

April 8, 2004

To: Planning and Transportation Committee

From: City Clerk, Toronto South Community Council

Subject: Community Consultation Meeting – Union Station Master Plan and Application to Amend the Zoning By-law – 61-71 Front Street West (Union Station) (Toronto Centre-Rosedale, Ward 28)

Recommendations:**The Toronto South Community Council recommends that:**

- (1) Mayor Miller, in consultation with the Chairs of the Planning and Transportation and Administration Committees and the Ward Councillor, retain an outside planner to conduct a peer review of the existing City and external planning documents and to work with City planning staff to create a draft Master Plan;**
- (2) a public consultation process be developed to include the Union Station Public Advisory Group, Save Union Station Committee and any other interested parties to discuss the draft Master Plan and peer review and report back to City Council through the Administration Committee;**
- (3) City Council amend Zoning By-law 168-93 for 61-71 Front Street West (Union Station) substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached as Attachment No. 4 to the report (January 12, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services;**
- (4) City Council authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the draft Zoning By-law Amendment as may be required; and**
- (5) City Council advise the applicant of the conditions outlined in Attachment No. 5 of the report (January 12, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services pertaining to the Site Plan Approval application.**

Background:

The Toronto South Community Council, on April 7, 2004, had before it a communication (February 5, 2004) from the City Clerk, Planning and Transportation Committee, forwarding the Committee's action of February 5, 2004 in:

- (1) referring the report (January 12, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the communication (February 4, 2004) from the Members of the Save Union Station Committee, respecting Rezoning Application 03 195332 STE 28 OZ, to the Toronto South Community Council for report to Council, through the Planning and Transportation Committee, to ensure adequate community consultation in the development of a Master Plan for Union Station prior to consideration of the Zoning By-law by the Planning and Transportation Committee; and
- (2) requesting the Toronto South Community Council to consider the retention of an outside consultant to assist in this matter and consider whether the site plan should be done concurrently with the development of the Master Plan and the processing of the Zoning Application.

The Toronto South Community Council also had before it the following reports/communications:

- (March 18, 2004) from the Director, Community Planning, South District, and recommending:
 - (1) That City Council adopt the proposed Master Plan for Union Station attached to the Commissioner of Urban Development's report of January 12, 2004 to the Planning and Transportation Committee on Union Station as Attachment No. 1, as the Master Plan to guide the revitalization of Union Station including the background documentation listed on Appendix 1 to this report; and
 - (2) That City staff, in addition to the usual process, continue to consult with the Union Station Public Advisory Group and the Operators' Committee throughout the Site Plan approval process associated with the ongoing restoration and renovations to the Station to ensure that conditions for the Site Plan approval are consistent with the policies enunciated in the Master Plan.
- (March 22, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, and recommending that City Council:
 - (1) amend Zoning By-law 168-93 for 61-71 Front Street West (Union Station) substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached to the report of January 12, 2004 as Attachment No. 1;
 - (2) authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the draft Zoning By-law Amendment as may be required; and
 - (3) advise the applicant of the conditions outlined in Attachment No. 2 to the report of January 12, 2004 pertaining to the Site Plan Approval application.

- (April 7, 2004) from Helen Riley;
- (April 3, 2004) from Mike Comstock, St. Lawrence Market Neighbourhood;
- (April 7, 2004) from John Sewell
- (undated) from David Garon; and
- (April 7, 2004) from Rhona Swarbrick.

The following addressed the Toronto South Community Council:

- John Sewell, Save Union Station Committee;
- David Garon, Toronto Railway Historical Association;
- Mr. Diamond, Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc.;
- Helen Riley, Feet on the Street;
- Janice Etter;
- Robert Allsopp;
- Rhona Swarbrick, Pedestrian Planning Network; and
- Lawrence David.

The Toronto South Community Council's recommendations are noted above.

City Clerk
Toronto South Community Council

Frances M. Pritchard/gj

20040407.22

c.: Commissioner of Urban Development Services
City Solicitor
Angus Cranston

February 5, 2004

To: Toronto South Community Council

From: City Clerk

Subject: Rezoning Application 03 195332 STE 28 OZ - Applicant: City of Toronto
61-71 Front Street West - Toronto Centre-Rosedale, Ward 28

The Planning and Transportation Committee on February 5, 2004:

- (2) referred the report (January 12, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the communication (February 4, 2004) from the Members of the Save Union Station Committee, respecting Rezoning Application 03 195332 STE 28 OZ, to the Toronto South Community Council for report to Council, through the Planning and Transportation Committee, to ensure adequate community consultation in the development of a Master Plan for Union Station prior to consideration of the Zoning By-law by the Planning and Transportation Committee; and**
- (3) requested the Toronto South Community Council to consider the retention of an outside consultant to assist in this matter and consider whether the site plan should be done concurrently with the development of the Master Plan and the processing of the Zoning Application.**

The Planning and Transportation Committee held a statutory public hearing on February 5, 2004, in accordance with The Planning Act and appropriate notice of this meeting was given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder.

