



## HUMBER BAY SHORES CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION

2240 Lake Shore Blvd West Suite 227 Toronto, Ontario M8V 0B1 416-792-4964

February 22, 2018

Mr. J Robert Prichard, Chair  
Mr. Phil Verster, President & CEO  
Metrolinx  
97 Front Street West, Toronto  
ON M5J 1E6

Dear Sir:

### **RE: Park Lawn GO Station – Re-evaluation and Issues with Initial Business Case**

At your March 8<sup>th</sup> board meeting, the Humber Bay Shores Condominium Association (“HBSCA”) hopes Metrolinx will reconsider a GO station in the Humber Bay Shores (“HBS”) area around Park Lawn Rd in south Etobicoke (i.e., Park Lawn station).

As discussed below, the HBSCA believes the assumptions that were used in previously rejecting a Park Lawn station are not reflective of the current situation and significantly underestimate the financial and economic net benefits of the potential station.

The HBS area, on the south side of a potential Park Lawn station, is a high rise community that will soon have about 50 residential condominium buildings, including about 18 buildings in the 40 to 65 storey range. It is one of the most densely populated areas in Toronto, and along with other areas around a potential Park Lawn station, has the potential for significantly more development. Also, due to the local geography, the HBS is the best location for a transportation hub in south Etobicoke.

Having reviewed the initial business case for a Park Lawn GO station<sup>1</sup> (“IBC”), the HBSCA has a number of concerns. In particular, we believe Metrolinx should consider the following points, the support for which is set out in the attached Appendix A.

- **Forecast Methodology:** It appears the IBC used a very simplistic approach to estimate the increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

This approach ignored the explosive growth that is occurring in the HBS area; instead the IBC used an assumed growth rate for the Lake Shore West corridor. It appears that it also ignored possible ridership on the weekend or any growth in ridership beyond 2031.

The attached Appendix B provides a visual example of the explosive growth that has been occurring in HBS.

---

<sup>1</sup> “RER New Stations Initial Business Case, Park Lawn, Park Lawn/Mimico Cluster Screening, Draft” dated July 2016.

- **Transportation Hub:** It appears that the IBC did not fully recognize the significance of Humber Bay Shores (“HBS”) as the best location for a transportation hub in south Etobicoke.

All transportation routes crossing the Humber River below Bloor Street pass through a narrow corridor beside HBS (see Appendix C). As a result, a GO station in HBS would have the best connections to local transit. This would tend to increase GO ridership and reduce the travel times for those who would use public transit to access GO. Also its key location would tend to reduce the cost of integrating local transit with GO service.

- **People + Jobs:** The IBC significantly underestimated the current and future density around a Park Lawn station.

According the IBC (page 11), the area within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station could have a density of 70 to 120 P+J/ha by 2031.

A more realistic estimate would be 125 to 150 P+J/ha by 2031, and possibly higher. For example, development of the Christie Property (beside a potential Park Lawn station) could add 40 to 60 people / jobs to the ratio (i.e., 165 to 210 P+J/ha), and possibly more. Further re-development within the 800 metre radius could also result in additional significant increases to the ratio.

- **Catchment Area:** Other than those within walking distance of the Mimico Station, most people in south Etobicoke and south Swansea (the area to the east of HBS) would be better served, or at least about as well served, by a Park Lawn station. This would tend to contain the loss of ridership from closing the Mimico station and encourage new ridership.
- **Fare Integration / Fare By Distance:** The IBS did not consider the recently implemented fare integration or the possibility of lower GO fares that better reflect fare-by-distance. These changes would likely have a significant impact on the net increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.
- **Impact of RER:** It appears that the IBC did not fully recognize the impact of improved service levels with RER (i.e., it is part of the assumed 2.4% annual growth in ridership up to 2031).

With the proposed RER service, a Park Lawn GO station would have 15 minute service – all day. This would be about twice the level of service that the Mimico station currently receives (Mimico ridership was used as the base in estimating ridership with a Park Lawn station). More importantly, it is comparable with or better than the level of service with the existing public transit options that serve HBS.

