

# Public Meeting Report

December 12, 2011 Public Meeting, Toronto Reference Library, 6:30 – 9:00 pm

## ATTACHMENT A. Questions of Clarification

Following a presentation by John Campbell – President and CEO, Waterfront Toronto and John Livey – Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto, participants were asked to discuss and identify questions of clarification. Below is a summary of questions asked (in the order they were asked) at the meeting along with the responses provided. It is not intended to serve as a verbatim transcript. A number of additional questions were asked in the 40 written table reports and 67 individual discussion guides completed. These additional questions are listed in a separate chart that follows the chart below.

#	Questions Asked at the meeting	Responses <i>Provided by John Campbell (JC) – Waterfront Toronto, John Livey (JL) – City of Toronto, and Brian Denney (BD) – Toronto &amp; Region Conservation Authority</i>
1	Would the public consultation process be demeaned at the expense of early shovels in the ground?	JC: Absolutely not. Our intent is to look at accelerating development but not to demean or undermine the quality in any way.
2	Given that the Don Mouth EA has been completed, why would we be considering other options? Are all parties committed to renaturalization?	JC: We want to look at options for financing and phasing the preferred alternative from the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA. All options we examine will be within the EA's Terms of Reference – flood protection, city-building, and naturalization of the river. Those objectives will stay in place.
3	Why do you want to speed up the process, how quickly, and what will be jeopardized?	JL: We think that there is a general desire to have things happen quicker in the Port Lands. While recognizing that things don't happen over night, we would like to see whether or not some areas or all of the Port Lands could be developed sooner than a 20 to 30 year timeline. JC: The pace of development on the waterfront under our current model is primarily driven by residential uses. Under this model, it would be necessary to burn off the inventory in East Bayfront, West Don Lands, and the central waterfront – probably 12-15,000 units – before tackling land in the Port Lands. Through this process we will examine options that do not depend as much on residential absorption rates, e.g. through uses such as research clusters.
4	What is going to City Council in June, will it be statutory or not, who will it bind, and is it appealable?	JL: At the June Council meeting we will present a non-statutory report on the public consultation effort and objectives established through this process. It will give us some sense of what we need to do to keep moving forward with the EA and whether there's any tweaking or changes that may be needed. JC: We want to go to Council with a broad consensus – that is, we hope this public consultation process will help ensure that the plan we take to Council has broad public support.
5	Will an overview of financial models in terms of strengths and weaknesses be conducted through this process and who will do this?	JL: An overview of financial models will happen through this process and that material will be presented at future public meetings.
6	What plans are being considered to maintain community sailing, rowing clubs, and marine uses?	JC: We conducted a marine study that featured the participation of the Toronto Port Authority, port users and recreational boaters that looked at how we enhance and preserve these uses.
7	What are the existing financing tools under consideration? Is the issuing of bonds feasible?	JL: There are a number of ideas that have potential, including: the traditional tri-party model, bonds backed by Waterfront Toronto or the City of Toronto; development charges; tax-increment financing/granting, through Community

		Improvement Plans, and other fees and charges. We are looking for participants to suggest some creative tools that they would like us to explore. We are also looking at the feasibility of financing in phases. JC: We are retaining consultants for certain pieces of work to help us tap into the best financing tools that are available.
8	Flood protection unlocks the value of the Port Lands. We have spent a lot of time and money on the EA, and came to a preferred alternative that was approved by City. We would like you to confirm that what we're looking at is building on that work that has already been done, that we are not looking for other alternatives than what has already been identified and studied through many years. I think we had understood that what was happening at this point with the results of that study process was a re-evaluation of the validity of the conclusion as opposed to looking at further alternatives.	JL: We have asked for the Province to pause the EA so that we can ensure we have best EA we possibly can, consistent with the terms of reference. The TRCA will give us some insights on whether there is some tweaking or changes that will improve the feasibility of the preferred option. We're also going to go back to a couple of the options and see how they compare to the preferred option. BD: I would just confirm that from TRCA's perspective, the underlying principle of meeting the requirements of the Provincial flood plain policy for large scale redevelopment to take place in this area has to be accomplished, and we also have to meet the requirements of the terms of reference that said we will do a substantial regeneration of the Mouth of the Don and we're committed to doing that. There may be some ways that we could tweak certain aspects of it that would add to the prospects of making it more developable in the short-term, or perhaps reconfigure blocks slightly so that they are more attractive for private sector investment, but the principles that we went into the EA with are still very much with us and we intend to fulfill those.
9	What is the anticipated water access for the public?	JC: Through prior planning exercises we had envisioned this area as having a greater level of public access than the central waterfront due to naturalization of Don – primarily through opportunities for water access for canoes, kayaks, etc.
10	Why acceleration? What is being lost? Will things like sustainability standards and the affordable housing component be reduced?	JC: This is not an effort to develop at the cost of core values. This is not a trade-off exercise to do things cheaper. Perhaps we will move forward in phases, but we will not demean the quality of what has been done.
11	What is the new phasing order in the accelerated process? Will it be naturalization, then infrastructure, then development?	JC: It is early to say what the exact phasing will be as it will be determined through this process. One potential option is to look at developing things outside of the flood plain first.
12	Does acceleration oblige us to have short term gain at the expense of long term gain from development investment?	JL: You can't just plan the short-term and leave the long-term to another day. You've got to have that broader picture – that's what we're trying to do. JC: One of the opportunities of this exercise – because we're looking at the entire Port Lands now – we can take a much longer-term vision instead of strictly looking at the Lower Don Lands.
13	What is the allocation for residential/office buildings versus open space and sports facilities?	JC: All of the waterfront plans and the precinct plans we've done to date have included a fairly generous public realm. It's a bit premature to say today what any ratios might be between residential and commercial and parkland for example. JL: The Port Lands are an asset for all of Toronto. It represents a great possibility for recreational opportunities for every resident of the City of Toronto.
14	The notification for this meeting referred to the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan, will you use this plan as a basis moving forward. Why wouldn't naturalization increase land value?	JC: To answer your last question first, it would. The Master Plan for Lake Ontario Park is done, it hasn't received Council approval yet, but it will be feeding in and informing our plans for the Port Lands.

# ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

In addition to the questions asked (and answered) at the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, there were 265 questions of clarification recorded by participants in the 40 written table reports completed at the meeting and in the 67 individual discussion guides received. All 265 questions were grouped by theme into the following 14 categories:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| A. Current Plans/Principles                     | H. Existing Land Uses/Existing Buildings |
| B. Acceleration                                 | I. Environmental Implications            |
| C. Timeline                                     | J. Land Use Planning                     |
| D. Status of Don Mouth Environmental Assessment | K. Parks and Recreation                  |
| E. Authority                                    | L. Process/Public Consultation           |
| F. Financing                                    | M. Public versus Private Development     |
| G. Transportation/Infrastructure                | N. Other                                 |

A number of similar questions were asked within each of these 14 categories, so in many cases one question has been identified by the Independent Facilitation Team that represents the intent behind several similar questions. This process reduced the total number of questions from 265 to 45. These 45 questions and answers to these questions are in the left column in the table below while all 265 questions are documented in the right column of the chart below.

#	Collapsed Questions and Responses	Detailed Questions
	<b>A. CURRENT PLANS/PRINCIPLES</b>	
1	<p><b>Why is the plan being re-examined when we already have a plan?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>Because City Council asked us to undertake a review as part of the work to create a high-level road map for accelerating development and maximizing the value of the Port Lands as a city legacy. Note that the review is looking at the whole Port Lands and not just the Lower Don Lands areas.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we being asked to compromise on all the good work that's been done before? Is this about compromising or accelerating?</li> <li>• Why "Stay with the Keating Channel" isn't still an option? Without the 600 million up front investment?)</li> <li>• Why not go ahead with the existing plan?</li> <li>• Status of existing plan?</li> <li>• Are we following the original agreed upon and previously approved plan?</li> <li>• Is there a danger that politicians could re-discuss and alter the current vision?</li> <li>• Why are solid plans – good plans – being revisited?</li> <li>• Where does the Port Lands plan that has already been created sit? How will it be incorporated in to plans as they move forward? (Michael Van Valkenburgh) Design in particular</li> <li>• Is there any way to protect what has been accomplished now from side swiping?</li> <li>• What can we do to protect this process from being derailed again like it has been in the past?</li> <li>• How does this "acceleration" initiative actually speed things up, given that we are re-examining work already done?</li> </ul>

<p>2 <b>What was the original plan? Why was it inadequate?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>In 2003, the City of Toronto adopted the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, which outlines the planning framework for the designated waterfront area, including the Port Lands. There have been a number of plans specific to the Lower Don Lands area in the Port Lands, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Lower Don Lands Framework Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>The Preferred Option from the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA;</i></li> <li>• <i>The Lower Don Lands Infrastructure EA;</i></li> <li>• <i>The West Keating Precinct Infrastructure EA;</i></li> <li>• <i>Official Plan amendments 388 and 389 to support the above plans; and</i></li> <li>• <i>The West Keating Precinct Plan Zoning By-Law amendment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>A Lake Ontario Park Master Plan has also been completed but not submitted to Toronto City Council. The review was initiated, not because of inadequacy, but to determine how to deliver the Port Lands vision in light of fiscal realities.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the original waterfront plan?</li> <li>• Was it complete?</li> <li>• If so, what was inadequate about it?</li> </ul>
<p>3 <b>What impact will this process have on plans Waterfront Toronto already has in place?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>While building on existing goals for waterfront revitalization and the Lower Don Lands, changes to existing plans may be considered if they can provide an improved financial picture that will help offset the costs of Port Lands development. Phasing options that advance these goals may also be considered, but only within the existing Terms of Reference for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will WT and the City build on, if at all, on previous work done in the Port Lands such as 2008 Port Lands business and improvement plan?</li> <li>• What work is being done to integrate new Ashbridges streetscape schedule and Port Lands transit?</li> <li>• Where do the Pan-Am games fit in to the Port Lands? What do they mean to the Port Lands plan?</li> <li>• If accelerated, will any Waterfront Toronto objectives be sacrificed? (sustainability, affordable housing)</li> <li>• What goals not willing to sell?</li> <li>• What happens to the previously done background and planning studies, for example the Transit and Don River EAs and Lake Ontario Park?</li> <li>• What happened to the Lake Ontario Park Plan?</li> <li>• How will phasing or priorities be consistent with acceleration process?</li> </ul>

<p>4 <b>Will the flood protection, naturalization and healthy city building that are the central principles behind the Don Mouth EA be compromised in this accelerated process?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>No. The objectives identified in the Terms of Reference of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA will be adhered to, and include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Naturalize and rehabilitate mouth of the Don River</i></li> <li>2. <i>Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2</i></li> <li>3. <i>Manage sediment, debris and ice</i></li> <li>4. <i>Integrate infrastructure</i></li> <li>5. <i>Encourage recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and accessibility</i></li> <li>6. <i>Contribute to revitalization and sustainability of waterfront</i></li> <li>7. <i>Design and implement this project in a sustainable manner</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Also principles are included in the City of Toronto's Official Plan and Central Waterfront Secondary Plan.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the Waterfront Toronto vision be preserved?</li> </ul>
---	--

## B. ACCELERATION

<p>5 <b>What does acceleration really mean?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>It means studying the Port Lands overall, undertaking economic and market analysis and due diligence of existing plans to see if there are any viable opportunities to move development of the area forward more quickly.</i></p> <p><i>The intent is to take a fresh and wide-ranging look at the challenges and opportunities of developing the Port Lands, including examining phasing options, higher-value interim uses, and the feasibility of modifying or removing existing constraints.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does acceleration mean?</li> <li>• What are you accelerating?</li> <li>• What is the purpose of acceleration?</li> <li>• What is result of accelerating or other adjacent areas (WDL, EBF)</li> </ul>
<p>6 <b>Why are plans being accelerated?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Acceleration is necessary because without a plan to minimize public sector funding of development of the Port Lands, it is very likely that revitalization of this important waterfront asset will not happen and piecemeal development will continue to define the area.</i></p> <p><i>See response to #5 above.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does this need to be accelerated?</li> <li>• Why is there a need to accelerate the development of this area?</li> <li>• I am still confused about why acceleration is necessary?</li> <li>• Why are we exploring new ideas?</li> <li>• Why are you accelerating?</li> <li>• Is the plan changing to avoid slower (20 to 25 years) residential development to speed up money back to the city?</li> <li>• What is the urgency? Why accelerate the development in the Port Lands given the remediation work that needs to be done?</li> <li>• Why do you want to speed up the process and how quickly?</li> <li>• What is the rush? Why the need for sudden acceleration?</li> <li>• What is wrong with taking some time for proper development?</li> <li>• Why is this project being "speeded up"?</li> </ul>

<p>7 <b>What will have to be sacrificed / jeopardized?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Existing plans for the Port Lands may change as a result of the review of acceleration opportunities. Though it is too early to identify the exact nature of any changes, they could occur in any one of the following areas being looked at by the 7 subcommittees:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Implementation &amp; Finance</li> <li>• Planning &amp; Infrastructure</li> <li>• River &amp; Constructability</li> <li>• Public Consultation</li> <li>• Governance</li> <li>• Project Management and</li> <li>• Due Diligence Review.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any proposed changes will be presented and discussed in detail as part of the public and stakeholder consultation process.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does accelerating plan lower environmental, energy, or affordable housing standards?</li> <li>• What will be sacrificed by speeding up development process</li> <li>• Does acceleration oblige us to choose short-term gain or long-term gain from investment? Green infrastructure, no pizza development (balance of uses)</li> <li>• What are you willing to sacrifice in order to accelerate this process?</li> <li>• Will the acceleration of the Port Lands development lower the value of the land because we put too much development on the market at once?</li> <li>• Will the speed (6 months) of this process compromise the quality of the project because we don't want a second rate Port Lands</li> <li>• We are going to focus on the acceleration of the area, what do we have to forgo in other areas?</li> <li>• How is "desire" measured in the definition of the acceleration process and what system is used to represent the "value" characteristic to residents?</li> <li>• If sites outside the flood protection zone are to undergo "accelerated development" will this be conditional on first producing a master plan for the whole port lands, especially for the routing of roads, utilities and other infrastructure? If this is not the case, the danger exists of servicing for a quickly-developed site being in the way of ideal overall development in the long term. (Toronto would presumably not have built the Gardiner Expressway if the current waterfront revitalization had been imagined in the 1950s.)</li> <li>• Does this exercise threaten long-term optimal development by permitting short-sighted installation of roads and other infrastructure to support development of isolated sites?</li> </ul>
<p>8 <b>What is the hard evidence for an actual need to accelerate this process?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The Port Lands have the potential to be a major asset for Toronto; The acceleration initiative responds to Council's request for a review of all viable opportunities to make this happen.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the benefits of acceleration? Is it just an inherently long process? What is the upside of acceleration?</li> <li>• What options have been considered for accelerating the project?</li> <li>• What are the options for accelerating development?</li> <li>• Does acceleration model affect the funding model in place?</li> </ul>

### C. TIMELINE

<p>9 <b>What is the desired time frame for acceleration?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The timeline for redevelopment of the Port Lands will be one of the results of this process.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the timeline for this?</li> <li>• Completion time frames?</li> <li>• What is the timeline?</li> <li>• What is the schedule for completing the building?</li> <li>• What is timeline for acceleration – time to time?</li> <li>• Has Waterfront Toronto been given a timeline?</li> <li>• What is the timeframe for redevelopment?</li> <li>• What is the timetable for political decision making?</li> <li>• What are the expectations and timelines for implementation post May 2012?</li> <li>• If so, what are the timelines for this development?</li> <li>• What are the time lines for forecasting costs?</li> <li>• Timeframe?</li> <li>• Are the time frames being changed?</li> </ul>
--	---