Background:

The Planning and Transportation Committee at its meeting held on February 5, 2004, had before it the following:

- (i) report (January 12, 2004) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services recommending that City Council:
 - (1) adopt the Master Plan attached as Attachment No. 1;
 - (2) amend Zoning By-law 168-93 for 61-71 Front Street West (Union Station) substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached as Attachment No. 4;
 - (3) authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the draft Zoning By-law Amendment as may be required; and

- (4) advise the applicant of the conditions outlined in Attachment No. 5 pertaining to the Site Plan Approval application; and
- (ii) communication (February 4, 2004) from Members of the Save Union Station Committee recommending that:
 - (1) City Council retain an independent consultant to advise on the contents of a Master Plan for Union Station, as called for in the Secondary Plan approved by Council in 1991;
 - (2) the consultant's report, when available, be the subject of at least one public meeting, with notification going to, among others, those who have already indicated an interest in Union Station;
 - (4) once a Master Plan is adopted by Council, the Union Station lease should be considered by Council and evaluated against the Plan, and the lease should either be amended to comply with the Plan or rejected;
 - (4) any City staff person who served on the Selection Committee should recuse themselves from any involvement or decision-making regarding Union Station.

The following persons appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. John Sewell, Save Union Station Committee, and filed a written submission with respect thereto;
- Ms. Helen Riley, and filed a written submission with respect thereto; and
- Mr. Lawrence David.

City Clerk

P. A. Morris
Item No. 1
Attachment

- c: Commissioner of Urban Development Services
Mr. John Sewell, Save Union Station Committee
Ms. Helen Riley
Mr. Lawrence David

To: Planning and Transportation Committee

Subject: Union Station,
Item No.1, February 5, 2004 agenda

Date: February 4, 2004.

From: Members of the Save Union Station Committee

We wish to speak on this item. There are a number of issues we wish to deal with, including: notice to the public; the status of the Master Plan for Union Station; the content of the Master Plan; and the previous bidding process.

1. Notice to the public

As the planning report of January 12, 2004 makes clear, a community meeting was held on November 19, 2003. None of the members of our organization, Committee to Save Union Station, were notified of this meeting even though we have addressed various committees at City Hall on numerous occasions to express our deep interest in Union Station. The planners' report notes that only three members of the public attended - as though no one was interested - when in fact many would have attended if the planners had seen fit to notify those who had previously indicated their interest.

We are most unhappy that the City decided to exclude so many interested people from this particular discussion.

2. Master Plan for Union Station

In 1991 Council approved the Railway Lands East Secondary Plan, which among other things called for the adoption of a Master Plan for Union Station. Here is what Section 10.4.2 of the Secondary Plan states:

“It is the policy of Council to ensure the retention of Union Station as a transportation terminal and to seek to ensure the satisfactory functioning of the station complex.

To this end it is the policy of Council to adopt a Master Plan for Union Station that will:

- (a) respect the historic significance of Union Station;
- (b) ensure transportation use is the primary function of Union Station;
- (c) provide for each of the necessary transportation functions in a safe, efficient and coherent manner;
- (d) ensure flexibility for expansion and future changes of use;
- (e) ensure that Union Station is fully integrated with its environs; and
- (f) establish civic design quality.”

The clear intention of City Council at that time was to prepare a comprehensive document against which proposals for rehabilitating the Station and development around the Station could be assessed. Further paragraphs of Section 10 indicate council's expectation of redevelopment

initiatives. Obviously this is a wise way to proceed: define the public goals to begin with and then use the statement of public objectives as a way of determining whether any proposals received should be approved.

Our organization has stated on many occasion in the last 16 months that what Council needed was a comprehensive approach to Union Station. We were not aware that 12 years ago City Council itself had required such a document be prepared.

City staff were clearly aware of this requirement since (we now realize) it was referred to in the voluminous Bid Documents prepared in 2001 – see Request for Proposal, Volume 1, page 3 – 3.

Yet such a master plan has not been prepared. Instead, staff and council decided to seek bids before preparing this necessary document. This has meant that there has been no document outlining public objectives against which bids could be assessed and judged.

Were the planners asleep at the switch? Did they deliberately disregard the 1991 decision?

Senior staff are now suggesting that such a document be prepared. But the problem is that the very staff recommending the contents of the draft Master Plan in the report of January 12, 2004 are those who have been in charge of the bidding process, a process which is very seriously flawed, as we describe later in this brief.

It would be unreasonable to say that those responsible for the flawed process should now be in charge of drafting a document which, after the fact, justifies the decisions arrived at. That is not what city council contemplated in 1991, and it is not in the public interest. Creating a Master Plan which justifies the preferred bid – and that seems to be the objective of the January 12 report – does not serve the city interest.

The question for this committee is how it can satisfy the requirements that Council set down in 1991.

We believe a fresh approach is required. A draft Master Plan should be prepared after public consultation by an independent consultant. We expect the consultant to carry out discussions with various public bodies to define objectives, find ways to coordinate services, sort through jurisdictional conflicts and generally make recommendations that will satisfy the terms of reference agreed upon in 1991. We believe this is the appropriate way of securing a Master Plan for Union Station. We see no other reasonable way to proceed.

3. The content of the Master Plan

The limitations of the Master Plan proposed by staff in the January 12, 2004 report can be clearly seen by showing some of the matters that are not talked about in the draft that is before you. In fact, it is fair to say that the Master Plan proposal appears to conform to the plans submitted by the preferred bidder, Union Pearson – not to broadly outline public objectives as called for by council in 1991.