- **Ability to Serve HBS:** The existing Mimico station is not a very attractive alternative for people in HBS. This was not explicitly recognized in the IBC and may have resulted in an underestimation of the net increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

From Park Lawn and Lake Shore Blvd, it is a 25 to 30 minute walk (about 2 km) to the Mimico station. From other parts of HBS, the walk can extend to 40 minutes (about 3 km.) – see Appendix C.

- **Public Transit Alternatives:** The IBC did not appear to recognize the significant net time savings that a Park Lawn station would provide compared to existing and proposed public transit alternatives. These savings would affect both ridership and the value of time saved in an economic evaluation.

For traveling from the HBS area to downtown or beyond (not to mention a trip west), the existing and proposed public transit alternatives would not be competitive on a travelling time basis. The existing alternatives would take about twice as long to get downtown, while the proposed Waterfront LRT would still likely take significantly more time.

- **Mimico Station Ridership:** The IBC appears to have overestimated the boardings and alightings<sup>2</sup> at the Mimico station, which may have resulted in an underestimation of the increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.
- **Savings on Mimico Station Improvements:** Replacing the Mimico station with a Park Lawn station would save 10's of millions of dollars in planned improvements to the Mimico station. It appears that the IBC did not consider this offset in estimating the net cost of a Park Lawn station.
- **Land Transfer Tax:** It appears that the IBC did not consider the net impact on land transfer taxes in either its financial or economic analysis.

A Park Lawn station would likely result in a significant net increase in provincial land transfer tax revenues. The present value of this net increase could reasonably be in the range of \$5 million to \$25 million, and possibly more. There would also be a similar increase in the municipal land transfer tax revenues.

- **Employment Lands:** The City of Toronto wants to keep the Christie Property (11 hectares on the south side of a potential Park Lawn station) as employment lands. A Park Lawn station would make a significant contribution to achieving this goal.

A Park Lawn station would significantly improve the ability of potential employees to access offices in HBS. It would also significantly improve the connections between potential offices in the HBS and offices in the downtown core, not to mention other office centres on the GO lines (e.g., the proposed East Harbour development), making the HBS a more attractive site for offices.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is assumed that “boardings” are the same as “Daily Riders’ Home Station”, while “alightings” are the same as “Daily Riders’ Destination Station”

Should the Ontario Food Terminal (on about 16 hectares on the north side of a potential Park Lawn station) ever decide to move, a Park Lawn GO station would also make a significant contribution to maintaining this property as employment lands.

- **Location of Park Lawn Station:** It appears no consideration was given to moving the location of a proposed Park Lawn station to the east – i.e. towards the Humber Loop (about 750 to 800 metres to the east of Park Lawn Rd.).

There is at least a question as to whether moving the station a couple of hundred metres to the east would mitigate environmental concerns, reduce the cost of constructing the station and /or mitigate Metrolinx's concern as to the distance between the proposed station and the existing Mimico station

The HBSCA believes there are a number of serious concerns with the IBC, some of which arise from changes since the IBC was written, and that the IBC significantly underestimated the financial and economic benefits of a Park Lawn station. As a result, The HBSCA urges Metrolinx to re-consider a GO station in HBS around Park Lawn Rd.

Thank you

Jim Reekie  
President

Appendix A Initial Business Case For Park Lawn GO Station - Issues With Underlying Assumptions

Appendix B Growth in Humber Bay Shores

Appendix C Humber Bay Shores - Potential as Transportation Hub

Cc: Peter Z. Milczyn (MPP Etobicoke-Lakeshore);  
Victor Fedeli (MPP Nipissing and Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario);  
Andrea Horwath (MPP Hamilton Centre and Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario);  
John Tory (Mayor, Toronto);  
Jaye Robinson (Chair, Public Works & Infrastructure Committee)  
Mark Grimes (Councillor Ward 6);  
Justin Di Ciano (Councillor Ward 5); and  
Sarah Doucette (Councillor Ward 13)

## **APPENDIX A**

### **INITIAL BUSINESS CASE FOR PARK LAWN GO STATION**

### **ISSUES WITH UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS**

#### **FORECAST METHODOLOGY**

It appears the initial business case for a Park Lawn station<sup>1</sup> (“IBC”) used a very simplistic approach to estimate the increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

This approach ignored the explosive growth that is occurring in the HBS area; instead the IBC used an assumed growth rate for the Lake Shore West corridor. It appears that it also ignored possible ridership on the weekend or any growth in ridership beyond 2031.

