. As it is likely that when this portion of Queens Quay is rebuilt in 10 to 15 years it will match the design east of Spadina, we are hopefully proposing just an interim solution.

Question/comment: We need to remember that the Martin Goodman Trail is a multi-use trail and that it is intended to be used by a range of user groups, including cyclists, roller bladders and pedestrians.

Question/comment: On the north side of Queens Quay, if you do not need the space, please do not remove the existing bike trail.

Response: We want to eliminate duplications. In the interim we would to maintain this trail but in the full build out this portion would likely be removed.

Question/comment: I would like to mention that there should also be an interim extension of the Martin Goodman Trail, east of Bay Street.

Response: This is a great point and we will get back to the working group on this as phasing becomes clearer.

Time required to cross Queens Quay

Following up from the initial summary of the allocated time that will be provided to cross Queens Quay, Jelle reviewed the City's standard crossing times and the standards that are proposed for Queens Quay. Specifically, he addressed the concern that people would not have sufficient time to cross the street, which may impact the movement along the Martin Goodman Trail.

Jelle also asked for volunteers (a woman and a man) to cross the room in order to highlight that the crossing time (1.2 metres per second) would allow people to safely cross the street. Based on the room length/standard time, the volunteers had 17 seconds to cross the room. Both volunteers crossed the room in 9 seconds, significantly less than the allocated time given. Harold from Arup also noted that the street crossing time can be modified, as needed.

Question/comment: I am reassured to hear that the timing of intersections is flexible. It is important to accommodate the least mobile.

Response: Yes, this is why the City's standards have changed in order to recognize the aging population.

Question/comment: What happens when large crowds of people cross Queens Quay? Will there be enough time? I would include more time at the York Street, Bay Street and Jarvis Street intersections.

Response: We will consider if certain intersections will need wider sidewalks or additional crossing time. We will look at those details at the gateway locations.

Question/comment: As discussed at the last meeting, if we introduce laybys for drop off uses on the north side (from the south to north side), there may need to be more opportunities for pedestrians to cross the street. It is also important to promote gathering spaces/ public realm at the corners of key intersections. We need to create inviting spaces where people can take a pause.

Response: We are creating generous gathering space on the south side. We recognize that all users will want to move from the north to south side of the street and that it is important to create inviting corners for this activity.

Question/comment: In the past, has the City adjusted intersection timing?

Response: Yes, the City has. It is quite easy to readjust the time allotted to cross the intersection.

Question/comment: The outcome of the Yonge Street, York Street and Bay Street ramp/EA should be reflected.

Response: We need to discuss with the project manager from City. We will report back once we receive additional information.

Curb radii and routing

Jelle provided an overview of their approach to curb radii and routing along Queens Quay. He noted that they have tried to identify and consolidate routes to/from Queens Quay sites for large vehicles (i.e. buses and trucks) which are necessary for tourism and servicing area residents and businesses in the area. Jelle highlighted that they have tried to minimize the number of large curb radii in order to improve the pedestrian environment and create a balance.

Jelle presented the design approach of a 'false radius,' where intersections that require larger turning radii would have flush curbs which will allow both small and large vehicles to make the turning movement.

Question/comment: I do not want to build traffic infrastructure for a non-traffic environment. We should be careful not to pare away the original vision brought forward by Waterfront Toronto for a new Queens Quay that supports pedestrian life because of the need to meet these standards.

Question/comment: How will cars make the turns at these intersections?

Response: Cars will make turns from a smaller turning radius, similar to other intersections found on Queens Quay. We are strategically introducing larger radii at specific locations in order to respect businesses that currently exist along Queens Quay. We have created inventory of where the larger radii should be located. Some of the intersections will include a larger turning radius but it will not be at every intersection. The City has agreed with this concept.

Question/comment: Has larger turning radius been introduced to support the uses at Queens Quay Terminal?

Response: Yes, larger turning radii have been introduced to support all movements to and from Queens Quay Terminal.

Question/comment: I am supportive of restricting the large radii along Queens Quay. However, we need to also acknowledge that we do not want to funnel all the trucks down York Street. We need adequate turning options in order to access Queens Quay.

Response: As previously explained, we are introducing the larger turning radii at strategic locations along Queens Quay. The intersections with the larger radii will feel like a regular intersection by creating 'false radius' areas.

Storm drain location

There was a question on the location of the storm drains along Queens Quay, specifically it was mentioned that storm drains should be located near pedestrian crossings in order to reduce large puddles. Jelle reviewed the where the storm drains will be located with the working group. Jelle presented an image of a typical intersection and showed that storm drains will be located down slope from crosswalks to avoid pooling at curb cuts.

Question/comment: We need to tell snow plow operators not to block the storm drains.

Response: The double storm drains will be located at the low point of the road and will not be located too close to the intersection crossing. For shorter blocks we may introduce more catch basins.

Question/comment: This is defiantly a winter problem.

Question/comment: What is the infrastructure in place to deal with the water collected?

Response: This is a matter that we will look at as part of the detailed design. At this point the water goes into the lake, however recognizing that there is a cost associated with treating the water, we would like to do more research on treatment options. It is likely that water treatment strategies/plant will be introduced in the East Bayfront and not in the Central Waterfront, since the East Bayfront is getting entirely redeveloped and the Central Waterfront has existing buildings and infrastructure. In the Central Waterfront, we will likely be introducing technologies, such as silva cells on the south side of Queens Quay, which can reuse stormwater.

Question/comment: What is the timing with Toronto Water's project? Is Waterfront Toronto working together with the City on this initiative?

Response: We have agreed with planning and space allocation with City. The City's project will not impact the Queens Quay design process.

Question/comment: Can we discuss the layby at York Street?

Response: We will discuss layby locations as part of curb management strategy discussion.

Pina provided a summary of when the other report back items identified would be discussed with the working group. Pina also provided a brief summary on the design process for revitalization of Queens Quay. Specifically, she noted that Waterfront Toronto has currently completed schematic design, which will immediately be circulated to the City for their review and comment. Following the technical review, Waterfront Toronto will move to detailed design, which is anticipated to start in two weeks, where they will produce a draft of the detailed design of all of the components of Queens Quay, including signage and street pavers. The detailed design process will happen within a three month time period.

4. 2 month outlook

Jelle provided a quick summary of the various issues and topics that will be explored by the design team within the next two months. The design team will be addressing the following topic areas:

- Complete 100% Schematic Design
- Start detailed design
- Wayfinding / signage
- Heritage and art strategy
- Accessibility review
- Bus management
- Electrification Plan for Queens Quay
- Street and tree lighting strategy
- Extent of construction for the first phase

5. Next steps

Pino thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He noted that the next Queens Quay Working Group is scheduled for November 16 and that the second Community Update Meeting is scheduled for November 17th. Pino also asked the working group if they would prefer to hold the public drop-in session, to review the technical plans, in December or in January. The working group felt that due to the number of meetings that will take place over the next few months and because the holiday break is fast approaching, Waterfront Toronto should host the drop-in session in January.