The following are five areas where there is probably widespread public agreement, but no mention of these concerns is made in the staff proposal for a Master Plan.

- a) Publicly used areas should be in public control.

Union Station is one of the most public buildings in Toronto, used by more than 40 million commuters and travelers annually. It makes sense to ensure that the areas used by the public on a regular basis are controlled by a public body such as the city. This will ensure that high public standards are met and that the public can feel at ease in this space. This space should not become privately controlled like Eaton Centre where private security guards can decide who is permitted to be there and who is not.

- b) Maximize the public use of the Great Hall

The Great Hall is one of the most stunning spaces in the city. It is both glorious and uplifting, which is why the structure registers so high on the public consciousness. Unfortunately, many people are stuck in the basement of Union Station, in mean, cramped space, and they never have the opportunity to experience the Great Hall.

Uses and routes within the Station should be configured to ensure that the maximum number of passengers possible have an opportunity of passing through the Great Hall. This can be done by appropriately considering the way platforms function, the placement of concourses, and generally conceiving of space which centres on the Great Hall rather than treats it as a problem.

- c) Ensure the Beaux Arts standard of design is apparent in all large public areas in the Station.

As the draft Master Plan makes clear, the Beaux Arts design of the station is quite extraordinary. The report notes “the proportion and order of the spaces, as well as their generosity of dimension, finishes, daylight and animation” is critical and that “the primary concourses [should be treated] as important public rooms with definable edges and uncluttered floors.” (page 22.)

These should be the benchmarks for determining the acceptability of any changes to the Station. New and renovated spaces should exhibit these characteristics.

But we know that unless there is great vigilance, these goals will not be met. Union Pearson has proposed concourses filled by almost two dozen staircases. The Master Plan must be forceful in requiring that the Beaux Arts standard of design is apparent throughout the public parts of the Station.

- d) Ease of vertical travel by pedestrians

Currently, the distance from the concourse level to the track level of GO Transit involves 31 steps. The distance between the teamways on Bay and York Streets and the GO Track platforms will be more than 31 steps.

To make these links accessible to most people, escalators must be installed. It doesn't make sense to design a facility used by 40 million people (the plan is to double that number) and requires that most people walk up and down three or four flights of stairs.

The Master Plan has a section about barrier-free access, but no section about ease of vertical access for most of the travelers. This can be done by escalators and should be a requirement.

e) Taxis and drop-offs

Areas for taxis and drop-offs should be readily available to all travelers. This is not an item that is dealt with in the Master Plan but it clearly is important for many people. There should be short-term parking directly under the station to allow ease of access for those driven to the station by friends and relatives, and who may have luggage. It is not good enough to suggest that they find a parking space within 400 or 500 metres of the Station. As well, there should be clear and commodious places for taxis to pick up and drop off passengers.

We believe these are five ideas would find wide public acceptance as important public objectives for Union Station. They should be part of any Master Plan. If there had been more time to review the Master Plan as well as opportunities for more general public discussion, other suggestions might also come into view.

We believe the public requires, and the 1991 city council decision now demands, that an independent consultant be retained to prepare a draft Master Plan, which is subject to public scrutiny and debate before consideration by council.

4. The previous bidding process

We are very concerned with the problems in the previous bidding process and the impact it has on documents such as this report. A brief history of the bidding will clarify our concerns.

Although City Council did not ensure that the Master Plan be prepared as called for in the Secondary Plan, Council did establish a very precise bidding and selection process in order to attract and judge private sector bids for Union Station, a process intended to ensure that there would be no undue influence in the selection of a preferred bidder.

Before a bidder was permitted to participate fully in the bidding, that bidder had to be financially pre-qualified, that is, the bidder had to show the financial ability to carry out the contract. In the end there were only two bids by financially pre-qualified bidders: Union Pearson, and LP Heritage.

A selection team of six persons was established. It included several senior city staff, including the current Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

On May 8, 2002, the selection committee members scored each of the two bids according to nine different criteria. The decision of the committee, by a considerable margin of votes, was to award the bid to LP Heritage.

One would have thought that would be the end of the matter, and the decision would be reported to council. That was not to be. The next day Union Pearson wrote to the selection committee asking for some changes and within a day or two it was decided that the financial health of LP Heritage was in some doubt even though it had been financially pre-qualified. LP Heritage was not told of these doubts, nor was city council. Instead, in utter secrecy the selection committee decided to take a second vote.

That vote second vote occurred on June 17, 2002. One senior city staff person awarded LP Heritage zero points in three of the categories relating to financial matters. The result was that Union Pearson narrowly won this second vote and was recommended as the preferred bidder. If this staff person's aberrant vote was excluded, LP Heritage would have again won this second vote.

City staff reported the results of the second vote to City Council, never hinting that there had been two votes and that the first vote had gone to LP Heritage. City Council was never told the full story, but agreed with the staff recommendation that Union Pearson should be the preferred bidder and a contract should be negotiated with Union Pearson. Attempts to make both bids public were rebuffed. The scoring sheets were destroyed by city staff, contrary to established practice and law.

