

**HUMBER BAY SHORES CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**

2240 Lake Shore Blvd. West, Toronto, Ontario
Wednesday, March 30, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present - Executive Board 2020-2021

Jim Reekie	President	
Jennifer Tocci	Vice President	Waterford
Laura Nash	Secretary	
Michelle Lian	Treasurer	
John Browne	Director-at-Large	Palace Pier
Sharon Jazzar	Director-at-Large	Newport Beach
Ron Anderson	Director-at-Large	Palace Place

Members Present - General

Mary Ciufu	Director	Marina Del Rey Phase III
Emily Doyle	Director	Lakeside Place
Susan Grimes	Director	Marina Del Rey, Phase I
Adam Kozak for K. Winter	(Proxy)	Grand Harbour A&B and Townhouses
Craig Robinson	Director	Grand Harbour C
Jim Simone	Director	Nautilus
Tod Stewart	Director	Grenadier Landing

Member Regrets

Angela Abromaitis	Director	Waterscapes
Maria Ancona	Director	Beyond the Sea Phase I
Marilyn Dumaresq	Director	Hearthstone by the Bay
Tom Killeen	Director	Marina Del Rey Phase II
Saifu Mawji	Director	Waterview Explorer
Adrian Wellman	Director	Waterscapes
Kathryn Winter	Director-at-Large	Grand Harbour A&B and Townhouses

Invited Guests (departed at 9:01 p.m.)

David Hunter	Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services, City of Toronto
Ryan Lo	Senior Coordinator, Public Consultation, City of Toronto
Robyn Shyllit	Supervisor, Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto

Observers

Aaron Prance	Policy Advisor, Office of City Councillor Mark Grimes
Julie Stefko	Property Manager, Nevis Condominiums

Recording Secretary

Julia Bennett	INaMINUTE Ltd.
---------------	----------------

This meeting was held by videoconference.

1.0 WELCOME / QUORUM / CALL TO ORDER

J. Reekie presided as Chair and welcomed those gathered. With quorum achieved, he called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. with the agenda as presented. He welcomed guests D. Hunter and colleagues from the City of Toronto's Transportation Master Plan team, who had returned with an update and details in response to questions from the HBSCA about plans to address road congestion in the area as new developments were built.

2.0 PRESENTATION

2.1 Introduction

D. Hunter introduced his team, reflecting the attendance list above. He shared a presentation on screen which detailed planning progress and traffic projections for options developed for the area, and spoke to strategies developed by the City and road and ramp construction maps.

He advised the following:

- The Final Report on the 125 The Queensway Conversion had been considered.
- The high goals of the broad TMP Study Area were safety and choice of transportation.
- The TMP Study Area work did not have a mandate to address traffic routes elsewhere in the GTA.
- If minor changes at the level of signage, for e.g., would not require environmental assessment, they could be mentioned in the findings but were not part of the focus.
- The City predicted car use would decline 30% in the next 20-30 years.
- Challenges would arise as each new destination changed things, and people changed where and how they wanted to live.

He recapped that since public engagement, steps taken since July 2021 by the TMP team included:

- Refining
- Developing design concepts
- Updating Legion Road extension
- Cost estimates.

He reported highlights of the public and stakeholder engagement from 2021 to date:

- People were supportive of Alternative 4-B, the preliminary "preferred" network.
- Support for improvements to existing streets, increased opportunities for cycling
- Lots of concern about traffic infiltration from the Gardiner Expressway
- Acceptance of the general idea of connecting Street A directly to the Gardiner was noted
- Useful suggestions received for signage and parking enforcement changes, which would be worked into the final report although they do not require environmental assessment.

He mentioned additional options being considered, such as alternating north-south streets south of Lakeshore Boulevard West, and cutting traffic on Marine Parade Drive itself.

