

yonge**T**omorrow

**Municipal Class EA –
Yonge Street from Queen Street to College Street**

Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #1 Summary

Prepared by LURA Consulting for the City of Toronto
September 2018

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Meeting Presentation	1
Questions of Clarification	1
Detailed Summary of Feedback.....	2
Next Steps	9

Appendix A: List of Participants

Appendix B: SAG Meeting #1 Agenda

Overview

The City of Toronto hosted the first stakeholder meeting for the yongeTOMorrow: Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) - Yonge Street from Queen Street to College Street on July 30th, 2018 from 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. at the Bond Place Hotel, located at 65 Dundas Street East. The purpose of the first stakeholder meeting was to:

- Introduce yongeTOMorrow: EA purpose, process and timelines
- Provide an overview of preliminary work completed to date
- Present preliminary vision, opportunity statement, and objectives, and discuss alternatives and seek feedback
- Outline opportunities for future engagement
- Solicit interest in the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)
- Review next steps

There were 85 stakeholder organizations invited to participate in the meeting and 26 representatives attended. Attending stakeholders including representatives from Resident Associations, Business Improvement Areas, advocacy groups, developers, and other stakeholder groups. A full list of invited and participated attendees can be found in Appendix A.

This meeting feedback summary document is generally organized according to the Stakeholder Meeting # 1 Agenda. A detailed agenda can be found in Appendix B.

Meeting Presentation

A presentation was given by Johanna Kyte, City of Toronto and Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants Inc. The presentation provided attendees with an overview of the background, purpose and engagement process and opportunities for the yongeTOMorrow study. The slide deck for this presentation is available upon request. The presentation was followed by a questions of clarification segment facilitated by Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting.

Questions of Clarification

The following represents a summary of the questions of clarification that followed the presentation. The summary is not verbatim. Questions posed by participants are noted with a 'Q,' comments made by participants are represented by a 'C,' and answers/responses provided by City of Toronto staff are represented by an 'A.'

- Q.** Will the presentation be provided to participants?
- A.** Yes, the presentation will be shared with all participants.
- Q.** The street configuration shown in the presentation stated Yonge Street has a width of 20m. Is this and the setbacks typical?

- A.** Yes, this is the typical right-of-way width.
- Q.** Will this study consider a car free zones such that pedestrian routes are connected to perpendicular streets within the area including nearby destinations outside of the corridor such as Ryerson University, City Hall, etc.?
- A.** Yes, this study will be considering these potential concepts.
- Q.** Why isn't safety an objective?
- A.** Safety is a fundamental consideration in any City initiative. Vision Zero and security perspectives will be considered throughout the study.
- Q.** What is happening on Yonge Street from Queen Street to the waterfront?
- A.** Waterfront Toronto has completed the 'Lower Yonge Precinct Municipal Class EA which accounts for Yonge Street from Front Street to the waterfront.
- Q.** What is the construction cost and timeline for Phase 1 and Phase 2 with the inclusion of reporting and approvals? Is this in the City's 10-year Capital Program?
- A.** The exact project timeline and cost are currently unconfirmed. However, there is funding through Section 37 provisions that has been allocated to transportation that will be made available for this project and the City is working on securing additional funding as part of the 2019 capital budget process.

Detailed Summary of Feedback

Following introductions and the presentation, attendees worked through feedback activities in table discussions which was facilitated by members of the project team. Using an activity workbook which included information outlined in the presentation, participants discussed the draft vision, opportunity statement, associated objectives, and alternative concepts of the yongeTOmorrow Study Area. The section below includes feedback shared during and after the meeting.

Overall Feedback

- Yonge Street needs to be seen as part of a broader network with a context sensitive approach and this project needs to consider the projections of growth for residents, visitors and workers within the larger Study Area.
- Pedestrians should be the top priority for mode of transportation within the Study Area followed by cyclists and then vehicles.
- Social issues and safety concerns are prevalent on Yonge Street today and it is important for stakeholders to understand how the City plans on addressing these issues and how the streetscape is connected.

Vision

A draft vision was presented to participants which stated:

“Yonge Street is iconic and plays an important role in the cultural identity of Toronto.

Growth brings an opportunity to elevate Yonge Street's physical form to reflect the significance it holds in both the city's landscape and in our minds.”

