



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #123
Wednesday, April 24, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Eric Turcotte
Peter Busby
Brigitte Shim

Regrets

Janna Levitt
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson

Recording Secretaries

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. 945 Lake Shore Boulevard East – Schematic Design
 2. Bathurst Quay Streetscape & Public Realm Improvement – Schematic Design
 3. Gardiner Public Realm: Vision & Implementation Plan – Design Development
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the March 20th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that comments from March 2019's DRP have been circulated to the **Bayside C2 (T3)** team, the project is targeting first SPA submission to the City at the end of April and is expected to return to DRP in June or July of 2019 given City approval. Mr. Glaisek added the DRP looks forward to seeing the City's

resolve on the issue of the proposed second floor parking. Mr. Glaisek noted comments from last month's DRP have been circulated to the **30 Bay** team, the project is expected to present final rezoning report to the TEYCC in June 2019, submit first SPA in the fall of 2019, and return to DRP in the fall of 2019. Following their first Issues Identification DRP review last month, Mr. Glaisek noted **West Don Lands Block 3,4,7** is expected to return to the DRP in May/June for Schematic Design with more design to be discussed.

After **350 Queens Quay West's** Schematic Design review last month with a focus on building design, Mr. Glaisek noted that the City and Waterfront Toronto are coordinating with Parks on the Peter Street Basin interface, the DRP comments have been circulated to the design team, and the project is expected to return to DRP to discuss landscape and public realm. Mr. Glaisek provided a City Council Decisions summary update on **Waterfront Transit Reset: Union-Queens Link Update**: the Streetcar Option has been approved as the preferred technology for the proposal, further develop cost estimate for report back to Council, and consider phasing strategy in advance of the Union Station construction. Mr. Glaisek noted that the project hopes to proceed with design so the team is in a good position to secure funding when it becomes available.

Mr. Glaisek noted **Port Lands Flood Protection (PLFP) Integration** is expected to return to DRP in May/ June, **PLFP Parks and Roads** return in June/ July of 2019. Mr. Glaisek noted that the construction of the **Cherry Street Storm Water Facility** commenced in September of 2018 and is expected to complete in October 2019. Finally, the **Jack Layton Ferry Terminal** pavement construction work is complete with final railing install in progress, Mr. Glaisek noted the April completion schedule is on progress and it is opened to the public.

Mr. Glaisek concluded with an overview of the tentative May DRP agenda.

The Chair's remarks:

The Chair provided an update on the OAA Design Roundtable discussion that took place on April 17th, 2019. Among the invitees were Eric Turcotte, member of Waterfront Design Review Panel, Lorna Day, City of Toronto and the Chair. Based on expert advice in a report completed by Bousfield Inc. in 2013, the OAA submitted two letters to the Province and recommended provisions of the planning act for specific design related elements be removed to reduce control in the Site Plan Control process to speed up development.

The Chair then summarized the consensus comments from the roundtable discussion on which there were agreement:

- The existing Site Plan Control process can be improved.
- Changes to the Planning Act however will not speed up the SPA process.
- Retracting the letters were discussed and it was agreed to instead send out supplemental letters as an update after the roundtable discussion.

- the letter is an important next step to intervene and should be completed soon before the Province takes further action.

Ms. Day provided a clarification that the Planning Provisions were originally endorsed and advocated by the City Council and the City of Toronto to be included into the City of Toronto Act in order to help implement the Official Plan and provide additional leverage to the Design Review Panel. However, it was decided by the Province to extend the conditions to the entire province. Ms. Day noted that the OAA roundtable discussion was divided on this matter. Ms. Day added that the City of Toronto is working on revising the Site Plan Approval process and reiterated that changing the Planning Act will not speed up the development process. Mr. Turcotte added that generally it is not the exterior design of the building that slows down the SPA process and representation from other cities advocated for different opinions- there was a general split between larger cities and smaller cities. Mr. Turcotte noted that the SPA process helps secure design elements that have been negotiated by the design team and ensure no surprises at the construction phase.

