



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #117  
Wednesday, November 21, 2018**

---

**Present**

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

**Regrets**

Pat Hanson

**Recording Secretaries**

Tristan Simpson  
Rei Tasaka

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

---

**WELCOME**

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

1. Port Lands Flood Protection Roads: Cherry Street – Detailed Design
  2. Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges – Detailed Design
  3. 350, 370, 390 Queens Quay – Schematic Design
  4. 101 Commissioners Street (Pinewood Studios) – Issues Identification
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel member to adopt the minutes from the October 24, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

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

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act requires that every five years the Corporation develops a

Strategic Business Plan. The plan reflects the organization's legislated mandate to transform 800 hectares of underutilized former industrial land into beautiful, sustainable, mixed use communities and dynamic public spaces that are accessible to all Torontonians. Mr. Glaisek noted that the 5-year Strategic Business Plan is going to the Board of Directors meeting on December 6<sup>th</sup> for approval. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Bentway Phase 2 Bridge RFP was released in early November. The signature bridge will provide accessible and continuous pedestrian connections across Fort York Boulevard and will be suspended by a cable system from the existing Gardiner columns.

Mr. Glaisek provide an update on the Quayside project which was reviewed at the October 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Glaisek explained that the project will be returning to DRP on December 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Glaisek added that the roundtable 4 meeting will be held on December 8<sup>th</sup> and will focus on the draft Site Plan Proposal.

The Chair reminded the Panel that a joint session with the City's Design Review Panel will be held on November 22<sup>nd</sup> to review the East Harbour project.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Port Lands Flood Protection Roads: Cherry Street**

*Project Type:* Roads and Municipal Infrastructure

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* WSP with DTAH

*Review Stage:* Detailed Design

*Review Round:* Four

*Presenter(s):* James Roche, DTAH

*Delegation:* Aaron Small, WSP; See-Yin Lim, DTAH

*ID#:* 1095

#### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Shannon Baker, Director of Parks and Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, introduced both the Port Lands Flood Protection bridges and Cherry Street projects. Ms. Baker provided a recap of Panel comments on the roads project from the September meeting, including the roads needing a stronger identity, recapturing the industrial heritage, adequate separation between pedestrian and cyclists, and a straightforward configuration of the left-hand turn lane on Commissioners Street. Ms. Baker also provided a recap on the bridges project from July, including further refinement of the balustrades, address safety concerns regarding climbing, the design of the fins requires further thinking, ensure there are adequate ways of getting down to the river from the bridge level, further detail is needed on how the landscape relates to the bridges, and refine the piers and treatment of the underside of the bridge. Ms. Baker raised areas for Panel consideration on the bridges, including the revised balustrade design, the revised lighting strategy, the proposed colour options and the underside of the bridges. Ms. Baker also raised areas for Panel consideration for the

Cherry Street design, including consideration of the design team's effort to make visible the management of water within the streetscape, clarification of the planting scheme and what it seeks to achieve, and strengthening of the individual identity of Cherry Street through materials and plant palette. Ms. Baker then introduced James Roche, Partner with DTAH, to give the presentation.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Roche began by walking through the team's response to the Panel's comments from the last meeting. Mr. Roche noted that Cherry Street's identity is the gateway into the Port Lands offering a sequence of "urban rooms" with a design that integrates social spaces within ecologically responsible stormwater management. Mr. Roche noted that the material palette consists of cast-in-place concrete, concrete unit pavers, and Caledonia granite. The planting palette has been augmented to ensure that the trees are salt tolerant. Mr. Roche explained that they will be out to tender for construction in early 2019.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked given that the planted medians are still subject to review by City of Toronto technical staff, if there are any other components subject to approval. Mr. Roche replied that the proposed paving surface in the LRT zone for this package will be asphalt for the interim BRT, but for the future conditions they will have to circle back with the City to approve materiality.

Another Panel member asked if the transit corridor will be asphalt as an interim condition until the LRT comes. Mr. Roche replied yes.

One Panel member asked how wide the median is. Mr. Roche replied that it ranges from 2.1 – 4.5 meters. The Panel member also asked if they have the ability to decide the location of water mains given that it will be all new infrastructure. Mr. Roche replied that their assumption is that no utilities are within the planting zone right now.

Another Panel member asked why on the west side of Cherry Street the public seating is located in the cuts for the crosswalk and not the more social edge. Mr. Roche replied that they are still looking into optimal locations for seating and where the urban rooms will be located.