As set on pages 35 and 36 of the IBC, the change in ridership was determined as follows:

*“Estimated the net change in ridership from closing the Mimico station and building a new replacement station at Park Lawn; and”*

*“Assumed ridership would grow from 2013 to 2031 at the rate for the Lake Shore West corridor.”*

The IBC did not set out how the net change in ridership was determined; including the information relied upon in making the estimate. However, it appears that the IBC underestimated the increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station:

- The net increase in ridership represents only 20% of the ridership at a Park Lawn station<sup>2</sup>. This despite the significantly greater population around a Park Lawn station and the improved public transportation links to the station.
- The estimated net new boardings at a Park Lawn station appear to be inconsistent with other information presented in the IBC. The estimated daily boardings at the Mimico station in 2013 should equal the estimated daily boarding at a Park Lawn station in 2013 less the estimated net new boardings of 463, or 2,008<sup>3</sup>. However, the estimated daily

---

<sup>1</sup> “RER New Stations Initial Business Case, Park Lawn, Park Lawn/Mimico Cluster Screening, Draft” dated July 2016

<sup>2</sup> Based on estimated net new daily boardings and estimated daily boardings as presented on page 14 of the IBC (i.e.,  $786 / 3877 = 20\%$ ).

<sup>3</sup> Based on estimated net new daily boardings and estimated daily boardings as presented on page 14 of the IBC (i.e.,  $2,471 - 463 = 2,008$ ).

boardings at the Mimico station in 2014-2015 were estimated to be 2,578 to 2961<sup>4</sup>; an increase of 28% to 47% within a year or two. Such a large increase appears unlikely and no reason for the large increase was given.

- As noted below, it appears that the IBC overestimated ridership at the Mimico station, which may mean that it underestimated the net change in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

The IBC discussed the significant growth that is occurring in the HBS area and the potential for further growth. However, it appears that this had no impact on the estimated net change in ridership from 2013. The IBC used the assumed growth rate for the Lakeshore West corridor, which was 2.4% per year (for a visual example of the explosive growth that has been occurring in the HBS, see Appendix B).

Based on the projected ridership of 10.1 million over 60 years, it appears that the 2.4% growth rate incorporates the impact of RER (discussed below under “Impact of RER”) and that no growth was assumed after 2031. It also appears that the forecast ignored any ridership on the weekends<sup>5</sup>.

## **TRANSPORTATION HUB**

It appears that the IBC did not fully recognize the significance of Humber Bay Shores (“HBS”) as the best location for a transportation hub in south Etobicoke.

All transportation routes crossing the Humber River below Bloor Street pass through a narrow corridor beside HBS (see Appendix C). For example, the two main east-west local routes in south Etobicoke are The Queensway (served by the Queensway bus) and Lake Shore Blvd (served by the Queen streetcar). West of Royal York Rd., these routes are about 2.5 kms apart; however they converge beside HBS and the Queen streetcar passes under the GO tracks to continue on The Queensway.

To make the Mimico station a transportation hub, it would be necessary to divert each of the Queen streetcar and Queensway bus over a kilometre. This would add over 2 km to each trip for those wishing to go beyond Royal York, and add over 4 km to the round trip for the Queen streetcar and Queensway bus (i.e., increasing the number vehicles and drivers required). It would also be very costly, and perhaps not even practical, to build streetcar tracks up Royal York and a turning loop at the Mimico station.

