

Lower Yonge Precinct Plan & 1 Yonge Application - Public Meeting

Tuesday, June 23rd 2015

6:30 – 9:00 pm (Open House 6:00 - 6:30 pm)

Harbourfront Community Centre, 627 Queens Quay West

SUMMARY REPORT

Meeting Overview

On June 23rd, 2015 approximately 150 people participated in the third of three public meetings for the Waterfront Toronto Lower Yonge Precinct Planning project. The purpose of the meeting was to seek feedback on the emerging Precinct Plan as well as the Development Application received for 1 Yonge Street.

To open the meeting, Christopher Glaisek, Vice President Development and Design, Waterfront Toronto, gave a project update. Then, Willie Macrae, Senior Planner, Community Planning, City of Toronto gave an overview presentation, followed by an update on the 1 Yonge application by David Pontarini of Hariri Pontarini Architects. The remainder of the meeting was split into four concurrent rotating sessions for participants to provide feedback on Public Realm and Community Services, Transportation, Built Form and Redpath Compatibility and the 1 Yonge application.

This summary report was written by the Swerhun Facilitation team. It summarizes the feedback received and is not intended to be a verbatim transcript. A draft of this summary was distributed to participants (who signed in at the meeting and provided an email address) for review prior to the report being finalized.



Summaries of the feedback received at each of the four rotating breakout sessions follows in the body of this report. Please see Attachment 1 for the Meeting Agenda; Attachment 2 for the questions of clarification asked, and responses provided, following the opening presentation on June 23rd; Attachment 3 for written feedback received at and after the meeting (prior to the June 30, 2015 deadline).

FEEDBACK RECEIVED

Note that in various places throughout this summary there is text *in italics* following the summary of participant feedback. The *italics* reflects information/responses from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto or Hariri Pontarini Architects (who presented the information about the 1 Yonge application).

Built Form and Redpath Compatibility

Themes in feedback received:

1. Many participants liked the efforts to accommodate Redpath, including buffering residences with commercial buildings and pushing residences further away.
2. Participants generally liked the change of size and location for the park, and suggested the City and Waterfront Toronto could be even more aggressive with proposing a bigger park.
3. Participants shared concerns about the number and size of condo units and the environmental sustainability of floor-to-ceiling glass. They suggested the City and Waterfront Toronto consider regulating floor-to-window ratios and requiring fewer, smaller units.
4. Participants felt that it was very important for Queen's Quay to have activities all-day and in the evening so that the area doesn't feel "dead" at night.



Detailed feedback related to built form and Redpath compatibility:

Building Location

- Many participants liked that residential buildings were further away from Redpath factory and buffered by commercial buildings.
- Many participants liked the proposed built form directions, with lower buildings closer to the water and higher, denser buildings set back further from the water's edge.
- Encourage the demolition of the Toronto Star building to create a more open, welcoming vista on to the lake and replace an older office building with a new facility. *The City and Waterfront Toronto prefer to keep the existing building because of the environmental impacts associated with demolishing and removing the existing building. "The most sustainable building is one that's already there." Pinnacle is contemplating opening up the base of the Toronto Star building, which would create a wider public realm at the foot of Yonge and a more open vista on to the lake.*

Building Size & Units

- Some participants liked the proposed six-storey podium for commercial buildings along Queen's Quay.
- One participant said he preferred tall, skinny towers to short, fat ones (to keep light and air circulating through the site). Another participant said buildings should be allowed to be taller than proposed.
- Encourage fewer, larger condo units. Several participants expressed concern about a "condo overload," particularly there being a large number of small condos.
- Do a 3D shadow study to understand where a shadow might fall in at any point on the ground AND in the air (such as a balcony), one participant shared concerns about height, specifically because of shadows and impacts on views. *There is a lot of effort required to do this kind of shadow study, and the Planning Act does not require protecting private views or shadows.*
- Avoid duplicating the homogenous feeling of City Place, one participant shared concern that the current plan could result in another City Place. *The City and Waterfront Toronto said that the retail and commercial uses should give the Lower Yonge area a different feel from City Place. Further, development applications will be expected to go before the Waterfront Design Review Panel.*
- Increase requirements for indoor bike parking in condos and planned space for Bike Share.

Transportation

- Consider making one or some of the streets pedestrian/cyclist-only streets to address concerns that the addition of new roads might create an auto-centric community.
- Change Queen's Quay to a one-way street (heading eastbound) and Harbour Street to a one way street heading westbound.
- Reduce parking requirements to reduce the amount of parking and traffic in the area. Also, consider additional bike parking in the area.

Heritage

- The City and Waterfront Toronto should not be supporting continued activity at Redpath.
- The LCBO buildings should not be considered heritage; they're "atrocious."