## D. STATUS OF DON MOUTH ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

<p>10 <b>What is the status of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The Ontario Ministry of the Environment notified the Project Team that the MOE's review of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA will be on pause until September 30th, 2012.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we sticking to the original plans, as approved by council?</li> <li>• What are the implications for the Don Mouth and since that is up for review, what else of the original plan is up for review?</li> <li>• Is the naturalization of the Mouth of the Don a priority for the area?</li> <li>• Will this be led by realignment of Don?</li> <li>• What's the status of the Don Delta TRCA Naturalization proposal?</li> <li>• Don Mouth naturalization still?</li> <li>• I don't understand this process in relation to the Don Mouth EA options?</li> <li>• What if we stay with the existing EA?</li> <li>• What is the status of the current Don Mouth Environmental Assessment?</li> <li>• The status of the findings and conclusions of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project needs clarification. The preamble to the documents for the meeting uses the phrase "further options." What does this mean?</li> </ul>
<p>11 <b>Will the naturalized flood plan be altered?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Any proposed alterations proposed to City Council in June 2012 must be within the Terms of Reference of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a plan in place for naturalization and revitalization or is it being set aside? Why re-plan when money has been spent?</li> <li>• What are the options for naturalization of the Don Mouth and costs associated with the EA?</li> <li>• How will the acceleration process alter the current Naturalization plan?</li> <li>• How will we ensure that past planning efforts such as the EA and transit plans for the Lower Don are not reopened?</li> <li>• Will the current exercise produce proposals for different routes for the river or for different interpretations of the meaning of "naturalization" with different proportions of the site being given to marsh, green space, etc.?</li> </ul>
<p>12 <b>Are all the parties committed to naturalization?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>All parties are committed to maintaining the objectives identified in the Terms of Reference of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA. (note that objectives are listed in the response to question 4 above)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due diligence on options of existing EA – How do we ensure that no further options are being examined and being included now?</li> <li>• Given that an EA has been completed for the Don Mouth Naturalization. Why would we be considering other options?</li> </ul>
<p>13 <b>What process will be used to examine the options for Don Mouth Naturalization and flood protection?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Any proposed alterations proposed to City Council in June 2012 must be within the Terms of Reference of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can anything be built before re-naturalization at river?</li> <li>• What is the minimum amount of green that will be devoted to the naturalization of the Mouth of the Don?</li> <li>• What are the priority projects for developing the Port Lands? What is the phasing? Is naturalizing the Don River the first priority?</li> </ul>
<p>14 <b>How much money is estimated to be required in the actual re-naturalization of the Don River?</b> <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>It is the purpose of this Initiative to clarify how much money will be required for re-naturalization of the Don River.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-naturalizing estimates from all the mandatory infrastructure costs. Infrastructure costs such as, transit, roads, soil remediation, etc. are technically necessary, but re-naturalizing costs may be viewed by many Torontonians as an optional luxury. Those advocating the re-naturalizing have been very successful in lobbying Waterfront Toronto to include this aspect into Lower Don Lands plans, but these advocates do not represent a majority of Torontonians</li> <li>• I would like to know the projected cost of the re-naturalizing the mouth of the Don River, distinct from every other infrastructure cost. Currently, you do not publicly disclose the breakdown of the costs.</li> </ul>

## E. AUTHORITY

15	<p><b>Clarify the governance structure. Who are the players? And what are their roles?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City, Waterfront Toronto, and the Toronto Port Lands Company (TPLC) was executed March 31, 2006. This review of the Port Lands will be conducted within the terms of the MOU and will respect the existing governance model and roles including the relationship with the Provincial and Federal government partners.</i></p> <p><i>The Protocol agreed to by the parties in September 2011 spells out the roles and responsibilities of each of the key players: the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, TPLC and TRCA.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is running the project? Authority is highly confused.</li> <li>• Who will be involved in development in terms of builders?</li> <li>• TPA role?</li> <li>• Role of private owners?</li> <li>• What is the Federal, Provincial, and city ownership?</li> <li>• What is the role of the differing land owners, and authorities – how will private property be dealt with?</li> <li>• Does the mayor and council have the power to alter the carefully constructed plans of waterfront Toronto; for example by selling parcels of the Port Lands for profit and for the benefit of city debt reduction?</li> <li>• Have province and federal gov't agreed and TPA</li> <li>• How are the other governments (province and federal) going to be engaged to support and move this initiative forward?</li> </ul>
16	<p><b>What is the decision making process going forward?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>In June 2012, City Council will receive recommendations from the Executive Steering Committee for the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative, which includes John Campbell from Waterfront Toronto, John Livey from the City of Toronto, and Brian Denney from the TRCA. They work with 7 subcommittees:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Business Implementation &amp; Finance</i></li> <li>• <i>Planning &amp; Infrastructure</i></li> <li>• <i>River &amp; Constructability</i></li> <li>• <i>Public Consultation</i></li> <li>• <i>Governance</i></li> <li>• <i>Project Management and</i></li> <li>• <i>Due Diligence Review.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In turn, their work is informed by the extensive consultation process being undertaken.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is Waterfront Toronto obliged to proceed with any acceleration idea? <u>Who</u> determines when short-term gain beats long-term gain?</li> <li>• The current city admin is opposed to LRT's. Why are you talking about them in your presentation? E.g. Tonight's PowerPoint.</li> </ul>

## F. FINANCING

17	<p><b>What is the financial situation?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Development of the Port Lands requires a significant investment in public infrastructure which, given the fiscal realities of the day, is proving a substantial obstacle to moving forward. As a result, the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative is exploring ways to reduce the development cost to the public.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is really going on re: the financing of this project/area?</li> <li>• What are the financial plans?</li> <li>• It's impossible to make a rational, informed decision about this aspect of Port Lands development without knowing the costs of each part of your plans. The taxpayers who provide funding for Waterfront Toronto deserve the best value possible for their taxes</li> <li>• Detailed and distinct information about each aspect of the plan is crucial for the overall public to judge what they want done. If this Don River cost is not currently broken out of overall estimates, it must be done before any planning proceeds further. It is impossible for the general public to assess relative value otherwise.</li> <li>• What's the ratio of development value to cover the cost of expected \$ of required infrastructure? What does it look like?</li> </ul>
----	--	--



18	<p><b>What existing tools for financing are being considered for accelerating?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The Port Lands Acceleration Initiative will examine a number of different financing tools (including financial and policy tools, incentives, and delivery mechanisms) all of which will be proposed and discussed during the stakeholder and public consultation process.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the financial models and delivery methods for developing the Port Lands?</li> <li>• Financing model → what different financing models are under consideration?</li> <li>• We've heard a lot about financing and alternate financing in tonight's presentation- what does this mean?</li> <li>• Bond issue practiced in Toronto? Work? Hamberg, NY option applicable?</li> <li>• Existing financing tools that are under consideration? Bond issues?</li> <li>• What are the financial options available to city/Waterfront Toronto? I.e. Debentures</li> <li>• Will development charges be paying for the required work?</li> <li>• What are the ways to creatively finance the project?</li> <li>• What about joint-ventures?</li> <li>• Are there any immediate sources of funds – private or public for infrastructure / flood protection – funding needed to initiate development?</li> </ul>
19	<p><b>Will a review of financial models be conducted?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Yes. A review of financial models is being undertaken as part of this initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will evaluate financial models? To what degree will development offset costs?</li> <li>• What will be the status of the report of the financial consultants soon to be engaged?</li> <li>• If they recommend other means of financing the public realm, including the re-naturalization of the river and the infrastructure plans in the DMNPLFP, will these be adopted in place of accelerated development of other sites or will they be shelved as politically unacceptable?</li> </ul>
20	<p><b>Have you considered TIF's?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Yes. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is one of the many financial tools that will be considered through the analysis of financial models.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the possible alternate methods of funding, which ones are we legally allowed to do? For example, I hear that tax increment financing (or one of those similar) is actually illegal in Canada.</li> <li>• What about Tifs?</li> </ul>
21	<p><b>Does Waterfront Toronto need the ability to borrow?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>This would be discussed by the three government partners and Waterfront Toronto.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the three governments involved prepared to make any necessary administrative or legislated adjustments if the consultants find that Waterfront Toronto should be given authority to borrow or for WT or some other authority to issue bonds or for the city to use Tax Increment Financing?</li> </ul>
22	<p><b>How will the best financial plan be determined?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The acceleration initiative is the start of determining the best financial plan.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can we have a financial model that encompasses a fair and equitable process?</li> <li>• Financing – will the accelerated plan create an impetus to go the “easy way” (i.e. sell of land)?</li> <li>• What has to be decided and in what order before the report on financing? What is the sequencing of decisions?</li> <li>• Is there an economic analysis of remediation, flood mitigation and accommodating, other environmental considerations/foundations?</li> </ul>
23	<p><b>Will revenue generated from lands on the waterfront development be invested back into the waterfront?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>There is an agreement (the MOU) that public revenues from waterfront revitalization will go back to fund more waterfront revitalization.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we ensure that revenue for this project doesn't go towards other projects in the city?</li> <li>• Will the revenues generated in the Port Lands development process be reinvested in waterfront development only?</li> <li>• How are the capital requirements for the Port Lands being protected from City cash needs?</li> <li>• Financing – how do we ensure Waterfront Toronto has financial capabilities to implement any accelerated plan?</li> <li>• City protects financial proceeds?</li> </ul>

## G. TRANSPORTATION/INFRASTRUCTURE

24	<p><b>How will the Port Lands be connected through transportation to the rest of the city, by car, bike, and all other modes of transportation?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>Both transportation and connectivity are key considerations of the business and implementation plan developed through the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling and transportation – how will the TTC connect with Port Lands and how will pedestrianization?</li> <li>• Is the transportation plan and transit plan adequate for the planned residents and employment numbers? Adequate transit? Funding? LRT? Metro wide accessible?</li> <li>• Can the TTC keep up with service in Port Lands?</li> <li>• To what extent will transportation (public transit) issues be addressed in conjunction with the acceleration strategy?</li> </ul>
25	<p><b>Will LRT come before or after development revenue?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>At this point it is too early to tell but transit remains a key infrastructure requirement for the Port Lands.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transit timing and LRT?</li> <li>• How guaranteed is the funding for transit and other public amenities. What are the risks moving forward, i.e., possible ways that this can be derailed, especially with current funding constraints with TTC, the current governance structure, and current mayoral regime? What can we do to help proactively avoid any potential roadblocks, say through proactively gathering public support?</li> </ul>

## H. EXISTING LAND USES / EXISTING BUILDINGS

26	<p><b>How does Waterfront Toronto plan to use/deal with existing structures such as the Hearn Generating Plant, LaFarge, and Heritage buildings?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>The City's Official Plan outlines the importance of heritage and makes particular reference to the Hearn as a potential catalyst for development in the Port Lands. Discussions with Lafarge, who intends to keep operating in the near term, are part of the consultation process. Waterfront Toronto has developed an overall plan for heritage buildings in the Lower Don Lands. The Plan identifies heritage buildings and seeks not only to preserve these elements but to reinvent them as actively programmed landmarks that enhance the character of the neighbourhood.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the plans for the Hearn to be integrated?</li> <li>• What are the options for existing structures e.g. Hearn?</li> <li>• How will this process resolve Lafarge's fundamental issue with the current plan – i.e. the current plan is premised on the need to close /relocate Lafarge's Polson St. terminal?</li> <li>• If the key issue is time and cost, how will the proponents work with Lafarge to preserve their existing operations?</li> <li>• How will a revised plan accommodate LaFarge cement plant? The current plan rests on the premise of cutting a river mouth through the plant, which LaFarge does not accept.</li> </ul>
27	<p><b>What guarantees exist to protect the rights of private landowners in the Port Lands going forward?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>Landowners are being consulted as part of the consultation process for this initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is happening to existing industrial?</li> <li>• How much expropriation of land privately held is anticipated? Is this really, really necessary?</li> <li>• Are you going to continue to store salt on the waterfront?</li> <li>• Is there a place in the Port Lands for the charter boat industry?</li> <li>• Will the area remain as it is?</li> <li>• What will happen to private lands in the area?</li> <li>• What guarantees exist to protect the rights of private landowners in the Port Lands going forward?</li> <li>• How will acceleration impact existing land uses such as the concrete campus at the east end and other incompatible land uses?</li> </ul>
28	<p><b>Is there anything that has to remain and what is the alternative?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <i>Existing leasing and planning permissions continue to apply.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on size/ownership/uses of the land</li> <li>• Is there a suspension on development while we go through this process? I.e. developing and leasing buildings?</li> <li>• Are you going to continue to lease available land?</li> </ul>

## I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

29	<p><b>What is the potential for renewable energy generation on site? E.g. wind, wave, geothermal, deep water heating/cooling, etc.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> Sustainability is a key principle of waterfront renewal and will be explored as part of overall infrastructure requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will this be powered and will net-zero objectives be considered?</li> <li>• Will this plan integrate sustainability?</li> <li>• When will all sewage be composted, natural gas methane received for fuel, and diverted away from lake</li> <li>• Energy and powering new sustainable buildings</li> <li>• Energy – zero energy is it a priority?</li> <li>• Renewable energy potential on site – infrastructure anticipated?</li> </ul>
30	<p><b>What are the soil conditions in the Port Lands and how are these conditions being dealt with? E.g. Soil pollution, soil remediation, and depth to bedrock.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> Soil and geotechnical conditions are being considered by the consultants tasked with assessing constructability issues. These include soil remediation, depth to bedrock, and ground water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be done with the contaminated soil? Does the problem go to another jurisdiction? Can they work around it? Piles – how deep do the footings go?</li> <li>• What will happen in the interim to the pollution that currently exists in the Port Lands?</li> <li>• Flood protection? Global warming – worse than H. Hazel?</li> <li>• Adequate sewage, remediation?</li> <li>• What is the status of soil remediation facility? Results of soil remediation?</li> </ul>

## J. LAND USE PLANNING

31	<p><b>What are Waterfront Toronto target proportions of affordable housing (%) within the Port Lands district?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> This will be considered as part of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative. The targeted proportions in other areas of the Waterfront (i.e. East Bayfront and West Don Lands) are 25% affordable (20% affordable rental and 5% low-end-of-market ownership).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the affordable housing mix and what is the revenue plan to support it?</li> <li>• Will there be affordable housing?</li> <li>• Affordable housing</li> <li>• Will there be a good mix of affordable housing vs. rampant condo development?</li> </ul>
32	<p><b>What will the land use designation be?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> This process will help determine the land use designations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there allocation for a certain % of residential, office buildings vs. open and green space, recreation</li> <li>• Land use – are there agreed upon targets (i.e. recreation, parks lands, condos) that will change through the process?</li> <li>• Is there an allocation for a certain % of residential and office buildings versus open and green space? I.e: land-use designation</li> <li>• Recreation/parkland ratio?</li> <li>• Land use proportions – residential, office</li> <li>• What is the relationship between commercial and recreational?</li> <li>• How are the uses in the area going to be prioritized?</li> <li>• Is there a possibility that there would be commercial development at the northern end at Tommy Thompson Park as shown on the attached map?</li> </ul>
33	<p><b>Why was the geographical study area selected?</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Port Lands is a clearly defined area in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why was this geographical area chosen and what uses are to remain?</li> <li>• Why are we looking at the whole Port Lands as opposed to breaking it down in to more manageable components?</li> <li>• Why has the geographical boundary been selected? Anything that has to remain?</li> <li>• Why can't we break it down into smaller more manageable pieces?</li> <li>• Why is the spit and Outer Harbour Marina not included in the Port Lands development plan?</li> </ul>