As a result of the local geography, a GO station in HBS around Park Lawn would have the best connections to local transit. This would tend to increase GO ridership and reduce the travel

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on estimated daily boardings as presented on page 14 of the IBC.

<sup>5</sup> In the IBC, the total increase in ridership over 60 years is 10.1 million. This is consistent with growing the daily increase of 463 in 2013 by 2.4% per year up to 2031, assuming no increase after 2031, assuming 250 days in the year and totalling the increase over the 60 year period starting in 2015. It should be noted that these numbers assume an increase in ridership of 710 in 2031 and beyond, not 786 as stated in the IBC (e.g., page 29).

times for those who use public transit to access GO. Also it would tend to reduce the cost of integrating local transit with GO service.

## POPULATION + JOBS

The IBC significantly underestimated the current and future density around a Park Lawn station.

According the IBC, the area within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station could have a density of 70 to 120 P+J/ha by 2031 (page 11). However, a more realistic estimate would be 125 to 150 P+J/ha by 2031, and possibly higher. The number would almost certainly be higher shortly after 2031. For example, development of the Christie Property could add 40 to 60 or more people / jobs to the ratio (i.e., 165 to 210 P+J/ha), and possibly more. Moreover, further re-development, could result in further significant increases in the ratio.

## EXISTING CONSTRUCTED AND PLANNED

Based solely on the condominium residents in HBS and Mystic Point that have been build or are planned, the density around a Park Lawn station will be in the range of 110 to 125 P+J/ha before 2031.

There are about 16,000 condominium units that have been built, are under construction, or planned. About 1,600 units are at the east end of HBS and would be just outside the 800 metre range, resulting in about 14,400 units within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station. This would result in an estimated population of 22,000 to 25,000, or a P+J/ha of 110 to 125<sup>6</sup>.

This P+J/ ha estimate ignores:

- any jobs within HBS and Mystic Point;
- any development of the 11 hectare Christie Property;
- any population or jobs south of the Gardiner Expressway and outside of HBS and Mystic Point; and
- any population or jobs north of the Gardiner Expressway.

With no further development other than the condominiums that are currently planned for HBS and Mystic point, it is likely that the total population and jobs within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station would be 3,000 to 5,000 higher, i.e., 25,000 to 30,000. This would result in in a P+J/ha of 125 to 150

---

<sup>6</sup> There are approximately 200 hectares in a circular area with a diameter of 800 metres (i.e.,  $\pi * r^2$  / (sq. metres in a hectare) =  $3.14 * (800 * 800) / 10,000 = 201$  or approximately 200):  $22,000 / 200 = 110$  and  $25,000 / 200 = 125$ . Based on Appendix A of the IBC, it appears that 200 hectares is the normal assumption – e.g., “<50 P+J/ha” is the same as “< 10,000 P+J”.



In addition there are about 2,500 residents at the eastern end of HBS that are just outside the 800 meter radius. If there were an additional entrance at the east end of a Park Lawn station, an additional 1,500 to 1,700 people at the east end of HBS would be within 800 metres of the station.

## CHRISTIE PROPERTY

The Christie Property consists of 11 hectares on the south side of a potential Park Lawn station. With development of this property, the density around a Park Lawn station would rise to a level significantly higher than the above estimate. There could be an additional 8,000 to 12,000 people or jobs, adding 40 to 60 people plus jobs to the P+J/ha ratio (i.e., 165 to 210 P+J/ha), with the possibility of significantly more.

If the Christie Property were developed for office space, assuming a 2 times site coverage<sup>7</sup> and a conservative estimate of 200 to 300 square feet per employee, there would be about 8,000 to 12,000 employees. This would increase the P+J/ha ratio by 40 to 60 people / jobs.

The Christie property could be compared to the East Harbour development (around the abandoned Unilever factory). This development will be spread over 62 acres (25 hectares), have 10 million square feet of office space for over 50,000 employees, and have 1.7 million square feet of retail<sup>8</sup>. This development would be much closer to the downtown, about 3 kms vs about 10 kms for the Christie Property. However, a Park Lawn station would put the Christie Property 15 minutes from downtown with trains every 15 minutes. Until a new GO station and subway station are built in the East Harbour area, it would likely take longer to get downtown by public transit from that property.