One Panel member asked whether they plan to raise the trees due to a tree viability issue. Mr. Roche replied that the planters are raised to reduce the amount of salt spray. The Panel member asked if they have a stormwater retention target. Aaron Small, Land Development Manager with WSP, replied that the stormwater retention target meets the City's requirements.

Another Panel member asked if any study has been done on the sun and shadow given that there is no development yet. Mr. Roche replied that they have selected a very resilient plant palette that can thrive in harsh conditions. Mr. Roche added that there

are lots of challenges predicting what the street conditions will be like once everything is built out.

One Panel member asked whether they have used a similar design before that deals with rainwater retention. Mr. Small replied that they designed a similar detail that has been approved by the City but has not been implemented yet. The Panel member also noted that the gradient slopes at the lowest point and asked if they considered using seasonal materials to help flushing the salt. Mr. Roche replied that they are still fine-tuning the planting, so this is something they can look into.

Another Panel member asked why the lane widths vary through all of the cross-sections. Mr. Small replied that the lanes are typically going to be 3.3 meters on the outside and 3 meters on the inside. Mr. Small added that some turning movements require more space. The Panel member asked about the industrial heritage and how this is being incorporated into the design. Mr. Roche replied that they are looking into elements such as the thickness of the wood and the planting material which has a rougher feel of the Port Lands. Mr. Roche also replied that the 40-meter right-of-way captures the openness of the Port Lands. The Panel member asked if there is a public art component of this. Pina Mallozzi, Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, replied that there is no public art funding for the roads, but there may be some allocation from the bridges.

One Panel member noted that Cherry Street is a bigger experience north of Lake Shore and asked whether the team has considered the condition of Cherry Street north into the design. Mr. Roche replied that they are treating the bridge as the gateway into Villiers Island and not Lake Shore. The Panel member also asked what the cut out in the planter is for. Mr. Roche replied that is meant to capture localised water.

Another Panel member asked what was meant by “Ye Old Port Lands”. Mr. Roche replied that they want to choose things that are robust and have a rougher feel to them. Mr. Roche added that there aren’t many options in terms of material selection to have a Port Lands feel. Safety, accessibility, cost and maintenance issues all have to be considered.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the landscape looks quite “pretty” and felt that the Port Lands industrial “toughness” is still missing from the street character.

Another Panel member noted that Waterfront Toronto leads by landscape and public art. The Panel member felt that public art needs to be integrated into the project somehow. The Panel member noted that this park is the entrance to the Villiers Island neighbourhood and also the entrance to Promontory Park. It’s a duality that’s built into the program and its important to address both users.

One Panel member noted that the road dimensions should be kept as tight as possible and encouraged ongoing coordination with the bridge team. The Panel member also felt that “urban rooms” should be created within the right-of-way.

Another Panel member felt that there is an opportunity to frame the whole strategy within a climate resilient strategy.

One Panel member was very interested in leading with landscape given that the landscape and roads will be there before everything is built. The Panel member suggested instead of having a seasonal planting strategy, maybe there should be a 5-year strategy and then readjust once the development is there. The Panel member added that it’s not just about the street furniture, but also the microclimatic experiences in the Port Lands.

Another Panel member noted that there might not be enough room for pedestrians to cross the street. The Panel member suggested turning the zebra crossing at Commissioners and Cherry Street into a wider space, similar to a scramble type crossing. The Panel member liked the overall design of the stormwater strategy and was excited to see how this project evolves.

One Panel member was concerned about all of the hard surface paving causing heat-island effect. The Panel member suggested creating urban rooms using landscaping in order to limit the heat island effect.

Another Panel member asked the team to bring plans and cross section drawings showing where the utilities will be located.

One Panel member noted that there will be thousands of people coming to the area and understanding the volumes of people anticipated on a day to day basis along with big events is important.

Another Panel member commended the team for selecting a performing plant palette that is tough.

### **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Consider creating “urban rooms” that provide pedestrians with areas of reprieve from weather conditions and help with the heat island effect.
- The street character still lacks “roughness” in keeping with the Port Lands industrial heritage.
- Ensure that adequate space is provided in the pedestrian waiting areas.
- Consider the role of public art and how it can be integrated into the project.
- Bring plans and cross section drawings showing the location of utilities.
- Ensure ongoing coordination with the parks and bridge teams.
- Technical staff from the City should be included in the next meeting.

