



MINUTES

Queens Quay Working Group Meeting #13
Held on September 20, 2011
Waterfront Toronto
6:00-8:00pm

Attendees:

Members:

- Braz Menezes, York Quay Neighbourhood Association, represented by a delegate
- Clay McFayden, cycling advocate/ Toronto Cyclist Union
- Julie Beddoes, Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association
- Ulla Colgrass, 55 & 65 Harbour Square
- Kelly Gorman, 260 Queens Quay
- Dennis Findlay, WaterfrontAction
- Pam Mazza, Toronto Island Community Association
- Blair Keetch, PawsWay
- Anna Prodanou, Toronto Island Community Association
- Cindi Vanden Heuvel, Mariposa Cruises
- Jennifer Chan, constituency assistant to Councillor Vaughan

Regrets:

- Ritu Gupta, WaterClub Condominium Corporation
- Bob Rasmussen, 65 Harbour Square (represented by a delegate)
- Brian MacLean, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association
- Rick Rabba, Rabba Foods
- Tammy Thorne, cycling advocate
- Tom Davidson, constituency assistant to Councillor McConnell
- Helder Melo, Harbourfront Centre
- Andrew Judge, Redpath Sugar Ltd.
- Sylvia Pellman, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
- James Russell, 33 Harbour Square
- Carol Jolly, Waterfront Business Improvement Association
- Kathi Bonner, Brookfield Office Properties
- Vicki Barron, Waterfront Regeneration Trust
- Laura Feltz, 250 Queens Quay

Advisors and Observers:

- Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Elsa Fancello, Urban Strategies Inc.
- Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
- Bruce Sudds, Waterfront Toronto
- JD Reeves, Waterfront Toronto
- Adam Nicklin, West 8 +DTAH
- Elnaz Sanati, West 8 +DTAH
- Debbie Adams of Adams and Associates Design Consultants Inc.
- Chris Ronson, Waterfront Secretariat

Agenda:

1. Welcoming remarks
Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
(Information sharing)
2. Introduction and meeting overview
Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
(Information sharing/feedback required)
 - a. Review agenda
 - b. draft meeting minutes from August 23, 2011
 - c. Review tracking matrix
3. Update on Construction Manager selection and CLC launch
Bruce Sudds, Waterfront Toronto
(Information sharing)
4. Design update
JD Reeves, Waterfront Toronto
Adam Nicklin, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing/feedback required)
5. BIA programing/animation elements
Adam Nicklin, West 8 + DTAH
(Information sharing/feedback required)
6. Update on signage and wayfinding
Debbie Adams, Adams and Associates Design Consultants Inc.
(Information sharing/feedback required)
7. Meeting working schedule and next steps
Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies Inc.
(Information sharing)

Minutes:

1. Welcoming remarks

Chris Glaisek welcomed the Queens Quay Working Group and thanked them for their participation and feedback into the Queens Quay revitalization initiative. Chris acknowledged that there has been a lot of discussion lately around the future of the Portlands redevelopment. However, through discussions with City staff and members of the public, a resolution has been reached. This matter will be discussed at the September 21, 2011 City Council Executive Committee meeting.

Chris also noted that through public feedback and the significant investments taking place within the Downtown Waterfront area, Waterfront Toronto is currently exploring introducing an eastbound off-ramp on the Gardiner Expressway at Spadina Avenue. Arup is currently undergoing a technical review which is expected to be complete within a three month period. He concluded by stating that Waterfront Toronto is transitioning to the next phase of the Queen Quay revitalization project and anticipates having a Construction Manager selected within the next few weeks.

Question/comment 1: Can you repeat the expected timing for concluding the Spadina off-ramp analysis?

Response 1: Three months.

Question/comment 2: Is the Spadina off-ramp review focusing on both east and westbound?

Response 2: The review is focusing of the Spadina eastbound off-ramp.

Question/comment 3: Can you provide an update on the timing Yonge, York and Bay Ramp Environmental Assessment?

Response 3: The City has not allocated any additional funding to this project. It is currently on hold.

