



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #93 Wednesday, July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

---

### **Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Claude Cormier  
Brigitte Shim  
Betsy Williamson  
Jane Wolff

### **Regrets:**

Peter Busby  
Pat Hanson  
Don Schmitt  
Chris Reed

### **Recording Secretary:**

Rei Tasaka  
Tristan Simpson

### **Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Alka Lukatela

---

## **WELCOME**

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

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair informed the Panel that Harold Madi is no longer working with the City of Toronto and therefore Alka Lukatela will be his interim replacement on the Panel until his position is filled. The Chair then asked Ms. Lukatela to summarize some of the key discussion topics from the All Design Review Panel Summit held on June 22<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Lukatela noted that it was a very successful meeting with a number of issues raised including, the development system and how to plan ahead, and the procurement process. Ms. Lukatela noted that minutes from the meeting will be circulated to the Panel shortly.

The Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. The Chair noted that he had a conflict with the Pinewood Toronto Studios Project and therefore would be recusing himself as Chair for that presentation.

The minutes from the May 18<sup>th</sup> meeting were moved.

The Chair then invited Ms. Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report on project progress.

---

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

Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on project progress noting that the Garden of Future Follies by Hadley and Maxwell, the final piece in Phase One of the West Don Lands Public Art Plan, has been installed. This piece is cast in bronze and consists of 190 details collected from pre-existing monuments and architectural features from around the city. Ms. Mallozzi also pointed out that the first panels of cladding at Aqualina, Bayside are being installed.

Ms. Mallozzi then discussed City Council approval of the Project: Under Gardiner Staff Report on July 12<sup>th</sup>. The report included the Programming Operations and Maintenance funding strategy, as well as the Governance Model, with the non-profit stand-alone entity or conservancy as the preferred model for the project, the suspended pedestrian and cycling bridge crossing was the preferred Design Alternative for the Schedule "C" Municipal Class EA and, "The Bentway" was endorsed as the official name for Project: Under Gardiner, as selected through a public competition. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the official launch of the new brand will take place once the branding exercise is complete in late August/September.

Ms. Mallozzi also mentioned that the Waterfront Transit Network Vision Phase One went to Council on July 15<sup>th</sup> and were given approval to initiate Phase Two of the study.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **R5 Development Block – Bayside**

*ID#: 1074*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: Bayside*

*Proponent: Hines and Tridel*

*Architect/Designer: 3XN Architects*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Audun Opdal, 3XN*

*Delegation: Bruno Giancola, Tridel, Michael Gross, Hines, Salvatore Cavarretta, Tridel, Michael Pirochhi, Tridel*

### **I.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Renée Gomes, Director of Development with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is Bayside R5 Development Block's second time presenting to the Panel. Ms. Gomes noted a couple of key dates for the project including, the first round Site Plan Application to be submitted in early fall with an estimated construction start date of September 2017. Some of the Panel comments from the April meeting included the location of the daycare space and the ratio of daylight to outdoor space, needing further detail on the sustainability portion, and maintenance and management of the terraced landscaping and planting. Ms. Gomes pointed out a number of issues for the Panel to focus on including; whether the modifications to the daycare space are sufficient, whether the revised massing/exceedances are in keeping with the overall intent for East Bayfront, whether the further development of the sustainability strategies are on the right track, and does the ground floor frontage to Aitken Place Park and the Water's Edge Promenade allow for ground floor animation.

### **I.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Gomes then introduced Audun Opdal, Principal at 3XN to give the project presentation. Mr. Opdal began by once again reviewing the key issues that were mentioned at the last Panel meeting and how they have been addressed. One of the major changes to the building was lowering the east wing roof from 51 meters to 48 meters. Mr. Opdal noted that another change was relocating the loading bay and parking ramp closer together, which allowed for the daycare space to be increased. Mr. Opdal explained that the design team wanted to keep the ground floor facade flexible, while still maintaining coherence throughout the building. The use of GFRC cladding brings warmth and texture to the space.

