

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #4 Wednesday, January 18, 2005

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
George Baird
Paul Bedford
Tania Bortolotto
Peter Clewes
Peter Halsall
Siamak Hariri
Anne McIlroy
Janet Rosenberg
Don Schmitt
Charles Waldheim

Regrets:

Renee Daoust
Greg Smallenberg

Recording Secretary:

Jennifer Andrews

Designees and Guests:

John Campbell
Robert Freedman
Christopher Glaisek

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair opened the meeting with two general issues:

- Meeting Schedule: it was suggested that perhaps meeting once a month is too frequent, and every six weeks might be preferable. The Corporation was asked to seek the input of Panel members when it is finalizing the schedule.
- Minutes: it was agreed that the format of the minutes and the timing and process within which changes are made to the minutes needed to be discussed as part of the review of the minutes scheduled for later in the meeting.

The Chair then thanked the Corporation's President and CEO for joining the meeting and invited him to give an overview to the Panel.

REPORT FROM THE CEO

The Corporation's President and CEO began with a summary of where the Corporation is headed in the coming year, noting that it had laid out a very ambitious agenda, including:

- The Corporation is moving into implementation, and hoarding will be going up soon around the West Don Lands and construction of the berm will begin in the spring.
- Developer proposal calls will go out in June so that upon approval of the development application, agreements can be signed immediately and offer certainty to developers.
- A signature design for the Central Waterfront Esplanade and Boulevard will be developed this year through an international design competition.
- Work will begin soon on a master plan for Lake Ontario Park, which is expected to ultimately become to Toronto what Stanley Park is to Vancouver.
- A Memorandum of Understanding is being finalized with TEDCO and the City to enable work to move forward expeditiously on the East Bayfront and Portlands areas.

- The Corporation continues to seek the highest standards in all aspects of its work. Design excellence is essential to achieving this goal, and the projects should inspire people to live downtown, raise their children downtown, and believe in downtown's future. The recent selection of Michael Van Valkenburg Associates to design Don River Park demonstrates the on-going commitment to hiring the best talent.

The Chair then thanked Mr. Campbell for his presentation and opened up the meeting for questions or comments from the Panel. One Panel member stated that it will be important to achieve design excellence in the first projects, since they will be scrutinized more rigorously than later ones and therefore will set the standard. It was felt that no issue should be considered "too small" for careful attention at the beginning.

Several Panel members felt that improved connections between downtown and the waterfront were critically important for revitalization to succeed. They stressed the need for a plan that links all the parts together into a bigger picture, and suggested an international ideas competition or a Panel-focused workshop as possible venues for addressing this, and asked how they could help make it happen. The President and CEO responded that although the connections to the north have not been a part of the Corporation's agenda to date, they are an important waterfront issue. The Corporation's 10-year business plan is expected to be revised every year as priorities change, and if the north-south connections become a priority, it might be possible to make funds available for an ideas competition or design charrette.

Another Panel member stressed the need to develop a set of principles that provide common ground for the entire waterfront, not just individual projects. There was concern that the process of doing RFP's for stand-alone projects made it difficult to address the broader issues and set constraints on the designers of the public realm. Other Panel members felt it was equally important that there be consistency not just at the large scale, but at the small scale as well. Attention to detailing and materials, particularly in the public realm components, was felt to be very important in establishing a sense of continuity. The President and CEO agreed that it is critically important that we make it clear where the public space is, and use every mechanism to ensure the public knows it belongs to them.

Another Panel member raised the importance of programming. Millennium Park was cited as a beautiful public park, but one that achieved its greatest success through activities like concerts and performances. Others agreed, but expressed concern that the Corporation not wait for cultural institutions to come to the waterfront but start implementing public improvements as a way of attracting these types of uses.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

The Chair then asked if there were any comments on the content of the minutes from the last meeting or the new format.

The Vice President for Planning and Design explained that further clarity is needed on protocol for discussing projects after a presenter leaves the room, as this came up as an issue after sharing the minutes with some of the participants. In particular, Victor Ford was concerned about some of the comments made after his departure, and the fact that he had no opportunity to respond to them in person.

A special request was made that the minutes be amended in this instance, on the grounds that the Panel is still working out its review procedures. However, Panel members felt strongly that the minutes as drafted did not harm the reputation of the designer, and did not need to reference his past projects and awards in any greater detail. There was consensus among the Panel members that the statements contained in the minutes were both appropriately and constructively recorded, and that it was not a good precedent for the Panel to change them.

