



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #97  
Wednesday, January 25, 2017**

---

**Present**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
George Baird  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Chris Reed  
Brigitte Shim  
Betsy Williamson

**Regrets**

Paul Bedford, Vice Chair  
Peter Busby

**Recording Secretaries:**

Tristan Simpson  
Rei Tasaka

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

---

**WELCOME**

The Acting Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the December meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Acting Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report.

**REPORT FROM THE SENIOR V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto has awarded the public art commission for Bayside's Aitken Place Park to the Calgary-based artist team of Caitlind Brown, Wayne Garrett, and Studio North. The artists have proposed a large-scale light projection that invites slow, contemplative interaction with visitors to the park. Mr. Glaisek noted that the artists were challenged to create a light installation with a minimal physical structure to animate the park's "urban porch" space.

Mr. Glaisek discussed the Ontario Place Bridge Feasibility Study which is being undertaken to provide information concerning site conditions, design concept options and preliminary cost estimates, and a land bridge between Exhibition Place and Ontario Place.

Mr. Glaisek reviewed the vision for waterfront transit which is a long range transit plan. Mr. Glaisek noted that this initiative currently does not have sufficient government funding, which has led to looking into the possibility of partnering with private sufficient development to pay for this transit. Mr. Glaisek introduced the idea of potential interim electric buses as a way of signaling new clean transportation initiatives. Mr. Glaisek noted that developers are finding it difficult to attract commercial tenants without transit in place.

Mr. Glaisek discussed the Jack Layton Implementation Plan which was presented to Waterfront Toronto's Partnerships Committee. The Committee recommended conducting an Opportunity Assessment for the terminal and surrounding area as a first step to exploring all potential funding sources. Mr. Glaisek noted that the study will establish the feasibility of funding all or a portion of the project and surrounding landscape through a hybrid of public and non-public funding sources.

Mr. Glaisek listed which members of the Panel were appointed by each level of government. Mr. Glaisek also noted that Mazyar Mortazavi will be the new Liaison to the Panel.

Mr. Glaisek reminded the Panel of the new review process which includes a 5-minute period for the Proponent to respond to any comments made by the Panel.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **Jack Layton Ferry Terminal & Harbour Square Park**

*ID#: 1066*

*Project Type: Master Planning, Park Design and Building*

*Location: Central Waterfront*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: KPMB, West 8 and Greenberg Consulting Inc.*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Jelle Therry (West 8)*

*Delegation: Bruno Weber (KPMB), Ken Greenberg, (Greenberg Consulting Inc.)*

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

Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that it was last presented to the Panel in December 2015. Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on the Master Plan by noting that public consultations were held in November, 2015 and January, 2016 to refine and finalize the Master Plan report. The order of magnitude cost of the project is \$75 million. Ms. Mallozzi proceeded to give an overview of Phase 1A, which consists of 60 meters of new promenade, new lighting, and signage.

She noted that in collaboration with the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division at the City of Toronto, and Deputy Mayor Pam McConnell, Phase IA funding of \$1.8 million has been secured. Feedback received from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee on Phase IA included, showing how this phase fits into the overall Master Plan, identify a wayfinding strategy at the entrance of Bay Street and Queens Quay, ensuring the promenade design improves pedestrian flow to the terminal, and engaging the Westin Hotel regarding the relationship of the hotel frontage and the new promenade. Ms. Mallozzi then raised a number of issues for the Panel to consider including, the proposed promenade, the queuing accommodation, wayfinding and signage, and the relationship of the park to the path.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Jelle Therry, Project Manager at West 8 introduced the project noting that the promenade consists of 60 linear meters of pavers that build on the palette of materials used on Queens Quay. The promenade will be widened from nine meters to approximately fifteen meters by removing the planters and centering the promenade between the Westin and the tunnel retaining wall. Mr. Therry explained that the drainage system used on the Portland Slip Water's Edge Promenade will be applied to the proposed promenade. Mr. Therry explained that the wayfinding strategy includes keeping the existing City standard park sign and the banners, and adding a mural to the Westin Hotel façade to indicate the location of the Ferry Terminal. Mr. Therry explained that the lighting strategy involves upgrading existing light poles with the signature Olivio light feature and shroud.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members asked for clarification on the existing retaining wall. Mr. Therry explained that the tunnel will be narrowed in future stages, and the retaining wall will be moved further west.

