



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel**

### **Minutes of Meeting #144**

Wednesday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2021

Meeting held Virtually

---

#### **Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Matthew Hickey  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Jeff Ranson  
Brigitte Shim  
Kevin Stelzer  
Eric Turcotte

#### **Regrets**

Janna Levitt  
Fadi Masoud

---

#### **Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

#### **Recording Secretary**

Leon Lai

---

## **WELCOME**

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

1. Queens Quay East Extension & East Waterfront LRT Area 2B – Issues Identification
  2. BQNP Eireann Quay Plaza – Schematic Design
  3. Affordable Housing Policy Update – For Information
- 

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

One Panel member noted **West Don Lands Block 20** is the building next to the Cherry St. Plaza which will be part of the presentation for **Queens Quay East Area 2B**, and reminded Panel members that this project was reviewed in April for Schematic Design.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflict of interest was declared.

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 **West Don Lands Block 20** is studying other options for all the ground floor facades including the glass atriums. The podium massing is being further terraced and the team is expected to return to DRP for a Detailed Design review. Mr. Glaisek noted the proponent team for **Bentway Bridge Redesign** is working to address the Consensus Comments, including revising materiality of the bridge "rooms", directing vertical access from the bridge, and additional details on railing design, signage, and lighting will be provided for the Detailed Design review scheduled for September 2021. Mr. Glaisek noted **Leslie Street Lookout** is working to address Consensus Comments while public consultation meetings continue, the project is anticipated to return for Detailed Design review in September 2021.

Other Waterfront Toronto Update:

Mr. Glaisek noted the construction of the **Stormwater Management Facility** has been completed. The building is currently in commissioning and the team is working to address deficiencies. Mr. Glaisek noted **Quayside** Request for Qualifications (RFQ) submissions deadline was May 28<sup>th</sup> and Waterfront Toronto (WT) received a total of 10 submissions. Following an evaluation of the qualified submissions, a shortlist of proponents will be selected to submit a Request for Proposal (RFP) – the shortlisted proponents will be named sometime after the July meeting of the WT's Board of Directors. WT anticipates selecting a preferred proponent from the RFP submissions by end of 2021/early 2022.

Mr. Glaisek provided an upcoming draft project agenda for July 2021 DRP.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

The Chair formally congratulated Brigitte Shim and Howard Sutcliffe for winning the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada's Gold Medal. The Chair noted that they continue to be inspiration for other architects and is very happy to have Brigitte on the Panel.

## PROJECT REVIEWS

### 1.0 Queens Quay East Extension & East Waterfront LRT Area 2B – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1125
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront, Keating Channel
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Public Work, Stantec
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adam Nicklin, Principal, Public Work Kenneth Poon, Senior Associate, Stantec
<i>Delegation:</i>	Marc Ryan, Public Work David Sauve, Stantec Brent Fairbairn, City of Toronto Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

#### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto began the introduction by noting the scope areas of East Waterfront LRT and the 2B area. Ms. Vangjeli noted the project timeline, anticipated scope of work, and recapped the policy context and vision of the design brief. Ms. Vangjeli noted the existing, future context of Queens Quay, and key adjacent design projects including Cherry Street, West Don Lands Block 20, Stormwater Management Facility, and the Cherry Street Rail Underpass. Ms. Vangjeli noted the project is her for Issues Identification review, recapped the Consensus Comments from May 2021's Schematic Design review, and noted the areas for Panel consideration. Ms. Vangjeli introduced Adam Nicklin, Principal at Public Work, to continue the design presentation.

#### 1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Nicklin began by noting the project has exciting context and there is a wide spectrum of opportunities. Mr. Nicklin noted the context of Queens Quay, from the vibrant central core, green street extension, to the river climax. The team is interested in creating a familiar but deeply ecological street, embrace the opportunity to create a more resilient and didactic landscape. Mr. Nicklin noted the importance of outdoor comfort, green track to significantly lower embodied carbon for the track construction, and introduced Kenneth Poon, Senior Associate with Stantec, to continue the presentation of Cherry Street.

