



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #120
Wednesday, February 20th, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Eric Turcotte
Janna Levitt
Brigitte Shim

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto

Regrets

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Peter Busby
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. 162 Queens Quay East- Issues Identification
 2. DRP Seminar: Toronto Green Standards v3
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Jan. 23rd, 2019 meeting. One member suggested to add the following to the consensus comments for Quayside: Sustainability: 1) it is important to make the technical information less esoteric to non-experts and 2) the Panel encourages the team to articulate clearly both blue and green ecological infrastructure strategies. The minutes were adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. The Members declared no conflicts for the meeting today.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the **Rees Street Park** will return to the DRP when funding for the project has been resolved. Mr. Glaisek provided an update that **Port Lands Flood Protection (PLFP)** has broken ground for early excavation near the river portion of the project. The project is returning for Stage 3 Detailed Design reviews: **PLFP Parks** is aiming for March or April, while **PLFP Roads and Bridges** are both anticipating being on the April DRP agenda this year. Mr. Glaisek noted that the **Gardiner Public Realm (GPR)** will prepare a report to council in May or June to confirm funding for public realm improvements to follow Gardner rehab and reconstruction, the project is aiming to return to DRP for Stage 3 Detailed Design review in March this year.

Update on last month's projects:

After last month's review, Mr. Glaisek noted that **West Don Lands Block 8** felt the review was positive, will work out the issues of Tank House Lane alignment and bridges with the City, and is expected to return to the DRP in either April or May. Mr. Glaisek reinforced the point made by many of the Panel members that the review last month for **Quayside: Sustainability** was positive and is expected to return in the spring. One member asked if Quayside has provided any feedback on the Parliament Slip. Mr. Glaisek answered that the team has suggested multiple alternatives and will continue to work on more options.

Update on recent Sidewalk Labs news:

Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto has a clear evaluation framework for the Quayside project and the recent news on Sidewalk Labs does not impact the established evaluation process of the Master Innovation Development Plan (MIDP). Mr. Glaisek then introduced Andrew Tumilty, Media Relations and Issues Advisor from Waterfront Toronto, to address the recent news. Mr. Tumilty explained that Waterfront Toronto released a statement on Friday Feb. 15th, 2019 addressing the media that the leaked information in the news article was based on an internal document between Sidewalk Labs and their parent company, Alphabet. This information does not change Waterfront Toronto's approach for the project and will wait for the full submission of the MIDP. Mr. Tumilty clarified that Waterfront Toronto has received media questions, but the focus has primarily been on Sidewalk Labs. Mr. Glaisek concluded the update by asking the Panel members to reach out to Mr. Tumilty should they be contacted by the media to comment on this issue.

Update on Ontario Place Revitalization:

One Panel member, Mr. Baird, participated in the recent Ontario Place revitalization discussion at the Harbourfront Centre and noted it was a packed room discussion with strong arguments. Strong positions were taken on the landscape of the site and that Ontario Place should be developed in conjunction with Exhibition Place. Mr. Parakh added that the cultural landscape assessment commissioned by the City is near completion and will inform the master plan of the revitalization.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair concluded the General Business segment by noting that the Panel will watch the Ontario Place project closely.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 162 Queens Quay East

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <i>Project ID #:</i> | 1104 |
| <i>Project Type:</i> | Building |
| <i>Review Stage:</i> | Issues Identification |
| <i>Review Round:</i> | One |
| <i>Location:</i> | Lower Yonge |
| <i>Proponent:</i> | 162 Queens Quay GP Inc. |
| <i>Architect/ Designer:</i> | Kirkor Architects, Alexander Budrevics + Associates |
| <i>Presenter(s):</i> | David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects; Ashley Turney, Alexander Budrevics + Associates Landscape Architects; Carleigh Oude-Reimerink, Armstrong Planning & Project Management |
| <i>Delegation:</i> | Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto |

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the site is located at the corner of Richardson Street and Queens Quay East, generally referred to as the FedEx lands, including East FedEx North (215 Lake Shore Blvd) and East FedEx South (178-180 Queens Quay East. Across from Richardson Street on the west side is Daniels Waterfront development, south of Queens Quay East is George Brown campus and the future site of Waterfront Innovation Centre that has recently commenced excavation. Mr. Hilburt noted that the project is in the East Bayfront Precinct Plan, a prominent waterfront district for working and living close to the water's edge promenade and other public activities- design excellence of public and private buildings, infrastructure, parks and public spaces will be promoted. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Paul Mule, Senior Planner, Community Planning from City of Toronto to highlight key City planning issues.

