



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #111
Wednesday, May 16, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Peter Busby
Nina-Marie Lister
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto
Chris Reed

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh on behalf of Lorna Day, City of
Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Gardiner East Public Realm – Detailed Design
 2. Waterfront Innovation Centre – Detailed Design
 3. 675 Commissioners Street – Issues Identification
 4. 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the April 18, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared a conflict for the 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East project and recused himself for that review.

The Chair shared a few images of the Bishop Strachan School Sustainability Project which was built by four teams of grade 8 students. The model displaying the students'

vision for Villiers Island will be displayed at Sidewalk Toronto's new space on Lake Shore Boulevard. The Chair also noted that a half-day session for the Panel to discuss practices and policies and how we can improve should be planned for the fall.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that construction of the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal Phase 1A was completed from the ticket booths to the Westin Harbour Castle and the promenade re-opened for public use on May 12 for the summer season. Mr. Glaisek noted that construction crews will re-mobilize and complete the remainder of the work in October 2018. Mr. Glaisek also noted that work is ongoing for the Cherry Street Lakefilling project. The inner confinement berm was completed in April 2018 and the targeted completion is March 2019. Mr. Glaisek noted that on May 3rd, Sidewalk Toronto held a Roundtable Meeting with over 375 participants. Some highlights from the meeting included details presented on the draft Responsible Data Use Policy Framework, including principles and commitments, and the announcement of 307 Lake Shore opening on June 16 as a new office, studio, exhibition and workspace for Sidewalk Toronto.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Gardiner East Public Realm – Detailed Design

Project Type: Building

Location: Lake Shore East Corridor

Proponent: City of Toronto/Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Dillon Consulting Inc., West 8

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8, Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

Delegation: Pinelopi Gramatikopoulos, City of Toronto

ID#: 1083

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the project's third time presenting to the DRP, and is seeking approval for Detailed Design for the south side of Lake Shore Boulevard between Jarvis and Cherry Street. Ms. Vangjeli explained that Dillon Consulting and West 8 have been retained to advance conceptual public realm improvements, including Lake Shore Boulevard streetscape, the bicycle network, the linear public space and improvements to the intersections. Ms. Vangjeli explained that Metrolinx is undertaking the Union Station Rail Corridor East enhancements to support Smart Track and RER work. The team is continuing coordination with Metrolinx. Ms. Vangjeli described comments received from City Staff, including pedestrian access should not be eliminated from the north side, separated bike and pedestrian trails preferred wherever possible, short sections of multiuse trail acceptable at areas of constraint, need to resolve space constraint on the north side between Parliament and Cherry Street, and unimpeded

inspection access for the underside of the Gardiner structure required. Ms. Vangieli noted that the team is specifically seeking feedback on the south side design, the Gardiner corridor vision updates, and the intersection design. Ms. Vangieli then introduced Adriaan Geuze, Partner with West 8, and Don McKinnon, with Dillon Consulting, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Geuze explained that the presentation includes the existing Gardiner, the south side design, improving the stormwater management, opportunities for connectivity, and aspirations for the north side vision. Mr. Geuze explained that the current Gardiner corridor has an imbalance of the pedestrian and car. Some areas along the corridor are extremely narrow and they are negotiating the possibility of widening these areas. Mr. Geuze explained that the ambition for the south side of Lake Shore consists of a simple and cohesive identity. Mr. Geuze explained that plantings on the south side will consist of salt tolerant native perennials to filter, retain, and soften the edges. Mr. Geuze explained that the intersections will all be concrete with saw cut patterns, potentially having different patterns at each intersection.

Mr. McKinnon explained that the existing conditions of the Gardiner include areas of localized ponding and multiple sources of runoff. The site constraints influencing the stormwater management options include high ground water table, contaminated soils, location of utilities within the ROW, limited space in the ROW, significant volume of runoff to be managed, and high salt context of roadway runoff. Mr. McKinnon explained that the recommended measures include permeable pavement with soil cells and underdrain, landscaped area with engineered soil cells, and impermeable liners to prevent seepage.

Mr. Geuze explained that they are aiming to slow down traffic along the corridor and make the pedestrian crossings more prominent and obvious to drivers. The traffic lanes will also be narrowed from 4 meters to 3.5 meters. Mr. Geuze also explained the concept of giving the bents “socks” which consists of painting the base of the bents using a thermoplast paint. Mr. Geuze noted that some of the aspirations for the north side of the corridor include, creating space for moveable pier structures and integrating a lighting strategy with the potential for each intersection to have signature lighting design.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether the saw cuts are an aspirational item. Mr. Geuze replied that the saw cuts are in the scope, but the ornamental lighting is aspirational.