Feedback provided by participants on the draft vision is presented below:

- Some participants noted that the statement was good because it does not pigeon hole the street function
- The words “experience” and “destination” were repeatedly mentioned as key ingredients of the vision for Yonge Street. Yonge Street is iconic and significant not just for its physical form but for the experience and the destination that it offers users
- A few participants noted that there wasn't enough focus on experience, specifically that it should be the focus of the vision and infrastructure should be what helps achieve that focus
- Yonge Street was noted as having more than one character. It should be as diverse as the city itself (it can and should include many different uses and experiences)
- It was noted that Yonge Street needs to keep its cultural and recreational identity (for all levels of society) and that the vision should incorporate cultural identity as a key element
- Some participants indicated that the historical, heritage and cultural significance, as well as the economic/local business identity should also be reflected in the vision
- Some participants described Yonge Street as being the “spine” and “thread” that connects to the heart of the City of Toronto. Yonge Street is the central marker in the city that leads and directs people and provides a gathering hub for all
- The history of Yonge Street should be integrated into the vision (e.g. why is it named Yonge Street, it is world renowned for being the longest street)
- Additionally, several participants noted that the vision should have a pedestrian priority that includes a fully pedestrianized portion of the street
- Greenspaces and park spaces were also noted as an ingredient that should be included;
- Some participants noted support for the use of the word “elevate”
- One suggested modification noted included the wording “elevate the vitality, culture and quality of life (by addressing social issues), and physical form” and defining the word growth

Opportunity Statement

A draft opportunity statement was presented to participants which stated:

Yonge Street plays a central role in the city's economy, transportation network, and cultural landscape. Dramatic growth is both changing the character of built form and the needs of street users - placing increased and shifting demands on aging infrastructure.

This provides us with an opportunity to re-examine how Yonge Street can best respond to our diverse and changing city.

Feedback provided by participants on the opportunity statement is presented below:

- It was noted that some participants like that the draft opportunity statement captures Yonge's changing character as well as pointing to the fact that there may be evolution and change over time. Some participants particularly noted liking the second paragraph
- Others noted that the focus seems to be too much on the infrastructure component and not the overall opportunities that Yonge Street presents. Some participants noted the opportunity to introduce a significant pedestrianized street and a focus on the term "people place"
- Some participants questioned whether the statement has considered future-proofing as a key element and suggested that it should consider the immediate needs and future impacts on people and infrastructure
- It was also suggested that the word "both" is moved to follow the word "changing"
- Some participants expressed the fact that new buildings and private developments provide a great opportunity for the area and the statement does not express this well
- It was noted that while Yonge Street is a destination, it is also a neighbourhood. The existing and growing residential component is not captured in the draft opportunity statement and a sense of community should be specifically included
- Some participants discussed the unique opportunity to increase capacity at Yonge Dundas Square to host larger festivals
- Participants also noted that changes with new technologies, green technologies and smart technologies should be reflected
- Tourism should be specifically mentioned
- Walking and mobility should be mentioned
- Needs of all street users or "street for all" should be specifically mentioned

Objectives

The draft objectives were presented to participants which stated:

The opportunity statement has been divided into the following Objectives:

- **Mobility** – provide Mobility for a diverse and evolving city.
- **Liveability** – celebrate and enhance Liveability by providing an enriching and adaptable urban destination.
- **Prosperity** – support Prosperity with a public realm that further develops Yonge Street as an economic and cultural hub.
- **Sustainability** – foster sustainability with design that respond to our changing climate, protects our ecological assets, and benefits our well-being.

Feedback provided by participants on the opportunity statement is presented below:

General Feedback

- Several participants acknowledged that the constraints necessitate balance and trade-offs;
- Some participants noted that the number of objectives should be minimal and simple in order to remain effective, while others emphasized the need to add objectives such as security and safety or ensure it is explicitly highlighted in each objective. Some suggested modification included language such as “safest environment” and “invitational experience”;
- Social issues were also discussed with regards to safety. Participants emphasized that the City needs to consider how to manage the public realm and physical design/uses of the area with issues such as safe injection sites, cannabis stores, mental health and homeless populations; and
- Participants also noted that objective pillars shouldn't be considered in silos but rather holistically with other objective lenses top of mind. For example, mobility should also be considered from a sustainability lens which could include detouring cars off of Yonge Street and on to other streets.

