

# CITY OF TORONTO DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

## MINUTES: MEETING 2 – February 17, 2022

The Design Review Panel met virtually on Thursday February 17, 2022 at 12:30pm.

---

### Members of the Design Review Panel

### Members Present

<b>Gordon Stratford (Co-Chair):</b> Principal – G C Stratford – Architect	✓	††
<b>Michael Leckman (Co-Chair):</b> Principal – Diamond Schmitt Architects	✓	†††
<b>Meg Graham (Co-Chair):</b> Principal – superkül	✓	**
<b>Margaret Briegmann:</b> Associate – BA Group	✓	
<b>Dima Cook:</b> Director – EVOQ Architecture	✓	**
<b>George Dark:</b> Design Partner – Urban Strategies	✓	
<b>Ralph Giannone:</b> Principal – Giannone Petricone Associates	✓	**
<b>Jim Gough:</b> Department Manager, Transportation Planning – WSP		
<b>Jessica Hutcheon:</b> Principal – Janet Rosenberg & Studio	✓	
<b>Viktors Jaunkalns:</b> Partner – MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects		
<b>Olivia Keung:</b> Architect – Moriyama & Teshima Architects		
<b>Paul Kulig:</b> Principal – Perkins & Will	✓	*
<b>Joe Lobko:</b> Partner – DTAH	✓	#
<b>Anna Madeira:</b> Principal & Business Head – BDP Quadrangle	✓	**
<b>Jim Melvin:</b> Principal Emeritus/Advisor – PMA; Owner – Realm Works	✓	
<b>Juhee Oh:</b> Director, Sustainability & Energy – WSP		
<b>Heather Rolleston:</b> Principal, Design Director – BDP Quadrangle	✓	
<b>Eladia Smoke:</b> Principal Architect – Smoke Architecture		
<b>Sibylle von Knobloch:</b> Principal – NAK Design Group		
<i>††Chair of 2<sup>nd</sup> Session</i>		<i>†††Chair of 3<sup>rd</sup> Session</i>
<i>#Conflict 3<sup>rd</sup> Session</i>		<i>*Absent 2<sup>nd</sup> Session</i>
		<i>**Absent 3<sup>rd</sup> Session</i>

### Design Review Panel Coordinator

Meredith Vaga: Urban Design, City Planning Division

---

### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Panel confirmed minutes of their previous meeting which was held on January 27, 2022 by email.

### MEETING 2 INDEX

- i. 2345 Finch Avenue West (1<sup>st</sup> Review)
- ii. Toronto Island Master Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Review)

# 2345 FINCH AVENUE WEST

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

### DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

---

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION OPA & Rezoning

*PRESENTATIONS:*

CITY STAFF Henry Tang, Community Planning;  
Prachi Patel, Urban Design

DESIGN TEAM IBI Group, Forrec



VOTE Support – 2  
Non-support – 8

---

## Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

- **The Public Realm**
  - Proposed location, organization and connections between pedestrian and cycling routes, natural features, parks, open spaces and community destinations both within the site and the broader surrounding context;
- **Built Form**
  - Proposed building heights, orientation and massing within the existing and emerging context within the Secondary Plan area; and
  - Proposed organization of uses at-grade, response to site topography and the pedestrian experience along Finch.

## Chair's Summary of Key Points

The Panel would like to thank both the City and proponent teams for their presentations. The proposed project is an important addition to Toronto. It is a major next step towards the completion of a multi-phase transit-oriented development transforming the intersection of Finch Avenue and Weston Road.

The proponent team's submission includes the goal of creating a public/private realm that interconnects with existing and future phases of development, as well as with the community and open space context beyond. Panel members have commended this emphasis; especially given that not all proposed projects make the same degree of effort, leaving spaces in between built form unfulfilled.

At the same time many of the Panel member remarks are directed towards how the proposed design does not yet achieve the proponent's goal depicted in the page 11 concept diagram in their submission. From reviewing the submission's pages 16 and 17 the integration of the transit station is lauded, while recommending that the inner courtyard become a much more cohesive "pedestrian and POPS/park"-first, vehicle-second realm. Members are also looking for the proposed design to

include the page 11 concept's connection and integration with the surrounding context of open/green spaces and amenities.

Considering that this development may last a hundred years or more and given the large number of people who will call it home over that time, it is vital that the public and private realm be of the highest quality right from the start. The proponent team has shown the promise of this level of quality in their concept and possesses the ability to realize that potential through rethinking and developing the design.

