



MINUTES

Queens Quay Working Group Meeting #4
Held on October 19, 2010
Waterfront Toronto
6:00-8:00pm

Attendees:

Members:

- Clay McFayden, cycling advocate
- Dennis Findlay, WaterfrontAction
- 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
- Sylvia Pellman, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
- Cindi Vanden Heuvel, Mariposa Cruises
- Rick Rabba, Rabba Foods
- Kevin Currie, Waterfront Business Improvement Association
- Robert Zeidler, Brookfield Properties Corporation
- Ulla Colgrass, 55 & 65 Harbour Square
- Helder Melo, Harbourfront Centre
- Tammy Thorne, cycling advocate
- Yvonne Bambrick, Toronto Cyclist Union
- Andrew Judge, Redpath Sugar Ltd.
- Ritu Gupta, WaterClub Condominium Corporation
- James Russell, 33 Harbour Square

Regrets:

- Bob Rasmussen, 65 Harbour Square (represented by a delegate)
- Anna Propanou, Toronto Island Community Association (represented by a delegate)
- Jennifer Chan, constituency assistant to Councillor Vaughan
- Robert Sherrin, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association (represented by a delegate)
- Tom Davidson, constituency assistant to Councillor McConnell
- Laura Feltz, 250 Queens Quay
- Blair Keetch, PawsWay
- Brian MacLean, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association

Advisors and Observers:

- Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
- Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto
- Samantha Gileno, Waterfront Toronto
- Dave Madeira, Waterfront Toronto
- Melissa Horwood, Waterfront Toronto
- Chris Ronson, Waterfront Secretariat

- Adam Nicklin, West 8 +DTAH
- Tanya Brown, West 8 +DTAH
- Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Elsa Fancello, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Jelle Therry, West 8 +DTAH
- Marc-Paul Gauthier, 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 Sept. 19th
 - c. Review comments/issues matrix
3. Report back from design team on questions/comments received
Jelle Therry and Adam Nicklin, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing/feedback required)
4. Summary and report back from Sept. 19th break-out discussion
One representative from red/blue team
(Information sharing/feedback required)
5. Streetscape design break-out discussion (part 2)
Jelle Therry and Adam Nicklin, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing/feedback required)
6. 2 month outlook
Jelle Therry, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing)
7. Meeting Working Schedule
Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
(Information sharing)
8. 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 provided a brief summary on the design process for revitalization of Queens Quay. Specifically, he noted that Waterfront Toronto is currently completing schematic design, which will then be circulated to the City for their review and comment. Following the technical review, Waterfront Toronto will move to detailed design where they will produce a draft of the detained design of all of the components of Queens Quay, including signage and street pavers. In regards to timing, Chris noted that the detailed design stage will begin over the next few weeks. Detailed design will be followed by the preparation of the construction drawings. Waterfront Toronto is still planning to start the construction of phase one next year.

Chris provided a quick update on the proposed phasing strategy for the first phase of the Queen Quay revitalization process. He noted that Waterfront Toronto is still exploring phasing options and coordination strategies with the TTC. He continued by stating that Waterfront Toronto is going through the detailed design process for the entire street and hope to build Spadina Avenue to Bay Street at one time. However, if phase one will need to constructed in stages, the construction drawings will be completed as Waterfront Toronto has funding for each portion. Chris concluded by noting that the Spadina WaveDeck received a Certificate of Merit as part of the 2010 National Urban Design Awards.

Question/comment: Is the linear park in the East Bayfront also funded as part of the work on Queen Quay?

Response: Yes, design for this is currently in progress.

2. Introduction and Report Back

Pino welcomed the working group members and reviewed the agenda for the working group meeting. Pino provided a quick summary of the minutes from the September 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, on page 4 in the intersection design section, my comment was not captured correctly. My question is where storm drains will be located and if they could be located near pedestrian crossings in order to reduce large puddles right at the intersection crossing.

Response: Noted.

Question/comment: On the issues/comments matrix, on page 6/7 of the streetscape design section, I suggest merging points 4 and 5 (re: floating pier and charter vessels service access at York Slip). The main issue is that we need to maintain vehicle access to the dock and piers for the variety of marine user groups, including businesses on the island and charter boats.

Response: Noted.

Pino reviewed the report back items with the Working Group members.

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

Pina and Jelle reported back on several of the questions and comments that were raised at past meetings and/or through email correspondence. Pina also introduced Chris Ronson, from the City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat, who will be sitting in on the Working Group meetings.