Another Panel members asked if the fifteen meter width is maintained the whole way. Mr. Therry replied yes.

One of the Panel members asked if wayfinding is a part of the budget. Mr. Therry replied that yes it is still part of the budget and is still being developed.

Another Panel member asked about the retaining wall and the resulting condition once the planter is taken away. Mr. Therry replied that this will be addressed in the Design Development stage.

Another Panel member asked if delineating a lane for bicycles was considered. Mr. Therry replied that this was considered, however, the main issue of the promenade was ensuring the space was maximized for pedestrians to flow through to the ticketing booths. Mr. Therry added that the number of benches has been minimized from the initial design in order to maximize pedestrian flow.

One of the Panel members asked about the land ownership. Mr. Therry replied that the tunnel is privately owned and the park on top is municipally owned. The Panel member asked if they are able to build on top of an underground parking garage as the City does not normally allow this. Mr. Therry clarified that the details of the parking garage are not yet worked out.

Another Panel member asked where the new Queens Quay Boulevard extends to. Mr. Therry replied that it extends just past Bay Street and the paving pattern on the promenade will reflect the pattern on Queens Quay.

One of the Panel members asked about the drainage performance and whether it will be maintained by the City. Mr. Therry replied that they have already had discussions with the Parks, Forestry and Recreation department regarding maintenance. In terms of the performance of the drainage system, Mr. Therry replied that they will apply the same system used at the Portland Slip promenade with slight improvements.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

A Panel Member noted that the widening of the entrance walkway will allow continuity from Queens Quay and the trees will “soften” the proposed entry. They recalled the previous presentation which included a large pergola, which expressed the Bay Street entrance as something special and symbolic.

Another Panel Member supported the widening of the pathway. They noted that the signage should be more than a wayfinding piece. The signage piece should be cognisant of its location as an entrance to the larger context, for example, the Toronto Islands. The wayfinding and signage should connect into something that foreshadows the future and symbolizes the beginning of a journey. The Panel member recalled that particular attention was paid along Leslie Street down to Tommy Thompson Park. This kind of foreshadowing could be applied to this project, with a wayfinding that implies a threshold of some kind.

Another Panel Member expressed their reservation about the scale of a pergola for the entrance feature. Pergolas as gateways in the city, such as the UofT gateways on Saint George, tend to become cluttered unless they are designed and executed well. The entrance to the ferry terminal as proposed, with the allée of trees and the continuous paving, is enough to alter the experience of entering from the urban setting into the park. The continuity shown in the proposed scheme with a minimal number of benches is therefore excellent. The Panel Member also noted that the signage needs to be further refined.

Another Panel Member praised the team for the clarity of the presentation and a high quality design that brings coherence to the space. The simplicity of the entrance design is excellent as it denotes a picturesque experience into the park and to the islands. Overall, all elements are a good choice. The Panel Member suggested that the wayfinding piece could perhaps become a totem style, and located at the west side of the pathway rather

than the Westin Hotel side. The Panel Member noted Gavin Turk's Rusty Nail in London as an example of a piece that has permanence, and incorporates public art.

Another Panel Member observed that there is a yearning for pergola on one hand, and preference for simply relying on the landscape, on the other. The Panel Member noted that the continuity of the paving is already a powerful gesture, therefore for this phase it may be enough to rely on just the paving. The wayfinding piece should have coherent graphics that are explicit (i.e. "To the ferry terminal") with an arrow pointing towards the gate.

One of the Panel members noted that the minimal benches with the trees responds to the high flow of pedestrians and suggested that perhaps all the benches can be left out.