Mr. Mule explained that the project has commenced pre-application of Site Plan Approval on a site that has had multiple development appeals and subsequent Minutes of Settlement in 2014. The massing and envelope scale of the project has been set over 10 years ago, including GFA and height limit. Mr. Mule noted that since the settlement, two items have impacted the density and height: 1) an east-west public road as part of the FedEx block settlement impacts the north façade and setback of the property 2) the original settlement did not contemplate the conveyance required for the Queens Quay East streetscape. Mr. Mule noted that the proponent team addressed these issues with a revised scheme that reduces density to 28,7000m² GFA, and raises the building to 68.5m with a 20m podium. The City is happy with the new height which is still under review. Mr. Mule noted that the affordable housing requirement will be met by either cash-in-lieu or off-site due to the small size of the property.

Mr. Mule highlighted the City's planning issues, including integration of small project site into the larger FedEx public realm ground plane, interface between the building and the new small east-west street, identity of the new street with addresses in

addition to loading and services, and public amenity at grade. Mr. Mule then concluded with Waterfront Toronto's areas for Panel consideration, including whether the team has adequately addressed the objectives of the East Bayfront Precinct Plan, does the massing and program distribution support Waterfront Toronto's vision for design excellence, does the proposed public realm strategy align with the established Queens Quay Blvd design, is the proposed streetscape and ground floor design of Richardson Street adequate and does the project meet or exceed the target sustainability objectives. Mr. Mule then introduced David Butterworth, Partner at Kirkor Architects to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Butterworth began the presentation by noting that the design team began with investigative work studying the site, pre-approved zoning and reviewing both present and future context. The project site is connected to adjacent districts and is an integral part of the Waterfront ecosystem. Although the project is relatively small and can only provide minimal open space on site, many cultural and community destinations are within walkable distance including the Corus building, George Brown Waterfront campus, the Waterfront Innovation Centre, Sherborne Common, Tridel and Hines' Bayside development, Quayside, other taller buildings, and historic context. Mr. Butterworth noted that the building fits within the height context allowing the adjacent Queens Quay East towers to take dominance is an important concern for the team. Mr. Butterworth noted that the noise from the Redpath Sugar Factory is an important site constraint for the team when designing outdoor spaces in the project.

Site strategy:

When the project began, Mr. Butterworth explained that the original zoning from Wallman Architects showed setbacks where the building lined up with the adjacent buildings on Queens Quay East. Both the front and rear setback lines have been revised and pulled back. The primary concern for the team has been to bring light into the center of the podium block and adjust the original zoning massing to accommodate for double loaded corridor and units. The result is an increased depth on the south wing. Mr. Butterworth explained that the Richardson façade of the building embraces the zoning setbacks and is further articulated to be more sculptural- the GFA was intentionally lowered by the developer in the revision while both height and setbacks for the building increased.

Public realm design:

Mr. Butterworth noted that the streetscape design on Queens Quay East (QQE) will begin with the 2m setback on the interim and develop into the full established streetscape pattern, it is planned to generate enough depth and adequacy for vibrant retail and help reinforce the public realm continuity of QQE. Mr. Butterworth pointed to sectional drawings of the public realm showing both interim and future streetscape conditions. Mr. Butterworth also noted various design strategies for the Richardson Street and façade: the team will match and mirror the streetscape on the Daniels side, step the building back at grade at the corner, maintain the line of the eleventh floor lower than the adjacent building, create a 5.2m high retail frontage as outlined in the OMB settlement, and fit both retail and generous amenity programs in the podium.

Referencing the shadow studies, Mr. Butterworth noted the roof is a green roof and native plants will be specified on all amenity levels. Floors eleven and twelve are also amenities. Mr. Butterworth explained the program distribution of the ground floor, noting it is important to extend the retail as much as possible and include bike parking at the corner of Richardard Street to engage the future public realm.