34	<p><b>Questions about specific initiatives</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>See responses in column to the right (in italics). At this early stage, few specifics are known.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a plan for continuous green space? <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>• Are there plans to build an airport on the Leslie Street Spit? <i>No.</i></li> <li>• Are you considering the flight path of the planes currently flying into the Island Airport? <i>Yes.</i></li> <li>• Can the Port Lands be used as a major central park? <i>To be determined.</i></li> <li>• Plans for large multi-use sports facility? <i>To be determined.</i></li> <li>• Does this initiative include the development of a yacht club? <i>To be determined.</i></li> <li>• What is the plan for south of Unwin Street? <i>To be determined.</i></li> <li>• Why did the accent in past presentations shift, from an emphasis on parkland and naturalization of the mouth of the Don, to a focus by John Campbell in his CBC interview, the Globe and Mail article, and the presentation on Dec. 12, on condo towers, commercial sports facilities and other commercial developments? <i>The entire Port Lands is being considered in this exercise, not just the Don naturalization.</i></li> <li>• How does the development of the Pan-Am athlete’s village impact planning/economics for the waterfront development? <i>The relationship between all waterfront development and the Port lands will be considered.</i></li> <li>• How much (either in absolute number, and/or percentage of development value) are we getting for Section 37 and what projects is it going to? <i>Too early to tell.</i></li> </ul>
35	<p><b>What are the density requirements? Deviations allowed?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>These will be determined through the acceleration initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much (either in absolute number, and/or percentage of development value) are we getting for Section 37 and what projects is it going to?</li> </ul>
36	<p><b>Is there any new accelerated land-use plan?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>The purpose of this Initiative is to produce a business and implementation plan that identifies opportunities for accelerated development.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why wasn’t a copy of the proposed land-use plan and current land-ownership map made available for reference?</li> <li>• Is this process directed to an end plan <u>OR</u> are we also looking at interim solutions (phases/temporary uses)?</li> <li>• What will the needs be for port facilities in the future? (Danger of selling off land that may be needed in the future if needs change, due to peak oil or a new ferry service to the US, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>K. PARKS AND RECREATION</b>		
37	<p><b>Where is consideration of the people that use the water?</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>Maintaining marine uses and access in the waterfront is a long standing principle of Waterfront Toronto and members of the boating community are being consulted as part of this initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community access is not just about viewing the water</li> <li>• What plans are being considered to facilitate secure cost effectiveness, stable, marine usage, specifically access for community sailing, rowing, paddling clubs and yacht clubs?</li> <li>• How does the plan allow for the existing users of the Waterfront and their facilities to continue (e.g. rollerblading and sailing clubs)?</li> <li>• What is the anticipated public water access?</li> <li>• What are the plans and intentions regarding the community sailing clubs e.g. Outer Harbour Sailing Federation?</li> <li>• Do not kick the community sailing clubs off the waterfront</li> </ul>
38	<p><b>Questions about parkland</b>  <b>Response:</b></p> <p><i>See responses in italics provided in column at right.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tommy Thompson park future? <i>Better connections between Lake Ontario Park and Tommy Thompson Park will be considered.</i></li> <li>• Park land connectivity to overall city waterfront? <i>Yes, will be considered.</i></li> <li>• Will everything south of Unwin Avenue be protected as parkland? <i>Too soon to tell – this will be considered during this Initiative.</i></li> </ul>

## L. PROCESS/PUBLIC CONSULTATION

39	<p><b>How is our voice translated into the actual design of the Port Lands?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>The public is heavily involved in the business and implementation plan for the Port Lands.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the public still able to implement or affect final design plans?</li> <li>• Is there an opportunity to be involved in the design?</li> <li>• How will design excellence be incorporated? Will there be a design review panel?</li> <li>• Will social media and online consultation include collaborative design?</li> </ul>
40	<p><b>How do we ensure that there is an effective public consultation process?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>A robust and comprehensive public consultation is required as part of the Protocol guiding the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (signed by the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, the TRCA and the Toronto Port Lands Company). In addition, an independent facilitation team of Lura Consulting and SWERHUN   Facilitation &amp; Decision Support has been retained to help ensure effective two-way communication takes places between the public, stakeholders, landowners, the City, Waterfront Toronto, TRCA and TPLC.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the public consultation process be demeaned at the expense of early shovels in the ground?</li> <li>• What has been approved, decided and/or received in terms of plans and therefore what is the current opportunity for the public to influence decisions?</li> <li>• Process – how will the existing process factor in? How will it be used?</li> <li>• What is your communications strategy to inform and solicit input from "non-usual suspects" to sell this project which will help as we run into problems with various governments? (inform so public can advocate)</li> <li>• If there are changes to plan it should go back to consult from the beginning</li> </ul>
41	<p><b>How will the Stakeholder Advisory Committee be chosen?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>SAC members represent a range and balance of interests in the Port Lands, both locally and from across the city as well as stakeholder representatives from the business and economic sectors, community sector and other sectors that advocate on behalf of other interests that may be impacted by the development of the Port Lands.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will stakeholders and advisory committee be selected?</li> <li>• Would I be able to join this organization to participate in the implementation of my proposal? Am willing to invest much time and knowledge</li> </ul>
42	<p><b>Can we see more in depth analysis of other models for waterfront?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>An in depth best practices review of financial models of waterfront development in other jurisdictions will be a part of the public and stakeholder consultation process in this initiative.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the context be examined before looking at the site specifically?</li> <li>• Can we have more in-depth analysis around world class examples to see how they apply here?</li> </ul>

## M. PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

43	<p><b>Will public space be compromised for speed of development?</b>  <b>Response:</b>  <i>New public spaces and access to public space are key core waterfront revitalization values.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are we going to make it publicly accessible?</li> <li>• How does this impact the mix (%) of public vs. private enterprise?</li> <li>• What percentage of lands is to remain a public asset versus lands intended for private development?</li> <li>• Is there a guarantee that public realm will not be decreased in quantity or quality?</li> <li>• How much access will the public still have under a public private partnership?</li> <li>• What happens with winter and public realm and water access during all four seasons?</li> <li>• How much public access will there be to the area?</li> <li>• Given the cities not the developer unless things change, is the goal to make money or improve access?</li> </ul>
----	--	--

---

## N. OTHER

---

44 **What is the priority, jobs or condos?**  
**Response:**  
*The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan calls for a mixed-use community set within the City's functioning port.*

---

45 **The presentation talked about co-operation among users. The Toronto Port Lands commissioned a study and did a presentation without Waterfront Toronto knowing. What controls are there on land users, and penalties if that was to repeat itself?**  
**Response:**  
*The Toronto Port Lands Company is signatory to the protocol guiding this acceleration initiative.*

---

# ATTACHMENT B. All Written Feedback Received

This Attachment contains all of the written feedback received in response to the Discussion Guides distributed at the December 12<sup>th</sup> public meeting and made available online following the meeting, including:

- Forty (40) table discussion guides
- Fifty (50) individual discussion guides

The questions from the discussion guides are as follows:

### Questions:

Please use the space below to identify any questions of clarification you have regarding the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative. Please put your 3 highest priority questions here.

### Focus Questions:

1. As Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto work together to create a development and implementation plan for accelerating development in the Port Lands, what are the top 3 goals they should be striving to achieve?
2. As Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto seek to accelerate development and maximize value of the Port Lands, what are the top 3 ideas you would like to see explored?

## TABLE DISCUSSION GUIDES

Note that tables are numbered for ease of reference only. Note that not all discussion guides included responses to all questions.

### Table 1

#### Questions for clarification:

- What are the financial models and delivery methods for developing the Port Lands
- Clarify the governance structure. Eg: Who are the players? And what are their roles and what are the time frames. Are the time frames being changed?
- Are we sticking to the original plans, as approved by council?

#### Focus question 1:

- Create a plan that is part of the fabric of the city that's vibrant, pedestrian acade, walkable, hear good concerns and with no big box retail, ensure the communities are affordable.
- Enhance and improve the existing natural environment for outdoor recreation and for wilderness
- Create a showcase of sustainability

#### Focus question 2:

- Accelerating development seems to contradictory and could flood the market with development. What does tweaking the plan mean?
- Don't compromise good design and plan by accelerating the plan/development
- Re-naturalizing the Don River should be part of the first phase to attract public development and investment to spur the next phase or phases.

### Table 2

#### Questions for clarification:

- Will the context be examined before looking at the site specifically? Concern expressed about ensuring generous and continuous public S. and non-negotiated transportation
- What can be done with the contaminated soil? Does the problem go to another jurisdiction? Can they work around it? Piles – how deep do the footings go?

- What is the timeline for this?
- Can the TTC keep up with service in pls?
- Cycling and transportation – how will the TTC connect with Port Lands and how will pedestrianization?
- What are the plans for the Hern to be integrated?

Focus question 1:

- Toronto will be the place where people will come for good waterfront design
- Identify and study the stimuli to move this forward (eg: housing and environmental factors)
- Maintainability should be a top concern from the outset (eg: Gardiner)
- Create a place that is connected to the city in a creative way.

Focus question 2:

- Develop Port Lands South of Unniod
- New industry
- Design competitions (integrating new industries into the generous and connected public realm – connecting the entire waterfront
- Maybe hotel, banquet and conference facilities
- Competitions for landscaping and public space

**Table 3**

Questions for clarification:

- What process will be used to examine further options for Don Mouth Naturalization and flood protection?
- Are we being asked to compromise on all the good work that’s been done before? Is this about compromising or accelerating?
- Where is consideration of the people that use the water? – Community access is not just about viewing the water.

Focus question 1:

- Accelerate enhancement of the natural environment – more access to boating, spit, etc.
- Ensure space is a public space, public realm is protected not privatized
- Mixed use – not just condos – make it a neighbourhood
- Easier access for all – seniors, children, etc. (not just a tourist destination)
- Put value to the consultation – honour what people have said in the consultation process. How does this consultation fit into goals of previous consultations?
- Stick to the plans
- Start with a good public realm , and developers will come after
- Ensure money made from land value (return on investment) goes back in to the Waterfront

Focus question 2:

- Natural environmental attractions – tourist attractions can be recreational and environmental – similar to Evergreen Brickworks.
- Ship channel has more potential as destination for recreation – brings people and creates demand for business
- Allow for a creative funding model ex: bonds that involve the public – not just corporate.

**Table 4**

Questions for clarification:

- Where does the Port Lands plan that has already been created sit? How will it be incorporated in to plans as they move forward? (Michael Van Valkenburgh) Design in particular
- Completion time frames

Focus question 1:

- Community connection
- Financial stability
- Plenty of public space
- Keep Michael Van Valkenburgh design
- Keep affordable housing component (low-income families, seniors)

Focus question 2:

- Set up zoning with flexibility in mind to meet market demands as they go
- Change ownership



- Campus use
- Extension of LRT into the Port Lands (ensure rapid transit is accessible)
- Stick with current plan, even though its going slower than an accelerated option

**Table 5**

Questions for clarification:

- Information on size/ownership/uses of the land
- Information on existing work/efforts
- Renewable energy potential on site – infrastructure anticipated

Focus question 1:

- Reinvest all profits back in to the Port Lands
- Maintain the established proves and not change by the city (unilateral changes)
- Very high emphasis on pedestrian and transit and low priority on the automobile

Focus question 2:

- Remove east Gardiner and convert to an Avenue for better integration
- Be a self-sustainable community – renewable energy development on site
- Emphasize integrated affordable housing

**Table 6 (summary of feedback from people participating online)**

Questions for clarification:

- Finding models – will a review of financial models be conducted? Who will evaluate them? To what degree will development offset costs?
- Will LRT come before or after development revenue?
- Does acceleration oblige us to choose short-term gain or long-term gain from investment? Green infrastructure, no pizza development (balance of uses)

Focus question 1:

- Please make building effective transit a top goal. LRT should come before development
- Access to natural areas and water is pivotal (water and others)
- Conserve and expand recreational areas with human and social values

Focus question 2:

- Balance of uses
- Speed up process by using existing buildings and infrastructure
- Pedestrian link between Port Lands and Toronto Island

**Table 7**

Questions for clarification:

- Is the naturalization of the Mouth of the Don a priority for the area?
- How will WT and the City build on, if at all, on previous work done in the Port Lands such as 2008 Port Lands business and improvement plan?
- Will social media and online consultation include collaborative design?

Focus question 1:

- Maintain the Naturalization of the Mouth of the Don as the priority for the Port Lands, and the marshes
- Reuse industrial structures and create a historical context as part of the naturalization/development of the area
- Sustainable community – balance of residential, transit, recreation, community gardens, arts, business etc. – livable and sustainable community, 12 month of the year use.

Focus question 2:

- No more manicured parks, more naturalized spaces
- Elevated walkway over the treetops
- Leisure use of water via cruise ships, ferries, sailboats and transportation options ie: bring in tourists
- Public transit system that has a zero carbon footprint

## **Table 8**

### Questions for clarification:

- How do we ensure that there is an effective public consultation process?
- Due diligence on options of existing EA – ensure that no further options being examined and being included now
- Financing – how do we ensure WT has financial capabilities to implement any accelerated plan?

### Focus question 1:

- Continue to lead with parks and public spaces and connect with existing open space already in place and protect the importance of the water's edge
- Strong comprehensive plan that allows for incremental development – phasing plan that maximizes value – promotion of mixed use development
- Transit! Comprehensive transit plan and transit first approach that can be expanded incrementally with development phases.
- Development must be environmentally and socially sustainable – housing for all, etc.
- Including extending core values of central waterfront to Port Lands

### Focus question 2:

- A full discussion on public financing tools. The process of waterfront Toronto to borrow money or issue debentures for major infrastructure needs

## **Table 9**

### Questions for clarification:

- What are the implications for the Don Mouth and since that is up for review, what else of the original plan is up for review?
- Why can't we break it down into smaller more manageable pieces?
- How are we going to make it publicly accessible?

### Focus question 1:

- Demonstrate that the whole plan is achievable by realizing success with one area first.
- Make sure that beauty isn't talking a backseat to development and the spaces are linked
- Maintaining the original approved plan
- Preserve 20% of the land as public

### Focus question 2:

- Continue a nice public waterfront trail, that is linked with all green spaces, and the goal is walkability not just to increase value of condos. Develop at a human scale.
- Make sure active water sports are on the Don
- Self-sustaining mixed-use community in a natural environment
- One spectacular public building

## **Table 10**

### Questions for clarification:

- Who is running the project? Authority is highly confused.
- Is there any new accelerated land-use plan? What is the timeline?
- How will a revised plan accommodate LaFarge cement plant? The current plan rests on the premise of cutting a river mouth through the plant, which LaFarge does not accept.

### Focus question 1:

- A plan that realistically and concretely accommodates current land owners and tenants, particularly LaFarge Cement.
- A clear sense of responsibility and authority from the waterfront team
- Open space for "breathing space" as the population grows

### Focus question 2:

- Exploration and implementation of innovative financing models beyond 3 levels of government (eg: bonds with a good rate of return)
- Situating a major destination attraction, eg: research park, innovation centre, major office HQ's, etc.
- Water-based public transportation options with multiple steps.

## Table 11

### Questions of clarification:

- What is the schedule for completing the building?
- Is there a plan for continuous green space?
- What is happening to existing industrial?

### Focus question 1:

- Excellence as priority guidance
- Mixed use
- Protect existing industrial uses: consider industrial next to residential? Consider value of land as is and as should be in 2011. Eg: where is industrial compatible with residential
- Historical nature maintained – as tourist draw (aesthetics) (disagreement in group)
- Modern urban design: eg. Sustainability, research centre, complete streets
- Balanced community, open space and continuous space, shoreline to be continuous and there needs to be access. Logical connection to city and to transit.
- Avoid disconnect (eg: city place)

### Focus question 2:

- Power plant – use this building
- Use bamboo = quick naturalization for soil reinitiation
- Find private group/science group (eg: silicone valley) or nanotechnology industry. Attract anchor company
- Have a Bixi bike hub

## Table 12

### Questions of clarification:

- We've heard a lot about financing and alternate financing in tonight's presentation- what does this mean?
- What is the status of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection EA?
- What does acceleration really mean? Has Waterfront Toronto been given a timeline?
- How does this impact the mix (%) of public vs. private enterprise?
- Will the WT vision be preserved?
- To what extent will transportation (public transit) issues be addressed in conjunction with the acceleration strategy?
- Given that we have a chance of a lifetime to create an incredible park, what is happening between Unwin Ave. and the water? Is the Lake Ontario Park vision being changed by Port Lands acceleration?
- Where do the Pan-Am games fit in to the Port Lands? What do they mean to the Port Lands plan?
- Will there be a good mix of affordable housing vs. rampant condo development?
- How will the Stakeholder Advisory Committee be chosen?

### Focus question 1:

- Aligned with op vision – lots of green space that is conducive to being by the water. Eg: unobstructed views; not too much concrete; low buildings
- Realize op
- Maintain public sector stewardship of the Port Lands
- Private sector interests/funding should not trump/diminish public aspect

## Table 13

### Questions of clarification:

- How will stakeholders and advisory committee be selected?
- What work is being done to integrate new Ashbridges streetscape sched and Port Lands transit
- Have province and federal gov't agreed and TPA
- What is timeline for acceleration – time to time
- Is this going to be development
- Will this be lead by realignment of Don

### Focus question 1:

- Bonds – issued by city or province
- Develop thoughtful balanced plan in its entirety prior to selling and developing individual properties
- Include a wide mix of uses including industrial/res/community/retail with a focus on recreational uses to attract

people. Create a destination and create value.

