### Evaluation Criteria

#### Waterfront Main Street

1. **Do Nothing**
   - No. Without functional and aesthetic improvements, existing conditions on Queens Quay cannot support a great street environment suitable for Toronto’s waterfront. Insufficient space for proper street tree planting to meet City standards, rebalance transportation modes, etc.

2. **Operational Changes**
   - Challenging. Small aesthetic improvements could improve the street (banners, trees, street lighting) but unlikely enough to elevate Queens Quay to Toronto’s main waterfront street.

3. **Existing ROW**
   - Yes. Rearranging space within right-of-way would allow for functional and aesthetic improvements that could elevate Queens Quay to Toronto’s main waterfront street.

4. **Expand ROW**
   - Yes. Rearranging space within expanded right-of-way would allow for functional and aesthetic improvements that could elevate Queens Quay to Toronto’s main waterfront street.

#### North-South Connections

- No. Existing pedestrian conditions are insufficient across Queens Quay. Numerous conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. No improved visual connections to waterfront.

- Challenging. Possible pedestrian crossing improvements with adjusted signals, but distance and potential conflicts with vehicles would remain the same. Improved visual connections to waterfront possible.

- Yes. Can rebalance space and adjust operations within the corridor to improve north-south pedestrian movement. Reduced pedestrian crossing distance across vehicle lanes. Improved visual connections to waterfront.

- Yes. Can rebalance space and adjust operations within an expanded corridor to improve north-south pedestrian movement. Improved visual connections to waterfront.

#### East-West Connections

- No. Does not improve pedestrian experience nor accommodate the Martin Goodman Trail, which requires a combined 4m trail off-street within Queens Quay right-of-way.

- Challenging. Does not improve pedestrian experience nor accommodate the Martin Goodman Trail, which requires a combined 4m trail off-street within Queens Quay right-of-way.

- Yes. Can improve the pedestrian experience and accommodate Martin Goodman Trail within the existing right-of-way.

- Yes. Can improve the pedestrian experience and accommodate Martin Goodman Trail within the expanded right-of-way.

#### Aesthetically Vital

- No. Existing conditions do not contain the elements required for an aesthetically vital and vibrant public realm: trees, generous pedestrian areas, adequate bike facilities, etc. Benefits to retail opportunities limited.

- Challenging. Benefits to local retail commercial activities are limited. Although functional and aesthetic improvements could take place, it cannot accommodate Martin Goodman Trail, would require planting street trees within a constrained space, and would retain pedestrian boulevards at existing width.

- Yes. Rearranging the space within the right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements, improve pedestrian activity, and thus increase support for retail opportunities.

- Yes. Rearranging the space within an expanded right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements, improve pedestrian activity, and thus increase support for retail opportunities.

#### Operations

- No. Signal timing for pedestrians, transit and vehicles is insufficient. Current arrangement and enforcement of on-street parking leads to several conflicts. No dedicated bike facilities.

- Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.

- Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.

- Yes. Modifications to signal timing would improve pedestrian, transit and vehicle operations. Adjustments to parking would reduce potential conflicts.
## Appendix 2: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

### Legend

- ✔ = Yes. Meets criteria
- ● = Challenging. May be designed to meet criteria
- ✗ = Fail. Cannot meet criteria

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Grand & Beautiful Blvd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>✗ No. Existing street does not address adopted City policies: not a scenic waterfront boulevard, no Martin Goodman Trail, does not encourage clean air alternatives, etc.</td>
<td>● Challenging. Can only coordinate some planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure along with signal modifications.</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Rearranging the space within the existing right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements to recast the street as a grand and beautiful boulevard.</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Rearranging the space within an expanded right-of-way would allow for significant functional and aesthetic improvements to recast the street as a grand and beautiful boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage Renewal</td>
<td>✗ No. Does not coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure and other waterfront revitalization projects.</td>
<td>● Challenging. Can only coordinate some planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure along with signal modifications.</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Can coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure to more effectively locate platforms along the corridor. Can also better incorporate transit improvements within overall public realm.</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Can coordinate planned improvements to TTC transit infrastructure to more effectively locate platforms along the corridor. Can also better incorporate transit improvements within overall public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Maintains access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.</td>
<td>● Challenging. Would provide existing or modified access for residents, tenants, service, emergency, fire and police.</td>
<td>✔ Yes. Does not require extraordinary land acquisition. May require local expansion of ROW where needed.</td>
<td>✗ No. Expanding the right-of-way entire length of corridor would require extraordinary land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREFERRED**