



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #111
Wednesday, April 18, 2018**

Present

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson
Chris Reed
Eric Turcotte
Carl Blanchaer, City of Toronto Design Review Panel
Michael Leckman, City of Toronto Design Review Panel
Heather Rolleston, City of Toronto Design Review Panel

Regrets

Paul Bedford, Chair
Mazyar Mortazavi
Brigitte Shim

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

The Vice Chair opened the meeting by noting that Paul Bedford cannot attend, and providing an overview of the agenda, which included reviews of:

1. 30 Bay Street – Schematic Design (Joint review with City of Toronto DRP members)
 2. Port Lands Flood Protection: River Valley and Parks Design – Schematic Design
 3. Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure – Schematic Design
 4. Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Vice Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the March 21, 2018 meeting. One Panel member asked for revisions to be made to section 1.5. The minutes were adopted as revised.

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

The Vice Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that George Brown College announced Moriyama & Teshima Architects + Acton Ostry Architects as the winning team to design The Arbour. Mr. Glaisek noted that The Arbour will serve as an educational and research hub and will also be home to a new child care facility to serve the growing East Bayfront community. The Arbour will be flexible and future proof, equipped with smart building systems that are networked, intelligent and adaptable. The building will also be designed to adjust to changing academic uses and a changing climate. Construction of this new building is scheduled to begin in 2021. Mr. Glaisek added that the team will be returning to DRP to present the Schematic Design in the summer.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 30 Bay Street – Issues Identification

Project Type: Building

Location: Bayside

Proponent: Oxford Properties

Architect/Designer: Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Graham Stirk, Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners

Delegation: Habon Ali, Urban Strategies, James Parahk, City of Toronto, Mark Cote, Oxford Properties

ID#: 1098

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parahk, Program Manager with the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that 30 Bay Street is a proposed commercial building in the South Core neighbourhood. Mr. Parahk walked the Panel through the site context noting that one of the site challenges is the Gardiner Expressway ramps to the north of the site. Mr. Parahk noted that the site is considered a Regeneration Area. Mr. Parahk also pointed out the Heritage building at 60 Harbour Street which will be conserved and maintained consistent with the Standards and Guidelines. Mr. Parahk also walked the Panel through the pedestrian circulation of the site and surrounding area noting the existing PATH connection and the proposed PATH connection through 30 Bay Street. Mr. Parahk raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider including the Bay Street frontage, streetscape and animation, and the pedestrian connectivity from PATH level to the ground floor. Mr. Parahk then introduced Graham Stirk, Senior Partner with Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Stirk began by noting that the project is a proposed commercial building that will add over 134,000 square meters of Class A office space to the area. Mr. Stirk noted that the design creates an erosion at the base of the building and will conceptually over-top the 60 Harbour Street building. Mr. Stirk noted that the podium is an L-shape that embraces the site and the diagonal corners of the towers create echelons. Mr. Stirk explained that the building organization consists of 5 levels of underground parking, 4-storeys of lobby space, followed by office space on top for a total of 60 storeys above grade. Mr. Stirk noted that there will be an internal atrium linking 60 Harbour Street to 30 Bay Street and the PATH network. Mr. Stirk noted that the tower floorplate is 54 meters by 54 meters with a simple and static design that is eroded at key areas.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked about the grey box indicated on the ground floor plan. Mr. Stirk responded that the grey box is the bike and parking ramp. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the canopy. Mr. Stirk replied that the details of the canopy still need to be worked out, but it will run along the Bay Street façade. The Panel member asked whether the atrium space has the potential to change. Mr. Stirk replied that the atriums are market driven and it's important to keep some flexibility.

Another Panel member asked about the sustainable design strategy for the building. Mr. Stirk replied that the building will be triple glazed, and they are looking into technology that deals with solar gain. The building will also have automated blinds. The Panel member asked that given the cost of triple glazing, whether they can ensure that this feature won't be value-engineered out of the design. Mr. Stirk replied that they can ensure that the building will be triple glazed, and the team always undertakes a rigorous value engineering process.

One Panel member asked how this building's floorplate compares to the surrounding office building floorplates. Mr. Stirk replied that this building is comparable to the TD tower on Bay Street.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the ground floor plan at the south east corner. Mr. Stirk noted that the landscape is intended to reference the past and the position that the 60 Harbour Street building once had on the waterfront. This public realm is intended to be one large all-encompassing surface that runs internally and externally.

One Panel member asked whether they are using bird friendly glass. Mr. Stirk replied yes, that it is required by the City of Toronto.

Another Panel member asked whether any sun/shadow studies have been undertaken. Mr. Stirk replied that they have not done this study yet, but they plan to. The Panel member asked whether the goal of the public realm is to blur the indoor and outdoor interface. Mr. Stirk replied yes that they have played around with the seasonal

activity and the possibility of having pivoting screens to make the ground floor engaging.

One Panel member asked whether the design team has had success using photovoltaic glass. Mr. Stirk replied that they used photovoltaic glass at an Airport in Geneva.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that this project begins with a feat of engineering to save the heritage building which is a very symbolic thing for Torontonians to see and experience. The Panel member noted that the 20-meter-high podium space needs to make people pause on the outside and feel invited in and out. The Panel member also felt that the animation at-grade needs to be expressed more strongly and ways of blurring the inside-outside boundary explored.

Another Panel member was appreciative that the ground level circulation and PATH takes advantage and celebrates the 60 Harbour Street building. The Panel member felt that people's natural desire lines will likely go on a diagonal and felt that planning the PATH route should respect the natural route that people will take. The Panel member was very supportive of the strength and design of the architecture. The Panel member felt that the columns needed more integration with the rest of the building façade. The Panel member also felt that the volume that sits above the lobby space is unnecessary and should be revisited.

One Panel member felt that the podium piece above the lobby works well as a counterbalance to the 60 Harbour Street building and as a shield from the Gardiner Expressway to the north. The Panel member was supportive of the winter garden and views from the top of the building but suggested that this space be accessible to the public. The Panel member was appreciative of the level of study that went into the PATH connection and the relationship to grade. The Panel member felt that this building adds a super-graphic quality to the city skyline from lake.

Another Panel member felt that there is a lot of paving expanse that doesn't have a lot going on. The Panel member felt that seasonal programming is a great idea with retail that can activate the lobby. The Panel member felt that walking along Bay Street should feel more inviting and welcoming.

One Panel member was appreciative of the rationale behind the structural design of the building. The Panel member felt the building design was simple and straightforward, however they were not engaged by it. The Panel member also felt that the soffit material is critical to the public realm and areas to be considered carefully.

Another Panel member felt that this building was very refreshing. The Panel member did feel that the lobby space could use more animation and retail activation.

One Panel member noted that Toronto's public realm is not successful yet. The Panel member felt that there is an opportunity to knit a more satisfying experience from the street into the building.

Another Panel member noted that diverse types of buildings are needed in the city. The Panel member was excited about the use of colour on the elevators. The Panel member felt that the use of water in the public realm was too timid and suggested reinforcing the shoreline reference further.

One Panel member asked the Proponents to expand the site context to show a wider radius. The Panel member was also appreciative of the PATH being simple and straightforward. The Panel member suggested that the team come up with a solution to ensure that the water feature does not get covered in plywood during the winter season.

Mr. Glaisek asked if the Panel felt that the water feature creates a barrier between the public realm and the building. Some Panel members suggested thinking of a less traditional way to think about a corporate lobby.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel appreciated the level of sophistication and thought that went into the development of the design
- Supportive of the heritage approach. The relationship and integration of the heritage building is handled very well.
- Push the elegant simplicity of the proposal by making the fundamental pieces clear, legible, and strong.
- The public realm needs to acknowledge the importance of Bay Street as a major pedestrian gateway to the waterfront.
- The water element is not convincing as a public engagement component in its current condition. Consider Harbour Street as an active frontage to the lobby.
- The podium generated different responses in terms of its relationship to the heritage building. Consider a singular expression of the podium instead of the stacked volumes approach.
- Ensure the sustainability strategy is robust and will carry through the value engineering, particularly the triple-glazed curtain wall and automated blinds.
- The ground floor space should participate more in the activation of Bay Street, through things such as a more porous façade and more interior programming.
- Supportive of the simple and straightforward termination of the PATH at the heritage building.
- Extend the site context analysis to include a wider radius for future reviews.
- Develop the streetscape in context with the existing adjacent infrastructure
- Establish a finer grained secondary scale of articulation in the public realm

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 with the conditions of

support being, resolving the public realm, the relationship of the podium to the lobby and the expression of the building relative to the structural design.