2. Introduction and meeting overview

Pino Di Mascio reviewed the evening's agenda and welcomed the Queens Quay Working Group members. Pino noted that this was the second to last meeting. He asked the Queens Quay Working Group members to contact Waterfront Toronto with any comments/questions that they would like addressed at the last meeting. He mentioned that if anyone had any comments on last month's meeting minutes or tracking matrix to email their comments to central@waterfrontoronto.ca.

3. Update on Construction Manager selection and CLC launch

Following up from the last Queens Quay Working Group meeting where Bruce Sudds provided a summary of the Terms of Reference for the Construction Liaison Committee (CLC), Bruce provided the Working Group with a brief update on the construction manager selection process and the

launch of the CLC. Bruce let the Working Group know that Waterfront Toronto is currently in the process of selecting a Construction Manager. Specifically, he noted that Waterfront Toronto will be hosting interviews with the shortlist candidates over the next couple of weeks. He also mentioned that the CLC will have a slightly different role than the Queens Quay Working Group. The CLC role will be to act as an ambassador for their respective group/organization by sharing information and reporting back to the Committee with respect to the ideas, concerns and suggestions of their respective groups, committees or organizations. He noted that some Queens Quay Working Group members have contacted him with interest to join the CLC and he welcomed others to also apply.

4. Design update

JD Reeves began with a quick update on the safety assessment currently being completed on the design for Queens Quay. Waterfront Toronto retained consultants to undertake a safety assessment on the design plans for Queens Quay. He noted that Waterfront Toronto received a draft report last week, which indicated that there were no major safety concerns. The report did, however, suggest a few refinements on signage. The safety assessment report will be circulated to the City for their review.

Adam Nicklin provided an update on the design process for Queens Quay. In his presentation, Adam focused on the non-standard elements that they are proposing for the redesign of Queens Quay (the design elements that are typically not seen elsewhere in the City) and the feedback that they received from City staff. He presented a number of non-standard elements that they are proposing in regards to surface materials, planting, street furniture, traffic control, civil infrastructure and transit infrastructure. Adam noted that after they presented their rationale for the non-standard elements, the City is generally in support of the changes. However, there are a few details that they are working with the City departments on, i.e. working with City of Toronto Technical Services to address granite pavers and granite curbs. Adam also mentioned that since the City has been working with the design team early on in the process many of the potential issues with the non-standard elements have been resolved.

JD concluded by provided a quick update on the second design submission. He noted that Waterfront Toronto will be meeting with various City departments and agencies to review and discuss City comments on the design submission.

Question/comment 4: In regards to the paving treatment along Queens Quay, has the design team confirmed whether the pavers will be brought to the building line or will it just go as far as the private property line?

Response 4: The design team has initiated discussions with the various property owners along Queens Quay and is asking them if they are interested in linking their respective property into the overall design. We will be seeking a cost-sharing program where Waterfront Toronto and the property owner will share the cost of paving to the building face instead of just to the property

line. The majority of people that Waterfront Toronto has talked with are very receptive to this proposal.

5. BIA programming/animation elements

Adam Nicklin presented on a number of possible programming and animation elements proposed in partnership with the Waterfront BIA. Adam provided examples of how to integrate tree lighting, banners and flags, planting pots and planters, hanging baskets and electrical equipment to power large events into the overall design for Queens Quay. Adam noted that these additional programming and animation elements are ultimately dependent on funding but are additional elements to help dress and animate the street.

Question/comment 5: Having some of these programming elements, especially in the winter months, will be a great selling point.

Response 5: Noted.

Question/comment 6: It would be great if next summer a few samples, such as planters, are placed on the street. It could get people excited and engaged on things to come.

Question/comment 7: Would it be possible to also integrate some other street furniture pieces early on in the process?

Response 7: We will look into strategies to integrate programming/animation elements early on in the process.

Question/comment 8: One of the tree lighting options showed up-lighting. Would that option contradict development parameters for bird migration that FLAP was part of?

Response 8: Up-lighting is mostly an issue for building development and not tree planting.

Question/comment 9: Out of curiosity, who pays for the plantings along University Avenue?

