



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #107
Wednesday, January 24, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson
Chris Reed
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

George Baird
Brigitte Shim

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Waterfront Innovation Centre
 2. West Don Lands Block 10 – Anishnawbe Health Toronto and Dream Kilmer
 3. Port Lands Flood Protection – River Valley and Parks Design
 4. Bayside – C1
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the December 20, 2017 meeting. One of the Panel members asked for minor revisions to section 1.4, 2.1 and 2.4. The minutes were adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Mr. Turcotte noted that his firm was involved with West Don Lands Block 10 and the Port Lands Flood Protection project and recused himself for both reviews.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to give a presentation on benchmarking waterfronts. Mr. Glaisek walked the Panel through a series of slides that tried to identify what makes a waterfront successful, and the Panel provided input for further consideration.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Waterfront Innovation Centre

Project Type: Building

Location: East Bayfront

Proponent: Menkes

Architect/Designer: Sweeny & Co

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Michael Goldberg (Goldberg Group)

Delegation: Joel Pearlman (Menkes), Sean Menkes (Menkes), John Gillander (Sweeny & Co), Shaun Siu Chong (Sweeny & Co)

ID#: 1068

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this project was last presented to the DRP in November 2015. Mr. Loudon explained to the Panel that this project is about innovation and collaboration. Mr. Loudon raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including the overall evolution of the design approach, the impact of the bridge connection on the view corridors, the reconfiguration of the Nexus/circulation space, the approach to LEED Gold, and the ground flood relationship to the public realm. Mr. Loudon then introduced Michael Goldberg, with Goldberg Group, to give the project presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Goldberg began by noting that this is the project's third time presenting to the DRP and this presentation responds to the comments made at the last review in November 2015. Mr. Goldberg explained that this building is in compliance with the zoning by-law with proposed uses of office and retail. Mr. Goldberg explained that the retail space is envisioned as having pop up retail that can be converted into an event space in the evening. The office space is designed for commercial tenants and the Proponent is looking to create efficiencies to enable a modern office building. Mr. Goldberg then introduced Alan Murphy, Principal at Green Reason Inc., who presented the sustainability portion of the building.

Mr. Murphy began by noting that they are targeting LEED Gold v.4 BD + C (Core and Shell). Mr. Murphy explained that this is an integrated design process and they are looking to combine services from Block 1 and Block 2 in terms of stormwater management. Mr. Murphy added that they are also investigating a geothermal field under the building, but this yet to be confirmed.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked how from the street one can identify the Nexus space as a public space and whether it is in fact, public. Mr. Goldberg responded that it is public, and you can get access to the space from the two lobby entrances in each block. It is also visible from the outside of the building. The Panel member also asked about the public art contribution. Mr. Goldberg replied that the money goes to the Waterfront Toronto public art program. The Panel member asked how many bicycle parking spaces will be provided to which Mr. Goldberg replied that they are unsure at the moment. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the high performance glazing. Mr. Murphy replied that the building is a curtain wall system with a warm edge spacer, double-glazed glass with low-e coating film.

Another Panel member asked where the spandrel is, as they only see vision glass. Mr. Siu Chong replied that the material palette is still a work-in-progress and they anticipate returning to the Panel with a refined material palette. The Panel also asked what the building's Energy Use Intensity (EUI) targets are. Mr. Murphy replied that they do not have this number yet and are working on how to balance heat gain while providing day lighting. The Panel member also asked if a daylight model has been completed. Mr. Murphy replied that they have not run a daylight model yet.

One Panel member asked if they have done any architectural planning studies to augment the potential relationship to Sugar Beach and how this informs the ground floor. Mr. Gillander replied that in terms of engaging the ground plane, retail and restaurant space will occupy three sides of the building. Mr. Gillander added that there are ongoing studies to see how the space can be opened up. The Panel member also asked how the reflective film will impact the transparency of the bridge shown in the renderings.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the bridge structure. Mr. Sui Chong replied that they will have trusses through them. Mr. Sui Chong added that Sweeny & Co. worked on the PATH bridge under the Gardiner where they maximized the glazing and minimized the floor plate where you would have structure. Mr. Sui Chong added there a few considerations as to where the services would run and how thin the floorplate would be.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the glass with respect to migratory birds in the area. Mr. Sui Chong replied that they will be complying with the TGS bird friendly guideline and the glass will have a patterned frit.

Another Panel member asked the design team to describe the public realm. Mr. Sui Chong noted that sidewalks and tree plantings are determined by the Waterfront Toronto public realm plan. The member also asked what aspect of this building expresses innovation. Mr. Sui Chong replied that they believe the Nexus space is reflective of innovation and this would be a public space used to exchange ideas with a mix of users.

One Panel member asked if Dockside Drive is a municipal road, to which Mr. Sui Chang replied yes.

Another Panel member asked how innovation is being created and spread around the space. Mr. Sui Chang replied that the Nexus was originally just an atrium, but has now evolved into a collision space with a mix of social uses.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member suggested that since the second floor, the Nexus, is the main floor, opening up the lobby will help draw people up to the second floor. The Panel member was very happy about the addition of the washroom and moving the transformer to inside the building. The Panel member felt that the design did not take full advantage of its proximity to Sugar Beach and needed to feel more engaged with the space. The Panel member also felt that there needed to be more uniqueness with the bridges and the overall massing of the building.

Another Panel member expressed disappointment that the building's sustainability targets are meagre. The Panel member was also felt that the massing and building envelope was conventional and needed to demonstrate more innovation. They also noted concerns on competing glazing treatment between transparency and reflective film.

One Panel member felt that the building looked like a typical office building. The Panel member added the surrounding buildings have large floorplates and feel suburban in scale, and the building should provide a more pedestrian scale. They also noted that in the high performance glazing the spandrel glass with reflective coating as a result would not look entirely clear as it is rendered. The Panel member questioned the framing of the building and suggested that the upper mass and lower mass should be differentiated. The Panel member noted that although they don't know who the tenant is, there should be a portion of the ground floor space committed for an outdoor restaurant space.

Another Panel member liked the idea of the Nexus space being a hub of activity. The Panel member felt that the potential for this space is high and they need to live up to this promise. The Panel member felt that the lobby entrance needs to be more obvious in order to attract people to the space. The Panel member also agreed with taking more advantage of the building's frontage on Sugar Beach. The Panel member was supportive of adding a washroom but was concerned of the location being too hidden and people not knowing it's there.

One Panel member recommended maximizing the opportunity for the public realm on the south-west corner. The Panel member also noted that the frit on the windows is a very important piece of the building and suggested bringing multiple options to the next review.

Another Panel member echoed comments from other Panel members regarding the building's frontage on Sugar Beach. The Panel member felt that the Nexus space might get taken over by the tenant space and wanted to better understand the operation of this space and how inviting this space will be to the public. The Panel member also wanted to hear what makes this space innovative at the next review.

One Panel member questioned whether this building will be a good representation of sustainability and innovation in Toronto 20 years from now and if it will demonstrate new solutions to meet social needs. The Panel member also felt that a more thorough analysis of how the building is going to perform from a sustainability perspective should be brought to the next review.

Another Panel member felt that the team needs to build a good story for this building. The Panel member felt that community integration needs more consideration. The Panel member suggested bringing the public realm paving to the building face and adding plenty of bicycle parking to help enliven the space. The Panel member felt that the presentation had competing points and recommended coming up with a compelling uncomplicated story for the building.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The building needs a clear narrative: What is special about this place? What is the innovation being sought?
- Architecture should demonstrate Innovation
- The ground floor requires further clarity
- Develop the Nexus:
 - Consider expanding and opening up the lobby to provide a mid-block connection from Queens Quay to Corus building
 - Clarify the Nexus: Is it public or semi-private?
- Sustainability requires more work
- Tie the building into the surrounding context such as how the Daniels' development connection to Sugar Beach through the use of pink umbrellas
- Materiality must be further developed to balance transparency and reflectivity and bird-friendliness. Bring samples of the material to the next review.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The majority of the Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project with one Panel member voting Non-support.

2.0 West Don Lands Block 10 – Anishnawbe Health Toronto and Dream Kilmer

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Anishnawbe Health Toronto with Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: Stantec, Quadrangle

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Joe Hester (AHT), Michael Moxam (Stantec), Sami Kazemi (Quadrangle)

Delegation: Susan Conner (Prism Partners),

ID#: 1093

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Waterfront Toronto has been working with Anishnawbe Health Toronto (AHT) on this site since 2014. AHT has been negotiating with the Province since having the land transferred in 2014 and has recently partnered with Dream and Kilmer. Mr. Loudon explained that the team presented to the West Don Lands Committee on January 15, 2018, and they are supportive of the project and use. Mr. Loudon then raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including the raised courtyard space, the street wall openings, the ground floor orientation and uses, the massing relationship to the Canary building, and the approach to landscape. Mr. Loudon then introduced, Joe Hester, Executive Director at AHT, to provide background on the project.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Hester began by noting that AHT started in 1987 and became recognized and funded as a community health centre in 1989. Mr. Hester noted that they felt there should be an Indigenous presence on the waterfront. In 2014 they received a transfer of land from the Province and began to engage architects and consultants to help design the centre. Mr. Hester noted that in 2015 they began to engage with the community and feedback received included incorporating health, culture, education and the younger Indigenous population wanted to have a place where people can work together and share a space. Mr. Hester then introduced Sami Kazemi, Principal at Quadrangle, and Michael Moxam, Vice President of Architecture at Stantec, to present the design concept.

Mr. Moxam began by noting that the guiding principles and inspiration for the project came from a connection to materials, nature, landscape, ceremony, and natural light. Mr. Moxam walked through the zoning and West Don Lands Precinct Plan noting that a key element from the Precinct Plan is the emphasis on mixed use. The design concept comes from thinking about the block centred around the landscape. Mr. Kazemi walked the Panel through the building program. A 15-storey residential rental building is proposed on Mill Street with a 6-storey residential rental building with townhouses along Cooperage Street. An 11-storey residential condo will be located along Front Street along with the existing heritage building on the corner of Front Street and Cherry Street. Cherry Street will consist of a 5-storey training, education and employment

facility, and the 4-storey AHT community health centre. Mr. Kazemi noted that access to parking and loading is all internalized which is why the proposed landscape is raised. The landscape is an Indigenous landscape that will be a destination for Toronto's Indigenous community and provide an opportunity for a gathering space.

Kate Goslett, Planner for the City of Toronto, noted that the City does not currently support the conceptual massing and that it is a departure from the Precinct Plan. Ms. Goslett noted that they will continue to work with the applicant in order to arrive at concept that the City is comfortable with.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if there will be a conflict between the ceremonial space and the landscape. Mr. Moxam replied that the ceremonial space will be located one level below the landscape which benefits from more privacy. The Panel member clarified that they were referring to the residential units above being able to look down into the landscape and the lack of privacy, to which Mr. Moxam replied that they will work on developing this further to ensure there is adequate privacy.

Another Panel member asked if there is a landscape architect on the team. Mr. Moxam replied that the landscape architect is from Stantec.

One Panel member asked for clarification on who is master planning the whole block. Mr. Kazemi replied that they are working collaboratively with Dream and Quadrangle.

One Panel member asked what the elevation of the main landscape space is and how they plan to draw people up to that space. Mr. Moxam replied that the idea is that its an Indigenous community destination and is approximately 6 meters from street level. Mr. Moxam added that the accessibility of the site still needs to be worked out. The Panel member asked how much parking is being contemplated. Mr. Moxam replied that they are providing one level of parking below the landscape.

Another Panel member asked what parameters have shaped this proposal. Mr. Kazemi replied that the uses proposed on Cherry Street are a continuation of the existing institutional uses on Cherry Street and the townhouses proposed on the west side of Cooperage Street mirroring the existing townhouses on the east side of the street.

One Panel member asked what are the core values of the project in terms of sustainability and whether these values will be applied across the site. Mr. Moxam replied that this is a development partnership and the intent is that they will be applied across the entire site. Susan Connor, CEO of Prism Partners, added that the team is working with Waterfront Toronto in terms of sustainability and believe that the Indigenous sustainability values will exceed the required targets.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that there is no clear comparison of the massing envelope showing what's being proposed with what's as-of-right zoning and would like to see this comparison at the next review. The Panel member also noted that they need a good rationale for the massing given that 15 storeys on Mill Street will create significant shade on the landscape. The Panel member added that accessibility to the elevated landscape needs to be clarified.

Another Panel member commended the team for beginning with good principles and leading with landscape. The Panel member asked to develop multiple scenarios of the landscape for the next review that the Panel can provide input on. The Panel member also felt that an Indigenous leader in landscape needs to be hired on the team. One Panel member noted that it is important to acknowledge that AHT is setting the model for health care delivery in Ontario. The Panel member felt that part of the authentic Indigenous relationship is the connection to soil. Given that the landscape is elevated with parking underneath, the Panel member asked if these are conflicting cultural ideas.

Another Panel member suggested pursuing the parking a half level underground to promote accessibility to the landscape.

One Panel member felt that once you map out the threshold of private and public space, there will be minimal landscape left. The Panel member noted that they need to come up with ways to reduce the building footprint or recalibrate the raised landscape concept.

Another Panel member noted that the measure of success is how everything reflects the health centre. The Panel member suggested listing five things that will make this project successful. The Panel member also felt that the approach to massing and planning needed to be modified.

One Panel member felt that a rationale for the proposed density needs to be brought to the next review.

