



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #124
Wednesday, May 22, 2019**

Present

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

Regrets

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Claude Cormier

Recording Secretaries

Leon Lai

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. West Don Lands Block 10 AHT – Schematic Design
 2. 162 Queens Quay East – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the April 24th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. The Members declared no conflicts for the project review sessions today.

The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the DRP consensus comments from April 2019 have been delivered to the proponent team of **945 Lake Shore Boulevard East**. The team is working towards creating a better public realm fronting Lake Shore Boulevard, exploring ideas of public art for the new fence, and providing street furniture. The planner on file has confirmed that the first Site Plan Application has been submitted in April and a re-submission is anticipated for next month. Mr. Glaisek added a return to DRP for the project is to be determined.

Mr. Glaisek noted that consensus comments from April 2019 have been delivered to the **Bathurst Quay Streetscape & Public Realm** team- a SPA re-submission is expected in June with more details on the canopy structures. For **Gardiner Public Realm: Vision & Implementation**, Mr. Glaisek noted that the DRP consensus comments have been delivered to the team. The draft Vision and Implementation Plan has been submitted to the City for review, Transportation Services is to confirm the timeline and phasing while the pilot project design is being finalized for a Building Permit application at the end of May. Mr. Glaisek noted the team is identifying and prioritizing other opportunities for pilots and quick starts including intersection improvements.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the Force Mains construction as part of the **West Don Lands Storm Water Facility** project- a neighborhood wide storm water treatment plan including particulate separator that brings filtered water back into the Corktown Commons. The construction of the Queens Quay segment is in progress and is anticipated to complete in June. Mr. Glaisek noted that the **East Bayfront Water Edge Promenade Phase II** construction work continues. While recent weather has caused several delays, the project is scheduled to complete by September.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the **Port Lands Flood Protection** construction progress with an aerial drone video released by Waterfront Toronto in May 2019. One Panel member asked how this material can be published publicly for discussions. Mr. Glaisek noted that an artist photographer will be selected through an RFP to document the progress and create a comprehensive body of work. Mr. Glaisek concluded with an overview of the draft June 2019 DRP agenda and wait-listed projects. For the **Quayside MIDP DRP** review, anticipated to occur around October 2019, Ms. Day noted the City will need to see how the project works with the City approvals. Mr. Glaisek noted David Stonehouse has confirmed that the project will not be a concurrent review- it will come for approvals at Waterfront Toronto first then at the City. Furthermore, once the MIDP is received by WT, it will be released to the Board of Directors then to the public within a week.

The Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted that the proposed changes to the Planning Act that related to urban design and site plan control advocated by the Ontario Association of Architects were not embraced by the Province in Bill 108. However, Bill 108 did make major changes to important planning provisions. Among them, development charges, Section 37 density and bonusing provisions and parks dedication charges were all eliminated and replaced by a new Community Benefits Charge with unknown amounts to be determined. Reduced timelines for processing Official Plan amendments of 120 days

and 90 days for rezoning applications were also made. In addition, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal will revert to the previous Ontario Municipal Board model of “de novo” hearings or starting from scratch without regard to a Council decision.

Taken collectively, these changes will likely produce far more hearings and appeals than before since applications cannot be processed within the proposed time limits. The changes may backfire and will likely not expedite the construction of much needed affordable housing. By removing the planning tools to create livable complete communities, the City could end up refuse more development applications since they would not meet the new Bill 108 test of “good planning”.

The Chair noted that that comments on Bill 108 were due June 3 and appreciated that the Mayor was speaking up against the proposed changes. Lorna Day added that under the guise of creating more housing, the proposed Bill has demonstrated no evidence that affordability will be passed on to the consumer. One Panel member also noted that the Bill is worth watching closely and anticipated that Toronto Region and Conservation Authority lands may be on the radar. The Chair also noted that Chief Planner Gregg Lintern has produced an excellent report on Bill 108 that was adopted by Council (Item CC7.3).