The Chair concluded that the Panel will follow up with the OAA on the letter in a week.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 945 Lake Shore Boulevard East

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1103
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Studio City
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	RAW Design
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Roland Rom Colthoff, Director, RAW Design; Matthew Bernstein, Partner, Terraplan Landscape Architects
<i>Delegation:</i>	Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; George Pantazis, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the site is located on a vacant site next to the existing Showline facility at 915 LSBE. Studio City Toronto, who won the bid to the RFP by CreateTO to lease the former Showline property, is relocating the 75 Commissioners Street JumboStage building due to the Don River channel construction and will be handing over the property on May 1st, 2019. Ms. Kim provided the policy context of the property based on the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and highlighted the importance of new developments supporting the adjacent public realm. Ms. Kim noted the project is situated in the warehouse district of the Port Lands Framework Plan, the urban form for the area should support walking, cycling, and sustain a diverse, active, and safe

public realm. Ms. Kim then introduced George Pantazis, with City of Toronto to provide an update on the project approval stage.

Mr. Pantazis noted that the proponent had a robust pre-consultation meeting with City staff, the project does not require rezoning or Official Plan amendment, and the relocation timing is a major concern. Mr. Pantazis noted that the project is returning for Schematic Design, following their SPA re-submission filed on April 16th, 2019. Mr. Pantazis noted that the issue of landscaping and surface parking have been consistent in various film studio facility developments and the lunch area is placed in a central area in anticipation of future development on 915 LSBE. Mr. Pantazis concluded with areas for Panel consideration: Does the current and proposed expansion scope support the long term goals of the site? Does the public realm design meet or exceed Waterfront Toronto's objectives of design excellence? Has the team adequately addressed the building exterior and entrance designs in creating a positive urban presence for the neighbourhood? And has the team addressed site access and building frontage in relation to LSB? Mr. Pantazis then introduced Roland Rom Colthoff with RAW Design to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Colthoff began by noting that the project has undergone subtle design changes since the last review, it is an example of the “decorated shed” design concept, and 915 LSBE will be phase two of this development. Mr. Colthoff summarized the changes: more context has been provided to better understand the site, an entry gate has been incorporated with the existing fence, outdoor amenity space is proposed to be shared between the 915 and 945 project, lunch area has been relocated to be more visible from the street, façade has been adjusted to improve relationship between entries, canopies are enlarged, bike racks and benches have been relocated. Mr. Colthoff noted the archway entrance is favoured by the client.

Looking at the site plan, Mr. Colthoff noted all office and admin program will be located at 915 and the team will return to the Panel with a proposed renovation and expansion of the site northward towards Lake Shore. Foot traffic is encouraged between the two buildings. Mr. Colthoff noted flexible functionality is critical and entrances are provided all on sides to keep the studios operational as much as possible. The relocated lunch room is highly visible, along with the canopy structures, which will be mirrored at the 915 building, and add character to the façade design. Mr. Colthoff noted that the building envelope has higher than normal acoustic and thermal wall structural performances. Mr. Colthoff then introduced Matthew Bernstein with Terraplan Landscape Architects to present the landscape changes.

Mr. Bernstein noted the revision in site plan provides additional planting opportunities especially at the pedestrian scale along Lake Shore and help reinforce security of the property. Mr. Bernstein noted the bioswale treatment of the landscape along the north edge, modification of the paving down the main corridor to signify entrance, slower traffic flow all promote a campus connection. Mr. Bernstein concluded that the fence will be maintained, and small plazas are delineated on the corners of the building.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the JumboStage's existing urban relationship with Commissioners Street. Mr. Colthoff noted that the proposed will require the same level of traffic access as the existing site.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the security mechanism to control access, provide street elevation of the south side of Lake Shore, and updated site plan with most current context. Mr. Colthoff answered that the entrance gate will be opened most of the time to allow deliveries and was not able to find another updated context to include into the site plan. The Panel member also asked if truck access in the middle will impact the proposed pedestrian public realm. Mr. Colthoff responded that the production house manages all parking and deliveries.

One Panel member asked how the future amenity outdoor space can be secured in the approval process from value engineering- through SPA or an aspiration. Mr. Colthoff noted that the amenity space will be included and secured in the future application. Regarding slide 11, the Panel member asked how permeability and additional trees are being implemented on the site. Mr. Bernstein noted the bioswale and trees will happen along the Lake Shore frontage and the paved areas are permeable.

Another Panel member asked if the larger studio district has a public realm ambition, such that connects to the city's network, or continuity from Lake Shore, or strictly private use. Mr. Pantazis answered that the land-use is light industrial as per the Port Lands Framework, a balance between public realm and private studios is recognized as needed. Phase two of 915 LSBE can contribute more to that respect if there is policy framework in place, otherwise implementation will be difficult after the projects have been developed.