Ms. Turney noted the building corner at grade is chamfered, planters line the streetscape in the interim and trees will be brought in for the full future streetscape build-out. On the roof of the 2nd amenity floor, the green space will be planted with trees and only accessed by units facing the courtyard. Although the program of the green amenity spaces will continue to develop, the strategy is to form a series of green layers, including a private dog run, that can extend the vernacular language down into the street toward the waterfront.

Building design:

Mr. Butterworth noted that the building has a strong base expression with retail canopy to define the public realm, and amenity on the second floor, while the upper volumes are articulated with various tones of a consistent material palette to create a rippling motif. Units will be mixed throughout the building with many family sized suites- the unit plans are currently being developed.

Sustainability and innovation:

Mr. Butterworth provided key aspects of the sustainability strategy: soft planting on outdoor areas to mitigate green island effect, fifty percent window to wall ratio to reduce energy capacity of the building, stormwater retention and reuse, low-flow fixtures, tap into Enwave district energy, and bicycle parking at grade. Mr. Butterworth explained bird friendliness is important as the building sits directly along the water's edge flight path, with smaller birds on lower levels and larger birds on top- in addition to bird-friendly frit the team is interested in stepping glass volumes back to help.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the issue of Redpath Factory and if it impacts the design of the building. Ms. Oude-Reimerink answered that the Redpath building is part of the noise study of the area and mitigating measures must be provided for noise and odor coming from Redpath. Based on that, the southwest corner of the building was adjusted, balcony depths and other outdoor spaces on the lower floors have been limited to 1.8m. However, roof amenity is not affected.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the zoning setback, realignment of the street on the north side and the design of the new street. Mr. Butterworth responded that both sides of the rear street would have to be completed at the same time to complete the road.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the stormwater management on site and the location of the retention area. Mr. Butterworth answered that the retention tank is located on P1 level, the team is developing a strategy to reuse to irrigate green roofs, the building meets the target of 60% roof stormwater coverage to satisfy the TGS, and is working with civil on stormwater reuse and retention.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the adjacent property on the east and its relationship with the project. Mr. Mule answered that the plan of subdivision has been submitted and lower Sherbourne Street will be straightened. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the block's access and circulation strategy in relation to adjacent blocks. Mr. Mule answered that the new street is meant to be a local, public street with services and residents.

One Panel asked if the other towers on the FedEx lands will have addresses along the new road. Mr. Mule confirmed this is likely to happen. Mr. Butterworth explained that the new building will try to limit access and service areas on the north elevation.

Another Panel member ask for clarification on the City's position on the side street stepping plane because the building density on Richardson Street feels high. Mr. Mule answered the intention for this site is to provide mid-rise buildings with a stepped back tower on top.

One Panel member asked for clarification on material palette. Mr. Butterworth explained that the intention is to reflect the sleekness of water, create a mirroring effect on the building exterior, and employ materials that will have longevity. The team is currently studying composite, metal panel and precast cladding, more detail will be presented at the next review.

Another Panel member asked if proponent is also the architect for the adjacent properties, clarification on the reason for adhering to the OMB settlement, and if the project aims to provide affordable housing on site. Mr. Butterworth confirmed that they are not the architect for the adjacent sites, the team is providing an alternative scheme to the City to avoid re-opening up the OMB settlement, and although the affordability requirement can be provided either offsite or cash-in-lieu, the project plans to provide cash-in-lieu. The Panel member also asked if the balconies are thermally broken. Mr. Butterworth answered that they are planned to be thermally broken and most balconies are inset to reduce thermal bridging. The Panel member asked if there are trees planted on the roof of the 2nd floor amenity space. Mr. Butterworth confirmed that is it planted with trees and would like to introduce skylights to bring natural light into the space.

One Panel member asked if the green roof is accessible and part of amenity program. Mr. Butterworth answered that it is not accessible.

Another Panel member commented that it is difficult to understand the extent of glazed surfaces on the retail level and asked for the bird friendly glazing strategy for the project. Mr. Butterworth answered that bird friendly glazing must be provided up to 12m above canopy of the tallest tree.