Mr. Poon noted the team is taking into consideration all adjacent on-going projects, including the existing infrastructure constraints, the Distillery loop, track alignment, and the Cherry Street portal configurations. The team is studying different options of extending the streetcar south along Cherry: eliminate or relocate watch tower for portal, or a new portal east of tower,

Mr. Nicklin noted the architectural significance and opportunities of the watch tower, and the concepts for the new Cherry Street plaza. Mr. Nicklin noted the right-of-way design of Queens Quay with one hundred percent surface water runoff captured, a more resilient and nature immersed experience. Mr. Nicklin walked through the perspectives along Queens Quay and concluded with a site plan overview.

### **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for more information on the supporting structure of the “periscope” watch tower concept, and the design of the space around it. Mr. Nicklin responded that it shows the idea of combining two strategies: a screening element that reflects and guides people through the plaza, plus wrapping and defining the experience from Cherry Street. Mr. Nicklin noted it is an early illustration, more studies will be done to design the space.

Another Panel member asked for the feasibility of the green track happening at Eglinton Crosstown. Mr. Nicklin noted it is planned to be built. The Panel member asked if the Cherry trees are a placeholder at Cherry Street plaza and would like to understand their role in the design vision. Mr. Nicklin noted the notion of having Cherry trees on Cherry Street is compelling, the team is interested in bosque grouping of trees, possibly catenary lighting, and extending the warm texture of brick at the plaza.

One Panel member asked if the cross section of Queens Quay considers pedestrian flows and loads in the area because it is a fine balance between spaces for movement and vegetation. Mr. Nicklin noted Queens Quay East is designed for the same capacity as the west, the team understands that maintaining a balance between the various modes of movement is important. The Panel member asked if there is enough space for high density of pedestrian. Mr. Nicklin noted there are many micro adjustments made on the bike lanes and the pedestrian right-of-way is consistent with the built Queens Quay.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on Queens Quay East’s identity past Cherry Street. Mr. Nicklin answered that the identity is green, perhaps a terminus park at the water’s edge. The Panel member noted Cherry Street veers off to the west south of the underpass, asked if it then leaves a pocket of developable land, and provide clarification on Sediment Park on p.62. Mr. Nicklin noted Sediment Park is the new river mouth park as most of the river’s sediments will arrive here. The team is interested in taking the park all the way to Cherry Street. Mr. Poon noted that there will be a small amount of remaining space once streetcar right-of-way is accommodated.

One Panel member asked if the team studied TTC tracks running through the northbound lanes split between both sides of the street. Mr. Poon noted this option has been investigated, there is flood risk and requires a larger bridge reconstruction. Both options have pros and cons while being feasible in terms of engineering. Mr. Nicklin responded that the City does not have a preference, the team is interested in seeing the watch tower as part of the plaza.

Another Panel member asked how involved is the team on the functional programming of the watch tower, and provide clarification on the coordination between plaza and other linear park areas at Queens Quay and Cherry St. – how do you see negotiating programming, park space, and private developments. Mr. Nicklin responded that the team is compelled to find an idea for the tower whether it stays or be relocated as it is an exciting part of a composition of the plaza. The original Queens Quay shows that a street can be both primary and expansive, the team is interested in giving Queens Quay a strong identity but also allowing other developments to connect to it - looking forward to having this conversation as the design progresses.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the primacy between the two reasons for the proposed changes to Queens Quay: ecological performance and the proximity to the river valley. Mr. Nicklin noted that ecology was addressed underground in the original Queens Quay revitalization, the team is interested in a more visual and didactic strategy for Area 2B. The ecological performance can also be met differently given the very different context of the project. Mr. Glaisek noted Area 2B is taking place fifteen years after Queens Quay West so there is a higher sensitivity for urban ecological systems – Waterfront Toronto’s values have evolved. The Panel member asked if there is any cost or technical advantage between the portal location options. Mr. Poon noted constructing the portal closer to the bridge requires more bracing and the track would have a higher elevation – a two to four-million-dollar increase. The Panel member asked if the emergency vehicle issue on green track is different at Crosstown than here. Mr. Nicklin noted TTC is very flexible, it depends on the secondary EMS and fire service vehicles who will look at the design of this street and the adjacent street network.