Another Panel member asked who will maintain the green wall. Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, replied that they are no longer proposing a green wall and it will be more of a free-standing vine wall. Ms. Mallozzi added that Metrolinx is aware of the vines proposed.

One Panel member asked if they will be remediating the soil. Mr. McKinnon replied that they will not be remediating the soil as they are not introducing a new use to the area. The clean soil on top will meet the MOECC requirements.

Another Panel member asked who the client is for this project. Ms. Mallozzi replied that the City of Toronto is funding the project and they have hired Waterfront Toronto to oversee the project. Dillon Consulting is the lead consultant and West 8 is the sub-consultant.

One Panel member noted that slide 25 shows lots of street furnishings such as the wooden guard rails and asked whether these will remain. Mr. McKinnon replied that the guardrails are in place due to the 60 km/hr speed limit along Lake Shore Boulevard. If they are able to reduce the speed limit to 50 km/hr it will eliminate the need for the wooden guard rails.

Another Panel member asked how well thermoplast responds to our weather conditions. Mr. Geuze replied that it is an existing technology used to paint airport tarmacs. Mr. Geuze added that the material fuses to the concrete and responds well to harsh weather conditions.

One Panel member asked how confident the team is that they can provide enough breathing room at the pinch point between Parliament and Cherry Street. Ms. Vangjeli replied that the challenge is that Metrolinx isn't planning any work in that specific area. Ms. Vangjeli added that the team has come up with a solution that modifies the corner of the intersection that allows enough space for the path to pass through.

Another Panel member noted that the centre median below the pillars are all raised and asked whether the team has thought about depressing them instead. Mr. McKinnon replied that they have thought of this, however, it depends on where the underground utilities are located. The Panel member also asked how they plan to mount the lighting. Mr. Geuze replied that it will be an independent linear cable system.

One Panel member asked whether the team has received feedback from transportation services regarding paint on the bents. Pinelopi Gramatikopoulos, with the Waterfront Secretariat, replied that they are able to change the colour of the concrete on the bents and they are also open to reflective lighting.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that rather than adding pavement to accommodate potential future uses, the space should be narrowed and planted instead. The Panel member suggested adding elevation through plant material, or large buffer stones to minimize the windswept feeling of the expansive paved area. The Panel member felt that simply increasing the size of the zebra markings will not be enough for vehicles to recognize and suggested doing something bolder. The Panel member also felt that the non-decorative lighting strategy requires more sophistication.

Another Panel member noted how important this project is and recognized the complexity of connectivity and having to coordinate with different agencies. The Panel member felt that the soil should be remediated. The Panel member also noted that public art is a signature of what Waterfront Toronto does and felt that some form of curated art could be incorporated along the corridor. The Panel member felt that this could be an opportunity to demonstrate the layered history of the area.

One Panel member commended the team for their work on the stormwater piece and felt that this is an opportunity to push the envelope. The Panel member liked the lighting strategy and suggested ways to incorporate solar powered lighting applications. The Panel member suggested randomizing the pattern of the thermoplast paint on the bents in order to reduce the need for maintenance.

Another Panel member appreciated the simplicity of the scheme. The Panel member advised the team to ensure that what is planted along the retaining walls will actually grow. The Panel member also felt that it is critical to get the speed limit reduced to 50km/hr in order to avoid having the wood guardrails and other unwanted clutter. The Panel member noted that it is important to ensure that the saw cut concrete gets replaced properly after any maintenance. The Panel member suggested emphasizing the lighting strategy east-west along the corridor rather than north-south. The Panel member also noted that it appears that the cyclist get priority when crossing the intersections and suggested making it clear that the cyclist needs to slow down.

One Panel member noted that the reference to the wood sheds as a programming opportunity should have more of a crisp and contemporary feel. The Panel member also suggested reaching out to Evergreen Brickworks regarding permeable paving.

Another Panel member felt that this project is extremely refreshing and was supportive of the non-design approach. The Panel member was, however, worried about the trees and their ability to flourish in these harsh conditions. The Panel member suggested doing a landscape without trees and building a river of pebbles that act as retention tanks.