## **Panel Commentary**

The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation as well as their "incredibly complete" drawing package. Many members commented that this area will be undergoing a lot of development that will functionally change the uses in the area.

The Panelists felt that further development of the public realm spaces and site circulation was required. Many members advised consolidating the amount of proposed vehicular circulation and reconsidering the provision of POPS and parks space in terms of location, connectivity and programming. Several members noted that moving forward the built form massing and density needed further consideration as well.

Various members felt that there was great potential in creating a human scaled internal courtyard with key retail and amenities that could become a central gathering space for the community. The Panel felt that this was such an important project with a lot of potential and looked forward to seeing it again.

### Response to Context

- Some members noted that this project was located at the crossing of major arterial roads, as evidenced by pages 27-29 of the drawing package.
  - o A member noted that the uses of the area will be changed and that this project will bring a lot of new residents. The member advised looking more closely at the urban system being created, including the public streets coming away from the corner.
  - o Another member commented that the project had the potential to change the dynamics of the area by creating a new centre of community.
- Various members pointed out that Finch and Weston are very large arterials while Zappacosta Dr. and Vena Way are incomplete roads terminating in cul de sacs.
  - o Some members commented that the road system appeared to be dedicated to "cars going in circles" to access back doors.
  - o The Panel was concerned that this was creating highly residual spaces.
- Some members advised that the connection to the development in the south would be through a dog leg. These members pointed out that this would likely result in many people using that dog leg as a short cut, which would negatively impact pedestrian safety.
- Looking at the broader context of Lindy Lou Park and the Hydro Corridor on the one hand, and the transit site and constrained CPR on the other, a member suggested looking at the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre as an precedent when thinking about where density could occur.

### Evolution of the Design

- Many Panel members wondering whether there were aspects in the current design proposal that were vestigial elements from earlier version(s) of the project.
  - o The Panel felt that the diagram on pg. 11 of the drawing package contained a lot of good ideas that could be looked at again.

- Some members noted that the project has been ongoing for 10 year, and that the thinking around multi use developments have evolved during that time.

#### Finch Easement & Underpass

- Some members felt that the easement on Finch Ave W was a lost opportunity.
  - One member thought it would be great if it could be brought into the realm of the project, acknowledging the grading challenges.
  - Another member noted that this could be a great asset and "really important" to the project, but cautioned the design team that if it wasn't resolved there was the danger that it could become a residual space requiring retrofitting after the fact.
- Various members pointed out that there are other examples of an underpass condition and that resolving it can be "tricky" and a "big risk".
- The underpass at Bathurst and Fort York Blvd was noted as an example where the conditions, documentation and construction was unknown and the result suffered due to not knowing what the final grading would be.

#### Site Plan

- Various members questioned whether the park was located in the right place on site.
  - Some members suggested considering the large potential green space available via the easement on Finch, or alternatively connecting the park to the hydro corridor.
- Many members commented that it would be nice if the uses in the bases of the buildings could spill out into the public realm areas without worrying about transit.
  - The Panel advised reducing the amount of driveways and internal circulation.
  - Various members noted that the pedestrian flow from the corner plaza should be able to effectively spill into the courtyard without having to cross the driveways.
- A few members questioned what type of urbanism was being adopted in the development. (e.g. deliberate, landscape, or diffuse urbanism).
  - These members commented that while the development to the south has very clear urbanism, this phase is proposing both open corners and buildings.
    - A member noted that this was resulting in fragmented edges.

#### Internal Site Circulation

- The Panel strongly felt that there was too much internal vehicular circulation.
  - Several members questioned whether the proposed amount of driveways was required.
  - Many members pointed out that the POPS felt very isolated from the buildings.
- The Panel members thought there were too many cul de sacs.
- Various members questioned whether the parking garage was correctly located, noting that it was currently cutting off a route to the hydro corridor.
- Many members advised not having parking in what should be public spaces.
- Some members commented that while the proposal was showing shared streets with overlapping pedestrian and vehicular uses, along with a woonerf, there would still be a lot of crossover between the different routes and uses.
  - These members questioned pedestrian safety even with the intended low traffic levels.
- Many members suggested using the diagram on pg. 11 of the drawing package as a starting point to reexamine the pedestrian connectivity within the site.

#### Site Access & Driveways

- The Panel felt that there were too many vehicular access points into the site and suggested reducing the number of driveways.
  - Various members suggested eliminating the north-south exit.