### **1.3 Panel Comments**

One Panel member commended the team for a strong approach in designing a system and dealing with the complexities of the context. Learning and bringing new ideas to the composition is encouraged. The Panel member is excited for the progressive thinking and that the project tackles all the major objectives well. At Cherry Street, the Panel member is in support of moving the watch tower into the plaza so the streetcar does not split the plaza. Having silva cells together will allow great tree growth and create a successful plaza in front of Block 20. The Panel member noted the crossing to Tank House Lane is very important. In terms of tree species, the Panel member appreciated Cherry Trees on Cherry Street, however it is important to address issues of monoculture and indigenous planting, consider other trees that will perform well and support overall resiliency. The Panel member supported the goal of 100% stormwater capture on Queens Quay. Even with an increase of 20%, if done visually, would be a great achievement. The Panel member suggested to continue to proceed with the attitude of ecology and simplicity in reinforcing the main idea of the project. The Panel member noted to ensure durability is delivered with the pilot projects, expand to all indigenous plant species, and strive for species that require little to no maintenance.

Another Panel member noted that ecology, resilience, and maintenance over time are all important issues that should be addressed and designed. The narrow planting beds do not perform well in urban environments, consider larger, wider areas. Employ resilient species. The Panel member supported the eastern portal to leave the watch

tower in place, appreciated the early provocations on the tower use, and noted that watching trains is a very intriguing experience.

One Panel member appreciated the layered and dense presentation. Queens Quay is an important piece of our public realm, continuity and unique aspects have to be balanced. Greening the transit is important as it demonstrates changing values in the waterfront - if Crosstown employs that strategy, we should implement it here. Lighting and weather coverings are essential, for example consider seasonality in the design of Cherry Street and plaza. The Panel member supported leaving the watch tower in place and noted that Cherry Street is a street that jogs and having bosque of trees will improve its character. The Panel member emphasized that clarity and simplicity on the various modes of movement and accessibility are key objectives that will help the public realm connect with context. The Panel member supported the crossing at Tank House Lane and appreciated that the thinking so far is a nuanced dance building on what we have learned.

Another Panel member appreciated the strong and powerful presentation. The Panel member noted this project is a critical moment for the city to shift the thinking and lead with landscape in the next evolution of Waterfront Toronto and demonstrate very capable involvement. The current design embodies that. The Panel member supported the tower as beacon and gateway and appreciated the changing urban condition. Queens Quay is a hugely popular street in the summer, it should be our mandate to encourage green tracks. The Panel member suggested more tree species diversity working together with the Cherry bosques to create visual impact and avoid monoculture. Resilient species are encouraged as well.

One Panel member appreciated the comprehensive and strong presentation, supported the portal location that is close to Cherry Street to keep the plaza whole and allow for great programming. It is important to curate uses surrounding the water tower and not fracture the space with streetcar. The Panel member appreciated the Cherry theme and supported the concept of Queens Quay streetscape promoting sustainability, health of the lake, and comfort. Provide dimensioned street sections at the next review and coordinate with traffic engineers to minimize turning lanes.

Another Panel member supported the contiguous plaza as streetcars are large and dangerous, plus it avoids having to move the tower. The Panel member suggested to double check the lots required for Sediment Park and recommended that the iconic qualities of Queens Quay be continued to Area 2B.

One Panel member supported not bisecting the plaza and noted it will make for better future development. It is important to understand how the streets will interact with adjacent developments and how they will address the ground floor. The Panel member asked the team to consider the future character of Queens Quay, if it will be more retail, mixed-use, or a quieter transportation route close to the water. The Panel member encouraged more dialogue between the design team and adjacent developments.

Another Panel member appreciated the water management strategy.

One Panel member appreciated maintaining the tower in place for industrial heritage and having the streetcars pass through the plaza. The Panel member asked for more information at the intersection of Cherry Street and the Gardiner to see how that can be activated. The Panel member commended the ecological performance objectives, noted the area is part of the Don River and asked the team to consider positive impact for both planting and animal health.

Another Panel member appreciated the public realm design, plaza ideas, and noted there are pros and cons with the tower use options. The Panel member's concern with keeping the tower in place and having the TTC go around is the potential streetcar equipment like shelters and signage that will take away from the plaza. The Panel member supported keeping the streetcar close to the road. A proof of concept for the plaza was suggested by the Panel member to investigate impact of shade, location of amenities and programming. At the Distillery District, there is a lack of public seating – a free public plaza here would be much appreciated. The Panel member encouraged more exploration on the plaza, public amenities, and the integration of the periscope ideas. The Panel member commended the Cherry Trees and asked to ensure shade is maximized.

One Panel member noted that improving the ecological performance of the street is indisputable, encouraged the team to anticipate the east as intensely used as the west, and that it would be a mistake to assume that it will have a major shift in street character until past Cherry Street. The Panel member noted that regionally there is a change in character starting there but ensure adequate room is still provided for pedestrian use. Simplify the planting bed designs and ensure the backside of the beds do not disrupt pedestrian movement. The Panel member asked that changes such as laybys be designed with minor implication to the urban design character of the street and that turning lanes are essential. The Panel member supported keeping the tower in place and move portal east of the tower, use the otherwise relocation money on restoration of the tower to help anchor the plaza. The support structure shown is too timid, given the retail uses on the east side of the plaza, it is recommended to keep the tower in public use. The Panel member supported Queens Quay to end in a “T” rather than dribble out. The Panel member asked the team to provide more clarity on the various modes of traffic related to the site areas at a regional scale and congratulated the team on a good start on a challenging project.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

### **General**

- Appreciated the excellent presentation, the project has great potential.
- It is important to lead with landscape and create a strong public realm.
- Strong support for the ecological approach and emphasis on greening the streetscape.

### **Landscape**

- Supported planting Cherry Trees at the Cherry plaza.
- Consider plant species that are resilient, indigenous to the site, and require little to no maintenance.

- Consider enlarging or consolidating the street side planting beds to avoid narrow stripes and create wider, more robust areas for planting.
- Strong support for the crossing at Tank House Lane.

#### Cherry Street Streetcar Portal

- Several Panel members supported keeping the portal close to Cherry Street to not break up the plaza.
- Other Panel members supported keeping the tower in place so the streetcar will run east of the existing building. The plaza can be conceived as a shared public amenity space. Additionally, it is more economical to keep the building in place.
- Strong support for the tower being conceptualized as a beacon to mark Cherry Street and help place-make the plaza.
- Further investigate the plaza design, provide a proof of concept, and explore functional and public programming opportunities at the next review.

#### Queens Quay

- While Queens Quay East might function differently than the West, the design must anticipate and plan for a large volume of users, ensure adequate right-of-ways are provided for various modes of use.
- Continue to coordinate the streetscape design with adjacent developments and identify the future ground floor character of the area.
- Provide key cross sections with adjacent building massing at the next review.
- General support for reducing turning lanes, but ensure essential ones are included.
- Strong support for the green streetcar tracks if it can be implemented.
- Provide a more detailed site plan indicating various modes of traffic and directions.

### 1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken for an Issues Identification review.

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

Mr. Nicklin appreciated the depth of thinking from the Panel members. The team will explore the benefits of both portal and tower options.

