STITCHING THE CITY TO **ITS LAKEFRONT**

WEST 8 + DTAH CECIL BALMOND, AGU ARUP HALSALL ASSOCIATES BA GROUP



Finally, the opportunity to stitch the City to its waterfront. This is loronto's moment to boldly unlock a remarkable and valuable corner of the city while defining the Identity of its primary urban routes The nake front as 21 st Century

Narrative Summary Connectivity is the Aim and Ambition

It is time to shift the focus. The debate about the waterfront and its connection to the city has most often centered on the most obvious barrier: the elevated structure of the Gardiner Expressway itself.

We widen that focus to include the rail corridor and – most importantly – confront the north-south connections between the lakefront and the urban hinterland as a matter of priority. This proposal takes two of Toronto's most under-considered elements – the northsouth streetscape routes and the rail berm – as the starting points for developing a series of civic gateway linkages.

By concentrating upon the spatial quality and character of the north-south routes we are able to fulfill the need and desire for a fully connected urban fabric to the water's edge.

With the framework of a 'replace' option, this strategy unfolds a spectacular urban extension of the central district towards the east that is born from these connections – a series of legible north-south figures within the urban fabric. The grain of this new urban tissue will be dense and diverse, but of a smaller scale, in sharp contrast to the verticality of the skyline. The result is the unlocking of new territories and potential to the east. Here, a new format for urban living in contact with water can be produced that is rivalled perhaps only by the Toronto Island community. At the mouth of the Don, a canal district that is fully connected by transit to the core, binds together formerly fragmented neighbourhoods from the West, East, Lower Don and Portlands to the Lakefront.



One Waterfront Connected The Gardiner Opportunity will ensure the City maximizes its benefits from the enormous public investments taking place on waterfront revitalization.





After Replacement View looking east from Jarvis

-

-

BE SAD IN

day

= " "

1111111



STARTING POINTS 1. 'REPLACE' 2. N-S CORRIDORS **3. CANAL DISTRICT & URBAN EXTENSION**

STARTING POINTS

Statement on the 4 Lenses

Today's solutions for infrastructure are innevitably hybrids, which take full advantage of the synergies between infrastructures, ecologies, and urban/civic amenities to propel the diverse needs of the contemporary city into an urban bundle that will redefine Toronto and its relation to the lakefront. We offer a bundle of infrastructures – traffic, transit, public space and stormwater/ ecolgy – that can be aligned into a strategic cross-section and delivered along a new alignment that will completely unlock a corner of the city for development of the highest quality and ambition.

Only with the consolidation of multiple infrastructures, multiple public agendas and overlapping logics can we begin to imagine an intervention in city-building at this scale.

Indeed, it becomes worthwhile to consider the Gardiner being replaced in another form as the 21st Century has taught us that when contemporary infrastructure is combined with environmental improvement, public transit and public realm or civic improvements it can have a transformative urban effect. This is certainly the case with the Gardiner.

For this reason, viewing the project through the multiple lenses of Environment, Economics, Transporation & Infrastructure, and Urban Design is natural – even necessary. The question is: what do

we prioritize, what drives the scheme? We believe that urbanism must be the guiding discipline within such an exercise; by its nature it is a broad, social discipline which is inherently comprehensive in its outlook and encompasses multiple lenses. Today, good urbanism is sustainable; sustainability carries multiple bottom-lines which ultimately expand the lenses to include social and cultural forces. In this sense, Toronto finds itself at a powerful moment about to chart a future for the city that embraces the multi-dimenisonal realities of contemporary urban life. These are questions about how we want to live in the city. Clearly this is not a singular issue.

To approach the Gardiner challenge we are forced to take a position about the city and about what it might promise in terms of citylife.

Starting points for approaching the Gardiner-Lakeshore challenge:

One Waterfront Connected

The Gardiner opportunity can ensure the City maximizes its benefits from the enormous public investments on waterfront revitalization such that a reciprocal relationship between city and lake is guaranteed. We believe it is essential to empower the shoreline of the Don River as an extension of the primary waterfront part of a coherent Downtown Waterfront.

The Promise of Toronto's Canal District for the 21st Century

This plan for replacing infrastructure will unlock a valuable territory to produce a new and distinct urban district that finally embraces the Lake – with a scale, built form, and materiality that give it coherence and identity. It will bind together a series of dislocated land parcels to build Toronto's next great neighbourhood and vital point of urban gravity towards the east.

Creating Development Value

What could be the building typology and parcelization strategy to develop a prototype for a sustainable city district engaged with the water in a way Toronto has always dreamt of?

A Series of 'City Gates' Connect the Lake with the Hinterland

Perpendicular connections from the lakefront to Old Town Toronto are necessary to bring the vitality of the city to the waterfront, and vice versa. 'City Gates' which widen and open up the miserable viaducts adding public programs at the rail berm will produce addresses at the threshold of the city and its waterfront.

Ensure 'Replace' is Not Another 'Big Dig'

We recognize and prioritize the necessity for an integrated strategic project – one that is efficient, agile, combines multiple agendas, is politically robust and fiscally sound. The Gardiner cannot affort delays, escalating prices, political division, public frustration, traffic inconvenience, nor upheaval of city functions during the process of construction.

Doubling Agendas

In today's political context, urban beltroads can no longer be considered an isolated traffic question. The Gardiner will inherently be a hybrid urban project. Our 21st Century infrastructure must now bundle multiple modes of movement, public space, and find new synergies that instrumentalize traffic. transit, and ecology to build a new public realm and urban district. In our scheme we identify the stormwater intercepter initiative that is part of the City of Toronto's Wet Weather Flow Master Plan as a potential partner in building the embankment infrastructure. The cleaning of stormwater at the scale of the district can become one of the neighbourhoods most memorable attractions - imagine: A place to swim in clean water in a canal in the city! And at the root of our work we believe in the joining of infrastructure and public space design such that these major capital investments of public funds provide concrete and tangible effects in building a spectacular public realm.



Not Simply a Traffic Problem

Traffic is not the issue here. What is at stake is the question of how we will live in the city in the 21st Century. Over the last 50 years, Toronto has been a city disconnected from its waterfront. For

Canada's greatest city, this is no longer acceptible.

Toronto's Blue Edge

The radical public improvements being undertaken as part of the waterfront's revitalization offer the starting point to a more symbiotic relationship between city and lakefront. For the first time, we have the possibility to reconfig-ure the relationship between the vital and established core city districts with emerging waterfront precincts and new territoring. and new territories.

Is it worth thinking about the Gardiner surviving in a different configuration? There exist a remarkable set of potential outcomes with the 'Replace' option.

(right) The vision for the water's edge promenade and boardwalk, with the "Green Foot" double-row of Maple trees as the foreground for views to the lake.



The Net Gain of Developable Land is Significant with the 'Replace' Option.