Other Advice

- Some participants supported the change to the size and location of the park, liking that the park was bigger and more central; many participants agreed that the consolidated park was better than the two separated park spaces; and others said the City should be more aggressive on the size of the park and seek a larger park.
- All buildings should have activities on the ground floor so that the area feels alive at all times of the day. There is concern that Queen's Quay could be "dead" at night (since all the uses proposed for Queen's Quay are commercial or retail). *The City and Waterfront Toronto can use zoning to encourage more active uses along the streets at night.*
- Create a minimum window-to-wall ratio to address concerns about the sustainability of buildings that have floor to ceiling windows.
- One participant expressed concern that a predominantly residential area will not be compatible with the industrial uses at Redpath.
- Consider planning for industries that dovetail with Redpath such as biotech (bacteria eat sugar) or breweries (old biotech).
- Work with Redpath for new mural on square building and sugar shed roof.
- Provide additional detail on how the new park will be compatible with Redpath.

Transportation

Note from the City of Toronto:

At the public meeting, project team members provided background regarding the status of the Lower Yonge Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The recommendations within the Lower Yonge TMP has been endorsed by Council in March 2015. The TMP Notice of Completion was filed with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in May 2015.

Subsequent to the Lower Yonge TMP, further Environment Assessment studies are required for a number of the recommended infrastructure components in order to further refine the recommended solution.

Themes in feedback received:

1. Many participants liked the general cycling plan for the precinct, though several had concerns about the use of sharrows on Harbour Street rather than the inclusion of separated infrastructure.
2. Many participants like the proposed integration of the PATH System.
3. Several participants suggested that the team provide additional details about the conceptual tunnel design.
4. Several participants suggested that alternate transit options should be reviewed, including BRT, as funding for the Light Rapid Transit along Queens Quay is unlikely to be secured soon.
5. Several participants shared a concern about a general lack of parking, both for residential visitors and retail. Others said that the City should keep parking for both residential and office building to a bare minimum.



Detailed feedback related to transportation:

Congestion

- Left turns from Yonge to Lake Shore Road West will be difficult due to congestion.
- Clarify the impact of the Gardiner hybrid decision. If and how does the hybrid option change the outcomes presented. It is unclear how this decision has been included in the work presented.
- Mobility and access for the current 2,000+ residential units between Bay and Yonge. There is already congestion in the area for residents.

- Event nights at the Air Canada Centre add significant traffic to the area.
- Create mid-block dead-ends for Cooper, Freeland and New street so they do not contribute to traffic on Queen's Quay.
- Add a left-turn signal on Yonge for Lake Shore Road West.
- Consider changing the direction of one or more lanes of traffic to coincide with peak traffic flow on the Gardiner (add additional eastbound or westbound based on time of day from the contra-lane – similar to Jarvis Street).

Cyclists and Pedestrians

- Create North/South dedicated cycling connection. The cycling plan is great but would be improved if the current lack of North/South dedicated cycle track connection could be addressed. As one participant wrote: "Sharrows on Harbour are not acceptable. Why not build a complete street from the start?"
- Many participants like the proposed integration of the PATH System. One individual from 1 Yonge (Toronto Star building) said she and a lot of her colleagues were very supportive of this as employees in the area. Another participant said: "The focus should be on the streets as people places. Then – if they can't be everything you need, build more connection for pedestrians and bikes, starting with at grade, followed as a last resort with the PATH."
- Create more North/South pedestrian connections near the railway.

Street configuration

- Several participants liked the new proposed street grid. As one participant wrote: "the new street grid would make Jane Jacobs proud."
- The landowner/developer of the eastern-most lot may not want to provide the North/South connection as per the proposed street design. Value of the land makes it difficult to guarantee the developer will see value in breaking the lot up in two.
- Create a mid-block dead-end on the street between the Pinnacle community centre and the park to build a seamless, safe and integrated connection between the two community space to address the poor connection between the community centre in the Pinnacle development and the park due to the street between them.
- Address and further explain the environmental and health impact (emissions) of large number of idling cars at 16 Yonge (residential) due to new street configuration/expected use patterns.
- Make Queen's Quay one way East-bound and Harbour one-way West-bound and consider a six or four lane boulevard if the Gardner decision changes.

Transit

- Create Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) with a right of way for buses southbound on Bay Street as an approach to address the current lack of funding for LRT. Consider a right-of-way for buses to travel South on Bay Street.
- Push for "transit first" development. Make rail based transit a requirement/component of sustainable development.
- Create continuous waterfront transit that doesn't go north on Bay but that stays on the water, consider using ferries.

Tunnel

- Ensure the tunnel is designed to support all non-transit modes of transportation (pedestrians, cyclists, vehicle traffic).

- Consider using periscopes in the tunnel design to enable natural light as part of the construction.
- A tunnel further east may cost less. Tunnel will need to go underneath parking garage and railway corridor. Tunnel must also consider new development on the corner of Church and The Esplanade.

Other Advice

- Provide updates on the timing of construction work as it become available, particularly the removal of the York ramp and other large infrastructure changes.
- Explain how the large number of concurrent changes is being managed, considered and implemented.
- Create a schedule to address the fact that there are several large concurrent changes occurring in the area at once. One participant said the current plan had too many concurrent changes to manage.
- Improve the design of traffic signals for bikes, pedestrians, cars and transit to reduce user conflicts in the area. Also consider no right-hand turns on reds in the area.

