



**Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Meeting #1**

Monday, September 24, 2007  
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
Waterfront Toronto, Main Boardroom

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Chris Glaisek (Waterfront Toronto) welcomed participants to the meeting, and a round of introductions followed. Mr. Glaisek indicated that the purpose of this first meeting was to review the Stakeholder Advisory Committee's (SAC) terms of reference, provide the SAC with an update on the data collection and preliminary analysis, and to discuss the draft Problem and Opportunity Statement.

**2. Agenda Review and Meeting Purpose**

David Dilks (Lura Consulting) reviewed the meeting materials and the agenda. He indicated that key agenda items included: discussion of the proposed Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee; a status report presentation by Arup on their work on the Class EA to date; and discussion of the draft Problem and Opportunity Statement.

**3. Role of EA Stakeholder Subcommittee**

David Dilks began the discussion of the proposed Terms of Reference (TOR) for the SAC, and invited stakeholders to comment on the TOR at this meeting or following the meeting using the Feedback Form. He suggested that the Committee approve its TOR at Meeting #2. Mr. Dilks then proceeded to walk the committee through the document at a high level:

- The advisory committee is to provide advice and feedback on key aspects of the Class EA process;
- The intention is for the SAC to work towards a consensus where possible. Any differences of opinion or varying perspectives will be noted in the SAC meeting records; and
- A proposed membership list has been prepared for the SAC based on feedback received at the Central Waterfront Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007. The SAC has been established as a sub-committee of the overall Central Waterfront Stakeholder Advisory Committee. A few positions on the SAC remain open, and the project team is currently working on filling the remaining seats.

Mr. Dilks noted that members of the project team will be present at meetings as a resource to the committee.

Mr. Dilks outlined the suggested procedures for SAC meetings:

- Committee members will receive the meeting agenda in advance of each meeting, as well as other meeting materials where possible;
- Meeting notes will be taken by Patricia Prokop of Lura Consulting;
- Committee members will have an opportunity to provide their feedback on the accuracy of meeting records at the start of each subsequent meeting;
- The primary contact for the committee, as indicated by the TOR, is Andrea Kelemen, Communications and Marketing Assistant for Waterfront Toronto;
- The EA process will last approximately 9-12 months; and
- All SAC meetings will be held at the Waterfront Toronto office at 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310.

Mr. Dilks then asked the committee if they had any questions or top of mind feedback on the TOR.

No feedback was provided at this point, and Mr. Dilks encouraged members to review the TOR in more detail prior to the next meeting. Members can contact Andrea Kelemen (Waterfront Toronto) with any questions or comments that may arise between meetings.

#### **4. Queens Quay Revitalization EA – Status Report**

David Pratt (Arup) provided a presentation on the status of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA. Mr. Pratt made the following key points during the presentation:

- The purpose of the Queens Quay Revitalization is to provide a facility that combines the needs of all users;
- The proposed solution for the waterfront must meet the City of Toronto's long term objectives of sustainable transportation, reduced automobile dependency and pedestrian priority;
- We are currently in Phase I of the EA process;
- The Notice of Commencement has been released;
- Arup will be looking at the transportation impacts outside the primary study area in adjacent "impact areas";
- Data collection consisted of on-the-ground observations, aerial photos, and traditional vehicular volume data;
- Other data to be collected includes topographic mapping, utilities mapping, transit loading information, tour buses data, collision data, and parking data;
- Arup will do more data collection in the Fall;
- The current Queens Quay does not serve its intended function as a scenic water view corridor;
- Conflicts exist between local and regional interests for the use of Queens Quay, as well as between different road users;
- Illegal on-street parking is a major issue in the area;
- 650 km of the waterfront trail is interrupted in the central section; and
- There is currently no direct public realm connectivity between waterfront attractions.

Mr. Pratt concluded with a brief outline of the proposed Problem and Opportunity Statement, developed by the project team for SAC and general public feedback.

## **5. Questions of Clarification**

David Dilks asked the Committee if they had any questions or comments regarding the presentation.