One Panel member asked, on slide 22-24, if the new streets are colored, and if the plaza enlargement area aims to provide specimen trees. Mr. Bernstein noted yes to both. The Panel member also asked if the building falls within the City's green roof standards for industrial buildings and how an energy saver roof might compare to the cedar roof. Mr. Colthoff noted that the building does not have a green roof requirement due to industrial use and the energy saver roof will have a light color top to reduce solar heat gain – solar panels can potentially be installed.

Another Panel member asked if the site plan introduces any traffic conflicts between truck movements and parking. Mr. Colthoff answered that vehicle movement is managed by the studio operator and current tenants feel additional parking can be provided. One Panel member asked if bicycle parking is provided on site. Mr. Bernstein noted that twenty-two bicycle parking spots are provided.

Another Panel member asked the team to provide clarification HVAC strategy and expectations on cooling load. Mr. Colthoff noted that there are two central HVAC locations: above lunch area rooftop with larger mechanical systems feeding studios

north and south with a high-volume low flow system and unit above canopy of south entrance.

One Panel member asked for clarification on building square footage as industrial buildings above 2000m² have green roof requirements and if the team has been negotiating with the City on exemption from TGS and other sustainability requirement to speed up the move. Mr. Colthoff noted that the building area is above the said area, no green roof is currently proposed, and the project is not going to Committee of Adjustment. Mr. Pantazis added that aspects of the TGS do not apply and no green roof requirement was discussed.

Another Panel member asked if a structural analysis has been completed to investigate adding PVs on the roof. Mr. Colthoff answered that this strategy can be explored at the same time studio tenants rely on the roof structure to hang heavy objects- it is important to balance both. One Panel member asked for the main drivers of the parking lot options and if other configurations of 100+ parking spots have been explored. Mr. Colthoff answered that the by-law requirement is for 1 parking spot and the client is intended to maximize on site parking.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that most comments from the previous DRP have not been addressed. The Panel member felt deeply troubled by the project: the explanations for the proposed site plan configuration are weak, the building can still move north closer to Lake Shore, graphical changes are unsatisfactory, and will not support the project moving forward.

Another Panel member noted that while suggestions from the last review still stand, the project can focus on giving more public realm treatments to the site such as canopies, trees, taxi pickup and drop-offs. If the film industry is interested in promoting sustainability as the project will have a lasting impact on the neighbourhood, the Panel member wished to see more exemplary behaviour done at the site plan level.

One Panel member noted that although the project brings economic investment and jobs, it cannot cost the city in climate impact and must offer something else in return even if the site is used primarily to fulfil the project's transit requirements. The Panel member suggested to capture the views and explore uses of the shipping channel for staff, consider a low-profile green roof, accessible public realm for staff and long-term impact of carefully positioned trees in rows and clusters to offset the negative effects of heat island, high albedo, micro-climates of heat and cold, etc. In summary, the Panel member felt the project currently does not take climate resilience into consideration. The Panel member added that the team has an opportunity to claim the title of a new generation of climate-friendly film studio.

Another Panel member noted that the project is an opportunity for the team to leverage design excellence, be a leader in civil engagement and future design guidelines of industrial uses in this region. The Panel member asked the team to consider how the

graphic quality of the building can be integrated into a more robust public realm design and the long-term vision of this waterfront development.

One Panel member noted that Lake Shore Boulevard has substantial pedestrian foot traffic, will become less suburban in the future, and the security fence creates a wrong identity for the neighbourhood. Citing similarities to the Canadian Tire building at the end of Lake Shore, the Panel member noted that the urbanism for big box developments in the neighbourhood is still a question. The Panel member felt PVs should be a minimum requirement for a building this size, green roofs and other sustainability features should be further investigated, and it is important for the project to set a different precedent for the future neighbourhood.

Another Panel member noted the team should consider other heating alternatives: ground source system can take advantage of the large site area, possibly with the help of geothermal developers, and help reduce mechanical noise. Solar wall on the south side of building that is affordable can be implemented with graphic design of the metal panelling cladding. The Panel member felt the wall assembly can be refined and consider employing z-girts to further improve thermal break. The Panel member noted instead of forcing the project, a primarily private site, to embrace the City and the public realm, the team should focus on offering more on the boundary edge as park and public art opportunities to re-orient the approach of giving back to the neighbourhood.

One Panel member noted that historically there has been little design progress with these types of projects as all studios have reasons to not embrace the public mandate. Instead of providing very minor improvements to the design, the team should consider making a few bold moves, such as greatly enhancing the design quality of the fence if it has to be kept, focus trees to the edge or outside of secured area, and provide great amenity at the boundary conditions.