The following report back items were scheduled to be presented:

- Spadina – Queen’s Quay intersection
- York Pier/York Slip
- Time required to cross QQ
- Trees species being considered
- Extension of MGT
- Curb Radii and routing
- Curb management: lay by's, ferry drop off, taxi stands, bus drop off
- Multi tasking of poles in order to reduce visual clutter/impact

Spadina – Queen’s Quay intersection

Jelle presented the cross-sections of a typical intersection along Queens Quay, as well as the intersection of Spadina Street and Queens Quay. Specifically, he looked at how cyclists and pedestrians will cross the street, recognizing that the intersection is a ‘T.’ He also noted that it is in the intent that the west side of Spadina Street, along Queens Quay, will eventually be redesigned in the same palette/cross-section and that a continuous Martin Goodman Trail will be created at that time.

Question/comment: How will bikes head north on Spadina Street from Queens Quay?

Response: Similar to the other intersections, cyclists will use the chevrons that will be marked on the street.

Question/comment: Since there is no vehicular traffic from the south side of Spadina Street and since cyclists are unable to follow the pedestrian crossing signal, will a signal for northbound cyclists be introduced?

Response: A designated bicycle signal has not been considered at this point. We will explore introducing a signal for both pedestrian and cyclists.

Question/comment: If the Martin Goodman Trail were extended to Bathurst Street, how narrow would the sidewalk be on the south/west side of Spadina along Queens Quay?

Response: It will meet the City’s minimum of 1.5 metres.

Question/comment: Didn’t the City establish a minimum sidewalk area of 1.8 metres for Jarvis Street?

Response: It depends on clearance area. The minimum clearance is 1.5 metres.

Question/comment: It was suggested that implementing the full two- way Martin Goodman Trail is really important.

Response: Design team is still assessing feasibility and will report back next month.

Question/comment: I am still unsure how the Martin Goodman Trail will end in the scenario where it is extended to the west.

Response: We still need to do research. We plan to report back in the coming months.

York Pier/York Slip

Pina noted that York Pier was added to the design drawings. Jelle presented several options charter vessel service access to York Slip:

- Option A: Access through Lower Simcoe, Canada Square, east of PowerPlant and along the Water's Edge Promenade
- Option B: Access through Lower Simcoe, Canada Square, west of the PowerPlant and along the Water's Edge Promenade
- Option C: Access east of Simcoe WaveDeck, along Simcoe Slip, around the Harbourfront Centre bandshell and along the Water's Edge Promenade

Jelle noted that they still need to consult the various user groups.

Question/comment: Have you explored restricting access to certain times of the day? How will service access impact pedestrian areas?

Response: There are currently restrictions on delivery times. This discussion will need to part of the site management plan to address these issues.

Question/comment: There are a wide range of user groups, including yacht club users, water taxis, marina, that require access for various events. I am not sure how we are going to restrict access and manage this?

Response: We are considering a layby on the north side of Queens Quay where people can park temporally and walk to water's edge.

Question/comment: How about delivery of goods to restaurants on the island?

Response: Servicing of boats is an issue that will be addressed through the management plan and not through laybys.

Question/comment: Islanders need direct access to the water's edge since they need to transport all of their amenities. This is a big issue.

Response: The design team will report back on this issue in the coming months.

Question/comment: What happens if the laybys are full with people grabbing coffee at Starbucks.

Response: We exploring strategies for the different user groups. Essentially there will be different strategies for different needs. However, as a reminder laybys are not intended to be for customer parking.

Question/comment: would it be possible to consider an alternative slip for the uses currently at the north end of York Slip.

Response: This is a possibility. The Yonge Slip may be an alternative. We will report back on this matter.

Question/comment: We may want to consider having a separate meeting to discuss this specific issue (access York pier/slip) with all the affected stakeholders.

Response: This is our intension. Waterfront Toronto will follow up on this matter.

Question/comment: Would it be possible to use the street to the east of the Second Cup. We could create a 15 minutes parking area.

Response: That is a private road owned by the condominium.

Question/comment: We may want to consider introducing a turnaround by the southside of York Slip and moving the building footprint of Second Cup slightly?

Question/comment: As a charter operator, Option A and B, would increase traffic on the promenade and raises serious safety issues.

Time required to cross QQ

Marc-Paul Gauthier of ARUP provided an initial summary of the allocated time that will be provided to cross Queens Quay.

Question/comment: What happens if people do not cross in the allocated time and end up potentially blocking the Martin Goodman Trail.