Another Panel Member recalled that the competition winning scheme used "green lungs" as the identity of the new park and there will inevitably be a transition along the walkway into an urban setting. As for the wayfinding, a large totem piece could work on this site.

Another Panel member noted that the success of the West Don Lands public, which, as it was carefully curated and selected, became part of the identity of the precinct. At the ferry terminal, there is a threshold into the park and the islands – therefore the wayfinding requires a bigger level of thinking in the later phase. This can be part of the future budget.

### **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

1. Overall a great presentation and the Panel feels confident that the team can deliver high quality public realm.
2. Strong support for the pavement design – there is commonality with Queens Quay which, supports the continuation of the waterfront vision.
3. The Panel is confident that the proposed design will respond to the queuing/operational needs.
4. Wayfinding and signage needs to be developed further in this phase to ensure it is unique and reads well.
5. Integration of public art needs to be demonstrated in this phase or the next phase of design.

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

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

## **2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure Due Diligence For Information Only**

*ID#: 1079*

*Project Type: Parks and Public Realm*

*Location: Port Lands*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates*

*Review Stage:*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto*

*Delegation: Ken Dion (TRCA), David Kusturin (Waterfront Toronto)*

### **2.1 Project Presentation**

Ms. Mallozzi provided the Panel with an overview of the Due Diligence work as a precursor to the Essroc Quay Lakefilling and Design presentation. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the Due Diligence report was completed in partnership with the City of Toronto, Toronto Region Conservation Authority, and The Toronto Port Lands Company. The Due Diligence Report is a comprehensive plan for flood protecting southeastern portions of downtown that are at risk of flooding. Ms. Mallozzi noted that until the flood risk is removed, this area is effectively undevelopable and economically underutilized. Ms. Mallozzi identified 21 scope elements such as carving out the river valley, the flow control weir system, Cherry Street re-alignment, etc. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the overall intention of the Due Diligence was to understand the unknowns and provide as much assurance on costs, risks, and schedule to reduce uncertainties. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the biggest findings involved the site conditions, specifically the flowing sand and compressible peat. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the cost estimate is \$1.25 billion with a 90% probability of completion within the budget. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the project was peer reviewed by Kiewit Corporation and the Netherlands Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment with the intention of having a qualified contractor and government perspective to examine the report's adequacy and accuracy. Ms. Mallozzi walked the Panel through a number of renderings showing the potential of the Port Lands once the area is flood protected and noted that after full build out there will be \$5.1 billion in value to the Canadian economy, 51,900 full time years of employment, and \$1.9 billion in government revenues.

### **2.2 Panel Questions and Comments**

One of the Panel members asked if they are seeking private funding for the project. David Kusturin, Chief Operating Officer with Waterfront Toronto, responded that they are looking into a variety of funding models.

Another Panel member asked how the Villiers Island Precinct Plan fits into all of this. Mr. Kusturin responded that the Precinct Plan assumes all of the elements of the river and both plans are aligned.

One of the Panel members noted that the vision from the 2007 competition plan is still reflected in the most recent design. The Panel member appreciated this given that most plans deviate from the original vision.

Another Panel member asked if there were any precedents for the type of project. Mr. Kusturin noted that there was one example in the Netherlands called Room for the River Program where an additional floodplain was created.

### **Essroc Quay Lakefilling and Design**

*ID#: 1078*

*Project Type: Parks and Public Realm*

*Location: Port Lands*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates*

*Review Stage: Issues Identification*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Herb Sweeney (MVVA), Michael Van Valkenburgh (MVVA)*