EXISTING 257 000 m² 63.5 acres

EMBANKMENT 304 000 m² 75.1 acres

TUNNEL 363 000 m² 89.6 acres

TOTAL DEVELOPABLE LAND

Existing Condition

The territory is currently broken into awkward areas by divisive elevated infrastructure. The elevated structure is perceived as a barrier to the lakefront, and effectively restricts the extension of a coherent urban district, extending from the city.

Embankment Scheme

This strategy takes on the collective problem of the rail berm and the Gardiner as one - directly addressing the potential of a new consolidated line of transportation that can also be re-considered as Toronto's city wall that is restored and animated to offer new civic gates between the city and its waterfront.

This is a practical scheme that is the most cost-effective; it is therefore the scheme we have started to elaborate upon within the framework of the competition.

Tunnel Scheme

This strategy takes the 'problem' of the elevated Gardiner and, quite literally, puts it underwater. In terms of implementation this offers benefits linked to offshore construction and the elimination of congestion effects, however, the costs and complexities of such an undertaking are high and would require significant political will.



CONSOLIDATE







Reflecting Concept Plan (Rounded up to nearest 25) Key Traffic Assignment Volumes - AM Peak Hour - Replacement of Gardiner w/ Embankment Road - New Gardiner to/from Lake Shore Blvd. Ramps in Tunnel Under Don River

- New At-Grade Road Network



DVP

ment, here accommodated by the new Waterfront Rapid Transit Line to the east and streetcar lines.

Traffic Assessment

The essence of the transportation component of the Concept Plan is the replacement of the elevated Gardiner Expressway east of Jarvis Street with new road and transit network elements which would replicate the function of the corridor while enhancing transit service and offering transportation capacity capable of supporting the significant new development potential which would also be created by the Concept.

The principal new road and transit system elements included in the Concept Plan include:

• a four lane roadway located on a southward extension of the railway corridor berm which would convey Gardiner traffic to/from the Don Valley Parkway and to/from Lake Shore Boulevard to the east of the Don River

• a new set of directional ramps which would connect the embankment road to the Don Valley Parkway by crossing the river and passing under the rail corridor in a new underpass tunnel located just east of the existing railway underpass

• a new tunnel which would facilitate the conveyance of traffic between the embankment road and Lake Shore Boulevard east of the Don River

• a significant enhancement of the north-south streets which cross the under the rail corridor to dramatically reduce the barrier effect of the rail corridor and to enable these streets to fulfill the important role of facilitating north-south pedestrian and cycling movements • the removal of the elevated expressway east of Jarvis Street and the re-development of Lake shore Boulevard (with a basic two lanes in each direction supported by left turn lanes where required) located so that continuous building frontage would be possible on both the north and south sides of the street

• the embankment road would be designed to accommodate rapid transit on structure in the median which would extend from Union Station east along the embankment roadway, through the tunnel to Lake Shore Boulevard, continue further east to the Beach Communities, and possibly be extended northward to connect with the Danforth Subway line

• an extension of Broadview southward from Eastern Avenue, across the railway corridor and south to Lake Shore Boulevard where it would extend further south to connect with Villiers and carry an extension of the Broadview streetcar line to the waterfront and intersect the new rapid transit line on Lake Shore Boulevard

It should be noted that in order to maximize the development and urban design opportunities associated with relocation of Lake Shore Boulevard, the concept also features the removal of the eastbound on-ramp from Lake Shore Boulevard east of Jarvis Street and the westbound off-ramp to Lake Shore Boulevard and Sherbourne Street east of Sherbourne Street.

The purpose of the traffic assessment has been to confirm that this new road network would support existing and baseline future AM Peak Hour Traffic volumes. It is assumed that the future non-local baseline traffic volumes in the area would generally be similar to the existing volumes and that the overall growth in travel demand generated by local development would both utilize current and future underutilized capacity in the local road network and added local capacity, and be offset by changes in travel behaviour arising from the extensive improvements to the GO Transit, local transit, cycling and pedestrian networks elements serving planned to serve the central area.

The AM Peak Hour traffic volumes illustrated in the Figure have been assembled from the best available source being the City of Toronto Transportation Services databases. The volumes have been adjusted modestly where necessary and have been rounded upwards to the nearest 25 vehicles per hour and only most relevant volumes have been illustrated.

The traffic which currently uses the eastbound on-ramp from Lake Shore Boulevard east of Jarvis Street and the westbound off-ramp to Lake Shore Boulevard and Sherbourne Street east of Sherbourne Street was re-assigned to the other available routes including the on-ramp from northbound Bay Street to the eastbound expressway, the westbound off-ramp to Yonge Street and Lake Shore Boulevard, the southbound off-ramp from the Don Valley parkway to Don Roadway, the northbound on-ramp from Don Roadway to the Don Valley Parkway, and the Richmond / Adelaide ramps from / to the Don Valley Parkway (not shown). The resulting key AM Peak Hour volumes were re-assigned to the Concept Plan road network and the results are illustrated in the second Figure.

It should be noted that the major stream of Gardiner Lake Shore Corridor traffic would generally be accommodated by the new embankment roadway and its ramp connections to the Don Valley Parkway and Lake Shore Boulevard east of the Don River. Given the one-lane in each direction configuration of these connections illustrated in the Concept Plan there would be less vehicular capacity than the current two lane ramps provide. However, the one lane ramps would provide the capacity sufficient to accommodate about 90 percent of the existing volumes experienced during the AM Peak Hour. This should be acceptable given the increasing capacity of the GO Transit system and the substantial additional capacity offered by the expansion of the local transit services both already planned and as described in the Concept.

The re-assignment shown in the second Figure demonstrates that the relatively lower volumes of the remaining traffic can be accommodated by the network of streets formed of Broadview, Villiers, Cherry and the portion of Queens Quay which would be extended east of Cherry.

The road network supports LRT operation on Queens Quay, Cherry, Villiers and Broadview and would accommodate a higher order rapid transit service along Lake Shore Boulevard east of Broadview, through the tunnel under the Don River and along the embankment road to Jarvis and further west to Union Station. The higher order rapid transit line could perform various functions including: a) providing a faster and higher capacity transit service between the core and the Beach Communities: b) provide relief of the Yonge Line and the Yonge Bloor Station by providing an alternative rapid transit route to the core; c) support intensification of the Lake Shore Boulevard corridor east of the Don River to Leslie Street, and d) provide additional capacity to augment the road system in the area.

Harbour Lead Rail Line

As acknowledged in the competition brief, use of the Harbour Lead rail line, its bridge across the Don River and the related Keating Rail Yard, has dropped off significantly over the past decades. While we appreciate the desire of rail authorities and serviced industries to maintain these facilities, we believe that the transformative potential of a comprehensive revitalization of this area should take precedence over this requirement in the brief. The incorporation of this rail facility into the revitalization proposal would have significant negative impacts on the potential of the overall endeavor. The cost. (both financial and physical), or replacing the rail infrastructure may not be economic and ultimately the transport needs of the serviced industries may much more cost effectively be serviced by truck. Accordingly, the Concept Plan has been developed based on that expectation and attendant abandonment of rail service dependent on the Harbour lead rail line across the Don River.