The Christie Property has 44% of the area of East Harbour<sup>9</sup>. If it had a similar density, it would have 4.4 million sq. ft of office space, over 22,000 office employees and 750,000 sq. ft. of retail space. Ignoring the retail employees, this would increase the P+J/ha ratio by over 110 people / jobs.

If the property were developed as residential condominiums with the density allowed to the west and south of the property, there would be 8,000 to 11,000 additional people; not to mention employees at the additional commercial space and employees working at the condominiums. Ignoring the possibility of additional jobs, this would increase the P+J/ha ratio by 40 to 55 people / jobs.

---

<sup>7</sup> Across the street at 2183 Lake Shore Blvd, the property under construction will have a 6.15 X coverage; while the property across the street at 42 Park Lawn will have a coverage of 5.01 X.

<sup>8</sup> Urban Toronto Website (urbantoronto.ca); Revamped East Harbour Plan Makes First Appearance at DRP; December 1, 2017.

<sup>9</sup> 11 ha / 25 ha = 44%



## OTHER DEVELOPMENT

Within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station there is still the possibility of further re-development south of the tracks and significant possibilities for re-development north of the tracks.

## CATCHMENT AREA

Other than those within walking distance of the Mimico Station, most people in south Etobicoke and south Swansea (the area to the east of HBS)<sup>10</sup> would be better served, or at least about as well served by a Park Lawn station. This would tend to contain the loss of ridership from closing the Mimico station, and especially with fare integration, encourage new ridership.

As discussed under “Transportation Hub” above, the main local east-west transportation routes in south Etobicoke are Lake Shore Blvd (Queen streetcar) and The Queensway (Queensway bus). Both these routes converge beside HBS but are over a kilometer away from the existing Mimico GO Station (by existing roads).

## FARE INTEGRATION / FARE BY DISTANCE

The IBS did not consider the recently implemented fare integration or the possibility of lower GO fares that better reflect fare-by-distance. These changes would likely have a significant impact on net increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

With a Presto card, the GO fare from a Park Lawn station to Union Station (presumably the same as the fare from the Mimico station) would be \$4.98. Until recently, if someone using GO had to also use the TTC, the cost would be an additional \$3.00 (again using a Presto card) or \$7.98. With the recently introduced fare integration, the increase would \$1.50 and the total amount would be \$6.48; a reduction of 19%.

A move to GO fares that better reflect distance would have a significant impact on the fare from a Park Lawn station. For example:

- The fare from the Oakville GO station to Union Station works out to \$0.23 per km<sup>11</sup>.
- The fare from a Park Lawn station to Union Station would be \$0.50 per km<sup>12</sup>; more than twice the cost per km from the Oakville station.

---

<sup>10</sup> The density in south Swansea is concentrated around The Queensway and Windermere Ave, which is about a kilometre east of the Humber Loop. However, between Windermere and the Humber Loop, the streetcar has a dedicated right-of-way, no cross traffic and only one stop.

<sup>11</sup> The Oakville GO station is about 34 km from Union Station and the fare is \$7.91:  $\$7.91 / 34 = \$0.23$

<sup>12</sup> The station would be less than 10 km from Union Station while the fare would be 4.98 (assuming the existing fare from the Mimico station to Union Station):  $\$4.98 / 10 = \$0.50$ .

- Even if a base fare of \$1.00 is assumed, the incremental cost per km for someone travelling from a Park Lawn station would be \$0.40 per km, twice the incremental cost per km of \$0.20 for someone travelling from the Oakville station.<sup>13</sup> With a base fare of \$2.00, the incremental cost per km would still be almost twice as high for someone travelling from a Park Lawn station: \$0.30 vs \$0.17<sup>14</sup>.