- Some members suggested moving some of the access roads to the exterior of the development.
- Some members wondered whether the driveway could become a discontinuous connection on the east to Zappacostra Dr. and then the connection west to Finch could be a dog leg.
- Many members suggested looking at the character of Zappacostra Dr. to open up the area and reduce the amount of vehicular traffic.
  - Some suggestions included locating more residential entrances on this street as well as a continuous public sidewalk area into the hydro corridor.

#### Connections

- Looking at connectivity south to Zappacostra Dr. various members advised that all the connections should be put in place as a part of the design, including connections to the hydro corridor.
  - Many members noted that part of the responsibility of this proposed development should be to ensure it is a part of a network of pathways.
- Some members commented that in terms of the peripheral pathway system, the eastern edge of the site has been pinched resulting in no opportunities for a greater pathway connection to the other neighbourhood.

#### Corner Plaza as Gateway

- Many members noted appreciation for the corner plaza and how it would act as a gateway from the transit node into the site.
  - Various members suggested incorporating more of the concept ideas expressed on pg. 11 of the drawing package to make this gateway plaza concept stronger.
- Various members thought the western plaza on Finch should be paired with another space on the eastern portion of Finch.
- Looking at pg. 7 of the drawing package, some members felt that Tower A was not currently acting as a gateway with respect to the proposed massing form.
  - One member pointed out that having the massing step up to 20 storeys in an L-shape would be very overpowering from the courtyard. This member suggested looking at instead having a point tower closer to the corner to avoid this amount of massing.

#### Park, Public Realm, POPS & Programming

- The Panel felt that while the POPS and park spaces might initially be perceived as an abundance of space for outdoor uses, the crossing roadways and piecemeal programming of the different elements would mean that the public realm amenities would not get the kind of use that was being anticipated.
  - The Panelists advised consolidating the amount of driveways.
    - Some members commented that this would help establish an interesting campus environment in the courtyard.
  - Many members commented that it would be difficult for users to perceive public vs. private public realm spaces.
    - Various members pointed out that there will be a delineation between POPS and parks which will make them seem more private.
- Various members wondered whether there was any way to add amenities around the POPS area.
- A member noted that residential was located at grade and wondered whether there was a way to introduce more community use at grade in that area.

- Various members noted that if the driveway encircling the POPS was removed and if some of the functions at grade could be changed not as many entrances would be required.
- Some members commented that the size of the green POPS spaces were correct; however, they were over-programmed.
  - o A member advised that any programming should include the park as well.
  - o A member pointed out that maintenance of the disparate public realm elements would become an issue.
- Various members thought there should be more parkland provision given the amount of density being proposed.
- Some members suggested the dog park should become smaller and have retail push into it to help the courtyard become an neighbourhood square for people to gather.
- Various member commented that the courtyard spaces lacked a human scale or sense of place.
- Many members pointed out that both POPS were surrounding by sidewalks as well as shared roads. Various members additionally noted the proposed amount of surface and layby parking
  - o The Panel was concerned by this amount of hardscaping.
  - o Some members additionally noted accessibility concerns accessing the POPS due to the driveway loop and Vena way extension in particular.

#### Amenities & Ground Floor Uses

- Various members pointed out that there was currently a "hodge-podge" of uses at the ground floor.
  - o These members felt there was a lack of overall consolidation of the uses that related to the exterior spaces.
  - o Some members additionally felt that the lobby, retail, offices, and townhouses all felt very disconnected from each other and suggested they would be improved by a more "coherent" public realm that allows the different elements to "feed off each other".
    - Various members wondered whether there were vestigial moves from a previous scheme.
- Many members suggested the inclusion of a grocery or food store would be a "true amenity" and an important addition to the project.
  - o One member pointed out that this area is a food desert and that the inclusion of this type of amenity would have the potential to create a sense of place for the area.
  - o It was suggested that having stores relating to food, pharmacy, liquor etc. would bring to the area the sense of the "joyous chaos of everyday experience".
    - A member hoped the project team would embrace this concept, commenting that this would be embracing the "spirit" of the neighbourhood.

#### Density & Massing

- Some members noted that the architecture and massing needed more development, but acknowledged that the proposal was at a rezoning stage.
- Various members questioned whether the proposed amount of density could be supported given the extent of the public realm.
  - o One member commented that the POPS will have to do a lot of work because it would be supporting so many phases of development.
- Various members felt that the density felt heavy along Finch Ave W.