A New Identity for Transportation and Infrastructure While meeting the transportation demands we prioritize transit, pedestrians, cyclists and establish a new human scaled urban tissue that is bound to the experience of the water.

and the state of the

Iconic Infrastructure

Structures of movement can become landmarks within the public realm that bring a strong identity to the district. Here, a language of expressive structures can expand upon the timber work being constructed at points along the Central Waterfront.



Signature Bridges Crossing the Don River

The connection from Lake Shore Boulevard over the Don River should be celebrated with a signature bridge designed by Cecil Balmond.

(below) Examples of a pedestrian bridge design by Cecil Balmond in Coimbra, Portugal which suggests the kind of expressive structure to define the mouth of the Don.





Tunnel Portal - Design

Splendour At the mouth of the tunnel portal – the moment Lake Shore Boulevard dives under the Don River – we create an iconic symbol and gateway to the city. Using expressive timber structures, the tunnel portal can be the place for a spectacular canopy structure that creates a memorable gate experience.



Canal Bridges The form and detailing of pedestrian timber bridges and Wavedecks from the Central Waterfront can be continued along the Keating Channel for coherence as a unified water's edge all the way to the Don.



Transportation Connections West Connection, Embankment Road to existing Elevated Gardiner Expressway (west of Jarvis)



DON VALLEY PARKWAY DATES COLD AND 198 205,107 dis 7404 (220) 4.7 1010 Antique 0101 o inter Tax 11102 128.01 ~ 1 R150.0 ----..... -23. Ξ. DON ROADWAY

East Connection, Embankment Road to Don Valley Parkway

Potential Phasing Strategy for the Scheme

1. Existing

2. Embankment Road

3. Tunnel Connection From Lake Shore Blvd. to Embankment Road

4. Lake Shore Reconfiguration and Extension of Broadview





8. Queens Quay Extended with Transit Connection to Lake Shore Loop

2. NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDORS TO THE LAKEFRONT

Toronto Built an Infrastructural Wall

Intrastructural Wall Seemingly without notice, the city accummulated a thick band of infrastructures that have cumulatively created a 'wall' separating city and lakefront. By addressing the north-south corridors, we take on the collective problem of the rail berm and Gardiner as one, to provide a solution for both the connectivity between the city and the waterfront and the need for a strong memorable identity for the streetscape routes and gates.









1812 to be a city

1915-1975



23

1975-2000



1965 divided city

1916 one city



2010 re-emerging city



2020 re-connected city



Wall of Opportunity

Overcoming the Barrier There exists an incredible latent potential to not only beautify the viaduct, but rather develop it as a genu-ine peice of the city fabric, focused at the north-south crossings.
















Actions to Achieve North-

South Connectivity Today, we encounter the waterfront through a series of miserable viaducts. To uncover their latent potential as city gates we will:

1. Widen the openings to nearly double the sense of openness;

2. Excavate depth to increase floor-toceiling height;

3. Use pre-fabricated construction tech-niques but add claddings of warm materials:

4. Add program wherever possible to invite the urban vitality and streetlife to pen-etrate the wall and enhance the continuity of urban tissue and activity to the water's edge.

What form to connect with Toronto's Local Identitites?

Toronto is a city of culture and diversity - multi-culturalism is in its DNA. The potential of the new city-gates lies in how their form and content can embrace the local, everyday functions and activities of the city. By emphasizing the continuity of urban programs rather than cliches of 'gateway representa-tion', the body and soul of the city can extend seam-lessly to the water's edge. This simple action could propel Toronto's rail berm wall into the civic gate for the 21st Century.

The streetscapes leading from the city to the lake have long been neglected in the debate about waterfront connectivity. By concentrating on the quality and character of these north-south routes we are able to fulfill the desire for a fully connected urban fabric to the water's edge.



Existing Conditions Each of the streetscapes hold their own particular potential, related in part to their historical form and the functions of the neighbourhoods which have grown around them.









41 WEST 8 + DTAH with Cecil Balmond, Arup, Halsall Associates, BA Group / Gardiner Expressway & Lake Shore Boulevard Reconfiguration







LAKESHORE BLVD. W.

QUEENS QUAY BLVD.

LAKESHORE BLVD. E.

QUEENS QUAY BLVD.

LAKESHORE BLVD. W.

BLVD.

SHIP CHANNEL BRIDGE

KEATING CHANNEL BRIDGE

BRIDGE

SUNLIGHT PARK RD.

COMISSIONERS ST.

UNWIN AVE.

front.

A Collection of Key Figures Within the Urban Fabric that are Able of Unlock the City and Its Waterfront These routes reflect the diverse character and (sometimes obscurred) identity of the city. Above all, the gates facilitate the continuity of the urban tissue to the water's edge. In each case, public programs or public spaces are integrated within the north-south passage between the city and the waterfront. These programs and spaces are born out of the local condi-tion and character of the streescape and district. They produce a new identity and experience at the threshold of the water-00000 Ш эс ЭГ ЭГ 猆 80 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 1 4 The Mouth **Market Wharf** Park Gate **Mouse Hole Parliament House Distillery Gate Fish Bone Cherry Straw** Berm Gate Jarvis Sherbourne Aitken Parliament Trinity Cherry West Don Lands Don River Park Don River





Jarvis

Extents: 3.2 km from Bloor Street to Queens Quay Boulevard

Historical Background: Named after William Jarvis, Provincial Secretary and Registrar of Records (1792-1817) - it was created between 1846-1851 along with Mutual and George streets, subdividing properties formerly owned by the Jarvis family. By the 1870s Jarvis became one of the most fashionable addresses in Toronto bordered on addressess in Toronto bordered on both sides by rows of mansions and trees.

Cocce

Existing Landmarks: Sugar Beach, RedPath Sugar Factory, St.Lawrence Market, St.James Cathedral, Ontario Court of Justice, Jarvis Street Bap-tist Church, Allan Gardens, National Ballet School of Canada, Jarvis Collegiate.

Neighbourhoods Within Cross-Section: St.Lawrence, Old Town, Garden District, Moss Park, Church-Wellesley Village, Upper Jarvis.

Jarvis Open Market Market Street and Lower Jarvis flank an expanded, flexible, open air temporary market space tucked under the rail berm. With the existing ground plane lowered to provide a more generous floor-ceiling height, a new public space that can host diverse events is created in the heart of the St.Lawrence District.



Sherbourne

Extents: 3.3 km Sherbourne St. runs from Queens Quay E. ending in South Dr., north of Bloor St. E.

Historical Background: It was named after the town of Sherborne in Dorset, England, home of the Ridout family who immigrated to North America in the 1790's.

Landmarks: Sherbourne Park, The Esplanade, David Crombie Park, Moss Park.

Neighbourhoods Within Cross-Section: St.Lawrence, Old Town, Garden District, Moss Park, Cabbag-etown South, Cabbagetown, Upper Jarvis, St.James Town, Rosedale.



Sherbourne Green Gate A bicycle-friendly passage separated from vehicular traffic which draws visitors into an inner world on the way towards the Sherbourne Common and the lakefront.