One Panel member felt that not having trees in this area would be unfortunate. The Panel member expressed that the reduced speed limit is critical to the project. The Panel member agreed that the lighting is just right and legible as a system.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall the Panel strongly endorsed the direction of the project
- It is critical to ensure that needs of pedestrians are met while also ensuring that vehicles are aware that they are entering an urban realm.
- Ensure quality materials are used throughout the corridor.
- Further refinement is needed on seasonal landscaping strategy given the poor growing conditions of the corridor.

- Ensure the lighting strategy has a strong focus on the corners of the intersections where pedestrians will be waiting.
- Consider incorporating a public art component throughout the length of the corridor with historic references.
- Reducing the speed limit along Lake Shore Boulevard to 50km/hour is critical to alleviate the need for street furnishings.
- Ensure that integration with Metrolinx is ongoing.

1.6 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 Conditional Support of the project.

2.0 Waterfront Innovation Centre – Detailed Design

Project Type: Building

Location: East Bayfront

Proponent: Menkes

Architect/Designer: Sweeny&Co

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Four

Presenter(s): Dermot Sweeny, Sweeny&Co; Alan Murphy, Green Reason Inc.

Delegation: Peter Menkes, Menkes; Sean Menkes, Menkes; Joel Pearlman, Menkes

ID#: 1068

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that this is the project's fourth time presenting to the DRP and today they will be presenting Detailed Design. Mr. Glaisek provided a recap of comments from the last meeting in January 2018, including the need for a clearer narrative, the architecture to demonstrate innovation, further clarity on the ground floor and the Nexus space, more work on the sustainability piece, and further development of the material palette. Mr. Glaisek noted that feedback is sought on the ground floor relationship to the public realm, the articulation of the ground floor façade and materials, and the overall circulation and programming of the Nexus. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Dermot Sweeny, Principal of Sweeny&Co, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeny began by noting that the updated design addresses the public realm in a strong way and brings the public into the building. Mr. Sweeny explained that they have made the Nexus more accessible by dropping it two meters. The lobby now goes through the middle of the building. Mr. Sweeny explained that the public realm strategy consists of clearly delineated entry points and bright metallic paint. Below the Nexus is the retail space which is open and inviting. Mr. Sweeny explained that the material palette consists of warmer coloured material on the ceiling with wood incorporated in the interior. Mr. Sweeny introduced Alan Murphy, Principal at Green Reason Inc., to present the sustainability portion of the building.

Mr. Murphy noted that comparative metrics were undertaken to compare this building with One York. Mr. Murphy explained that there is a need to think about sustainability as more than just environmental and incorporate a social and cultural aspect. Mr. Murphy noted that it's important to have a building that engages with the community. Mr. Murphy noted that the team is looking at improved lighting, and better glass. Mr. Murphy explained that getting the waterfront LRT built is critical to the project's success.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether the big loads are the heating and cooling components of the building. Mr. Murphy replied that the fan power loads and the cooling are the biggest profiles. The Panel member asked whether they are anticipating a server room. Mr. Murphy replied yes and there will be a higher plug load which they are looking to recover heat from this.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on how the stair meets the wall. Mr. Sweeny replied that the public washroom is located underneath the stair and that the space between the stair and the wall is very narrow.

One Panel member asked what outdoor amenity space is provided for the people that work there. Mr. Sweeny replied that the Nexus extends to two terraces and they see this as being the main outdoor space. The Panel member asked whether the rooftop will be publicly accessible. Mr. Sweeny replied that there are accessibility issues which necessitates the need for an elevator and an increase in overall height of the building.

Another Panel member asked what the team is doing to support the retail along Queens Quay. Mr. Sweeny replied that 70% of the building perimeter is retail. Mr. Sweeny added that there is going to be a balance of smaller retail spaces and larger retail spaces to attract diverse tenants.

One Panel member asked why if cooling is the biggest energy consumer, are they making the building all glass. Mr. Murphy replied that the all-glass building is heavily driven by the fact that this is a market driven building and right now, the market wants floor to ceiling glass. The Panel member asked whether there will be any external shading. Mr. Sweeny replied no because they are building right to the property line.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member asked the team to look into transpired solar thermal collectors for ventilation air pre-heat since there is so much surface area. The Panel member added that given that this will be an all glass building and cooling will be the biggest load, they suggested electrochromic glass.

Another Panel felt that there's an amazing opportunity to make the greenroof accessible to employees. The Panel member liked that the building has terraces looking north and west.