Mobility - *provide Mobility for a diverse and evolving city*

- Participants were supportive of mobility as an objective and some noted that it should support pedestrian activity as the primary mode of travel on the street, and the major priority for the design overall. Others felt cycling was an equal priority and vehicles should have lower priority
- Some participants expressed that mobility should be a subsection of all other objectives
- Other considerations suggested for mobility include:
 - Increase pick-up locations for deliveries and ride share programs
 - Additional bike stations
 - What other streets can provide in terms of a whole network focus

- Improved wayfinding (including along Yonge Street and connections to transit and other areas of the City)
- One-way streets may allow movement for goods and more space for pedestrians
- Safety and accessibility
- Laneways
- Extend PATH (underground or overhead)
- Varying speeds for different modes of transportation
- Including the wording “all ages and mobilities”

Liveability - *celebrate and enhance Liveability by providing an enriching and adaptable urban destination*

- Participants were supportive of liveability as an objective and some participants particularly noted support for the use of the word “adaptable”, or “seasonal adaptability” while others suggested modifying the wording to state “support a pedestrian-priority street with a safe, attractive, and welcoming streetscape that supports life and activity in the public realm”
- Some participants felt that social fabric would be a better terminology that could also speak to safety and security
- Other considerations suggested for liveability include:
 - Infrastructure impacts (growth management)
 - Residential sense of community
 - The social fabric of the area and people with a lived experience – Yonge was noted as a community and social gathering for people with and without homes and all aspects of society need to be considered
 - Resources such as: DYBIA Report on ‘Street Use from Walkabout with Police’, Financial BIA Street to Home Program, Metropolitan United Church housing worker staff resource
 - Engagement spaces that provide equal access to different users
 - Greenspace and places to sit

Prosperity - *support Prosperity with a public realm that further develops Yonge Street as an economic and cultural hub*

- Participants were supportive of prosperity as an objective and some participants particularly noted that it should also consider the unique character of the street that is supported by small, independent businesses and the ways in which a pedestrianized street could support a vibrant successful local economy along Yonge Street; and
- Other considerations suggested for prosperity include:
 - Support is needed for the range of businesses from local independent to larger corporate (i.e. Eaton Centre)
 - Examine how increased rents from increased developments and dynamism will affect local and independent businesses (Yonge Love addresses this also)
 - Ensure that all types of businesses, small and large, are successful
 - Animate/attract frontages
 - Smart, flexible and adaptable technologies

Sustainability - *foster sustainability with design that respond to our changing climate, protects our ecological assets, and benefits our well-being*

- Participants were supportive of sustainability as an objective and some participants particularly noted that it should recognize that the design of Yonge Street itself must be flexible to adapt to changing needs, neighbourhood growth, changing mode splits and travel patterns in the future; and
- Other considerations for sustainability included:
 - Additional greenspace, healthy street trees and “green” smart technologies
 - Pedestrian commuter routes
 - Subway is an asset that moves people through the area and at the same time is a challenge for street trees

Alternative Concepts

The project team noted that there are numerous alternatives considering all travel modes and different timeframes, including that there could also be a different solution concept for each block within the Study Area.

A highlight of feedback provided by participants about alternative concepts is presented below:

- Some participants indicated that they would like to respond to concrete ideas rather than reflect on vague ideas in discussing alternatives for Yonge Street as there is an understanding that there will be trade-offs and the consideration of determining who the area is serving is unclear
- Participants indicated that sidewalks, pedestrian pathways and pedestrianized areas are a major priority. This includes the use of mobility devices as well. Some participants noted that Yonge Street, within the study area, should be closed to cars and parallel streets should be used to accommodate traffic flow
- Some participants noted hesitation for daily time changes and the difficulty to communicate rules to the public. One-way dead ends were also noted as being difficult for users and unfavourable
- Participants noted that it was difficult to envision individual blocks as Yonge Street is linked to a wider city network and needs to be connected for consistencies. Sidewalks and cycling lanes were particularly noted as needing to be continuous
- Some participants also expressed concern for construction during peak hours and hope that the majority will take place during off peak hours
- Alternative methods for waste removal was suggested such as ENVAC systems;
- Ensure economic and social diversity including accommodating and managing social issues
- Ensure adaptability and flexibility
- Use pilot project and test cases to get feedback and gain acceptance

Additional Information

Participants indicated that the following information would be useful in the project process:

Research

- Information from past pilot project studies and reports
- A showcase of what has been learned from other cities that are similar to Toronto
- Preliminary position papers or other works so that more imminent developments can help towards the solution / objectives due to the fast-paced nature of development along the Yonge Street corridor
- Data collection that is captured during peak seasons such as summer months (especially at TTC stations and consideration of the worst-case scenario of a complete shut down)