3

Parliament

Extents: 2.75km Parliament St. runs from Queens Quay E. to Bloor St.E.

Historical Background: Parliament Street commemorates the first location of the Parliament buildings planned south of Front and Berkely streets by Lieutenant Governor Simcoe. Completed in 1797, the buildings were burned down during the 1813 American invasion, then rebuilt and burned again during a chimney fire in 1824. The marginal, marshy eastern harbour location was deemed unhealthy and unsuitable by this time and new government buildings were eventually relocated to Queen's Park in 1892.

Landmarks: Archeological site of first parliament buildings, Parliament Wavedeck, Victory Soy Mills Silos, Distillery District, The Esplanade, Regent Park, St.James Cemetery

Neighbourhoods Within Cross-Section: Distillery District, West Don Lands, Old Town, Corktown, Moss Park, Cabbagetown South, Regent Park.



Parliament Gate

Leading from a new archeological park on the site of Upper Canada's first Parliament buildings, this brick-clad gate widens the viaduct structure and provides a generous pedestrian environment. This widening invites a more seamless interface with animated streetfrontage from the Distillery District and St. Lawrence neighbourhood to flow towards Parliament Wavedeck and the lake.









The Site of Toronto's Early Beginnings: First Parliament

(Top) Images of Upper Canada's first parliament buildings, partially burned to the ground in the War of 1812. The archeological remnants still exist, and offer the potential for a cultural centre/museum set within an archeological park - the ultimate green anchor at the seam of St.Lawrence and Distillery neighbourhoods. Archeological Remains Within a New Park (Above) We propose to unearthing the covered-up remains of the Parliament buildings as a feature of a new park design. Marking the footprints of the 3 historic buildings plus adding a new Toronto Museum of Heritage within the park make this a living monument in the heart of an emerging district.





Toronto Heritage Museum at the Original Parliament Archeological Site An underutilized lot at the corner of Front and Parliament Streets hides the archeo-logical remnants of Upper Canada's first parliament building. Here, lies the promise of an archeological park and new Heritage Museum that explores the often-over-looked history of the City of Toronto.



Trinity Gate Trinity Square is framed by a public tri-bune which leads into a passage of ate-liers under the rail berm. Here, visitors from the Distillery District move from examples of Victorian era industrial architecture into a 21st Century brick wharehouse district which culminates in a cultural ensemble of buildings around the iconic Victory Soya Silos.



Cherry

4

Extents: 2.7km Cherry St. runs west of the Don River from Lake Ontario to Shuter St., changing its name to Sumach St. north of King St. E.

Landmarks: Cherry Beach, Toronto Windsurfing Club, Keating Channel, Cherry Street Bridge, Athletes' Village (Toronto 2015 Pan Am Games),

Neighbourhoods Within Cross-Section: Distillery District, West Don Lands, Corktown, Trefann Court.

Potential Program: Recreation – skate park under viaduct Convenience Retail/Supermarket built within rail embankment

00000000000



passage.

New Pedestrian Passage at West Donlands to Canal District Island

Potential Program: Simple excavation bored through rail embankment to allow for pedestrian and bicycle connection between two neighbourhoods. Emphasis on creating skylights between tracks to allow for natural light into the public









Special Iconic Buildings are Set Within the District to Reinforce Local Identities and Civic Connections These buildings should be designed with the highest level of architectural quality and work on an urban level as civic gateways. Their positioning within the plan helps to draw people towards the landmarks and associated public spaces.

A A A A A

11

000000000000

055000000000000000000



High Density, Low-Mid Rise The proposal posits that Toronto seems to be trapped in a habit of producing the same urban forms of development, irregardless of site location. We put forward a proposal built upon a notion of diverse, fine grain urban tissue. Diversity of building types, diversity of development and parcelization models, diversity of population demographics that better represe the diversity and DNA of Toronto itself. The economic logic is links closely with creative economies and the desire for a more sustainable development model.

3. CANAL DISTRICT & URBAN EXTENSION OPENS UP THE EAST

Unlock the Redevelopment Potential of the East This proposal puts forth an urban program of districts including the East Bayfront (Jarvis to Parliament), The Canal District (Parliament to Don), and the East Donlands. The creation of a strong identity through the Canal District opens up the development potential east towards the Beaches. With the removal of divisive infrastructure, neighbourhoods can come together at the mouth of the Don. The potential extension east to Leslie with the transformation of Lake Shore East distinguishes employment lands to the south in the Portlands while allowing neighbour-hoods such as South Riverdale and Leslieville to extend south towards the lake with a mixed housing/wharehouse district that embodies the creative culture of these neighbourhoods..

Coherence, Legibility, and Identity of the District The new urban districts gathered at the mouth of the Don can take clues from Old

The new urban districts gathered at the mouth of the Don can take clues from Old Town Toronto in terms of scale, materiality, and block structure. As in the St. Lawrence district, the predominant use of brick as a building material effectively unifies the place as a coherent and memorable district - seemingly independant of the quality of the architecture itself. In Barcelonetta (below) this city district distinguishes itself from Barcelona due to its consistent scale of built form and materials. Toronto's next waterfront precinct must set itself apart from the glass and steel and inhuman scale of some of the recent developments in the western downtown to guarantee its own sustainable future and quality of life for its inhabitants.











Evolution of Contemporary timber narrow building types which draw from the Harbour Heritage and Promote a Fine Grain Neighbourhood

















Water Living on the Island Next to the Metropolis Those fortunate enough to be among the 262 home-owners on the Toronto Islands are able to experience a truly unique format of living within the city of Toronto. We know from other water-cities around the world that these unique areas also tend to have the highest real-estate values. values.











Proliferation of 'Water Marketing' among Toronto's Condo Development

For those on the mainland, many of Toronto's staggering 500+ condo buildings compete for sales with promotional materials distinctly targeting water lifestyles. The relationship with water offered by these developments has been mostly reduced to a room with a view from high up in a generic skyline.



features a generously landscaped courtyard and lush outdoor





Eau, they love it

Suzanne Wintrob, National Post Salurday, Jun 19, 2010 Looking to own a piece of waterfront? By the looks of it, developers think everyone does and are eagerly pumping their high-rise and low-rise waterfront properties to anyone who will listen.

From Cobourg to downtown Toronto and all the way to Oakville and Burlington, the waterfront is abuzz with activity. Projects already on the market are pushing their last remaining units, while new developments are either awaiting final approval or are under construction and set to launch.

"People everywhere view waterfront ownership as a sound investment, especially in high demand areas," says Marc Hewitt, president of Niche Development Lich building Oakville's Edgemere Private Residences. "Waterfront land is a commodity, and in urban areas such as the GTA, it's a scarce commodity. That makes it a sound investment and something people take great pride in owning."

While Muskoka chairs and pesky black files may be missing from this urban waterfront equation, it's the idea of waking up and gazing out at the lake --or walking the dog a block or two to it -that has purchasers hooked. Even the well-chosen names -among them Bluwater, River City, South Beach and Westlake-conjure up thoughts of sand castles and seagulls in a bid to beighten sales.