Another Panel member noted the team should provide other design precedents including Paramount Studios and Pinewood Studio at the next review, consider the entire south side of Lake Shore Boulevard beyond the extent of the building as an important public/ private interface threshold, and adding more street trees. The Panel member asked the team to relocate the northern fence southward to the edge of the parking spaces to allow for accommodating the gate, compose layers of trees and landscaping, and encourage a more substantial public realm along Lake Shore Boulevard East for the City.

2.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

- missed opportunities in variety of areas and little changes have been made in response to the suggestions made between now and the first DRP review; the project has the potential to be much improved
- given the proposed developments and public realm improvements of Lake Shore Boulevard, the neighbourhood will evolve over time into a different district with

more urban characteristics- consider the studio relocation and expansion as an important opportunity to set the table for the future vision of Lake Shore Boulevard East

- expect further improvements in the design and a subsequent return to the DRP

Public Face VS Private Interior

- understanding the project is fundamentally private with no public access inside, the Panel encourage the design to make a bold statement on the public face and consider the following suggestions:
 - relocate the fence along the north property line southward to the north edge of the proposed parking spaces to allow for a strong public realm along Lake Shore Boulevard with much more landscaping and tree species
 - incorporate opportunities for bold public art in the public realm

Stronger civic engagement

- consider a stronger public/ private interface by moving building close to LSBE and support the line of street frontage
- explore opportunities of consolidating and shifting more parking to the south of the building

A different kind of film studio

- encourage the team to embrace the project as an opportunity to create a different, better, climate friendly film campus
- provide full exploration of building mechanical system options
- provide clarification on the green roof requirement and feasibility of installing low profile green roof on the existing structure
- explore solar wall on south side of building

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Mr. Colthoff responded that the comments are not surprising; the team hopes to have more to show the Panel in the right direction at the next review.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in Non-support of the project.

3.0 Bathurst Quay Streetscape & Public Realm Improvement

Project ID #: 1087
Project Type: Public Realm
Review Stage: Schematic Design

<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	City of Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Dillon Consulting; Montgomery Sisam
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Waterfront Toronto; Bryan Bowen, Project Manager, Waterfront Secretariat; Ian Dance, Dillon Consulting; Paul MacLeod, Dillon Consulting
<i>Delegation:</i>	Michael David, Ports Toronto; Susan McAlphine, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting that City Council endorsed the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan (BQNP) in 2017 and approved it through an Official Plan Amendment in 2018. The BQNP describes a long-term vision for the silo site as a community and cultural hub; in the near term, the BQNP recommends creating a streetscape and public realm improvement plan to identify “quick start” improvements to existing conditions. Ms. Stuart summarized the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context and situated the project site being near the 509 and 511 streetcar stops. Ms. Stuart noted that a greater plaza vision is forthcoming and would like the Panel to discuss if the short-term plan is in line with the overall BSNP. Ms. Stuart then introduced Bryan Bowen with Waterfront Secretariat at the City of Toronto to give an update on the project timeline.

Mr. Bowen began by providing a project background update and explained how the current strategy is informed: City Council has directed that the long term use of the site would include a below grade parking structure, however, given the importance of the site, a short term plan is required to kick start smaller objectives. Mr. Bowen explained that the existing site is fragmented, parking function areas can be consolidated to open up space for future potential public use, and summarized six quick start projects proposed that will be implemented before the longer 15-year plan of swimming pool and malting silo rehabilitation: 1) Dock wall rehab – extend West 8’s design and rehabilitate 140m of dock wall to seamlessly tie into Waterfront Toronto’s scope of work, 2) Administration building revitalization – lease has been signed with Ireland Park Association with partial occupancy by Ports Toronto and will highlight beautiful views with south facing windows, 3) New pedestrian plaza and path- the design, a mix of hard and soft landscapes, will have its precise requirements determined and is scheduled to come to DRP three times for review, 4) Improving Eireann Quay- consolidate vehicle drop-off areas and reclaim space for the future plaza, 5) Malting silo rehabilitation- create a thriving environment around the silos, in the meantime utilize the silos exterior as a backdrop for public space, and finally investigate future ground floor use and revitalization strategy, 6) Parking work- ferry waiting area is currently over-built and underused, taxi corral can be reduced in size, and plan alongside the future pedestrian realm. Mr. Bowen then introduced Ian Dance with Dillon Consulting to present the project.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Dance began by describing the open spaces that have been created due to the consolidating of the taxi corral: driving area is asphalt paving and the pedestrian areas will be laid with unit pavers like Canada Square with diversity of tones and permeability. The site has potential to support difference landscape technologies, Mr. Dance added it is important to understand and design potential linkages to future public realm design with transitional edges. Mr. Dance noted tree preservation is important- the centre point of the proposed taxi corral is consistent with the existing centre to reduce impact to existing trees. Furthermore, two rows of trees are proposed between the parking area and the taxi corral. Mr. Dance noted a 9-10m clearance has been provided as a comfortable pedestrian forecourt at the Admin building and from a grading perspective. Finally, Mr. Dance noted the stormwater management strategy would recognize the various grade changes.