Another Panel member also wanted to see more attention to the materiality of the building from a sustainability and building performance perspective.

One Panel member felt that a more thorough understanding of the site issues, site program and the historic Canary building was needed. The Panel member noted that the landscape is wrapped with conventional development and this works against what the Proponent is intending to do.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall supportive of the health centre and the Indigenous uses
- The project would benefit from further analysis of the site context
- Devise a statement of core values for the next review. What do you believe in and why?

- The Indigenous landscape needs to be reflected in the materiality and sustainability of the building
- Bring a comparison of the as-of-right zoning and the massing that's being proposed
- Make a case for the increased height and density. 15-storeys will cast a big shadow on the raised landscape
- The accessibility to the raised landscape needs further resolution
- Engage a landscape architect with experience in Indigenous design
- Linkage to the surrounding public realm is important

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken, as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure: River Valley Flood Protection and Parks

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MVVA

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

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

Delegation: Paloma Garcia (MVVA), Neil Budzinski (MVVA)

ID#: 1090

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that 290 hectares of southeastern downtown Toronto are at risk of flooding from the Don River watershed. The Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure Project is a comprehensive solution to flood protection. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the project has previously presented the EA and Master Planning process to the Panel. This is the project's second time presenting the River Valley and Parks Design and the team will be presenting Schematic Design today. Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on the MT35 building which was partially destroyed by a fire in May 2017. TPLC and the City of Toronto are undertaking a study to determine the go forward approach for the MT35 building. Ms. Mallozzi noted that they will determine if the remainder of the building can be maintained and if not, what elements can be preserved for commemoration. Ms. Mallozzi raised some topics for the Panel to consider, including the revised river design, the appropriateness of the 6 Big Moves, the proposed river modifications regarding sinuosity and ecology, the park program balance and proposed location and the appropriateness of entry and arrival points. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Michael Van Valkenburgh, President and CEO of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA), and Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Van Valkenburgh began by noting that one of the fundamental challenges of this project is finding a coherent and integrated solution for flood control, naturalization and placemaking. Mr. Valkenburgh explained that the 6 Big Moves for the project are; connection to the urban context, generously responsive to needs, composed with special and sectional variety, designed and engineered with nature, orchestrated as a complete ensemble, and grounded in Waterfront Toronto sustainability principles. Mr. Sweeney noted the new meander reduces the sheer stress on the channel and the sinuosity creates better habitats. Mr. Van Valkenburgh walked the Panel through the thinking behind the park program development and distribution, noting that there is always a push and pull between active and passive recreation. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that data has been compiled by the Parks Department and Waterfront Toronto to create an inventory showing the distribution of current and future park and public realm programs. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that there is a hunger for an imaginative and challenging play space to bring kids and outdoor cafes, picnic and barbeque areas. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that they are looking into alternative sites to locate the catalyst building.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if the team considered a separated artificial pool that looks like it's part of the lake. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that they did not consider this. The Panel member noted they saw a scheme in the Chicago river and thought it would be a suitable asset for the park. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that they will certainly look into the feasibility of this.

Another Panel member asked the Proponents to walk through which material will be exposed and whether this has any relation to the programming. Mr. Sweeney replied that they are looking into integrating fishing nodes near the park edge. Mr. Sweeney added that the systems are not exposed until the 100-year storm event.

One Panel member asked how the Proponent is analyzing stormwater runoff and whether they are dealing with stormwater on site. Mr. Sweeney replied that one of the challenges is that this is a future development site but there may be an opportunity within the park systems to deal with stormwater runoff.

Another Panel member asked what a catalyst building means. Mr. Glaisek replied that it means something with a signature use and a cultural draw. The Panel member asked for their thoughts on Toronto's multi culturalism and how this shapes the thinking around the programming. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that Toronto is such a diverse city and there is a strong feeling of extended family, which they are seeing lots of in Brooklyn Bridge Park. Mr. Van Valkenburgh added that the more a park offers, the more likely it is to serve a diverse group of people and their needs.

One Panel member noted that there seems to be a drive to design the best kid's playground but wondered if there was any drive to make the best adventure playground. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that the adventure play requires a lot of commitment from adult supervision and staffing.

Another Panel member asked whether the designers are planning to design the park with the hopes of having 50% maintenance practice or 100%. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that they are hoping that this park is very well maintained but also have to understand that this is a very peculiar landscape especially after a flood. Projects that have been the most successful capture revenue from surrounding buildings and use that to pay for maintenance.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that this project is fantastic and was very supportive of the design.

