Fort York Pedestrian Bridge

Public Works and Infrastructure Committee
November 3, 2011
Purpose

- Identification of lower cost pedestrian bridge options
- Status update on area planning activities relevant to the pedestrian bridge
Recommendations

- **Fort York Pedestrian Bridge be constructed**
  - Either Alternative A1, A2 or A5
  - Visually appealing inclined arch design at reduced costs

- **All parties work to**
  - incorporate pedestrian bridge into area development
  - Achieving the planning objectives for area

- **Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning**
  Consider Master Plan (Ordnance triangle)
  - 5 Year OP Review and the Municipal Comprehensive Review
  - Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee by June 2012
Financial Implications

- **Budget Status**
  - Waterfront Revitalization Initiative’s Capital Budget
  - $21.44 million Budget (as per 2011 Capital Budget)
  - $1.716 million spent (ESR, Design, project costs)
  - $19.724 million unspent
Financial Implications

- **Project Cost Estimates**
  - Costs range $17.958 to $19.719 million
  - Represent savings of $6.55 to $8.311 million

- **Proposed redevelopment**
  - will generate Section 37 and other development related funding
  - minimum of $5 million
  - May be used to directly offset cost of bridge
Financial Implications

- **Build Toronto**
  - Identified value creation by including pedestrian bridge in Master Plan
  - Proceeds from value created will exceed remaining cost of bridge
  - Additional dividend flow forms part of monetization target (Executive Committee Report)
Alternative Bridge Designs

Pedestrian Bridge Cost Drivers

- **Center Support**
  - Center pier (impacts span length)

- **Deck Layout**
  - Curved deck

- **Span Length**
  - Angle of rail crossing

- **Structural System**
  - Inclined Arch
Alternative A1
Alternative A2
Alternative A3
Alternative A4
Alternative A5
## Alternative Summary

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Deck Layout</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Span Lengths</th>
<th>Rail Crossing</th>
<th>Environmental Study Report</th>
<th>Construction Costs* (million)</th>
<th>Other Project Costs* (million)</th>
<th>Total Costs* (million)</th>
<th>Costs To Date * (million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Design</td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>Inclined Arches</td>
<td>100 m 100 m</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$22.814</td>
<td>$3.455</td>
<td>$26.269</td>
<td>$1.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>Inclined Arches</td>
<td>90 m 70 m</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>No Addendum</td>
<td>$16.844</td>
<td>$2.875</td>
<td>$19.719</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>Inclined Arches</td>
<td>85m 65 m</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>No Addendum</td>
<td>$16.273</td>
<td>$2.646</td>
<td>$18.919</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>Vertical Trusses</td>
<td>64 m 64 m</td>
<td>New alignment</td>
<td>Addendum Required</td>
<td>$10.604</td>
<td>$2.596</td>
<td>$11.21</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>Vertical Trusses</td>
<td>90 m 70 m</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>No Addendum</td>
<td>$11.050</td>
<td>$2.465</td>
<td>$13.515</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>Inclined Arches</td>
<td>64 m 64 m</td>
<td>New alignment</td>
<td>Addendum Required</td>
<td>$15.084</td>
<td>$2.873</td>
<td>$17.958</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structural System

- ESR evaluated truss and inclined arch
- Concluded desire for visual feature of inclined arch
Recommended Alternatives

- Either Alternatives A1, A2 or A5
  - All maintain visual feature of Inclined Arch Structure
  - All replace center pier with earth berm (reduces span length)
  - A2 and A5 - straight deck configuration
  - A5 - right angle rail crossing (span length further reduced)

- Cost Range $17.958 to $19.719 million
Planning Considerations
Pedestrian Bridge Rationale

- Connectivity & safety
  - Trinity Bellwoods Park, Stanley Park, Fort York, June Callwood Park, Coronation Park, and the Martin Goodman Trail
  - Improve pedestrian and cyclist sense of safety and comfort
- Consistent
  - City's Official Plan & Bike Plan
  - Area planning studies & community involvement since 1996
- Should be seen as a city building initiative
Ordnance Lands

- Privately owned lands
  - Zoned mixed use – current proposal under review

- City owned lands
  - designated employment lands
  - Any residential use requires OPA
  - Site plan approval process follows

- OPA undertaken in context of 5 Year OP Review and Municipal Comprehensive Review process

- Development of lands
  - creates opportunity for Section 37 and other development related funding (minimum $5 million)
Build Toronto

- Asked by Council to initiate area Master Plan
  - Significant opportunity to improve
    - site size, configuration and functionality
    - new park site and pedestrian bridge integration
  - Will reflect city planning objectives and principles
  - Joint venture agreement with private land owner
- Value created through joint development