Eight months later, after much public pressure, City Council agreed to ask the provincial integrity commissioner, former judge Coulter Osborne, to review and report on this situation. It was Mr. Osborne's research which first revealed that there had been two votes, not one, and that a city staff person had taken the action which resulted in Union Pearson winning the bid. Mr. Osborne noted the zero scores by the city staff member was "patently unreasonable," (p.55 of the report). He said it was "something of an over reaction, a misguided response" (page 55.) If this vote were excluded, the original decision of the selection committee would stand, awarding the LP Heritage the preferred bidder status.

We believe it is difficult to believe that senior staff who in the past have hidden details of the Union Station bidding process from City Council can now be expected to offer fair and objective advice on Union Station matters. We question whether a senior staff person who has been criticized so strongly by an independent investigator can have the credibility to continue to have carriage of such an important matter.

It is for these reasons that we think it appropriate that City Council seek independent advice on the contents of a Master Plan for Union Station. We fear that asking the same senior staff who have already recommended one bidder after such an unsatisfactory bid process, and after refusing to inform council of that process, may not give fair and professional advice. In retrospect, we find it disturbing that senior city staff have left it so late in the process to propose the Master Plan called for more than 12 years ago. At the least, one would call this bad planning.

For this reason, we believe Council should retain an independent consultant to advise on the contents of a Master Plan, which would then be a matter of public comment, and decision-making by Council.

In the interim, we believe that any city staff person who served on the Selection Committee should recuse themselves from any involvement or decision-making regarding Union Station.

5. Recommendations:

(i) City Council retain an independent consultant to advise on the contents of a Master Plan for Union Station, as called for in the Secondary Plan approved by Council in 1991.

(ii) The consultant's report, when available, be the subject of at least one public meeting, with notification going to, among others, those who have already indicated an interest in Union Station.

(iii) Once a Master Plan is adopted by Council, the Union Station lease should be considered by Council and evaluated against the Plan, and the lease should either be amended to comply with the Plan or rejected.

(iv) Any city staff person who served on the Selection Committee should recuse themselves from any involvement or decision-making regarding Union Station.

Yours sincerely,

Save Union Station Committee
John Sewell (416 977 5097)
Linda Sheppard
Cathy Nasmith
Laura Cooper
Bobbi Speck.
Noelle Zitzer
Alison Reid
Copy: Mayor David Miller.

 **TORONTO** Staff Report

March 18, 2004

To: Toronto South Community Council

From: Director, Community Planning, South

Subject: Supplementary Report on the Union Station Master Plan
Application No.: 03-195332 STE 28 OZ
Applicant: City of Toronto
61-71 Front Street West
Toronto Centre-Rosedale, Ward 28

Purpose:

To provide further information pertaining to the proposed Master Plan for Union Station and respond to concerns raised at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting held on February 5, 2004.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) City Council adopt the proposed Master Plan for Union Station attached to the Commissioner of Urban Development's report of January 12, 2004 to the Planning and Transportation Committee on Union Station as Attachment No. 1, as the Master Plan to guide the revitalization of Union Station including the background documentation listed on Appendix 1 to this report; and
- (2) City staff, in addition to the usual process, continue to consult with the Union Station Public Advisory Group and the Operators' Committee throughout the Site Plan approval process associated with the ongoing restoration and renovations to the Station to ensure that conditions for the Site Plan approval are consistent with the policies enunciated in the Master Plan.

Background:

At its meeting on February 5, 2004, the Planning and Transportation Committee referred the January 12, 2004 report from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services as well as communications from the public to the Toronto South Community Council for report to Council

through the Planning and Transportation Committee, to ensure adequate community consultation in the development of a Master Plan for Union Station prior to consideration of an amendment to the Zoning By-law. The Committee also requested Toronto South Community Council consider the retention of an outside consultant to assist in this matter and consider whether the site plan should be done concurrently with the development of the Master Plan and the processing of the Zoning By-law application.

The Master Plan recommended by City staff is a compilation of a number of previously approved planning and heritage documents produced by independent consultants and government agencies with respect to Union Station. The following chronology provides further background information related to the preparation of a Master Plan for Union Station:

- In 1975 the Federal Government designated Union Station as a National Historic Site.
- In 1975 Union Station was further protected by its inclusion in the federal Heritage Railways Protection Act. In August 1989 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board published a Heritage Character Statement identifying the reason for designation of Union Station and the character defining features.
- In 1985 as part of the planning process for the development of the railway lands, the City of Toronto recognized the importance of Union Station and commenced a series of studies to establish principles to accommodate future pedestrian and passenger circulation routes at Union Station. The fragmented ownership and divergent interests of the various stakeholders associated with Union Station made this a difficult task.
- In 1989 City Council established the Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Master Plan Steering Committee to prepare a long range development plan for pedestrian circulation within and surrounding Union Station. This Committee included representatives from the City, CN, CP and Toronto Terminals Railway (as owners of Union Station); the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, GO Transit; VIA Rail; Toronto Transit Commission; Marathon Realty and the Province. The Committee retained Roger duToit of du Toit Allsopp Hillier to prepare the pedestrian circulation master plan.
- In 1991 City Council adopted OPA 570 (The Railway Lands East Secondary Plan) which included a requirement for City Council to adopt a Master Plan for Union Station.
- In December 1991, the Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Master Plan Steering Committee approved the Master Plan prepared by du Toit Allsopp Hillier.
- The 1992 staff report recommending adoption of the du Toit Plan noted various implementation initiatives that are similar to those proposed today. These included the development by GO Transit of a west concourse, expansion of the TTC station, the possible enclosure of the moat and teamways for improved pedestrian circulation, as well as developing improved connections to the south.
- In February 1993, Toronto City Council adopted the Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan dated December 1991 as the Master Plan for Union Station.

