

## Appendix 2: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

### Legend

✓ = Yes. Meets criteria ● = Challenging. May be designed to meet criteria X = Fail. Cannot meet criteria

Evaluation Criteria	1. Do Nothing	2. Operational Changes	3. Existing ROW	4. Expand ROW
Waterfront Main Street	X No. Without functional and aesthetic improvements, existing conditions on Queens Quay cannot support a great street environment suitable for Toronto's waterfront. Insufficient space for proper street tree planting to meet City standards, rebalance transportation modes, etc.	● Challenging. Small aesthetic improvements could improve the street (banners, trees, street lighting) but unlikely enough to elevate Queens Quay to Toronto's main waterfront street.	✓ Yes. Rearranging space within right-of-way would allow for functional and aesthetic improvements that could elevate Queens Quay to Toronto's main waterfront street.	✓ Yes. Rearranging space within expanded right-of-way would allow for functional and aesthetic improvements that could elevate Queens Quay to Toronto's main waterfront street.
North-South Connections	X No. Existing pedestrian conditions are insufficient across Queens Quay. Numerous conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. No improved visual connections to waterfront.	● Challenging. Possible pedestrian crossing improvements with adjusted signals, but distance and potential conflicts with vehicles would remain the same. Improved visual connections to waterfront possible.	✓ Yes. Can rebalance space and adjust operations within the corridor to improve north-south pedestrian movement. Reduced pedestrian crossing distance across vehicle lanes. Improved visual connections to waterfront.	✓ Yes. Can rebalance space and adjust operations within an expanded corridor to improve north-south pedestrian movement. Improved visual connections to waterfront.
East-West Connections	X No. Does not improve pedestrian experience nor accommodate the Martin Goodman Trail, which requires a combined 4m trail off-street within Queens Quay right-of-way.	● Challenging. Does not improve pedestrian experience nor accommodate the Martin Goodman Trail, which requires a combined 4m trail off-street within Queens Quay right-of-way.	✓ Yes. Can improve the pedestrian experience and accommodate Martin Goodman Trail within the existing right-of-way.	✓ Yes. Can improve the pedestrian experience and accommodate Martin Goodman Trail within the expanded right-of-way.
Aesthetically Vital	X No. Existing conditions do not contain the elements required for an aesthetically vital and vibrant public realm: trees, generous pedestrian areas, adequate bike facilities, etc. Benefits to retail opportunities limited.	● Challenging. Benefits to local retail commercial activities are limited. Although functional and aesthetic improvements could take place, it cannot accommodate Martin Goodman Trail, would require planting street trees within a constrained space, and would retain pedestrian boulevards at existing width.	✓ Yes. Rearranging the space within the right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements, improve pedestrian activity, and thus increase support for retail opportunities.	✓ Yes. Rearranging the space within an expanded right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements, improve pedestrian activity, and thus increase support for retail opportunities.
Operations	X No. Signal timing for pedestrians, transit and vehicles is insufficient. Current arrangement and enforcement of on-street parking leads to several conflicts. No dedicated bike facilities.	✓ Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.	✓ Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.	✓ Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.

## Appendix 2: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

### Legend

✓ = Yes. Meets criteria ● = Challenging. May be designed to meet criteria X = Fail. Cannot meet criteria

Evaluation Criteria	1. Do Nothing	2. Operational Changes	3. Existing ROW	4. Expand ROW
Grand & Beautiful Blvd.	● No. It is not a grand and beautiful boulevard in its existing form. Finishes and materials are not extraordinary and current arrangement is not inviting for pedestrians.	● Challenging. High quality materials and decorative elements could improve the street but effectively rebalancing Queens Quay towards a pedestrian oriented environment is not possible.	✓ Yes. Rearranging the space within the existing right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements to recast the street as a grand and beautiful boulevard.	✓ Yes. Rearranging the space within an expanded right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements to recast the street as a grand and beautiful boulevard.
Policies	X No. Existing street does not address adopted City policies: not a scenic waterfront boulevard, no Martin Goodman Trail, does not encourage clean air alternatives, etc.	X No. Existing street does not address adopted City policies: not a scenic waterfront boulevard, no Martin Goodman Trail, does not encourage clean air alternatives, etc.	✓ Yes. Can rebalance the street to better serve pedestrians and cyclists, create a scenic waterfront drive, etc.	✓ Yes. Can rebalance the street to better serve pedestrians and cyclists, create a scenic waterfront drive, etc.
Leverage Renewal	X No. Does not coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure and other waterfront revitalization projects.	● Challenging. Can only coordinate some planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure along with signal modifications.	✓ Yes. Can coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure to more effectively locate platforms along the corridor. Can also better incorporate transit improvements within overall public realm.	✓ Yes. Can coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure to more effectively locate platforms along the corridor. Can also better incorporate transit improvements within overall public realm.
Access	✓ Yes. Maintains access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.	● Challenging. Would provide existing or modified access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.	● Challenging. Would provide existing or modified access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.	● Challenging. Would provide existing or modified access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.
Fit	✓ Yes. Does not require land acquisition.	✓ Yes. Does not require land acquisition.	✓ Yes. Does not require extraordinary land acquisition. May require local expansion of ROW where needed.	X No. Expanding the right-of-way entire length of corridor would require extraordinary land acquisition.

**PREFERRED**