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the public session.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block 10

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1093
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Anishnawbe Health Toronto/ Dream Kilmer Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Quadrangle Architects, Stantec, Two Row Architect, NAD Design Group, ERA Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Les Klein, Principal + Co-founder, Quadrangle; Matthew Hickey, Partner, Two Row Architect; Suzanne Graham, Associate, Stantec; Susan Conner, CEO, Prism Partners
<i>Delegation:</i>	Angela Li, Development Manager, Waterfront Toronto; Kate Goslett, Community Planning, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, Urban Design, City of Toronto; John English, Tricon; Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; John Steven, Senior Principal, Stantec

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the project context including precinct vision, block plans of the West Don Lands (WDL), project height, and setbacks. Ms. Li highlighted the key policy context for West Don Lands: the redevelopment of a diverse mixed-use communities, excellence in the design of public and private buildings, protection of view corridors, frame and support the adjacent public realm, coherent framework of public realm, and take part in a coordinated public art program. Ms. Li noted that the City is in general agreement with the proposed massing of the project and the site is primarily serviced by the Cherry streetcar line.

Project background and history

Ms. Li noted that in 2014 the property was conveyed to AHT by the Province, then AHT partnered with Dream/Kilmer on the residential condominiums and Dream/Kilmer/Tricon on the residential rental buildings. The project was presented for Stage 1: Issues Identification review at the January 2018 DRP, and since then has held a series of design workshops with the City and Waterfront Toronto staff. Ms. Li noted the current health centre design and site plan were presented to the WDL Committee in February 2019.

The construction is intended to be one single phase, anticipating the first Site Plan Application in June of 2019, Committee of Adjustment for minor variances related to height, parking, loading requirements, step backs and targeting construction start for Q3 2020. Ms. Li noted that the Training, Education, and Employment Building is set to transfer to Miziwe Biik upon construction completion. In terms of sustainability, the Health Centre has customized targets aligned with TGS v3 with certain exemptions from Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR) while the remaining buildings target LEED Gold and MGBR. Ms. Li noted the project is part of the Public Art Program and will accommodate a piece of indigenous public art.

Ms. Li provided a summary of January 2018's DRP consensus comments and provided areas for the panel consideration in three aspects: building, landscape, and sustainability. Ms. Li then introduced Matthew Hickey to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

AHT Building:

Mr. Hickey began the presentation with the traditional acknowledgement, an important statement for a unique project in Ontario and Canada specifically designed for Indigenous use. Mr. Hickey thanked the attendees being able to meet today with an open heart and mind.

The Don Valley Parkway is an important land for the Indigenous people. Mr. Hickey added it is important for the project to recall pebbles in the stream, delta in the Don, and convey the movement of water back and forth. Mr. Hickey provided a summary of the core values of the project: include indigenous expression and values in all aspects of the development, express the notion of pebbles in the stream in the ground scape, reference directionality and recognize indigenous population in the design of the overall block, acknowledge celestial movement, reinforce the datum of a "ground" and

“sky” with building materiality, plant with indigenous species, and finally demonstrate the importance of craft in the project. Mr. Hickey then introduced Les Klein to present the residential buildings and landscape.

Residential Buildings:

Mr. Klein noted that ERA Architects is the consulting architect on the industrial heritage building and Urban Strategies is the planning consultant for the project. The entire development is intended for the community at large and indigenous population and would like to speak to reconciliation at the onset of the experience of entering the building.

Looking at the AOR diagram, Mr. Klein noted the team has worked with the City on finding an agreeable massing, leveraging a complex layering of programs with key service and loading components underground, serving all the buildings, with an accessible landscape on top. Pointing to the project elevation drawings, Mr. Klein noted that the continuous podium façade on Cooperage St. is broken by “frames” and demarcate the entrances to the parking. Sectionally, Mr. Klein noted that the south wall of the heritage building is left exposed and all the major service functions are located under the landscape. The lobby of the rental building opens to the plaza.

Mr. Klein noted that the condo building has a precast base with a “lighter” top half that draws people’s gaze upward toward the sky and the heavens. The light finish continues to the exterior of buildings facing the courtyard to maximize light. Mr. Klein noted the earth tone of the base of the condo continues at podium height along Cooperage St.

Residential Landscape:

Mr. Klein noted that the AHT landscape will be presented by Suzanne Graham from Stantec. Referencing page 12 of the presentation, Mr. Klein noted the rooftops of the rental buildings are green roofs with outdoor amenities and a public plaza is located at the southwest corner of the block. On page 13, the raised landscape area is represented by the grey tone- the MB training building cuts into the landscape. On Page 14, the upper ground floor plan, Mr. Klein noted the partial floor residential units here are grade-related and open onto Cooperage Street. On the 2nd floor, the outdoor courtyard is part of the AHT hub, and private spaces from the condo and rental units are raised to give privacy from the courtyard. Looking from the third floor, the MB training building’s presence can be felt as it rises from the raised landscape. Mr. Klein noted that the setback in the condo volume respects the heritage building on Front St. Mr. Klein noted that there is a rooftop pool on the 9th floor with interior amenity spaces for both condo and rental.