If the fare per km from a Park Lawn station were the same as that from the Oakville station, the fare would drop from \$4.98 to \$2.30, less than the cost of a TTC fare. Even if a base fare of \$1.00 or \$2.00 were assumed, the fare would drop to \$3.00 or \$3.70, providing a savings of \$1.98 or \$1.28 – i.e., a savings of 40% or 26%.

## **IMPACT OF RER**

It appears that the IBC did not fully recognize the impact of improved service levels with RER (i.e., it is part of the 2.4% annual growth up to 2031).

With the proposed RER service, a Park Lawn GO station would have 15 minute service – all day. This would be about twice the level of service that the Mimico station currently receives. More importantly, it is comparable or better than existing modes of public transit that serve HBS.

The TTC 66B bus (to the Bloor Subway) comes every 12 minutes during rush hour and every 18 minutes during the midday period. The TTC (501) Queen streetcar (to downtown Toronto) comes about every ten minutes or more (until the streetcars return, buses come about every 6.5 to 7.5 minutes throughout most of the day); however the service tends to be erratic, for example it is not uncommon to wait 15 to 20 minutes and then have a streetcar arrive with another right behind it.

## **ABILITY TO SERVE HBS**

The existing Mimico station is not a very attractive alternative for people in HBS. This was not explicitly recognized in the IBC and may have resulted in an underestimation of the net increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station

From Park Lawn and Lake Shore Blvd, it is a 25 to 30 minute walk (about 2 km ) to the Mimico station. From other parts of HBS, the walk can extend to about 3 km and 40 minutes. (see Appendix C)

The TTC is proposing to implement a bus service from HBS to the Mimico station and estimates the time to get downtown with this new service at 50 to 55 minutes. This proposed bus service would not go any further east than Park Lawn and would not be much faster than the existing public transit alternatives. Even if it took an extra five minutes to walk to a Park Lawn station

---

<sup>13</sup> Park Lawn station:  $(\$4.98 - \$1.00) / 10 = \$0.40$ ; Oakville station:  $(\$7.91 - \$1.00) / 34 = \$0.20$ .

<sup>14</sup> Park Lawn station:  $(\$4.98 - \$2.00) / 10 = \$0.30$ ; Oakville station:  $(\$7.91 - \$2.00) / 34 = \$0.17$ .

than a TTC stop, people in the HBS would save 25 to 30 minutes, each way, with a Park Lawn station.

## **PUBLIC TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES**

The IBC did not appear to recognize the significant time savings that a Park Lawn station would provide compared to existing and proposed public transit alternatives. These savings would affect both ridership and the value of time saved in an economic evaluation.

For traveling from the HBS area to downtown or beyond (not to mention a trip west), the existing and proposed public transit alternatives would not be competitive on a travelling time basis. They would take about twice long to get downtown.

According to the GO schedule, the time to get to Union Station from the Mimico station is about 17 minutes while the return trip is about 15 minutes. Presumably the times from and to a Park Lawn station would be slightly less, especially with an electrified service.

The existing public transit options for getting downtown are the Queen streetcar, the TTC 145 express bus and the TTC 66B bus up to the subway. According to the TTC, it takes 55 to 60 minutes to get downtown with these options. Even if it took 5 to 10 minutes more to walk to a Park Lawn GO station than a TTC stop, people in the HBS would save 25 to 30 minutes, each way, with a Park Lawn station.

It should be noted that people can get to downtown faster from the Oakville GO station (35 to 45 minutes) than they can from HBS using public transit, even though it is three times the distance.

There are discussions about a Waterfront LRT that would use the right-of way for the Harbourfront (509) streetcar between Exhibition Place and Union Station. However, with more stops, cross traffic and a number of relatively tight turns; it is unlikely that the proposed LRT would be able to compete with a Park Lawn station on the basis of the time it takes to get to or from downtown. For example, the Harbourfront streetcar takes about 18 minutes to get from Exhibition Place to Union Station; in comparison, the existing Queen streetcar takes 16 minutes to get from Ossington Ave (north of the Exhibition stop) to Yonge Street<sup>15</sup>.