*Delegation: Ken Dion (TRCA)*

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

Ms. Mallozzi began by introducing the project noting that the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan created in 2003 had a vision for re-naturalizing the mouth of the Don River. Since then, a number of revisions have been made to the plan. Ms. Mallozzi explained to the Panel that in September 2016, the three orders of government announced \$65 million for the Essroc Quay Lakefilling project. The project consists of creating a new landmass around the current Essroc Quay and stabilizes that area shoreline under flood conditions. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the project will also create new naturalized open spaces and aquatic habitat, improve water quality, optimize water and storm water infrastructure, and facilitate the construction of roads and transit into the Port Lands by enabling the shift of the Cherry Street Bridge. Ms. Mallozzi outlined MVVA's scope of work which involves, providing design integration as it relates to the future Promontory Park, advance programming and preliminary design of Promontory Park in order to provide details for edge conditions, advance habitat and ecological design through construction in order to accelerate the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada approval, and undertake design for diversion of existing sewers and oversee Construction Administration for this work. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the schedule for this project is to start construction in August 2017 with a completion date of March 2019 as a condition of funding. Ms. Mallozzi raised a number of issues for the Panel to consider including the relationship of Essroc Quay to the larger context, the relationship of the project with respect to sustainability, prosperity, destinations, neighbourhoods and engagement, and the definition of success for this project.

#### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Michael Van Valkenburgh, President of MVVA noted that the site is only two hectares located on the North West tip of the Port Lands and will be the opening moment of sequences of parks in the Port Lands.

Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal at MVVA, walked the Panel through the site context, pointing out the Essroc Silos and the MT35 building which are both listed heritage buildings. Mr. Sweeney identified areas with important views and areas that are exposed to prevailing winds, ice, and waves. Mr. Sweeney noted that the team has looked at the two hectares and how some of the programming identified in the Due Diligence Report can be applied here.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that the design team is drawing ideas from other projects such as Brooklyn Bridge Park. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that there are only four parks in Toronto where you can access the water. This project intends to make the edge porous rather than making it a boundary. Mr. Van Valkenburgh also noted that a big part of the visual quality is working on the shoreline and the edge condition.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

A Panel member asked if the coves were necessary to satisfy the approvals process. Mr. Sweeney replied that yes the coves are part of the aquatic habitat requirements.

One Panel member asked for clarity on the map that outlines the proposed boundary of Essroc Quay. Mr. Sweeney noted that the red line defined the limit of work for the Due Diligence exercise. The team is currently running hydraulic models for pushing the northern edge beyond that boundary to create a more prominent cove. The Panel member then asked when the team will know the validity of model. Mr. Sweeney noted that the team is running variations and from a high level perspective, this version currently works.

Another Panel member asked about the topography and sought clarification on whether they are building a tall hill. Mr. Sweeney noted that yes they are creating a tall hill, approximately 75 feet.

One Panel member asked about the status of the MT35 building. Mr. Sweeney replied that it is a listed heritage building, and they are now being asked to consider its retention.

Another Panel member asked if the MT35 building will be programmed. Mr. Sweeney noted that they are unsure of the future use of the MT35 building. The Panel member also asked how the grade change will be reconciled with the heritage buildings. Mr. Sweeney noted that some buildings will be moved and others will be slightly buried, but this has not been studied for MT35.

One of the Panel members asked if you will be able to access the water's edge and touch the water. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that there will be spaces where you can access the water and the team will bring sections to show where these locations are proposed. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that one of the great things about Brooklyn Bridge Park is the access it provides to the water.

Another Panel member asked what is driving the need to move forward so quickly. Mr. Sweeney replied that the project will need to start construction in August to meet the requirements of the grant program.

One of the Panel members asked if there will be a bridge connection to Trinity Street. Mr. Sweeney replied that they're showing what was presented in the Lower Don Lands Environmental Assessment.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One of the Panel members felt that this project was promising and was very intrigued overall. The Panel member noted that the bridge will have an impact on the upper cove proposed. The Panel member also felt that MT35 building has such a presence on the site and encouraged the Proponent to consider uses for the building.

Another Panel member liked the idea of the hill but was sceptical about adding a skating ribbon given the proposed topography. The Panel member also raised concerns of the proposed high density built form of Villiers competing with the natural landscape. The Panel member felt that this goes against the overall intention of the project which is simple habitat.