### **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 Conditional Support of the project.

## **2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges**

*Project Type:* Structure

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* Entuitive with Grimshaw and Schlaich Bergermann Partner

*Review Stage:* Detailed Design

*Review Round:* Four

*Presenter(s):* Paul Maguire, Grimshaw; Juan Porral, Grimshaw

*Delegation:* Simon Karam, Waterfront Toronto; Michael Meschino, Entuitive

*ID#:* 1096

### **2.1 Project Presentation**

Paul Maguire with Grimshaw gave an update on the design details. The balustrade design consists of “cassette” type panels that try to maximize transparency and optimizes the pickets so that they are as small as possible. This also allows for flexibility for maintenance and to follow the curves of the bridge. Mr. Maguire noted that the street furniture is coordinated with the road furniture but with their own design sensibility added using the stainless-steel supports. Mr. Maguire explained that the piers were originally a simple cylinder and they have now taken the minimum cross section from a structural point of view and added a seam to make them more dynamic and in keeping with the overall bridge structure. Mr. Maguire noted that anti-climb signage has been incorporated to deter people from climbing on the arches.

### **2.2 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the height of the crash barrier is in comparison to where the bridge tapers down. Mr. Maguire replied that the crash barrier is higher than the bridge where it tapers down. The Panel asked where the signage is going to be located. Mr. Porral replied that they are going to avoid having anything hanging off the bridge structure.

Another Panel member pointed out that crash barrier looks like it comes from a catalogue and asked whether its possible to modify the design slightly so that it is coordinated with the vertical elements of the bridge. Mr. Meschino replied that the crash barriers have to be tested and certified, but they will look into this.

One Panel member asked where the lighting is going to be in relation to the pedestrian path. Mr. Maguire replied that they are looking into using lighting bollards in the landscape and are working with MVVA to develop this detail.

Another Panel member asked what the bridge clearance is during a flood event. Mr. Meschino replied that the clearance for a typical condition is just under 4-meters but was unsure of the exact clearance during a flood event.

One Panel member asked whether the underside of the bridge over the river will be open for birds to migrate. Mr. Maguire replied that the piece that is over the pedestrian walkway will be covered by a stainless-steel mesh protection and the piece over the river will be open. The Panel member asked if the team has any plans for a brushed rough finish on the underside of the bridge to deter graffiti. Mr. Maguire replied that they will consider this.

Another Panel member asked what the sidewalk top surface is. Mr. Maguire replied that the pedestrian pathway will be concrete, and the cycle path will be asphalt. The Panel member asked if it will be standard asphalt or if it will be a rubberized asphalt for noise reduction. Mr. Maguire replied that they have not gotten that far.

One Panel member asked why they changed the linear benches in the pedestrian walkway to just two benches. Mr. Maguire replied that it was in response to providing more continuity with the road design.

Another Panel member asked if they are recommending a colour. Mr. Maguire replied that they like the idea of the contrasting bridges.

### **2.3 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the proposed crash barrier takes away from the bridge's design. The Panel member suggested a jersey barrier that was used on the Lion's Gate Bridge in Vancouver that would be more complementary to the overall design. The Panel member also noted that they have used the stainless-steel mesh product before and found it to be fussy. The Panel member suggested using a single stainless-steel cable in place of the mesh. The Panel member also suggested using horizontal spikes in place of the anti-climb signage. The Panel member was in favour of the shades of colour rather than the contrasting colours and overall felt that this was a beautifully designed bridge.

Another Panel member noted that people climbing on the bridge is going to be a problem and asked the team to consider not bringing the taper of the bridge down so low. The Panel member also liked the shades of colour more than the contrasting colours.

One Panel member felt that one pure colour would make the bridges solid, clear and wholesome.

Another Panel member was concerned about the lighting strategy. The Panel member felt that there was too much focus on lighting the bridge in an architectural way and not enough focus on lighting the pedestrian areas.

One Panel member was opposed to up-lighting due to night sky pollution. The Panel member suggested using linear parallel cables on the underside of the bridges as a bird deterrent to maintain the linear design aesthetic.

Another Panel member raised the issue of snow plows potentially damaging the pickets and suggested raising the stainless-steel cover.

One Panel member felt that the revised benches look like an afterthought. The Panel member also urged the team to not forget the experience under the bridges.

Another Panel member suggested that team consults with the City's Bird Friendly Guidelines and think about birds where it makes sense. The Panel member also asked the team to consider either using a rough texture finish on the underside of the bridge or incorporating nice graffiti art. The Panel member also suggested using rubber asphalt for noise reduction.