One committee member asked why the presentation did not mention the City's bike plan in the list of policy initiatives, and inquired about how the transit plans being looked at for East Bayfront will affect the Queens Quay revitalization. Mr. Pratt explained that Arup is working closely with the East Bayfront Class EA project team to ensure consistency down the entire length of Queens Quay. He added that the City's cycling plan provides important guidance from a policy perspective for revitalizing the Queens Quay streetscape.

Another committee member asked whether the current study included data collection about pedestrians. Mr. Pratt indicated that pedestrian data was gathered and is part of the overall analysis.

A committee member inquired about a traffic study on Lake Shore Boulevard. Mr. Pratt explained that a study of that area has been done, and added that traffic impacts in areas adjacent to the primary study area will also be examined as part of the analysis for the Queens Quay EA.

Another committee member asked whether any of the studies are going to take a look at the impacts large conferences have on the traffic in the study area, especially since it is at these times that large numbers of shuttle buses are running in the downtown core. Mr. Pratt indicated that he would consider the potential impacts associated with large conferences and invited the member to provide any available information on upcoming conferences.

One committee member suggested that Arup present data such as time lapses in the right context, to ensure the observations are not over-exaggerated. Mr. Pratt explained that Arup will run a clock on the screen during the time lapse to illustrate actual time passed.

Another committee member suggested that removal of barriers should be one of the bullet points in the Committee's TOR in the mandate section. Mr. Glaisek suggested that this can be incorporated but suggested it should be worded in positive terms.

One committee member asked how the south and the north, and the east and the west will be connected as an outcome of the EA process. Pina Mallozzi of Waterfront Toronto explained that the purpose is to make the waterfront a destination that is easily accessible from all directions.

Another committee member suggested that "beauty" should be seriously considered as an objective of the Queens Quay Revitalization, as it has a value in itself.

A committee member suggested that the "quality of the experience" should be emphasized when considering revitalization plans for the waterfront.

## **6. Problem and Opportunity Statement Discussion**

David Dilks asked the committee to briefly read through the Problem and Opportunity Statement, and to think about what people liked about the draft statement, what might be added, or what might be changed.

One committee member suggested that the context of the EA needs to be presented, with respect to location, and should include a reference to the City of Toronto, its population, and its location on the Great Lakes. The context should be more rooted in a "sense of place".

Another committee member observed that the City of Toronto is located on a lake yet Torontonians seldom use it. It was observed that Torontonians often leave the City to go to a lakefront property. The committee member suggested that the statement needs to recognize that Toronto has a lakefront and encourage the connection to it. There was overall agreement among committee members that Queens Quay itself acts as a barrier to the waterfront.

One committee member observed that the waterfront is being used as a parking area, rather than a destination.

Another committee member suggested synchronizing the TOR and the Problem and Opportunity Statement. Mr. Dilks and John Kelly of the City of Toronto explained that the TOR is intended to guide how the committee works whereas the Problem and Opportunity Statement is intended to provide a basis for examining the proposed solutions against the project goals. The committee member indicated that a list of common principles would be helpful to the SAC in dealing with potential disagreements.

One committee member indicated that any changes to Queens Quay will affect the ability of residents to move through the area. The committee member noted that the area is very densely populated, and there has to be a stronger recognition of the residential presence in the statement.

Another committee member suggested that cycling is not just a recreational activity but a mechanism for commuting and exercising, as well as a key part of a greener, cleaner transportation system. This should be recognized in the statement.

Two committee members suggested that the statement needs to address the economic viability of Queens Quay, and the problems facing the area in this regard.

A committee member observed that the pedestrian flow on the north side of the street is minimal, and pedestrian facilities on the south side are problematic. There needs to be more restaurants and shops along Queens Quay to cater to the needs of pedestrians and tourists, and to create a destination for pedestrians.

A committee member inquired whether Arup will be doing a study of the parking facilities outside of Queens Quay, and suggested that the City may be able to use some of the empty corporate parking lots north of Queens Quay and use shuttle buses to transport people down to the waterfront. Mr. Pratt explained that Arup will be looking at parking data in the overall impact area.

Another committee member suggested that Arup create some definitive headings in the statement so that future discussions can be clear and focused. The following examples of headings were provided: transportation, recreation, and neighbourhood. Mr. Pratt explained that categories such as these can also be considered as part of the evaluation criteria.