The lifestyle is so desirable that a decade ago the governments of Toronto, Ontario and Canada joined forces to create Waterfront Toronto, charged with overseeing the renewal of Toronto's waterfront. Derek Goring, director of development at Waterfront Toronto, says the corporation is taking a "holistic" approach to waterfront development by creating people-focused neighbourhoods with a mix of residences, commercial and retail space, public spaces, plus community necessities such as childcare, schools, community centres, libraries and access to transit.

Initially, 13,000 residential units are planned for Toronto's East Bayfront and West Don Lands areas -- 7,000 and 6,000 respectively -- with another 27,000 units expected over the next decade in those 'hoods plus North Keating by the Don River. At least 20% will be affordable housing, says Mr. Goring, and 20% will be rental. All will be LEED Gold-certified. One-quarter of residential design will be devoted to public green space, he adds. In fact, this summer, Canada's Sugar Beach at the foot of Jarvis Street and Sherbourne Park at the foot of Sherbourne Street will open in the East Bayfront area, with construction starting later this fall on Underpass Park and Don River Park in the West Don Lands.

"What makes Toronto's new waterfront communities so appealing is that, not only are they at the water's edge, but they are also in the heart of the city," says Mr. Goring, "This waterfront gives people the best of both worlds -- the beauty and tranquility of life at the lake and the culture and vitality of the urban experience."



Toronto's First District Born from its Relationship to the Water and Linked to the Downtown Core


Scheme Diagrams





Traffic Movement







Toronto Development Precedents

at a Range of Scales This sampling of small, medium, and large sized urban developments within a single parcel suggests that the market is prepared for a strategy of fine grained urban texture, diverse building types.





DUNDAS BUILDING -899 Dundas St W

Length: 7m Depth: 13m Floors - 3 Commercial at grade Residence and studio above Architect - Kohn Schnier



Length: 7m

Depth: 17m

Floors - 3

Residence above

Architect - Superkul Inc

SUPERKUL OFFICE -2208 Dundas St W

Length: 4m Depth: 25m Floors - 2 Office at grade and basement Residence above Architect - Superkul Inc



ALISON SMITH GALLERY -1412 Dundas St W

Commercial gallery and office at grade





Length: 8m

Depth: 30m

Commercial and Office

Floors - 6

RIVERSIDE LOFTS -747 Queen St E

Length: 11m Depth: 38m Floors - 4 Commercial at grade Units - 12

Developer - Streetcar Development Inc.



645 KING ST W



STAGEEAST LOFTS

Length: 16m Depth: 57m Floors - 5 Commercial at grade Residential units - 24 Architect - Raw Design

Developer- Neilas Inc.



2 OSSINGTON

Length: 33m Depth: 13m Floor s - 4 Units - 18 Largest Suite - 927 sq.ft. (?) Smallest Suite - 400 sq.ft. (?) Architect - SMV Architects Developer - NDS Development



Length: 26m Depth: 28m Floors - 6 Units - 21 Largest Suite - 196.58m² (2,115.97f²) Smallest Suite - 50.45m2 (543.04f2) Architect - Raw Design Developer - Neilas Inc.



- 29 Camden Street

Length: 40m

Depth: 19m

Floors - 8

Units - 48

Largest Suite - ?

Smallest Suite - ?

Architect - Core Architects

Inc., Oleson Worland Architect

Developer - Dundee Realty,

Urban Capital Property Group



CAMDEN LOFTS

19 RIVER STREET

Length: 23m Depth: 37m Floors - 5 Units - 38 Height - 22.45m (73.65f) Largest Suite - 105.82m² (1,139f²) Smallest Suite - 71.44m² (769f²) Architect - IBI Group Developer - Streetcar Development Inc.





SYNC LOFTS - 630 Queen Street East

Length: 43m Depth: 31m Commercial - 700m² (7,534.74f²) Residential - 4,832.12m² (52,012.51f²) Floors - 8 Underground Floors - 2 Height - 27.24m (89.37f) Number of Residential Suites - 97 Architect - Arsenault Architects Developer - Streetcar Development Inc.



Depth: 32m

Floors - 11

Number of Suites - 95

Developer - BSaR

Architect - Core Architects Inc.

12 DEGREES CONDO - Beverley St and Queen St Length: 38m

570 King St W Length: 54m Depth: 57m Floors - 12 Largest Suite - 157.94m² (1,700f²) Smallest Suite - 41.81m² (450f²)

Number of Residential Suites - 320 Architect - Core Architects Inc. Developer - Freed Developments





FASHION HOUSE 473 Adelaide St W

Length: 16m Depth: 55m Floors - 11







THE WRIGLEY LOFTS

245 Carlavy Ave. Length: 25m Depth: 80m Floors - 5



CORKTOWN DISTRICT

Commercial - 430.86m² (4,637.74f²)

Smallest Suite - 42.74m² (460.05f²)

Largest Suite - 142.88m² (1,537.95f²)

Architect - Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Developer - Streetcar Development Inc.

569 King St E Length: 27m

Height - 21.4m (70.21f)

Depth: 27m

Floors - 6

Units - 46



549 King St E

Length: 28m Depth: 24m Floors - 6 Height - 21.2m (69.55f) Units - 48 Commercial - 512m² (5,511.12f²)Largest Suite -142.88m² (1,537.95f²) Smallest Suite - 42.74m² (460.05f²) Architect - Quadrangle Architects Ltd. Developer - Streetcar Development Inc.

Base Length: 26 Floors - 6 Units - 314



18 Yorkville Ave

Tower Length: 26 Depth: 52m Depth: 26m Floors - 30 Height - 107m (351.05f) Largest Suite - 249.63m2 (2,686.99f2) Smallest Suite - 43.76m² (471.03f²) Architect - Architects Alliance Developer - Great Gulf Homes

Application of Toronto Precedents to Typical Blocks Sample Development Scenerios











TYPICAL BLOCK - WEST OF CHERRY



А

60 RICHMOND



B

12 DEGREES



FASHION HOUSE

- KING BUILDING

С



D











С

Canal District View east along the Keating Channel





Then: Timber Piers, Wharves, and Sheds along the Harbour A vital land/water interface where the city and its lakefront were in continual exchange

Sanda Barra and a state

12.25

COLUMN .

Now: Canal Wharf Island A pedestrianized timber triangular island features an eclectic mix of dense, small-scaled wooden buildings inspired by the timber sheds and structures of the his-toric harbour wharfs. The island forms toric harbour wharfs. The island forms the centre of the Canal District, filled with cafes, bars, restaurants and boutiques and a market square. It is surrounded by a canal inlet, which serves as the final natu-ral UV stage in the water-cleaning process of the stormwater management system. Here, the canal becomes a central public amenity that is fit for canoeing, skating in winter – even swimming in summer!

Stormwater Infrastructure

as Public Amenity The inner 'V' canal branching off of the Keating Channel provides the infrastruc-ture for water-cleaning of stormwater for the overall district.