2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Parks and River Valley

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MVVA

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: two

Presenter(s): Herb Sweeney, MVVA, Emily Mueller De Celis, MVVA

Delegation: Neil Budzinski, MVVA

ID#: 1090

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Director of Parks and Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is a massive infrastructural project that will flood protect part of the downtown. Ms. Baker explained that there will be three separate presentations today, including the Parks and River Valley Design, Roads and Municipal Infrastructure, and Bridges. Ms. Baker raised a number of areas for Panel consideration starting with the Parks and River, including the appropriate mix of space devoted to park programming for passive and active recreation as related to space allocated for high functioning ecological habitat, feedback on the experiential qualities of Promontory Park, and the appropriateness of methods of commemoration for MT35. For the roads presentation Ms. Baker noted that they are looking for feedback on the developing character of the roads, the appropriateness of the proposed overall network as related to all modes, and assessment of the connectivity to the public realm and river. Ms. Baker explained that the bridges team is looking for feedback on the design development of the bridge for the “city of the future”, assessment of the connectivity to the public realm and the river afforded by the bridges, the assessment of the character of the bridges as a family, the assessment of the bridge typology as related to the ability to create gateways into the Port Lands and to provide landmarks within the wider landscape. Ms. Baker then introduced Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, and Emily Mueller De Celis, Associate Principal with MVVA, to present the Parks and River Valley Design.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began by noting that lots of feedback has been received since the last DRP meeting, one of the main messages being the role of the river in establishing the identity of the park. Mr. Sweeney noted that since the last meeting, the team has been looking at the river sinuosity and reconsidered the valley frame. Mr. Sweeney noted that previous park programming eroded the valley frame. Mr. Sweeney added the valley frame pulls the design together and makes it feel like a much larger park. Ms. Mueller De Celis explained that the team has been studying the various kinds of programming that can be embedded within the park. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted that they have choreographed a circulation network that plugs back into the urban roads

system, adding that there are moments where the path is more separated, ultimately developing a “park for people”. Mr. Sweeney explained that there is a balance of managing the sediment and regulatory requirements while also providing recreational uses and making it a maintainable landscape. Mr. Sweeney added that connectivity is a challenge through the sediment management area with the confluence of trains, vehicles, barges and trails. Mr. Sweeney then walked the Panel through Villiers Park, the Don Greenway, River Valley Park, and Promontory Park North and South, outlining each of the park’s distinct characteristics.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if vehicle drop-off areas will be provided to serve the multiple kayak launches. Mr. Sweeney replied that they have provided vehicle access where possible.

Another Panel member asked what the grade change is within the park. Ms. Mueller De Celis replied that top of bank is 78 and the north east portion of the park 80. The Panel member also asked whether the streets and the park are coplanar. Mr. Sweeney replied yes, that the big grade change is within the park.

One Panel member asked whether there is a larger vision about the integration of the streets and bridges from MVVA. Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, replied that MVVA plays the role as integrator and they also frame out the strategy for the roads.

Another Panel member asked whether the carp gates are exclusionary to just carp or if this also includes salmon. Mr. Sweeney replied that they are unsure about the salmon. The Panel member noted that the salmon run is a popular community event upstream, so this would be an idea to investigate.

One Panel member asked what the passive lawn capacity is for Promontory Park. Ms. Mueller De Celis replied that they did scale comparisons to Brooklyn Bridge Park and the capacity is approximately 1,200 people.

Another Panel member asked why the multi-use path system looks choppy and not continuous. Ms. Mueller De Celis replied that its mostly a shared multi-use trail and only at moments changes to separated paths.

One Panel member asked what precautions are being taken for the areas of contaminated soil. Mr. Sweeney replied that barrier strategies are being determined by the environmental consultant. The Panel member also asked about stormwater management in the urban areas of Villiers Island. Ms. Mueller De Celis replied that there are technical and policy challenges to bringing stormwater from the roads into the park. Ms. Mueller De Celis added that there is a hybrid option that takes water off the right-of-way and into the park. The Panel member also asked about the multi-use path and what safety precautions they are taking to prevent accidents between cyclists

and pedestrians. Ms. Mueller De Celis replied that they are having discussions about safety and how to address all the conditions on site to minimize conflicts.

Another Panel member asked who will be running the park once it's complete. Ms. Mallozzi replied that it is still a work in progress, but TRCA has the expertise to take care of the park below top of bank and the City's Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department would take care of the area above top of bank.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that they were pleased to see the degree of simplification of the spatial order since the last review. The Panel member questioned whether the additional two pedestrian bridges crossing the river and the Keating Channel are necessary. The Panel member was also concerned about the degree of informality of the program of young school children at play in proximity to the Keating Channel. The Panel member also suggested eliminating the possibility of boats entering the naturalized greenway.