- Develop robust financial plan including equity, user fees, tolls, development charges

Focus question 2:

- Explore a catalytic development to draw attention to and attract people to Port Lands
- Mitigate environmental impact of winter on public realm to extend use
- Integration of transit, toads, bicycles, pedestrians to access and navigate the Port Lands

**Table 14**

Questions of clarification:

- How is the public still able to implement or affect final design plans?
- How is our voice translated into the actual design of the Port Lands?
- What has been approved, decided and/or received in terms of plans and therefore what is the current opportunity for the public to influence decisions?
- Who will be involved in development in terms of builders?
- What is the decision making process going forward?
- What is the desired time frame for acceleration? What does acceleration mean?
- Is there an economic analysis of remediation, flood mitigation and accommodating, other environmental considerations/foundations?

Focus question 1:

- Addressing flood risk in a manner that facilitates development and connectivity between precincts
- Establishing a clear plan with parameters for what is proposed, permitted, but flexibility to facilitate organic development of communities
- Integration of expert opinions and public input/democracy
- Keeping politics out of decision making

Focus question 2:

- More design competitions
- Urban experiments, eg: cable cars, gondolas, alternative transit
- Organic development instead of planned development
- There is idea fatigue: why do we keep going back to the drawing board?
- Apply ideas that have been successful elsewhere over past 10 years but tweak to local context

**Table 15**

Questions of clarification:

- Why is the plan being re-examined when we already have a plan?
- Is there a danger that politicians could re-discuss and alter the current vision?
- Why is there a need to accelerate the development of this area?
- Will development charges be paving for the required work?

Focus question 1:

- Larger portion of public space than currently in East Bayfront area
- Smaller scale development to allow more diverse development, design, ownership and smaller scale business (main street)
- Uses like a centre for industry, recreation, educational, residential

Focus question 2:

- Start development in areas that are out of the flood plain (ready to go)
- Develop hierarchy governing structure as a home for interim uses
- Semi-permanent home for the cirque du soleil
- Interim sports facilities
- Look for new ideas on how to deal with the 100 year flood from other countries and cities

**Table 16**

Questions of clarification:

- Is there a suspension on development while we go through this process? Ie: developing and leasing buildings?
- Is there an opportunity to be involved in the design?

- Why are we looking at the whole Port Lands as opposed to breaking it down in to more manageable components?

Focus question 1:

- Grass roots development accelerate development while planning for long-term
- Mixed use environmentally friendly development that supports communal, recreation, residential etc.
- Signature developments
- Sounds transportation planning

Focus question 2:

- Develop temporary uses now while market/funding etc. becomes available in the future
- High density development can create an opportunity for other uses. I.e. green space, communal uses etc.
- Water, rail and road transportation

**Table 17**

Questions of clarification:

- What was original plan? Why was it inadequate?
- What are you accelerating? Why?
- How is “desire” measured in the definition of the acceleration process and what system is used to represent the “value” characteristic to residents?

Focus question 1:

- All-season
- Showcase idea – play into existing themes – dramatic, attract global attention, value to community, don’t destroy what we have, connect it.
- Multiple land use designations (commercial, residential, public)
- Controlled development, released in phases – don’t rush and give to one developer all at once

Focus question 2:

- Existing planning process flawed – expedite manner of how zones can be easily changed
- Make it a destination – central theme
- Balance development that will bring revenue to complete Don River and then build out

**Table 18**

Questions of clarification:

- Why are plans being accelerated?
- If accelerated, will any WT objectives be sacrificed? (sustainability, affordable housing)
- What are the financial options available to city/wt? Ie: Debentures

Focus question 1:

- Ensure public transit – LRT not subways, with connectivity to the city
- Ensure wt core values – sustainability, public realm, mixed income communities
- Ensure connectivity to rest of city
- Ensure lake water quality is improved

Focus question 2:

- Landmark building/project
- Mixed neighbourhood – mixed use, rental, affordable, work, live, play
- Complete streets concept – for all users, pedestrians, bikes, plus cars
- Ensure community facilities – community centre, library, retail

Other comments:

- What opportunities for the Port Lands to be hijacked again? How can it be stopped?
- What are we accelerating?
- Which agency will get the revenue from sale of lands?
- Can city/wt objectives being sacrificed – sustainability, affordable housing
- What is public transit infrastructure?
- Ensure public transit first/ high sustainability standards/mixed income community
- Public realm/ public spaces – pedestrian area
- Connectivity to rest of city
- Landmark building / project

- Mixed neighbourhoods / mixed use – rental
- Complete streets concept – water quality

**Table 19**

Questions of clarification:

- What are WT target proportions of affordable housing (%) within the Port Lands district?
- Relationship between commercial and recreational?
- What plans are being considered to facilitate secure cost effectiveness, stable, marine usage, specifically access for community sailing, rowing, paddling clubs and yacht clubs?
- What is the affordable housing mix and what is the revenue plan to support it?
- What is the green – energy/tech/environmental aspect of the plan
- Public transit timing LRT

Focus question 1:

- Keep taxes down/ relationship commensurate with zoned use
- Balance accessibility and park space and public/private uses/interests of community (boat/yacht)
- Protect broader spectrum of society interests

Focus question 2:

- Let clubs buy facilities and develop
- Maximize value by better community mix – serve community better – not just real estate but natural capital considerations
- Infrastructure /public amenities first accelerate in phasing
- Casino/entertainment – venue for large-scale festivals
- A broader spectrum of housing types throughout the precinct

**Table 20**

Questions of clarification:

- Why not go ahead with the existing plan?
- Are there any immediate sources of funds – private or public for infrastructure / flood protection – funding needed to initiate development
- Are you going to continue to lease available land?

Focus question 1:

- Keep waterfront Toronto in charge to reduce the short-term thinking associated with a 4-year election cycle
- Maintain the area’s functionality as a port
- Don’t forfeit the old plan

Focus question 2:

- Develop the Port Lands using creative financial mechanisms in a manner consistent with the existing waterfront plan
- Examples of financial options include leasing of unused lands, bonds, public/private partnerships and philanthropy and tax increment financing (TIF)

**Table 21**

Focus question 1:

- Define maximize value?
- How is the spending being phased in? What is the status quo?
- Focus on buildings?
- Is the ownership frozen until a particular point in time? Is buying or selling going

Focus question 2:

- More public use of the waterfront to maximize value of “human use” and “recreational” use
- Ideas – accessibility for SAC
- Continuation of design excellence and competition
- Idea – do not accelerate the plan
- Pedestrian cycling bridge – access to water (seasonal)
- Boating use

- Increased consultation for all topics – process needs to be followed to 2008 plan
- Transparency

**Table 22**

Questions of clarification:

- Tommy Thompson park future?
- Bond issue practiced in Toronto? Work? Hamburg, NY option applicable?
- Will public space be compromised (sacrificed) for speed of development?
- What goals not willing to sell?
- Don Mouth naturalization still?
- TPA role?
- Role of private owners?
- Status of existing plan?

Focus question 1:

- Don't compromise WT objectives, eg. Sustainability
- Make sure investment and developer fees are directed back into Port Lands
- Transparent. Not closed door meeting with developers
- Can't trust politicians. Remain public. Public decision.
- Educational institution invest. Excellence. Knowledge based hub

Focus question 2:

- Energy independent, innovation
- Example, pilot grow vegetables. Sustainable
- TTC early. Bike everywhere. More flexible zoning
- Congestion fees
- Not deputations for consultation
- Creative public meetings around financing, with finance experts in room
- Access to water
- Mixed-income residential
- WT should have ability to raise bonds
- Accessibility high standards
- Ask Rotman school to solve
- Funding model competition

Other comments:

- Council need to talk about what can be done, not all can't

**Table 23**

Questions of clarification:

- Would the public consultation process be demeaned at the expense of early shovels in the ground?
- What's the status of the Don Delta TRCA Naturalization proposal?
- What's the ratio of development value to cover the cost of expected \$ of required infrastructure? What does it look like?
- Is there any way to protect what has been accomplished now from side swiping?

Focus question 1:

- Excellence in design must be defined in more human scaled buildings to promote environmental sustainability. Ex: glass buildings are not good
- Create transportation without cars (or with smaller cars)
- Ensure water quality and flood protection

Focus question 2:

- Save the Hearn! Early adaptive reuse, skating rinks, retail, academic, residential (some in disagreement)
- Floating markets in waterways
- Within the design create harsh or micro-climate management. Ex: Path system in downtown Toronto, effective landscaping

**Table 24**Questions of clarification:

- Does accelerating plan lower standards – environmental, energy, affordable housing
- What goes to city council in June, how much weight does it carry? Is it statutory?
- What is result of accelerating or other adjacent areas (WDL, EBF)

Focus question 1:

- Excellence in design – accessible transit, must be a priority
- Clearly articulated vision interface with waterfront – mixed use
- Best possible plan that can be done/built
- Nothing wrong with existing timeframes

Focus question 2:

- Do not give land away
- Trails to waterfront – continuous edge
- Get transit to area

**Table 25**Questions of clarification:

- Given that an EA has been completed for the Don Mouth Naturalization. Why would we be considering other options? Are all the parties committed to naturalization?
- How is the Port Lands connected transportation wise to the rest of the city, by car, bike, all modes of transportation?
- Will the revenues generated in the Port Lands development process be reinvested in waterfront development only?
- What is the urgency? Why accelerate the development in the Port Lands given the remediation work that needs to be done
- What is the Federal, Provincial, and city ownership?

Focus question 1:

- Make sure WFT stays in charge of the process.
- The site must be liveable
- Go forward with the naturalization and the flood control
- Remediate the soil and put the city services in
- All the money from the waterfront should be reinvested in the waterfront

Focus question 2:

- Canal housing – canal village – canal community (see napkin)
- A lot of waterfront frontage
- It should be something we don't have now. It should be beautiful
- Don't ignore the transportation
- Open the RFP process with charettes for each site

**Table 26**Questions of clarification:

- Is there allocation for a certain % of residential, office buildings vs. open and green space, recreation
- What will land use designation be?
- How will we ensure that revenue for this project doesn't go towards other projects in the city?
- How will we ensure that past planning efforts such as the EA and transit plans for the Lower Don are not reopened?

Focus question 1:

- Some projects can happen sooner – like fields for kids
- Get funding
- Naturalize Don and add more green space
- Look at new ways to finance. Mixed ways; innovation
- Consider partnership between city and private investor to build recreation facilities
- More community involvement in design, build and operation of recreational / sailing / marine space
- Respect existing ways communities and groups are currently using space
- Plan to limit building height
- Build in walkability and cycle-ability in to plans. Pedestrian/ cycle friendly



#### Focus question 2:

- Link schools with rec facilities – domed field to be used 365 days a year. During day used by school, after hours, teams/public
- Give WT the ability to borrow money
- Ensure there are still business and commercial space available to ensure mixed use/live /work balance
- Access to a variety of activities
- Make use of Keating channel – promenade – make use of waterside

#### Other comments:

- Hijacking of project x 2
- Keep the plan followed – focus of plan, silos between divisions
- Land uses – affordable housing – EA – Financing
- City needs to tell us what accelerating means to them. What is their goal?
- Goal – to ensure at minimum existing wildlife – birds, mammals, fish are maintained
- Incorporate wildlife into environment
- Family friendly
- Balance between natural areas and manicured areas
- Ensure sustainability...lights out at night. Avoid light pollution
- Idea – contact Dutch to learn how to reclaim more land – expand land base
- Walkways for people
- Access and corridors for animals
- Consult with parks staff to hear about feedback from recent parks plan consultation. Don't work in silos!
- Bond offering – community based financing – gives everyone a chance to participate

#### **Table 27**

##### Questions for clarification:

- What percentage of lands are in mind to remain a public asset versus lands intended for private development?
- Why does this need to be accelerated? What's the rush?
- Is there a plan in place for naturalization and revitalization or is it being set aside? Why replan when money has been spent?

##### Focus question 1:

- Make development of a progressive ecological and environmental standard that is the best in the world (design and sustainability)
- Don't accelerate for short term gain based on current economic circumstances. Think long term – don't just sweep things aside
- Mixed-income and affordable neighbourhoods where people can afford to stay downtown
- Public access to water's edge/promenades

##### Focus question 2:

- Set buildings back from water's edge to create public spaces between buildings and lake/river
- Public-private partnerships like Regent Park for affordable housing, but with greater emphasis on market rental
- Seek out local development firms or business but not exclusively "made in Toronto" to maximize local involvement and create a great place with international experience

#### **Table 28**

##### Questions for clarification:

- What happens to the previously done background and planning studies, for example the Transit and Don River EAs and Lake Ontario Park?
- How much money is estimated to be required in the actual renaturalization of the Don River?
- How does the plan allow for the existing users of the Waterfront and their facilities to continue (e.g. rollerblading and sailing clubs)?

##### Focus question 1:

- Environmental Sustainability
- Economic Sustainability

#### Focus question 2:

- Secure funds from World Bank and Bill Clinton Foundation available for environmental and sustainable city building projects as part of C40 initiatives
- Improve pedestrian environment and public realm, starting at the edges
- Ensure uses that can thrive 365 days a year – good and bad weather

#### **Table 29**

##### Questions for clarification:

- Why was this geographical area chosen and what uses are to remain?
- What existing tools for financing are being considered for accelerating?

##### Focus question 1:

- Do not compromise naturalization of the Don River flood plain
- Make accessible for transit and cycling
- Work on methods of making water clean enough for kids to play in
- Use sport infrastructure to support the new and existing residential communities
- Designer parks are not going to meet the needs
- Link justification for healthy active facilities to investment of public health dollars → public health funding for long term gain

##### Focus question 2:

- Develop outside flood plain from east to west, connect to east sewage system
- Start with sport and cultural to bring the city to the area, use sport facilities to support Pan Am 2015 AND bid for 2024 Olympics
- Open up understanding of “infrastructure” and use investments as tools for naturalization

#### **Table 30**

##### Questions of clarification:

- How are the uses in the area going to be prioritized?
- How are the other governments (province and federal) going to be engaged to support and move this initiative forward?
- Is this process directed to an end plan OR are we also looking at interim solutions (phases/temporary uses)?

##### Focus question 1:

- How will this exercise ensure that current sustainability and naturalization goals and objectives are not lost/sacrificed
- How can we ensure a liveable, mixed-use community integrated with the City, that capitalizes on the amazing lakefront location
- How can we achieve acceleration that does not sacrifice quality for expediency – we want the same positive results as those WT is delivering in East Bayfront and West Donlands

##### Focus question 2:

- Accelerate opening up some land to private sector involvement to start raising needed funds
- Create a “world class” retail district like the Olympic complex in East London using a new and innovative format
- Maximize the length of the water’s edge which will increase value and opportunities for public access and enjoyment of Toronto’s waterfront

#### **Table 31**

##### Questions of clarification:

- What is the plan for south of Unwin Street?
- What is the anticipated public water access?
- What are the plans and intentions regarding the community sailing clubs e.g. Outer Harbour Sailing Federation?
- What happened to the Lake Ontario Park Plan?
- Why is the spit and Outer Harbour Marina not included in the Port Lands development plan?
- Are there plans to build an airport on the Leslie Street Spit?
- Are you going to continue to store salt on the waterfront?
- Are you considering the flight path of the planes currently flying into the Island Airport?

#### Focus question 1:

- Maintain the Lake Ontario Park plan, as published in 2008. Most importantly maintain all of the aquatic clubs as they currently are

#### Focus question 2:

- Basic infrastructure be made available to the various football and aquatic clubs
- Continue with absence of fairground activities south of Unwin (i.e. leave as green park land)

#### **Table 32**

##### Questions of clarification:

- How does this “acceleration” initiative actually speed things up, given that we are re-examining work already done?
- How will the best financial plan be determined, and does Waterfront Toronto need the ability to borrow?
- Density requirements? Deviations allowed?
- Is there a guarantee that public realm will not be decreased in quantity or quality?

