

MEETING SUMMARY

The York Quay Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) had their second meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 2010. The meeting focused on reviewing and providing feedback on the work completed to date by MVVA, the consultant team retained to lead the design of the York Quay revitalization (Phase II). Discussion focused on both the proposed design of the parking garage, as well as early concept ideas for the design of other elements of the site, including the two open spaces (an urban plaza adjacent to Queen's Quay Blvd, and Canada Square at the water's edge), and the cultural village.

Members of the SAC continued to be very supportive of the overall project. This summary highlights key points raised, with additional detail beginning on page two.

- 1. Support for the design of the parking garage, particularly the “light well”.** Ideas for suggested improvements included the addition of bike parking, priority parking for motorcycles and scooters, and anything that could be done to make the entrance to the garage less foreboding.
- 2. Interest in seeing a larger focus on bikes.** Several participants would like to see revitalization of the site demonstrate a commitment to cycling, including providing safe and secure places to park bikes.
- 3. Concerns about traffic (cars & people) at the intersection of Simcoe & Queen's Quay.** Participants wanted to make sure strategies were in place to minimize the congestion of the intersection and back up on adjacent roads. Ideas included early notification to alert motorists if the parking garage is full (so they can find other options), and encouraging other crossing options for pedestrians.
- 4. Regarding the cultural village,** discussion focused on designing the village for year round use, the importance of being clear about the impact that buildings heights will have on views, and protecting views where possible. There were also questions regarding the servicing of the village, and particularly the relationship between the service corridor for the Queen's Quay terminal and the “back” of the cultural village. Several participants recommended that the team revisit the term “cultural village” since it did not leave a clear enough idea of what would be included in the village. There was also a strong feeling that for this revitalization to be successful it needs to serve the needs of both residents and tourists, not one or the other.
- 5. Connecting with the public sooner rather than later.** Several participants felt the time was right to introduce the project to the public, and to share the early concept ideas. A public meeting was suggested, designed so that it provides a meaningful opportunity for public feedback.

This Meeting Report was written by Nicole Swerhun, Meeting Facilitator. It is intended to reflect the key points raised at the meeting, and is not a verbatim transcript. It was subject to the review of participants at the meeting. If you have any comments or questions about this report, please contact Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator (nicole@swerhun.com or 416-999-2665) or Andrea Kelemen, Waterfront Toronto (akelemen@waterfrontontario.ca or 416-214-1344 ext.248).

MEETING DETAILS

I. Participant Briefing

Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator, opened the meeting and reviewed the proposed agenda. Participants introduced themselves, including representatives from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), Waterfront Toronto, Harbourfront Centre, and their consultant team (MVVA). The meeting agenda is included as Attachment 1 and the list of participants as Attachment 2.

Chris Glaisek and Chris Barre from Waterfront Toronto provided a quick update on key activities completed since the first SAC meeting in September 2009, including:

- Selection of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) to lead the design of the York Quay Revitalization Project (Phase II) for Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre; and
- Receipt of approval from the City of Toronto's Committee of Adjustment for a minor variance application to permit the underground parking garage (November, 2009).

Gullivar Shepard, MVVA, then reviewed the proposed parking garage design as well as early ideas emerging for the cultural village. Gullivar's presentation covered:

- MVVA's approach to designing the space, including consideration of materiality and climate, engineering and daylight, planting and culture;
- The planning context;
- Existing and future site considerations;
- Different options considered for configuration of the parking garage, and criteria used to review and compare the options;
- Vehicular movements, including buses;
- Ideas regarding the entrance to the parking garage; and
- The public space framework for the site, including ideas regarding the cultural village buildings, and for the open spaces, including an urban plaza on Queen's Quay and a unique place on the waterfront (Canada Square).

II. Feedback on the Presentation

Participants were then asked to share their thoughts on the ideas presented, and to respond to the following questions:

- What do you like/don't like about the proposed public realm aspects of the parking garage and why? Do you have any other ideas to be considered?
- What do you like/don't like about the ideas being explored for the cultural village and why? Do you have any other ideas to be considered?

Feedback focused on these questions as well as other aspects of the presentation. Participant thoughts and perspectives are organized here around seven key themes. Note that responses, where provided, from Waterfront Toronto, Harbourfront Centre, or the MVVA team are noted in *italics*.