## 2.0 BQNP Eireann Quay Plaza – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1087
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Four (Fourth appearance for the BQNP master plan)
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Secretariat
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	PFS Studio
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Jennifer Nagai, Partner, PFS Studio Vinh Van, Project Designer, PFS Studio

*Delegation:* Rhomney Forbes-Gray, Principal, Lightbrigade Architectural Lighting  
Bryan Bowen, Waterfront Secretariat  
Julius Aquino, City of Toronto  
Stephen O’Bright, City of Toronto  
David O’Hara, City of Toronto  
Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto  
Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto  
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

## **2.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Bryan Bowen, Project Manager with the Waterfront Secretariat, introduced the project by providing an overview of the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan (BQNP) and the history of site. Mr. Bowen noted the BQNP conceptual master plan and action plan, including the 2019 “fence-breaking” at the water’s edge, dockwall rehab, and construction of the new Water’s Edge Promenade (WEP). Other work includes the re-designed transportation footprint by Ports Toronto, future plans for the improvement of the community centre, the Corleck building by Canada Ireland Foundation, repairing of the Canada Malting Silos, and a multimedia feasibility study done by Moment Factory. Mr. Bowen noted that bringing all those elements together is a new public open space and through the 2020 RFP, the Eireann Quay Landscape Plan will play a critical role in “stitching” pre-existing uses and recent and emerging BQNP improvements, together to achieve a coherent identity and sense of place.

Mr. Bowen noted PFS Studio’s scope of work, the project timeline, DRP history of the site, and recapped previous Panel comments. Mr. Bowen noted the areas for Panel consideration and introduced Jennifer Nagai, Partner with PFS Studio to continue the presentation.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Nagai began the presentation by noting the public meeting timeline and noted the team is interested in creating a park space that supports the neighbourhood and the community at large. Ms. Nagai provided a recap on the greater site context, broader site edges and connections. Ms. Nagai noted the design concept through the abstraction of grain produced by the silo, speaking to the rebirth, migration, and growth of the site as an organizational idea for the plaza. Ms. Nagai noted the elements of the design: north forecourt, north promenade, flexible plaza, Corleck forecourt, south terrace, and the streetscape improvement along Bathurst Street.

Ms. Nagai noted green areas wrap each “room” and the team is interested in employing low maintenance planting palette. Ms. Nagai introduced Vinh Van, Senior Project Designer with PFS Studio to continue the presentation. Mr. Van noted the details of each “room”, the sectional details of the sun deck at the south terrace, and perspective views of the plaza in use. The monolithic sundeck is designed to take advantage of the sun, capture lake views, provide ample seating and perennial shrubs create a comfortable area. It is important to create both an inward and outward experience. Mr. Van noted the pedestrian circulation, access, focal points in the design, planting approach, seating, programmatic opportunities, and introduced

Rhomney Forbes-Gray, Principal, Lightbrigade Architectural Lighting to present the lighting strategy.

### **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the airport taxi corral has been improved and if the partial demolition of the silo will provide a connection to the water's edge. Mr. Bowen responded that first stage repair of the silo is strictly restoration, a new partner for the arts will be selected next year. Mr. Bowen noted that the improved taxi area will be more orderly, and vehicles will no longer spill out like before.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on existing and new trees. Ms. Nagai noted the trees on the Water's Edge Promenade (WEP), south of silo structure, center of the taxi corral, and framing the park into the parking lot, are all existing. The Panel member asked for the ownership of the parking lot, is there any opportunity for that area to be included into the scope and provide more information on water retention. Mr. Bowen answered that the parking area is structured with a share use agreement. Most of the time it is a parking lot but on evenings and weekends there are provisions for animation such as food trucks to preserve pedestrian primacy. The verdant edge is a way to soften the condition but also allow for permeability. Mr. Bowen noted the parking lot is owned by the City, however Ports Toronto and the school have a use provision that predates our ownership. The team can do more to plant trees on the western edge of the parking lot to further soften the edge. Ms. Nagai noted the ribbons of planting is intended to collect stormwater and there is an existing system that will be tapped into.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the existing taxi drop-off zone. Mr. Bowen noted that area is due to a license agreement that Ports Toronto has on this site, who is the owner and operator of Billy Bishop airport. The original agreement planned a taxi corral south of the Gardiner but since The Bentway, it has been relocated here. The Panel member asked if the playground is owned by the school to the north. Mr. Bowen noted it is licensed for school use during school hours, the school is embarking on its own master plan for modernization. The Panel asked if the North Promenade would provide access for both vehicles and pedestrians. Ms. Nagai noted yes that is the intended use.