Another Panel member was supportive of the overall design. The Panel member felt that the Promontory Park south feels too introverted when you're at the climax of the city. The Panel member liked the underpass under the land bridge but felt that the south side is going in the opposite direction of the team's intention. The Panel member was also disappointed to see the MT35 structure taken away.

One Panel member liked the redesign of Promontory Park, however there was concern about the sledding hill that would empty into the lake. The Panel member was also concerned about the multi-use trails leading to conflicts with all of the users and asked the team to reconsider shared pathways.

Another Panel member was appreciative of this complex and sophisticated project. The Panel member felt that seeing a video of the model would be helpful. The Panel member liked the wildness and messiness of the park. The Panel member also felt that there should be more celebration of the sediment and debris management area with the interesting operations happening in that area.

One Panel member thanked the team for the coherent presentation. The Panel member noted that this project will now be part of a greater system with the announcement of the Meadoway project. People will soon be able to walk from the Port Lands all the way to the Rouge River. The Panel member also felt that it would be useful to get the Chief Resilience Officer engaged to think about the regional scale of high performance urban green infrastructure.

Another Panel member suggested thinking about integrating agriculture and food into the plan as this is something the public will be interested in. The Panel member also noted that there are three types of cyclists that will want to enjoy the waterfront trails, including leisurely cyclists, commuters, and higher speed cyclists.

One Panel felt that its critical to design the land bridge well as it has the potential to become a dark unwelcome space that creates more of a barrier to the lake.

Another Panel member appreciated that the presentation was both at a macro and micro scale. The Panel member felt that there was an interesting juxtaposition with the heritage elements. The Panel member felt that the bike trail pinch points are a problem and suggested the Panel reconsider the number of paths. The Panel member felt that integrating the industrial heritage of the city into the park is an important element.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The multi-use recreation trail's location in the park space will likely create conflict between users. Further consideration is needed on whether the trail should be shared multi-modal or not.
- There needs to be a good balance between the constructed nature of the park and the landscape. Reconsider the number of paths proposed near the greatest habitat areas.
- Integrating the industrial heritage and city into the park is important and this piece has been lost too much. Work with Waterfront Toronto to reconsider how MT35 will be expressed.

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. Six of the Panel members voted Full Support and four Panel members voted Conditional Support.

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure

Project Type: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: WSP and DTAH

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: two

Presenter(s): James Roche, DTAH, Gullivar Shepard, MVVA,

Delegation: Aaron Small, WSP

ID#: 1095

3.1 Project Presentation

Gullivar Shepard, Principal with MVVA, walked through the four strategies for design advancement, including reconnecting the Port Lands to Toronto's regional road and bike network, programming opportunities for innovation, sustainability, and resilience strategies, clarifying the identity of the Villiers Island public realm plan, and developing a site-specific character for each major thoroughfare. The Martin Goodman Trail will follow the water from Queens Quay down to Cherry Street and Lake Ontario Park, then up Leslie Street. Mr. Shepard explained that adaptive technology includes the road infrastructure featuring a joint use trench (JUT) with fibre/copper and other road design considerations the allow for autonomous urbanism. Mr. Shepard then introduced

James Roche, Principal with DTAH, to speak to the street character. Mr. Roche began by noting that there are three organizing characteristics of the streets, including Cherry Street as the urban street, Commissioners Street as the Park Street and the Don Roadway as the river street. Mr. Roche walked the Panel through the proposed site-specific characteristics of the three major thoroughfares.

3.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there are two Hydro One towers on Commissioners Street. Mr. Roche replied that there are two towers, but they don't impact Commissioners Street on Villiers Island. The Panel member also asked the team to elaborate on the difference between Cherry Street north and Cherry Street south. Mr. Roche replied that cost was one factor, but the planting beds are the decisive factor.

Another Panel member asked why the bike path on Commissioners Street peels away to avoid the intersection with the Don Roadway. Mr. Roche replied that this is something they are still working through with the City of Toronto.

One Panel member asked what the approach to materiality of the paving and the different combinations of tree species. Mr. Roche replied that they are looking into exposed concrete and asphalt for some locations, but they are still developing the palette. Mr. Roche added that they are looking to mix species and bring the park wildness up into the street.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the team's proposed approach to street design for the smart city. Mr. Shepard replied that clarity of separation of the modes will be important for smart city transportation.