Another Panel member felt that the catalyst building is a problem especially if there is too much servicing. The Panel member liked the intention of creating the hard and soft edges and the expression of human-made weaving its way through the park. The Panel member also felt that being able to see the park post flood is very unique.

One Panel member noted that the design of the constructed edge should not look like anything that we have seen before. In terms of the flat fields, the Panel member felt that there is potential for things like cricket fields and more urban programming pieces.

Another Panel member felt that the catalyst building should be removed from this location altogether and the focus rest on park design and uses.

One Panel member suggested incorporating a connected stormwater landscape from the buildings in Villiers Islands, such as bioswales.

Another Panel member felt that this could be the signature to Toronto's waterfront, especially with the notion of landscape ecology having a big signature on the waterfront. The Panel member added that leaving room for flexibility is important.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Landscape ecology and the connection of the river to the lake could become part of Toronto's signature identity
- The operations and maintenance strategy needs to be resolved
- Think about the opportunities for stormwater runoff
- Investigate further the work completed for TOcore regarding what type of park programming Toronto needs more of

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

4.0 Bayside C1

Project Type: Building
Location: East Bayfront
Proponent: Hines
Architect/Designer: Hollwich Kushner
Review Stage: Issues Identification
Review Round: One
Presenter(s): Michael Gross (Hines), Matthias Hollwich (Hollwich Kushner)
Delegation:
ID#: 1094

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting that this is Hine's first commercial building to be built in the Bayside community. The remaining developments in Bayside are, R6, an affordable rental housing building with 260 units and C2, the second commercial building. Ms. Li noted that the Proponents are targeting a construction start of winter 2018. Ms. Li raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the relationship to C2 and other Bayside buildings, the ground floor configuration, and the relationship to Aitken Place Park and Queens Quay. Ms. Li then introduced Michael Gross, Senior Construction Manager with Hines, to give the presentation

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Gross began by noting the that project objectives include, best-in-class creative use office development, mixed use office with retail at grade, and daytime and employment use to animate the community. Mr Gross noted that some of the design objectives for the building include, efficient and rectangular market driven design, interesting façade materials and composition, relationship to the public realm and private plaza space, above grade parking integration and design for future change of use. Mr. Gross walked through the site context and building massing of the surrounding Bayside buildings. Mr. Gross explained that some of the site constraints include, no vehicular access from Queens Quay East, limited lake views and the loading and parking entry on Edgewater Drive. Some of the site opportunities include the private plaza, the relationship to Aitken Place Park and Queens Quay, the view corridor, and the office lobby location. Mr. Gross then introduced Matthias Hollwich, Partner at Hollwich Kushner to introduce their firm. Mr. Hollwich began by noting that Hollwich Kushner is a small firm based out of New York and they specialize in innovation and people. Mr. Hollwich noted that they work at every scale and with all typologies citing some of their projects from around the world.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked why they are putting the parking above grade. Mr. Gross replied that it is due to the accelerated timeline of the project.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale behind building an office with a potential institutional tenant. Mr. Gross replied that they are seeing a drive in the market where creative employers are looking for this type of density.

One Panel member asked what the sustainability approach is for this building. Mr. Hollwich replied that sustainability is a big driver at Hollwich Kushner and Hines has a good reputation when it comes to sustainability.

Another Panel member asked whether the C2 site will be developed through the concept design on C1. Mr. Gross replied yes and added that the public plaza is on the C1 site and will be delivered through the first phase.

One Panel member asked what their retail philosophy is on Queens Quay. Mr. Gross replied that the space will not be a retail use however, the programming of the ground floor will draw people into the space.

4.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member noted that the plaza space is critical especially its relationship to the park.

Another Panel member suggested moving the loading dock entrance to the centre.

One Panel member cautioned putting that parking above grade noting that this will set a bad precedent for surrounding developments. The Panel member also liked that the Bayside buildings are all contrasting and suggested this thinking be applied to the design of C1 and C2.

Another Panel member suggested this building be marketed without parking and commit to having parking at C2 instead.

One Panel member felt that Queens Quay is going to be an important corridor with transit and having purely retail on the Queens Quay frontage is not enough.

Another Panel member noted that the plaza space is critical and there needs to be a good relationship to Aitken Place Park.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The ground floor treatment is critical to the project
- Ensure animation and activation of the plaza space to continue the connection of adjacent Bayside buildings.
- Queens Quay is an important public presence that will eventually carry transit. Ensure that this frontage has something that will attract people to the space.
- Encourage marketing this building without parking and commit to have parking at C2 instead
- Think about making C1 and C2 contrasting buildings, but still have aspects of the Bayside typology.

4.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken, as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.