##### Focus question 1:

- Preserve original vision and do not compromise on it
- Minimum level of density that integrates mixed uses → Access to recreation → avoid low density (surface parking lots, big box stores, etc.)
- Process needs to be completely transparent for citizens to give informed input and ultimately support the plan
- Money raised in Port Lands development needs to stay to finance the next stage

##### Focus question 2:

- Continuous water-edge trail, facilities to incorporate festivals and sporting events to raise tourism revenue
- Allow Waterfront Toronto to borrow to finance the best long-term plan

#### **Table 33**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Financing model → what different financing models are under consideration? How are the capital requirements for the Port Lands being protected from City cash needs?
- Land use – are there agreed upon targets (i.e. recreation, parks lands, condos) that will change through the process?
- Process – how will the existing process factor in? How will it be used?
- What are the benefits of acceleration? Is it just an inherently long process? What is the upside of acceleration?

##### Focus question 1:

- Make sure it’s not a “drive to” location → make transit considerations up front
- Natural area connectivity/wildlife corridors
- Core Issues: waterfront connectivity, access, greenspace, green infrastructure
- GET THE GREEN STUFF DONE FIRST
- Naturalization, flood protection, public space → existing plan
- Leave the condos back from the water’s edge, make sure public can access water’s edge

##### Focus question 2:

- Define public spaces first → incrementalism
- Continuous waterway access (e.g. for canoes) all the way along the waterfront
- Corporate funds/public funds to beautify the spit
- Start working on creative financing → temporary land uses that would bring immediate revenue but could be dismantled later
- Access/utilize “polluter pay” from previous industrial land uses

##### Other Comments:

- Are they willing to stake out the public realm → developers provide upfront cash for public realm
- Start with naturalization and make these the priority siting locations → accelerate these developments
- Don’t discount the process/planning that has already happened

#### **Table 34**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Why do you want to speed up the process and how quickly? What will have to be sacrificed/jeopardized?
- What has to be decided and in what order before the report on financing? What is the sequencing of decisions?
  - How will design excellence be incorporated? Will there be a design review panel?

#### Focus question 1:

- Various types of transportation and parking facilities
- Lots of recreation opportunities
- A focus on sustainability and making sure what is built lasts
- Maintain wilderness
- Consideration for potential issues with incompatible uses
- Build on a human scale (e.g. Yonge Street)

#### Focus question 2:

- A cultural or public institution to act as a destination → something to attract tourists, something with an economic impact
- Multi-use sports complex/winter recreation
- A nice neighbourhood on a human scale
- See TRCA for ideas (e.g. fishing) → ecotourism

#### Other Comments:

- Idea for the Hearn: a demonstration/education facility for energy efficiency

#### **Table 35**

##### Questions for clarification:

- What is really going on re: the financing of this project/area?
- Is there a place in the Port Lands for the charter boat industry?
- What is the timeframe for redevelopment?
- What about joint-ventures?

##### Focus question 1:

- Achieve a balance between small and existing local business owners and big business funding
- Encourage safe and active nightlife and entertainment facilities
- Provide infrastructure for charter boat industry as charter boats allow the greatest number of Torontonians to get out on the lake and harbour

##### Focus question 2:

- Charter boat village – centralize commercial tourism as a tourist destination with proper infrastructure so docks are secure, safe and nice places to be
- Natural Museums – like Montreal’s Biodome, focus on butterflies/birds
- Eco-Tourist attractions – things to see and do, cultural complexes, like a “natural” national mall a la Washington D.C.

##### Other Comments:

- Public transit and parking must be available to ensure widest possible use by all Torontonians

#### **Table 36**

##### Questions of clarification:

- How much access will the public still have under a public private partnership?
- How will this be powered and will net-zero objectives be considered?
- Will this plan integrate sustainability?
- Will the area remain as it is?
- What are the options for existing structures (e.g. Hearn)?
- Can we have more in-depth analysis around world class examples to see how they apply here?
- Financing – will the accelerated plan create an impetus to go the “easy way” (i.e. sell of land)?
- How can we have a financial model that encompasses a fair and equitable process?

##### Focus question 1:

- Create as much public access as possible and maintain access for all Toronto’s citizens
- Create high density development but establish viewing corridors/protect key views from key areas
- Create a unique jewel, high quality space, iconic for Toronto
- Need to define public and private responsibility for financing and infrastructure
- Public access/recreation should be right along the edge – no wall of condos
- Affordability for community and residential space to encourage diverse use versus high income
- Focus on end game, not short term

- High quality architecture with high quality use/diversity of uses
- Open and transparent consultation process throughout
- Coordination with transit → funding for it, roll out of transit

Focus question 2:

- Work with existing buildings – adaptive reuse of spaces such as the Hearn
- Integrate creative bio-remediation and energy co-generation facilities with development
- Create and establish an artistic theme throughout the Port Lands, reinforce iconic concepts/spaces
- Build public realm first to enhance private sector investment (continue what the plan says)
- Sustainable development and architecture
- Create artistic theme throughout the Port Lands
- Civic city building fundraising campaign (private or corporate donors)
- Not a Ferris wheel

**Table 37**

Questions of Clarification:

- Can the Port Lands be used as a major central park?
- What is the priority, jobs or condos?
- What is the forecast for future shipping needs?
- What is the timetable for political decision making?

Focus question 1:

- Create an area that’s walkable, used, all year round
- Need to think long term (500 years plus), not short term “monetization”
- Think “out of the box” – not more of the same

Focus question 2:

- Should be a special place – not more of the same
- Tourism/cultural centre – not just another neighbourhood
- Institutional uses – Universities

**Table 38**

Questions for Clarification:

- What is the minimum amount of green that will be devoted to the naturalization of the Mouth of the Don?
- What is the role of the differing land owners, and authorities – how will private property be dealt with?
- How will acceleration impact existing land uses such as the concrete campus at the east end and other incompatible land uses?

Focus question 1:

- Development should maximize lake views and proceed in an orderly fashion – not piecemeal
- District heating and cooling should be implemented throughout the area

Focus question 2:

- Focus should be on maintaining green space – all existing green and trees should be preserved. Land is publicly owned and should be preserved primarily for public access. This includes semi-public uses such as sailing clubs
- Lake Ontario shore should be natural, no walls etc.
- Existing plans should be respected – too much time and money to discard them
- Include a feature that attracts tourism, especially natural features. Elements that make the area attractive to residents can also bring tourists

**Table 39**

Questions of Clarification:

- What are the options for naturalization of the Don Mouth and costs associated with the EA?
- What will happen to private lands in the area?
- How will phasing or priorities be consistent with acceleration process?
- Is the transportation plan and transit plan adequate for the planned residents and employment numbers?
- What happens with winter and public realm and water access during all four seasons?

#### Focus question 1:

- Do not compromise Waterfront Toronto principles with an accelerated plan
- Give Waterfront Toronto more power to borrow money/bonds
- Maximize accessibility – north/south, into/out of area, transit, active transport, mixed use, socio-economic accessibility
- Sustainable energy plan – accelerated
- Triple bottom line – approved by final developer

#### Focus question 2:

- 300 acres confirmed – using EFTE – Off grid – four seasons
- Creative re-development of Hearn (e.g.) wine warehouse in Balbo Spain
- Net zero sustainable energy plan
- Change dock walls – consider other options such as aquatic ecosystems
- “Star” Bonds
- Build neighbourhoods
- Maintain shipping ability/opportunities
- Sustainable water and energy plan

#### **Table 40**

##### Questions of Clarification:

- What guarantees exist to protect the rights of private landowners in the Port Lands going forward?
- What are the expectations and timelines for implementation post May 2012?
- What impact will this process have on plans Waterfront Toronto already has in place?
- What can we do to protect this process from being derailed again like it has been in the past?
- What will happen in the interim to the pollution that currently exists in the Port Lands?

##### Focus question 1:

- Protect the plan from political influence
- Allow the voices of all constituents to be heard, not just in this round table format because there are some voices absent from this discussion
- Maintain transparency throughout the development process
- Ensure compatible treatment of landowners and business owners in the area

##### Focus question 2:

- Use a model that works like East Bayfront where public sector lead the way by using a catalyst like an academic institution
- Alternative financing methods i.e. TIFs, TIGs , road tolls etc.
- Improve transit system to improve access to the Port Lands

## INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSION GUIDES

Note that individual responses are numbered for ease of reference only. Note that not all discussion guides included responses to all questions.

### **Individual 1**

#### Focus question 1:

- Need to do a very thoughtful retail strategy for future.
- Bigger retailers can be ok if properly integrated and there’s reasonable vehicle and public transit access

#### Focus question 2:

- Integrate water taxi’s like in Vancouver for commuters and pleasure - \$2 ride from core to keating channel – from Rochester ferry docks base, drops off at wards, to public uses along channel
- Investigate formula to avoid “dig and dump” remediation. Leave bad stuff in place and build on top. Raise the grades. Use above ground parking.
- Do blocks like in Berlin with 2-4 story high courtyards inside buildings on top of parking
- Hearn = Tate Modern – a catalyst destination institution (not an aquarium)
- New campus for U of T? But leave Hearn for a major institutional cultural destination

#### Other Comments:

- Don't be afraid of height
- Don River Naturalization – has to be done based on a phased plan, implemented over time
- Must be realistic about market and phasing = start on the blocks that are most likely drivers of private investment. May end up being a university hospital. Save the Hearn for a premier use
- Raising grades will help reduce “flood-proofing” needs

#### **Individual 2**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Is there an allocation for a certain % of residential and office buildings versus open and green space? Ie: land-use designation
- Plans for large multi-use sports facility?
- Will there be affordable housing?

##### Focus question 1:

- Not ‘butcher’ the waterfront/Port Lands with high-rises like along Queens Quay
- Balance of low-rise housing, public open green spaces, multi-sports use, and natural areas (incl. Watersports)
- Build-in “walkability” and cyclability

##### Other comments:

- Please don't over-build on the Port Lands, ie: high density instead of open spaces
- Beautify the water frontage with promenades and public spaces; along the lake and the channel

#### **Individual 3**

##### Focus question 2:

- Floating wetlands
- Shipping container village
- Crowd sourced design

#### **Individual 4**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Why are solid plans – good plans – being revisited?
- What is the financial situation?
- I don't understand this process in relation to the Don Mouth EA options?

##### Focus question 1:

- Build another great Toronto neighbourhood
- Restore the Mouth of the Don river by creating a large estuary / park
- Enhance the areas recreational amenities for all Torontonians

##### Focus question 2:

- Create a park / marsh at the Mouth of the Don to increase property values
- Redevelop the Hearn for mixed-use, including recreation and non-profit uses
- Fast track development west of Cherry street – on the Quays
- Try a version of mars somewhere

##### Other comments:

- Engage the non-profit sector – perhaps consider rental space for non-profits
- Build temporary structures for short-term uses? As interim use
- I don't mind phased implementation but I am concerned that look at “options” for Mouth of Don will mean less substantial Don River park / Don Mouth restoration

#### **Individual 5**

##### Questions of clarification:

- What is the hard evidence for an actual need to accelerate this process?
- What are you willing to sacrifice in order to accelerate this process?
- The current city admin is opposed to LRT's. Why are you talking about them in your presentation? Eg: Tonight's Powerpoint.

#### Focus question 1:

- Not repeating mistakes of the past because of a perceived need for acceleration
- Maintain and even enhance the public realm/space

#### Focus question 2:

- Injection of a catalytic project to spur development. Eg: creative (arts based)

#### **Individual 6**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Adequate transit? Funding? LRT? Metro wide accessible?
- Flood protection? Global warming – worse than H. Hazel?
- Adequate sewage, remediation

##### Focus question 1:

- Naturalized Mouth of Don, natural areas
- Public accessibility – waterfront for all metro citizens
- Good quality workmanship, sense of pride to residents of whole city

##### Focus question 2:

- Blue flag beach protection
- Realistic

#### **Individual 7**

##### Questions of clarification:

- How does the development of the Pan-Am athlete's village impact planning/economics for the waterfront development?

##### Focus question 1:

- Leisure – think the banks of the Seine, Paris, Sydney harbour, South bank London, Vancouver harbour port
- Wildlife – Migratory bird sanctuary? (see similar one in Barnes, London)
- Access – TTC connection?

#### **Individual 8**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Does this initiative include the development of a yacht club?
- If so, what are the timelines for this development?

#### **Individual 9**

##### Focus question 1:

- The first priority should be to find as much as possible through unlocking the value of waterfront land – through both public asset development proceeds and TIF schemes. We need to understand how much money this will raise – since any waterfront proceeds should be invested in the waterfront – in order to have an informed discussion about funding shortfalls

##### Focus question 2:

- A difference with some European developments – eg: Hafen city and Amsterdam – is the fine grained feeling of their developments. The initial projects in EBF are all quite wide and lack differentiation in materials – the George Brown building and Coins Quay appear to use exactly the same glass cladding, for example. More diversity is critical for a proper neighbourhood feeling.

##### Other comments:

- Both Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto should be ashamed of such a poorly-run meeting. While WT's reputation for public consultation has generally been well-earned, this is not the first project kick off meeting with too little space to accommodate the public. Surely a seat with a view of the presentation is a basic minimum standard to meet before boasting of one's excellence in public consultation? In presenting for the City of Toronto, it seems John Lively could not be bothered to prepare his own slides, instead borrowing the first three from the next presentation. He failed to present any substantive arguments for why the past, publicly supported Port Lands EA's should be overturned.



### **Individual 10**

#### Questions of clarification:

- Can anything be built before re-naturalization at river?

#### Focus question 1:

- Transit in place before development

#### Focus question 2:

- Connection to Ward's Island

### **Individual 11**

#### Questions of clarification:

- How will this process resolve Lafarge's fundamental issue with the current plan – ie: the current plan is premised on the need to close /relocate Lafarge's Polson St. terminal?
- If the key issue is time and cost, how will the proponents work with Lafarge to preserve their existing

### **Individual 12**

#### Focus question 1:

- Environmental
- Economic
- Sustainable

#### Focus question 2:

- C40 cities – goals

#### Other comments:

- Why Port Lands projects connect with the C40 cities in formulating and implementing a final plan
- C40 cities includes world 40 great cities to address urban problems like transportation, air quality, sustainability, green amenities, urban forest, urban, urban employment, climate change, etc.
- Behind C40 cities: Bill Clinton foundation, Bloomberg, the World Bank

### **Individual 13**

#### Questions of clarification:

- Recreation/parkland ratio?
- Park land connectivity to overall city waterfront?

#### Focus question 1:

- Full connectivity of public realm throughout the waterfront
- High transit/pedestrian/cycling/water connectivity with imaginative landscaping
- Develop a historical plan for integration with new development
- Design competition – of many industries/health pursuits to set the tone for design

#### Other comments:

- Unique features – Hearn, Keating channel
- Hearn Generating Station – use for shopping, hockey, restaurants?

### **Individual 14**

#### Focus question 1:

- Keep the preferred Don River Mouth plan and not water it down. Allow Waterfront Toronto to borrow money if they are not then there is a fear they will try to find a lower cost solution
- A dense urban mixed-use community and not suburban car oriented developments
- All money generated from the development of the Port Lands must be used to facilitate more development by reinvesting in the Port Lands

#### Focus question 2:

- Pinewood Studios bought Film Port and they want to create a Film Lot/ condo development that would replicate famous streetscapes from New York City, Chicago and London England. It would combine residential (condos), commercial (film shoots) and tourism (people will want to see the replica streetscapes). A creative way to combine several uses in one location. It is a serious proposal by Pinewood Studios.

#### Other comments:

- An Olympic bid. If it is successful could bring federal and provincial money to help build an athletes village along with the infrastructure and transportation (LRT's) that would be needed to service the village.

#### **Individual 15**

##### Questions of clarification:

- What is the status of the current Don Mouth Environmental Assessment?
- Is Waterfront Toronto obliged to proceed with any acceleration idea? Who determines when short-term gain beats long-term gain?