Public Realm and Community Services

Themes in feedback received:

1. Many participants expressed a high level of support for the proposed community services and facilities, in particular for the proposed central park, pedestrian connections, a community centre.
2. Many participants emphasized an opportunity for the precinct to become a city destination and provide a continuous improved public realm along the waterfront for all to enjoy.
3. Several participants raised a series of concerns, including:
 - Lack of parking;
 - Shadow impacts on existing buildings;
 - Lack of green spaces and play areas;
 - The need for pedestrian and bike-friendly public realm to community services and facilities;
 - Full integration of affordable housing.



Detailed feedback related to public realm and community services:

Public Realm

- Ensure that the public realm improvements make Lower Yonge a city destination for all; not only local residents and employees. Use the precinct plan as an opportunity to implement a continuous improved waterfront.
- Clarify that the 3 meter setbacks are the setbacks that extend from sidewalks onto private lands.
- Ensure that the ground floor activation calls for more open retail space with more visibility of activity, and shallower retail frontages. Avoid creating ground floor activation similar to the Queens Quay and Bay area.
- Explain the effect of shading from the proposed developments in combination with shading from the Pier 27 developments on the existing residential units along Yonge Street. Design and locate the new proposed developments in such a way that create minimal impact on the existing buildings.
- East Bayfront is an example of good public realm.
- Create a signature gateway at the foot of Yonge. Yonge Street is the longest street in the world and central to Toronto. Consider a big, beautiful, sculpture to commemorate the street as Toronto's landmark.
- Have private funders consult the public on public art.

Parks

- There is a big need in this area for non-programmed open green space. If you live in the area, the closest non-programmed green spaces to play sports are at the City Place and St. James' Town. A good example of an urban downtown park that provides something for everybody is Haultaine Park in Calgary.
- Consider the underground use of the proposed central park for uses, especially underground parking. *Jennifer Tharp from Parks, Forestry and Recreation at the City of Toronto, explained that the underground use of the park would really limit what could be done in the park due to maintenance and repair needs of the parking structure roof membrane.*
- Consider creative solutions, such as artificial turf, to ensure sustainability of the park with the underground use.
- Consider including the Yonge slip into the precinct area and making a public park out of it. Fill 1/3 of the slip with 10K trees because trees are lacking in the area. Plant as many trees as possible at the central park.

Schools

- Many participants questioned whether the projected population would warrant the need for a community school. One participant cautioned that the projected 13K+ new residents and 15K new employees does not necessarily translate into the child population growth to warrant a new school. *Mario Silva, land use planning officer at TDSB, attended the session as a participant and responded that the Downtown core has undergone a baby boom trend, particularly in the Wards 10 and 14, and there is an expectation that families will stay downtown. He also added that the proposed schools in the area will be sufficient to accommodate the projected population.*
- Proposed schools in the area should be located away from main streets and have a wide drive-way for safe pick-up and drop-off. It is important to locate and design the proposed school with a consideration in mind that many children will be driven to the downtown school. One participant said that the Downtown Alternative School creates a lot of traffic and unsafe road conditions as

there is no proper pick-up and drop-off area for school kids. Another participant suggested looking at various successful schools in highly urban areas.

- Make sure that it is safe, easy, and pleasant to walk and bike to school. All urban downtown schools should be surrounded by pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly public realm and amenities to reduce congestion and encourage active transportation.
- Make school playgrounds available for public use after school hours. The lack of green space and play areas for children are one of the biggest challenges in the downtown, which could be solved by opening up school playgrounds to the public.

Dogs

- There is a huge need for fenced-in dog runs. The number of dog owners living in the downtown core is big and it's growing. To make sure that the new central park is well-maintained and enjoyed by everyone, it is important to provide fenced-in dog runs in the park.
- Consider a requirement for private developments to provide dog accommodations within their premises if these developments allow dog ownership.

Community Centre

- Make sure that the proposed community centre is open to everyone and not just local residents.
- Ensure there is adequate parking available for community centre users.
- Ensure that there is a high degree of walkability to and around the community centre.
- Make sure that the community centre accommodates non-profits that are currently located in the precinct, such as Toronto Business Development Centre. Innovation and job creation are key to ensuring successful neighbourhoods. A representative from the TBDC extended an open invitation to the City of Toronto to take a tour of their office and learn more about TBDC.

Affordable Housing

- Provide a clear explanation of what affordable housing is, what the renting and ownership opportunities are, and what impact it has on the property values and the neighbourhood. There were several participants who indicated that the difference between social housing, community housing, and affordable housing is very unclear; many thought that these terms were interchangeable. One participant was concerned that affordable housing units would drive the real estate value down.
- Ensure that there is a strategic plan to fully integrate affordable housing within the building and the neighbourhood. There needs to be an "invisible line" to blends affordable housing with the rest of the units and make it an integral part of the neighbourhood.
- Consider creating affordable housing units for senior population. One participant noted that the aging population is growing each year and many seniors are moving downtown because they want to age in a place. As such, it would be good to have affordable, fully accessible housing for seniors in the precinct. *Lauralyn Johnston from the City of Toronto said that generally affordable housing units for seniors are designed in the same way as the units for singles. She further added that 30% of all affordable housing units must be barrier-free.*

Other Feedback

- Clarify that the proposed PATH extensions are not a requirement from the City, but rather a suggested road map for those developers who would want to provide PATH connections to their developments.