Response 9: The City pays for planting and maintaining the landscaping along University Avenue.

Question/comment 10: Can you explore more year round landscaping so there is some green in the winter months i.e. shrubs?

Response 10: Noted.

Question/comment 11: Have you explored engaging the local community in the planting like what happens in the music gallery?

Response 11: Great idea to engage the community in the planting process itself.

Question/comment 12: Some of the condominiums along Queens Quay have their own planters that they take care of i.e. 250 and 260 Queens Quay.

Response 12: Great suggestion and example for others on the street.

6. Update on signage and way finding

Debbie Adams presented on the proposed signage and way finding program for redesign of Queens Quay. Following up from our initial presentation to the Queens Quay Working Group on November 16, 2010, Debbie reviewed the objectives for signage and way finding and the overall approach. Specifically, she noted that the objectives are to provide clear and useful information, integrate with other public realm elements and ultimately reduce clutter. Debbie continued by presenting on potential street identification methods, pedestrian scaled signs, banner hardware and area/pier/WaveDeck identification strategies.

Question/comment 13: You mentioned that they signs need to be clear even with the reduced speed limit along Queens Quay. What will the speed limit be along Queens Quay?

Response 13: 40 km/hr.

Question/comment 14: Why are you suggesting grey on the signs? There is already quite a bit of grey.

Response 14: It is an accent colour and provides clear and high contrast. For clarity, you require accent colours in signs.

Question/comment 15: I think that the grey is too much especially since the waterfront will be grey the majority of the year.

Response 15: There are new accessibility guidelines that require 70% contrast. We still need to complete an on-site review to confirm the colour choice. That said, we stayed away from blue since there is already quite a bit of blue in the landscape and other street elements.

Question/comment 16: I am glad to hear that this proposal will be consolidating heritage and wayfinding. The pier signs that you presented are much more elegant than the WaveDeck signs. Are you planning to redo the WaveDeck signs as part of the overall program?

Response 16: The WaveDeck signs were just completed but we will consider redoing the signs in the future.

Question/comment 17: Will the signs be showing distance in metric or imperial?

Response 17: We will likely present the distance in both metric and imperial. We want to encourage people to take active forms of transportation. We also plan to include distance markers along the Martin Goodman Trail.

Question/comment 18: I really like your proposal for four different colour neighbourhood identification markers. You did not speak much on the proposed signs along the Martin Goodman Trail. Can you speak to that?

Response 18: We still need to consult the City but plan to incorporate the trail with existing mapping.

Question/comment 19: Will you consider using pier names instead of slips?

Response 19: Noted.

Question/comment 20: It would be helpful if the pier names were different in order to help people find the tour boats.

Response 20: We will suggest that there directional signs on the provided maps and that the piers are properly signed.

Question/comment 21: I like how the proposal to include different signs based on the various areas/precincts of the waterfront. The signs are very beautiful including weather vanes.

Response 21: Noted.

Question/comment 22: A number of the signs presented say 'ferry docks'.

Response 22: It is important to keep reinforcing directions as part of the way finding approach. The western portion of the downtown waterfront will likely be reinforcing the Harbourfront Centre and Billy Bishop Airport, while the east side will be reinforcing the ferry dock.

Question/comment 23: It would be helpful if there were more signs for the airport.

Response 23: More signs specific for the airport is a separate discussion with the City, especially with the name change of the airport.

Question/comment 24: What are the dimensions of the banners? Some of the proposed banners seem out of scale and very high.

Response 24: The banners are standard size that commonly found in the City.

Question/comment 25: Would the city own the sign when finished?

Response 25: This is an item that required further discussion with the City. It would be considered a non-standard detail that would need sign-off from the City.

7. Meeting working schedule and next steps

Pino Di Mascio thanked everyone for their feedback and for attending the meeting. He noted that the next and last meeting will be held at the end of October/early November once the Construction Manager is on board. Waterfront Toronto will confirm shortly in regards to the meeting date. He reminded everyone to review the minutes and comment matrix and contact Waterfront Toronto if they want a specific item addressed at the next meeting.