- In 1998 the City commenced negotiations with TTR to resolve outstanding rent arbitration issues. These led to the City purchasing Union Station in August 2000.
- In order to transfer ownership of the Station to the City under the Heritage Railways Protection Act, Parks Canada required the City to enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement thereby providing the highest level of protection to the Station. The Heritage Easement Agreement (dated June 30, 2000) included as appendices the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada Heritage Railway Stations Heritage Character Statement dated August 28 1989, and the draft Commemorative Integrity Statement for Toronto Union Station (prepared by Parks Canada and completed in consultation with a group of stakeholders in July 2002).
- In early 2001, the City initiated the Request for Proposals (RFP) process.
- In 2001, the City retained ERA Architects Inc., to prepare “Heritage Guidelines” to provide an overview of the principles that would serve to protect Union Station and guide the proposed revitalization. These guidelines, dated July 2001, were approved by Parks Canada and appended to the RFP.
- The City also worked with the transportation operators in 2001 to create a Functional Plan adhering to the principles from the duToit plan to identify the potential for 100,000 sq. ft. of commercial space to be accommodated within the Concourse and Great Hall levels at the Station. This material was also part of the RFP package.
- In anticipation of the RFP process, the City commissioned du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier to update the 1991 Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan in consultation with the Station’s transportation operators (GO Transit, VIA Rail, TTC). This updated document was part of the package of material circulated with the RFP issued in August 2001.
- The RFP provided proponents with all the above documentation and required proponents to base their proposals on the du Toit principles and the Functional Plan. It also required that the successful proponent to submit a Master Plan in conjunction with a site plan application.

Comments:

The proposed Master Plan for the Station consolidates the transportation principles enunciated in the 1991 Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan, as updated by the 2001 study of the same name; the Heritage principles enunciated in the Commemorative Integrity Statement; and Design Guidelines for the future restoration and redevelopment of the Station. The Master Plan forms a basis for evaluating ongoing maintenance and any changes proposed in the future.

The 1991 du Toit Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan, adopted as the Master Plan and subsequently updated, as well as the Heritage Guidelines were both prepared by independent consultants in advance of the RFP process. The proposed Master Plan consolidates both heritage and transportation principles in anticipation of the future revitalization process. As such, it is considered unnecessary to retain another consultant to assist in this matter.

The proposed Master Plan has been prepared in consultation with Union Pearson Group's heritage, planning and transportation consultants in order to address both the City's identified revitalization goals and Union Pearson Group's proposal.

The Planning and Transportation Committee referred the January 12, 2004 Staff Report on the Rezoning Application and Master Plan for Union Station and communications from members of the Save Union Station Committee and the public to the Toronto South Community Council for a report to Council, through the Planning and Transportation Committee, for consideration prior to consideration of the Zoning By-law amendment. The February 4, 2004 communication from the Save Union Station Committee noted the following issues in respect to the Master Plan:

1. Concerns in respect to the notice for the meeting on the Zoning By-law held November 19, 2003:

Notice of the Toronto South Community Council meeting has been advertised and mailed to anyone who has previously expressed an interest in the Union Station proposal, including members of the Save Union Station Group.

2. Concerns respecting the lack of a comprehensive approach to the planning for Union Station and that the proposed Master Plan is deficient in respect to the following:
 - maintaining public areas of the Station in public control,
 - maximizing the public use of the Great Hall,
 - ensuring that the Beaux Arts design rationale is maintained,
 - improving the ease of vertical access through the provision of escalators to the GO platforms,
 - the provision of adequate taxi drop-off areas.

Both the Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plans by du Toit Allsopp Hillier and the currently proposed Master Plan for the Station place considerable emphasis on the maintenance of the Great Hall as a public space and maximizing its use and accessibility for all passengers and members of the public. The principles of Beaux Arts design underlay all functions proposed within the Station. The work that has been undertaken to date strives to implement these principles and to bring the Station back to the best of its original construction and design.

The City retains ownership of Union Station. All current public spaces will remain public spaces. Agreements are already in place to maintain public access through Union Station and Save Union Station Committee's concerns respecting freedom of public access to public areas is best addressed in the contract between the City and the operator of the Station will also contain similar requirements. As in all publicly accessible, privately operated spaces there need to be provisions for maintaining public access while ensuring public security.

Platform access and platform widths, are issues which are GO Transit's operating responsibility. Significant constraints are imposed by the existing structure and its heritage designation, as well as the Building Code. Maintaining rail operations at the station and budget restrictions also pose serious constraints on the ability to reconstruct the tracks, platforms and access to them. GO Transit has expressed its opposition to the use of escalator access to its platforms on numerous occasions.

Elevators to all platforms will provide handicapped accessibility. A copy of a report to GO Transit's Board of Directors, in response to these same issues raised by the City of Pickering at the request of Mr. Sewell and the Save Union Station group is attached as Attachment 2 to this report.