- Mixed opinion about ferry terminals. One person said that it would be nice to have another ferry terminal in the area, the other said that more ferries from the existing terminal within the existing ferry system.

Yonge Street Application - Pinnacle

Themes in feedback received:

- Several participants said they liked that the Pinnacle application steps down from west to east and north to south, and many said they generally like what Pinnacle is trying to achieve.
- Most concerns related to the proposed development blocking views from existing residential units at 10 Yonge. There was interest in receiving information about shadow studies completed that would provide more information about this.
- There were a number of concerns expressed about the recent development approval granted for the site immediately beside (to the east of) where Captain John's used to be docked. There were also questions about how the Development Application at 1 Yonge Street would interact with this development.
- There were current tenants of the Toronto Star building in attendance, and many were keen to know what Pinnacle's plans are for their building. Some participants (primarily current tenants) wanted to see the building remain, while others said they'd prefer to see the Toronto Star building removed and more density located there instead.
- A handful of participants said that they felt that the 95 storeys proposed by Pinnacle for the tallest building is too high, and wondered why 95 storeys are needed. Others focused on how the proposed development of the site is configured, and asked if there were opportunities to make especially the southwest portion of the site more porous and include more separation between buildings.



Detailed feedback related to the 1 Yonge Street Development Application:

Many liked the design concept

- Several participants said they liked that the Pinnacle application steps down from west to east and north to south, and many said they generally like what Pinnacle is trying to achieve.

Concerns about blocked views

- Most concerns related to the proposed development blocking views from existing residential units at 10 Yonge. There was interest in receiving information about shadow studies completed that would provide more information about this. *David Pontarini noted that the plan for the site deliberately tried to keep the height away from the water. The curve at the northern edge of the site*

could provide an opportunity to create a bit of a buffer to the developments to the north. Kyle Knoeck (City of Toronto) noted that shadows from towers generally move quickly, and that the City is looking more closely at these impacts.

- One participant asked about what consideration is given for existing views when the City considers new development applications. Kyle Knoeck (City of Toronto) said that views from existing buildings is not a priority consideration, however things like light, privacy, etc. are considered.

Site adjacent to Captain John's

- There were a number of concerns expressed about the recent development approval granted for the site immediately to the south of where Captain John's used to be docked. There were also questions about how the Development Application at 1 Yonge Street would interact with this development.
- One participant noted that the Pier 27 tower building is not on the display boards, and asked that it be added. David Pontarini agreed that it should be added.

Future of the Toronto Star building

- There were current tenants of the Toronto Star building in attendance, and many were keen to know what Pinnacle's plans are for their building. Some participants (primarily current tenants) wanted to see the building remain, while others said they'd prefer to see the Toronto Star building removed and more density located there instead. David noted that Pinnacle's plan is to keep the building at 1 Yonge Street as it – operational and perhaps refurbish it. In terms of the overall process, the timing depends on the phasing and the approval process. It would likely be 2-3 years before any construction happens, and we would likely start going to market with one building.

Green space

- One participant noted that the drawings made it look like there were trees and green spaces going through the Toronto Star building. David confirmed that the design contemplates a re-design of the ground floor of the Toronto Star building, including the creation of a porch-like arcade along Yonge.
- How big is the park expected to be? Approximately 2.5 acres (1 hectare).
- One participant asked whether the trees crossing the site were outside. David noted that the design is still conceptual, and that the idea could be to have more of a winter garden condition with a lot of glass so that light penetrates.
- One participant wondered if the site could contribute public space on the roof, potentially an entire floor. David indicated that this may be possible to consider.

Height and density

- A handful of participants said that they felt that the 95 storeys proposed by Pinnacle for the tallest building is too high, and wondered why 95 storeys are needed. Others focused on how the proposed development of the site is configured, and asked if there were opportunities to make especially the southwest portion of the site more porous and include more separation between buildings. David explained that there is a demand for intensification in the downtown, and that the standards for height are increasing. There is an incremental shift in mature urban centres with more people wanting to live and work downtown. Not every site is appropriate for 95 storeys, but the foot of Yonge is an appropriate location for this kind of height – especially given the proximity to Union Station and the core of the city.