Island Water-Cleaning Machine The infrastructure here is the public ame-nity. Tanks set within the dockwall provide the first phases of watercleaning. The 'V' canal provides natural UV cleaning and can be linked to an area safe for swim-ming. Underneath the island lies a parking resource for the core of the district.

Timber Island, Intimate Scale Scaled for pedestrians, Timber Island will become the winter place for gathering with its intimate spaces and comfortable microclimate in all seasons.













Environment After The mouth of the Don River is opened up so it has space to breath, with a green shoreline that enhances the biotopes and aquatic habitat through the creation of islands, or shoals.





SUMMAF	٩	<u>.</u>	4		L	c				2					
Block Jumber	Block Description	Block Type	Site Area (Hectares)	E Maximum Block Height (m)	Average Block Height (m)	d Maximum Building Storeys	Total (GFA m ²)	Office %	Office (GFA m ²)	Retail %	(GFA m ²)	Residential 1 %	(GFA m ²)	Other % ()ther GFA m ²)
	EAST BAYFRONT														
- 0	Market Commercial	Pa Ds	18	5 20	5 20	1 6	4,357 55,614	%0 <u>/</u>	0 38,930	80% 30%	3,486 16,684	%0 %0	0	20% 0%	871 0
4	Commercial Commercial	Ds Ds	13	20 20	20	6	31,476 43,812	85% 85%	26,755 37,240	15% 15%	4,721 6,572	%0 %0	0 0	%0 %0	00
40	Residential Residential	S S S		20	20 20	999	11,274 10,962 18 540	%0 %0		10% 10%	1,127 1,096 1 854	85% 85% 85%	9,583 9,318 15,750	5% 5%	564 548 027
		S	2	07	20		0+0.01	0/0		0.01	100'I	8	501.01	8/2	170
800	Residential Mixed Use Commercial	Ds Ds	23 18	24 25	24 11	7 8 13	20,145 38,966 100,000	50% 80%	0 19,483 87.270	15% 30% 15%	3,022 11,690 16 365	85% 0%	17,123 0	0% 20% 5%	0 7,793 5.455
11	Mixed Use	n a a	20 26	40 40	33 22 27	13	73,618 108,282	20% 20%	01,273 14,724 10,828	10%	7,362	0.0 65% 65%	0 47,852 70.384	5% 20%	3,681 21,656
13	Residential Residential	DS SO	9	25 25	25 25	8 8	32,522	%0 %0	0	10%	3,252	%06 %06	29,270	%0 %0	0
15 16	Mixed Use Commercial	Ds Ds	10	35 52	35 41	11 17	65,967 133,717	20% 85%	13,193 113,659	10% 15%	6,597 20,058	65% 0%	42,879 0	5% 0%	3,298 0
17 18	Mixed Use Residential	Ds Ds	5 α	24 68	24 44	7 22	42,856 48,385	25% 0%	10,714 0	10% 10%	4,286 4,838	65% 85%	27,856 41,127	5% 5%	0 2,419
19 20	Residential Mixed Use	Ds Ds	17	20 25	20	8	14,694 64,355	0% 20%	0 12,871	10% 10%	1,469 6,436	85% 65%	12,490 41,831	5% 5%	735 3,218
21	Residential Residential	Ds Ds	9	124 24	67 23	41 7	96,227 42.229	%0 %0	0	10%	9,623 4.223	85% 85%	81,793 35.894	5% 5%	4,811 2.111
23	Mixed Use Residential	Ds	901	15	13	4	19,607 34,824	20%	3,921 0	60% 10%	11,764 3.482	0%85%	29.601	20%	3,921
25	Park	Pa	22	0	0	0	0	%0	0	%0	0	%0	0	%0	0
27	Residential	Sn Sn	100	33	26	10	42,359 15,205	10% 5%	4,236	5%	2,118	85%	36,005	0% 5%	760
28 29	Residential Residential	Ds	10	16 16	15 16	5	20,722 33,199	5%	1,036 1,660	5%	1,036 1,660	85% 85%	17,614 28,219	5% 5%	1,036 1,660
30	Residential	Ds	8	18	15	5	14,598	5%	730	5%	730	85%	12,409	5%	730
	EAST DON LANDS														
31	Commercial Residential	Ds	9	20	20	9	17,148 38.334	80% ///	13,718 0	20% 10%	3,430 3,833	%0% %0%	30.667	10%	3 833
33	Residential	S S S	28	20	20	099	89,244	5% 70%	4,462	5%	4,462	85%	75,857	5% 10%	4,462 4,343
35	Residential	2 2 2 2 2	18	20	20	999	62,226	5%	3,111	5%	3,111	85%	52,892	5%	3,111
37	Mixed Use	200	0 4 0	20	20	999	14,718	%0 %0	0	15%	2,208	80%	11,774	5%	736
39 39	Residential	Ds	10	20	20	9	34,716 37,854	0%0 0%	0	5%	1,730	%06 %06	31,244 34,069	5%	1,/30
40	Residential Park	Ds Pa	7 8	20	20	9	27,462 0	%0 %0	0	5% 0%	1,373 0	%06 %06	24,716 0	5% 0%	1,373
42	Park	Pa		0	0	0	0	%0 %0	0	%0	0	%0	0	%0	0
44	Mixed Use	Ds 2	16	88	44	22	43,356	5%	2,168	5%	2,168	85%	36,853	2%	2,168
45	Mixed Use Mixed Use	Ds	7	20	20 20	6 6	39,978 26,400	5% 10%	1,999 2,640	5% 15%	1,999 3,960	85% 70%	33,981 18,480	5% 5%	1,999
47	Commercial	Ds	8	20	20	6 A	27,852 75 408	90% 80%	25,067 60 326	10%	2,785 7 541	%0 %0	0	0% 10%	0 7 EA1
49	Commercial	Ds C	12	20	20	990	39,852	80%	31,882	10%	3,985	%0		10%	3,985
51	Park	Pa		0	0	0	0	%0 %0	0	%0 %0		%0		%0 %0	
53	Park Park	Ра Ра		00	0	0	0	%0 %0	0	%0 %0	0	%0 0%	0 0	%0 %0	00
	SOUTH OF														
	EASTERN														
54 55	Park Mixed Use	Pa Ds	32	0 20	0 20	9	0 61,536	0% 5%	3,077	0% 5%	3,077	0% 85%	0 52,306	0% 2%	0 3,077
56	Mixed Use Commercial	Ds	26	20	20 20	9	46,980 46.392	50% 75%	23,490 34.794	5%	2,349 2.320	40% 0%	18,792 0	5% 20%	2,349
58	Commercial	Ds	2	20	20	6 6	26,436 6 858	75%	19,827 6 858	5%	1,322	%0 %0	00	20% 0%	5,287
60	Residential	S	144	20	20	0 9	13,140	%0	0	5%	657 657	95% 95%	12,483	%0	
62	Commercial	200	1010	20	20	999	35,658	806	32,092	10%	3,566	0% 0%	0 0 0 0	0%0 2%0	1 405
64	Residential	50	יטמ	20	20	9	17,142	%0 %0	0 0	5%	1,403 857	95%	16,285	%0 %0	0
65 66	Commercial Residential	Ds	- 7	20	20 20	6 6	6,492 4,560	100%	6,492 0	%0 %0	0 0	0% 100%	0 4,560	%0 %0	0 0
67 68	Residential Mixed Use	Ds	90	20	20	6	19,860 31,980	50% 50%	0 15,990	0% 5%	0 1,599	100% 40%	19,860 12,792	0% 5%	0 1,599
69 70	Commercial Residential	Ds	7	20	20	6 6	31,680 15,912	90% 5%	28,512 796	10% 5%	3,168 796	90%	0 14,321	0%0	0
71	Mixed Use Commercial	Ds Ds	7 9	20 20	20 20	6 6	20,220 22,776	25% 90%	5,055 20,498	10%	0 2,278	75%	15,165 0	0%0 0%	0
73	Mixed Use Residential	Ds	9	20	20	9	14,190 28.764	%0 %0	0	5% 0%	710 0	80% 80%	11,352 25,888	15% 10%	2,129
75	Mixed Use	<u>ئەر</u>	0 8 7	20	20	999	63,204	25%	15,801	5%	3,160	65%	41,083	5%	3,160
77	Commercial	566	ο- 11 α	20	20	999	30,780 30,780	90% 90%	20,323 27,702 8.666	5%	1,539 1,539	0%0	0 0 25 065	%0	
79	Commercial	20	, ∞,	20	20	90	26,532	%06	23,879	10%	2,653	%0 %0	20,000 0	%0 %0) O (
80 81	Commercial Commercial	Ds Ds	6	20 20	20 20	6	13,368 15,282	90% 90%	12,031 13,754	10%	1,337 1,528	0%0	0	0%0	0
82 83	Mixed Use Commercial	Ds	17	20	20 20	6 6	45,762 21.444	25% 10%	11,441 2.144	5% 90%	2,288 19.300	65% 0%	29,745 0	5% 0%	2,288 0
84	Commercial	Ds	. ∞	20	20	6	27,078	10%	2,708	%06	24,370	<u>%0</u>		%0	
			867.40				2,718,532		U 905,775		0 298,305		0 1,371,543	1	0 141,369
PHASES	×	B	-		Auto-Calcul	ation		DISTRICTS ▲		۵	υ				
Description		Phase Number	1					Description		Site Area (Hectares)	Average Block Height	Total GFA			
								East Be	ayfront	60	18	176,035			
								East Do	Channel n Lands	274 231	24 15	1,095,435 646,038			
								South of	Eastern	303	19	801,024			