- Some members wondered whether it was appropriate to have such tall buildings fronting Finch.
- A member suggested reorganizing the towers on site and having more of a midrise typology focused along Finch with the towers pushed further into the site.
- Looking at pg. 29 of the drawing package, some member commented that the building massing was creating an interesting frame around the proposed "courtyard".
  - However, many members pointed out that the courtyard was not currently functioning as a cohesive ground plane and what is public vs. private is unclear.
  - Various members suggested the scale of the architecture should be reduced to make the scale within the courtyard more comfortable such that people will inhabit these spaces.
- Some members noted appreciation for the tower separation distances.
- Some members thought the point tower massing was a good response to the predominantly slab tower form context.

#### Hydro Corridor

- The Panel thought that the overarching project should make a contribution to the activation of the hydro corridor.
- Many members advised that at minimum, the project needed to establish a safe way to get to the high school through the hydro corridor.
  - Various members pointed out that the current design requires walking through a cul de sac, followed by a dirt path to access the school.
- Various members noted that better connections to both Finch Ave W and the hydro corridor had the potential to make big moves for the area.
  - Some members wondered whether the park and POPS should shift to the eastern end of the property to make a direct connection to the hydro corridor without requiring a road.
    - One member noted that while this would require the elimination of a tower, it would be a better use of public amenities than currently proposed.

# TORONTO ISLAND MASTER PLAN

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

### DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

---

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION City Study

**PRESENTATIONS:**

CITY STAFF Lori Ellis, Parks, Forestry and Recreation

DESIGN TEAM Victoria Bell, DTAH



VOTE No vote

---

## Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice and feedback on any comments that the Panel would like to provide.

## Chair's Summary of Key Points

The initiative to guide the future of the Toronto Islands is very important to all Torontonians, and the Panel was very appreciative of an excellent presentation. Our stewardship of this rare resource is crucial. As the city becomes more dense, open space becomes more important: it needs to work for tourists, for residents, for daily visitors, it needs to support businesses as well as a wide range of stakeholders. In addition, the Islands are culturally significant, and can recognize cultural heritage in new ways, ways that are provoked by this master plan study.

The lenses that you've applied to guide improvements are excellent and supported by the Panel: revealing Indigenous space; elevating equity and belonging; enhancing visitor experience; supporting a dynamic environment; and improving access and connection.

What's attractive about the Islands is that it's magic, it's weird, it's iconic, and it had an organic genesis. Its future should acknowledge this essential aspect of its DNA. As well, for the master plan to be successful, governance and sources of capital are essential, and that governance needs to be visionary.

Access is crucial and should be emphasized. So many great cities of the world that are on water are able to access their natural resources – though few of them have an 800-acre park in the water – but think of New York City, Vancouver, London, Bangkok, Venice, and Hamilton Bermuda. All of them have well developed shuttle networks that allow you to easily - and spontaneously - gain access to their vast resources of open space.

There was enthusiasm for the art and cultural markers and educational opportunities. Additional comments from Panel comments should be considered: integrating the cycling network with the City network; enhancing a sense of the wild; considering, even at this early stage, the possible future of the airport and how it can be part of a bigger vision of the Islands; considering the larger context of the inner bay shoreline; that business opportunities are important and need to be "of the place".

---

### DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Finally, there is a need for the Islands to represent reconciliation, an important opportunity offered by this moment in our history. It is possible to do so meaningfully and boldly. We look forward to seeing progress of this important initiative.

## **Panel Commentary**

The Panel thanked the study team for their presentation. Many members felt that the team had presented a very exciting preliminary vision through a very well laid out drawing package. The Panel thought that Toronto Island was an incredibly special, unique, and important place for the city and strongly encouraged the city in proceeding with undertaking the master plan.

The Panelists advised that there needed to be a deep understanding of what makes the islands a special place in order to ensure those qualities are retained in the execution of the master plan. Several members further advised that any interventions needed to have a very light touch to protect the specialness of the islands.

Various members commended the study team on their identified focus lenses, and the Panel was supportive of the moves to increase equity for visitors to the islands. The Panel looked forward to seeing the study again.