- One participant wondered whether the 95 storey building was modelled on the building at One Bloor. *David said yes, and that the two buildings could be seen as “book-ending” this stretch of downtown Yonge.*
- One participant expressed a worry that if the height is lowered then it would make the building “fatter” and noted that width can create more of a problem than height.
- One participant asked if Pinnacle would be willing to reconsider the site configuration to open up views through the site from the south or the west. *David indicated that the design tries to push the density away from the park, and also that it doesn’t make sense to split up the office floor plate since banks are looking for larger than 25,000 square feet on the same floor. He said that he could reflect on how to massage the configuration, however noted that that 18,000 square foot Toronto Star building limits options.*

Liveability

- One participant expressed concern that the design concept reminded them of City Place, and that City Place should be considered a very bad development example for a number of reasons: “it is dead”, there is not enough public space, there is such a high ratio of residential units, the construction is poor quality, and the wall to window ratio creates big energy consequences.

Schedule and Phasing

- There were several questions about the schedule (when construction would start, finish, etc.) and phasing (what would be built first, next, etc.). *David noted that that tallest building would likely be first, and that the construction could then happen west to east and then north to south – however this depends on approvals and sales. He said the first building could be 2-3 years away.*

School

- One participant noted that the school at Parliament seems a long way from the community centre, and wondered if the developer would be willing to consider a school along with the community centre, potentially using the roof for playground space. *Another participant responded by saying that a representative from the TDSB, Mario Silva, noted at another breakout group that conversations are ongoing between the City and the TDSB about what’s required in terms of schools.*

Affordable Housing

- There were a few participants who raised concerns related to affordable housing, including concern that it would be too hard to achieve affordable housing due to the higher construction costs incurred when buildings are higher than 40 storeys.
- Questions were asked about the definition of affordable – noting that this may be affordable for millionaires. *Kyle noted that the policy in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan identifies a 25% target for affordable housing in new residential developments. He added that this is a much easier policy to achieve on publicly owned land rather than privately owned land. This development application includes 10% affordable rental housing for 15 years and rental housing for 25 years. This one development will not solve the City’s affordable housing issues but it does provide some help.*

Interest in more detail

- There were participants who were interested in seeing more design detail, as well as more information on the types of retail likely to be attracted to the development. *David said that more design detail would be provided at the next meeting. He also noted that Pinnacle is committed to a landmark development on the site.*

- There were participants interested in having more information about the connection between the 1 Yonge application and the adjacent sites, including the park, LCBO property and Loblaws plans.
- A few participants expressed concern that Pinnacle had already taken their development application to the OMB. *Kyle noted that Pinnacle has stepped back from pursuing its OMB appeal and no hearing dates have been identified. The City is trying to continue working through issues. David added his perspective, noting that since 2012 there has been a lot of progress made.*
- One participant asked about servicing for taxis and other access vehicles. *David noted that his team is aware of those issues and that additional detail would come later in the process.*

Next Steps

Nicole Swerhun thanked participants for attending, and asked that they send any additional written feedback by the June 30, 2015 deadline. She confirmed that the report would be posted online and encouraged attendees to stay up to date by visiting Waterfront Toronto's project website at: http://www.waterfrontoronto.ca/explore_projects2/central_waterfront/lower_yonge_precinct_planning

or the City of Toronto's project website at:

<http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=bd6ec6f87bdb1410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD>

ATTACHMENT 1. Meeting Agenda



Lower Yonge Precinct Plan & 1 Yonge Application

Public Meeting #3

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

6:30 – 9:00 pm (Open House starts at 6:00)

Harbourfront Community Centre, 627 Queens Quay West

AGENDA

6:00 Open House with Display Boards

6:30 Introductions & Agenda Review

Nicole Swerhun, Swerhun Facilitation

6:35 Welcome & Quick Process Update

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

6:45 Overview Presentations

- Update on Lower Yonge Precinct Plan & Emerging Directions (Willie Macrae, City of Toronto)
- 1 Yonge Application (David Pontarini, Hariri Pontarini Architects)

7:20 Facilitated Discussion

Do you have any questions of clarification on the presentation?

7:30 BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Feedback will be sought during four smaller rotations focused on specific elements of the emerging Precinct Plan as well as the Pinnacle Proposal. Each breakout group discussion will last 15 minutes, providing participants an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback in response to the questions on the attached worksheet. There will be 5 minutes to rotate between groups. The timing of rotations is as follows:

7:30 – 7:45 | 7:50 – 8:05 | 8:10 – 8:25 | 8:30 – 8:45

The four breakout stations include:

1. Transportation (includes new roads, ramp changes, cycling, transit, traffic, parking)
2. Public realm & Community services (includes park, community facilities, affordable housing)
3. Built form & Redpath Compatibility
4. Application for development at 1 Yonge (Pinnacle)

9:00 Adjourn

ATTACHMENT 2. Questions of Clarification

The following questions of clarification were raised in plenary following the overview presentations delivered by Willie Macrae and David Pontarini. Responses, where provided, are noted *in italics*. A copy of the City of Toronto/Waterfront Toronto presentation is available online here:

http://www.waterfrontoronto.ca/uploads/documents/lyp_ccm_presentation_june_23_2015_1.pdf