1. Feedback on the Parking Garage

- i. Support for the Parking Garage, particularly the light “well”
 - Very impressed with parking garage.
 - The opening in the parking garage that lets light in, will it be covered? I’m thinking about whether snow would come in. *It is not covered, and snow would come in.*
 - Congratulations on a wonderfully ingenious plan. The central well is a marvelous idea. I like the platform idea so the entrance is artful.
 - This really has the potential to be something quite exciting, even just as a parking garage. I like the light, public art, greening ideas.
- ii. Question about whether garage could be larger?
 - Is there any flexibility to build a larger garage (for example if contractors are able to build the garage for less than is budgeted)? *No because we are constrained both in terms of time and space. Drilling into bedrock creates construction delays which would mean we wouldn’t be able to meet the federal funding sunset clause. Also in terms of space, laterally we can’t expand onto other properties. If we go further south we’ll end up spending more, and we can’t go west because we have to keep Harbourfront Centre running.*
- iii. What about motorcycle and scooter parking?
 - In terms of bike parking, people are beginning to use scooters more, and motorcycles often use a whole parking spot. Have you thought about specific spots for motorcycle and scooter parking? *We can consider this.*
- iv. Thoughts about the entrance to the garage
 - The ramp towards Harbourfront Centre looks good.
 - I do have a concern though about the parking garage entrance. It looks foreboding from ground level. Is there anything that could be done? For example, could a green wall be incorporated?
 - I like the green wall idea, but think about ways to have the wall green all year round. Not only deciduous trees.
- v. Other thoughts on the parking garage
 - Work to avoid having ventilation vents from the parking garage blowing onto the sidewalk.

2. Interest in seeing more bike parking

- Is there space for bikes in the garage? We’d be willing to pay. *We’re still exploring whether cyclists need parking below ground. We’ve been looking at options for bike parking below the platform.*
- I agree we’re going to need more bike parking.
- Have you thought of using bike parking so that it becomes a barrier to the streetcar tracks? *That’s an interesting idea, we’ll look into it.*

3. Traffic at the intersection of Simcoe & Queen's Quay

- This will bring more traffic through the Queen's Quay/Simcoe intersection.
- There will be a lot of pedestrian traffic coming down Simcoe and crossing Queen's Quay. Will there be any way for pedestrians to get across Queen's Quay other than at street level? *All pedestrian crossings will be at street level. We're not looking at any bridges or underground crossings. We will be adding a number of crosswalks across Queen's Quay through the revitalization of Queen's Quay.*
- How can we avoid car traffic backing up across Queen's Quay and the Martin Goodman Trail? *We're still exploring options, including a pay & display parking system.*
- How will motorists be notified that the parking lot is full? *We're looking at putting a sign before the intersection so cars can turn north into the garage on the north side of Queen's Quay.*

4. Connections on the site, and between the site and adjacent areas/properties

- Have underground connections to buildings been considered? I'm concerned that the design will be complete and then we'll want connections – makes more sense to plan for this early. I'm wondering if it may be possible to create an enclosed pathway to the EnWave Theatre? *It's a question of cost. We would consider anything, but need to make sure we can afford it. We can explore options with our engineers.*
- I'm concerned about what it will be like to travel on the "back side" of the cultural village (beside the Queen's Quay terminal).
- It looks like the cultural village blocks off access to the Queen's Quay terminal and shopping. *That's not the intent, we'll take another look at this.*
- We need to think about how this fits into the streetscape in the area, not just Harbourfront Centre.