Mr. Opdal then introduced Scott Torrance, Principal at Scott Torrance Landscape Architect, to present the landscape portion of the project. Mr. Torrance noted that the team has been working with Hines, Tridel and legal advisors to work on the maintenance regime. It was concluded that the terraces will be owned and maintained by the condo corporation which will entail regular maintenance and monitoring by a horticulturalist. The design team studied a number of maintenance strategies for terraces and shared a handful of precedents from around the world including, Bosco Verticale in Milan, Picasso and Ellis Park in Toronto, and Habitat 67 in Montreal.

Mr. Torrance then explained that the planter depth has been increased from 350mm to 450mm. The sun conditions will allow for 6 hours of sunlight per day which allows for a variety of plants. Mr. Torrance explained the diversity of planting typologies that range from low to high in order to respond to privacy, interaction, and allowing for unencumbered views of the lake. In terms of the planting palette, Mr. Torrance explained that the terraces will mainly consist of native plants with seasonal qualities being considered.

Mr. Torrance explained how the team concluded that vehicular access on Kanadario Lane was not necessary and will therefore be a non-vehicular route. The team also collectively agreed that placing a single row of trees by the park was the best option. Mr. Torrance noted that a CorTen steel edge will be added to tie Kanadario Lane to Aitken Place Park.

Mr. Torrance then introduced Subhi Alsayed, the Innovation Manager with Tridel, to present the sustainability portion of the project. Mr. Alsayed explained that the team is targeting LEED Platinum for this project. One of the methods of achieving LEED Platinum is to install in-suite ventilation using Energy Recovery Ventilation (ERV), which is very efficient, easy to clean and critical for residential buildings. This system also helps mitigate any odours. Mr. Alsayed also explained the use of Active Ceramic Tiles which are anti-bacterial and anti-pollution, in the bathrooms and kitchens. Mr. Alsayed described the building envelope which will consist of a 45% window to wall ratio with higher performance glass. In terms of heating and cooling systems, Mr. Alsayed described the Variable Refrigerant Flow (VFR) which has a modulating valve to provide heating and cooling required based on outdoor conditions. Community EV Charging Stations will be installed in the building for residents and visitors to use.

### **1.3 Panel Questions**

One of the Panel members asked how the stormwater system works. Mr. Torrance noted that they have an irrigation consultant working with the team and is looking into how to reuse as much stormwater as possible. It is critical to have soil and rain sensors in case of low rain season. There will be a cistern in the basement.

Another Panel member asked to clarify the north elevation and what is happening at street level. Mr. Opdal replied that there are entrances to parking, loading and bike elevator. They have not looked into how the garage door will operate however the façade is intended to read in the same language.

Another Panel member asked about the rationale for the daycare location given that the play space does not seem to get light based on the shadow diagrams. Mr. Opdal explained (with supporting shadow study materials) that even though the daycare space is covered, there will be sunlight on the east and west during required hours of 10 to 11AM and 2 to 3PM during March given the angle of the sun. The location of the daycare space was based on the intention to keep the ground floor program simple and allow flexible space and provide their own façade.

Another Panel member asked if the Bosco Verticale used in the precedent was a Hines project and how long it has been since completion. The proponent team noted that they will verify. The Panel Member noted that some of the older precedents such as the Lowther example are more reliable than new ones. Mr. Torrance noted that Ellis Park has been completed for about 7 years. The Panel Member then asked whether the balustrades on the balcony were inside or outside the planters. Mr. Opdal confirmed that they are on the outside as shown in the landscape drawings and will ensure the renderings are consistent. The Panel Member also asked whether there are precedents of the daycare being on two levels in Toronto. Another Panel Member noted that there is one at Maple Leaf Square. Mr. Torrance also noted the daycare at the Distillery District which is another good example.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair asked the Panel for their comments.

A Panel member noted that the townhouses along the park do not look sufficient enough and suggested that the retail space at the south end be reduced to add townhouses. The Panel Member noted that the building's framing strategy has weakened, identifying the double-height columns of the new daycare space seems inconsistent with the overall framing strategy. The Panel Member then referred to two renderings (page 29 and page 14 of the presentation) noting that the building requires more framing and the corner columns seems unresolved. The Panel Member noted that once large umbrellas are set up on the patios, the image in the renderings will alter. They noted that there are logistical challenges with the design of the roof terraces which are very open, but also require shade via projecting elements such as awnings.