One Panel member felt conflicted about the relationship of the soffit to the primary bridge. The Panel member also felt that the feature stair needs more space at the base and the landings. The Panel member felt that the top of the of the west block isn't right volumetrically, and maybe more outdoor terraces would help. Lastly, the Panel member suggested to move the bridge on the fourth floor further away from the bridge on the second floor to avoid them merging visually.

Another Panel member felt that a clearly articulated architectural vision is missing. The Panel member noted that looking at the quality of the entrances, there seems to be an overreliance on transparency as the proxy for a design strategy. The Panel member felt that it would be beneficial to take a deep dive into the qualities at all scales of what the spatial and material experience is moving from the outside to the inside.

One Panel member was worried about the potential privatization of the Nexus space. The Panel member felt that it is critical to ensure that the nature of the second floor is fool-proof, so it cannot be privatized. The Panel member noted that the feature stair facing the park needs more refinement and felt that people will want to reexperience the hill that's there now. The Panel member asked the team to consider making the feature stair end at a pivot or foldaway door to open up to the landscape. The Panel member felt that the main bridge doesn't feel light because of the deep soffit. Lastly, the Panel member noted that the wood shown in all of the renderings is warm however the actual materials themselves seem to be cooler tones.

Another Panel member felt that it's important to consider how retail along Queens Quay will support the public realm. The Panel member felt that the configuration of the retail spaces need to support different models.

Another Panel member felt that the façade along Queens Quay appears to have a sameness about it and felt adding some subtle differences to break up the façade would be helpful.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall the Panel was appreciative of the improvements made to the design since the last review.
- It is fundamental to the project that the Nexus is clearly accessible to the public and visible from the ground floor.
- Ensure that the design of the retail animates the public realm along Queens Quay and Sugar Beach
- Further refinement is needed on the bridge design. Consider reducing the depth of the soffit where the bridge abuts it.
- Consider incorporating more wood into the soffit and ground floor interior space given the proximity to George Brown College's proposed tall wood building.

- Consider providing more terraces.
- Further resolution is required on how the stair on Block 1 meets the entry door, and making it feel fully connected to the surrounding spaces inside.

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 members voted Conditional Support.

3.0 675 Commissioners Street – Issues Identification

Project Type: Building

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: FedEx

Architect/Designer: Kingsland + Architects Inc

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Thomas Goetz, Kingsland + Architects Inc.; Martin Wade, MWMA; George Pantazis, City of Toronto; Kim Storey, Brown and Storey Architects

Delegation: Elliott Orford, Colliers

ID#: 1095

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

George Pantazis, Planner with the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the project's first time presenting to the DRP and the team will be presenting Issues Identification. Mr. Pantazis explained that On December 5, 2017, City Council adopted recommendations in a report on the purchase of 915 and 945 Lake Shore Boulevard East properties (previously Showline Studios) by Toronto Port Lands Company and sale of 675 Commissioners Street. The recommendations approved this transaction and authorized that the Lake Shore Boulevard East properties, currently owned by Canada Post, be sold to the Toronto Port Lands Company in exchange for land at 675 Commissioners Street. Mr. Pantazis explained that Canada Post intends to construct a postal sorting station which became a permitted use in the area on April 24, 2018. Mr. Pantazis added that a rail spur currently runs through the site, but it will be relocated onto Leslie Street as a separate but parallel process. Mr. Pantazis requested Panel feedback on the building siting and its relationship to Commissioners Street and Leslie Street, the treatment of the public realm, and the appropriateness of the proposed sustainability goals. Mr. Pantazis introduced Kim Storey, Principal at Brown and Storey Architects to give a brief overview of the proposed look-out interface and park concept for the Leslie Street look-out.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Storey provided an overview of the site plan noting that the park will be located at east end of the Ship Channel and will provide views west to the city and the inner harbour. Ms. Storey noted that a hedge wall will wrap the outside of the Canada Post facility and create a buffer from the parking lot. Ms. Storey then introduced Thomas Goetz, Partner with Kingsland Architects Inc., to present the building.

Mr. Goetz explained that this will be a prototypical Canada Post building. Mr. Goetz explained that some of the modifications being made to the prototype include, moving the entrances and occupied areas to the corner of Leslie Street and Commissioners Street, provide an 8-meter buffer landscape strip between the building and Leslie Street, and include a stamp gallery wall to break up the long blank east elevation. Mr. Goetz explained that the sustainability targets include a 25% greenroof, shaded internal pedestrian walkway, bird friendly glass, and reflective paving in the south parking lot. Mr. Goetz introduced Martin Wade with Martin Wade Landscape Architects to present the landscape design of the site.