### Master Plan

- Many Panel members thought that in terms of importance going forward, this study ranked near the top for Toronto, if not at the top.
  - o The Panel thought the master plan had been clearly stated and was critical for the future health of this incredibly special place.
- Various members pointed out that the city is getting denser, and more "compressed" as people increasingly live in vertical communities without backyards and more and more people are coming to the city every year.
- Some members felt that the study was only reflecting the tip of the iceberg in terms of what the islands mean to Toronto.
- Various members noted that while they supported the scope and intentions of the study, they wanted to see the science to back up what is being presented right now.
- Several members thought that the study needed to either encompass or trigger a much larger study of all of Toronto's inner bay shoreline.
  - o Various members advised looking more at the story of the central waterfront, including Villiers Island and the mouth of the Don.
  - o Some members felt that a study of the whole waterfront would help inform the study of the Island.
- A member pointed out that a large amount of capital would be required in order to bridge what was being discussed in the study. This member pointed out that Governor's Island in New York City had substantial resources, and that Toronto Island deserved the same type of investment.

### Focus Lenses

- The Panel thought the identified areas of study seemed "pitch perfect".
  - o Many members felt that the lenses chosen to organize the big ideas appeared to be working well.
  - o Some members noted appreciation that the various ideas and layers were so comprehensive in terms of scale and scope.
  - o A few members noted that the lenses may need to evolve as the study progresses.
- The Panelists commended the study team on their approach to proceed with a "light touch". Various members commented that this was exactly what was needed for the Island.

### Special Place

- The Panel strongly felt that the islands were a treasure, iconic, and incredibly important for Toronto. Several members noted that the ongoing stewardship of the islands to ensure they retain their specialness was of the utmost importance.
- Various Panelists remarked that there is a magic quality to the islands.
  - o Many members commented that there are so many aspects to islands and places one can get completely lost in.
  - o One of the aspects that makes the islands special is that they are islands that are separate from the mainland.
- Some members noted appreciation for the tension inherent to the islands, including the physical landscape as well as regarding such things as the residents living on the islands.
- Many members commented that Toronto was lucky to have the luxury of this geography in the harbour.
  - o Some members pointed out that the geography was "really extraordinary", both as a discrete place and in relation to the geographic scope of the city.
  - o Various members commented that having "800 acres of green sitting in front of a major city" was unprecedented.
- A member noted that they were glad to hear more explanation around the business opportunities identified as one of the elements sprinkled throughout the document.
  - o Many members advised the study team that this element needed to be carefully development and executed to protect the specialness of the islands.

### Cultural History & Spirit of Place

- The Panel strongly advised that any responses or interventions needed to be extremely respectful, appropriate, and Toronto-specific.
- Many Panelists strongly felt that the study needed to employ careful consideration of the spirit of place, and history of place to ensure the spirit of the islands continued to resonate.
  - o Some members felt that finding the balance between any future interventions and preserving the spirit of place was at the crux of the study.
  - o The Panel advised further work into teasing out the spirit of the islands to ensure this aspect is protected and retained.
    - One member felt that this could also help inform what aspects, if any, needed to be further amplified.
- Various members commented that Toronto Island has a completely organic quality that can be seen in its accommodation of events in a way that could never be replicated.
- Many members noted that there were many layers making up the cultural history and spirit of place. The Panel advised that each layer needed to be understood.
  - o Further, the Panel cautioned that the study should not start "tinkering and tampering" with things that are working well on the islands.
- The Panel noted that one of the major questions the study team had to grapple with was how far to go with the study.
  - o One member pointed out that if the inventions are too heavy handed the islands will lose their specialness; however, if the islands are not "refreshed" there is a danger they could become redundant.
- Various members described the cultural history and the spirit of place of the islands as "quiet".

### Reconciliation

- Various Panel members pointed out that the islands could have an important and a "phenomenal" role in Reconciliation.
- Many members encouraged a deep understanding of the islands from Indigenous sources.

- One Panel member noted that the McMichael Art Gallery was undertaking an incredible study about its position on the Carrying Place Trail and ways to turn the gallery grounds into a stewardship pattern that relates to this history. This member wondered whether this approach could be used as a precedent for the islands.

#### The Role of Natural Places in Toronto

- A member, reflecting on the important role of large natural places in Toronto, commented that when the islands flooded there was suddenly an enormous increase in the amount of visitors to the Toronto Brickworks.
  - o This member reflected that this indicated that these places served an extremely important purpose for Torontonians.
  - o This member additionally pointed out that the Brickworks are 40 acres, while Toronto Island is 800 acres.
    - The "luxury" of the islands' natural geography was further put into context by pointing out that Governor's Island in New York City is only 172 acres.

#### Enhance "Wildness" of the Island

- Many members felt that there was a "wild" quality about the islands.
  - o Some members thought the mood sketches in the package were an interesting way of presenting the ideas as they had a sense of the wild to them.
  - o Other members noted that while the camping and more formalized element being proposed could have their place on the islands, the study team should create something a little "more wild" that was different from the rest of the parks.
  - o Various members advised "loosening up" the design of the islands.
  - o The Panel strongly advised holding onto this quality, with some members commenting that the wildness was important.