Another Panel member congratulated the proponent team for successfully addressing the Panel's previous comments including the redistribution of the massing, which seems to work. The Panel Member suggested that the south-west façade should have a stronger residential frontage and the retail should focus mainly on the south face of the building given the potential of the south frontage. The Panel Member noted that the landscape treatment along Kanadario Lane is nice. They noted some scepticism about the proposed daycare space and noted that the daycare on Front Street in the RBC building as a good example of an "urban" daycare.

Another Panel member was pleased with the revisions since their last presentation. They noted that the architecture is well-designed as it engages the landscape and the building with controlled aesthetics. The Panel Member noted that the proposed plant selection works well and there is control to the planting strategy with the three types of the edge treatment. They applauded the maintenance strategy which is critical to the project and noted these should become part of a policy. The Panel Member referred to the rendering (page 50 of the presentation) noting that in the summer, the patios will be hot and therefore encouraged the proponent to think of a device that will provide shade and comfort without compromising the "look" of the proposed roofscape. The Panel Member noted that only one tree is shown in the renderings (in the outdoor pool area) therefore they should illustrate more trees. The Panel Member preferred the trees along Kanadario Lane to be closer to the townhouses and not the park. The trees closer to the building will provide a street that will bring people closer to the park instead of to private dwellings.

Another Panel member also noted that the presentation pays a high level of attention to the previous comments. They noted that one of the interesting challenges of the project is that there are no back sides to the site. The Panel member also noted that the L-shaped building warrants the articulation of the corners and strong relationships to the ground level, given that each corner has entranceways to different programs inside. The Panel member noted that there has been an interesting evolution to the mid-block connections in the waterfront and the passageways through buildings seem to work well when they are aligned with the streets. They suggested that a link, physical or visual, from Edgewater Drive to the water's edge should be considered. The daycare frontage along Edgewater Drive could mimic the language of the retail front on the water's edge to help tie the building into the rest of the site.

Another Panel member congratulated the proponent team on the great work. The double height space for the daycare and frontage on the west face is a substantial improvement. The Panel Member noted that the landscape strategy is also well-resolved. The Panel Member asked the team to show more construction details of how the roofscape will interface with the building materials. The Panel Member supported the GFRC as it provides warmth to the material palette. They also suggested that the planting strategy on the double height space for daycare should be special.

One of the Panel members was pleased to hear that a horticulturalist will be involved in the maintenance of the outdoor space. The Panel member would like to see programs that engage children with gardening and planting.

Another Panel member noted that an outdoor BBQ space that can host parties, is an important amenity for residents.

### **1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues**

The Chair then summarized the comments by the Panel.

- Reducing the amount of retail on the west side to allow for additional townhouses would build up more critical mass;
- Formalize the overall framing strategy;
- The corners at the ground floor lack identity;
- The sun/shading strategy on the terraces should be further refined;
- Consider relocating the trees closer to the townhouses along Kanadario Lane; and
- Supportive of the pursuit for high sustainability standards.

### **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 Conditional Support of the project.

---

## **2.0 Project Under Gardiner**

*ID#: 1070*

*Project Type: Precinct Plan*

*Location: Under the Gardiner from Strachan to Bathurst*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto,*

*Architect/Designer: Public Work, Greenberg Consulting Inc.*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Third*

*Presenter(s): Marc Ryan, Public Work*

*Delegation: Adam Nicklin, Public Work*

### **2.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project noting that this was their third time presenting to the Panel.