2.2 Park Lawn

D. Hunter spoke about potential changes to Park Lawn:

- It was likely that Park Lawn had originally been added as a major Gardiner off-ramp due to industry and motel strip traffic.
- The preference would be to give Park Lawn different qualities north of, and south of, Railway Overpass, and the impact of such changes.
- South of Railway Overpass, they would like to see Park Lawn as a 40 km street, one (1) lane in each direction, with cycling routes and tree plantings.
- The current thinking was to take the dual-turn lane down to a single-lane.
- The dual left turn lane that turns north onto Queensway would also be reduced to one (1) lane.

J. Browne asked whether if many people use it, perhaps it could not be reduced to two (2) lanes.

D. Hunter responded that 50% of travelers were trying to get through the area, not into it, and the goal is to keep that traffic on the Gardiner all the time, east or west.

D. Hunter responded that the intention was not to accommodate everyone who wanted a thoroughfare, but to find a middle ground between too much capacity and not enough capacity. He added that broader transit factors would make a difference, stating that the modelling work his team was doing included the Mimico GO Station and other key points of a broad area. This was a long-term plan 20-30 years out, and transit would be improved.

J. Reekie noted that the streetcars would have their own right of way which would help.

2.3 New North-South Street

D. Hunter spoke about a possible North-South street, not immediately but perhaps in the future.

This new 40 km street would have one (1) traffic lane in each direction, with bike lanes and tree plantings. He reviewed maps showing several options for the proposed new street, noting all of the options would be assessed:

- using a short tunnel
- using a long tunnel
- diverting around the Food Terminal.

S. Grimes noted that it would be 25-30 years before the infrastructure was all in place, including dedicated transit. She asked if given that timeline, current Residents would receive all the traffic, without seeing the benefits of the infrastructure.

D. Hunter reminded members that the Christie site development could not proceed until the new GO station was built. He stated that the idea was not to have development before infrastructure. He emphasized that all long-range planning as a rule took shape over a span of time.

C. Ritz added that the Christie site would not begin development for five (5) years.

2.4 Traffic Flow Modelling

D. Hunter turned to specific modelling of traffic flow for the options under consideration to address Gardiner and Park Lawn traffic

He showed a map of west Toronto and Mississauga showing the green area of focus on the map which was the primary TMP study area and a larger area around it which was the larger scope of the TMP. He explained that:

- The goal was to analyze ways to get people on and off the Gardiner at other places than in the Humber Bay area.
- The projections used symbols universal to city modelling, where six (6) gradations of colour, ranging from green and yellow to orange and red, were used to denote type of traffic flow, from free flow (green) to approaching unstable (orange) and congested (dark red).
- Many places in the GTA currently had unstable or approaching unstable traffic flow and this did not impede life in the City.
- If no changes or remediation were done, he stated, modelling showed that the area would nevertheless not attain the most congested flow state.

He then directed those present to a diagram showing the projected improved traffic flow that would result if a new street was created from Queensway to Lakeshore, and if Alternative 3 – Modified Gardiner Ramps and New Lake Shore Ramp were chosen. He noted that the difference among the options was not very great.

R. Anderson noted that the argument for making no change was compelling, as proposed changes could encourage Gardiner infiltration into Humber Bay Shores. He added that he was not convinced about option 4-B as the ramp built under that plan, at the time of the GO Station build, would further enable traffic congestion.

D. Hunter responded that he understood that fear, but that the reason for a solution was the peak rush hour growth. He displayed a diagram showing people coming off the Gardiner and coming on to the Lakeshore and Marine Parade Drive in the morning, and the same thing in the opposite direction at the end of the day.

J. Simone wondered at the reluctance of drivers to take the QEW/Gardiner exit right on to Lakeshore.

D. Hunter responded that these drivers may be taking the Park Lawn collector exit at its earlier point, based on observing congestion on the Gardiner express lanes, not realizing it was still faster to stay in the express lanes.

J. Browne noted that proposed changes would add three (3) or four (4) traffic lights to that route which could further cause congestion.