5. Design of the Cultural Village

i. Need to design for year round use

- I have a suggestion – I'd like to see people use the PATH system to get here. Also I don't think the cultural village should be seen as a series of buildings exposed to the wind, but instead design it with lanes, grass roofs, etc. It's critical that this be designed to attract a critical economic mass of activity that keeps people here year round. *There are things we can put in the design guidelines and zoning requirements that could encourage these things to happen. We will not be designing the cultural village as part of our Phase II work.*
- Even though this project doesn't include the design of the cultural village, we know Toronto is a winter city and we'll need wind breaks, protected walkways, etc. I've seen people lifted off their feet and thrown to the ground with the wind down here. People should be able to sit and enjoy the sun in the park without being subjected to the wind. We want this to be a year round destination.

ii. Height of buildings

- There are several buildings in the cultural village that are 3-4 stories high. A lot of people now have a clear view of the lake and boardwalk, and at some point that

view will be obstructed from the height of the cultural village buildings. *We'll do a drawing of what the view plane might be from different angles. Trajectory will be important – for example, the EnWave building blocks more views because it is closer to the water.*

- I suggest you pretend that there is an external elevator on the buildings on the north side of Queen's Quay across from the site and show how views are impacted. Where the massing lines up is critical. Consider having fewer stories closer to the lake. Also since a lot of people will be looking at the rooftops it will be important to consider the design of the rooftops – they should be green.
- I'm a bit concerned that the building envelopes are so big. I would like the western edge of the cultural village moved a bit so there is a wider view corridor. That corridor is also a way to draw people to the water.

iii. Unsure about "Cultural Village" terminology and what's included in the "Village"

- I'm not sure that the "cultural village" is a concept that is well understood. It needs to be translated into language which makes it easier to define.
- We need to know more about the cultural village. The word "village" sounds a bit cute, but I live in an area that's trying to be a cultural village (the Distillery District) and places are going broke all the time. We need to hear a lot more about the sorts of uses and programming for the site.
- There's a responsibility for this site to provide the services in the area that are sadly lacking. If the site serves only the needs of residents or only the needs of tourists, it will fail. It needs to serve the needs of both, all year round.
- Who will own and manage the cultural Village? *Harbourfront Centre.*
- The Waterfront BIA did a survey of what we need in the area in terms of services (e.g. hardware store, etc.).
- Rather than calling this a cultural village, consider revisiting the terminology. Think about ways of being more transparent by describing it as a mixed use development that will include galleries, retail, etc. I suggest you keep it diverse to encompass a broad definition of culture.
- Harbourfront Centre is running out of space, and that's one of the primary motivations behind development of the cultural village. The idea is that the village and space will be animated. We won't have a problem with a lack of cultural activity because Harbourfront Centre is way over capacity.

iv. Servicing the Cultural Village

- I suggest the team consider whether it's possible to incorporate a service elevator into the parking garage that would service the cultural village. Also consider a service corridor that could be accessed from the interior of the buildings.
- I'm confused about how the service vehicles will access the cultural village. How will they get there if not down beside Queen's Quay? *We had planned that service vehicles would access from the front and side of the cultural village.*

6. What happens during construction?

- What happens along Queen's Quay during the construction period? Will they be digging the hole for the parking garage during the summer? What will happen on the sidewalk? Would be good if you could keep it open. *The construction manager will offer a lot of advice on how to mitigate the temporary impacts on the right-of-way.*
- Is closing that side of Queen's Quay an option? *That's not our intention.*

7. Feedback on process

- We have to have a public meeting at some point soon - people need to have an opportunity to talk about this project. Would be helpful to see: a mock up of the Queen's Quay service lane and the view corridor down the service lane/alleyway; what the north edge of the site would look like from a pedestrian's perspective; and rudimentary massing on the site. People need to understand what the larger goals are for the site.
- For the public meeting, make the involvement of the public meaningful.

III. Feedback on Draft Terms of Reference for the SAC

Participants had been distributed a copy of the draft Terms of Reference for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) at their first meeting (in September 2009). Discussion focused on any suggested refinements. Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator, indicated that she had identified a few areas for refinement. Participants agreed that Nicole should go ahead and make the refinements and finalize the TOR. The final TOR is included as Attachment 3.

IV. Next Steps

The meeting wrapped up with a thank-you to participants for their thoughts, and a commitment to follow-up on the process suggestions. The next meeting of the SAC will likely take place in the Spring of 2010.