For the southwest corner plaza, the team proposed to represent “pebble in the pond” at the centre of the plaza and allow the “ripples” to be expressed in various locations. Sectionally, Mr. Klein noted that the public plaza includes a sitting area, planters, and trees creating an intimate relationship with Cherry St. Mr. Klein highlighted the proposed material palette of the public realm design, planting palette that maximizes indigenous plants, and the proposed paving details to create the “ripple” graphic. Mr. Klein then introduced Suzanne Graham with Stantec to present the AHT landscape design.

AHT Landscape:

Ms. Graham noted that the concept of firmly attaching to the land and opening to the sky is central to the landscape of the first purpose-built indigenous health centre. Pointing at the section drawing, the raised landscape connects Cherry St. with the sky, creating a sense of transparency through the building with both upper and central landscapes. The landscape is meant to be intuitive. From the main entrance, Ms. Graham noted views into the courtyard are encouraged- with two outdoor private ceremonial spaces in the courtyard. While the two traditional service spaces are shaped like pebbles, there are also council rooms, therapeutic services, and one traditional healer room on every floor.

Mr. Hickey further highlighted the driving concepts of the AHT design: the red stair recalls the indigenous thought of ‘walking the good path”, various motifs are represented on the surfaces of the atrium, the glazed opening to the east takes advantage of eastern sunlight, and the exterior soffit screen is a thin layer of perforated metal that recalls the protective indigenous “shawl”. Mr. Hickey concluded that the theme of the landscape is to connect the project back to nature.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the sectional relationship of the courtyard and buildings. Mr. Klein answered that the courtyard is accessed from the health centre; the courtyard stops with a retaining wall at the southwest plaza and the heritage plaza. The Panel member asked if the animal patterns are created with frit. Mr. Hickey noted that they are currently placeholders, they will ultimately be something printed on exterior and/or interior glass panels. Another member asked if any daylighting studies have been provided. Mr. Klein noted that shadow studies are provided in the appendix of the presentation.

One Panel member asked for clarification on AHT building’s sustainability exemptions. Ms. Graham noted that the health centre negotiated an exemption with Waterfront Toronto. Ms. Conner answered that over the course of last year, AHT worked with Waterfront Toronto staff in negotiating the development agreement and the sustainability requirements were reproduced based on a comparison of TGS v3 tier 1 standards with indigenous standards. Mr. Steven explained that the framework of the indigenous sustainability requirements will meet 15% of improvement of the building code, include teachings of indigenous culture to tell a story of place making. Currently, the team is exploring stormwater management, passive lighting – all of which are too early at this stage of design. Another Panel member asked if the interior courtyard has public access. Mr. Graham noted that it is restricted only for health centre use.

One Panel member asked for the proposed heritage building use. Mr. Klein answered that the uses are not determined but will be a retail space; accessible entrance is located from the south plaza between the MB and the heritage façade. Aside from the rental building not having any balconies, the exterior expression between the condo and rental is not differentiated. Another Panel member asked for clarification on the

glass frames on the podium façade along Cooperage St. and if they are the parking entrances at grade. Mr. Klein answered that the expression is meant to break up the vertical masses; materiality is not yet decided.

One Panel member asked for the mechanical system strategy of the project. Mr. Klein answered that the team is not at the stage for the residential components. Mr. Steven answered that the AHT energy performance is in the process of costing and early design- it will have a stand-alone system, independent of the residential buildings, not 100% fresh air, exploring options of an open ground floor while balancing the need for infectious disease control.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the spaces under the raised landscape facing the southwest plaza and if they are public rooms. Mr. Klein answered the spaces are part of the rental building lobby, health centre, and bicycle parking. One Panel member asked for clarification on the sectional experience through the courtyard landscape. Mr. Klein answered that the condo landscape is raised and screened from the courtyard.