Another Panel member asked if there is a pedestrian path between the WEP and the North Forecourt. Mr. Bowen confirmed that there is a path. The Panel member asked for the timeline for the community centre upgrade. Mr. Bowen noted the team is hoping to begin detailed design work with MJMA next year.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the connecting point of the North promenade. Mr. Bowen responded that the promenade goes through the anticipated break in the silo structure to the WEP.

Another Panel member asked if the sundeck is fully accessible. Ms. Nagai noted the design is sculpted with an incline to ensure accessibility, as is the terraced seating in the main plaza. The Panel member asked for clarification on the west interface of the

famine memorial with the plaza since the memorial is very eastern facing. Ms. Nagai noted there is an opening in the memorial that allows access between the two sides, the team is interested in bringing the hard surface right up to sculpture from the west.

One Panel member asked if the WEP has completed construction and if seating is provided. Mr. Bowen confirmed that it has completed construction and public seating is there. The Panel member asked if there is a shadow study done on the silo structure. Ms. Nagai noted this has not been explored, it is part of the 3d model and can be provided at the next review. The Panel member asked if the community is looking for more connection of a different kind or if the existing network of connections are not enough. Ms. Nagai noted the stakeholders and community are interested in a highly connected public realm that will complement the existing elements on site.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the canopy pavilions shown in the renderings. Ms. Nagai responded that they are intended to show temporary events taking place in the plaza, the stalls can be freely positioned. The Panel member asked why the pedestrian sidewalk down Bathurst varies in width. Mr. Bowen answered that the design shifts to accommodate the taxi corral improvement work.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

One Panel member commented that a thorough site analysis is missing to help identify the big issues of a very challenging site. There is an important need to address directionality, pedestrian flow, and character of the site as a primary “door” to the city with an industrial heritage. The site is further complicated by elements with varying scales, consider more contextual connections to avoid an insular approach. The Panel member is unsure if the wheat idea is the right approach, the planting strategy shows hints of addressing the key issues but felt it is too idyllic and pristine – not fitting for the site. Instead, consider a rougher approach and further animate the space with events that are separate from the airport. The Panel member recommended a strong, simple, and bold design approach that matches the context and site character. Avoid timidity. The Panel member felt the color of the lighting strategy is too commercial. Consider stepping back and evaluate whether the concept of wheat stems is the appropriate intensity in response to the silo structures – currently there is too much disparity across the site elements and a revised approach is required to address the project at an infrastructural level.

Another Panel member felt that there are too many small elements, consider simplification in the design. The simplification can extend to the lighting strategies, the high and low lighting feel in conflict with each other, consider only low lighting to allow viewing the water at night. The Panel member felt the water retention objective is underwhelming for a project of this calibre, consider further development given the amount of non-porous surface. The Panel member felt the portal through the silo requires more definition to mark the space, make it safe and fun, consider something significant like the public art under Granville bridge in Vancouver. The Panel member felt the Panel should oppose the exclusion of the north parking area from the design and recommended the team to include that area as part of the scope now to ensure there is integration even if the scope has to be implemented at a later time.

One Panel member appreciated the concept of “breaking fences” in the overall approach to the project – a strong metaphor to achieve. The Panel member recommended to improve the parking lot with trees and new pavement. The Panel member recommended greening the North Promenade as well. Even though there are conflicting use agreements, there is opportunity to define it as a functional landscape and avoid voids in a key urban site. For the playground, consider a joint working group with the school to explore a more comprehensive landscape approach. The issues of the fragmented site should be addressed as a key strategy for “breaking fences”. The Panel member felt that the lawn south of the silo structure is out of place and does not fit the scale and character of the site. While the micro responses are appreciated, the Panel member recommended a bold, big-picture vision for the site.

Another Panel member suggested the team to look beyond the picturesque in the design and selection of the plantings, consider the post-industrial character of the site and ecological enhancing qualities, select species that can withstand the harsh traffic and waterfront conditions.

