



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #171

Wednesday, Oct. 30th, 2024

Meeting held in-person hybrid at Waterfront Toronto

---

### **Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair  
Pat Hanson  
Matthew Hickey  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Fadi Masoud  
Kevin Stelzer  
Eric Turcotte

### **Regrets**

Gina Ford  
David Leinster  
Janna Levitt  
Pina Petricone  
Brigitte Shim  
Emily Mueller De Celis

---

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

**Recording Secretary**  
Leon Lai

---

## Overview of Review Agenda

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda, which included reviews of:

1. 190 Cherry Street – Stage 1: Issues Identification
  2. Waterfront East LRT Queens Quay East Extension – Stage 3: Detailed Design
  3. Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge – Stage 2: Schematic Design
- 

## GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest for disclosure. Matthew Hickey declared a conflict for **Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge** and recused himself for the review.

The Chair noted this meeting is the second part of the Oct. 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2024 WDRP meeting, concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

## PROJECT REVIEWS

### 1.0 190 Cherry Street – Stage 1: Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1147
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Polson District
<i>Proponent:</i>	DFC Auto Group
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	BDP Quadrangle Strybos Barron King Landscape Architects The Planning Partnership
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Bruce Hall, Principal, The Planning Partnership Bryn Barron, Principal, Strybos Barron King Landscape Architects Arthur Grabowski, Associate, The Planning Partnership Mauro Carreno, Associate, BDP Quadrangle
<i>Delegation:</i>	Kendra Barkman, CreateTO Alexa Legge, City of Toronto Anthony Kittel, City of Toronto Julie Bogdanowicz, City of Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto Nigel Carvalho, Waterfront Toronto



#### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Alexa Legge, Community Planner with City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting the greater site context, current site conditions, the project scope and background. Ms. Legge noted the zoning is Industrial Commercial (IC) and the car dealership is a permitted use. Ms. Legge noted Polson Street is a designated Priority Retail Street and there are two adjacent heritage structures: LaFarge Cement Terminal and Dominion Boxboards. Ms. Legge noted the project is being reviewed at Stage 1: Issues Identification and the areas for Panel consideration: architectural expression in response to the Port Lands, car dealership typology, public realm animation, landscape strategy, and sustainability objectives.

#### 1.2 Project Presentation

Bruce Hall, Principal with The Planning Partnership, introduced the team and summarised how the project helps unlock important planning opportunities in the Port Lands. Mr. Hall noted the strategic location of Polson Quay, compatibility with existing

adjacent uses, and adjacency with Port Lands Flood Protection. Arthur Grabowski, Associate with The Planning Partnership, noted the project timeline, working with City staff on the site plan application, and the key project statistics.

Mauro Carreno, Associate with BDP Quadrangle, noted the building program, plans, sections, and that the team is interested in expanding the retail presence of the building by creating a café with outdoor seating, animating the Cherry Street frontage. Mr. Carreno noted the brand's consistent design, implementation of high-quality materials, and the sustainable design measures.

Bryn Barron, Principal with Strybos Barron King Landscape Architects presented the landscape concepts, green wall façade elements, native plant species, streetscape design, green roof, and screening surface parking with vegetation. Mr. Grabowski noted the site accommodates a future phase two development of PIC use and that the project is targeting TGS Tier 2 or higher.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked for the timing of the second phase expansion work. Mr. Grabowski noted the team is working with City staff on the phasing through Site Plan Application, future variance on parking will be required to alleviate some of the requirements. Mr. Hall noted the precious timing is dependent the client.

Another Panel member noted the project is different from other recently reviewed projects as it is low height and density, and asked the team to provide more information on site context including adjacent uses and LaFarge. Mr. Kittel noted Polson Quay does not have a precinct plan nor residential permission, work is not anticipated to take place within the decade due to orderly development based on transit access and infrastructure provision. Mr. Kittel noted the site is categorized as PIC use but does not expect any residential here.

