

DRAFT ISSUES LIST**Lafarge Canada Inc.****APPEAL OF THE PROPOSED CITY OF TORONTO CENTRAL
WATERFRONT SECONDARY PLAN****A. Issues of a General Nature:**

1. Does the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan adequately recognize the Port of Toronto and surrounding area as a valuable economic asset for the City of Toronto, one which would be virtually impossible to replace if it were lost to other forms of urban development?
2. Does the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan adequately recognize existing industrial uses?
3. Is the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan's vision for the Port Lands compatible with their historical and ongoing use for various heavy industrial uses?
4. Does the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, and specifically, its treatment of existing industrial uses have appropriate regard for Policies 1.1.1(f), 1.1.3(b), 1.1.3(g), 1.3.2.1, and 2.2.3.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement?
5. Is it appropriate to designate land with existing industrial uses, or lands in close proximity to such existing industrial uses, as "Parks and Open Space Areas", "Regeneration Areas", "Public Promenade", and "Inner Harbour Special Places"?
6. Is there any need for additional residential development land in the Port Lands?
7. Is it appropriate for the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan to require as a matter of policy the relocation of major existing industries within the Port Lands, particularly given that no other area in the GTA offers the unique combination of access to major expressways and roads, rail lines and international water transportation, bordering on one of the largest concentrations of economic activity in North America?
8. Does the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan remain viable as a planning policy document if these existing industries do not relocate?

9. What performance standards can be established in the interim that will ensure new sensitive land uses and existing industrial uses can co-exist without negatively impacting their operation, as asserted in Policy P42 of the Plan?
10. If such performance standards can be achieved is there any need to consider relocating existing industrial uses?
11. Does the Central Waterfront Plan adequately recognize the future land needs for the Port of Toronto and shipping operations, given the relatively low cost and environmentally-friendly nature of water transport?
12. Is it appropriate for Policy P44 of the Plan to state that existing waterfront industries shall remain important only so long as they can be accommodated within emerging communities?
13. Is the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan's goal of creating a transportation system that gives priority to transit, walking and cycling compatible with the trucking, rail and industrial transport requirements of existing industrial uses?
14. Should the Plan's policies regarding "Regeneration Areas" be modified to permit general and heavy industrial uses, and port uses, and specifically encourage the retention of such uses?
15. Should the "Public Promenade" policies be amended to reflect current Federal policies and regulations respecting safety and security?
16. Should Map B, "Transit Plan", be modified to remove the "Street Cars In Own Right-Of-Way" designation from both Commissioner Street and Cherry Street? Is such a designation compatible with the various existing industrial uses that rely on these streets for access?
17. Should Map D, "Pedestrian, Cycling And Water Routes Plan", be modified to remove the "Key Pedestrian Links" and "Bicycle Lanes (On-Street)" designation from both Commissioner Street and Cherry Street? Is such a designation compatible with the various existing industrial uses that rely on these streets for access?

B. Issues Relating to Lafarge's cement distribution Facility at 54 Polson Street, and concrete batching plant and aggregate depot at 535 Commissioners St.:

18. Should Map C, "Parks And Open Space Areas Plan", be modified so as to remove the "Inner Harbour Special Place" designations from lands municipally known as 54 Polson Street and the "Public Promenade" and "Inner Harbour Special Place" for lands known municipally as 535 Commissioners Street together with other lands in the vicinity of these lands? If so, which other lands should be similarly re-designated (including lands proposed to be designated "Parks and Open Space Areas") so as to ensure the retention of the existing Lafarge facilities at these addresses, land use

compatibility between these facilities and surrounding uses, and the maintenance of a viable sustainable employment/ industrial area?

19. Should Map E, "Land Use Plan", be modified so as to re-designate the 54 Polson Street and 535 Commissioners Street properties from "Regeneration Areas", "Public Promenade", and "Inner Harbour Special Place" to "Existing Uses", together with other lands in the vicinity of these facilities? If so, which other lands should be similarly re-designated (including lands proposed to be designated "Parks and Open Space Areas") so as to ensure the retention of these uses, land use compatibility between the Lafarge facilities and surrounding lands, and the maintenance of a viable sustainable employment/ industrial area?