#### Landscape & Vegetation

- Various members pointed out that there were likely invasive plants on the islands, and that from a resiliency perspective this needed further consideration.
- Various members wondered about new plant opportunities for future uses of the Island.
  - o Some members wondered whether there could be more opportunities for native foraging within the islands.
  - o A few members wondered how much lawn would be an acceptable land use and vegetation use.

#### Island Resilience

- The Panel advised that further work should be done around the resiliency of the islands.
  - o Some members commented that portions of the islands feel very vulnerable and "mushy". These members felt that some things on the Island needed to feel more permanent, such as via retaining walls, to ensure the resiliency of the place.
- Various members questioned the carrying capacity of the open spaces and wondered whether there should be time restrictions or limits on some of the land use areas.
- Some members wanted to see an ESA map.
  - o These members pointed out that a fundamental aspect of the study was the idea of design with nature and without seeing this information the Panel had to take the study team's word that those things were being incorporated.
- Looking at the residential uses on the Island in terms of environmental impacts, a member advised that further work should be done regarding waste management and mitigating these types of activities that might degrade aspects of the islands.

#### Waterfront Connectivity & Activities

- The Panel supported the idea of increased ferry service as well as incorporating smaller boat launch services.
  - o One member pointed out that smaller shuttle services from one part of the islands to another is similar to Copenhagen's waterfront.
  - o Many members noted support for increased connectivity via water transport.
- Various members encouraging looking for opportunities to enhance activities on the water.
  - o These members felt this would be really important as the waterfront from the mainland doesn't lend itself to many opportunities to touch the water apart from at a few locations simply due to the nature of how the wake, winds, and waves work.

#### Art & Culture

- Some members thought the idea of incorporating art and cultural markers was interesting and had huge potential.
  - o One member suggested focusing on the educational aspect of cultural markers for all people visiting the islands. This member further suggested placing the markers at key points on the islands, such as at the ferry docks.

#### Island Amenities

- Various members thought it was important to ensure that diverse amenities were available on the Island, including access to bathroom facilities, inexpensive and diverse food, picnic tables and BBQs, etc.

#### Accessibility

- The Panel applauded the approach to increase accessibility at every scale to help people both access the Island via reduced ferry fares and increased water shuttle services, as well as to help people traverse the islands no matter their mobility level.
- Some members suggested looking at how other cities on the water negotiate accessibility while preserving their inherent "spirit of place".
  - o The fact that the islands are organic islands separate from the mainland, and that together with the mainland form the inner harbour, is an important component of the cultural history as well as the "specialness" of the place. This aspect should be preserved while accessibility is improved.
  - o One precedent noted was Copenhagen's waterfront whereby boat launches and shuttle services are utilized.

#### Cycling Network

- Some members advised, if there was no conflict with the broader business plan, finding a way to bring Bike Share to the Island.
  - o These members felt that integrating the cycling network from the rest of the city in this capacity should be part of the "big idea" for the islands.

#### Detailed Locational Opportunities

- Various members commented that some of the very detailed finer grain moves would be really critical as they will have major impacts and will require a very light touch.
- Some specific locational opportunities noted by various Panel members included:
  - o The Eastern gap as a wonderful place and special location with different views that should be enhanced.
  - o Following an ESA, connecting behind the water treatment plant to Mugg's Island which hasn't been available to the public.

#### Governance Structure

- Some Panel members advised that the governance of the Island would be very important going forward.

- Various members questioned whether a traditional governance structure would be broad or comprehensive enough to support the aspirations of the master plan.
- Among other reasons, one member noted that as an economic development tool a different governance structure for the Island would be able to support partnerships to access capital, which will be needed to bridge what is being discussed in the master plan.
- It was also noted that through the potentiality of different governance there would also be the ability to protect the organic nature and special qualities of the islands.

#### Billy Bishop Airport

- Various Panel members questioned the exclusions from the master plan, notably Billy Bishop airport.
  - These members pointed out that the airport's lease will be up within 10 years.
  - Some members commented that master plans should look at adjacent components.
- Various members suggested the study should include references to potential opportunities for the future of the airport lands as a part of a whole island complex.
  - A member noted that now would be the time to lay advocacy and ground work for reimagining the airport site, and that waiting for the lease to be up in 10 years would be too late.