One Panel member asked if the design follows a brand standard. Mr. Carreno responded that Porsche has a very strict standard on design, no flexibility on key design components like the screen, and the team has pushed for some flexibility on the design. The Panel member noted the site has some mature trees and asked if they are being kept. Mr. Barron responded that the team did a full inventory of the site trees, existing are black locusts and they are considered invasive species, so there is support from Urban Forestry to remove them – some of them in the back of the parking lot may be kept.

Another Panel member asked if the team considered carbon sequestration on the trees that are being removed. Mr. Barron responded no. The Panel member asked if CreateTO or City of Toronto have principles that screen tenants and uses. Mr. Kittel noted City is not involved on the selection of tenants and rely on planning documents approved by Council.

One Panel member asked if this is a permitted PIC use. Ms. Legge responded yes.

Another Panel member how for the length of the lease. Mr. Hall responded it is in the order of 30 years then site goes back to CreateTO. The Panel member asked if the landscape considers how the site will work in the long-term, if the asphalt permeable, and the living room is limited to its location or can be integrated into the building. Mr. Carreno responded water is being captured on the green roof, rest of the stormwater goes to the retention tank and separated, parking lot water goes to a separate system which is planned to work with the future phase of development.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the surface parking use. Mr. Carreno responded both staff and clients will use the surface parking lot, clients arrive in the service land then valet move car to the lot. The Panel member asked for more information on future phase parking and LaFarge lease. Mr. Hall noted the existing soil is bad, doubtful any basement parking will be built for future phase, so client has secured external parking offsite. Mr. Kittel noted the entire area will be re-examined through future precinct planning work, LaFarge has a very long lease and it is not a compatible use to residential development.

One Panel member asked if any new soil will be brought in for planing. Mr. Barron responded yes soil will be imported.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member noted the WDRP reviewed two precinct plans recently in areas of high transit use and walkability, this project will kick off the development of Port Lands but at the same time is hard to imagine next to the new park. The Panel member felt the design is not progressive enough, however is inspired by the second phase of development with more density and encouraged the team to build a brick building with a dealership in it. The Panel member is concerned about the project fitting with the site and felt that this could be integrated within a larger residential development in a planned block.

Another Panel member felt in some ways the design is progressive in the context of other car dealerships, but the site cannot be business as usual. The Panel member appreciated sustainability features and objectives and landscape conditions. The Panel member asked the team to try to make the design more contextual in the spirit of the waterfront, make a case for keeping existing trees, ground the project within the context and the constraints.

One Panel member felt the site has a huge opportunity and alignment with the global brand is somewhat against the goals of the city. The Panel member encouraged the team to amplify the sustainability goals, but cautioned that it will run up against the brand's demand for homogeneity because a strong landscape concept will demand biodiversity. The Panel member asked the team to celebrate walkability of the site, and further develop the project features that will respond positively to the climate goals.

Another Panel member felt the project is out of place, suggested the design team look at the history and Indigenous presence of the site over thousands of years, and build a space not just for humans but other species. The Panel member recommended to use this understanding to advance the design, create placemaking, leverage landscape as

a design driver to make the building feel integrated with the site – consider strategies to restore soil and process water. Finally, consider how the facade can help accommodate shade.

One Panel member asked CreateTO to persuade Porsche to reconsider the strict brand design, consider stacking the programs and create a more dynamic vertical experience where cars and ramp are visible from the street, celebrate the whole working of services on the inside. The Panel member felt the current design is too similar to a dealership one might find off the highway and should be rethought.

Another Panel member supported the use of the building given LaFarge next door, however questioned the design in its contextual quality. The Panel member noted that when McDonald's opened a new store in Quebec, the company demonstrated an embrace of the local community by rethinking the design which was well received – there should be more done to celebrate the building at this location without losing the brand. The Panel member asked if it is possible to eliminate the Polson Street curb cut and have the access be incorporated with the circulation in the rear of the site, consider increasing green wall, and create a double allée of trees.

One Panel member commended that the operational carbon reduction strategies are quite advanced, and it is low carbon. The Panel member noted the embodied carbon figures are very low and asked the team to provide more information at the next review to demonstrate how they are archived.