One Panel member recommended overall simplification while developing a stronger understanding of the key linkages in the design to tie the entire site together. The Panel member encouraged the team to create a better relationship between the silos and the plaza. Without the parking lot parcel and the community centre, it is challenging to understand the role of the north plaza, consider an alternative relationship between the north and main flexible plaza.

Another Panel member recommended the team to find an idea to make the design more coherent and cohesive while simplifying. The silo structure is the dominate image of the site and a driver of ideas that should inform the space around it, such as patterning, shaping of the spaces, etc. Planting strategy should encourage shelter and offer more protection against the harsh climate. The Panel member asked the team to look for a different conceptual device to ground the design and give the project more structure.

One Panel member suggested the addition of spaces that provide intimacy and comfort. The Panel member felt the design is still unclear in addressing pedestrian flow, there is a lack of formal gateway, not sure how people will access the site. It is important to recognize the paths and provide a clear connection and gateway to the north as the site feels like an island now. The Panel member recognized the need to highlight the silo structure but encouraged the team to consider light pollution and impact on dark skies.

Another Panel member commented that the design does not sufficiently address access and permeability to the site, consider planting as performative for rainwater capture, and ensure that all areas of the plaza are accessible and inclusive. The Panel member encouraged the team to emphasize seasonality considerations in the design.

One Panel member noted that the site is very challenging as it has no clear front. The Panel member appreciated the strategy of the various edge, however the edges should do more to protect the park against the vehicular traffic. The Panel member suggested a more intense green edge to wrap the site and use the silo as an anchor to form a

loop. The Panel member felt that this project as somewhat of an end to the waterfront trail should provide a powerful experience.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider more trees along Bathurst Street to make the east sidewalk more amenable. The north promenade is very important as it is an entry point and will lead to the water's edge, consider a more assertive and bolder threshold moment with Bathurst Street to make visually evident the new east-west path. The Panel member recommended that the lighting strategy be designed to reinforce the site boundary: trees, green edges, paths, etc.

## 2.5 Consensus Comments

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

### General

- Appreciated the team for taking on a challenging site.
- Commended the powerful analogy of “breaking down fences” as a guiding principle for the project.
- The Panel requested the Proponent in future respect the time allocation for presentation and limit their material to what was circulated in advance.

### Design

- Appreciated the beauty of the plaza design, however the design language is too fine and pristine to match the industrial characteristics of the site dominated by the silos. Consider a rougher design language that can lend a unifying approach integrating the visual, spatial, and industrial character of the silo structures.
- The different elements of the plaza design do not feel strongly connected, consider overall simplification and a more unifying design approach/concept.
- The prevailing wind creates a tough environment for most of the year, especially in the winter, consider enhancing the microclimates in the plaza with more trees and vegetation to provide shade and natural wind mitigation.
- Consider seasonality in the design to promote year-round use.
- Currently, the site is further complicated by the heavy traffic associated with the airport operations, ensure the design is well considered to respond to this context. At the same time, ensure the design works in context of future evolution of the airport.
- Ensure the plaza and landscape designs are fully accessible.
- Provide more information on the stormwater capture strategy and how it can be implemented in the design.

### Strengthening the edges

- The various edge conditions of the plazas can be further enhanced to improve connections with the city, help signify the site, and draw people down to the water.
- The threshold with Bathurst Street is challenging because it is both the front and back of the plazas, it is important to provide a safe, welcoming, and inviting experience to draw visitors in. Consider a powerful “gateway” experience, such as a dense green edge along the boundary, to capture pedestrians and lead them to the water's edge.

- The Panel restated its desire to see the north parking lot incorporated into this stage of the project if possible.

#### Relationship with the silo structures

- Appreciated the direct connection to the water provided by the North Promenade and the break in the silos.
- The silos have multiple scales of reading and engagement, consider the lighting and immediate plaza landscape designs as viewed and experienced from the following:
  - the city
  - the lake, as a lighthouse or marker to signify the western entrance to the harbour
  - the airport on arrival for visitors
  - the base of the structures as a place of gathering

### 2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted unanimously Non-Support for the project.

One Panel member noted it is important for the City to resolve the edges of the project scope to achieve a comprehensive landscape vision.