With the proposed revisions to Union Station, adequate taxi and private car drop off functions will be provided both from Front Street West and from Bremner Boulevard. In respect to vehicular access to the Station it also should be noted, that the majority of rail users either walk to and from the Station or use other forms of public transit.

The proposed Master Plan was presented to the Union Station Public Advisory Group at their meeting on March 19, 2004. The policies of the Plan were discussed. The Planning Advisory Group noted their concerns that the delays in the approval of the By-law, Master Plan and associated details of the agreement with Union Pearson Group were delaying much needed restoration and renovation work. A further meeting to discuss detailed comments relating to the Master Plan is scheduled for March 30, 2004 and the Union Station Planning Advisory Group may submit comments directly to the Toronto South Community Council.

It is suggested that the previously adopted Master Plan for the Station (Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan by du Toit Allsopp Hillier, December 1991), as well as the other documents noted in Attachment 1 to this report be appended to the Master Plan presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee on February 5, 2004. These documents form the basis for clear policy direction and provide a graphic illustration of how the station may be developed in the future. To ensure consistency between the Master Plan and the detailed design developed for the Site Plan review and approval process, it is recommended that the Site Plan Approval application be reviewed in consultation with the Public Advisory Group and the Operators' Committee (composed of GO Transit, VIA and TTC representatives). This will allow a comprehensive review of the details of the proposed restoration and renovation plans. In the interim, the proposed Master Plan and the supporting documents form a solid basis for proceeding with the necessary rezoning process.

Conclusions:

The proposed Master Plan is based on the principles established in the 1991 Union Station Pedestrian Circulation which was adopted by Council in 1993 as the Master Plan. In 2001, the original consultant subsequently updated the Plan in preparation for the RFP process. Similarly, three independently prepared documents form the basis for the heritage principles outlined in the proposed Master Plan. Given this lengthy history it is recommended that no additional consultant work be undertaken.

It is reasonable to proceed by approving the consolidated principles outlined in the proposed Master Plan for the Station. This will guide the long term restoration and renovations of the Station and form the benchmark for the evaluation of any future proposals. The Station's operator will still have to submit an application for Site Plan Approval and the Master Plan will form the basis on which to evaluate this application. The approval of the Master Plan also will provide a strong statement of commitment to proceeding with necessary requirements for improving the City's transportation infrastructure.

Contact:

Angus Cranston, Senior Planner, East Section

Telephone: 416-392-0425

Fax: 416-392-1330

E-mail: acranston@toronto.ca

Ted Tyndorf
Director, Community Planning, South District

(p:\2004\upd\pln\tsc043454.doc) – smc

Attachment 1
Appendices to The Master Plan for Union Station

1. Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan, December 1991, prepared by du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier
2. Union Station Pedestrian Circulation Plan, updated June 2001, prepared by du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier
3. Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada Heritage Railway Stations Heritage Character Statement, August 28, 1989
4. Heritage Design Guidelines, July 11, 2001, prepared by E.R.A. Architects Inc.
5. Commemorative Integrity Statement for Toronto Union Station-National Historic Site of Canada dated July 4, 2002

Attachment 2**GO Transit Responses to Issues raised by the City of Pickering and John Sewell**

SUBJECT: City of Pickering Council Resolution Regarding Union Station Passenger Flow Improvements

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board receive this report which outlines GO Transit's response to the City of Pickering's Council Resolution from February 3, 2003, regarding Union Station passenger flow improvements, and that the Mayors and Chairs of the municipalities of the GTA be forwarded this report.

BACKGROUND:

At its February 3, 2003 Council Meeting, the City of Pickering passed a resolution requesting GO Transit consider enhancements to the platforms at Union Station, including better access for persons with disabilities, the installation of additional escalators and improvements to the connection between Union Station and the PATH system, and also that revenues from any lease of Union Station be allocated and used to improve Union Station and its transportation function. Subsequently, the Township of Scugog and Municipality of Clarington passed similar resolutions.

The issue of the revenue from the retail leases is outside the GO Transit sphere of influence, since the station is owned and managed by the City of Toronto. Consequently, this report will only deal with the issues of platform width, the use of escalators within the Union Station train shed area, accessibility for persons with disabilities and the issue of the connection to the PATH system.

Union Station, in Toronto, was built over 70 years ago and has operated as a railway station since then. GO Transit has been operating a safe and efficient passenger rail service through Union Station, and the adjacent rail corridor, since 1967. With the anticipated traffic growth, GO Transit recognizes that its operation at Union Station will reach its capacity unless improvements are made to both the passenger and train handling facilities at the station. It is projected that peak hour ridership will double over the next 20 –30 years.

1. Platform Width

One of GO's considerations in identifying its long-term requirements at Union was the question of platform capacity. Although several of the existing station platforms are quite narrow, they are functional and meet our current requirements. To determine their long-term acceptability, GO investigated future capacity requirements and confirmed that the existing platform configuration could accommodate future passenger volumes, provided more vertical access points are provided into the concourse areas of Union Station. It is GO Transit's position that the benefits associated with widened platforms do not justify the significant expense (\$50-\$70 Million in additional expenditures) and disruption during construction which platform widening would incur. The GO Board, at its November 2001 meeting, endorsed this position.