D - West8 + DTAH

Innovative Design Competition Master Plan Summary Table TEAM:

Block Number	Site Area	# OF BLDG	S BLD	۳ ۵	3LDG Height Stories	Foot	orint GF/	A MAX E Height	slock Max BLDG t Stories	
	-	7997	-	A	ى ك	-	4,357	4,357		
Total		8			5	~	4,357	4,357	5	-
	2	7773	e	< 8 (20 20	ى ى ى	1,675 1,596 - 200	10,050 9,576		
Total		18		د	20	9	0,269	55,614	20	9
	m	9227	с	< ₪ ()	20 20 20	ى ى ى	1,693 1,901 1,652	10,158 11,406 9,912		
Total		6			20	9	5,246	31,476	20	6
	4	3417	4	< m ∪ ⊡	20 20 20 20	9 9 9 9 9 9 9	992 1,999 1,973 2.338	5,952 11,994 11,838 14.028		
Total		13		1	20	9	7,302	43,812	20	6
Total	2	3368 3	~	A	20 20	9 9	1,879 1,879	11,274 11,274	20	9
Total	9	3188 3	-	A	20 20	9	1,827 1,827	10,962 10,962	20	6
	7	4617	~	A	20	9	3,090	18,540		
Total		S			20	9	3,090	18,540	20	6
Total	8	5028 5	~	A	24 24	7	2,747 2,747	20,145 20,145	24	7
	6	3034	5	A B C D I	ດ ຍ ຍ ຍ 72	∞ - - 0	2,549 3,904 2,498 2,986	19,542 5,205 3,331 6,967		
Total		23		ш	9	n n	1,680 13,617	3,920 38,966	25	8
v	0	7696	ى ا	< α ∪ □ ш	38 42 18 42	12 5 13 7	1,666 1,912 1,455 2,951 2,566	19,992 25,493 7,760 21,641 34,213		
Total		18			33	10	10,550	109,099	42 1	3
Total	1	0221 20	4	A B C D	40 14 1 22	13 6 7	2,455 2,095 5,087 481 10,118	31,097 8,380 32,218 1,924 73,618	40	3
~	2	5727	ω	≺аоошк	59 27 14 27	0 0 0 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,800 4,122 1,978 1,224 1,735	34,200 34,350 18,461 4,896 1,917 14,458		
Total		26			27	ω	12,009	108,282	59 1	9
Total	13	6746 7	-	A	25 25	∞∞	4,242 4,242	32,522 32,522	25	8
Total	14	5638 6	.	A	25 25	ωω	3,112 3,112	23,859 23,859	25	8
Total	15	9701 10	-	A	35 35	11	5,997 5,997	65,967 65,967	35 1	~
Total	16 1	5619 16	с	< ₪ ∪	52 43 29	17 14 13	2,830 3,710 3,983	47,167 50,703 35,847 133 717	53	2
		0357	.	Ā	PC	2 1	5 844	42,856	72	-
Total		930 <i>1</i> 9	_	z	24	- 2	5,844	42,030	24	7
	18	7698	с	≺ n o	24 40 68	7 13 22	2,595 1,060 724	19,030 13,427 15,928		
Total		8			44	14	4,379	48,385	68 2	2
Total	19	4600 5	÷	A	20 20	9 9	2,449 2,449	14,694 14,694	20	6