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

Mr. Bowen noted the team will take time to reflect on the comments. The challenge of the site is the cross that the team has to bear - they are real constraints that we have to work with in trying to find opportunity to make improvements after a long time of idleness. Mr. Bowen noted the team invested a lot of time to untangle the complex legal boundary issues and appreciated the helpful feedback.

The Chair noted that the Panel is interested in helping the project succeed and continue to improve the design.

### 3.0 Affordable Housing Policy Update – For Information

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1126
<i>Project Type:</i>	Policy
<i>Review Stage:</i>	For Information
<i>Review Round:</i>	-
<i>Location:</i>	City of Toronto
<i>Proponent:</i>	Housing Secretariat, City of Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	-
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Jacob Larsen, Housing Development Officer, City of Toronto
<i>Delegation:</i>	Angela Li, Senior Development Manager, Waterfront Toronto

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Senior Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the Housing Secretariat provided a similar presentation to the City's Design Review Panel and the update will include an overview of affordable

housing programs and policies in delivering the HousingTO Action Plan 2020-2030. Ms. Li noted projects with affordable housing units in the West Don Lands and East Bayfront that have been previously reviewed by the Panel. The Quayside development will also provide 815 affordable units. Ms. Li then introduced Jacob Larsen, Housing Development Officer with the City of Toronto Housing Secretariat, to give the presentation.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Larsen began by recapping the HousingTO 2020-2030 Action Plan: targets of approval of 40,000 new affordable rental homes by 2030, including 18,000 supportive housing units, tools to incentivize affordable rental housing development on private lands, and governmental initiatives. Mr. Larsen noted the Open Door Affordable Rental Housing Program was approved by Toronto City Council in 2015, with city financial contributions to private section/non-profit applicants including capital grant funding, fee waivers, and property tax relief. Fees waived include Planning and Building Permit fees, parkland dedication fees, and development chargers; fast-tracked planning approvals are also part of the process.

Mr. Larsen noted there have been fifteen affordable rental developments recommended through this program and some changes will be made to the program in 2021: simplified non-profit planning fee relief, streamlined process for incentives-only, annual call for applicants to focus on projects that request capital funding, and the target of 30% gross area as affordable housing. Mr. Larsen noted the Surplus Lands Initiatives: Housing Now, the development of City-owned lands for affordable housing within mixed-income, mixed-use, transit-oriented communities. Housing Now will provide affordable rental, market rental, and market ownership housing options. Mr. Larsen noted some project examples such as 150 Queen's Wharf Road, 375 Front Street East, and 321 Dovercourt which is part of the Modular Housing Initiative. Another initiative is through Inclusionary Zoning, Official Plan Amendment to require affordable rental housing in strong/moderate market areas. Finally, Mr. Larsen noted the updated definitions of affordable housing.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on cost based on the updated definitions of affordable housing. Mr. Larsen noted that the proposed definitions translate to the maximum rents as defined. The Panel member asked if there is any feedback on developer uptake as many developers in Vancouver say they cannot be profitable and sites are sitting empty. Mr. Larsen noted that if there is a requirement for affordable housing, such as Inclusionary Zoning, developers might shift towards larger unit sizes if the maximum cost of 1-bedroom units is higher than the others – all of the impacts of these policies are actively debated.

Another Panel member asked what the percentiles are based on in the definitions and suggested to provide the actual cost of the units. Mr. Larsen noted that the rents would be published on an annual basis to provide the certainty. The Panel member noted some of the percentile range is quite large, and asked if these are decided on a project

by project basis. Mr. Larsen noted 60<sup>th</sup> percentile is the maximum, 30<sup>th</sup> would be at the limits of their affordability.

One Panel member asked how the city is ensuring the design of modular housing is well integrated with the context and not have a visual stigma. Mr. Larsen noted the modular buildings are encouraged to have façade finishes that unite the project in a singular aesthetic, also significant landscaping for outdoor amenities will be provided for the residence.

### **CLOSING**

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.