Another Panel member asked for the clarification on the lack of balconies for the rental buildings. Mr. English with Tricon answered that the team thought the terraces might suffice and did not foresee tenants paying premium for balcony. One Panel member asked for clarification on the condo volume on the south side of Front St. being much larger than the north. Mr. Klein answered that the massing aligns with the adjacent blocks on the south side of Front St.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt the project can push for LEED 4.0 with a new carbon metric, show more details on the sustainability strategy at the next review including a list of sustainability initiatives, and consider the “alternative compliance” description for the AHT building goals. Provide energy target information for energy use intensity, thermal energy demand intensity, greenhouse gas intensity, and preliminary energy modelling of the proposed buildings. On energy performance, ventilation is a big concern, consider low carbon heating source, investigate geothermal for buildings of this size instead of traditional boiler system and partner with geothermal developers to deal with upfront costs. The Panel member appreciated the general design of the site but felt the residential lobbies are oversized and encouraged the team to develop a retail main street on Front St. creating a more civic experience.

Another Panel member appreciated the addition of Two Row Architects to the team. The Panel member felt the southwest quadrant landscape has enormous amount of hard paving, there is advantage to increase landscaping and permeable surfaces to the plaza. Consider re-thinking the building frontages that face onto the plaza, potential for seasonal uses and other functions. The Panel member encouraged the team to develop a mediated landscape strategy: planting to mitigate privacy and eliminate use of guardrail at the sunken areas.

One Panel member commended the inspirational character of the project but felt overall editing is required. The Panel member felt part of the challenge for this project is the delivery of imagery and architecture from the source, finding materiality, design elements that speak authentically to the origin inspiration. For example, the “shawl” can be more than a thin layer of perforated metal, the “ground and sky” metaphor at the residential buildings need further rigorous development. The Panel member encouraged the team to avoid tokenism, consider more fundamental, raw materials instead of typical materiality of our industry.

Another Panel member appreciated the presentation and the incredible introduction of the unique project. The Panel member noted the project is catalytic, the team should position the project as leading sustainability and in connecting indigenous culture with city building. The AHT Building is most resolved – concerned that the landscape competes with residential balconies. For the southwest plaza mounts and landscape design, consider introducing textural differences, look at Tanner Fountain by Peter Walker as a precedent: the use of rocks and pebbles can transform the motif to a literal connection to water and ground.

One Panel member appreciated the uplifting project, felt this project has legacy for the next century and encouraged the team to tell the story in an exemplary way. The Panel member asked the team to invest in the materials and standards of tomorrow in terms of resilience, felt the southwest plaza has potential but falls short – there is opportunity offered to use water without being a standing pool. The Panel member noted that the healing garden, diversity of plantings and landscapes can be honoured given excellent soil- AHT can set the frame for this work.

Another Panel member is concerned with the shading of the courtyard and the amount of daylight into the AHT atrium- consider a landscape strategy to ensure the courtyard is successful under this condition including careful plant species selection. The Panel member noted this issue was already raised in the first Issues Identification review. The Panel member felt that given the multitude of designers involved, the buildings can be individually toned down to enhance the sense of the whole such that the AHT Building stands out while others create more calmness in support.

One Panel member felt the project is very interesting and commended the team for undertaking the complexities. The Panel member shared the concern for low light level in the courtyard- the raised courtyard helps only in the morning and early afternoon – encouraged the team to modify the tops of the buildings to help bring in south light. The Panel member noted the team should develop a stronger formal relationship between the landscape and sunken courtyards. The Panel member is concerned with the overly optimistic expectation of transparency through the building as glass facades, with three layers and relative contrast in light levels, do not guarantee the intended level of transparency- more realistic considerations should be applied. Sharing the façade editing considerations, especially along the Cooperage façade, the Panel member noted some degree of marking is appropriate but taking the entrance demarcations all the way up the podium volume is contrived and adds yet another element to the formal motif. Finally, the Panel commented to demonstrate how the buildings relate to the street and adjacent blocks at the next review.

Another Panel member complimented the aspirational project in place-making through built-form and landscape, and hoped it can be maintained throughout the development process. In the public realm, the Panel member felt Cherry Street is currently lopsided and should be considered as a key contributor to the civic contribution of the project- civic effort should be made to develop the north and south corners of Cherry Street. The Panel member commented that the heritage frontage feels diminished by the proposed built form which is a huge leap from the north side of Front St. – consider both heritage buildings on Front St. forming a gateway and respond to the scale of the Canary heritage building on all sides, especially on the north side of the residential building. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider the complex foreground and background hierarchy in developing the set of buildings, simplify material palette on the block, and interrogate the use of materials that help create deeper meaning than mere motifs.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Commended the team for the on-going development of a unique and complex project, the Panel felt the result will be fantastic.
- Consider fine-tuning the various aspects of the project and make elements as strong as possible.