The Vice President for Planning and Design then made two recommendations to the Panel for addressing this situation in the future. The first was that the Panel formally adopt a general policy of not discussing projects without at least one member of the presenting team present. The second was that, in special cases where the Panel feels an in-camera session is absolutely necessary, that the public record show that the designer was given a sense of concern, and not allowed to leave with a misunderstanding.

One Panel member felt there was real value in making in-camera comments on the record, while another felt it was important for consultants to be in the room. There was general consensus that the Panel needs to be comfortable in vocalizing its concerns with a project or a project consultant, and that such discussions not be precluded. It was suggested that, in the event one or more Panel members feels an in-camera review is needed, they signal to the Chair who will ask the designer to wait outside until after the discussion. At that point, the designer will be asked to come back and be given a summary of the Panel's comments and concerns.

There being no further issues regarding the minutes, the Chair then asked the Vice President Planning and Design to give his project report.

PROJECT REPORT

The Vice President for Planning and Design gave a brief update on current projects, noting that the coming year which would place a great deal of emphasis on the role of the Panel.

Panel Procedures

- The Corporation and the Chair are beginning the process of developing more formalized policies and procedures to ensure that the Panel operates in a professional manner, including signing a Confidentiality Agreement and Code of Conduct.
- The original Terms of Reference for the Panel will be re-crafted into a more comprehensive guide describing the Panel's role and responsibilities, and a draft will be circulated for Panel review prior to the next meeting.

West Don Lands

- Terms of Reference will be issued shortly for a soil cleaning facility, which will begin operation in the spring.
- The Corporation has hired Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates to design the 19-acre Don River Park, and the team will be introduced to the Panel later in the day.
- The Corporation is about two weeks away from completing its development application with the City. The block planning and design guidelines are the biggest outstanding piece, and are now being completed by Urban Design Associates. In response to concerns raised by the Panel, final submission of these plans was delayed in order to allow time to incorporate Panel feedback, and Paul Ostergaard will be presenting for a fourth time to the Panel later today and soliciting final comments.
- The Corporation is nearing completion of a public realm framework document, which will lay out the basic requirements and configurations of the streets, sidewalks, and smaller open spaces. The framework is intended to satisfy city requirements to

complete the development application and to serve as the basis for issuing an RFP for detailed design of the public realm, it will be presented later in the day.

East Bayfront

- City Council approved the East Bayfront Precinct plan on December 9, 2005, and the Corporation is now preparing to start the next phase of work on block plans, design guidelines, and the area East of Parliament.

Central Waterfront Esplanade and Boulevard

- The Corporation is about to release a call for an international design competition for the water's edge and Queens Quay Boulevard within the next month. The scope of this project will be presented to the Panel later in the day.

Lake Ontario Park

- Four teams have been short-listed for the master plan exercise, and the winning bidder will be introduced to Panel as soon as they are on board.

Martin Goodman Trail

- Construction continues on the Western Beaches Watercourse, and the completion of the Martin Goodman Trail segment through Marilyn Bell Park is to be finished in time for the Dragon Boat Races in August.
- Victor Ford is working to address the design issues raised at the last Panel meeting, and those revisions will be presented to the Panel at the February meeting, with a tender for construction of the trail issued by the end of that month.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block Plans

ID#: 1002

Project Type: Precinct/Master Plan

Location: Area bounded by Parliament St., Eastern Ave., the Don River, and the CN rail corridor

Proponent: Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation

Architect/Designer: Urban Design Associates with Joe Lobko Architect

Review Round: Fourth

Delegation: None

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced this project, noting that it was now critical to finalize the block plans in order for the development application to be completed and approvals obtained. Therefore the issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought were focused on those related to finalizing the Plan of Subdivision, including:

- Configuration of the block patterns and street rights-of-way
- Disposition and massing of buildings, both signature and non-signature
- Ground floor commercial uses on Front Street

1.2 Project Presentation

Paul Ostergaard, Urban Designer with Urban Design Associates, began by stating that the Panel had had an enormous, positive influence on the West Don Lands precinct plan. He then gave a detailed presentation of the plan and summarized the key changes since the last meeting:

- Public Open Space: the park at the south-west corner of the precinct was expanded; the green corridor on River Street was extended further north; River Square Park was modified to improve the traffic patterns; and a laneway was added along the rail line.
- Building Massing: height limits were changed so that all of the 10-storey buildings face onto public open space, and the shorter buildings face onto smaller streets.
- Front Street: the ground floor uses have been rethought to encourage a “main street” to develop east of Cherry Street, with higher mandatory first-floor heights intended to protect for and promote commercial uses.
- King-Parliament: these buildings are now being target for mixed-use commercial, rather than simply residential with ground-floor retail.
- Cherry Street: buildings were moved to parallel the line of the street to define the edge.
- Townhouse Blocks: these blocks were reworked to provide longer continuous townhouse frontages with fewer interruptions from driveways and taller buildings.
- Eastern-Front Intersection: the triangle park where these two streets come together continues to be a challenge that will require additional work in the public realm design phase and probably more traffic analysis.
- Sub-Districts: four separate zones were consolidated into a single planning document that sets out the goals for the neighbourhood overall and provides detailed, block-by-block urban design guidelines based on common principles.

1.3 Panel Comments

Several Panel members felt that the Eastern-Front intersection was of critical importance to the future of the neighbourhood, and suggested that perhaps it needs to be reconsidered with Front Street as the major arterial instead of Eastern Avenue. As currently configured, the intersection is not only dangerous for pedestrians, but favours cars speeding across the Don River over those traveling to this neighbourhood.

Another Panel member suggested continuing the widening of Front Street west to Eastern Avenue. This would increase the street’s prominence at the intersection and set development back from the two heritage buildings at Cherry Street, therefore making them more prominent features of the neighbourhood. Others questioned the usability of the open space in the center median, and suggested that perhaps the sidewalks on either side be widened instead. However, there was general consensus that Front Street should be treated as a major spine, and that the plan had greatly improved in this respect.

The towers south of Mill Street were considered much improved as well, although one Panel member suggested they be rotated to give them a north-south orientation. Others felt that the more important issue was that of the Cherry Street frontage of the garage building, and suggested the need for that building to have a front entrance on a vehicular road, not just facing the TTC turn-around. The new laneway running alongside the rail corridor was praised as a good move, and was suggested as a possible solution to providing a suitable entrance location.

The Panel liked the straightening out of the street wall at the north-east end of the precinct, and felt that the Bayview Crescent had been made stronger by this move. However, several Panel members expressed scepticism about the need to echo this curve in the 24-storey corner tower, and felt it should be required only in the base building of that block.

The Panel also liked the consolidation of the sub-districts into a single plan. Several thought it called into question the need for “four neighbourhoods” at all. One Panel member pointed out that many Toronto neighbourhoods are the size of the entire West Don Lands, and that the

sub-districts could seem forced and artificial over time. Others questioned how the plan actually created four neighbourhoods, feeling instead that it really created one neighbourhood, as it has but one main street, one school, and one major park.

1.4 Summary of Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the major themes that emerged from the Panel discussion:

- i. In general, the Panel was pleased with the evolution of the plan in urban design terms, and expressed a desire to see a similar evolution in the complexity and richness of uses.
- ii. The Eastern-Front intersection remains a big area of concern, and the Panel felt much more exploration of better design alternatives was needed.
- iii. The massing of the towers south of Mill Street, particularly with regard to the logic of the height restrictions and orientation, could use some further refinement if possible.
- iv. The final configuration of Front Street, particularly the issue of the center median versus wider sidewalks, should be determined by testing the usability of open space.
- v. The re-structuring of the four district plans into a single plan is a positive step, and suggests that the final draft should eliminate the notion of sub-districts entirely.
- vi. The proposed bus ramp connection to Bayview Avenue was felt to be a bad idea.

1.5 Proponent's Response

Mr. Ostergaard thanked the Panel for its efforts in making the West Don Lands precinct plan better over the course of the last eight months.

2.0 Leslie Street Greening / Martin Goodman Trail Enhancements

ID#: 1004

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Linear trail running south on Leslie Street from Lakeshore Blvd. to Unwin Ave.

