Appendix 1

FORT YORK
PEDESTRIAN & CYCLE BRIDGE
CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

TORONTO

Stantec
MontgomerySisam

EVALUATION OF "ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS"

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1: DO NOTHING	ALTERNATIVE 2: ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN/CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE ON EXISTING ROADS	ALTERNATIVE 3: CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINK PRELIMINARY PREFERRED SOLUTION
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT	• Is not consistent with plans for an open space linkage between Stanley Park and Fort York • The Strachan Avenue and Bathurst Street bridges and roadways (even with the proposed rehabilitations) do not provide adequate cycle and sidewalk facilities.	• Could require structural changes to bridges and roadway corridors to accommodate bike lanes and sidewalks, which are either non-existent or sub-standard.	• Recognizes previous City of Toronto Fort York, and Waterfront Toronto planning objectives to provide additional pedestrian/cyclist access to Fort York.
TRANSPORTATION			**Alternative 3 is preferred from a Transportation Perspective.**
	• Does not improve neighbourhood pedestrian and cycling opportunities. • No change to public and user safety. • Pedestrian and cycle operations remain constrained due to inadequate north-south corridor links. • No change to existing rail corridors unless improvements to other corridors are approved (Example: Strachan Avenue grade separation). • Potential for increased use of TTC to access subject area to compensate for lack of convenient pedestrian/cycling routes.	• With infrastructure improvements, pedestrian and cycling access needs may be achieved, but are somewhat compromised at structures and other pedestrian/cyclist barriers. • Some improvement to public/user safety by providing sidewalks and bike facilities on existing routes – existing safety concerns remain at at-grade vehicular and railway crossings • The City could upgrade the crossings to remove the at-grade railway crossings. However, the cost of this work would be fairly significant • Moderate improvements to pedestrian and cycle operations however, does not remove existing barriers, including at-grade crossings of rail and roadways and proximity of vehicular traffic. • Strachan Avenue grade separation currently under review. Railway operations would need to be addressed with any upgrade plans at existing and proposed structures. This option also has significant cost implications. • No impact to transit operations.	• Addresses the need for improved pedestrian and cyclist access opportunities in the neighbouring communities. Will be a highly visible and functional facilitator of alternative transportation modes. • Significantly enhances public and user safety by minimizing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. • Potential safety improvements through installation of lighting. • Potential safety concerns (personal safety, potential for pedestrian/vehicles conflicts) • Greatly enhances the opportunities for pedestrians and cyclists to utilize existing and proposed trail facilities; and to connect between Stanley Park and Fort York, and other park areas in the adjacent neighbourhoods. • Technical approvals required from CN and GO Transit for an overhead structure. • May complement existing TTC operations by providing alternative transportation connection mode north and south of railway tracks. • Potential to minimize TTC demand as people switch from transit to walking and cycling to Fort York
LAND USE			**Alternative 3 is preferred from a Land Use Perspective.**
	• Does not reflect extensive planning objectives and philosophy to provide an open space link between Stanley Park and Fort York. • Does not provide continuous open space linkage. • Out-of-way travel to access Fort York Park by foot or bicycle. • Does not support the Niagara and Fort York Neighbourhood Planning goals. • Is not consistent with City of Toronto Bike Plan. • Not compatible with the Fort York and Garrison Common Open Space Planning policies approved by the City of Toronto. • Does not support City Official Plan policies to provide a connected green space network that links parks and open spaces • Does not support City Official Plan policies to minimize physical and visual barriers between the City and Lake Ontario • Does not support Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan polity to offer multi-modal access to cultural (i.e. Fort York) and recreational (i.e. the Waterfront) opportunities; and to provide safe, comfortable travel for pedestrians and bicyclists	• Does not reflect extensive planning objectives and philosophy to provide an open space link between Stanley Park and Fort York. • Does not provide continuous open space linkage. • Out-of-way travel to access Fort York Park by foot or bicycle. • May partially achieve planning goals of local neighbourhoods. • Not compatible with the Fort York and Garrison Common Open Space Planning policies approved by the City of Toronto. • Does not support City Official Plan policies to provide a connected green space network that links parks and open spaces • Does not support City Official Plan policies to minimize physical and visual barriers between the City and Lake Ontario • Partially supports Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan polity to offer multi-modal access to cultural (i.e. Fort York) and recreational (i.e. the Waterfront) opportunities; and to provide safe, comfortable travel for pedestrians and bicyclists	• Supports the many approved planning documents that propose a continuous open space link between parkland in the Stanley Park area (north) and the Fort York/June Callwood/waterfront open spaces (south). • Is fully compatible with local neighbourhood planning policies and objectives, within the Fort York and Niagara communities. • Fully addresses and supports recent Open Space Planning goals and objectives of the Fort York and Garrison Common National Historic Site. • Supports City Official Plan policies to provide a connected green space network that links parks and open spaces • Has the potential to support City Official Plan policies by minimizing a physical (i.e. railway) and visual barrier between the City and Lake Ontario (the Waterfront) • Supports Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan polity to offer multi-modal access to cultural (i.e. Fort York) and recreational (i.e. the Waterfront) opportunities; and to provide safe, comfortable travel for pedestrians and bicyclists
CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT	**Alternative 1 is preferred from a Cultural Environment Perspective.**		
	• No adverse impacts on the high archaeological resources potential within the Fort York Area, including areas north and central to the railway corridors, plus the Garrison Common which is part of an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (ASA). • Does not impact the Built Heritage Landscape and the Cultural Heritage Landscape.	• No adverse impacts on the high archaeological resources potential within the Fort York Area, including areas north and central to the railway corridors, plus the Garrison Common which is part of an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (ASA). • Modest impacts on the Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes may be anticipated due to street widening and user wear.	• Potential for impacts on high archaeological resources in the Fort York area is significant. Further discussions and possible field work may be required to address actual impacts during detailed design stage. • The most significant Cultural and Built Heritage Landscape Feature is Fort York, which is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and is recognized as a National Historic Site. Impacts will occur to this site, at the south end of the structure, while other less significant impacts may occur at 11 Ordnance Street and at the two railway corridors (Grand Trunk Railroad, and Great Western Railway)