Buildings

- Health Centre should be the prominent building and receive special attention in contrast to other buildings on the block, consider simplification and create the remaining more as “background” buildings.
- For the building on Cooperage Street, consider editing through a simplification lens, further develop its identity as a local residential street and relationship with adjacent blocks. Ensure the street feels right and ties in with the neighbourhood.
- For both the interior and exterior materiality, consider moving away from typical material palettes to more “raw” alternatives that would express and reflect the indigenous meanings and cultures.
- Consider the scale of the Canary heritage building in relation to the residential building on all sides, especially from the Front Street side.

AHT Building and landscape

- Improve the building connection to public realm by enhancing visual connections from sidewalk to interior.
- Limited sunlight in the courtyard landscape and building atrium is a concern, the design team should pay special attention to the landscape design, building materials, and possibly altering certain aspects of the buildings to maximize sunlight throughout the year.

Public realm

- Cherry Street is the longest frontage of the block, ensure the buildings and their ground floor designs support the public realm
- Effort should be made to locate retail components on Front Street and the southwest plaza should the residential lobby area be reduced
- Consider size, shape, and the use of permeable materials at the southwest corner plaza
- Consider stronger connection to the sky and ground in the plaza's design and materiality.

Sustainability

- Avoid using the term “exemption” in the description of the requirements for the AHT Building, consider leveraging the language of “alternative compliance” to reflect different goals
- Investigate low carbon energy sources for the project

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

Mr. Klein thanked the Panel for listening and absorbing the intentions of the project; it is very important architecturally and for society.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

The Panel voted in Conditional Support and expected the project to return for Detailed Design review.

3.0 162 Queen Quay East

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1104
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<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; Samantha Menard, Energy, EQ Building Performance
<i>Delegation:</i>	Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the project is located along Queens Quay East, between Lower Jarvis St. and Lower Sherbourne St. as part of the East Bayfront Precinct Plan. The site is adjacent to 215 Lake Shore Blvd. (East FedEx North) and 178-180 Queens Quay E. (East FedEx South). Ms. Kim provided the policy context for the site and an update on the project history: the development parameters were defined through an appeal and subsequent Minutes of Settlement (2014), primarily residential with retail uses at grade, and the affordable rental housing contribution is satisfied with cash-in-lieu. Ms. Kim noted that through a more recent OMB settlement, 178-180 Queens Quay East has a 24m height allowance for the Queens Quay East podium, 4m taller than the 162 Queens Quay East settlement podium façade height allowance- a discrepancy that the Panel should consider. Ms. Kim noted that the project is returning for Stage 2: Schematic Design review and has submitted their first Site Plan Application submission in March 2019. Ms. Kim summarized the Issues Identification review consensus comments from February 2019 and introduced Ms. Mighton to provide an update on City Planning Issues for Panel consideration. Ms. Kim concluded with Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel consideration, noting the building frontage height discrepancy between 162 and 178 Queens Quay East is a key consideration, continuity of public realm in the proposed landscape design, and the project's support of Waterfront Toronto's sustainability objectives. Ms. Kim then introduced David Butterworth to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Butterworth began by noting that the proponent team has recently just received the 178 Queens Quay E. OMB settlement and is aware of the discrepancies and interface problems between the two projects- building depth is also different in plan. Given the retail level height cannot be raised any higher in order to make the above floors work for residential units. The team is investigating other options.

Ground floor/ Public Realm

Mr. Butterworth noted that as per Panel comments from the previous review, the team has extended the depth of the ground floor retail and relocated more bicycle storage to underground. However, traffic consultant advised to not shift loading and ramp setup due to the efficiency of having them combined- the larger question as noted by Mr. Butterworth is how this interface with the adjacent development. Mr. Butterworth noted the façade design has been revised to further express the notion of landscape and water on the façade of the building and respond to Panel's comments of bringing more light colored panels- the revision proposes more white panels close to the ground, also creating "gradients" where white corners dispense into darker positions in the other corners of the elevation.