And a copy of the presentation by David Pontarini is available online here:

http://www.waterfrontoronto.ca/uploads/documents/1_yonge_presentation_june_23_2015_1.pdf

Questions, and responses, following the presentations included:

1. Is the large park land secured? *Not yet, however the process is underway with LCBO.*
2. There may be a lot more families here, which means a lot more babies, however there is one school option. Is that enough? *We are consulting with the school boards to ensure we best understand their needs. There is a new school planned at the foot of Parliament and in the new Villiers precinct and likely elsewhere in the Port Lands.*
3. How many units are planned for the 1 Yonge Street development? *We're estimating around 3,000 – 4,000 units.*
4. Having the buildings shorter near the water and higher farther away from the water is a good idea. How does this relate to the massive tower I understand is planned for the site beside Captain John's? *That is Pier 27, and the development for that site is approved for 35 storeys.*
5. I'm worried that there isn't enough separation between the buildings on the 1 Yonge site. *We understand that there is a demand for office space with a bigger floor plate. The community centre also needs a bigger floorplate.*

ATTACHMENT 3. Written Feedback

Feedback provided via completed worksheets submitted at the public meeting & through post-meeting emails received prior to the June 30, 2015 deadline.

Built form & Redpath Compatibility	
1. What do you like about the new / emerging directions for built form?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District energy • Tall buildings (appropriate for this location) • Love it. • No concerns. • The new direction of built form should reflect the nature of waterfront. Low density. Strong visual and physical connection to the water.
2. One of the objectives for the built form is to ensure compatibility with Redpath. Does the built form achieve this objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes but, how will the park be compatible with the Redpath facility? • Yes. High tech industry is an important and sometimes overlooked • What about planning for industries that dovetail with Redpath such as biotech (bacteria eat sugar) or breweries (old biotech). • There should be a large open space in front of Redpath. Building frontage facing Redpath and along Queens Quay should be irregular rather than straight and linear. Buildings should form a series of plazas/courtyards with well-designed landscape features along Queens Quay.
3. What concerns / issues do you have, if any, about the new / emerging directions related to Built Form and ensuring compatibility with Redpath?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of discussion on bike parking • Buildings could be taller or better positioned for PATH routes. • Although wider setbacks, the proposed built form does not create strong sense of waterfront. The density is too high. The podiums are too tall and wide. The use are mainly residential and business. These types of building is more suitable for downtown core, such as Bloor/Yonge area, but not for waterfront.
4. What ideas to address these concerns / issues do you have, if any, that you would like the City and Waterfront Toronto to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need plenty of space for bike parking (indoor and outdoor) as well as planned space for Bikeshare so it's not an afterthought. • Standards for indoor bike parking are currently far too low. Need to be much higher with comfortable access to the street. • Allow taller buildings. • Lower density. Create segmented building facade to reduce the scale. Create theme parks.
Other Built Form & Redpath related feedback:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Redpath for new mural on square building and sugar shed roof. • I do not think the 35-storey proposed tower for Pier 27 is appropriate for location on the south side of Queen's Quay. It will provide a poor precedent in that it will encourage developers of other buildings on the south side of Queen's Quay to propose buildings higher than the originally approved 14-storey height and that block the sunlight of other pre-existing owners. • There are no sunlight plans that have considered the existing condos at 12 and 16 Yonge. • Re the built form for the Lower Yonge precinct, I know that the time for public comment is closed. 	

However, as an architect living on the waterfront, I keep on thinking about it and observing the space. There are ample good examples in Europe, Amsterdam for example that high rise building with big cantilever but little podium. So it save the ground level for public space. There is one building I found in Vancouver shows the similar idea, although it is old but I feel it is inspiring. I am attaching it here just to share with you.

I feel very excited about this project. I am just hoping to make any contribution to turn it a space that not only economically beneficial but make people who live in the city feel proud.



Transportation

1. What do you like about the transportation initiatives in the Precinct Plan?

- Ground Floor animation
- All good, except the tunnel between Cooper and Church Street. Tunnel will need to go underneath parking garage and railway corridor. Tunnel must also consider new development on the corner of Church and The Esplanade. A tunnel further east may cost less.
- The new street grid would make Jane Jacobs proud.
- Need further consideration for Jarvis ramp shortening it. It is busy with long line up most of the time so any change need to take into consideration the impact on the Gardiner.
- No I'm not okay with it.

2. What concerns/issues do you have, if any, about transportation initiatives?

- Bike Plan
- See above
- Streetcar line needed along Queens Quay. Plan needed to fund the line.
- No rail based systems
- No comments on Gardiner East
- Many don't know Harbour Street exist other than as Lake Shore Eastbound.
- Sharrows on Harbour are not acceptable. Why not build a complete street from the star?

3. What ideas to address these concerns/issues do you have, if any, that you would like the City and Waterfront Toronto to Consider?

- More than sharrows are need if we're gonna get kids and seniors cycling.
- More pedestrian connections needed between North of railway corridor and South.
- Include Queens Quay East LRT and Lake Shore LRT.