## 1.5 Consensus Comments

### General

- 30-year lease is not an interim use, the building will be there for a long time, so it is important for the design to respond to both the immediate industrial context and the Port Lands precinct with the river valley and parks.
- The landscape can take a more leading role to help contextualize the entire project, encouraged the team to develop a bolder landscape concept and story that will enhance the experience of the public realm and the building.
- The project is on a very important site, ensure the design responds to both the on-going transformation of the nearby waterfront and the Indigenous past.
- Amplify and embrace the sustainability objectives, let them steer the design in a meaningful way.

### Building

- Felt the building is out of place, not urban, and does not appropriately respond to the context.
- Consider a more compact and urban typology of a dealership, i.e. consolidating the footprint and celebrate the brand's identity with vertical presence, consolidating the two curb cuts into one, etc.
- Encouraged the team to continue to evolve the building design to better respond to the context and create something that is both unique and exemplary of the brand identity.

- Where possible, revisit elements that are standardized and propose changes that can enhance the design’s relationship with the site.
- Encouraged the team to consider a holistic strategy that will better integrate the future phase of the development with the currently proposed dealership building. There is great potential for a multi-storey development where the dealership is integrated at the base.

## 1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed at Stage 1: Issues Identification.

Mr.Hall thanked the Panel and will discuss comments with the brand. On the point of a taller building, Mr. Hall noted the client makes investments when there is a long-term ownership of the land.

## 2.0 Waterfront East LRT Queens Quay East Extension – Stage 3: Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1122
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Queens Quay East
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Public Work
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adam Nicklin, Principal, Public Work
<i>Delegation:</i>	Mary Hicks, Public Work Kenneth Poon, Stantec Gail Rodrigues, City of Toronto Jackie Tam, City of Toronto Katya Zappitelli, Waterfront Toronto Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Margot Shafran, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto



### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Katya Zappitelli, Assistant Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the context of WELRT segments 1 to 3, the project team, and Queens Quay East extension work. Ms. Zappitelli noted the design process for the different segments to date, previous WDRP comments , objectives for this round of 60% design, and that the project is here for Stage 3: Detailed Design. Ms. Zappitelli noted the areas for Panel consideration: finding balance between ecological performance and transportation and place-making, stitching together various neighbourhoods, continuity with Queens Quay West, and material and plant palette integration.

### 2.2 Project Presentation

Adam Nicklin, Principal with Public Work, began the presentation by providing an overview of the Waterfront East LRT project, the conceptual response to Queens Quay

West, a more dynamic and immersive expression, and the evolution of the Queens Quay character from west to east. Mr. Nicklin noted the streetscape elements, typical street section evolution from 30% to 60% design, right-of-way adjustments, and the planting approach for low and high salt zones. Mr. Nicklin noted green tracks are no longer being proposed for this segment due to emergency vehicle and replacement bus needs, but the team is positive about the potential of green track on Cherry Street.

Mr. Nicklin noted the embodied carbon metrics, the streetscape character between north and south promenades, key furniture and streetscape elements including bench, granite outcrop at midblock, planter edge protection, forest pockets, light strategy, and the water capture bioswale systems on the north side of Queens Quay.

### 2.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked if there are trees in the green median between the two sides of traffic. Mr. Nicklin noted that where there is more than 1.5m space, trees can be added, however the median is very challenged with high salt road. The Panel member asked if it is possible flush out salt every few times a year. Mr. Nicklin responded yes.

Another Panel member asked how the team envisions plant maintenance. Mr. Nicklin noted it is City's responsibility, Maintenance is elaborate, and it is characterized as diverse and mixed, which is easier to maintain. There may be some plant failures, but the landscape is meant to evolve over time. The Panel member asked if the maple leaf pavers pattern is on the north side. Mr. Nicklin responded that the mosaic is primarily on the south side, but at major intersection the mosaic is installed on both north and south. The granite boulders occur at several moments.

One Panel member appreciated the combination of layering and asked if the team has local sources for the plants. Mr. Nicklin responded that the project is not at that stage and that the volume of plants is relatively small, there will be a process of selecting what can be locally sourced. The Panel member asked about maintenance. Mr. Nicklin replied that a simple graphic guide for maintenance is to be developed and that the City has come a long way. The Panel member asked if there is any progress on salt loading. Mr. Nicklin noted the team expects less salt but will plan for the worst.