Mr. Wade began by noting that the landscape objectives are to protect and maintain the existing streetscape and enhance the pedestrian circulation and connectivity. Mr. Wade noted that they plan to enhance the green infrastructure with canopy trees.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether the existing Canada Post Facility to the north will remain. Mr. Goetz replied that the other Canada Post Facility will remain.

Another Panel member noted that the building skin is prototypical and asked whether there is an opportunity to incorporate some colour. Mr. Goetz replied that all of the Canada Post Facilities are intended to have the same look and feel. The Panel member also asked about the unit pavers. Mr. Goetz replied that those are existing concrete unit pavers.

One Panel member asked what the water retention strategy is for the parking lot. Mr. Wade replied that the greenroof will help achieve the water balance and there is a larger infiltration feature built into the site. The Panel member also asked whether parking will be provided for employees commuting by bicycle. Mr. Goetz replied that there will be bicycle parking provided and if there is even more demand, they will ensure it is accommodated. The Panel member asked what the need is for the curb cut located on the new park. Mr. Wade replied that the curb cut is interim to service the building located there. The Panel member asked about the overall function of the new park. Mr. Wade replied that the park will have a great view into the industrial area of the Harbour and one of the only locations to access these views.

Another Panel member asked whether the locker rooms have windows. Mr. Goetz replied that the locker rooms will have windows, but the remaining part of the operations facilities does not have natural lighting due to operational requirements. The Panel member asked if there is an outdoor area for employees to take lunch breaks. Mr. Goetz replied that there isn't a dedicated area for employees to sit outside, but other facilities have created an area for employees to barbeque.

One Panel member asked what the lifespan of this type of building is. Mr. Goetz replied that it is approximately 25 years. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the hedge around the building. Mr. Goetz replied that Brown and Storey Architects will be developing this part of the landscape and both teams will be well coordinated on this.

Another Panel member asked whether the stamp gallery wall will have rotating images or if they will be permanent. Mr. Goetz replied that they are still working out the details of this, but the idea is that they would be fixed.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that it would be amazing to have the greenroof span the entire roof. The Panel member also asked the team to ensure that there is a dedicated outdoor area for employees that could be shared with the public realm. The Panel member also felt that the postage art looks like it can come off and felt that more consideration for how the art is mounted on the façade is required.

Another Panel member noted that the corner of Leslie Street was one of Waterfront Toronto's first projects and felt that it was successful in terms of using native plant material and being robust. The Panel member noted that this is a tough space with the dumptrucks, cyclists, and pedestrians all using the space. The Panel member felt that the landscape should be designed in a way that requires minimal maintenance.

One Panel member was interested in understanding how this project, as a Federal agency, aligns with Canada's long-term low-greenhouse gas targets. A building like this should be able to achieve an incredible thermal performance. The Panel member noted that there is an expansive parking lot which could accommodate solar canopies. The Panel member suggested incorporating radiant in-floor heating to address thermal comfort.

Another Panel member noted that there is a lot of control on the landscape and felt that more of a balance is required between creating a structured and a more organic landscape. The Panel member felt that the corner of Leslie and Commissioners Street should be explored further. On the park piece, the panel member was interested in understanding more about the berm maximizing the views and how the park will be integrated with future programming.

One Panel member felt that the landscape should be more robust and not as manicured.

Another Panel member felt that the proposed hedge along the building perimeter will need to be pruned which will incur operational costs. The Panel member also felt that the stamp gallery should have rotating stamps.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Take advantage of the location and proximity to Tommy Thompson Park.
- Consider a more wild and robust approach to the landscape around the building that requires minimal maintenance.
- Supportive of the stamp gallery on the building façade. Consider interchanging the library of stamps on occasion.

- Raise the bar for sustainability. Consider building a full green roof, adding solar canopies to the parking lot and radiant floor heating.
- Provide an outdoor amenity area for employees with the potential to be integrated into the public realm.

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.