Ms. Mallozzi reviewed Panel comments from the May meeting which include:

- Providing more detailed information on Phase One to demonstrate that it can be delivered at a high level of quality within the current budget and timeframe.
- Ensure that enough of the project can be completed and open on July 1st 2017 to inspire and capture people's imagination for more.
- Establish in advance what component of the project is the lowest priority so it can be easily cut in the event that the current scope exceeds the budget.
- The amount of detail provided on the Strachan Gate and the Fort York Bridge was not sufficient to fully evaluate the design – particularly the rigging, the steps, the handrails, and building code compliance.
- The individual components need a more powerful continuous element to tie the site together and expand the project in the future without losing its identity.
- Land ownership needs to be clearly mapped to understand private lands vs. public realm and north south connections beyond the project.
- Detailed costing schedule needs to be shared
- The palette of both material/landscape elements and signage/wayfinding/graphics needs to be simplified.
- A sun/shadow study is needed to assess the viability of different treatments/uses proposed in each area.
- Washrooms must be provided if this is to be successful as a destination when it opens.

Ms. Mallozzi then provided a design update noting that Design Development (50%) was completed and submitted to the City of Toronto and Toronto Public Utilities Coordinating Committee on July 4, 2016. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the team has hired a scheduler who is currently refining a project delivery schedule. Prequalification for the Construction Manager has been completed, and the RFP will be released later in July, with the intension of having a Construction Manager on-board in September and the first tenders released in October. Bespoke Cultural Collective has been retained to develop a brand for the new name "The Bentway". Ms. Mallozzi also noted that Artscape has been retained to help the project team develop the "Non-profit Entity" and to commence the Programming Planning. Ms. Mallozzi explained to the Panel that City Staff is still reviewing the Design Development drawings, but have provided the following feedback;

- Ensuring the Gardiner columns are sufficient to enable maintenance staff access for long-term inspection and rehabilitation of the structure.
- Designing the Bridge and the Strachan Gate to comply with AODA and City Accessibility Guidelines.
- Continue to work with the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department to confirm feasibility and details for the skating rink and planting approach.

Ms. Mallozzi then raised a number of issues for the Panel to focus on including;

- Whether Phase One, as presented, achieves a high level of quality and capture people's imagination on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017
- What are your thoughts on the further development of the Strachan Gate and Fort York Blvd Bridge?
- What are your thoughts on the more refined material palette presented?
- Has the team been successful at creating a continuous identity which ties the individual components together?
- What are your thoughts on the movement sequence and experience of the space?
- What are your thoughts on the revised Phase One configuration of the skating rink/trail?
- Are the amenities/ furnishings proposed sufficient for Phase One?

Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Marc Ryan, Co-founder of Public Work to present the design to the Panel.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Ryan began by explaining that Phase One has been focused around three aspects, the Strachan Gate, the Fort York Blvd Bridge, and the hardscape and softscape. Mr. Ryan walked the Panel through the land ownership of the site, delineating private versus public land. Mr. Ryan also gave the Panel a quick update on the material palette, reminding them that the team is looking to draw from the founding landscape. Mr. Ryan walked the team through the project starting from Strachan Gate to the west. Strachan Gate is the defining feature of the western edge and serves multiple purposes such as an entrance, and a view aperture into the project. Mr. Ryan introduced the use of pivoting panels at the aperture to indicate when a performance is in progress and will also take on event promotion and wayfinding. Mr. Ryan explained that the slated timber seating will match the seating on the bridge (milled timber). There will also be rigging apparatus installed above the stage to allow for stage equipment etc.

Mr. Ryan then proceeded to describe the trail system and how it connects through the projects. The design team is working with the City regarding trails that are underway to ensure that the trail systems complement each other. Mr. Ryan noted that the skating trail has been revised since the last meeting, clarifying that the trail has been split into a rink and a separate trail with rubber matting connecting the two. The rink will allow for vendors to crowd around and the possibility for performance. Mr. Ryan explained that in Phase Two, the rubber matting can be removed and the two skating pieces can connect. The team is working with Fort York to design an extension to the visitor's centre which will house a functional mechanical room and Zamboni storage (approximately 1,800 sf). Mr. Ryan then explained the material palette for the hardscape which consists of recycled aggregates from the Leslie Spit, at various scales including, concrete, resin bound and rock gardens. The idea is to build from a palette of concrete that would extend through to larger textures. Mr. Ryan walked the Panel through the liquid landscape which consist of bioswales, a splash pad and a reflecting pool.