A. Kozak asked how the traffic flow modelling was done, and where the data was obtained.

D. Hunter spoke to the kind of data used. He noted this was a unique area boxed in by physical elements such as Lake Ontario and High Park.

2.5 Option 3

D. Hunter then asked those gathered to look more closely at Option 3, which offered connection to and from the Gardiner from Street A.

Members observed that in the morning rush hour from the West, Street A would connect to the Gardiner and the Lakeshore, and get people back onto the Gardiner, making it a glorified side ramp to the Gardiner. However, it did not remove traffic off Lakeshore.

D. Hunter noted that demand was still coming from other areas in that model and there would still be cars on Lakeshore under Option 3. However, under that model there were fewer cars travelling south on Park Lawn, so Option 3 could enable a reduction to Park Lawn traffic. He summarized that Option 3 would encourage more potential Gardiner traffic to come into Humber Bay Shores because Street A would be part of the neighbourhood. There would be nothing to stop them from doing other things besides getting on to Lakeshore Blvd. West.

J. Simone asked about the potential to use signage along the lines of “Local Traffic Only.”

C. Ritz replied that enforcing such signage was difficult. She also noted that Residents in the dense condominium area received visitors and that all citizens had to be treated equally.

D. Hunter supported that point, adding that although Humber Bay Shores was currently predominantly residential, in the future with the Christie site developed, there would be more offices, stores and mixed use, and that would change the traffic patterning.

J. Browne asked whether a change to the timing of the lights at the Legion Road and Lakeshore Blvd West offramp could be effective. A longer red light would stop that traffic and back it up, effectively discouraging people who would not use it any more.

D. Hunter explained that could not be guaranteed, as time and space were the chief variables.

M. Ciuffo noted, however, that design did affect behavior.

D. Hunter agreed that there were not a lot of examples in the City where a “gate” was installed effectively, which is what such a long red light would be, barring people at certain times of the day. He was not averse to metering, which is done on ramps, as a general principle.

D. Hunter noted that at present there were some curious traffic flow modelling results. The do-nothing model in afternoon westbound traffic showed only 220 cars coming south on Marine Parade, whereas Option 3 in afternoon westbound traffic showed more than 400.

2.6 Option 4-B

D. Hunter moved to a discussion of Option 4-B, noting that by discouraging traffic with Option 4-B there was a 25% reduction because the streets were configured to discourage them. Some of those drivers would go up to the Queensway, which would then make it some other neighbourhood’s problem. Option 4-B also modelled good traffic flow for Park Lawn.

J. Browne asked whether these considerations amounted to shifting deck chairs on the Titanic, as there was a limitation on car numbers crossing the Humber River at any point during rush hour.

D. Hunter cautioned that traffic flow was dynamic and that if Option 4-B discouraged them, they may go elsewhere entirely. It might help locally. He added that Option 4-B still maintained a ramp connection to the Gardiner, but that it was a north-south street which improved distribution.

J. Reekie asked whether there was consideration of continuing the north-south street from the Gardiner to the Queensway separately, as a partial North South street.

D. Hunter replied that this was an interesting idea not considered.

J. Browne noted that there were two (2) left-hand turns to get off the Gardiner and onto it, which was not a very dramatic obstruction.

D. Hunter stated that modelling was done not only to see if the options considered discouraged traffic coming off the Gardiner. He said another key goal was to enable drivers to get between the Queensway and Lakeshore Blvd. West without using Park Lawn, and Option 4-B offered more connection. He also noted that Option 4-B, in modelling at least, reduced traffic coming off the Gardiner in afternoon rush hour from 1,000 cars onto Street A in the do-nothing scenario, down to 600 cars with Option 4-B.

J. Browne noted the modelling for Option 4-B was based on Monday to Friday, but that there is back up on Saturdays and Sundays as well.