ATTACHMENT 1: Meeting Agenda

YORK QUAY REVITALIZATION

STAKEHOLDER MEETING 2

6:00 – 8:00 pm

Tuesday, January 12, 2010

Waterfront Toronto

DRAFT PROPOSED AGENDA

6:00 pm **Introductions & Agenda Review**

Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator

6: 05 **Briefing**

1. Update since Stakeholder Meeting 1, including introduction to Winning Team

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

2. Parking Garage Design & Early Ideas for the Cultural Village

Gullivar Shepard, MVVA

3. Next Steps

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

Questions of clarification

7:00 **Discussion**

1. PARKING GARAGE

What do you like/don't like about the proposed public realm aspects of the parking garage, and why? Do you have any other ideas to be considered?

2. CULTURAL VILLAGE

What do you like/don't like about the ideas being explored for the cultural village, and why? Do you have any other ideas to be considered?

3. SAC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Take a moment to review the draft Terms of Reference for the SAC distributed at the first meeting. Do you have any suggested edits and/or refinements?

Any other advice?

8:00 **Adjourn**

ATTACHMENT 2: Meeting Participants

Brookfield Properties, Robert Zeidler
City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat, Steven O'Bright
City of Toronto Planning, Jeff Markowiak
Community Member At Large, Julie Beddoes
Councillor Adam Vaughan
Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office, Jennifer Chan
Harbourfront Centre Mural Routes, Karin Eaton
Mariposa Cruise Lines, Cindi Vanden Heuval
Member of Parliament Olivia Chow's office, Nathan Jackson
Member of Parliament, Olivia Chow
Queen's Quay Terminal Resident, Rares Pateanu
The Riviera, Sandra Taylor
Waterfront Action & Port Lands Action Committee, Dennis Findlay
Waterfront Regeneration Trust, Vickie Barron
York Quay Neighbourhood Association, Michelle Ramsay-Borg
York Quay Neighbourhood Association Member, Braz Menezes

Waterfront Toronto

Christopher Barre
Chris Glaisek
Margaret Goodfellow
Amanda Santo
Pina Mallozzi
Gullivar Shepard, MVVA
Nate Trevethan, MVVA

Harbourfront Centre

Bill Boyle
Helder Melo

Facilitation

Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator



York Quay Revitalization Project (Phase II) Stakeholder Terms of Reference

June 2010

I. Introduction

Harbourfront Centre operates a 10 acre site along Toronto's central waterfront which encompasses York and John Quays. In 2000, Harbourfront Centre developed a master plan for the revitalization of its site designed to reclaim underutilized spaces for recreational, cultural and commercial purposes and strengthen public access to the water's edge. The master plan also included a vision for Canada Square, an urban plaza at the water's edge.

This project, now known as the York Quay Revitalization Project, has since evolved to include elements from the winning submission of Waterfront Toronto's 2006 Central Waterfront Design Competition. In its submission, the design team, West 8 + DTAH envisioned a vibrant, mixed-use cultural village for the site including Canada Square and another urban square bordering Queens Quay.

An essential part of the process will be effective communication and consultation with members of the public and stakeholders. One of the planned activities in meeting this goal is to establish a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC). This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the SAC and its role in the Canada Square Development project.

II. Mandate

Committee members are guided by these Terms of Reference and participate in the SAC at the pleasure of Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre.

The mandate of the SAC is to provide an ongoing forum for feedback, guidance and advice to the Project Team at key milestones during the project. Specifically, the SAC will:

- Act as a sounding board for the Project Team to share and discuss ideas and findings;
- Provide guidance, critiques and suggestions on proposed study approaches, concepts and materials (including materials to be presented at public meetings);
- Provide a sense of the broader community's reactions and concerns and how these might be addressed;
- Liaise between the community at large, stakeholder organizations and the Project Team.

The Project Team consists of representatives from Waterfront Toronto, Harbourfront Centre and the consultant team.

III. Decision Making

As an advisory committee, the SAC will operate using a consensus-based approach where members seek general agreement on guidance and advice to the project team. A consensus based approach is where participants openly discuss ideas, perspectives and viewpoints and seek to develop common ground. Where differing viewpoints and opinions exist, these will be documented in the SAC meeting notes.

IV. SAC Composition and Membership

The SAC will be comprised of representatives from interested and affected stakeholders and organizations as well as those with specific expertise related to the project. Membership in the SAC will consist of representatives from organizations in various “sectors” including but not limited to:

- Neighbourhood associations
- Condominium boards
- Residents at large
- Business Improvement Association
- Tourism
- Retail and restaurant
- Education
- Arts/cultural
- Urban design/landscape architecture

SAC meetings will also be open to observers from interested government representatives and agencies.