One Panel member asked for the affordable versus market unit distribution of the building. Mr. Butterworth answered the split is almost fifty-fifty, with 48% two and three-bedroom units in the project. Another Panel member asked for clarification on the retail condition of the ground floor. Mr. Butterworth answered that currently the retail space is single tenant but is planned for the eventuality of four individual units.

One Panel member asked if it would be possible to provide more windows to the east-end units, such as pulling the northeast corner back. Mr. Butterworth replied that the opportunity would be decided by the developer. Another Panel member asked if a Loblaws will occupy the retail. Mr. Butterworth explained that currently they are getting early responses from smaller boutique supermarkets.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that the quality of the outdoor amenity space is a concern, particularly on the health of the plants and trees due to the party wall condition on the east. This Panel member felt it is important to study natural light in relation to the outdoor landscape design, especially if they will be accessed and used by families. The Panel member also noted concern for the lack of retail and animation on the northwest corner and the new street on the north; cautioned that this might become a precedent for other developments along the street.

While another Panel member appreciated the project's response to the challenging site and landscape constraints, the member shared concern for the quality of the outdoor amenity spaces and encouraged the team to do more and try to extend landscaping to other places: develop the winter experience for amenity spaces, link bird friendly strategy to pollinating species on the lower floors, more thoughtful development for the ground level planters, and look for opportunities to integrate ecological aspects of landscape to Waterfront Toronto's mandate.

One Panel member felt that the presentation was very clear and helpful for understanding the project and the zoning differences. The Panel member noted that it is important to consider materiality in relation to context such as the brick exterior at Daniels, the new Waterfront Innovation Centre, and either echo or enhance the streetscape of Queens Quay East. The unit mix is appreciated; consider the narrative of the families thriving in the development.

Another Panel member commended the thoughtfulness of the presentation, noting the before, interim and future conditions of the street including building massing is very helpful for understanding the public realm at this stage of review. Not providing affordable housing on site is a disappointment. The Panel member was curious to see stronger consideration for reducing thermal bridging, a material palette concept, and the development of the 3rd floor courtyard. Noting the building has no backside, the Panel member questioned the building's position on anchoring the new street and if the street design can carefully resolve City issues like lighting. The Panel member noted that the corner condition is a concern: the split overhangs and planters should

be reconsidered and integrated- planters should signal a more welcoming dimension for the public realm. The Panel member also suggested that the amenity space on the 2nd floor have a different exterior expression from the podium and change the dynamics of the lower floors onto Queens Quay East.

One Panel member encouraged the team to take a position on the roof spaces and select a clear amenity strategy that will work with the proposed trees that need a lot of light. The Panel member suggested the retail area on the ground floor can extend to the east face of the building to animate the future adjacent mews and anchor the public realm to fit within the bigger context of Queens Quay. The Panel member suggested to consider a clear public realm strategy that celebrates the corners of the site as access points. The Panel member also suggested to demarcate public access and reinforce safety on the sidewalks. Lastly, the Panel member commented that a black material is not the best choice for the building due to narrow width of Richardson Street and should consider a material that reflects light and creates a positive mood.

Another Panel member re-iterated the importance of understanding and developing the nature of the new street: consider how the new street will impact façade design and location of frontage at grade. The Panel member pointed out tree location conflict on ground floor plan and that better coordination with the City and adjacent developments will make the north side less isolated. Observing the limited retail and building amenity areas on the ground floor, the Panel member suggested consolidating parking, loading and perhaps shifting bicycle parking to lower floors. The Panel member echoed previous comments on stronger corner treatments, and that the planters are foreign to the Queens Quay East streetscape.

One Panel member suggested to place as much of the parking, loading and bicycle storage in the basement, and expand retail to two-thirds of the site. The project is meeting sustainability standards at a minimum and should be targeting tier 2 TGS; while there is empathy on the challenges of developing a sustainable condo project, the Panel member noted the project will be obsolete as soon as it opens. The Panel member noted the EUI target is underwhelming, the wall envelope can be improved, setback the balcony with knife-edge to save cost, consider simpler solutions to do a thermally broken balcony, and envelop and air tightness can be improved as well. Lastly, the Panel member asked the team to consider aspects of resilience like a centre of refuge in the amenity for extended power outages, and identify sustainability consultant at next the review.