D. Hunter noted these days were not studied. He added that traffic lights will help manage traffic, and the future ramp would not be free flow.

D. Hunter added the modelling for Option 4-B projected “acceptable delay” or “approaching unstable flow” which was not a bad range to be in.

2.7 General Comments and Questions

D. Hunter stated generally that the purpose of streets was not solely to convey car traffic. The next nearest rail underpass after Park Lawn was 2 km away at Royal York, and it was a challenging area for all movement including transit with Humber River and Mimico Creek on either side, making it feel like not a very coherent network. He added that all the projects and options discussed were required to be Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) Project Schedule ratings of C, which meant complex or expensive and required much more detail, with separate projections for the 1-10 year scope near-term, the 11-20 year scope medium-term, and the 20+ year scope long-term.

R. Anderson asked why Street A was projected to be as costly as a new north-south street, when it involved a lot less work.

D. Hunter noted that the cost estimates at the current juncture were very high-level. And the Street A estimate was probably the more accurate estimate as it had been worked on more than the north south street, which might well have a higher cost.

J. Reekie asked about Legion Road, noting that money had been put aside for Legion Road to come south off Mystic Point. He asked whether any thought had been given to then run Legion Road north to the Queensway or the Gardiner instead of simply ending it.

D. Hunter cautioned that such an idea might not be constructible. He stated that the \$35 million set aside for Legion Road was not intended just to help create a better traffic network, but also to connect local communities northward and westward to the new park and assist with a nice main street and shopping in Mimico.

J. Browne mused whether anyone in the neighbourhood would be alive when a new street to the Queensway was built.

D. Hunter responded that such was the conundrum of planning.

C. Ritz added that city building took time. She had previously worked extensively on the Port Lands project, a 50-year plan, which she would not be alive to see completed. All planning looked ahead 20-25 years.

D. Hunter noted that the GO Station was not yet figured into the plans in terms of impact. There were other initiatives in the community that would require catch-up projections as not a lot had been built.

J. Tocchi asked what the vision was for Marine Parade Drive.

D. Hunter replied that there were minor changes and that his team was recommending a Neighbourhood Transportation Area Study be undertaken that did not require an environmental assessment. Also, there was no vision that Marine Parade Drive would be a one-way street in the future.

J. Reekie asked where there was data of any recent traffic count from Kipling and Islington into Humber Bay Shores.

D. Hunter advised that there would be a traffic count (# of cars/bikes counted), but he had not heard of one in Humber Bay Shores.

C. Ritz added that the older environmental assessment report on the Gardiner had lapsed and a widening of the Gardiner had occurred since then.

A. Kozak asked whether there was a City tolerance range of traffic congestion, for instance a certain number of cars in traffic for a certain number of minutes to get from Point A to Point B.

D. Hunter responded that he didn't know of time-based modelling and did not think it could be effectively done based on maximum time in an area.

C. Ritz noted that regardless of the options chosen, Park Lawn was the only option to exit Humber Bay Shores. The network of an extra street and other options would at least distribute the traffic around more equitably.

D. Hunter noted that another main goal of the City was to build public networks. A public network would make it easier for cyclists, especially recreational cyclists.

In conclusion, **D. Hunter** noted that the City wanted to convey a strong message that planners are committed to identifying and implementing solutions to support the local community. The message to travellers was that, if you were travelling long distances on the Gardiner, we want you to stay there. The reality was that there was no space to expand the City's streets. Instead, the task was to better manage the traffic Toronto has.

In answer to a query from Members as to whether the presentation could be shared with condominium Boards of Directors, **D. Hunter** said that he would share the presentation with the HBSCA for the present. All data would be in the Traffic Master Plan (TMP) report that would be released by the City of Toronto in a few weeks. The HBSCA could submit a response to that report.