## **MIMICO STATION RIDERSHIP**

The IBC appears to have overestimated the boardings and alightings<sup>16</sup> at the Mimico station, which may have resulted in an underestimation of the increase in ridership from a Park Lawn station.

---

<sup>15</sup> The estimates are from the TTC Trip Planner, assuming departure at 8:00 am on Thursday, February 15, 2018.

<sup>16</sup> It is assumed that “boardings” are the same as “Daily Riders’ Home Station”, while “alightings” are the same as “Daily Riders’ Destination Station”

The IBC stated that, in the 2014/2015 period, daily weekday boardings and alightings at the Mimico station were in the range from 2,578 to 2,961 (page 9). As stated in a footnote, the source for these numbers was the Metrolinx 2015 Spring Cordon Counts and 2014 Fall and Winter Cordon Counts. However, this estimate appears to be twice the estimate based on a more recent Metrolinx report, a report that also relied on Cordon Counts.

In the Metrolinx report “GO Rail Station Access Plan, Final Report” dated December 12, 2016 (page 55), it is stated that the number of “Daily Riders’ Home Station” at the Mimico GO Station in 2016 was 1,275, while the number of “Daily Riders’ Destination Station” was 250 – for a total of 1,525 boardings and alightings or about half the number used in the IBC. As stated on page 12, these numbers were based on the GO rail Cordon Count information from Spring 2016.

### **SAVINGS ON MIMICO STATION IMPROVEMENTS**

Replacing the Mimico station with a Park Lawn station would result in the saving of 10’s of millions of dollars on planned improvements for the Mimico station. It appears that the IBC did not consider these savings in estimating the net cost of a Park Lawn station to replace the Mimico station.

According to a 2016 article in the Etobicoke Guardian<sup>17</sup>, some of the \$44-million in planned upgrades for the Mimico station were completed in 2013, however, it was expected that “detailed design work” for the remaining improvements would not begin until 2018.

### **LAND TRANSFER TAX**

It appears that the IBC did not consider the net increase in land transfer tax revenues in either its financial or economic analysis.

A Park Lawn station would likely result in a significant net increase in provincial land transfer tax revenues with a present value that could reasonably be in the range of \$5 million to \$25 million, and possibly more. There would also be a similar net increase in the municipal land transfer tax revenues.

There will soon be about 16,000 residential units in HBS and Mystic Point. Assuming an average value of \$650,000 per unit<sup>18</sup>, this would result in a total value of \$10.4 billion for these residential units. Assuming a weighted average tax rate of 1.5% and a turnover rate for the units of 10%; HBS and Mystic Point residential units would produce an average of \$15.6 million a year in land transfer tax revenues for each of the Province and the City.

---

<sup>17</sup> The Etobicoke Guardian; “Mimico GO Station Accessibility Upgrades Still Years Away” September 29, 2016; page 14.

<sup>18</sup> The estimate of land transfer tax revenues is meant to provide a “ball park” number. In the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2017, the average sale price for a condo in south Etobicoke below the Gardiner Expressway was \$515,000 (Toronto Real Estate Board; Condo Market Report; Fourth Quarter 2017), while the recent asking price for a condo in Mimico was \$751,000 (Condos.ca; February 14, 2018; based 96 active listings).

On page 45, the IBC states: *Over the past few decades, construction of transit systems in Canada, the United States and Australia has been seen to result in property value increases ranging from 2% to over 60%. The larger increases in property values are generally tied to rail and subway system.*

If a Park Lawn station increased residential property values in HBS and Mystic point by 2%, this would increase the land transfer tax revenues for the province by \$312,000 per year. Assuming property values increase at the rate of inflation and using Metrolinx's real discount rate of 3.5%, the net present value of this increase over a 60 year period would be \$7.8 million. If the Park Lawn station were to increase property values by 8%, the net present value would be \$31.1 million.