Another Panel member asked if there is a design spec for the toe rails. Mr. Nicklin noted the design team will apply their best logic to prevent pet use. The Panel member asked if there is a strategy on the locations of the seating. Mr. Nicklin responded that there is seating at the intersection of Cherry Street, close to the midblock connection so they can be experienced along the street and at specific crossings.

One Panel member asked if the increase in plant intensity is metaphorical or physical, and if the change is gradual or abrupt. Mr. Nicklin noted rather than a hard abrupt change at a threshold, each zone will substantially shift in experience, i.e. Jarvis shows the first granite and introduction of new elements.

Another Panel member asked if the design is fully accessible. Mr. Nicklin noted the design will be presented to the accessibility committee and think it should be fine.

## 2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the project and narrating. The Panel member suggested some trees in the median to amplify the project's greenness. The Panel member commended the bench as a great piece of urban furniture and encouraged the team to continue their designs and refining, i.e. arm rest looks thing can be more robust.

Another Panel member commended the presentation, appreciated the reduction of roadway width and increase in pedestrian and planting area, as well as the more consistent elevations. The Panel member asked the team to consider the placement of low elements in anticipation of tripping hazard and snow plough. The Panel member noted the under 100% water capture but felt it is still a great design that sets a high bar and should become the standard street design throughout the city.

One Panel member appreciated the winter views, supported the design of complete street with a high ecological performance, and appreciated the intentionality around climate resilience that is much better than most streets. The Panel member supported the living laboratory approach in dealing with salt, commended the biodiversity and mix of species, and felt that this can spur the development of a new economy for nurseries and supplies – a powerful teaching moment. The Panel member commended the project's legibility and felt that people will understand and thus care for it.

Another Panel member supported the design and felt the project reinforced Waterfront Toronto's mandate of innovation and leading with landscape. The Panel member encouraged the team to further develop the toe rail details to have a strong pet management strategy, continue to develop the seating areas to emphasize that these pockets are gathering spots, and consider auxiliary elements like garbage cans in the plan.

One Panel member commended the presentation.

Another Panel member commended the fantastic project, encouraged the team to be bold and start the new segment in the most intense way so visitors will feel the impact. The Panel member supported the roadway narrowing. The Panel member felt the flat ground rock elements are conceptually weaker than the other components because they are not abstracted in the same way, and asked the team to refine them.

## 2.5 Consensus Comments

### General

- Strong support for the design.
- Appreciated the didactic design moments as teaching and learning are important for the city.
- Appreciated the see, touch, and feel aspects of the design.
- Supported the reduction in roadway width for more pedestrian space.
- Supported the climate resilience strategies.

- Work with the City to create a maintenance manual to ensure long-term success.
- Encouraged the team to monitor and report on the project after implementation to provide lessons for future streets. Supported the design becoming a new standard in the city and hope to see this replicated in more areas.
- Encouraged that the project has the potential to support a new economy for new plant species.

#### Landscape

- Consider planting trees in the center median.
- Supported the bench design and stone outcrops at key locations.
- Include considerations in the design for garbage and recycling bins as infrastructure to serve areas for gathering established by the stone outcrops.
- Continue to develop the plant guards and define a clear strategy on managing pet use.
- Continue to develop the flat rock pavers as they currently feel out-of-place among the palette of elements.

### 2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support unanimously for the project.

Mr. Nicklin thanked the Panel for the comments and is excited to address the comments in the next stage of design.

### 3.0 Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge – Stage 2: Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1142
<i>Project Type:</i>	Infrastructure
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Parliament Slip / Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	WilkinsonEyre Architects Zeidler Two Row Architect
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Elliott Krause, Associate Director, WilkinsonEyre Erik Skouris, Architect, Two Row Architect
<i>Delegation:</i>	Matthew Firestone, Zeidler Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Anna Ingebrigtsen, Waterfront Toronto Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto Kasia Gladki, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto



#### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Senior Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by recapping the RFP objectives, project goals, site context, future context with PLFP completed, and the north and south landing areas. Ms. Mallozzi noted the project progress to date, the project is here for Stage 2: Schematic Design review, and the areas for Panel consideration: relationship with context, integration at the landing sites, active transportation challenges, design evolution, and key aspects through value-engineering.