Mr. Bowen concluded with a construction schedule overview and outlined key stakeholder consultations required. Western Channel dock wall rehab will be completed in the fall of 2019, while taxi corral, parking lot, Ireland Park Foundation renovations, and Eireann Quay streetscape improvements, will begin in summer of 2019. Mr. Bowen noted environmental remediation has been delivered along with the dock wall work and design work will begin to take place in 2020. Mr. Bowen concluded with a summary of upcoming key stakeholder consultations.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the site plan – the extent of the dock wall rehab work, the location of the school bus drop-off, and taxi corral access. Mr. Bowen noted that the brown area in the site plan is the dock wall work and the drop-off is for wheels-tran not full-size school bus. Mr. Dance responded that the entry to the taxi corral is from the north curb-cut and the corral provides double-loaded pick-up, not drop-off. The Panel member asked for clarification on the Billy Bishop airport lease. Mr. David noted it is between the City of Toronto and Billy Bishop airport.

Another Panel member asked for the status on the canopy structure and if a design team has been selected to work on the silo upgrades. Mr. Bowen noted that the canopy structures are being re-designed no longer as a feature, but a “background” building and will be submitted as part of the SPA resubmission. Mr. Bower added that no design team has been selected for the silo work; engineering team is currently completing assessment to inform future phases of work.

One Panel member asked if the proposed taxi corral has the same centre as the existing and if a rental car lot will be provided. Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed corral has the same centre as the existing but smaller in footprint, the rental pavilion is not in the proposal however three of the future parking spots will be dedicated to rental with remaining to be located on the island.

Considering north-south circulation, another Panel member asked if there are initiatives to improve the sidewalk on east side of Eireann Quay from Queens Quay to

the site. Mr. Bowen noted that the sidewalk will be reconstructed and should begin construction ideally this year, before the new plaza and open space work.

One Panel member asked for the location of the future below grade parking, entrance and swimming pool. Mr. Bowen noted that the answer lies with Billy Bishop airport as the long-term plan will be determined beyond the current lease, most of the plaza and parking will be re-designed when the pool is confirmed. The Panel member asked for clarification on the access of the Admin building. Mr. Bowen noted that there are public entrances on the north façade and east side that will open to the adjacent open space.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale behind the location of the entry to the surface parking lot. Mr. Bowen explained that the team is attempting a “quick win” by accepting that the existing school play-space, malting silos and centre of the taxi corral are fixed elements and must be accommodated. Furthermore, the play-space is accessed via stairs from the north and has a perimeter fence – all of which will stay. The Panel member asked for the number of annual visitors through the airport. Mr. David answered that there are 2.8 million passengers, 1 million of which are transfers.

One Panel member asked if Uber/ Lyft will share the taxi corral. Mr. Bowen answered the corral is strictly for taxis, other forms of ride-shares are consolidated to the old ferry queue or the new cell phone lot area. The Panel member asked for the clearance between the Admin building and the curb line of the taxi corral, rationale behind the location of the parking lot, and if the team has explored ways to pacify the long stretch of concrete along Eireann Quay. Mr. Bowen explained that the clearance is between 9-10m, the parking lot is located to accommodate the existing school board owned green space at the northwest corner, and the long stretch of concrete is part of Ports Toronto’s area for transit parking. Mr. David noted that a permanent barrier will be installed to separate the ferrying vehicles from the north and south traffic.