##### Focus question 1:

- To create a high-quality, long-term investment in city-building in Toronto
- To retain the founding principles of the original plan
- To provide a more transparent process, where the public is given all the information to make informed commentary

##### Focus question 2:

- Interim uses should involve festivals and sporting events
- After Cirque de Soleil a new space in the Port Lands once its current location closes for development
- Build infrastructure for cycling sporting events within the Port Lands, to provide for IRONMAN, etc..
- DO NOT BUILD ANY SINGLE STORY BIG BOX RETAIL

#### **Individual 16**

##### Focus question 1:

- Process should be more transparent – we need the info (what is the draft, ie: financing plan for preferred option)
- Key preferred plan – don't water down
- Sufficient recreation space for people – avoid over-crowding
- Public access to recreation space
- Preserve original vision – environmental, social, cultural goals – don't let pragmatism
- Sustainability in all forms: green, mixed-use (min. infrastructure req.)
- Ensure money raised in Port Lands stays in Port Lands to finance next stage of development
- Need minimum density – not allow surface parking, big-box. Get to urban use. Avoid interim
- Transit oriented development

##### Focus question 2:

- R&D cluster education institutions – centre of excellence to fund film industry
- Build on stilts early and get building – landmark feature
- Continuous water edge trail
- Allow WT to borrow – so that watered down plans aren't required
- Incorporate festivals/sporting events in Port Lands – support tourism revenue

#### **Individual 17**

##### Focus question 1:

- Respect for original consultation and concept
- Quality (non-prescriptive)- solution- communicate the vision and ask the private sector to work with it
- A long-term vision when it comes to interpreting the cost of land/soil remediation and river mouth naturalization

##### Focus question 2:

- Close collaborative planning and development with the private developers
- City council investment – raising taxes if need be – show some gumption
- Creative thinking when it comes to activities and enable the place to become a world class city centre and therefore attract global talent to Toronto

#### **Individual 18**

##### Focus question 1:

- Build a sustainable community – keep the commitment under the Clinton Climate Initiative's Climate Positive Development program to build a climate-positive community

- Build transportation infrastructure first
- Make it a 24<sup>th</sup> community with a mix of uses and a mix of people

Focus question 2:

- Integrate energy planning: solar, geothermal, anaerobic digestion, and district energy
- Like in Amsterdam Port Lands, set aside some land to create lots that can be built on by individuals with their own designs – with performance standards
- A car-free neighbourhood as part of the greater plan, like Quarter Vauban in Freiburg, Germany (residents can own cars .. in garages at edge of community)

**Individual 19**

Focus question 1:

- Making Port Lands accessible to Torontonians – this must include transit and encourage pedestrian activity
- Continuous and connected public spaces throughout the Port Lands

Other comments:

- I love the work Waterfront Toronto has done with the wave decks, sugar beach, and Sherbourne common
- Please follow through with Queens Quay makeover to fully connect to waterfront

**Individual 20**

Questions of clarification:

- Timeframe
- Sustain building
- Response to trends – changes/shocks

Focus question 2:

- Attract a major “thing” science/edu? To anchor the area and provide a draw
- Huge opportunity for urban agriculture

**Individual 21**

Questions of clarification:

- Will revenue generated from lands on the waterfront development be invested back into the waterfront?
- Will the acceleration of the Port Lands development lower the value of the land because we put too much development on the market at once?
- Will the flood protection, naturalization and healthy city building that are the central principles behind the Don Mouth EA be compromised in this accelerated process?
- Will the speed (6 months) of this process compromise the quality of the project because we don’t want a second rate Port Lands

Focus question 1:

- Naturalize the Mouth of the Don
- Flood protection that will work
- Create an exciting, sustainable community that ecologically sustainable!
- Don’t compromise on these (above) three!
- Public transportation infrastructure early (including bikes)

Focus question 2:

- Explore the financing options – in a transparent to the public format
- Increment taxing
- Bonds (investment financing)
- Explore incorporation of existing organization and other existing uses
- Ensure that the infrastructure (transportation – transit, cycling, pedestrian, water, electric below grade, parks and public space) is in place before we start and end spring!

Other comments

- So much of what has been said to tonight has been said before many times before in all the previous public engagement so the message should be: that those politicians who have never been engaged in the process should shut up and start listening to what has already happened in the public process. In other words learn about what has already been done before they throw in some ½ baked crock pot ideas!

## **Individual 22**

### Questions of clarification:

- We are going to focus on the acceleration of the area, what do we have to forgo in other areas?
- Do not kick the community sailing clubs off the waterfront

### Focus question 1:

- Should not cater to 'big box' stores pandering to car culture
- Low rise, limited high rise zoning
- Arrange for the community currently on the waterfront to remain there eg: community sailing clubs

### Focus question 2:

- No big box retail
- Maximize public use of actual waterfront ie: beaches and parkland

## **Individual 23**

### Questions for clarification:

- Is there a possibility that there would be commercial development at the northern end at Tommy Thompson park, as shown on the attached map?
- Will everything south of Unwin Avenue be protected as parkland?

### Focus question 1:

- Access to the water by the public
- Public transit access to the neighbourhood
- Extensive parkland

### Focus question 2:

- Bike lanes on every street
- Mix of housing – low, middle, and high income housing
- Extensive parkland

## **Individual 24**

### Questions of clarification:

- Are we following the original agreed upon and previously approved plan?
- What is the purpose of acceleration?
- Why are we exploring new ideas?
- Is the plan changing to avoid slower (20 to 25 years) residential development to speed up money back to the city?

### Focus question 1:

- Maintain the original agreed upon and previously approved plan!

### Focus question 2:

- Need an explanation for any deviation from the original agreed upon and previously approved plan, thanks.

## **Individual 25**

### Questions of clarification:

- Land use proportions – residential, office
- Affordable housing
- City protects financial proceeds
- How do we ensure sustainability of plans?

### Focus question 2:

- I would like to build an integrated sports/school complex for grade 5 to 12 students. Y would provide the financing for the facilities if city provides land. The plan would foresee a school building and 4 turf soccer fields (domed in the winter) for all year use by school and community

## **Individual 26**

### Questions of clarification:

- Have you considered TIF's?

- Why geographical study area selected?
- Is there anything that has to remain and what is the alternative?
- What are the ways to creatively finance the project?
- How will the acceleration process alter the current Naturalization plan?
- What if we stay with the existing EA?
- What options have been considered for accelerating the project?

Focus question 1:

- What about interim use/facilities?
- Stay with the process
- Link public health investment

Focus question 2:

- Develop East to West to maximize value in future connect to the city from Leslie and Carlaw
- Improve air quality by planting and greening
- Look at infrastructure improvements as assets and tools for naturalization

**Individual 27**

Questions of clarification:

- Why has the geographical boundary been selected? Anything that has to remain?
- Existing financing tools that are under consideration? Bond issues?
- Will naturalized flood plan be altered?
- What are the options for accelerating development?

Focus question 1:

- Do not compromise naturalization of Don river flood plain – make accessible with public transit and bike trails. Work on methods of making water clean enough for kids to play in
- Build sports and rec field/opportunities. This is necessary for a complete community – parks not always suitable substitute

Focus question 2:

- Open up understanding of “infrastructure”, flood proofing
- Understand how to value natural areas
- Build and integrate with natural areas

**Individual 28**

Focus question 1:

- Build the sport infrastructure to support the new and existing residential communities. Designer parks aren’t going to meet the needs. Balance active and passive recreation

Focus question 2:

- Start with a sport and culture to bring the city to the area. Allow WDL and PL to develop and then service and build PL residential and mixed use when the demand exists
- Develop outside flood plain – south/east end of PL. Acceleration requires deadline (2015? Phase 1, Olympic bid 2024 Phase 2)
- Allow and innovate with off grid solutions
- Build and integrate with natural areas like TTP and LO park

**Individual 29**

Focus question 1:

- Naturalized and flood protected
- Innovative design
- Profits to be paid forward to reach and maintain naturalization and flood plain
- EA must be done w/in same Terms of Ref
- Multi-use – no high rises

Focus question 2:

- Create humanly scaled development with innovative design

### **Individual 30**

#### Questions of clarification:

- What will be sacrificed by speeding up development process
- What are the time lines for forecasting costs?
- Financial plans

#### Focus question 1:

- Naturalization of river
- Sustainability – energy, transit, linkages with city - Long-term
- Natural environment with recreation

#### Focus question 2:

- Cultural destination – ice rinks, swimming pools – great lakes – history, fisheries, etc.
- Places for fishing include native peoples – they escaped dish of all kinds
- Consideration of winter activities

### **Individual 31**

#### Questions of clarification:

- When will all sewage be composted, natural gas methane received for fuel, and diverted away from lake
- Energy and powering new sustainable buildings

#### Focus question 1:

- Primarily private sector investment money with public compliance
- Public funding is primarily for transit LRT and power generation (wind, hydrogen heating, natural gas, nuclear expansion at Pickering)
- Divide big picture vision in to “lots” developers may bid
- Possible affordable housing purchases (pre-planned)

#### Focus question 2:

- Sustainable building architecture and engineering
- Zero o2 emission power generation, waste recycling
- Design water cooling in summer instead of A/C compressors
- Incorporation of steel and glass slag, coal and ash into cement/concrete of new buildings
- Collection of rain water for consumer and toilets
- Automated window
- Wind turbine street lights
- Artistic/creative theme for largest Canadian city – Ex: Dubai Palm Island resorts
- Ontario wind farm 10km – 20km in lake (from shore)
- All harbour-front properties are million dollar properties in every city so value is not an issue

### **Individual 32**

#### Focus question 1:

- A public waterfront with access for all citizens
- Dense and intense development but with view corridor protections at key points
- Connect the waterfront intelligently to the rest of the city (connections should be natural and visible and take all forms (vehicle, transit and active))

#### Focus question 2:

- Develop public amenity first to encourage private sector investment
- Development should be contiguous (ie: don't start everywhere, but build from one side first and continue). This allows for future development if economy tanks and private sector investment dwindles
- Focus on architecture that is high quality and will last – avoid “flavour of the day”

#### Other comments

- I am strongly in support of the current plan and would be quite happy if its implementation is accelerated – stay the course

### Individual 33

#### Questions of clarification:

- Tiffs

#### Focus question 1:

- Sustainability

#### Focus question 2:

- Something as memorable, unique, and beautiful as New York's highline park
- If using PPP ensure that public space is still accessible to public and NOT dominated signage/advertising etc.
- Are bonds an option for Toronto? If not, we should be getting more revenue to us from city

### Individual 34

#### Questions of clarification:

- Does acceleration model affect the funding model in place?
- How much public access will there be to the area?
- How does waterfront TO plan to use/deal with existing structures such as the Hearn Generating Plant? Heritage buildings.
- Can we see more in depth analysis of other models for waterfront?
- Energy – zero energy is it a priority?

#### Focus question 1:

- Open consultation with transparent process
- Public use for/by broadest group of users, focus on residents, visitors, shoppers, cyclists, etc. – Good land use, high quality architecture
- Focus on the end game, not attempt to speed things up in advance of proper planning. Don't make same mistake as with subways

#### Focus question 2:

- Take existing structure, eg: Hearn, to build focus, physical tourism, etc.

### Individual 35

#### Questions of clarification:

- What is the potential for renewable energy generation on site? (E.g. wind, wave, geothermal, deep water heating/cooling, etc.)
- What will the needs be for port facilities in the future? (danger of selling off land that may be needed in the future if needs change, say due to peak oil or a new ferry service to the US, etc.)

#### Focus question 1:

- Naturalization of the mouth of the don should take priority over flood protection and over maximizing land area available for development (e.g. allow more land to be available for flooding)
- Reinvest any profits made back in to the Port Lands (e.g. for naturalization) and not used for other purposes
- Make the Port Lands "off grid" – supplying its own renewable energy, dealing with its own wastewater, composting on site, etc.

#### Focus question 2:

- A swimming area on site (need not be a beach, maybe an adult swimming area with ladders from the lake to the pier-look at St. Mary's quarry for an example)
- Centralized heating/cooling to be shared by all buildings on the site, preferably powered by a mix of renewable energy sources
- Minimize parking requirements so that buildings will be less expensive to build (perhaps showcase a few buildings designed without any parking and good pedestrian, cycling and transit)
- Would a scenic ferry service connecting the Port Lands to downtown be a tourist and investor draw?

### Individual 36

#### Questions of clarification:

- Does the mayor and council have the power to alter the carefully constructed plans of waterfront Toronto; for example by selling parcels of the Port Lands for profit and for the benefit of city debt reduction?

### Individual 37

#### Focus question 1:

- Very high emphasis on pedestrian and transit use and very low automobile and parking use
- Dual use of flood protection and public recreation
- Active, comfortable public realm and human scaled buildings

### Individual 38

#### Focus question 1:

- Sustainable development financed through charges on development to encourage state-of-the-art environmental design
- Existing recreational uses and affordable housing
- Variety of uses

#### Focus question 2:

- Use a private infrastructure company to develop financed through a public bond offering

#### Other comments:

- Use dockside green in Victoria as a model – low rise, sustainable design, inviting for tourists, friendly for existing community, family friendly
- A bond offering would open up financing to public – assists public engagement

### Individual 39

#### Focus question 1:

- Transit – important to have good public transit to serve community, so it doesn't become car dependent and bloated
- Affordable housing – the Port Lands should not become an exclusive community by one with a mix of incomes and families

#### Focus question 2:

- Some sort of educational use
- Keep Michael Van Valkenburgh's plans
- Slow and steady wins the race

### Individual 40

#### Questions of clarification:

- What was the original waterfront plan?
- Was it complete?
- If so, what was inadequate about it?
- (I am still confused about why acceleration is necessary?)

#### Focus question 1:

- The Port Lands should be a multiple-use district with commercial activity of all types, public uses and residential
- Please develop in a way that does not affect the value of Tommy Thompson park as a globally recognized bird sanctuary
- Do not let one developer build more than a section at a time

#### Focus question 2:

- Enhancing the natural heritage of the region – Tommy Thompson park bird sanctuary can just be the start
- More social housing...more affordable housing. Integrated housing LEED platinum housing
- Revitalize the Don River without compromise. It will maximize the value in its own way

#### Other comments:

- Please save the Hearn Power Gen Building
- Please have facilitators that already have some sort of background in waterfront Toronto's planning initiatives. Even knowledgeable member of the public like myself
- Please provide more details before the discussions (like tonight) start. I feel the presenters gave very little info of value
- I would be happy to help in any way possible



### **Individual 41**

#### Focus question 1:

- Truly public lands – not public access to private land. Avoid selling off publicly owned land as much as possible. Better to go slowly to avoid this
- Transit and pedestrian access – not a playground for rich people with cars but a space we can all enjoy
- Public affordable housing – a firm commitment to public housing units that cannot be cancelled further along in the process (see: Vancouver's Olympic Village)

#### Focus question 2:

- I don't think the development should be accelerated if it means changing the plans that have been made. This question is biased, but I suppose one way to speed up the process is to somehow increase public funds – perhaps through taxing the rich or development even more than we already are
- Also, public washrooms!

### **Individual 42**

#### Questions of clarification:

- The presentation talked about co-operation among users. The Toronto Port Lands commissioned a study and did a presentation without Waterfront Toronto knowing. What controls are there on land users, and penalties if that was to repeat itself?
- Given the city's not the developer unless things change, is the goal to make money or improve access?

#### Focus question 1:

- Allow big box stores in. "There is a demand or will be".

#### Focus question 2:

- Is max value – highest dollar value on green space which gives max value to people i.e. provincial parks near Toronto, people have to travel (2 hours plus)
- What internal rate of return is expected given the max value? 15%? 20?

### **Individual 43**

#### Questions of clarification:

- What are the priority projects for developing the Port Lands? What is the phasing? Is naturalizing the Don River the first priority?
- What is the rush? Why the need for sudden acceleration? What is wrong with taking some time for proper development?
- What is the status of soil remediation facility? Results of soil remediation?

#### Focus question 1:

- Maintaining waterfront Toronto's original vision and master plan particularly re-naturalization of mouth of the don river
- Providing opportunities for public consensus and input from public and key stakeholders
- Providing mixed-use development – living, work, parks, etc.

#### Focus question 2:

- Naturalize the mouth of the Don River – why need to accelerate?
- Improve transit/LRT – public access to area to encourage development
- Mixed development/ use of Hearn as sports facility/stacked arena proposal

#### Other comments

- What is plan for land that was considered for stacked hockey arena? Could this land be used for living/residential development? Could the plan for the standard arena be revisited and brought back?
- What happens at end of consultation process?
- Why consider other options for sake of acceleration when millions of dollars and studies have already taken place? Seems redundant and waste of time and money
- Leave the original plan for re-naturalization for mouth of Don River as is
- Could public be involved in fundraising aspects of development plan?