Appendix 1

FORT YORK
PEDESTRIAN & CYCLE BRIDGE
CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

TORONTO

Stantec
MontgomerySisam

EVALUATION OF "ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS"

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1: DO NOTHING	ALTERNATIVE 2: ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN/CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE ON EXISTING ROADS	ALTERNATIVE 3: CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINK PRELIMINARY PREFERRED SOLUTION
SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT			**Alternative 3 is preferred from a Social Environment Perspective.**
	• No property impacts. • Does not recognize the Fort York "Visibility- in the-Community" objectives. • Does not enhance or improve Visual Vistas to Fort York and the Toronto skyline. • Does not support sustainability goals within the context of current community "green" initiatives.	• Potential for property impacts may be greater, with reliance on widening of existing road corridors in the north-south direction. • Does not recognize the Fort York "Visibility-in-the Community" objectives. • Does not enhance or improve Visual Vistas to Fort York and the Toronto skyline. • Enhances sustainability goals within the context of community "green" initiatives; neither enhances nor detracts from objectives.	• Property impacts are minor, as most affected lands are owned by the City of Toronto. • Consistent with City of Toronto and the Friends of Fort York, Visibility-in-the-Community" objectives. Improved access will lead to better use of the Fort York site. • Potential to enhance opportunities to provide Visual Vistas of Fort York and the Toronto skyline from elevated levels of the structure. • Strongly supports community sustainability objectives. • Strongly supports sustainability by promoting walking and cycling
TECHNICAL	**Alternative 1 is preferred from a Technical Perspective.**		
	• No change to roadway and bridge network beyond existing planned improvements. Potential impact to existing roadway and bridge network due to increased vehicle use to access Fort York and need for related infrastructure (i.e. parking areas) to accommodate vehicles. • No constructability issues. • No geotechnical issues. • No utility impacts.	• The redesign of the Strachan Avenue and Bathurst Street Bridges includes improvements to pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure • Potential constructability constraints if existing bridges require widening/reconfiguration to accommodate pedestrians/cyclists. • No significant geotechnical issues. • Potential impact to utilities.	• No impact to existing roads and bridges (Strachan Avenue and Bathurst Street). • Minimizes demand for vehicle related infrastructure (i.e. parking areas) as people switch to walking and cycling to access Fort York and/or the Toronto Waterfront. • Construction could impact existing railways. • Geotechnical conditions do not have any major impacts on design feasibility. • No significant utility impacts. Potential impacts on railway telecommunication overhead lines, along existing rail corridors; may require relocation. To be confirmed during detailed design.
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	**All of the alternatives have similar, and very minor, impacts to the natural environment. There is no clear preference between the Alternative Solutions from a Natural Environment Perspective.**		
	• No impacts on existing vegetation. • No impact on Garrison Common or Garrison Creek. • Long term pedestrian and cycle needs may result in adverse impacts on existing roadside environment on Niagara Street, Wellington Street, Strachan Avenue and Bathurst Street due to walking or cycling on vegetated surfaces. • No impacts on surface water and drainage.	• Low impact on existing vegetation, except perhaps on Wellington and Niagara Streets due to street widenings. • No impact on Garrison Common and Garrison Creek. • Highest impact on roadside environments due to widening and other physical reconstruction needs. • May require adjustments to drainage conditions due to road widenings.	• Will impact on vegetation (trees) that currently line the existing rail corridors, and may require the removal or replanting of isolated trees within the Garrison Common Open Space. • Structure ramp connections will be designed to minimize impacts on Garrison Common, but grading and filling operations have the potential to impact existing open space. • No impact on existing roadside environments anticipated. • Existing drainage and surface water fun-off conditions will be maintained. Snow deposits from the bridge to the railway corridors will be reviewed with CN and GO Transit for solutions.
COST	**Alternative 1 is preferred from a Cost Perspective.**		
	• Lowest Cost.	• Low to moderate cost.	• Cost is dependent on bridge architecture, to some degree, as well as spans, materials, illumination and other design features. Highest cost alternative but with largest potential benefit.