2.8 Next Steps

D. Hunter noted the following upcoming milestones:

March 2022 – additional stakeholder engagement with the Ontario Food Terminal, HBSCA, Christie site and others

April 25, 2022 – Infrastructure environmental meeting

May 11, 2022 – City Council meeting

Summer-Fall 2022 – Final Traffic Master Plan (TMP) report goes out to the public for 30-day review period, anticipated to end in the fall.

Ongoing – TMP meetings

The Association Members thanked the guests for their time and the comprehensive presentation. The guests departed at 9:01 pm.

3.0 CALL TO ORDER

As there was quorum present, J. Reekie called the meeting to order at 9:03 p.m., presiding as Chair.

4.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of January 26, 2022

Amendments were requested by two (2) Members to the minutes of January 26, 2022 and submitted to the Recording Secretary.

*On a **MOTION** by J. Reekie, **seconded** by J. Tocci, **it was resolved** to approve the minutes of the Board of Directors' meeting held on January 26, 2022, as amended.*

The motion was carried.

5.0 TREASURER'S REPORT

J. Reekie shared comments from the Treasurer, who sent regrets due to illness, that the finances were in good shape and that anyone was welcome to email her with financial questions.

It was noted that the financial statements were unaudited and for internal use, and that the approved annual statements could be shared with member condominium Boards if requested.

6.0 COMMUNITY REPORTS

6.1 Community Spring Clean-Up

J. Tocci reported that the Community Spring Clean-Up was scheduled for May 14. There would be a barbecue for volunteers at the Mimico Cruising Club after the event.

6.2 Farmers' Market

The first Market day was scheduled for Saturday, May 28, 2022. It was noted that as of March 1, 2022, the decision had been that there would be no masks required at the Market although the situation was being monitored.

6.3 Waterfront Festival

J. Reekie reported that the Waterfront Festival was scheduled for Saturday, August 6, 2022:

- Several meetings had already been held.
- The park would tentatively be closed off as of 11:00 a.m. on Friday morning and remain closed until Sunday morning for the festival, and the City would erect signage to that effect;
- If anyone was parked or in the way of stages or vendors they would be towed.
- HBSCA was working closely with City on parking, and attempting to secure Park Lawn parking spots from First Capital and 200 parking spots from Eau de Soleil.

7.0 COMMUNICATIONS

7.1 HBSCA Shared Drive

S. Jazzar reported that M. Ciufu was working on a project plan as to where the Shared Drive was going. She required two (2) volunteers to help.

7.2 Bell Boxes

S. Jazzar advised she would put a notice together for Directors to post at their condominiums.

7.3 Ukraine Relief

The Board congratulated A. Kozak for spearheading the incredible outreach for the Ukraine Humanitarian Relief Drive at Humber Bay Shores from March 14-18, 2022. An incredible 14 skids of medical supplies, clothing, food, blankets, and hygiene products were collected in a wonderful outpouring of generosity.

7.4 Replacement of City Art – Palace Pier Court

S. Jazzar reported that the jury members, assisted by Humber Bay Shores, had selected a short list of five (5) Indigenous artists for the project. The selection process was underway, but there was no date set as yet for installation.

8.0 OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 HBSCA Meetings

In answer to a query, it was determined that Residents of member condominiums were not generally invited to attend HBSCA meetings for practical reasons. A full Board meeting was held every second month, and the Executive Board met every month.

8.2 Rogers/Ignite

A.Kozak expressed frustration dealing with Rogers/Ignite, and sought to know whether other buildings were Rogers clients. R. Anderson noted that Palace Place had a longstanding contract with Rogers.

9.0 NEXT MEETING

The next full Board meeting of the HBSCA was scheduled for May 25, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

10.0 CLOSE OF MEETING

*On a **MOTION** by S. Grimes, **seconded** by J. Tocci, **it was resolved** to close the March 30, 2022, Full Board Meeting of the Humber Bay Shores Condominium Association (HBSCA) at 9:30 p.m., as there was no further business to discuss.*

The motion was carried.

Director

Date

Director

Date