## **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair asked the Panel for their questions.

One of the Panel members noted their lack of understanding of the Strachan Gate and asked the team for clarification. Mr. Ryan replied the park area to the south is a City project that the team is involved in, however the timing of this park and the delivery of P:UG Phase I may not be concurrent. The Panel member noted that the grading needs to accommodate the Strachan Gate to ensure that the platform is flush with the park. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the strategy of the treatment of the undercroft, whether the storage space underneath will be accessible. Mr. Nicklin replied that there will be a soffit. Mr. Ryan replied that the space is two

meters in height and will be accessible with doors, similar to a service space with cladding that will prevent people from accessing the undercroft. The Panel member also asked if the rinks will become pools in the summer time. Mr. Ryan replied that the curling section will be a pond and the rest will be a large programmable plaza with edges that are flush to the rest of the space.

Another Panel member asked what people will see on July 1, 2017 and how it will be communicated and understood by the public. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the aspiration for July 1<sup>st</sup> is for all performance components to be complete which includes Strachan Gate and the plazas, followed by the skating rink in November. Mr. Ryan added that they have retained Artscape to implement wayfinding and signage. They are working on the layer of orientation and navigation which involves a physical and digital component (i.e. website). This work is to be completed mid-August. Mr. Nicklin noted the reason that this work is behind schedule is because of the naming exercise (“The Bentway”). Mrs. Mallozzi added that “The Bentway” is part of the branding strategy. Mr. Ryan noted that the project is surprisingly “simple” in that there is a lot of visibility and sightlines throughout.

One of the Panel members asked why there is a pivoting door when the space is public. Mr. Nicklin explained that this feature is intended to provide flexibility and brand identity. The Panel member then asked what system of ice rink will be implemented. Mr. Nicklin replied that they have been pricing both CO<sub>2</sub> and glycol systems. The upfront cost for the CO<sub>2</sub> system is more expensive than glycol, however the costs to run and maintain the system are less. Current numbers show that the CO<sub>2</sub> system could work, which would allow for a good quality skating rink. Mr. Nicklin noted that the Gardiner structure will provide shade. The Panel member asked about the area beneath the suspended bridge, specifically from the ground level. Mr. Ryan noted that the West Landing is a public space and with a beautiful soffit. Mr. Nicklin added that the space will have plantings and a cistern.

Another Panel member asked about the lighting strategy. Mr. Ryan replied that it is a simple strategy that uses washings on the columns. There will be more catenary lighting along with art installations on the ceiling. The general level of lighting will be safe but not glaring.

One of the Panel members asked about the pavement dispersal and what governs the location of the aggregates. Mr. Ryan replied that the smoothest and smallest aggregates represent higher speed and flow of people, where the larger aggregates represent places of pause.

Another Panel member asked what happens with the streetscape especially at intersections and transition zones. There are no images of the intersections. Mr. Nicklin replied that the sidewalk remains and this is part of City’s purview.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel to provide comments.

One of the Panel members noted the transition of aggregates could be smoothed out. This would allow for the geometry to be more coherent and fluid throughout the ground plane.

Another Panel member noted that there is clarity at the ground plane and above air. They asked the team to bring a sample of the yellow cedar to the next meeting showing weathered versus natural. The Panel member noted that they are looking to see the graphic portion of the project on the ground as a backup, in lieu of the bridge not being complete for the opening. The Panel member suggested using a larger aggregate to create a blockade under the bridge and suggested that increasing the scale of the rocks could make a play feature. They also noted that the lighting



strategy still needs work. The team could think about having lights floating in space to draw peoples' attention and how the lights will fall along the louver doors.

Another Panel member noted that there has been good development on the project. They felt that the project has started its language by using the Gardiner bents as the structure and the "demountable" aspect. The Panel member felt that the approach to events required work, asking how there could be all sorts of scales of events here. They also noted that lighting is key to the project, suggesting that lighting could be used as an art installation, as something special amongst other smaller lighting fixtures.