One Panel member felt that the precedents shown were all very interesting. The Panel member was sceptical about the pedestrian bridge connection across the Keating Channel from the project site.

Another Panel member commended the team for a thorough presentation. The Panel member agreed with the locations of the large habitat indentations and liked the proximity and accessibility of the north cove to Villiers Street. The Panel member wondered where moments of juxtaposition of creating hard edges and soft ecological landscapes will occur in the future.

One of the Panel members felt that this was a great example of thinking about the landscape before the infrastructure. The Panel member felt that this will really give Villiers Island an identity. The Panel member compared it to Corktown Common in the West Don Lands, noting that it has such a great presence and gave the area an identity. The Panel member noted that with the hill, the MT35 building, and the two coves, the amount of remaining open space needs to be considered. The Panel member noted that a sectional diagram should be presented at the next stage in order to better understand the proposed topography.

Another Panel member felt the context plan needs to be enlarged to include the 3C development project and the Keating Channel Precinct. The Panel member liked the idea of the pedestrian bridge connection given that it would ultimately lead to the Distillery District. The Panel member felt that the MT35 building needs to be thought about before moving into the next stage of design. The Panel member also pointed out that there is a

series of notable topographic points on the waterfront and this could be seen as an urban system connected through topography.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

1. Overall the Panel appreciated the clarity of the presentation and the variety of scales of context presented.
2. Include the context of the 3C development site and the Trinity Bridge connection in the next review.
3. Provide sectional diagrams to understand the proposed topography and relationship to built form.
4. Establish a program for the MT35 building given its size and relation to the project.
5. Ensure that there will be enough open space given the large coves and adjacent MT35 building.
6. Avoid the perception of the natural landscape “slamming” into the built form landscape.
7. Consider this as one point of an urban system along the waterfront connected through topography.

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

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

## **300 Commissioners Street – Storage Facility**

*ID#: 1062*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: Port Lands*

*Proponent: Belleterre Real Estate Partners*

*Architect/Designer: Quadrangle, Terra Plan*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: two*

*Presenter(s): Blair Martin, Belleterre Real Estate Partners, Matthew Bernstein, TerraPlan Landscape Architects*

*Delegation: Don Bannister, Belleterre Real Estate Partners*

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

Amanda Santo, Director of Development Approvals with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that it was last reviewed at DRP in July 2015. Ms. Santo noted the site is zoned industrial which permits as of right self-storage facilities. Ms. Santo also noted that the site will be graded to accommodate flood protection in accordance with the Don Mouth Naturalization Project Environmental Assessment. Ms. Santo explained that the Proponent appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) which resulted in approval of their project in conflict with the proposed alignment of the Broadview extension contemplated in the Port Lands Planning Framework. Ms. Santo reviewed Panel comments from the July 2015 meeting which included, refining the initial concepts further, the blank west wall treatment could be a potentially undesirable situation, and the landscape could be more unique. Ms. Santo raised a number of issues

for the Panel to consider, including the future adaptability, the treatment of the interim west wall, the treatment of the windows and corridors, and the landscape concept. Ms. Santo then introduced Blair Martin, President of Belleterre Real Estate Partners, to give the project presentation.

#### **4.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Martin began by noting that their design accommodate the original Broadview alignment, however, the most recent alignment drove further through their property which is why they appealed their application to the OMB. Mr. Martin noted that the overall design of the building has not changed since the last review, however, the building footprint has been revised slightly. Mr. Martin explained that the concept behind the coloured windows is to represent the appearance of stacked shipping containers. Mr. Martin felt that removing some of the windows would take away from the original concept. Mr. Martin also addressed the issue of the corridors by noting that they would only be accessible by maintenance staff so as not to become informal storage areas. If the corridors were to be made active, a significant amount of square footage would be lost. Mr. Martin explained that as an interim solution to the west wall, the team has looked into painting the wall different colours to represent vertically stacked shipping containers.