Response: If we increase the north/south crossing time this would decrease the west/east crossing, which would decrease time for transit. We plan on introducing signage along Martin Goodman Trail, whereby cyclists will need to yield to pedestrians.

Question/comment: Have you explored introducing a flashing green light and/or warning lights?

Response: Introducing flashing green light/ warning lights has not been decided. We are currently discussing this matter with the City.

Question/comment: Have you considered holding the red light along the Martin Goodman Trail for a few more seconds so that pedestrians can safely cross.

Response: I do not think this is possible but I will explore this matter. It may cause confusion.

Question/comment: We should not be bound by historic city policies, there are City Pedestrian Guidelines, which we should reference more. We need to reflect higher standards of pedestrian safety.

Response: We are currently reviewing potential strategies, including adding more time to cross the street.

Question/comment: A balance needs to be met between north/south safety and promoting transit east/west, especially at high volume pedestrian intersections (such as Bay Street and Queens Quay).

Response: We will consult the pedestrian counts that we collected and report back to the working group.

Tree species

Pina noted that this topic will be deferred to a specific meeting that will address tree planting and landscape treatments.

Extension of Martin Goodman Trail

Pina noted that this is not part of our current scope of work. However, Waterfront Toronto is studying this concept further to see if it is feasible. Specifically, Waterfront Toronto is exploring the possibility of expanding the Trail to Bathurst Street or Dan Leckie Way.

Curb radii

There was not sufficient time at this meeting to address the matter. It will be addressed at the next working group meeting.

Curb management

Pina noted that the curb management discussion will be deferred to the discussion on the bus management strategy.

Multi-tasking- in agreement- task for DD

Pina noted that they are in agreement with this approach and will be included in the detailed design stage of Queens Quay and will be discussed with the Working Group in the coming months.

Since there was not sufficient time to discuss all of the report back items, Pino suggested transitioning to the break-out discussion groups. The remaining items will be discussed at the next working group meeting.

4. Summary and report back from Sept. 19th break-out discussion

As noted above, the Working Group members agreed to move directly to the break-out groups, since the majority of issues were presented in the previous discussion.

5. Streetscape design break-out discussion (part 2)

Jelle Therry and Adam Nicklin each led a break-out group that looked at the detailed streetscape design of the East Bayfront portion of Queens Quay. The two break-out groups had a large print out of the proposed design of Queens Quay and were invited to ask questions or provide comments as the design was being presented.

Break-out Group Red (led by Jelle):

Question/comment: There are so many people dropping off strollers, kids, people here for Ferry Terminal. We should consider including more laybys?

Question/comment: Have you considered including a layby on north side of Queens Quay at Bay Street?

Question/comment: Have you considered extending the layby on south side of Queens Quay right to driveway of Harbour Westin Castle?

Response: This seems feasible. We will confirm with Arup on MTO standards for setbacks, etc.

Question/comment: Have you considered eliminating the left turn lane or right turn lane westbound onto Bay Street from Queens Quay to create more space for a layby?

Response: Pina asked Ulla to bring the topic to her condo board (Harbour Square) for discussion. Pina will provide reference maps. Waterfront Toronto intends to do some traffic modeling to assess potential impacts of eliminating a turning lane. Waterfront Toronto and Ulla will report back to the Working Group.

Question/comment: Could a dedicated lay-by for the ferry be installed on Bay Street next to the conference centre?

Response: Team will look into feasibility and will report back.

Question/comment: Have you considered creating a lay-by on north bound /east side of Bay Street?

Response: Team will report back.

Question/comment: We need more laybys on the south side, more capacity needed at Yonge Street Slip for future redevelopment.

Response: We are working to install as many laybys as possible along Queens Quays.

Question/comment: We want laybys but we do not want to block lake views at the slips.

Question/comment: Have you considered a dedicated bus drop-off at Yonge Street and Queens Quay

Response: We will explore this matter.

Question/comment: Can the public realm/park be improved at Bay Street, specifically the ferry terminal? It should be part of Queens Quay project.

Response: This is outside the scope of Queens Quay project but part of the master plan for the Central Waterfront.

Question/comment: Is a dedicated right-turn lane required for Redpath, heading east bound?

Response: This right turn lane is a temporary condition. In the future as the TTC platform lengthens it will be eliminated.

Question/comment: Would Redpath contribute financially to ensure paving could be installed in front Redpath (not currently shown on drawing)?