One of the Panel members noted the high level of complexity that this project ensues and congratulated the team of managing it well. The Panel member commended the harshness of the work that Blackwell is doing with the bridge, however, cautioned the use of the resin bound aggregate as it becomes too cute. The Panel member explained that simplifying the palette and eliminating one of the aggregates, helps reinforce the language. They concluded that the material language is better, with the harshness versus the softness, and would like to see this tension maintained moving forward.

Another Panel member appreciated the team's hard work. They reinforced the importance of what the public will see on July 1<sup>st</sup> and noted that it must be clear, simple and evoke imagination. The Panel member also asked the team to increase the level of understanding and clarity of the past, present and future stories of the existing neighbourhoods.

One of the Panel members commended the team the significant level of simplification of material palette that has occurred since the last meeting. They were however concerned with the branding strategy which has not been presented as of yet. The Panel member noted that the bridge looks great, and seems more resolved than the Strachan Gate, suggesting that the surface of the undercroft should perhaps read as a landform instead of a building. They also felt that the lower bleachers which tries to emulate the balustrade of the bridge, is not quite right. The Panel member raised concerns about the bioswale and planting details given with the volume of visitation causing potential damage. The Panel member also questioned the proposed extension of the Fort York Visitors Centre, noting that it needs to be revisited. They also suggested that a long section along the entire project would be good to see.

Another Panel member noted that there is the feeling of the wavedeck of the waterfront brought to this part of the city which is nice. They also noted that the Fort York Vistor Centre by Patkau is catalytic to this project and this project must reflect the extension of it. The Panel member also noted that the undercroft detail needs to be developed.

## **2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues**

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

Summary of Panel's Comments:

- Remove the resin bound aggregate from the hardscape palette;
- Branding strategy and lighting strategy requires further development;
- The underside of the bridge needs more resolution;
- Patkau's design of the Fort York Visitor Centre is catalytic to the project and the extension needs to reflect this

## **2.6 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 in Support of the project.

---

### **3.0 225 Commissioners Street - Pinewood Toronto Studios: Film and Television Support Facility**

*ID#: 1075*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: 225 Commissioners Street*

*Proponent: Castlepoint Numa*

*Architect/Designer: HOK*

*Review Stage: Design Concepts*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Gordon Stratford, HOK*

*Delegation: Alejandra Perdomo, Denim Pascucci, Alfredo Romano*

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

Amanda Santo, Director of Development Approvals with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is their first time presenting to the Panel. Ms. Santo noted that the applicant anticipates submission to the City of Toronto for Site Plan Approval in July 2016. The proposal is for a new 4-storey Film and Television Support Facility in the Pinewood Studios Secured Zone, located within the Toronto Waterfront Studios Development Inc. lands. Ms. Santo explained that the proposal is located on 1.75 acres of land and is the first of two phases. Ms. Santo raised a number of issues for the Panel to consider including:

- Layout of the site in relation to the future road network in the Port Lands.
- Ground floor design in relation to the potential future public street to the north.
- The relationship of the interim proposed surface parking lot and future Water's Edge Promenade.
- Articulation of building façade and colours.
- Building site location blocking future north-south view corridor to the water.

#### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Santo then introduced Gordon Stratford, Senior Vice President with HOK, to give the presentation. Mr. Stratford began by noting that this building is in response to the increasing demand for support facilities in the film industry. The team is looking to attract and maintain the growth that is happening by offering this support facility. Mr. Stratford stressed to the Panel that the speed of which the demand is happening, reflects the speed of development. Mr. Stratford explained that the building will be 300,000 square feet total with 20,000 square feet of workshop and carpentry flex space. One of the goals of the building is to allow for flexibility and convertibility i.e. two rooms becoming four. Mr. Stratford explained that the 18.5 meter right-of-way to the north of the site, has been set aside due to the unknown future plans of the area. Mr. Stratford explained that the material used is prefinished metal panels with an added pop of colour. Phase Two will consist of the exposed surface parking on the south side being replaced by structured parking. Mr. Stratford explained the potential for retail on the south side and a green roof on the parking garage. Mr. Stratford concluded by telling that Panel that this project needs to move with speed as production possibilities are hanging in the bounds.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Acting Chair asked the Panel for their questions.