Another Panel member suggested to study precedents with similar cladding concept in Toronto such as B Street Condos at Bloor and Bathurst, and look for more material consistency while avoiding the monolithic, loadbearing feeling on the material palette

One Panel member commented that the team and the City must confirm the new position and character of the new street as much as possible before the project reaches the next stage of development. The current planters and canopy designs are in conflict, and the Panel member suggested to re-consider the corner condition by thinking about the relationship between the main volume and the public realm. Lastly,

the Panel member suggested to avoid the typical monochromatic palette and come up with an exterior strategy that carefully considers the setbacks and massing concept.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel appreciates the evolution and development of the design from the OMB results and challenging site constraints
- A good start; appreciates the issues that the team had to wrestle up to this stage
- Looking forward to seeing the comments captured in greater detail in the next review

Context

- Consider showing more context information of the adjacent streets in all directions, include adjacent building and public realm context

Building

- Consider exploring material treatment alternatives, develop color and material pallet concept that builds on massing, setbacks and define podium programs
- Review suggested precedents
- Consider strategy for defining the four corners of the building and take advantage of the new future Queens Quay East streetscape
- Due to the tight site constraints and size limitations, the Panel encourages the team to prioritize quality over quantity in programming and spaces

East Façade

- Clarify East façade relationship with future adjacent development, provide concept and strategy moving forward
- Consider minimize loading and service areas at grade and explore below grade opportunities to maximize functional programming

Streetscape

- Consider how the retail at grade can be improved to further reinforce retail continuity on Queens Quay.
- Reconsider the ground floor landscaping strategy: planter and canopy elements should be located to give priority to pedestrians and tie into landscape character as established by Waterfront Toronto

New Street

- Encourage the team to push and clarify the design and characteristics of the new street in collaboration with City, such as degree of publicness, treatment of street for pedestrians, loading, access and lighting
- Include more information on the new street in drawings at the next review

Families

- Appreciates the strong two- and three-bedroom unit distribution but expresses disappointment on the lack of on-site affordable housing units
- Consider the quality of amenity spaces from the perspective of families
- Consider year-round use and quality of the outdoor amenity spaces

Sustainability

- Encourages team to push the envelope of green objectives as the current targets are only marginally better than the minimum

- Explore other strategies in dealing with thermal bridging at balconies

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 DRP Seminar: TGS v3 Update

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <i>Project ID #:</i> | - |
| <i>Project Type:</i> | For information |
| <i>Review Stage:</i> | - |
| <i>Review Round:</i> | - |
| <i>Location:</i> | - |
| <i>Proponent:</i> | - |
| <i>Architect/ Designer:</i> | - |
| <i>Presenter(s):</i> | Lisa King, City of Toronto |
| <i>Delegation:</i> | Shayna Stott, City of Toronto; Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto |

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Aaron Barter, Innovation and Sustainability Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the presentation by contextualizing the Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR), part of Waterfront Toronto's standards, as it relates to the Toronto Green Standards (TGS), from its launch in 2006 to subsequent updates up to the version three in 2018. Mr. Barter noted that the MGBR is enforced on projects that have a development agreement with Waterfront Toronto through contracts that reference the requirements which is an important distinction from private projects that do not have MGBR required. For projects with a development agreement, the developing party provides a letter of credit and if the MGBR is not delivered, Waterfront Toronto can draw upon the credit as a penalty. Mr. Barter summarized the Corporate Social Responsibility report including Waterfront Toronto's green achievements to date but noted that new approaches are needed to meet the 2050 goal, plus the even higher target of climate positive. An opportunity to reconceptualize the MGBR would also allow the MGBR to fit better with the TGS by reducing contradictions in requirement structures. Through the Quayside project, Mr. Barter noted that Waterfront Toronto hopes to incorporate the findings of what it means to have a net carbon object at a building level and form the foundations of the new MGBR v3 with various thresholds of intensities.

Role of DRP:

Prior to the DRP review, Mr. Barter noted his team aims to start the conversation with proponents early to help understand the stakes, so they are well informed and prepared for the review session. Mr. Barter explained that the DRP is critical in raising questions and identifying aspects of the projects that relate to the TGS and MGBR. Mr. Barter then introduced Ms. King from the City of Toronto to present the TGS v3 update.