The SAC will be comprised of a maximum of 20 participants. Members will be selected based on experience, knowledge and representation of a committee, group or sector. Membership should also be reflective of demographics (youth, seniors, ethnic/cultural diversity).

Only one member of each represented organization is required on the committee. A back-up can be named if that primary member is unable to attend.

V. SAC Meeting Procedures

The following procedures will be used when convening meetings of the SAC:

- SAC meetings will be facilitated by a third-party facilitator to enable all members to participate fully in the discussions
- Members of the Project Team will attend SAC meetings to present project-related materials and receive feedback from SAC members. Other technical advisors will attend as required.
- Proposed meeting agendas will be prepared by the Project Team and distributed in advance of each meeting. SAC members will have the opportunity to provide suggested edits or refinements to the proposed agenda.

- Meeting notes will be taken by the third-party facilitator and circulated to the SAC following each meeting for review and comment by members. Notes will be approved at the following meeting.

VI. SAC Member Roles and Responsibilities

As a SAC member, each participant will:

- Liaise with the organization they represent (if applicable) and bring forward advice;
- Strive to operate in a consensus mode where participants openly discuss views and opinions, and seek to develop common ground and narrow areas of disagreement to the best of their ability;
- Review all relevant project material and provide feedback as appropriate;
- Attend and participate in a minimum of three SAC meetings; and
- Ensure the results of the SAC discussions are accurately recorded in the meeting records

SAC members will also receive materials made available to the public and will be invited to all public meetings.

While the SAC will provide input to the Project Team, final decisions about the project will rest with the Project Team.

VII. Project Team Members

Project team members will:

- Strive to provide accurate, understandable information to SAC members, such that they can contribute informed advice and recommendations;
- Ensure that appropriate Project Team representatives (or other resource people) are present at discussions on specific issues or components of the planning process;
- Be open, receptive and give careful consideration to advice and ideas received from SAC members; and
- Ensure that advice, recommendations and consensus positions from the SAC are considered

VIII. Facilitation and Secretariat

Facilitation services for the SAC will be provided by a third party facilitator, Nicole Swerhun. These services will include facilitation at SAC meetings and preparation of SAC meeting records.

Secretariat services will be provided by Waterfront Toronto. These services will include organizing SAC meetings, distributing meeting notices and materials and SAC contact list management. The point of contact for all SAC correspondence is:

Andrea Kelemen
Communications and Marketing Coordinator
Waterfront Toronto
1310-20 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M5J 2N8
Email: akelemen@waterfronttoronto.ca
Website: www.waterfronttoronto.ca

IX. Term of the SAC

The SAC will be in effect throughout the design of the York Quay Revitalization, Phase II which is expected to be complete in late 2010 or early 2011. SAC members are strongly encouraged to attend each meeting to ensure consistency, but may send an alternate to meetings in the event of unavoidable schedule conflicts.

SAC Meeting Logistics

Waterfront Toronto will host the SAC meetings at Waterfront Toronto – 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310.

The SAC will meet at key milestones during the design process to provide input to Waterfront Toronto, Harbourfront Centre and the Design Team. Your anticipated time commitment would include attendance at the following meetings:

Stakeholder Committee Kick-off Meeting	September 16, 2009
Stakeholder Meeting #2	Early 2010
Stakeholder Meeting #3	Middle of 2010
Stakeholder Meeting #4	Late 2010/early 2011

X. Public Meetings

In addition to the SAC meetings, members of the SAC are encouraged to attend public meetings that will be convened as part of this process. The dates, topics and format for those meetings will be discussed as part of the SAC meeting.

IX. Protocols for SAC members

Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre are privileged to have engaged Stakeholders on all of our projects. SAC membership, its roles and responsibilities should be taken seriously.

Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre aim to foster an environment of openness and inclusiveness, where members and participants can express their opinions and perspectives freely. While acknowledging that the role of SAC members is to liaise with their organizations and provide feedback, SAC members are asked to respect a level of discretion and not disclose the proceedings of meetings to the media, lobby government officials, or promote speculation about the project.