One of the Panel members asked for clarity on the sustainability portion of the project. Mr. Stratford replied that the team is targeting Toronto Green Standards Tier 1. Mr. Stratford noted that the building includes bike storage and showers, and the mechanical systems and building envelope will be looked at very carefully with regards to energy efficiency. The Panel member also asked how this building contributes to design excellence. Mr. Stratford replied that the existing context is industrial, and when productions are looking for locations to use, they look at the quality of neighbourhood and the building itself. The building is a first step in the masterplan that could easily look very industrial but the team is paying attention to looking into the future.

Another Panel member asked whether the street that will run to the north of the site is part of the proposal. Mr. Stratford replied that they are looking into both scenarios. The masterplan's goal is to achieve a mix of uses that create a neighbourhood. The street will start its life in the middle of the larger campus with the building to the south, but it could also be part of the larger public realm. Mr. Romano noted that security for film studio campus is critical and the 20-metre right of way in the short term will remain private. Broadview extension will also play into the design of this precinct. Mr. Stratford noted that that the proposed studio will layer on other programs in the future to make it more urban including stacking vertically additional floors, which will be a new model for studio type buildings in the city.

Another Panel member asked what will happen to the hydro property to the east of the site. Mrs. Santo replied that the Broadview extension will cut through Hydro One property and currently undergoing a feasibility study to relocate it elsewhere within the Port Lands with a smaller footprint. The Panel member then asked whether Paramount Studios have any public streets that penetrate the compound. Mr. Romano replied that Culver City has a large parking structure outside the gate, and its façade has a functional element. The security gate is in the periphery of the compound. He noted that Basin Street will remain private, with sound studios within the gate and support facilities to the periphery. Mr. Stratford added that in the masterplan, the buildings will form the edges.

Another Panel member asked Mr. Stratford to reiterate how the building responds to design excellence. Mr. Stratford replied that what is on the site currently is entirely industrial, which is the starting point for the project. The building attempts to provide fenestrations, articulation and colours and tries to keep to the materials of higher standards. The Panel member asked whether Phase 2 is guaranteed, given that the application is for Phase 1 only. Mr. Stratford replied that Phase 2 is not guaranteed.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

One Panel Member noted that the team should further develop their design to better demonstrate the speaker's aspirations for Design Excellence. They appreciated the information given on the future phases however noted that, parking along the shipping channel adjacent to the water's edge promenade is unacceptable. The Panel Member suggested that the team explores alternative locations for parking.

Another Panel Member noted that while they also appreciate the masterplan of the film studios, the team has not yet developed a public realm plan that demonstrates the notion of the ship channel becoming something spectacular.

Another Panel Member mentioned that there is excitement and a sense of mystery and privacy that is evident in the film studio lands in Culver City and Hollywood. They raised architect Eric Owen Moss's buildings as inspiring precedents that are able to channel the excitement within its context. The Panel Member then noted that they are generally in support of the project if it complies with the Port Lands Framework Plan, however at this time it is unclear how the project will participate within the larger vision and masterplan, especially the landscape component. The Panel Member also noted that the proposal does not reflect the waterfront's larger vision, which aspires to the goal that any type of project is to become the "best example of itself". The proposed building and materials is basic and regular and does not bring a level of mystery or excitement that film studios should manifest. The Panel Member noted that it is possible to build "shed" buildings as an "interesting shed building" within a limited budget, such as the photo studio designed by KPMB Architects in the Port Lands which is beautiful. The Panel Member concluded that the team should bring precedents of film studio buildings in an urban setting.

### **3.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues**

The Acting Chair then summarized the comments by the Panel:

- Develop a public realm and landscape design that will demonstrate how it will interface with the Port Lands Framework Plan;
- Sustainability strategies should be developed and be part of the presentation;
- Provide a stronger position on the building's Design Excellence, with reference to precedents that evoke mystery and interest; and
- Explore and justify the proposed location of the short term and future parking structure.

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

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

## **CLOSING**

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

---