Another Panel member asked for the extent of the Admin building expansion. Mr. Bowen noted the property is currently under a 5-year lease and the team will know more after. One Panel member asked if there will be a new TTC stop at the end of Eireann Quay- Bathurst TTC line be extended to airport and return. Mr. Bowen noted that TTC extension is not in the proposal now since it was not included as part of the Council direction and other transit plans take priority. Mr. Bowen added that other ways have been provided to alleviate the current load.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted the project has many constraints and is concerned that the area of paving west of the malting silo is not enough to bring a critical mass down to the plaza. The Panel member suggested the team to consider more soft landscaping like the Music Garden, for people to meander and require less programming for activation.

Another Panel member commended the project's creation of civil space and bringing interest to the site that is a unique entry and access point to the City. The Panel member noted to consider the project not only as circulation but as a place-making exercise for visitors- provide more trees and comfort.

One Panel member commended the project for doing so much short-term work on a shoestring budget and appreciated the summary of the six key kick-start projects. The Panel member suggested the team to consider more investments in trees if the plaza becomes an important spine for the site and noted that it is important to provide comfort infrastructure for users of public transit.

Another Panel member appreciated the clarity and thoroughness of the presentation. The Panel member commented that the curb cut locations and designs can be improved to further reduce terrain elevational changes.

One Panel member noted it is important to provide more trees, design plaza space to allow for varying degrees of utilization, and commended the team on the good sense in the malting silo revitalization strategy- not every old structure has to be re-used. The Panel member commented that although the proposed diagonal pedestrian route will facilitate pedestrian flow, it will not replace the heavily used Eireann Quay due to the existing transit connections.

Another Panel member noted that rain protection is very important, existing asphalt between the Admin building and the malting silo should be removed for new opportunity, and the woonerf style pedestrian zone should be extended to capture all curb access points.

One Panel member noted the project requires multiple ways of access, ensure all arriving and exiting function together. The Panel member felt the school board play-space holds the potential to unlock the site plan and given the complexity of the project perhaps negotiating with the school board would provide leverage for a more comprehensive master plan.

Mr. Glaisek commended the team for the work, noted concern with the surface parking lot location and suggested the team to consider working with TDSB for a one for one swap of the play-space which would bring parking to the edge of Eireann Key.

Another Panel member commended the team for the great presentation and shared the suggestion for the parking lot swap. However, the Panel member noted the parking lot in its proposed location can also be considered as an extension of the plaza, as a more managed piece of flexible public realm infrastructure that can be programmed to support other uses. One Panel member supported the idea of a multi-use parking lot, felt the school board will be difficult to engage, and suggested the design team to confront and represent the play-space fence as an integral part of the design.

3.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

- Appreciate the project and the thorough explanation of the six major moves; excited to see the work take place
- Commend the thoughtfulness of the malting silo revitalization strategy
- The project is an important north-south gateway and will be the first sight of Toronto for many visitors, encourage the team to be bold and bring a powerful vision for the project
- Due to the long implementation timeline, it is important for the first moves to be strong to create momentum for remaining work

Public realm design

- Consider a woonerf street typology with table-top pedestrian crossing zones at the parking lot and taxi corral areas
- Consider reducing the amount of hardscape west of the silo and provide more trees and landscape areas
- Consider feasibility of bringing the streetcar all the way down Eireann Quay
- Provide appropriate rain protection for pedestrians at the taxi corral waiting area
- Explore a range of options with respect to the issue of school play-space: 1) consider engaging the school board to swap play-space with parking area, 2) consider multi-use strategy for the parking lot and build in flexibility over time

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Mr. Bowen appreciated the Panel comments and extended an invitation to the Panel to see the work on site when construction starts in the summer.

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in Full Support of the project.

3.0 Gardiner Public Realm: Vision & Implementation Plan – Design Development

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1083
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Fourth
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront, East Bayfront, Keating Chanel Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8, Dillon Consulting
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adriaan Geuze, Director, West 8; Don McKinnon, Partner, Dillon Consulting
<i>Delegation:</i>	Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto; Pinelopi Gramatikopoulous, City of Toronto;

4.1 Introduction

Sonja Vangjeli, project manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the project has many moving parts with different site conditions, complex assumptions of future site conditions and adjacent projects- coordination with all the various moving parts is a challenge and will be completed in parts under an overall implementation strategy over time.

Ms. Vangjeli provided a summary of the key milestones of the project: City Council directed that Lake Shore Blvd. be a balanced multimodal corridor with continuous landscape identity, Dillon Consulting and West 8 were retained to advance the public realm design work, and now 30 percent design has been reached on the north side of Lake Shore with 100 percent design completed on the south.