4.0 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East – Schematic Design

Project Type: building

Location: Lower Yonge

Proponent: Greenland Development

Architect/Designer: Hariri Pontarini Architects

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: two

Presenter(s): David Pontarini, Hariri Pontarini Architects; Janet Rosenberg, Janet Rosenberg and Studio

Delegation: Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies

ID#: 1088

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that this is the project's second time presenting to the DRP and they will be presenting Schematic Design. Mr. Glaisek provided a recap of the comments made by the Panel from the September 2017 meeting, including more work is needed on the positioning of the towers to improve the public realm experience, the public realm should create a stronger edge along Sherbourne Common, the location of access points for vehicles should not dominate the space, the architectural character of all three buildings feels inconsistent, incorporate softer landscape elements into the courtyard space, and the sustainability targets should exceed the minimum required. Mr. Glaisek noted that feedback is being sought on the appropriateness of the revised landscape elements and the public realm along Sherbourne Common. Mr. Glaisek then introduced David Pontarini, with Hariri Pontarini Architects, to give the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Pontarini began by noting that in response to the Panel's comments from the last review, the team has straightened the edge along Sherbourne Street. Mr. Pontarini explained that a tower orientation study was undertaken to determine shadow impacts and the results showed that rotating the tower results in the building footprint landing outside of the zoning envelope with little increase in the amount of sun on the plaza. Mr. Pontarini noted that in terms of the overall massing, the midrise building has been pulled in and where there was once a curve, it is now straightened. Mr. Pontarini explained that they still want the midrise building to read as a discreet piece. Mr. Pontarini then introduced Janet Rosenberg with Janet Rosenberg and Studio to present the landscape design.

Ms. Rosenberg explained that the landscape now has three times the amount of greenscape as the last version and 50% more trees. Ms. Rosenberg noted that the tree species consist of Black Elm and Red Oak. In terms of soil depth, Ms. Rosenberg noted that they are getting as much as they can, using soil cells for the street trees. Ms. Rosenberg noted that the dog park will be grass or granular.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the vehicular circulation. Mr. Pontarini explained that the drop off area is marked by bollards and there is only one parking entrance off New Street.

Another Panel member asked whether the curvilinear landscape has a relationship to the curved building. Mr. Pontarini replied that the building originally had more curved elements, but in response to the comments from the last meeting, they are trying to keep a good balance of curves. Ms. Rosenberg added that the curves of the landscape look good graphically but it also feels good to walk through something that's not so angular.

One Panel member noted that the renderings show a shimmer to the façade and asked the team to speak to the material palette. Mr. Pontarini explained that they are proposing a frit pattern on the glass which has a reflective quality.

Another Panel member asked how many parking spaces are provided. Mr. Pontarini replied that it will be roughly 0.5 spaces per unit. The Panel member also asked what the building height is. Mr. Pontarini replied that the building is 49 storeys.

One Panel member asked whether 5mm is the target set for stormwater. Mr. Pontarini replied that they would like to see more than 5mm as the target for stormwater. The Panel member also asked if they are required to meet TGS Tier 2 standards. Mr. Pontarini replied that they are required to meet TGS Tier 1 standards.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was appreciative of the current elevations being shown beside the previous elevations to show what have evolved since the last review. The Panel member also felt that the balance of curves has been resolved nicely and liked the way that the podium of the westerly tower has been introduced.

Another Panel member felt that the nine-square grid on the north podium makes it seem like it's not part of the building language as it doesn't appear anywhere else on the building. and felt that the grid pattern should be removed. The Panel member was appreciative of the improvements to the landscape and likes the idea of creating small rooms instead of the big paved area.

One Panel member felt that the tower is too big for the base. The Panel member liked that there is a master plan for phase 2 as this is a very important piece for this neighbourhood. The Panel member also suggested connecting with the West 8 team to discuss the condition on the south side of Lake Shore regarding the Gardiner Public Realm improvements.

Another Panel member felt that more work is needed on the stormwater piece. The Panel member also suggested building a centre of refuge in the building for residents to go to when there's a power outage, which will start to occur more frequently, consistent with the recommendations in TOcore. The Panel member noted that minimizing the amount of vehicle entrances is key and suggested having one parking entrance for both phases of the building.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall the Panel was appreciative of the work that has been done since the last review
- Ensure the landscape remains lush and responds to densely populated towers
- Push the replication of the curvilinear language to the rectangular language
- More resolution is required on the relationship of the podium to the tower
- Consider incorporating a centre of refuge for residents in emergencies
- Engage with West 8 regarding the treatment of the south side of Lake Shore Boulevard.

4.6 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 members voted in Full Support of the project.