

PW11.1.2

From: [George Milbrandt](#)
To: [Public Works and Infrastructure Committee](#)
Cc: [CodeBlueTO Internal](#)
Subject: CodeBlueTO submission to PWIC Meeting 11, Item PW11.1, Gardiner Expressway
Date: Monday, February 29, 2016 9:53:04 AM

Of the remaining alternatives in the Gardiner East EA, Hybrid 3 comes the closest to fulfilling the project goals and should be named as the preferred alternative. While none of the alignments satisfy all five of the project goals, it is important to note that Hybrid 1 does not fulfill any of the criteria set out by this EA and if put forward by city council would likely be challenged in the MOECC review process.

Ramps from the Gardiner East to Lakeshore Blvd. in the study area are a major impediment to non-automobile traffic in the corridor. We are disappointed with the lack of clarity in the ramifications around automobile travel times when considering the removal of existing or proposed ramps.

All of the currently proposed alignments fail to adequately address half of the study area. Without significant changes to Lakeshore Blvd. west of Cherry St. these alternatives will continue to be a barrier to north-south connections and will not help reconnect the city with the lake or balance modes of travel. In the adjacent St. Lawrence Market Neighbourhood 41% of residents walk to work, a proportion likely to be replicated or increased in the emerging East Bayfront, Keating, and Villiers Island precincts. The amount of pedestrian and cycle traffic in the study corridor will soon outnumber traffic on the Gardiner East and the delays and inconvenience caused to these people must be considered with the same care as the needs of automobile commuters.

Hybrid 3 will unlock the development potential of the Keating Channel precinct and Villiers Island and provide an important connection to the future growth of the Port Lands and Riverside areas. These changes would allow for the Don River to be opened up to north-south views and make possible better active transportation and recreation uses along the Don connecting the city with the renaturalized river mouth.

When it comes to active transportation, recreation opportunities, and developable land it is less important to quantify them than it is to measure their quality and value. Land sales and direct costs do not begin to describe the differences in net economic benefits between the different schemes. Hybrid 3 is a far superior option for the future growth and prosperity of Toronto.

While the costs involved with all of the Hybrid options are significant, the less expensive and previously recommended Boulevard alternative is not being considered at this time. Those concerned with budgetary constraints should look past the insignificant differences in cost between the Hybrid options and reexamine the Boulevard alternative.

Assessed against the project goals and the long term interests of the city it is clear that Hybrid 3 is the best alternative currently being offered. CodeBlueTO supports the staff recommendation.

Thank you for your consideration,
George Milbrandt
CodeBlueTO