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Elliott Krause, Associate Director, WilkinsonEyre, began the presentation by noting the project team, the project goals, and overall site analysis including connectivity. Mr. Krause noted the concept design studies, design inspiration, the schematic stage design in plan and elevation. Mr. Krause noted that the overall width has been adjusted, bridge seating areas have evolved, the revised materiality and their sustainable qualities. Mr. Krause noted the lighting design and the accessibility considerations of the seating area.

Erik Skouris, Architect with Two Row, noted the Indigenous Design Approach in the concept design and lighting strategy, and summarized the discussions at the Indigenous Talking Circle design workshop. Mr. Krause noted the landscape design at the two landing sites and concluded the presentation by summarizing the design optimizations for 30% design.

### 3.3 Panel Questions and Comments

One Panel member appreciated the hard work and thanked the team for the detailed presentation. The Panel member felt the strength of the project is the S-shaped deck and twisted curvature with tension rods, encouraged the team to keep these key elements in the VE phase. The Panel member recommended turning common materials into something extraordinary through detailing while maintaining the overall design, not reduce the number of tensions rods if possible to keep the dynamism. On the north landing, the Panel member noted if it must land on the WEP, embrace the threshold using landscape and planting.

Another Panel member felt that because the design is great the cost reductions don't appear to be significant, the spirit of the project is so strong that perhaps some of the smaller elements, i.e. mesh, can be removed. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider the durability of the areas by the landings as they are highly used, and the ground finish needs to accommodate a lot of movement. The Panel member recommended more seating along steps rather than standalone benches that feel less integral to the bridge.

One Panel member encouraged the team to create a durable design to honor the Indigenous place-keeping stories that are integral to the design, leverage durable materials but executed in an extraordinary way. The Panel member recommended to thicken the landings at the park with a more robust landscape edge and create a natural anchor for the bridge. The Panel member asked if there has been any exploration of a private and public model of topping funds for the storytelling aspects

of the bridge. Ms. Mallozzi noted fundraising has been considered but not done. The Panel member felt there is potential for private philanthropy to help tell an important contemporary story.

Another Panel appreciated the poetic design, emphasized that the curved arch and frequency of the rods are core to the iconography of the bridge, these should not be taken away during value-engineering. Instead, consider both the width of the deck and seating as areas for simplification. The Panel member asked the team to further develop the circulation to work with cycling and ensure no negative friction, as well as consider low carbon steel in the construction. Mr. Krause responded low carbon steel is a priority.

One Panel member commended the beautiful design, encouraged the team to not complicate the landings as directness of flow is important, continue to study the width to ensure clearance for all modes of movement and users. The Panel member noted the importance of lighting, it should be very delicate and maintained in the next phase of design.

### 3.4 Consensus Comments

- Supported the design optimization as long as there is an emphasis on good, durable materials being specified.
- The “s” curve, the arch, rods and lighting, are all important key components for the much-loved iconography and elegance of the design, encouraged that they are not lost during the next phase of design optimization.
- Not adamant on the switchback at the north landing –the Panel is open to other options if smooth flow of movement is maintained.
- Concerned that the landing area landscape will not withstand heavy traffic, encouraged the team to develop a more robust landscape strategy and celebrate the landing areas such as a thicker landscape buffer/ threshold.
- It is important to minimize conflicts between the various modes of movement, ensure pedestrians and cyclist have clear movement zones. Some Panel members supported the 4.5m wide option.
- Strong support for the design symbolism and placekeeping goals.

### 2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support unanimously for the project.

Mr. Krause thanked the Panel and noted the team will continue to address the feedback in the next stage of work.

## CLOSING

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting.

These Meeting Minutes are formally adopted and approved by Panel on November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

*These Meeting Minutes have been signed by Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair, and Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto Chief Planning and Design Officer. Waterfront Toronto has on record a copy of this document with their DocuSign signatures.*