Ms. Vangjeli noted this is the fourth DRP review for the project in anticipation of the Council report in June of 2019. Ms. Vangjeli highlighted the ongoing coordination related to Metrolinx USRC East Enhancements, Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study (PCCS) and Port Lands Flood Protection work at Cherry Street, Lower Don Trail, and Don Roadway intersections. Ms. Vangjeli highlighted the project design objectives: prioritize traffic calming measures and improve safety, design an urban civic boulevard with a distinct continuous landscape identity, improve east-west connectivity through rebalanced multimodal mobility, improve north-south connectivity across the barriers of the Gardiner Expressway and rail berm, and design for sustainable operations and maintenance for public realm. Ms. Vangjeli noted key comments from community stakeholders, City staff, previous DRP comments, and areas for Panel consideration at this review including: 1) has the design achieved the stated project objectives? 2) does the project have a cohesive boulevard identity? 3) have the intersections been humanized sufficiently to improve the perception of connectivity? 4) have sustainability and innovation opportunities been seized with this design challenge and finally? And 5) how can the team ensure consistency and quality are maintained and implemented across the corridor?

Ms. Vangjeli then proceeded to present the Lake Shore Boulevard Vision and Implementation Plan.

4.2 Presentation

Ms. Vangjeli began the presentation by noting there are four typical zones to the Lake Shore corridor and identified the different challenges and site conditions of each zone. South side corridor is narrow with developments and east of Cherry Street is fragmented. Ms. Vangjeli noted that both re-prioritization of modes of transport to include pedestrians, cyclists, nature, infrastructure, and creation of a continuous landscape identity through the varied conditions are key elements of the vision.

Ms. Vangjeli noted the implementation strategy including general master plan, design guidelines for the typical sections, typical material palettes, and pilot projects completed by the City and Waterfront Toronto.

South sidewalk design guidelines and pilot project

Ms. Vangjeli noted the design guideline includes a series of components to accommodate a variety of conditions and all the components work as a system: integrated stormwater is used as passive irrigation, planting, can be retained and filtered prior to sewage, planting strategy aims for species diversity and salt tolerance, and a material palette that accommodates permeability and texture diversity in the public realm.

Seizing an opportunity for early implementation in front of Monde Development between Sherbourne Common and Bonnycastle St., Ms. Vangjeli noted the pilot project was initiated in response to previous Panel suggestion. Due to site constraints of narrow boulevard area, shaded by tall tower, high traffic road, heavily salted in winter, and multiple existing underground utilities, the original pilot design had to be adopted to work with the site. Ms. Vangjeli explained the monitoring plan which will take place for two years. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Adriaan Geuze with West 8 to present the North Linear Park and Lake Shore Trail Master Plan.

North Linear Park & Lake Shore Trail Master Plan

Mr. Geuze noted the vision of the North Linear Park and Master Plan is to revitalize a section of the Lake Shore that is extremely noisy, aggressive, and inconsistent – the challenge is to work through the complexities and embrace the linear quality of the design. The project section introduces raised profile with clean soil for trees, new buffer elements for an articulated human scale experience, “bent socks” to humanize the pillars with reflective elements at night and recall the numbering of the Gardiner “bent” system, and an industrial red colour on the Metrolinx retaining wall. Mr. Geuze noted that if the topsoil condition is good, great birches growth is ensured as seen from previous projects completed by the office, and believed this type of atmosphere is possible in the narrow park. Mr. Geuze presented the material palette of the trail, from stone median edge to birches and ground cover, selection criteria for the planting strategy including pioneer/ ruderal tree species and wildflowers, and other local precedents of a managed succession planting strategy. Mr. Geuze further described the changing sectional characteristics of the trail from Jarvis, to Sherbourne, to the Parliament “transitional zone” including the redundant ramp and rocky shore at Cherry Street. Mr. Geuze then introduced Don McKinnon with Dillon Consulting to present the stormwater management and engineering strategy.

Stormwater Management and Engineering

Mr. McKinnon began by noting that the project is inheriting stormwater from the Gardiner and rehabilitation work of the Gardiner does not improve the stormwater management system- currently results in flooding from all the down sprouts creating surface ponding that conflicts with the pedestrian realm. Mr. McKinnon noted that the integrated stormwater management strategy includes bioswales located primarily on the western section of the corridor, soil cell stormwater storage, permeable pavers, upgrades to certain sections of sewer system, open planting area, and “permavoid” system under sidewalk. Mr. McKinnon noted that the design must accommodate the Gardiner maintenance access that requires access by a “genie” lift system. Mr. McKinnon concluded that when the utility line is decommissioned in the future more space can be allocated for planting.