Response: Yes, this is possible. Waterfront Toronto is meeting regularly to discuss these types of coordination issues.

Question/comment: How much capacity for parking is being allowed in East Bayfront?

Response: There are some street laybys which may be allocated to parking. This will be further refined as part of the bus management strategy. In addition, the Corus building has an underground garage which will have weekend parking capacity. There is also a large underground garage planned for George Brown College. In addition, Pier 27 has plans for a large parking lot with a public parking component. Future developments Parkside and Bayside will also have parking.

Question/comment: What are the current and future transit users statistics for the East Bayfront? Who did the projections?

Response: TTC undertook the projections. The projections include full breakdown of Lower Donlands.

Question/comment: Will TTC platforms lengthen in the Central Waterfront?

Response: Projected volumes show much higher traffic on the East Bayfront line, Queens Quay in the CW shows much less traffic so longer platforms to accommodate longer cars is not necessary. However, current plans are for 30 metres platforms which accommodate the 30 metre articulated TTC vehicles.

Question/comment: How will cyclists negotiate the T- intersection at Jarvis Street?

Response: It is anticipated that cyclists will dismount and negotiate the same way the pedestrians would.

Question/comment: How many T-intersections are being proposed?

Response: Two T-intersections are being proposed; one at Jarvis Street and one at Yonge Street.

Break-out Group Blue (led by Adam):

Question/comment: Is it possible to connect the Parliament Street bus with the future LRT line. It could be transformed into a transit hub.

Response: There is definitely the space to support this use. However the loop is temporary indefinite in nature, therefore we cannot confirm this matter at this time. The idea of positioning it as a transit hub is a good one. Connecting this two transit modes could bring life to that area.

Question/comment: Can you please show connections to water on the design plans. There are a lot of activities happening in the slips, we need to address the connections to the surrounding context, including north/south connections. There is also an opportunity to incorporate water user's needs in future East Bayfront development.

Response: Noted.

Question/comment: Can you consider including a public boat ramp, recessed in the wall?

Question/comment: Corus building will likely have a taxi stand near it and there are no laybys shown or parking stands?

Response: Corus building has created an underground parking garage. In addition, there is short-term parking available at the front of the building.

Question/comment: The volume of servicing for marine users is huge. A vital strategy needs to be in place. We need to look at vehicular traffic at the water's edge.

Response: Understood. We will continue to address this matter with the working group.

Question/comment: The Bixi bike program is coming to Toronto. We should plan for a future Bixi hub location along the waterfront.

Response: A Bixi bike location has been approved at Queens Quay Terminal.

Question/comment: There is an opportunity to support spill out from restaurants onto sidewalks on the north side. Have you planned for this?

Response: Under the Zoning Bylaw, there is a requirement for 5 metre deep colonnade to support spill out and animation along the street.

Question/comment: Have you considered reducing the 4 metre median. I would prefer additional space on north side sidewalk area.

Response: We will consider this and report back on this matter.

Question/comment: Can you please introduce wider pedestrian crosswalks at busy intersections, such as Bay Street.

Response: We will definitely look into this. Our intent is create a comfortable environment for pedestrians.

Question/comment: I prefer on street parking to laybys.

Question/comment: Would it be possible to put a bench near the bus/taxi waiting area at the Westin Harbour Castle?

Response: We will look into this.

Question/comment: If you do create a bench, we need to ensure that people do not move their luggage into the Martin Goodman Trail.

Question/comment: Would it be possible to include a layby at Yonge Slip to take bus overflow?

Response: We are working to install as many laybys as needed along Queens Quays.

6. 2 month outlook

Jelle provided a summary of the various issues and topics that will be explored by the design team within the next two months. He provided a quick summary of 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

7. Next steps

Pino thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Pina suggested that bi-weekly meetings occur till the end of the year in order to resolve the outstanding technical issues. Pino suggested the first week of November and noted that Waterfront Toronto will get back to the Working Group members with a possible date shortly. The November 16th meeting date will still take place. In addition, the Community Update Meeting #2 is scheduled for November 17th.

Pino noted that the next few meeting will be reserved for addressing outstanding issues, such as curb radii.

Question/comment: Would it be possible to address contentious issues at the bi-weekly meeting and those that are interested can attend and the regular meeting can address the planned topics?

Response: We believe that it is important to have collective group present at all of the meetings.

Question/comment: Would it be possible to reorder the agenda with less contentious issues first and more contentious issues near the end of the agenda.

Response: We will adjust the agenda for the next meeting.