The increase in property values may be offset by lower property values around the Mimico station (i.e., lower than they otherwise would be). However, the density around a Park Lawn station would be much greater than around the Mimico station, and other than those within walking distance of the Mimico station, most of the people in south Etobicoke and south Swansea would be better served, or at least about as well served, by a station at Park Lawn. It should also be remembered that the above numbers include only residential real estate, ignore any redevelopment of the Christie property, ignore any properties within 800 metres of a Park Lawn station that are outside of HBS and Mystic Point and ignore any further re-development within HBS and Mystic Point.

## **EMPLOYMENT LANDS**

The City of Toronto wants to keep the Christie Property (beside a potential Park Lawn station) as employment lands. A Park Lawn station would make a significant contribution in achieving this goal.

The IBC stated that the area around a potential Park Lawn station is not particularly well-positioned to attract major new office development. Certainly the poor level of existing public transit and the increasing traffic congestion in the area would make it difficult for potential employees to reach the HBS area, reducing the attractiveness of the area for employment use. However, a GO station would significantly improve employee access to offices in HBS. Also being about 15 minutes from the downtown core with trains coming every 15 minutes, not to mention improved connections to other office centres on the GO lines (e.g., the proposed East Harbour project), would significantly improve the attractiveness of the area as an office location.

Should the Ontario Food Terminal (on the north side of a potential Park Lawn station) ever decide to move, a Park Lawn station would make a significant contribution to maintaining this property (about 16 hectares) as employment lands.

## **LOCATION OF PARK LAWN STATION**

It appears no consideration was given to moving the location of the proposed Park Lawn station to the east – i.e. towards the Humber Loop (about 750 to 800 metres to the east of Park Lawn Rd).

There is at least a question as to whether moving the station a couple of hundred metres to the east would mitigate environmental concerns, reduce the cost of constructing the station and /or mitigate Metrolinx's concern as to the distance between the proposed station and the existing Mimico station.



## **APPENDIX B**

### **GROWTH IN HUMBER BAY SHORES**

The two pictures below are from Google Maps. They are looking towards Park Lawn and Lake Shore Blvd from a position on the north side of the Christie Property. The first is from August 2011, while the second was taken from the same vantage point in August 2017 – six year later.

The second picture contains about a half dozen new buildings with between 40 and 50 stories. Of the buildings under construction or planned that will soon be visible from this vantage point, two will have 56 or 66 stories while three others will be in the 40 to 50 story range.



Image capture: Aug 2011 © 2018 Google



Image capture: Aug 2017 © 2018 Google



## APPENDIX C

### HUMBER BAY SHORES POTENTIAL AS TRANSPORTATION HUB

The following three pictures show how all of the routes crossing the Humber River below Bloor St. converge beside HBS, making the HBS the best location for a transportation hub in south Etobicoke. The pictures are from Google Earth and appear to have been taken in 2015 (as a result, some recent development is missing – see Appendix B).

The first picture focuses on HBS. The HBS area<sup>21</sup> consists of the space south of the GO rail tracks from the Humber River in the east to about Louisa St. in the west. Mystic Pointe is in the wedge between the Gardiner Expressway and the GO rail tracks.



Relevant Distances in HBS	
Lake Shore Blvd & Park Lawn to:	
Palace Pier Crt.	1 km
Louisa St.	700 m
Park Lawn & GO rail tracks	400 m
Humber Loop (through street car tunnel)	900 m
GO tracks from Park Lawn to Humber Loop	750 to 800 m

<sup>21</sup> The exact definition of the HBS boundaries can vary. Some would have the Mimico Creek (just west of Park Lawn) as the western boundary while other would have it limited to the area east of park Lawn and south of Lake Shore Blvd.

## HUMBER BAY SHORES CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION

The first of the next two pictures looks west from HBS, while the second looks east towards HBS.

West of Royal York Rd., Lake Shore Blvd and The Queensway are about 2.5 kms apart. At the Humber Loop, they are about 200 m apart and the Queens streetcar crosses under the GO tracks to The Queensway