Proponent: Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation

Architect/Designer: du Toit Allsopp Hillier

Review Round: First

Delegation: None

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced this project, noting that Phase 1 had already gone out for construction tender and was therefore largely fixed, but that Phase 2 was just starting and open for substantial Panel input. The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Appropriateness of the scale of the project
- Impact of the project in surrounding uses such as Tommy Thompson Park

2.2 Project Presentation

John Hillier, landscape architect and partner at du Toit Allsopp Hillier, then gave a detailed presentation of the plan, describing:

- Existing Conditions: Leslie Street is the main public access point to Tommy Thompson Park yet is in a state of severe disrepair, with improvements to the trail sorely needed.
- Context: the route is surrounded by industrial uses such as the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant, the Concrete Campus, and the Works Yard.
- Alignment: the trail is proposed to be widened, a separate sidewalk created in order to reduce conflicts between cyclists/rollerbladers and pedestrians, and seating nodes added.
- Plantings: early successional plants are proposed to fill in quickly and provide a buffer to industrial uses.

- Lighting: contemporary, industrial aesthetic is proposed, oriented to pedestrians at approximately 12-15 feet high.
- Paving: asphalt surface for trail bordered with stones like those used around Queens Quay Terminal, to promote consistency along the waterfront.
- Drainage: the existing swale will be rebuilt to improve water carrying capacity, but construction of a new storm sewer is not within the \$2 million project budget.

2.3 Panel Comments

The Panel expressed concern that there was not enough money in the budget to do something “more than mediocre” with so many components. They suggested that priorities be established and the project pared down to ensure that one or two elements could be made outstanding.

Another Panel member expressed disappointment with the results of dismantled Gardiner Expressway east of the Don River, citing dead plants and lack of sense of place as the biggest shortcomings. It was urged that fast-growing plants and a linear, rather than episodic, landscape design be used to ensure that Leslie Street is more successful than Lakeshore Boulevard. One Panel member questioned the seemingly “random” pattern of tree plantings proposed. Mr. Hillier responded that they received constant requests to naturalize the stretch, and balancing that objective with a strong urban design character was challenging. Another Panel member suggested that it was a question of scale, and that it was important for the consultant to determine how much space is needed rather than simply working with what is easily available.

Other Panel members questioned the separation of the street trees from the grove of trees by the path. It was suggested that they should be integrated, and that this notion be carried through Phase 2 even if only the path can be built at first. The Panel requested a better drawing showing the relationship of Phase 1 to Phase 2, and indicating how parts of Phase 2 might be implemented over time if the required land and/or funding is not available now.

Another Panel member asked if this project was conceived of as permanent or temporary, suggesting that it should perhaps include some temporary installations to give it more life in the short term, until the bigger moves can be accomplished. The creative use of plantings, crushed glass, and temporary art were suggested as economical ways to add character. The Panel also cautioned that the design of Phase 1 would in many ways set the standard, and urged that it be treated as a “demonstration block” that would inform the development of the remainder of the street over time.

2.4 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

The temporary acting Chair, Paul Bedford, then summarized the major themes that emerged from the Panel discussion:

- i. The project needs to be seen as part of a much bigger set of ideas, and continuity for the entire length of the route is essential for its success.
- ii. The design needs to be “more than ok” even if that means reducing the scope to match the budget.
- iii. The trees must be “done right” both in terms of where and how they are planted.
- iv. An appropriate gateway to Tommy Thompson Park is important, and the design of this project needs to work with whatever is proposed for the park entrance.
- v. All of the ideas should be shown on the plan drawing(s) so it is clear how the current phases relate to the bigger, future ones.
- vi. The extensive use of grass should be reassessed in favour of a more diverse palette of materials.

- vii. The project priorities should be reassessed to get a bigger “wow factor” out of fewer elements.

2.5 Proponent’s Response

Mr. Hillier thanked the Panel for its comments and stated that he looked forward to coming back when the designs for Phase 2 were further developed.

3.0 West Don Lands Public Realm Plan

ID#: 1005

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Area bounded by Parliament St., Eastern Ave., the Don River, and the CN rail corridor.

Proponent: Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation

Architect/Designer: Urban Strategies with Marshall Macklin Monaghan

Review Round: First

Delegation: Pascale Dionne

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced this project, noting that this was an essential component of the development application filed with the City, and that it needs to be finalized along with the block plan. Therefore, the main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- The appropriateness of the scope of the framework to inform future design work.
- The acceptability of the basic configurations of streets, sidewalks and plantings for the purposes of the Plan of Subdivision.
- The quality of the proposal on Bayview Avenue and River Street specifically, as those two will start construction at the same time as the berm.