Intersections Design

Mr. Geuze noted that the intersections design is to connect communities and identified the existing site issues with the four key intersections. Six strategies are proposed for transforming the intersections: 1) improve alignments of the crossings and bolder pavement markings, 2) introduce new special pavement at corners, 3) introduce bent socks, 4) utilize light temperature difference to create a warmer pedestrian zone at the intersection, 5) introduce anchoring portal elements and invite artists to create public art at key corners, and 6) declutter traffic signage and guard rails. Mr. Geuze noted the vision is a series of humanised intersections and hope people will appreciate the simplicity.

Vision East of Cherry Street

Mr. Geuze concluded by presenting the vision of the Gardiner Public Realm east of Cherry Street: an infrastructural linear park from Cherry to Don River, and an urban boulevard from Don River to Logan Avenue.

4.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the lighting strategy. Mr. Geuze answered that the intersections will have normal illumination level at a consistent, warmer level to create an effect for the area.

4.2 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted the design and presentation are impressive. Given Waterfront Toronto's strong commitment to legibility and readability in the public realm, the "whispers" do not seem integral to the scheme. The Panel member has no objection to the linear park vision but felt the intersections should be the overwhelming priority as they are more important than the park- perhaps two or three intersections should be completed first as a powerful public statement and create subsequent political success to follow. The Panel member noted the north side are more challenging yet least important and reiterated the importance for the team to focus on the intersections.

Another Panel member noted the project engages 945 Lake Shore Boulevard East's property and the urban continuity proposed here should be shown to the proponent of the film studio. The Panel member noted the project is scientific, humane, subtle, clever, and loved the description of the project site. The Panel member asked for an update on the ballet bar concept. Mr. Geuze explained that the concept is no longer feasible considering the different agencies involved.

One Panel member appreciated the outside voice of the design team, the plant selection and the priority of speed reduction of Lakeshore. Successful quick starts for the project are important and the Panel member encouraged the team to not lose sight of the pilot project. The Panel member noted the tree solution must be acknowledged elsewhere and learn how much water trees can capture. The Panel member added that

children planting trees in the community is a great way to engage vulnerable communities and requires support and management.

Another Panel member noted that the minimal design moves to increase legibility is fantastic and the radical simplicity is translatable to all users. The Panel member concurred that the intersection should come first and celebrated as an entrance to the waterfront through public art or large-scale graphics.

One Panel member noted that the presentation material is very impressive and reducing the speed of traffic is critical to removing the barriers for a much safer public realm. The Panel member noted the lighting strategy is simple and works well. In order to ensure consistency through various players and development timelines, the Panel member noted the project can be implemented as a design manual from the City of Toronto, will require City Council approval or adoption, and important to avoid exception projects along the scope.

Another Panel member appreciated the simplicity of the north corridor; the trees will be hardy and easy to maintain. One Panel member noted that the project, an urban “stitch”, establishes a new normal condition for the City and the key challenge is to ensure consistent implementation in decision making in the long term. The project should be extended to the beaches/ Woodbine Ave. and will connect the entire city together. The Panel member commended the team for handling the constraints delightfully and with a human touch.

Another Panel member noted the project has improved from previous DRP- the preciousness has been replaced with an implementable vision and the development of a priority list is important to ensure implementation. The Panel member also appreciated the number of trees in the proposal. The project being one of the first that connects the City from east to west can help identify where we are along the Gardiner- the spelling of the street signs requires more development.

4.3 Consensus Comments

- supportive of the project and appreciate the radical simplicity of the vision

Implementation

- While it is important to flesh out the design, encourage the team to identify opportunities for the public to experience the design spatially, such as developing one or two key intersections first
- The pilot project holds great potential and is a key first step
- Implementation of this project over time with a consistent approach is the main challenge- important for the project to receive City Council approval and Waterfront Toronto should consider a long-term, continuity role in the project much like the re-naturalization of the Don River
- Develop priority list for the project elements: 1) intersections, 2) north side of Lake Shore work, 3) south side of street.

Design

- Highly supportive of the linear park concept and design
- Supportive of the lighting concept; consider other ideas for the “whisper” elements as the spellings are confusing
- Speed reduction on Lakeshore is an important foundation to an improved public realm experience
- Consider extending project scope east to Woodbine Ave.

4.4 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in Full Support for the project.

Motion to go into “in-camera” session

CLOSING

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