#### **Individual 44**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Why is this project being “speeded up”
- If there are changes to plan it should go back to consult from the beginning

##### Focus question 1:

- Don’t let financial pressure mean less attention to environment and quality. There is nothing wrong with taking 10-20 years to get it right!

##### Q2

- I worry a one-off development won’t have the transit – people will drive – it will go downhill
- Need to stick to the plan. Remediate the Don, build housing. That density brings transit. There is a reason the plan is what it is – we have already been to this meeting!

#### **Individual 45 (received by email)**

##### Questions of clarification:

- The status of the findings and conclusions of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project needs clarification. The preamble to the documents for the meeting uses the phrase “further options.” What does this mean? Will the current exercise produce proposals for different routes for the river or for different interpretations of the meaning of “naturalization” with different proportions of the site being given to marsh, green space, etc.?
- If sites outside the flood protection zone are to undergo “accelerated development” will this be conditional on first producing a master plan for the whole port lands, especially for the routing of roads, utilities and other infrastructure? If this is not the case, the danger exists of servicing for a quickly-developed site being in the way of ideal overall development in the long term. (Toronto would presumably not have built the Gardiner Expressway if the current waterfront revitalization had been imagined in the 1950s.) Does this exercise threaten long-term optimal development by permitting short-sighted installation of roads and other infrastructure to support development of isolated sites?
- What will be the status of the report of the financial consultants soon to be engaged? If they recommend other means of financing the public realm, including the renaturalization of the river and the infrastructure plans in the DMNPLFP, will these be adopted in place of accelerated development of other sites or will they be shelved as politically unacceptable? Are the three governments involved prepared to make any necessary administrative or legislated adjustments if the consultants find that Waterfront Toronto should be given authority to borrow or for WT or some other authority to issue bonds or for the city to use Tax Increment Financing?

##### Focus question 1:

- Build out of the Lower Don Lands according to the preferred alternative of the DMNPLFP EA
- Development of a long-term master plan for the entire port lands with infrastructure developed outward from that proposed in the preferred alternative of the EA with no “accelerated development” of any sites until this is in place.
- Absolute protection of all plans for public realm developed with public consultation to date, including rivermouth renaturalization and park construction in the Lower Don Lands, renewal of transportation infrastructure in the East Bay Front and North of Keating precincts and the build-out of Lake Ontario Park.

#### **Individual 46 (received by email)**

##### Questions of clarification:

- would I be able to join this organization to participate in the implementation of my proposal? Am willing to invest much time and knowledge.

##### Focus question 1:

- be a complete waterfront solution
- be accessible to Toronto citizens from all income brackets
- attract tourism through beautiful scenery and educational experiences

##### Focus question 2:

- accelerate development, maximize value
- allow boat creation, and ship building
- allow for boat storage via, mooring, marina,
- allow for boat market, renting, leasing, mortgage and selling

#### Other comments:

- The proposal is to have at least several types of shipyard zones. For building large, medium, and small ships. Ranging from cargo-ships, and tugs to house-boats, yachts, and personal craft like canoes and sailboats
- Important is to be accessible to Torontonians, people actually living in Toronto. So it's best to have some areas available
- Much boat-building can actually be done outdoors, so infrastructure requirements are minimal. The most sophisticated part is to have a method of transporting heavy boats to the water.
- For the larger cargo-ships it may be wise to create some dry-docks, which would also facilitate the repair of large vessels
- Tourists and citizens alike, could ideally see at least some of the projects as they are under construction, perhaps an elevated walkway or tower could give an overview, though even through a fence most projects would be visible
- The proposed area for shipyards is the along the shiplanes, which could facilitate ease of launch
- The large factory with smoke-stack could be used for making local building-material on site, such as cement, marine-grade-rebar, and wire-mesh
- In terms of public access, it could have black-smiths, with internships available for various roles
- There can be an education area where people can learn how to become boat-builders, with souvenirs such as boat-models available. This could be near the waterfront market
- For that ancient portland feel, it would be great to have a farmers-market or bazaar area, where people can sell imported and local goods
- Can finance all of these shared creative-space location with land-shares, which allow people to buy or rent spaces as small as a m<sup>2</sup> to conduct their proposed activity.

#### **Individual 47 (received by email)**

##### Questions of clarification:

- I would like to know the projected cost of the re-naturalizing the mouth of the Don River, distinct from every other infrastructure cost. Currently, you do not publicly disclose the breakdown of the re-naturalizing estimates from all the mandatory infrastructure costs. Infrastructure costs such as, transit, roads, soil remediation, etc etc are technically necessary, but re-naturalizing costs may be viewed by many Torontonians as an optional luxury. Those advocating the re-naturalizing have been very successful in lobbying Waterfront Toronto to include this aspect into Lower Don Lands plans, but these advocates do not represent a majority of Torontonians
- It's impossible to make a rational, informed decision about this aspect of Port Lands development without knowing the costs of each part of your plans. The taxpayers who provide funding for Waterfront Toronto deserve the best value possible for their taxes. Detailed and distinct information about each aspect of the plan is crucial for the overall public to judge what they want done. If this Don River cost is not currently broken out of overall estimates, it must be done before any planning proceeds further. It is impossible for the general public to assess relative value otherwise.

##### Focus question 1:

- Port Lands development must make a positive contribution to Toronto's economy. It must benefit all citizens, not just those who live nearby, or those who will live or work there in the future
- Waterfront Toronto must ensure that the general public will have access to every metre of the shoreline, whether it's the Outer Harbour, the ship channel, the Keating channel etc. etc. The private sailing clubs that occupy prime public land on the north shore of the Outer Harbour must be moved to accommodate full unfettered public access to that shoreline. They claim they are 'public' clubs but this is clearly delusional as their properties are hidden behind fences and only club members and their guests are permitted access.

This land will be part of the site of the future Lake Ontario Park, which will be built largely with taxpayer funds. It must be fully accessible to the general public to be acceptable. Their exclusive use of this land must end with LOP implementation. There are many kilometres of Toronto shoreline that can be used to relocate these clubs elsewhere.

- Waterfront Toronto must be ready to accommodate any use that contributes to the economic prosperity of the whole city. This means it must accommodate diverse uses, not limited solely to 'mixed-use residential'. It must also accommodate a full variety of recreational, institutional, religious and entertainment uses, to make a positive economic impact.

##### Focus question 2:

- Plan for uses that are available 365 days a year, 24/7. Do not focus solely on residential development. Allow for a variety of uses summer and winter. Allow for uses such as recreational, entertainment and retail all of

which should be geared for positive economic impact.

- Build neighbourhoods that reflect Toronto's grid plan of streets to extend the built city, as it exists, into the Port Lands. The current Lower Don Lands street plan of crescents and courts, that inhibit choice of access to a neighbourhood, is a suburban model that has no place in our city in the 21st century. Development models that restore the traditional square grid plan of streets, (such as the Regent Park and Don Mount Court re-developments) should be the development model for the Port Lands. The mistakes of the previous century shouldn't be repeated here. For example, Commissioners Street should be maintained in its current configuration as a straight, direct route from Leslie St. through to Cherry St. to facilitate industry.

#### **Individual 48 (received by email)**

##### Questions of clarification:

- Of the possible alternate methods of funding, which ones are we legally allowed to do? For example, I hear that tax increment financing (or one of those similar) is actually **illegal** in Canada.
- How much (either in absolute number, and/or %age of development value) are we getting for Section 37 and what projects is it going to?
- How guaranteed is the funding for transit and other public amenities. What are the risks moving forward, i.e., possible ways that this can be derailed, esp with current funding constraints with TTC, the current governance structure, and current mayoral regime? What can we do to help proactively avoid any potential roadblocks, say through proactively gathering public support?
- And related... what is your communications strategy to inform and solicit input from "non-usual suspects" to sell this project which will help as we run into problems with various governments? (inform so public can advocate)

##### Focus question 1:

- **Affordability:** of both commercial and residential space - in order to encourage a truly diverse community vs. one with a higher income demographic. You might consider partnering with Toronto Community Foundation, United Way, and/or putting out calls to service organizations, and definitely be reaching out to those with experience and knowledge of, say, creating the St. Lawrence Market area in the 80s/90s. As well as working with organizations like Evergreen and Artscape and the Centre for Social Innovation.
- Coordination with **transit**, both for planning ahead, and with higher levels of government for funding, and/or look at best practices for creative ways to leverage development/land value increases to fund these and other infrastructure costs
- **Sustainability** - best practices of smart communities elsewhere around the world, e.g., co-generation of steam heating, common waste disposal chutes (vs. trucks), etc.

##### Focus question 2:

- **Fundraising campaign - civic building** - if people know what is needed and what our constraints are, it could be an opportunity for people at all levels (from regular citizens to philanthropists, from tourists to Ontarians to residents of the GTHA) to contribute to a great cause. Possibly providing a full range of donor opportunities, everything from "buy-a-brick" to street furniture to bigger chunks of cash (with plaques, etc.) Will also help build a sense of pride and ownership among a broad stakeholder base. I know having such a broad range of donation levels may cost, but using technology, there must be a clever way to do this. Any best practice case studies out there? Can there be a tax incentive at all?
- **Public campaign to push for new funding methods**, if required. If the best funding methods are currently prohibited by provincial or federal law, I don't think we should dismiss them out of hand. Although we may not be able to make use of them in the short term, we should still launch a campaign to get the darn laws fixed so that we in Canada aren't hamstrung by outdated regulations.

##### Other comments:

- At meetings, please try to have an **enclosed overflow room** so that **parents can bring children** (if unable to provide actual childcare) without disturbing other participants
- Have a **laser pointer**
- **Outreach, outreach, outreach** - need to reach out to general public so they know about this project and we can all rally around it. Just a quick list off top of my head includes:
- kiosk down at Sugar Beach, along Queen's Quay (wave walks), or in Corus bldg, at Eaton Centre, Yonge-Dundas Square, at all the city street festivals. Can be staffed by summer students and /or volunteers, and would include the ways for people to get involved etc. Do make sure that the folks in the booth are knowledgeable about context (history) as well as constraints.

- Should have an FAQ which is improved upon after each event with updated questions and this FAQ can be posted online.
- Exhibition that can go up at Centre For City Ecology Urbanspace gallery, community libraries around the city, etc.
- Get co-sponsored by the city (so can be featured on the city's page)
- Reach out to urban, planning, and architecture communities to try to find ambassadors to solicit their help.
- Partner with tourism groups
- Organize/advertise/push the Youtube videos and develop more tailored to a very broad (e.g., CityTV/Sun/Breakfast Television) audience
- Jane's Walks, Open Doors Toronto (new Corus Bldg, anything else?)
- If your organization doesn't have the resources to execute these tactics in-house, maybe you can leverage existing networks within the city and region to try to get this moving. Or it could be taken on by another committee (like the Stakeholders Advisory Committee).

### **Individual 49 (received by mail)**

#### Questions of clarification:

- Why wasn't a copy of the proposed land-use plan and current land-ownership map made available for reference?
- Why isn't the "Stay with the Keating Channel" still an option? (without the 600 million up front investment?)
- How much expropriation of land privately held is anticipated? Is this really, really necessary?

#### Focus question 1:

- Residential/commercial/recreational neighbourhood should not compete directly with the downtown/financial district!
- The plan should have a "regional" recreation focus and provide ample land to realize this!

#### Focus question 2:

- Leap-frog the relocation of the Don issue – start from there into the Port Lands, without the need for billions
- Be modest, not grandiose
- Find immediately sites to locate the Amsterdam Brewery Co., tennis courts (just like the present soccer pitches that are wildly appreciated)

### **Individual 50 (received by mail)**

#### Questions of clarification:

- Why did the accent in past presentations shift, from an emphasis on parkland and naturalization of the mouth of the Don, to a focus by John Campbell in his CBC interview, the Globe and Mail article, and the presentation on Dec. 12, on condo towers, commercial sports facilities and other commercial developments?

#### Focus question 1:

- A very significant addition to public green space along the Don River
- No more condominium canyons
- For built structures, some imaginative and innovative architecture (no more throw-away condos, and, please, no more Liebeskind and Safdi)

#### Focus question 2:

- Green space that is usable, i.e. provide a continuous, broad band of park land suitable for uninterrupted walking and bicycling in order to maximize both natural and public health benefits of naturalized public space. It should not consist of a "necklace" of disconnected patches of lawn whose primary purpose is to enhance the value of condominiums
- At least one iconic piece of spectacular architecture, but no more

#### Other comments:

- Past development of the lakeshore has often been a sorry story of missed opportunities, bland high-rises, and pathetically thin strips of "public" land along the shore of Lake Ontario.
- An ideal mix of Port Lands development should mix attractive (and at least one or two spectacular) residential, commercial and community buildings with a broad band of parkland that connects the shoreline parks to the west, the Leslie Street Spit, the ravine of the Don to the north, and the Ashbridges Bay parks and not just by streets with a few trees and shrubs running through condo canyons. As public amenities, such streets are useless, however "green" they may be made to look on planners' drawings. The same applies to the green roofs of condo buildings which were so visible in the images shown on Dec 12. They make sense in reducing energy consumption, but are (purposely?) misleading because they will not be seen from street levels, and add no public natural space to the Port Lands.

### **Individual 51 (hand written note received December 12<sup>th</sup>)**

#### Other comments:

- Suggestion for future consultation meetings: PROVIDE CHILD CARE for parents who wish to attend the meetings, and OFFER TTC TOKENS to those for whom transport is a barrier to attending. DO SPECIAL OUTREACH to people in Regent Park, South Riverdale, Chinatown East, and other lower-income areas of the city. I was disturbed by the low proportion of women, and people of colour at this meeting. Thank you!

### **Individual 52 (letter received by mail after December 12<sup>th</sup>)**

#### Other comments:

- To whom it may concern, after 25 years of hard work for this project in Lakeshore Regeneration, I feel quite strongly that we have to keep our priorities straight:  
The Ecosystem Approach is the way of the future. We have to follow the Bruntland Commission's direction for sustainable implementation using the famous three legged stool analogy Social; Economic; Ecosystem (the system doesn't work without all three) "my waterfront has turtles and frogs". It is our duty to Bring Back the Don which means resorting AS MUCH OF THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AS POSSIBLE in the Lower Don Lands (AKA "Port Land"). The lacustrine lake marsh that was Ashbridges marsh can now have regenerated habitat. The target species for this project should be: 1. Bullfrog, 2. Snapping Turtle, 3. Wood Duck, 4. Northern Pike.
- Since Toronto's functional Port never materialized with the St. Lawrence Seaway completion, the name "Port Lands" must be changed to "LOWER DON LANDS"!

### **Individual 53 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Questions of clarification:

- How is the OP affected?
- When?
- What happened – there was a plan? Why are we going back to the public?
- Where is the gap? What can we actually influence?

#### Focus question 1:

- Maintaining plan for naturalization

### **Individual 54 (received by mail)**

#### Other Comments:

- Are we insuring that we are designing for a sustainable future? Including recreational parks?
- What will happen to the commercial shipping and what is the plan for raising funds?
- What are the criteria that will ensure that the plan contributes to city-building delivers a great waterfront where people live, play, work! Will they be similar to the ones that were used during the Lower Don Lands Study?

### **Individual 55 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Focus question 1:

- Prioritize sustainability – such good work was already been done and approved. Why are we starting over?
- Do you risk losing the transit first policy by a spot development approach?
- Is there going to be a defined balance between development and parks?
- Will there be outdoor active permitted fields with associated indoor facilities?

#### Focus question 2:

- To find an inventive day and night space that helps to make Toronto a number 1 choice for a new business, new residents and Torontonians
- Transit oriented development is the key
- Transit will bring \$10 in development for every dollar invested in transit
- Stick with the Lower Don Lands plan and value engineer it. It has a signature focus, village clusters and spectacular public buildings

### **Individual 56 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Focus question 2:

- Naturalization of the Don Mouth and lakefront to provide linkage with the lakefront to the east and the islands. All as part of the flood prevention
- The reinvestment of all profits into the Don's re-naturalization and the natural area planned already
- Adaptive reuse of existing buildings-sustainable is not landfill. Heightened value of land should be reflected in an offset public realm for common good against private interest aggrandizement

### **Individual 57 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Questions of Clarification:

- What is going to happen to the current shipping business and do you have a plan for raising funds?
- A slide from John Campbell's first presentation showed a large highway interchange...are we ensuring that we are designing for a sustainable future?
- What are the criteria that will ensure that the plan contributes to city-building delivers a great waterfront where people live, play and work. Will this be similar to those used for the Lower Don Lands and Don Mouth EA?