- Tear it down [Gardiner East]
- Ideas on how to manage Eastbound traffic back onto Lake Shore.
- There is space available for a proper, grade separated bike lane that is safe for all people (13,600).
- Side walk will have impact on operability moving from / to 10 Yonge St.

Other transportation feedback:

- City keep parking for both residential and office building to a bare minimum
- City require proper parking for trucks used by tradespeople. i.e. contractors.
- Make rail based transit a requirement / component of sustainable development.
- Push for “transit first” development
- Ingress and egress to Harbour Street is a nightmare since traffic planning altered n/bound Yonge lane[s] reduced from 2 lanes to one. The police sit around the corner and ticket constantly if a hapless motorist tries to turn north from the 2nd lane - a common practice for decades. I cannot depart the condo driveway without being threatened by the absolute onslaught of motorists exiting the Gardiner and trying to cross over 4 lanes and proceed in the one only n/bound lane to Yonge st. With the proposed number of units in the 1 Yonge complex traffic will alternately cause accidents and gridlock.

Parking here is an absolute nightmare. Two top floors of the 4 tower condo complex UNDER+GROUND parking are used by Pinnacle for revenue. They are not for the owners who own the lower 2 levels. During any commercial use it is impossible to go home.

Public Realm & Community Services

1. What do you think are the key components of the public realm and essential community services and facilities to support a complete and well balanced community?

- Plaza at Yonge and Lake Shore: I’m Split. Part of me says it’ll be dead space because of the lakeshore / Gardiner traffic noise. Other part says build to 100 year plan. Gardiner will come down eventually.
- PATH is great for keeping people walking in the two coldest weeks of February. But it also sucks life from the streets. How can you make the public realm beautiful and walkable YEAR ROUND!? Same with pedestrian connections. Make them great, but don’t do so instead of making the streets great as well. The focus should be on the streets as people places. Then – if they can’t be everything you need, build more connection for pedestrians and bikes, starting with at grade, followed as a last resort with the PATH.
- PATH required – should be a must not a possibility
- Tree lined streets
- What about schools for the many children in the area?
- Human scale streets and buildings, community focal points, public facilities for all ages and income groups, street activities at daytime and nighttime. Positive spaces that engage people's interaction.

Other feedback related to Public Realm & Community Services:

- Please increase budget to improve quality of waterfront public spaces.
- A park on the East side of Yonge Street just north of One Toronto and South of Lake Shore Blvd would provide habitat for some welcome wildlife such as sparrows and other birds. Such a park would also be aesthetically appealing and would enhance the value of surrounding properties.

Also, consideration of attracting wildlife such as birds and facilitating activity such as feedings would be environmentally responsible. This would enhance Toronto's international rating of attractive

places to live. In turn this would increase tourism and housing demand in Toronto which would translate into higher residential prices and buttressed tax revenues to the City of Toronto.

1 Yonge Application

1. What are your thoughts on the proposed built form and streetscape in the Pinnacle development?

- No issues with heights of residential buildings. No issues with office buildings. Toronto Star building will require new building envelope / cladding. Walkways and path seem fine.
- Not as dramatic and skyline defining as previous plan.
- There is no separation between office towers in lower lot. It will block view / sun on east and south. It is like having large block of glass and concrete which is a big barrier to public and it will mostly effect 10 Yonge Street and Pier 27 residence. To better suit the neighbourhood, block should be broken.
- Our view, sunlight etc. will be blocked by 95 storey tower. At present we live at 16 Yonge (Pinnacle building). Will be given any incentives to move to the new Pinnacle tower (being an existing owner at 16 Yonge?)
- The built form is too high and too dense. The scale is overwhelming. Streetscape lacks of unique character.

2. What concerns / issues do you have, if any, about the 1 Yonge application?

- “What are the demands emerging in the market place for large floorplate” that would necessitate 13 – 18 base buildings?
- Unconvinced; not enough separation
- That community centre not built last, should be built in phase one.
- No details on PATH.
- Affordable housing phase out. Risk of people being priced out and req spectrum of people to man stores, etc. now have to commute in.
- Population boom. Destroy openness along waterfront. Destroy view quality of adjacent building. Block sunlight on the entire street in the morning.

3. What ideas to address these concerns / issues do you have, if any, that you would like the City and Waterfront Toronto to consider?

- In with smaller towers with proper separation.
- Reduce density. Create more ground level public open spaces. Enhance visual connection and public accessibility to waterfront.

Other feedback related to the 1 Yonge Application:

- Pinnacle is a terrible corporate citizen and a terrible builder using substandard materials and methods. A complex as large as they are proposing at 1 Yonge would be dangerous in my opinion. At 16 Yonge Pinnacle condo when I took possession in 2006 I found every unit wood floor in the building had to be replace due to clearly substandard wood materials. Pinnacle was clever - this item was NOT part of the standard condo unit declaration. EACH owner had to pay 5000.00 for new floors. Windows, walls and ceilings cracking - the expansion joint[s] done POORLY [come and see] and are getting wider all the time. Not enough elevators were included in the building. Parking spaces at ground level were removed to create commercial space[s] and these commercial spaces sit empty since 2006.