3.2 Project Presentation

Melanie Hare, Partner with Urban Strategies Inc., began by summarizing the principles used in developing the public realm framework, including:

- **Open Space Strategy:** consisted of an inventory of all the public spaces, from large to small, and a basic idea for their use.
- **Streetscapes:** focused on the minimum rights-of-way that will be protected.
- **Movement Corridors:** identified non-street routes that would be used by pedestrians.
- **Infrastructure and Servicing:** looked at all of the below-ground requirements for sewers, water, utilities, district energy, and intelligent communities.
- **Archaeology and Heritage:** considered relationship of historic structures and sites to the public space network.

Robert Webb, Executive Vice President for Operations with Marshall Macklin Monaghan, then gave a detailed presentation of the proposed street sections, including River Street, Bayview Avenue, Front Street, Mill Street, Cherry Street, all of the secondary roads, and bike lanes.

3.3 Panel Comments

One Panel member felt that the relationship of Bayview Avenue to Don River Park was a critical consideration. Others expressed a similar concern about whether or not the dimensions would allow for the creation of a true park boulevard. It was recommended that the Don River Park design team be involved in the decisions regarding Bayview Avenue, and that some provision be made for breaking down the perceived pavement width with interruptions in the parking lane such as trees and pedestrian refuge areas.

Another Panel member suggested that the configuration of the bike lanes be rethought, as they are an increasingly important component of the Toronto landscape but are typically articulated as just another “traffic lane.” Consideration should be given to creating an entirely separate bike lane, or to making the streets one-way so as to free-up more space for bikes.

Several Panel members agreed that the European sensibility of the precinct plan called for the streets to be as narrow as possible. It was suggested that this area be thought of as a demonstration project where everything is oriented primarily towards the pedestrian realm. Simple issues like how children cross the streets to get to the park should be readily apparent from the sizes and configurations of the roads and sidewalks.

Other Panel members pointed out that when European sensibilities are transposed to North American cities they do not always work. Panel members urged consideration of issues such as where snow goes when the streets are plowed. Today, there is a so-called “kill zone” where snow gets pushed, but if the streets were narrower that might block the sidewalks.

3.4 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then apologized for having to cut this discussion short due to time constraints, and summarized the major themes that had emerged from the Panel:

- The 11.5-metre R.O.W. on Bayview Avenue was considered workable, but more specific designs were requested for review as work progresses.
- The spacing of trees and their relationship to the rights-of-way on Bayview Avenue and River Streets specifically, and all of the streets generally, needs fine tuning.
- Guidelines are needed on the radial formation of Bayview Avenue, to describe how streets, sidewalks, tree pits, etc. relate to the curve.

3.5 Proponent’s Response

Mr. Glaisek thanked the Panel for its comments and stated that the project will be brought back to the Panel next month for further discussion and feedback.

4.0 Don River Park – Introduction to Design Team

ID#: 1006

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Area bounded by proposed Bayview Avenue crescent and the CN rail corridor.

Proponent: Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation

Architect/Designer: Michael Van Valkenberg Associates

Review Round: Introduction

Delegation: Laura Solano, Chris Matthews, Emily Mueller deCelis

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced Michael Van Valkenberg of Michael Van Valkenberg Associates, who were recently selected to design Don River Park.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Van Valkenberg began with a short introduction about his firm and his initial thoughts about how to approach the design of Don River Park, highlighting his interest in ensuring that it is a great park in winter as well as summer, and that it be a truly public park that can be maintained by the City. He then invited the Panel members to ask questions.

4.3 Panel Comments

One Panel member asked if he viewed the flood protection landform as an opportunity or a constraint. He responded that he did not view the landform as a liability.

A similar question was asked regarding the perception that the neighbourhood is “turning its back” on the Don River because of the berm. He responded that the view from the top of the landform back to the City is exhilarating, and that the edge facing the river offers some strong possibilities for a unique perspective on the water.

Another Panel member asked how the park could be made usable on the day it opens, rather than after years of landscape growth. He responded that it is important to design a park that fits the budget, which in this case means not relying on large numbers of mature plantings which drive project costs way up. Instead, features like fountains are great on opening day, and so-called “weed trees” like Black Locusts can be used effectively where quick cover is needed. He also stressed that the phenomenological quality of plant growth over time can itself be a device that animates the park, engaging people in changes with the seasons and the years.