Mr. Butterworth noted trees are proposed on the Richardson sidewalk and opened the corner for a better public realm. Integrated benches are proposed as part of the retail façade and three types of metal panels, along with wood where appropriate, will complete the ground floor façade. Looking at the building elevations, Mr. Butterworth noted the panel pattern does not change; the mosaic is created through the different color panels. The window to wall ratio is strong for a residential project at 48%.

Mr. Butterworth noted that the continuous canopy and down-lighting strategy form a pattern that tie the building base together from corner to corner; the design extends to the future new street frontage including loading and service areas. While the retail frontage highlights pedestrian movement along Queens Quay, the second floor amenity space is an important identifier for the project.

Landscape

Mr. Butterworth noted that the team has brought the maple leaf pattern into the southwest corner of the project, further integrating the project with Queens Quay. Bringing vegetation and light into the middle courtyard is important, the team is proposing a sculptural rock art with lightwells to draw natural light into the amenity space below- the proposed sketch is representative of the idea of this element. The rooftop green roof landscape including trees and plantings has not changed. Mr. Butterworth then introduced Samantha Menard, with EQ Building Performance to give the sustainability part of the presentation.

Sustainability

Ms. Menard noted the key sustainable features of the project: continuous insulation between spandrel panel to increase comfort of tenants, an accessible green roof, roof hardscape with high albedo material, heat recovery providing fresh air, submetering for better control of unit energy use, low window to wall ratio, district energy connection with Enwave, and bicycle parking to help reduce tenant carbon footprint. The project meets overall TGS tier 1 with a few tier 2 objectives: reduced parking, green roof, 100% high libido hardscape at grade exceeding tier 2. Ms. Menard noted the features that exceed TGS tier 1 are: connection to Enwave, resilience checklist, addition of the emergency refuge area, low flow fixtures for stormwater management.

In terms of ecology, Ms. Menard noted the team is focused on planting native, adaptive species that are dark sky compliant and encourage pollinators. Ms. Menard noted that construction and demolition waste will be diverted from landfill, waste storage system will be provided for residents, and dedicated bulky waste storage is also provided. Ms. Menard noted that energy performance has been significantly improved from last review with 26% better than the OBC requirements.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the soffits are insulated. Mr. Butterworth answered yes.

Another Panel member asked if the continuous insulation is proposed in place of a rainscreen façade system and provide more details on the metal panel system. Mr.

Butterworth answered that moving the insulation point to outside improves the insulation performance and the metal panels will have rigid backing for support.

One Panel member asked if the elevation drawings indicate any material differences proposed. Mr. Butterworth explained that all the panels are the same material, with different colors.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the façade color strategy. Mr. Butterworth noted that the principle is to create gradual transitions from white to black starting from the southwest corner outward, with enough variation to not read the transitions obviously. It is important for the building to be differentiated from the neighbour buildings.

One Panel member asked if the green roof trees are mature and the soil volume being provided. Ms. Turney answered that they are large shade trees with appropriate soil volume to support them. The Panel member asked if the species on the roof would be mixed as specified in the TGS. Ms. Turney explained that the team is working with consultants to hand pick the species, looking at species that support pollinators, and shade-tolerant- biodiversity will continue to be refined as the project develops.

Another Panel member asked if the ground floor plan is showing a layby along Queens Quay. Mr. Butterworth confirmed it is a layby.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the light well concept and design. Ms. Turney explained that the success of the sculptural element is not reliant on plants, provide a sense of flow echoing the concept of movement, water, will add more visual interest for the residents from above, and have a presence year-round. Mr. Butterworth noted that the team is responding to previous DRP comments that the trees might not work with little sunlight, however the intent is to further flesh out the lightwells to light the amenity space.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

With regards to the massing and relationship to adjacent building, one Panel member noted to consider raising the building podium frontage to align with adjacent height and let the façade pattern cope with that change. If getting light into the courtyard amenity space is important, consider increasing the skylight areas, such as industrial sawtooth to maximize light and reduce planting. The Panel member is not convinced of the planting up against the retail façade, consider moving planters and benches away from the building face and into the street zone.

Another Panel member felt the coloration scheme, being different from other developments, is acceptable. Regarding the podium height discrepancies, the Panel member agreed that 162 QQE should be raised to match adjacent height. Noting a building of this size, the Panel member felt some of the amenity spaces should be dedicated for dogs, and the energy efficiency numbers can be further improved.