Within the train-shed area, the passenger platforms at Union Station are serviced by 13 tracks; seven tracks are utilized by GO Transit, providing access to nine platforms. Passengers are able to

access each platform from the underlying station concourse area via a number of stairs, elevators and escalators.

With regard to increasing passenger-handling capacity at Union Station, two basic approaches are available, as follows:

- Essentially maintain the current track and platform configuration and add vertical circulation elements (stairs, elevators, escalators) between platforms and the concourses below.
- Rearrange the tracks and train shed structure within the station to create wider, but fewer platforms.

Rearrangement of the tracks (option 2 above) would create significant disruption to GO Transit and VIA operations during construction and would cost approximately \$50 to \$70 million more than Option 1. With these considerations in mind, a platform capacity analysis was conducted in 2001 to determine if Option 1 could accommodate projected traffic growth at the station.

The analysis included passenger flow analyses, which considered passenger loads from both current 10-car train consists and potential 12-car train consists that may be utilized in the future. A number of future platform access configurations were considered in the analysis, including the double berthing (trains stopped end to end so that two trains would be accommodated on a single station track) of trains along certain tracks. This is a future consideration when the West Concourse opens at Union Station. Currently GO does not fully utilize the west end of the station tracks, as the concourse below the western tracks is unfinished and not accessible to passengers.

The analyses showed that, in all but a few cases where 12 car trains were considered, platforms could be cleared of passengers in less than the required 4 minutes from train arrival. Additional vertical circulation elements would be installed in a staged manner and double berthing would only be required at Tracks 5, 6 and 7 to handle the projected 2031 passenger loading. In effect, when fully implemented, double berthing would create at least four new platforms at Union Station. An additional benefit of double berthing would be the east and west placement of exits, beyond the existing train shed, resulting in reduced passenger loading in the “central core” of Union Station. This would result in a more effective dispersal of GO passengers to downtown destinations.

Based on the above analyses, it was concluded that sufficient passenger handling capacity could be provided at Union Station for the next 30 years without resorting to the expense and disruption associated with platform widening. This conclusion is documented in a report titled Platform Configuration Analysis, prepared by HDI Joint Venture, dated October 2001. These findings were presented to the GO Transit Board on November 9, 2001.

The proposed plan is to increase platform lengths and resulting roof coverage, thereby reducing the Occupant Load to keep it within GO Transit and industry safety limits. From a safety perspective, the issue is not so much crowding but how quickly can the crowd move off the platform in the event of an emergency. The Platform Configuration Analysis shows that these platforms can continue to function and clear efficiently provided the planned additional vertical circulation system is constructed. Once the issue of private sector management of Union Station is resolved, more formal implementation plans will be developed for the West Concourse access.

Part of the perception of overcrowding comes from loading on platforms prior to train arrival, particularly around stair and escalator enclosures. However, GO Transit's operational approach is to hold patrons in the Concourse area until trains arrive. Essentially the platform functions as a "landing" between the train and the concourse. With new signage systems to be located in the concourse, this approach will be reinforced with a "proceed to platform" notification when the train is entering the train shed.

Parks Canada, through a Review of Heritage Zones in 1999, reviewed the heritage resources of the Station and Train Shed and concluded that the structural elements, roof and platforms of the Train Shed were protected areas that contributed or defined the heritage character of the facility. GO Transit's planning for increased capacity is based on the assumption that minimal alteration to the original form of the platforms, etc. would be consistent with the value of the Train Shed, as set by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board.

2. Stairs vs. Escalators at Union Station

It is GO Transit's position that, in general, stairways are preferable to escalators in delivering passengers to and from the platforms. Elevators are provided for the mobility challenged and those passengers with luggage or strollers. Through ongoing rehabilitation programs at Union Station, it is intended that elevator access to all platforms be provided from the appropriate concourse locations. Stairwells provide greater flexibility and dependability than escalators for able-bodied passengers. GO Transit considers a combination of stairs and elevators at Union Station as the most effective means of passenger access to the platforms for the following reasons:

- In the event that an escalator is stopped during an emergency, there is an effective reduction in exit width over a stair caused by handrails and escalator structure. In general, stairs are installed adjacent to escalators to overcome this impediment. This is not possible at many locations in Union Station.
- Escalators travel in one direction at a time, so bi-directional passenger movement is not possible unless two escalators are installed side by side. Again, this is not feasible at most locations in Union Station.
- An escalator, closed for maintenance, has a significant impact on passenger flows.
- Escalators have significant capital and ongoing maintenance costs.

There are also overcrowding risks caused by escalators which can continue to deliver patrons into already crowded areas, such as the platforms or concourse areas at Union Station, especially in cold weather when patrons tend to shelter inside the stair/escalator enclosures.

3. Accessibility

Given the linear nature of the station platform areas and the limited amount of vertical circulation elements that can be installed, GO Transit's approach to the provision of services for the mobility challenged is to provide elevators at all of its platforms for accessibility. Elevators cater to all needs, whereas escalators will not accommodate wheelchairs, people with strollers and those with significant ambulatory challenges or those with aversion to using escalators.

4. Union Station Connection to the PATH System

Regarding the Union Station connection through the PATH system, the TTC desire is to consolidate its station operations and eliminate a congested public thoroughfare through the middle of its ticket mezzanine area. GO has expressed concerns that the selected design should not inconvenience the majority of passengers destined to the PATH system, while providing a convenient path to the minority of passengers destined to the TTC. GO has some concerns with the impacts that a redesigned subway station may have on GO passengers once they have left GO's area of influence. GO will be working with the TTC and the City during the design and environmental assessment process to minimize any impacts.