20	17229	4	CBA	15 22 25	4 M 8	2,556 4,722 2,459	11,076 31,480 18,852		
otal	17		٥	12 19	ი თ	884 10,621	2,947 64,355	25	8
21	9278	ę	× ۵	52 24	17	1,498 880	24,967 6 510		
otal	o		o n	24 124 67	41 22	009 1,592 3,979	64,741 66,227 96,227	124	41
22	10837	2	A	24	2	2,373	17,402		
otal	11		В	22 23	7	3,724 6,097	24,827 42,229	24	7
23	8841	9	< ⊑	4 0	4 0	1,384 334	5,536 779		
			ОDШ	15 1 3 1 4	444	1,405 645 1,067	6,088 2,580 4,624		
otal	б		ш	15 13	4 4	213 5,048	805 19,607	15	4
24	10005	ю	A B (21 22	9	3,478 885	22,027 5,900		
Total	10		υ	21 21	9 9	1,089 5,452	6,897 34,824	22	7
25 Total	21562 22	0	0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0	0
26	9869	5	۵ ک	18 33	5	1,750 3.106	9,333 33 025		
Total	10		<u>-</u>	26	o co	4,946	42,359	33	10
27	9967	e G	C B ≽	14 17 11	400	1,680 1,406 485	6,720 7,030 1,455		
Total	10		, ,	14	4	3,571	15,205	17	5
28 Total	6799 7	2	B A	14 16 15	404	2,314 2,457 4,771	9,256 11,466 20,722	16	5
29	9874	2	A B	16 16	ນມ	3,457 3.657	16,133 17.066		
otal	10			16	Ð	7,114	33,199	16	5
30 .otal	8496 8	2	A B	11 11 ع	4 9 0	1,552 2,107 3,659	8,277 6,321 14 598	18	Ľ
31	6161	N	A	20	e Q	2,108	12,648	2	,
otal	9		в	20 20	9 9	750 2,858	4,500 17,148	20	9
32 otal	10622 11	-	A	20 20	99	6,389 6,389	38,334 38,334	20	9
33	27864	e G	< ๓ (5 5 0 5 7 0	ဖြစ	2,617 4,722 7 525	15,702 28,332		
otal	28		c	20	စ	14,874	89,244	20	6
34 otal	28366 28	5	B A	20 20 20	999	3,473 3,766 7,239	20,838 22,596 43,434	20	9
35	17760	N	A B	20 20	9 9	5,643 4,728	33,858 28,368		e
0tal 36	18 10275	-	A	20 20	0 0	4,676	62,226 28,056	20	٥
otal	10			20	9	4,676	28,056	20	9
37 otal	4390 4	2	B	20 20	9 9 9	1,047 1,406 2,453	6,282 8,436 14,718	20	6
38 otal	11850 12	÷	۷	20 20	9	5,786 5,786	34,716 34,716	20	6
39 otal	9895 10	.	A	20 20	9	6,309 6,309	37,854 37,854	20	9
40 otal	7584 8	÷	A	20 20	9	4,577 4,577	27,462 27,462	20	9
41 -^fal	1596 2	0	0	0	0	0	00	c	C
42	1711	0	0	, o	0	0	0		'n П
otal 43	2 1576	c	c	0 C	0 0	0 C	0 C	0	•
otal	2		•	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 otal	15910 16	2	BA	68 20 44	22 6 14	750 4,476 5,226	16,500 26,856 43,356	68	22
45	14277	7	B A	20 20	99	4,243 2,420	25,458 14,520		
otal 46	14 6762	-	A	20	9 9	6,663 4,400	39,978 26,400	50	0
Total	7			20	9	4,400	26,400	20	9
47 otal	8406 8	-	A	20 20	6	4,642 4,642	27,852 27,852	20	6
48 otal	24107 24	5	4 8	20 20	မ က က	6,850 5,718 12,568	41,100 34,308 75,408	20	ç
49	12042	-	A	20	9 0	6,642	39,852	3	° 🗌
otal	12			20	9	6,642	39,852	20	9

50 Total	4436 4	0	0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0	0
51 Total	2345 2	0	0	0 0	00	00	0 0	0	0
52 Total	2272 2	0	0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0	0
53 Totol	630	0	0	0	0	00	0	d	
54	31959	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total	32			0	0	0	0	0	0
55 Total	18517 19	2	B	20 20 20	6 6	5,143 5,113 10,256	30,858 30,678 61,536	20	6
56	26466	2	BA	20 20	99	6,301 1,529	37,806 9,174	Ċ	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Total	26	c	<	20	9 0	7,830	46,980	20	9
57 Total	12606 13	2	B A	20 20	9 9 9	4,419 3,313 7,732	26,514 19,878 46,392	20	6
58	7158	5	B	20 20	6 6	2,501 1,905	15,006 11,430		
Total	7			20	9	4,406	26,436	20	9
59 Total	1932 2	.	A	20 20	9	1,143 1,143	6,858 6,858	20	9
60 Total	3934 4	-	A	20 20	9 9	2,190 2,190	13,140 13,140	20	6
61 Total	4066 4	~	A	20 20	9 9	2,201 2,201	13,206 13,206	20	9
62 T 4401	10043	5	8 ⊳	20 20	999	2,970 2,973	17,820 17,838 25.550	c	(
63	8617	.	A	20	9	4,950	29,700	01	
Total	6		·	20	9	4,950	29,700	20	6
64 Total	5169 5		A	20	9	2,857 2,857	17,142 17,142	20	9
65 Total	1855 2	÷	A	20 20	9 9	1,082 1,082	6,492 6,492	20	9
66 Total	1307 1	~	A	20 20	9 9	760 760	4,560 4,560	20	9
67 Total	5133 5	÷	A	20 20	9	3,310 3,310	19,860 19,860	20	6
89	9472	2	< □	20	99	1,962 2.260	11,772 20.200		
Total	თ		c	20	9	5,330	31,980	20	6
69 Total	9050 9	7	B A	20 20	9 9 9	2,639 2,641 5,280	15,834 15,846 31,680	20	S
20	7034	N	A	20	9	2,099	12,594		
Total	7		В	20 20	9	553 2,652	3,318 15,912	20	6
71	7411	5	B A	20 20	9 9	1,799 1,571	10,794 9,426	:	
Total	7			20	9	3,370	20,220	20	9
72 Total	6926 7	2	B A	20 20 20	9 9 9	1,898 1,898 3,796	11,388 11,388 22,776	20	6
73 Total	9177 9	~	A	20	999	2,365 2,365	14,190 14 190	20	с С
74	9272	5	A	20	9	2,390	14,340	ì	ì
Total	o		В	20 20	9	2,404 4,794	14,424 28,764	20	6
75	19360	5	ΒA	20 20	9 9	5,757 4,777	34,542 28,662		C
T otal 76	19 8522	0	Ø	20	9 4	10,534 2 456	63,204 14 736	20	9
Total	9	L	c m	20 20	9 9 9	2,456 2,456 4,912	14,736 29,472	20	6
Ш	17893	7	A B	20 20	9 9	2,848 2,282	17,088 13,692		
Total	18			20	9	5,130	30,780	20	6
78 Total	10756 11	5	B A	20 20 20	9 9 9	3,529 2,241 5,770	21,174 13,446 34,620	20	9
79	7823	7	< 8	20 20	9 9	2,211 2,211	13,266 13.266		
Total	ω		•	20	9	4,422	26,532	20	6
80 Total	3982 4	.	A	20 20	9 9	2,228 2,228	13,368 13,368	20	9
81 Total	6385 6	~	A	20 20	9 9	2,547 2,547	15,282 15,282	20	6
82	17303	2	۸ ۵	20	9 9	4,326 3 301	25,956 10 806		
Total	17		2	20	9	7,627	45,762	20	9
83 Total	7140 7	-	А	20 20	9 9	3,574 3,574	21,444 21,444	20	6







101 WEST 8 + DTAH with Cecil Balmond, Arup, Halsall Associates, BA Group / Gardiner Expressway & Lake Shore Boulevard Reconfiguration