Engagement

- Participants would like this project process to follow the model use of TOcore that provided multiple opportunities for all users to be engaged and participate in the process
- Project notification should be continuous with updates
- Presentations should be delivered by the project team on a request basis to formal associations

Workshop Session

- Participants noted the difficulty in covering too many topics in one meeting and suggested focusing on one topic at a time (i.e. traffic, environment, community, retail, etc.)
- Participants would like to be presented with viable tangible options and react to more concrete ideas
- Participants would like to receive additional information to better understand the concept of workshop materials
- Participants would like to receive communication about project and construction timelines as early as possible. This is of particular importance to businesses, developers and their tenants
- Ryerson University would like to be involved directly with case studies and design process

Other

- Information about minimum standards for waste removal and Emergency Medical Services (EMS), Fire and Police
- Information about the varying needs of residents, workers and tourists

Additional Stakeholders/Organizations

Participants indicated that the following individuals/organizations should be involved in the project process:

- Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)
- Police
- Waste removal
- Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
- Transitional Housing and Social Housing Services
- Toronto Public Health (TPH)
- Transportation Services Accessibility Committee
- Accessibility community
- Multi-cultural community
- The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH)
- Youth
- Children
- Ryerson University Student representatives
- Indigenous communities/organizations
- Visitors associations

* Consultation with government agencies and First Nations are key components of the Environmental Assessment process.

Next Steps

Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting, and City staff thanked participants for their feedback and asked that any additional feedback be shared with the project team by August 13th, 2018. City staff committed to sharing the presentation and meeting summary in the coming weeks.

Appendix A – List of Participants

The following is a list of organizations that have been invited to participate in the SAG. Those organizations that participated at the July 30th, 2018 meeting are signified in **bold text**.

Stakeholders

1. Aboriginal Legal Services
2. Advocacy Centre for the Elderly
3. Aura Tower
4. Avenue Bay Cottingham Residents Association
5. **Bay Cloverhill Community Association**
6. **Bloor East Neighbourhood Association**
7. Bloor Yorkville Business Improvement Area (BIA)
8. Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD)
9. Canada Employment & Immigration Union
10. Canadian Courier and Logistics Association
11. Canderel
12. **Church of the Holy Trinity**
13. **Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association**
14. Church-Wellesley Village BIA
15. College Park/The Carlu
16. Collier-Asquith Residents Association
17. **Covenant House**
18. **Cresford**
19. **Cycle Toronto**
20. Delta Chelsea Hotel
21. **Downtown-Yonge Business Improvement Area (BIA)**
22. Eaton Centre Child Care/Canadian Mothercraft Society
23. Elgin Winter Garden Theatre
24. **Financial District BIA**
25. Friends of Berczy Park
26. Garden District Residents Association
27. Greater Yorkville Residents Association
28. Heritage Toronto
29. **HNR Properties Limited**
30. Hospital for Sick Kids
31. Greater Toronto Hotel Association
32. Kingsett Capital
33. **Lanterra**
34. Lifetime Developments
35. LOFT Community Services
36. Massey Hall
37. Massey Hall Revitalization
38. McGill-Granby Residents Association
39. **Metropolitan United Church**
40. Mirvish

41. Miziwe Biik Aboriginal Employment & Training
42. MOD Massey Tower Condos
43. Native Child and Family Services
44. Native Canada Centre of Toronto
45. Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition
46. Ontario Motor Coach Association
47. Queen Street West Business Improvement Area (BIA)
- 48. Ryerson University: City Building Institute**
- 49. Ryerson University: Facilities Management**
- 50. Ryerson University: Student Learning Centre**
51. Salvation Army
52. Social Planning Toronto
53. St James Cathedral
54. St Lawrence Market Neighbourhood Business Improvement Area (BIA)
- 55. St Lawrence Neighbourhood Association**
- 56. St Michael's Choir School**
57. St Michael's Church
- 58. St Michael's Church Master Plan Redevelopment**
59. St Michael's Hospital
60. St Vincent De Paul Mary's Home
61. The 519
62. The Aura
63. Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
- 64. Toronto Eaton Centre (Cadillac Fairview)**
65. Toronto Entertainment District Business Improvement Area (BIA)
66. Toronto Film School
67. Toronto General Hospital (UHN)
68. Toronto Street Food Vendors Association
69. Toronto Taxi Alliance
70. Toronto Women's City Alliance
71. Tourism Toronto
72. University of Toronto
73. U Travels & Tours/Ontario Tourism
- 74. WalkToronto**
75. Waterfront BIA
76. Women's College Hospital
- 77. YMCA (Grosvenor)**
78. Yonge Street Missions Evergreen Centre
- 79. Yonge-Dundas Square**
- 80. Yonge Suites**
- 81. York Quay Neighbourhood Association**
82. Youth-Motion Foundation
83. YSL Cresford
84. YWCA Toronto