As well, with the potential development of the West Concourse, GO Transit has strongly suggested that the City of Toronto take a proactive role in establishing a western connection to the PATH system (via York or University), as the ongoing reliance of the Bay Street PATH route to handle future crowds from GO/TTC and the Waterfront area is not sustainable.

Submitted by:

R.D. Boyle, Director, Facilities Services

GO Transit Board Meeting No. 56 dated March 14, 2003

Union Station – J. Sewell

Chairman Chong welcomed Mr. John Sewell, who requested the Board to re-visit the decision made by the Board in November, 2001, not to widen platforms and install more escalators. Mr. McNeil stated that GO Transit's comprehensive studies have shown this is not necessary in the 30-year analysis period and additional stairwells can disperse crowds faster and control crowds more efficiently. However, if it is found that track relocation is necessary sometime in the distant future, then it can be addressed at that time as GO Transit's current plans would not preclude future relocation. Members concurred. Item was tabled for Members information.

Received.

 **TORONTO** Staff Report

March 22, 2004

To: Toronto South Community Council

From: Commissioner of Urban Development Services

Subject: Supplementary Report on Union Station Rezoning
Application 03-195332 STE 28 OZ
Applicant: City of Toronto
Architect: N/A
61-71 Front Street West
Toronto Centre-Rosedale, Ward 28

Purpose:

To amend and restate the recommendations outlined in the report by Urban Development Services pertaining to the rezoning of Union Station and to remove reference to the proposed Master Plan and respond to concerns raised at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting on February 5, 2004.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that City Council:

- (1) amend Zoning By-law 168-93 for 61-71 Front Street West (Union Station) substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached to the report of January 12, 2004 as Attachment No. 1;
- (2) authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the draft Zoning By-law Amendment as may be required; and
- (3) advise the applicant of the conditions outlined in Attachment No. 2 to the report of January 12, 2004 pertaining to the Site Plan Approval application.

Background:

At its meeting on February 5, 2004, the Planning and Transportation Committee referred the January 12, 2004 report on Union Station from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and communications from the public to the Toronto South Community Council for report to Council to ensure adequate community consultation in the development of a Master Plan for Union Station prior to consideration of the Zoning By-law. The Committee also requested Toronto South Community Council to consider the retention of an outside consultant to assist in this matter and consider whether the site plan should be undertaken concurrently with the development of the Master Plan and the processing of the Zoning By-law application.

Comments:

The Union Station report of January 12, 2004 dealt with both the rezoning of the Station and the proposed Master Plan. These two issues can however be considered separately. The intention of the rezoning is to increase the permitted non-residential gross floor area and to broaden the range of permitted commercial uses within the Station to support the existing transportation uses. This would allow for the development of existing space currently used for storage and some parking areas within the building for use as primarily transportation or pedestrian circulation related functions.

These amendments to the Zoning By-law would not in any way predetermine the detailed design or operation of facilities within the building. The amendments are needed to facilitate the anticipated revitalization of the station including the currently planned expansion of GO Transit's operations, as well as improved pedestrian access through the Station.

Planning and Transportation Committee has asked Toronto South Community Council to consider whether the site plan should be done concurrently with the Master Plan and the rezoning application. The intention of the rezoning application is to allow the City to prepare for the redevelopment inside the station by any of the transportation operators or the station operator (regardless of who that may be). Site plan applications will be filed by either the transportation operator(s) or station operator upon finalization of their proposals. It would be inappropriate in these circumstances to defer consideration of the rezoning by-law to await these proposals. Rather, the Zoning By-law and Master Plan should be in place in advance of any site plan application in order to allow the Site Plan application to be reviewed against the City's stated policies and principles.

In July 2003, Council endorsed the establishment of a public advisory group to provide a forum for public consultation and to review matters related to the planning and development of the Station. The composition of this group includes a broad range of community representatives, transportation interest groups and business members in the vicinity of the Station. The Public Advisory Group has been consulted on matters related to the rezoning application and the development of a Master Plan for the Station. It is expected that the Group will continue to provide input into such matters as the inter-relationship of transportation elements, pedestrian planning, Station design and public benefits.

Conclusions:

It is essential to proceed with the rezoning of the Station at the current time to increase the permitted gross floor area within the Station and allow an expanded range of uses. Such approval in no way commits the City to any approval of functions or particular uses within the Station, nor does

it grant any exemption from the heritage preservation requirements associated with the ongoing maintenance or restoration of the building. Details will be dealt with through the Site Plan approval process. The approval of the rezoning will provide a strong statement of commitment to proceeding with necessary work related to improving the City's transportation infrastructure and revitalizing this heritage asset. It is also one of the conditions to finalizing the lease transaction with Union Pearson group or other operator and should not be delayed further.

Contact:

Angus Cranston, Senior Planner, East Section

Telephone: 416-392-0425

Fax: 416-392-1330

E-mail: acranston@toronto.ca

Ted Tyndorf

Director, Community Planning, South District

(p:\2004\upd\pln\tsc043455.doc) – smc