### **Individual 58 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Focus Question 1:

- Environmental concerns and public access to the waterfront
- Balance of public and private and business spaces
- Building of attractive residential communities with pedestrian priority

#### Focus Question 2:

- Choosing a signature focus – opera house already existing to other value attractions, e.g. major museum, art, City of Toronto museum, aquarium or global awareness centre?
- Village clusters of residential development – as previously designed, with lots of pedestrian walkways
- Architecture – spectacular public buildings with maximum views and scenic spaces

### **Individual 59 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Questions of clarification:

- How are children being accommodated in the way of recreation?
- No sports complex in area for a variety of sports
- All kinds of research initiatives, focus groups, public feedback

#### Focus Question 1:

- Look for partnerships like a sports facility that would be paid for by private investment. Donate land for sports, but let private investment put up infrastructure
- Making sure that all segments are accommodated. Where are the playing fields for children?
- Not all of the Port Lands needs to be evaluated based on how much money can be made from converting the land

#### Focus Question 2:

- Sports complex with tenants/permits would generate ongoing revenue for the city. Hockey was approved, now too much. How about soccer for boys and girls, all ages and all economic levels!
- Are you serious the Cherry Beach sports fields only have another lifespan of 8 more years? Where are all children to play that are in all the images of Port Lands?

#### Other Comments:

- Children in all the pictures of the Port Lands. However, other than sailing, sand box, sprinkler systems, walking... where are the fields of play for soccer "the world's #1 sport", football, baseball, etc.
- Start with some given ideas – sports complex, the Hearn – and build around them
- Approximately 30 000 kids in the downtown area and many don't have proper access to fields of play

### **Individual 60 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

#### Questions of clarification:

- How can I get your interest and commitment to be involved in a T.V. series?
- Can you assist me in contacting potential participants?

- How can a T.V. series potentially help promote Waterfront Toronto initiatives and entice future architects?

Focus Question 1:

- Global awareness
- Branding
- Canadian “new age” culture

Focus Question 2:

- Television series starring Toronto and David Miller
- Auctions

Other Comments:

- A presentation for opportunities and ideas has been presented to Waterfront Toronto with David Miller approached to star in the TV series to promote and entice architects and feature architecture in Canadian and world history with a focus on green initiatives. I’d like to request a revisit of this proposal. The time is prime to consider the potential lucrative benefits of this avenue. Similar to Dragon’s Den, Kevin O’Leary, Canada’s Top Model, So you think you can dance, Canada’s got talent, etc.

**Individual 61 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

Questions of clarification:

- What is being accelerated? Why? What cost? Why is it taking so long now? Is the current pace reasonable?
- New financing model? Is the old one flawed or do we just need to wait for the market to improve?
- If the plan has no profits (cost = amount of funding) why rush? We will get it eventually.
- If there is no profit in moving faster, why rush?

Focus Question 1:

- How can you accelerate without reducing public and natural space to lose than is already planned?
- Build on work already done, don’t start from scratch – move in the direction of prior plans
- Naturalize as much as possible, not less than what has been planned to date

Focus Question 2:

- Stay with the plan, maybe faster if it doesn’t compromise results
- Follow the existing central waterfront Secondary Plan
- Creative financing models

Other Comments:

- Natural infrastructure costs less than hard infrastructure (green)
- Use the same terms of reference for new studies as the older studies
- Consider new natural shoreline tree trunks and less seawalls and paved surface – like what’s been done behind harbour castle. Even a few meters width of shoreline/rocks/trees (naturalized) is better than a seawall and concrete with trees in boxes

**Individual 62 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

Questions of clarification:

- Previous EA was full of great detail and result of a good democratic process and is the fundamental basis so should not be waived.
- What is the current financial plan/model?
- Why is there a need for “hurry”?
- IJC still designates Toronto as a hot spot – how will this development improve water quality and create a more sustainable, healthy waterfront?

Focus Question 1:

- Naturalization of the Don and lakeside areas and their scales must be planned first, then hard parts (roads, buildings, trails later)
- Connect natural spaces: spit, cherry beach area, etc. to form natural corridors – cannot be just a couple of metres for animals and ecosystem functions
- Put active recreation close to roads and “disturbed” areas of buildings, etc., not into natural areas



#### Focus Question 2:

- Creative financing so goals of naturalization are not compromised
- Temporary land uses that bring revenue but later must be dismantled for the real plan. Revenues from the waterfront must be dedicated to the waterfront plan.
- Start with naturalization funded by bonds/lottery so land will be attractive to developers and serve ecosystem functions while awaiting phasing.

#### **Individual 63 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

##### Questions of clarification:

- What are the benefits of acceleration?
- Will acceleration impact the proposal plan for naturalization and public space?
- Will we be building on or changing past efforts and work?

##### Focus Question 1:

- Don Mouth naturalization, flood protection and public space
- Mixed use residential and commercial buildings and development
- Access by transit, bike, pedestrian and less car destination
- All money created by the waterfront goes back into the waterfront

##### Focus Question 2:

- Naturalization, Green Space, Public space
- Creative financing
- Dream big, spend big. Make it incredible

##### Other Comments:

- Please respect all the years of hard work, public input and money already invested in this process

#### **Individual 64 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

##### Other Comments:

- To find an inventive, day and night space that helps to make Toronto a number 1 choice for new business, new residents and Torontonians

#### **Individual 65 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

##### Other Comments:

- I noticed in the plan that there will be 1200 affordable housing and 4800 market rental. How would 1200 of affordable houses will accommodate all the people that are on the waitlist with housing connection.
- I live all the way in West Hill, and would like to move back to the city as I have live in the city for 25 years. My family doctor is at Jarvis and the Esplanade, cause I can't find a doctor in Scarborough.
- I am 55 years of age and wonder what options does the Portland Development has to offer me. I find commuting tedious from this side of the neck of the woods and it is very expensive to live in the city and is now becoming available to those who can afford it and owning a piece of real estate in downtown Toronto is like a piece of gold. Please advise me how I can get on the waitlist for one of the affordable units.
- Is Cooperative Housing a Consideration for the Portland?

#### **Individual 66 (received by Waterfront Toronto)**

##### Other Comments:

- I am all in favour of the timetable for the Port Lands being pushed up. 25 years is way too long. Having said that, the 6 years that Mayor Ford was talking about is clearly too short a timetable to get this right. A 10-15 year completion schedule would be good.
- Don't cheap-out on the flood protection when it comes to re-routing the mouth of the Don River. I understand wanting to maximize developed land, but if this neighborhood cannot survive a 100-years-hurricane, then our descendants will be learning about how stupid and short-sighted we were back in the early 21st century.
- Please don't make the same mistakes you made with the Cityplace neighborhood. Cityplace is such that if you don't live there or are visiting someone who lives there, you have no reason to ever go there. There is nothing there to draw people in. You can't even drive there really. It's just somewhere you drive by on the way to the Gardiner. I hope you

know what I'm talking about and where Cityplace went wrong or we will be doomed to repeat that mistake.

- Please make the Portlands a 24 hour neighborhood. Parks are fantastic, but that only draws people during the day (and no so much in winter). Only the underbelly of society hangs out in parks after dark. We need offices, restaurants, bars, art galleries, shopping, sports as well as residential. Please create a living, breathing, vibrant neighborhood that is not brimming with tumbleweeds after dark.
- Cherry trees on Cherry Street. This is one Ford idea and can get behind.
- I'm not sure I'm for a mega-mall. But I definitely would like to see shopping. Good shopping. Clothes, shoes and such. Women (and me) like to shop. That would draw people who don't live there into the neighborhood. Is that a bad thing? An argument can be made for a large mall elsewhere in this general area. I do find it odd that there is only one large shopping mall in downtown.
- The Hearn site is perhaps the biggest opportunity. I understand there are issues with the site with respect to the sweet-heart deal Mike Harris gave to one of his cronies here, but if you can get past that, this could be a jewel. My vision is a regional/national/local athletic centre. Swimming, speedskating, velodrome, basketball, gymnastics, volleyball, etc. Placing where young and old can join athletic clubs. Be they novice or Olympic caliber. This will give kids an opportunity to take part in sports they might not have had an opportunity. It will also give the young-at-heart an opportunity to take up speedskating and cycling that I did not have a chance to experience as a child. It could be done in phases little by little adding new facilities. It could also be a training area for Olympic athletes.
- Another Ford idea I kind of like like is the observation deck atop the Hearn smokestack. From what I have read the ferris-wheel idea is not suited for this area. It would have to be no further east than Jarvis Street to get the wow-factor of the skyscrapers of the downtown core. This I read from a Ferris Wheel "expert".
- If it is possible to have any streets closed to traffic, making them strictly pedestrian, this would be great. Perhaps restaurants, bars, cafes as well as shopping. Something akin to what is found in Europe.
- Bridges. I love beautiful bridges. Who doesn't!?
- Let the architectural review panel do their jobs. They are crucial to preventing mediocre buildings in this neighborhood. Architectural excellence above all. No more pandering to the banality of the Corus building. That building does not belong on the waterfront. It's not good enough.
- A park that could accommodate a mega concert. Remember when the major cities of the world put on simultaneous concerts for a particular cause several years ago? I'm not sure if it was SARs or something else. Ours was in Molson Park in Barrie. Around the world the scenes were beamed all over the world. Scenic landscapes and cityscapes. Ours was overlooking a highway. How embarrassing. Please don't let that ever happen again. Toronto is not a highway in the boonies. Let's show the world.
- I was deadset against Rob Ford's vision of the Portlands, but I commend him for at least getting a conversation going on this piece of land. It was so far on the backburner that it was out of everyone's mind.
- Let's get financing figured out for the flood-protection. I think, in spite of the EA, your group was twiddling your thumbs with respect to the Portlands. Having said that, I am largely happy with what you have accomplished elsewhere on the waterfront. Props.

### **Individual 67 (received by email)**

#### Focus Question 1:

- I must challenge the premise that the work should be accelerated. The first goal is to know how the buildout of the entire eastern waterfront fits into the development cycle of Toronto, how fast the market can reasonably absorb what is built, and whether the tradeoff between changing land use and development speed is worth what we would wind up with. Put another way, you might be able to sell a megamall sooner, but that might not be an ideal use of the space in the short or long term. How will development of the Port Lands compete with the Lower/West Don Lands and the East Bayfront projects? You cannot begin to plan before you understand the context in which the plan will be implemented.
- The second goal is to have a plan that recognizes the quality of the waterfront we have all worked so hard to achieve and does not trade this away for a "quick fix". Especially important to this goal is the preservation of the Don River Park which is the jewel that gives the whole future neighbourhood its special character. John Campbell stated that the residential absorption rate will drive the timelines, but that the land is zoned for multiple uses that could allow (presumably) non-residential development to occur earlier. However, this type of development, likely strongly car-oriented, could destroy the very pedestrian character of the neighbourhood so prevalent in many design proposals.
- The third goal is to ensure that this is a "transit first" plan, and more generally that we not nickle and dime the infrastructure (notably the proposed LRT connection to Union Station) as a short-term expediency. This will be

particularly important if there is a fast build-out in the Port Lands where, originally, development and the transit demand it would generate were thought to lie many years in the future. It is quite disgusting that the transit component is moribund for a funding amount that would be lost in the small change of the Eglinton or Sheppard subway/LRT projects. The TTC often talks about the need to open and operate transit lines at a loss before development occurs. This happened with the original Spadina subway, and with the Scarborough RT. It will happen with the Vaughan extension in 2015. The Waterfront is no different. If we are serious about making this a transit oriented community, then we need good transit from the point where development begins, not as an afterthought. A few buses running now and then through the site simply won't provide the incentive for people to have a transit-oriented lifestyle. Transit priority (lanes, signalling) must exist from day 1, not as an afterthought. On a related note, with the changes that might occur in land use, the layout of the proposed transit service south of Keating Channel should be reviewed. Also, the early construction of a link to the east to Ashbridge Carhouse (Leslie and Commissioners) should be contemplated in order to provide an alternate route to that site. Whether that's strictly a Waterfront Toronto project or not for funding, it will affect things like road layouts and reconstruction plans. The Hearn is a special challenge because it is so far away from proposed transit service. This must be rectified in any planned use. Indeed, if the Hearn did not exist, but was merely a patch of scrub land on the southern edge of the site, would you even be thinking about building something there? Be careful not to be seduced by the idea of "recycling" a building artificially enhancing its priority in the overall scheme. If the development of the land is scattershot, this will make transit more difficult to provide, especially in the short term, and will lead to a suburban-style auto-centric community. You are building, in effect, a twenty-first century "streetcar suburb", and you need to organize the land use to support the transit line(s).

#### Focus Question 2:

- Again, I must challenge the premise that development would be accelerated, and this may actually work against maximization of value. The best value for the land will be obtained if it lies within an attractive future community including public spaces, infrastructure and transit. That requires public investment up front with the payback guaranteed against something whether it be future tax revenue (TIF) or development charges. It is VITAL that this exercise not be seen simply as an opportunity to sell land to the short-term benefit of the city to pay for other capital or operating expenses. The project cannot be self-financing if it is robbed of the very value that the public investment creates. "Value" is not just the short term monetary value of the land, but the long term worth of a major new part of the city. We can establish that we are a great city that cares to build well for the long term, or we can show ourselves as a bunch of rubes eager to take the first half-baked proposal cooked up by a developer. The discussion cannot take place intelligently (either by the citizenry or the politicians) if we do not have a reasonable idea of the net cash flow available from land sales and/or other revenue tools. What is our starting point? Do we have anywhere near enough money likely to come in over, say, 20 years, to pay for what is proposed, or will some public investment go unrewarded in the medium term? We are conducting this discussion without any sense of the scale of money that might be available, the time over which this would be received, or the public cost necessary to prime the development. And so ...
- First, understand just what we mean by "value" as this is far more complex than the dollars you might get for land. It embraces the quality of what will be built and its role in establishing Toronto's future character.
- Second, understand that maximizing value (and accelerating development) will require investment. Selling land just to get money to build water pipes is astoundingly stupid, and yet that seems to be the prevailing attitude.
- Third, ensure that the process remains transparent and that it is not high-jacked for short term benefit. Include the public in a discussion of the broad scope of expected costs, revenues and financing. Yes, I know that this sort of thing is considered confidential for various reasons, but as long as politicians can make vague statements about how the quick development will solve all of our problems, we need the numbers out in the open, at least on a broad scale to consider the effect of various options.

#### Other comments:

- I know that the format and size of the meeting at the Central Library was not the easiest, but I found that the facilitator at our table actually got in the way. She spent so much time trying to understand any one point someone was trying to make that she didn't get beyond one idea in the "group" feedback. I have no idea of how much might have been lost this way, and as the evening wore on, we lost members of our group who were getting frustrated.
- One missing piece was a quick review of what people might have thought was important. You wouldn't get such a list right the first time, but could refine it with write-ins as these sessions go along. You probably would have got a better sense by getting people to respond to specific ideas ["do you think we should preserve the Don River Park" on a scale of 1 to 5] rather than forcing people to come up with all of the more obvious ideas as part of their reviews. That

would leave more time/space for “other comments” from which you would find the items that were not in your original group.

- As you go forward in this process, there may be issues where you need to determine the mood of the respondents to various questions that might come up in the design/development process. There is always the danger that pre-formatted questions could be seen as trying to “manage the response”, but if this is done in the context of an open ended list/discussion you may be ok. A lot has to do with how such questions are presented. An early focus group to review the questions may be worthwhile.
- I cannot say this strongly enough. Waterfront Toronto has a degree of credibility that will be forever lost if you turn into little more than a mouthpiece for a mayor and his brother whose influence is already waning and who may well be out of office before much of the work on these plans actually gets underway. If the discussion is framed only by the narrow scope we hear from the Fords, the quick-buck approach to development, then Waterfront Toronto might as well close up shop.
- The citizens of Toronto and members of Council did not rise up against the Fords and their blatant stupidity to have Waterfront Toronto sell out at the first opportunity.