One Panel member liked the contrasting colour option. The Panel member also felt that the benches can have their own identity and doesn't need to be unified with the roads. The Panel member noted that the connection between the bridge and the piers still feels like a table top and how they meet requires further refinement.

Another Panel member liked the Chicago precedent with the steps down to the water. The Panel member added that the stairs will need to be accessible. The Panel member felt that the lighting strategy still needs more refinement and suggested lighting the underside of the bridge rather than having bollards with lights. The Panel member felt that having a graffiti strategy as part of the overall project would be a good idea given that the base of the bridge will likely get vandalized.

One Panel member noted that the signage on the bridge is inevitable and it's best to design where the signage should go, rather than having a traffic engineer decide for you. The Panel member was in favour of making all of the bridges blue.

## **2.4 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall the Panel felt that the bridges are beautifully designed.
- The Panel was supportive of the overall approach to colour, but no consensus was reached.
- More focus is needed on the lighting where pedestrians will be, such as the pedestrian walkway and the underside of the bridge.
- Consider using an alternative crash barrier that is more complementary to the overall design
- The bird deterrent on the underside of the bridge requires further thinking.
- Consider designing a bench that is more in keeping with the bridge design rather than conforming with the road benches.
- Traffic signage on the bridge is inevitable. Determine the required signage locations and design how the signage should be mounted.
- Consider preventative measures for vandalism on the underside of the bridge or incorporate graffiti art into the design.



## **2.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

## **3.0 350, 370, 390 Queens Quay**

*Project Type:* Building

*Location:* Central Waterfront

*Proponent:* Coal Harbour Properties

*Architect/Designer:* Quadrangle

*Review Stage:* Schematic Design

*Review Round:* two

*Presenter(s):* Les Klein, Quadrangle; Scott Torrance, Forrec

*Delegation:* Peter Smith, Bousfields; Ken Brooks, Quadrangle

*ID#:* 1073

### **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager of Parks with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the site is currently developed with two 21-storey rental apartment buildings, linked by a 3-storey commercial/amenity building, surrounding the Peter Street Basin. The project was last presented to the Panel in March 2016 for concept design with a proposed 29-storey mixed use building. Ms. Stuart explained that the LPAT (OMB) hearing in February 2018, they agreed on the revised 21-storey proposal. Ms. Stuart raised some areas for the Panel to consider, including the proposed fence along the north and west side of the property, the pedestrian, cyclist, vehicular circulation on Lake Shore Boulevard frontage, the modifications to retail frontages on Queens Quay, and the interface with the proposed Rees Street Park. Ms. Stuart then introduced Les Klein, Principal of Quadrangle Architects, to give the presentation.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Klein began by walking through the context and evolution of the site. Mr. Klein explained that the Section 37 contribution will go towards public realm improvements to the water's edge promenade surrounding the Peter Street Basin. Mr. Klein noted that the piece of property at the north west side will be conveyed for parkland to regularize the Rees Street park frontage. Mr. Klein introduced Scott Torrance, Senior Director with Forrec, to talk about the landscape design.

Mr. Torrance walked through the existing conditions of the entire site. Mr. Torrance noted that they are looking to integrate the Queens Quay paving strategy throughout the site to make it feel continuous. Mr. Torrance explained that they will be integrating their design with the Rees Street Park team. Mr. Torrance noted that they are trying to bring life and colour to the Lake Shore frontage.

Mr. Klein walked through the revised building proposal which is now 21-storeys. Mr. Klein noted that they are trying to emphasize the verticality of the building using the coloured panels.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked why a fence is required on the north and west side of the property. Mr. Torrance replied that TTC is requesting the fence for safety reasons. The Panel member asked if the Parks Department allows cafés along the Peter Street Basin. Mr. Torrance replied that they are unsure but agreed that having retail spill out would be great.

Another Panel member asked whether the tower separation meets the 25-meter tower separation guidelines. Mr. Klein replied that the OMB was triggered by Council and neighbours to the north. There is a mid-rise part of the tower which isn't required to meet the 25-meter tower separation, however the tall rise tower portion does meet the 25-meter tower separation.

One Panel member asked if they have an EUI target for the building. Mr. Klein replied that they will bring that number to the next review. The Panel member asked if they are targeting Tier 2 to which Mr. Klein replied, yes.

Another Panel member asked if there is an opportunity to make the roof of the parking garage to the west of the site a greenroof. Mr. Klein replied that it is not part of this application, but it can be explored. The Panel member asked what material will be used for the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Klein replied that they are looking at a decorative metal enclosure.