Additional Comments

- Keep up the good work

Regarding the Toronto Islands:

- The Toronto Islands are the city park that your future residents will be visiting constantly. Helping

them to access it safely must be part of your plans. The future density planned for this waterfront project will create much more year-round pedestrian traffic to the Toronto Islands. Winter tourist traffic to Toronto Islands has been expanding fast in the last two years. Winter travel systems in this neighbourhood MUST be part of your awareness in the planning. Winter at the lake's edge lasts at least half of the year. Feedback includes:

1. The Ferry boats are from 60 to over 100 years old. No other transportation system has vehicles that old servicing the public. The Ongiara, the 60 year-old, the non- ice-breaking winter truck-ferry that also takes passengers, is rusty, leaking, and breaks down annually because the ice ruins the two unprotected propellers. One of the two four-bladed propellers stopped working last winter. As it does every winter. The Ferry then travelled across the bay with three blades missing on the last working propellor, zig-zagging and going in circles through the ice, across to the Ward's Island dock. (There are photographs of the damaged propeller.) Each trip taking over a half an hour....a trip that takes 10 minutes in the summer.

These off-shore boat trips for school children, various workers, and families, twice a day in sub-zero weather on an inappropriate, faulty boat are clearly fragile and dangerous. When the Ferry does inevitably break during the coldest of part of the year, the City pays for several buses that go through the airport on a much-reduced and chaotic schedule on both sides of the trip. All truck traffic ceases for weeks at a time. A very inefficient and expensive system. An ice-breaker Ferry is essential to the waterfront. There is news from City Hall that a new winter Ferry is 'in the works', however, 'years away'. Funds from your project towards this goal could, no doubt, hasten this process. It is an investment in this community.

2. Your planners and architects might also think of investing funds to achieve safer and more frequent winter travel to the Islands by re-thinking and altering the Ward's Island dock. The U-shaped dock, the only one functioning in the winter, is completely the wrong shape for any winter Ferry. The winds blow great huge shards of ice into the U-shape. The Ferry is forced to land in the ice-collecting dock area, causing even more damage to it. Changing the shape of the dock would make a huge and permanent difference. That project could be part of your community building plan.
3. The empty Terminal building on Cherry Street, constructed a few years ago for the Hovercraft to Rochester, could be revived as another Winter Terminal, or destination, for the ice-breaking Ferry.

Understanding the winter weather at the waterfront is the secret to the quality of life for your future 'community' condo project. In my opinion. There are possible design solutions that could enhance everyone's life: resident, tourist, sailor, student or worker, in this historical part of the city. Let's really make it work.

From the LCBO:

Our primary concerns arising from the materials presented at Public Meeting #3 are as follows:

1. We reiterate our concerns regarding the location and amount of parkland presented in the Urban Design Report which continues to be shown in the more recent materials presented by the City and Waterfront Toronto. Specifically, our concerns relate to the lack of apparent rationale for designating an entire block of the LCBO property, and the lack of consideration of other options or approaches that would provide greater flexibility to achieve the City's objectives with respect to the

provision of parkland within the Precinct.

2. As raised in previous correspondence, one of our general concerns is whether the Plan and its approach to implementation will result in an equitable treatment of landowners within the Precinct. Specifically, we would like the City and Waterfront Toronto to provide greater clarity regarding the future obligations of landowners within the Precinct, including the requirements and associated costs for specific on- and off-site improvements generally, and clarity regarding specific funding obligations and how such obligations will be allocated to individual landowners within the Precinct in an equitable manner.

From UNITE HERE Local 75 CLC-FTQ:

- Based on the overall building massing plan sketched out by the applicant's representative, we are concerned about the integration of the new project into the surrounding neighbourhood. The building massing, step-backs and step-down to the east only make sense if the LCBO lands to the east carry out the same scaling down toward Lower Sherbourne and Parliament. The province has yet to sell the LCBO lands, and we have yet to see an actual development application from a prospective buyer. Could the new owner use the increased height and density at 1 & 7 Yonge as a precedent to achieve similar heights and densities? If so, the eastward scaling down proposed at 1 & 7 Yonge would be unachievable.
- We are concerned that the proposal for 1 & 7 Yonge relies on a prospective park location that has yet to be established. Until the park space has been secured, the overall relationship of 1 & 7 Yonge to the rest of the area in terms of building massing, green corridors, pedestrian and traffic flow, etc. cannot be determined.
- Our union represents approximately 100,000 hotel workers in cities across North America. We are interested in learning more about the applicant's hotel uses in one or more of the new towers. We have seen the overall number of hotel rooms to be built reduced from almost 700 rooms to 180 rooms. Even still, in our experience, hotel uses create specific challenges in terms of services, loading, and guest and worker access, especially in dense urban areas. We hope as the proposal becomes more refined and the planning process moves forward, we see more details of the applicant's plan to appropriately accommodate hotel use at the site.