One Panel member commented that the living landscape elements can contribute to the public realm, consider biodiversity for treatment around the trees to achieve that. The Panel member noted that renderings can help answer the question of design excellence by showing more details and intentionality of the product- it is important to show biodiversity if it is proposed. Mr. Glaisek added that the public realm is part of Waterfront Toronto's area and will coordinate with the proponent team.

Another Panel member commended the team for successfully solving complex massing issues, appreciated the insert balconies and the façade tonalities but do not fully comprehend the strategy – consider simplifying the colors to help express clear massing. The green roof is appreciated, it is an opportunity to include more successional palette of plants, add visual interest, and bring biodiversity to the planters. The Panel member felt the retail canopy and insert lighting are both successful.

While it is a financially efficient project, one Panel member felt the massing can be improved. The current abstract pattern does not reflect the concept of water, consider tones of shimmer, silvers and grays- move away from graphic design but rely on subtle materiality changes. On the ground floor, consider a change in materiality, such as non-metal panel on ground floor, and how the bench and building interface can be further improved. The Panel member felt the canopy lighting is too harsh, heavy-handed and consider a more subtle approach.

Another Panel member felt the façade patterning was excessive, not convinced by the moire pattern from white to black, consider a simpler, thorough city-building elevation. The lighting under the soffit only signal entry, consider how it ties in with the urban design of the project. The Panel member felt the inconsistencies in the public realm represented in the renderings can be improved to clarify intentions.

One Panel member appreciated the project improvements but felt that the relative energy performances are not great even though the absolute performances are high, the building is still one that cannot compete with its peers in terms of sustainability performance. Consider the visual interest of the canopy as seen from above, putting more bike parking underground, and sharing the parking ramp with adjacent developer to retain valuable ground floor space.

Another Panel member appreciated the site plan on page 11, noting that it highlights clearly the urban condition of this neighbourhood and midblock connections. Sharing the ramp would benefit the future new street and give it a chance to become more than a service lane- every building along that street should contribute to the future conveyance of a public road and can set precedent for future blocks. Citing page 34, the Panel member noted to consider a more the urbanistic relationship with the Daniels building to the west. The Panel member felt the canopy establishes a strong horizontal datum, unconvinced with the amenity facade design as it does not support the datum. Furthermore, since the canopy demarcates public realm on all three facades, consider more emphasis and thought on this element. With regards to the black and white metal panels, the Panel member felt the design can be more subtle

and refined, consider how the elevation will look ten years from now. The Panel member added that the project is a key piece of the urban fabric and is a big leap from the last presentation.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the abstracted pattern as elevation design is a reoccurring theme in Toronto- color is a potential consideration if it is compatible urbanistically.

One Panel member noted it is important to distinguish the issue of materiality from the issue of the color variability strategy. The Panel member felt the color spectrum on the panels is too harsh, not subtle and durable. However, the Panel member is in support of the seemingly random, varying, transition from darker to lighter panels with some relation to the overall massing.

Another Panel member noted to consider how the material will age and fade over time; the integrity of the material contributes to the identity of the neighbourhood- consider the colors of East Bayfront, the St. Lawrence. An understanding of colors and context is important and required.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel is encouraged by the progress of the project.
- Consider stepping up the Queens Quay East podium façade near the adjacent building.
- Consider pushing the envelope of the exterior materiality and introduce subtler tones.
- Ensure that the landscape renderings are consistent with what is proposed.

Ground floor and public realm

- Consider the relationship between the Daniels development and 162 QQE, and address concerns for materiality, corner condition, canopy design and the reading of both buildings together.
- Consider moving the benches away from the building façade.
- Consider introducing more biodiversity in the green roof plantings and trees.
- The lightwell objective of bringing in light should be pushed further.

Planning for right-of-way of the new east-west street

- Explore the possibility of a shared ramp with the future adjacent building to preserve ground floor animation space.
- Consider moving the bike parking downstairs to free up valuable ground floor space.

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

Mr. Butterworth appreciated the suggestions and will continue to work with the client. There is no indication now the type of retail that will occupy the ground floor, the benches in a way give the team an opportunity to keep them separate.

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 Conditional Support and looks forward to the project's return review.

Motion to go into "in-camera" session

CLOSING

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