One Panel member asked what the size of the living space in the stacked units will be. Mr. Klein replied that the living room is typically 3-meters wide and the bedroom is 3-meters wide.

Another Panel member asked what the unit mix is. Mr. Klein replied that the majority is two-bedroom with approximately 10% three-bedroom. The Panel member asked what the retail strategy is for the base. Mr. Klein replied that they want there to be active uses. Mr. Klein added that there is lots of interest, but it is all dependant on the improvements to the existing Basin. Mr. Klein noted that they would like to see the Basin cleaned up as it is a grossly underutilized asset.

One Panel member asked who owns the Basin. Mr. Klein replied that it is owned and operated by the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that having through connections is important and will also help activate the space. The Panel member noted that the fence along the north side of the property needs to go. The Panel member also felt that the greenwall should not be pursued further and instead focus on developing a good public realm.

Another Panel member noted that the front address is on Lake Shore and there shouldn't be a fence along the property's front door. The Panel member also felt that a through-connection is important and will help the retail's success. The Panel member added that treating the façade with garage doors will also help to activate the space.

One Panel member noted that the east side of the building is now part of the new park and should be reevaluated as a landscape edge. This might also initiate more activity along that side of building.

Another Panel member felt that the rounded corners are missing on the new tower and suggested adding some curvature to the mechanical penthouse to emulate the existing two towers. The Panel member was concerned about the acoustics on the north side of the building and suggested using a smaller window pane with bigger glass spans to improve the acoustic performance. The Panel member also suggested creating smaller retail spaces as they will be easier to fill.

One Panel member noted that this site has three front doors, Lake Shore, Rees Street Park and the Peter Street Basin. The Panel member suggested that the team experiments with planting modules in the public realm and to get rid of the greenwall and focus on the greenroof instead.

Another Panel member felt that the new building should read as a different building and doesn't need to replicate the material of the existing buildings. The panel member noted that there needs to be a good rationale for the pattern and motif of the façade.

One Panel member felt that the mechanical penthouse is an add-on and needs to be understood as an extension of the built form. The Panel member felt that the location and potential of this project is so unique given its proximity to Rees Street Park, the Peter Street Basin and HTO Park.

Another Panel member requested that the team show the public realm design around the entire building at the next review. The Panel member suggested replacing the asphalt driveway with paleo-tech instead to help reduce traffic speed. The Panel member also felt that this is an opportunity to make a new building that stands out. The Panel member was sceptical about a 3-meter wide living space.

One Panel member urged the team not to build a greenwall. The Panel member felt that the east elevation facing Rees Street Park needs to be acknowledged. The Panel member felt that the amenity area should include a child play area. The Panel member was looking forward to seeing more options for the building façade at the next review.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The project's front door is on Lake Shore, but it will also have a front door on Rees Street Park and the Peter Street Basin. Consider adding north-south and east-west connections through the buildings.
- The Panel was not supportive of the fence on the north side of the property as it incumbers porosity through the site

- Create the image of what Peter Street Basin could be.
- Consider pursuing a greenroof instead of a greenwall
- The 370 Queens Quay façade requires further refinement. Exposure, noise and acoustics should be considered when choosing the façade material.
- Consider using a unit paver in place of asphalt on the driveway to slow down traffic.
- Create smaller retail spaces that are more affordable for tenants.

### **3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

### **4.0 101 Commissioners Street (Pinewood Studios)**

*Project Type:* Film Studio

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Pinewood Studios

*Architect/Designer:* HOK

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Elsa Fancello, Castlepoint Numa; Paul Gogan, HOK; Alison Lumby, HOK

*Delegation:*

*ID#:* 1075

### **4.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Rei Tasaka, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the site is part of a 33-acre site that is home to the Pinewood Toronto Studios facilities. The site will support 20,890 square meters of new communication and broadcasting establishment and offices uses within the Pinewood Studios campus. Ms. Tasaka noted that the production office and flex workshop was reviewed by the Panel in July 2016 and is now built and occupied. Ms. Tasaka raised some areas for the Panel to consider, including the siting and orientation of the buildings, the landscape strategy, and the sustainability strategy. Ms. Tasaka then introduced Paul Gogan, Senior Principal with HOK and Elsa Fancello, Vice President of Planning and Design with Castlepoint Numa, to give the presentation.

### **4.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Gogan began by walking through the existing site conditions. Mr. Gogan noted that the size of the spaces is designed based on the nature of the production work. Stages are designed for safe and effective movement of large vehicles. Ms. Fancello noted that since making the application the City, there have been some small changes, including wrapping the office space around to the west side of the building. Ms. Fancello explained that they are targeting Toronto Green Standards Tier 1 with 39 electric vehicle spaces and a high albedo roof.