One committee member suggested that Arup consider the historical background of Toronto's waterfront, as well as the concept of sustainability, in the statement.

Another committee member recommended that traffic problems in the Bathurst Quay area be considered as part of Arup's research.

One committee member suggested that efficiency of public transit needs to be considered as part of the statement, since parking lots will slowly disappear from the downtown core as more condominiums are built.

Another committee member was concerned that tourism is not being considered and suggested that this concept be reflected in the statement.

A number of committee members raised the issue of public washrooms, suggesting that more need to be constructed along the waterfront, and existing facilities need to be properly maintained.

Steve Willis, a member of the project team, explained that the Problem and Opportunity Statement should be viewed in the context of other written materials that will provide background for what is in the statement. He suggested that the project team and Committee should think about what should be included in the statement versus what would be covered in accompanying contextual descriptions.

David Dilks concluded the discussion with a brief synopsis of the suggestions raised by committee members, and encouraged stakeholders to use the feedback form for additional comments.

## **7: Central Waterfront Update**

John Hillier (DTAH) updated the committee on the progress of the central waterfront design. Mr. Hillier made the following key points:

- DTAH completed the design for the first slip, at Spadina Avenue;
- Construction at the Spadina slip will begin in the middle of October this year, and will finish in late spring or early summer; and
- The overall waterfront design recently won two urban design awards, one for long range vision and one for Quay to the City.

Mr. Hillier then asked the committee members if they had any comments or questions.

One committee member asked about Canada Square. Ms. Mallozzi explained that Waterfront Toronto is midway through a feasibility study for Canada Square, and would like to meet with the local community soon. Currently Canada Square is the parking lot west of the Queens Quay Terminal and Waterfront Toronto is looking at opportunities for putting this parking lot underground, creating a large public space component, and cultural retail uses.

Another committee member inquired about a retail study as part of the Canada Square project, and noted that retail or shops at Canada Square would be in direct competition with a retail centre that is already present in the area and is currently struggling. Ms. Mallozzi explained that a retail study is being conducted for Canada Square including the broader York Quay, and Waterfront Toronto is hoping to find synergies with existing retailers.

A committee member also asked about the Rees Street Parking Lot north of HtO Park. It was noted that there is a city initiative to transform it into a park.

David Dilks thanked the committee for their feedback.

## **8: Next Steps and Wrap-Up**

Mr. Dilks indicated that the next SAC meeting is to be held the week of November 18<sup>th</sup>, and a public forum is tentatively scheduled for the week of December 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Dilks asked that additional comments be sent to Andrea Kelemen of Waterfront Toronto. Mr. Dilks thanked the committee and adjourned the meeting.

## Appendix A: Attendance List

Name	Organization
<b>Committee Members</b>	
Jeff Orlans	Brookfield Properties
Jennifer Chan	Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office
Julie Beddoes	West Don Lands Committee
Patrick Harrington	Loblaw Properties Ltd.
Dennis Findlay	Portlands Action Committee/Waterfront Action
Ann Corbitt	Premier Conference & Events
Kevin Currie	Queens Quay and Harbourfront BIA
Karen Honsinger	Queens Quay and Harbourfront BIA
David Dunphy	Resident
Helder Melo	Harbourfront Centre
David Fisher	Rocket Riders
Clay McFayden	Cycling Advocate
Kelly Gorman	York Quay Neighbourhood Association
Braz Menezes	York Quay Neighbourhood Association and QQHBIA
Vicki Barron	Waterfront Regeneration Trust
<b>Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto Staff</b>	
Pina Mallozzi	Waterfront Toronto
Chris Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto
John Kelly	City of Toronto
Bill Lashbrook	City of Toronto – City Planning Division
Jayne Naiman	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat
Jim Sinikas	Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)
<b>Consultants</b>	
David Pratt	Arup
Marc-Paul Gauthier	Arup
Ayako Kitta	DTAH
Brent Raymond	DTAH
John Hillier	DTAH
Steve Willis	MMM
<b>Facilitators</b>	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Patricia Prokop	Lura Consulting