2.2 Project Presentation

Ms. King began by noting that the TGS is an outcome-based metric and the presentation today is aimed to empower the Panel members to use the TGS as a tool, alongside with the MGBR, in providing feedback and comments. Ms. King noted that alignment between the two frameworks is important but nonetheless temporary- however, they are objectively aligned in their mission to work together in creating the same goals for the communities.

Ms. King explained that the TGS is built around five categories that are integrated into City policies: air quality, energy/ GHG & resilience, water quality, quantity & efficiency, ecology, and solid waste. For example, tree canopy percentage follows the standard set by City council, and solid waste management ties into the policies of the Official Plan and other City standards. The framework rewards efficient developments: a portion of the development charge is refunded when the project successfully reaches a set tier in the TGS.

Ms. King noted that Tier 1's minimum required standards are mostly focused on the site, such as bird-friendliness, cycling infrastructure, tree planting, stormwater retention & quality, pedestrian infrastructure, and green roofs. Tier 2, is differentiated to be more focused on building components and enhancement of the site level requirements, such as high energy efficiency, construction waste diversion, enhanced landscaping & stormwater retention, EV parking, and renewable energy & geo-exchange. Whereas LEED covers a lot of these components, the TGS addresses the same objectives locally while typically exceeding their standards. Ms. King noted that Tier 3 reaches passive house level and Tier 4 begins to align with objectives of carbon neutral. Ms. King highlighted that once Tier 4 is reached, the capital cost of building operations decreases due to downsizing of mechanical system.

Ms. King noted opportunities for the TGS to address moving forward, including disconnect between the design vision and realities of building operation, envelop air tightness and thermal bridging, Living Building Challenge to consider building life cycle, and learning from other frameworks such as Thermal Energy Demand Intensity (TEDI) which focuses on high degrees of indoor comfort.

Looking ahead, Ms. King explained that every four years the TGS is planned to be revamped with the goal for TGS v6 Tier 1 to meet zero emissions and even carbon positive building requirements.

Ms. King highlighted the requirements in the TGS that relate the to MGBR: 1) air quality, EV for both retail and residential projects 2) energy efficiency and air tightness 3) ecology – trees and required soil volume 4) solid waste – recycled or locally sourced content for building construction and diverting demolition wastes. Finally, Ms. King noted that the TGS encourages prioritization of passive design principles.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the framework of the TGS and MGBR address sustainability at a non-building scale, such as measuring a district, neighbourhood,

quasi-zone, or an aggregation of projects – is it possible to broaden the standard that goes beyond the measure of a building? Mr. Barter answered that there are more process driven standards out there such as eco-district and LEED for communities. Another Panel member commented that none of the neighbourhood standards have taken off in Canada because they work best for campus-like communities with single owners. However, the Panel member noted that Waterfront Toronto has overall sustainability targets and the biggest challenge is the import and export of infrastructure off-site.

One Panel member asked if the Living Building Challenge and lake water cooling are mentioned in the framework- and if thermal break could be made a standard requirement. Mr. Barter noted he is unfamiliar with Living Building Challenge and wonders if it is comparable to the tier 4 of TGS.

Another Panel member asked if there is a set of priorities that should apply to every building project. Mr. Barter answered that the outcomes are different based on the development contract as well as the building district.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the ecological aspects of the TGS is still too removed and siloed- struggles to think of examples of implementable standards from other frameworks. The Panel member also felt that the landscape component is an after-thought in LEED and the TGS is an opportunity to prioritize ecology, landscape and ecological hybridized objectives: site, ecology and water could be more integrated and vice versa the building criteria can be extended out more into the open space.

Another Panel member wondered if it would be possible for the TGS to be structured to encourage more forward-looking criteria, like a roadmap, for projects that have achieved one tier but has potential for the next tier. The Panel member also questioned if retrofit projects can be better integrated into the framework of the TGS due to their sheer popularity and that many of them stop at Tier 1.

Another Panel member felt that is it very important for the TGS to reference water management.

2.5 Consensus Comments

No consensus comments were provided because the presentation was for information.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was for information.

Motion to go into “in-camera” session

CLOSING

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