Several Panel members asked about how the park design can be integrated with the streetscape surrounding the park. He responded that Bayview Avenue will be designed and built as part of the berm, and that his main concern was not so much the details of the road configuration but that the tree pits and the soils be done right to ensure survival and growth. He noted that the treatment of the edge between the park and street is extremely important, and that his team had already begun discussions with the berm designers about that issue.

4.4 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

N/A

4.5 Proponent’s Response

Mr. Van Valkenberg expressed his appreciation to the Panel for inviting him, and stated that he looked forward to working with them as the design evolved.

5.0 Central Waterfront Esplanade and Boulevard – Introduction to Project

ID#: 1007

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Area bounded by the water’s edge and the north side of Queens Quay Boulevard, from Bathurst Street to Jarvis Street

Proponent: Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation

Architect/Designer: N/A

Review Round: N/A

Delegation: N/A

5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced this project, noting that the Corporation had decided to hold a design competition for this part of the waterfront to ensure a comprehensive approach was taken to this important asset. The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Scope: is this the right set of issues to look at to ensure the central waterfront is not developed in a piecemeal fashion?
- Focus: are the Heads of the Slips an appropriate focus of energy for both the competition and immediate implementation?

- Jury: are the skills and/or types of people being contemplated the right mix?

5.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the Corporation hoped to form a jury of five people including not only members of the architectural design profession, but other cultural leaders who are interested in the future of the City. He then gave a presentation of the expected scope of the design competition, including:

- Signature Identity: the central waterfront is the prime stretch of Toronto's shoreline, and an identity, or brand, should be developed for it.
- Heads of Slips: these points where the waterfront meets Queens Quay Boulevard are currently pinch points, but should be developed as special places as called for in the City's Secondary Plan.
- Queens Quay Boulevard: this is the main route that links together all the major points along the waterfront, and a distinctive character should be developed to make it into an attraction.
- Martin Goodman Trail: this popular recreational route should be extended through the central waterfront, one of the few places where it is not currently continuous.
- Lighting: a series of special lighting fixtures, or "beacons," should be developed to provide light at night and to help create the signature for the central waterfront, as called for in earlier plans for the waterfront.
- Palette of Materials: a consistent body of materials should be developed that help identify all the different open spaces along the central waterfront as "public."

5.3 Panel Comments

Several Panel members felt that the jury should be Toronto-based, and should be geared to attracting international attention. Inclusion of leading writers, film-makers and/or journalists was suggested as a way to stimulate interest world-wide and make the jury more diverse. Other Panel members cautioned that the jury should be weighted towards design professionals, as a way of ensuring sufficient precision in expertise.

Another Panel member cautioned that competitions are difficult to make successful, and strongly recommended a very clear and specific work program be given to the short-listed teams, along with an equally-specific set of required deliverables. There was general agreement that this would be critical to a useful outcome.

One Panel member commented that this proposal would deal with the east-west connections along the waterfront, but not address the north-south connections. There was some discussion of incorporating both agendas into the same competition, but ultimately there was consensus that this would create an unworkably large project. The need for a comparable exercise for the north-south connections was stressed by the Panel members, and it was suggested as a "Phase 2" that would follow the completion of this competition.

There was some discussion regarding the appropriateness of this as a priority project, and whether or not the Heads of Slips were the best use of \$20 million. One Panel member stated that the Toronto waterfront needs a good waterfront promenade and that this project was indeed extremely important. There was general agreement that this project should continue to be a priority, but that the north-south connections must not be forgotten.

Several Panel members stressed the importance of picking the right people for the jury. They agreed that the names of the jury members were one of the first things potential respondents would look at when considering whether or not to enter the competition. Many said they knew

this from their own experience and felt it was perhaps the most important thing to get right. The Panel then suggested a list of possible candidates in the fields of architecture, landscape, urban design, graphic design, film, and others. The Chair suggested that panel members should email any additional thoughts on potential jury members to Chris Glaisek.

5.4 Summary of Panel's Key Issues

N/A

5.5 Proponent's Response

Mr. Glaisek thanked the Panel for its comments and stated that the draft Request for Proposals for the competition would be revised to reflect this input prior to being issued, and asked Panel members to contact him if they had any further suggestions for jury members.

CLOSING

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