Toronto City Councillors/Representatives

- Tristan Downe-Dewdney, Ward 27 Chief of Staff

Project Team

- Johanna Kyte, City of Toronto, Senior. Project Manager Public Realm
- Jeff Dea, City of Toronto, Manager Infrastructure Planning
- Tracy Manolakakis, City of Toronto, Manager Public Consultation Unit
- Maogosha Pyjor, City of Toronto, Senior. Coordinator Public Consultation Unit
- Alexa Aiken, City of Toronto, Coordinator Public Consultation Unit
- David Sit, City of Toronto, Manager Community Planning
- Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants Inc.
- Harold Sich, Steer, Project Manager
- Jeff Qiao, Steer, Project Coordinator
- Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting, Community Engagement Lead
- Zoie Browne, LURA Consulting, Community Engagement Project Manager

Appendix B – SAG Meeting #1 Agenda

Meeting Purpose:

- Introduce yongeTOmorrow: The EA's purpose, process and timelines
- Provide an overview of preliminary work completed to date and seek feedback
- Present preliminary vision, opportunity statement, and objectives, and discuss alternatives
- Outline opportunities for future engagement
- Solicit interest in the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)
- Review next steps

2:00 pm	<p>Opening Remarks and Introductions</p> <p>Jeff Dea, City of Toronto Johanna Kyte, City of Toronto Kristyn Wong-Tam, Ward 27 Councillor Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting (Facilitator)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study overview including purpose, process and timelines for yongeTOmorrow • Work in progress/completed (including Yonge Love, Living Yonge, TOCore)
2:10 pm	<p>Presentation</p> <p>Ken Greenberg, Consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and opportunity statement • Objectives and alternatives • Engagement opportunities • Key upcoming activities
2:30 pm	<p>Questions of Clarification</p> <p>Liz McHardy, LURA Consulting, (Facilitator)</p>
2:40 pm	<p>Activity #1 – Write a tweet/social media post about Yonge Street in 2050!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants will individually reflect on the presentation and their vision for what the future of Yonge Street will look like and write their responses on their activity sheet using 280 characters or less. • Study Area map and area to write response is on Page 2 of the activity workbook • <i>Guiding question: Envision a Yonge Street in 2050. How would you describe the street? What does your Yonge Street experience look like?</i>
2:45 pm	<p>Activity #2 – Vision, Opportunity Statement, and Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants will remain seated at roundtables of 6-8 people and will be asked to reflect individually for 2 minutes on each discussion question below and then discuss, as a group, in order to gather input on the vision, opportunity

	<p>statement and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each participant can refer to Page 3 and Page 5 of the activity workbook for vision, opportunity statement and objectives information as shown during the presentation • During the group discussion, facilitators for each group will record group feedback • <u>Guiding question: Reflecting on the work completed (Yonge Love, Living Yonge, TOcore), as well as the work that is yet to come:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the vision reflect your future for yongeTOMorrow? Why or why not? ○ Do you agree with the opportunity statement? Why or why not? What, if anything is missing? ○ Do you agree with the objectives? Why or why not? What, if anything, is missing?
3:05 pm	<p>Activity #3 – Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants will remain seated at roundtables of 6-8 people and will be asked to reflect individually for 5 minutes then discuss, as a group, the question below to gather initial input on the alternatives • Each participant can refer to the activity workbook for information as shown during the presentation • Input will be recorded on page 6 of the activity workbook • Facilitators for each group will record group feedback • <u>Guiding question: What advice do you have for the project team as they move into the next Phase?</u> • <u>Additional questions to probe discussion (if needed):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What types of activities/uses should the area have? ○ What issues/concerns should be considered in the future? ○ What opportunities should be considered?
3:30 pm	<p>Report Back</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group will be asked to report back
3:55 pm	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team will discuss next steps for the project, SAG membership and engagement process
4:00 pm	<p>Meeting Adjourns</p>