Mr. Martin introduced Matthew Bernstein, Partner at TerraPlan Landscape Architects to present the landscape and sustainability goals of the project. Mr. Bernstein noted that the plaza space is now free of obstacles after eliminating the wall shown in the last proposal. Now that the plaza space is more open, there is room to accommodate street furniture. Mr. Bernstein noted that the bioswales will be coordinated with the building noting that they will be lined with rubble. Mr. Bernstein also described the green roof by noting it will be irrigated for the first two years to ensure its viability. Mr. Bernstein noted that the asphalt paving will have a special coating to make it less heat absorptive.

#### **4.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members asked about the future adaptability of the building. Mr. Martin noted that the building can be easily adapted for future uses.

Another Panel members asked if they are looking to achieve Tier 1 or Tier 2 Green Building Standards. Mr. Bernstein replied that they are aiming for Tier 1.

One of the Panel members asked for clarification on the rubble detail in the bioswale. Mr. Bernstein noted that the precedent image shown is river stone and they would likely use something similar. Mr. Bernstein noted that the logic of the rubble is to keep the area looking clean. The Panel member also asked for detail on the paving of the plaza. Mr. Bernstein explained that they will be using either exposed aggregate or coloured paving.

Another Panel member asked for the reasoning behind having bollards in the driveway. Mr. Martin explained that they're required for safety reasons. The Panel member then asked if it would be possible to improve the appearance of the bollards to which Mr. Martin responded yes.

One of the Panel members asked if the Proponents have looked into climate control for the building. Mr. Bernstein noted that storage facilities are cooled to a lower level and lighting is sensor activated which helps with energy efficiency.

Another Panel member asked about the purpose of the corridors and whether they are purely symbolic. Mr. Martin replied that they are only accessible to maintenance staff in order to maintain the windows and lighting. The Panel member also asked if it will be possible to see the ceiling from the windows. Mr. Martin replied yes.

#### **4.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One of the Panel members noted that the building design has not changed since the last review. The Panel member noted that the colour of the painted panels on the west wall differs from the colours of the windows, and felt more work was needed to resolve the design of the west wall. The Panel member was appreciative of the introduction of more trees into the space.

Another Panel member felt that the proposed painted vertical bands on the west wall don't match the horizontal pattern of the coloured windows, and suggested maintaining the horizontal language throughout. The Panel member noted that more direction from the City needs to be given regarding the context of the streetscape.

One of the Panel members commended the team for the bold vision of the building and appreciated the green roof. The Panel member also agreed that attempting to make a streetscape without guidance is difficult. The Panel member felt that more trees could be added to the parking lot which would bring more vegetation into the site and would help cool the pavement. The Panel member expressed that the bioswales are articulated in a very suburban way and suggested making it feel more industrial in character. The Panel member also felt this way about the plaza noting that it's a bold industrial building and the plaza should reflect this. The Panel member also noted that the scale of the entrance plaza with finer and smaller elements seemed inconsistent with the boldness of the building.

One of the Panel members agreed with the plaza space needing to be more bold and simplified. The Panel member also felt that there should be more involvement with the design architect, who will best be able to make the building design a reality. The Panel member noted that the glass coating with the Low-e coating could look very different from what is shown in the rendering, and questioned whether the transparency of the glass windows is actually achievable.

Several Panel members felt that the drawings presented and the renderings shown do not align. They noted that there needs to be consistency between both to ensure that the design shown is actually achievable, and expressed a strong response to see this project again at Detailed Design for proof that the concept can be delivered.

#### **4.5 Consensus Comments**

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

1. Overall the Panel likes the building, however, concern was raised as to whether the rendered image is deliverable based on the plans shown.
2. The Panel appreciated the attempt to make a streetscape without certainty from the City of Toronto on its design.
3. Simplify the plaza space to respond to an urban, industrial environment.
4. Update the rendering to reflect changes to the plaza and the urban environment.
5. More resolution is needed on the design of the west wall. Consider making the bands of colour horizontal to tie in with the windows.

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

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