Ms. Fancello then introduced Alison Lumby, Senior Associate with HOK, to present the landscape design. Ms. Lumby explained that the front door of the site is at 225

Commissioners Street and they are looking to pull the public realm space down and continue the streetscape treatment into the site.

#### **4.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the light blue represents on the master plan. Ms. Fancello replied that they would like to see hotel/long-term housing and potentially a set. Ms. Fancello added that they envision that all shooting streets would be wired rather than having generators.

Another Panel member asked whether trees are discouraged on shooting streets as they are seen as barriers. Ms. Fancello replied no, that is not their intention. The Panel member asked if there was an opportunity to add a greenroof as it could help with the building's acoustics. Ms. Fancello replied that having a greenroof is not the standard anywhere in the world for sound stages. There are precedents with solar panels but not greenroofs.

One Panel member asked given that there won't be a greenroof, how they plan on dealing with stormwater. Ms. Fancello replied that they are using tanks and landscaping. Ms. Lumby added that there is an existing bioswale on site. The Panel member asked the proponent to speak to the film studio as a community and how it contributes to placemaking. Mr. Gogan replied that the studio faces Commissioners Street which adds to the street's activation and the shooting streets will be fundamental to creating integrated public realm access. Ms. Fancello added that they are building convertible units to adapt to future needs.

Another Panel member asked how many people are on the site per day. Ms. Fancello replied that when they inherited the site it wasn't doing well. Now they have 97% occupancy and approximately 1500 people on site per day when it's at full capacity. The Panel member asked where these people go for lunch. Ms. Fancello replied that they have an on-campus café and a commercial kitchen on site. Ms. Fancello added that as part of the overall plan they have protected for future commissary.

One Panel member asked whether they plan to retain the existing bioswale on site. Ms. Fancello replied that they will maintain parts of it.

Another Panel member asked if there is an envelope that needs to be met. Ms. Fancello replied that there is a height regime that needs to be met for the stages which is between 40 feet to 60 feet clear height.

One Panel member asked about the parking lot. Ms. Fancello replied that the surface parking is interim, and they are looking at parking structures for the future.

#### **4.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member encouraged the team to bring a strong sustainable strategy to the next review. The Panel member noted that there needs to be good building design but also have a responsible site. The Panel member suggested that they stop pretending to be visible and instead own up to the fact that this project is an island.

Another Panel member noted that the building blocking the north-south view corridor is not acceptable given the direction from the Port Lands Planning Framework which protects for the north-south view corridor. The Panel also advised the team to protect the existing wetland. The Panel member asked the team to consider a greenroof as it will contribute to the sustainability and the building acoustics.

One Panel member felt that a more comprehensive sustainability strategy is required. The Panel member noted that there is not enough tree canopy on site adding that there are only 14 trees of 142 acres of land. The Panel member noted that landscapes can be ephemeral, but they can also evolve so give us something that is going to evolve over the next 99 years.

Another Panel member noted that they were less concerned about the secured zone as it is really only accessible to people that work there, however, they felt that a more aggressive strategy for the urban design outside of the secured zone is required. The Panel member noted that Saulter Street does not extend very far north and therefore was not offended by the building blocking the north-south view corridor.

One Panel member noted that Commissioners Street is a major east-west street and it wasn't mentioned at all in the presentation. The Panel member added that this is the spine of the Port Lands and needs to be understood as such. The Panel member noted that views to the Ship Channel are key and should not be blocked.

Another Panel member noted that it is acceptable for this project to be an "island" within its confines but shouldn't feel like an "island" as it relates to the urban context.

#### **4.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The building siting should not block the north-south view corridor to the Ship Channel.
- Project should have a stronger relationship to the rest of the Port Lands community.
- Bring a comprehensive landscape plan to the next review. Consider incorporating greenroofs on the buildings and opportunities for tree canopy in the public realm. Consider retaining the existing wetlands and bioswale.
- Bring a comprehensive sustainability plan to the next review. Film studio complex should play a role in establishing future-proof sustainable strategies and adaptability.
- Commissioners Street is the spine of the Port Lands and will be the front door to the site. Explore peripheral areas to improve interface along west and north sides.

- The plan should take advantage of its unique location on the water. View corridors to the Ship Channel need to be preserved as key links to the water's edge.

#### **4.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

#### **CLOSING**

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