One Panel member noted that the scale of the streets are quite large and asked the team what their landscape idea is for the roads that are so wide. Ms. Mallozzi responded that the road widths are established by the Environmental Assessment. Ms. Mallozzi added that the team is ensuring that a large portion of the street width is dedicated to public realm.

3.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the team for the great work but felt that there were missed opportunities to create not just a tweaked version of what we have now, but a different vision for what the street system will be like.

Another Panel member felt that the storm water management approach could be improved. The Panel member also felt that the internal streets in Villiers could be much smaller and could be one-way, laneways or woonerf type streets.

One Panel member noted that not providing parking on the main streets is great. The Panel member was also excited to see the adaptive local road network. The Panel

member felt that the park should look like its spilling onto the street and suggested making the plantings more irregular.

Another Panel member felt that the street is unnecessarily large and should be rethought. The Panel member noted the opportunity to use a portion of the land for development opportunities.

One Panel member agreed that the street is quite wide, but felt that distributing the elements differently, such as treating the bike lane as part of the landscape would be an improvement.

Another Panel member noted that the team is working from street standards that have already been set, and they have done a good job compensating for the width by providing a generous landscape treatment.

3.4 Consensus Comments

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

- Think about the opportunity to economize with the streets by minimizing some of the plantings to integrate larger development parcels, give more space to the park or just make the street easier to cross.
- Ensure that the plan is forward thinking in terms of where the traffic will naturally go and where car parking will be accommodated during the transition phases.
- Ensure pedestrians are brought forward with as much thought as vehicles and cyclists.

3.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of full Support, Conditional Support or Non-Support for the project. Six of the Panel members voted Conditional Support One Panel member voted Non-Support.

4.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges

Project Type: Bridges and Structures

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Entuitive with Grimshaw and SBP

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: two

Presenter(s): Juan Porral, Grimshaw, Michael Meschino, Entuitive, David Dennis, Grimshaw

ID#: 1097

4.1 Project Presentation

David Dennis, Associate Principal with Grimshaw, introduced the project by noting that the last time, the team presented the industrial bridge and the landscape bridge. Mr. Dennis noted that today they would be presenting a new concept which is a bridge for the “city of the future”. Mr. Dennis explained that through conversations with

Waterfront Toronto, the feedback received was the designs should be more of a celebration of technology and the future. Mr. Dennis explained that the bridge will have a 2-3-inch-thick steel shell with patterned perforations. Mr. Dennis noted that each bridge could have a different expression through perforation patterns. Mr. Dennis explained that lighting strategy could be a way to create more meaningful engagement with the users by becoming a canvas for art to help reinforce the culture of the city itself.

4.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the plate steel is welded together and perforated or if it covers an inner structure. Mr. Porral replied that it is solid steel and the roadbed is held up by conventional W section decks.

Another Panel member asked whether a person in a car or on a bike has the ability to see over the crossing. Mr. Porral explained that they can make adjustments to ensure that drivers can see over the crossing. The Panel member also asked whether they have decided on a colour yet. Mr. Dennis replied that this is still up for discussion.

One Panel member asked whether there is a requirement from traffic engineers to not have drivers distracted by the views at bridge crossings. Mr. Porral explained that they have the ability to shape the plate in a way that enables views or blocks them.

4.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the last time the team presented the design, they showed industrial and landscape options. The Panel member liked the look of Cherry North but felt that Cherry South and Commissioners should be more landscape type bridges. The Panel member also felt that the perforations should better reflect the structural loads. The Panel member was overall very impressed with the idea of the bridges.

Another Panel member felt that the structural idea was very interesting and liked the family of bridges. The Panel member did, however, struggle with the overall look of the bridges while admitting they could not fully articulate why.

One Panel member was worried about what the bridge will look like once light poles, LRT poles, and other fixtures are introduced. They expressed concern these could diminish the purity of the design and urged the team to show those elements

Another Panel member felt that the pattern on the bridges should be more timeless.

One Panel member noted that the colour of the bridges will be an important factor. The Panel member suggested bringing asymmetry into the design, possibly by “shifting” the pairs.

4.4 Consensus Comments

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

- Appreciate the form, thinness and advancement of the design since the last review.
- Focus on bringing rigour to the patterning, views, and experience of the landscape and river.
- There was concern over the bridges feeling more closed than open.
- The colour is an important element. Bring colour options to the next review.
- Consider how light poles and overhead streetcar wires will affect the appearance of the bridges.
- Think about incorporating asymmetry into the design.

4.5 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 of the project