



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #137
Wednesday, Sept. 23rd, 2020**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Kevin Stelzer
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. West Don Lands Block 5 Re kai Centre – Schematic Design
 2. Rees Street Park – Issues Identification
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the July 22nd, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts were declared for this meeting.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that **Queens Quay East Revitalization** is anticipated to return to DRP for Schematic Design in October. For **West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7**, Mr. Glaisek noted the project received a vote of Full Support at last month's DRP, completing the final stage of the DRP, and is not expected to return. Mr. Glaisek noted **60 Trinity Street's** team has discussed the DRP comments with internal stakeholders and is expected to share a design update with Waterfront Toronto in October. The project received a vote of Non-Support in July and is anticipated to return to DRP in November. Mr. Glaisek noted the consensus comments for **Metrolinx Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study** have been circulated to the proponent team. The team is organizing a final meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee to discuss comments for closeout in early November. The project is not anticipated to return to DRP.

Mr. Glaisek provided construction updates on **Port Lands Flood Protection** that the foundation for the Cherry Street bridge and the first section of the river valley excavation have been completed, Mr. Glaisek noted the **Stormwater Management Facility** construction is at 85% with building curb and plinth formwork continuing, and it is anticipated to finish construction by the end of the year. Mr. Glaisek noted the **Lake Shore Public Realm Pilot Project** is nearly the end of construction and there is an agreement for Waterfront Toronto to deliver additional Quick Start projects in 2021. Mr. Glaisek concluded by providing an update on October's draft DRP agenda.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block 5 Re kai Centre – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1091A
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Re kai Centres
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Montgomery Sisam
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Robert Davies, Director and Principal, Montgomery Sisam; Sue Graham-Nutter, CEO, Re kai Centres; Peter Re kai, Chair, Board of Directors, Re kai Centres

Delegation: Elie Newman, Board of Director, Re kai Centres; Michael Wolfe, Waterfront Toronto; Leslie Gash, Waterfront Toronto, Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Afaf Zaheer, Re kai Centres; Dustin Hooper, Montgomery Sisam; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto; Emma West, Bousfields;

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Michael Wolfe, Innovation & Prosperity Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting that Options for Homes is no longer a partner in the development, and provided a general background overview of Re kai Centres. Mr. Wolfe noted the project scope, development timeline, the existing site context, and site property line. Mr. Wolfe provided an update on the precinct context: adjacent development proposals of Block 10, Blocks 3,4,7, and block plans. Mr. Wolfe noted the project height currently exceeds the zoning as-of-right. Mr. Wolfe noted the project is here for Schematic Design review, following their Nov. 2017 Issues Identification review, and provided a summary of the previous consensus comments. Mr. Wolfe noted the areas for Panel consideration for both City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto, and introduced Peter Re kai, Chair of the Re kai Centres Board of Directors, to begin the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Re kai began by noting that the team has been working tirelessly on this project for a very long time and has been looking forward to sharing the design with the Panel. Mr. Re kai introduced Sue Graham-Nutter, CEO of Re kai Centres, to continue the presentation. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted this is the first post-COVID long-term care home in downtown Toronto, the changing design context due to COVID, and the leading innovative infection control measures. Ms. Graham-Nutter provided the updated program elements including dementia and Alzheimer focused space, dialysis centre, college for PSWs, and senior's assessment centre. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted letters of support from the West Don Lands Community and the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association. Ms. Graham-Nutter introduced Robert Davies, Director and Principal with Montgomery Sisam, to continue the presentation.

Architecture

Mr. Davies began by summarizing the project site context, urban connections, as-of-right and proposed massing envelopes. Mr. Davies provided the programmatic breakdown of the building, the sectional concept, and section drawings of the building. Mr. Davies noted there is no underground parking. Mr. Davies noted the exterior design expressions of the four elevations, materiality of the window bays, and interior design of the suites. Mr. Davies summarized the floor plans, renderings of the building exterior spaces, and the public realm.

Public Realm and Sustainability

Mr. Davies noted the spatial characteristics, streetscape design, pavement palette, and the planting strategy. On sustainability, Mr. Davies noted the project is required to meet Waterfront Toronto Minimum Green Building Requirement 2.1, LEED Gold version

4 Building Design & Construction, and the project will achieve these, at the same time the Toronto Green Standards Tier 2.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member noted the lowest and highest floor of the east and west elevations appear to have a taller floor to floor height than the in-between floors and asked for further clarification on this design. Mr. Davies noted the façade has been dropped on the lowest floor and raised at the top to create a parapet condition.

Another Panel member asked for the program of the gallery space along Cherry Street. Mr. Davies noted it is an unprogrammed lounge space, for gatherings and possibility of coffee carts – a space for residents. The Panel member noted animation in that space is important during different times of the day and asked for the façade material. Mr. Davies answered it is precast concrete.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the ground floor public realm animation vision, control points, and access requirements. Mr. Davies noted walking is very important for the residents and the plinth supports the use. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted other possible ground floor uses include music playing and performances.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the acute senior's assessment centre. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted often ERs can have very long wait times so this space would allow Rekai to deal with the needs of the elderly clearly and swiftly. The Panel asked for clarification on the ground floor parking spaces and if they can be served in other ways. Mr. Davies noted they are primarily for staff, the team studied parallel parking on the easement but there was concern with unsolicited use so garage doors are being proposed.

Ms. Graham-Nutter noted the team looked at underground parking but the cost was too high, Honda also indicated they are interested in shared use of the lane. The design currently has the same number of parking spaces at the other long-term care homes. The design protects the off-load areas from traffic. The Panel member asked if the team has studied additional landscaping opportunities at the laneway. Mr. Davies noted the team is still developing the landscape and the team feels there is little successful landscaping opportunity available when all ground floor service demands are provided.

One Panel member asked for clarification of the black form at the base of the building and if it is a change in material. Mr. Davies noted the bench is granite.

Another Panel member asked for the primary function of the façade screens and if they reduce solar heat gain. Mr. Davies noted they are solid precast panels in brick pattern. The Panel member asked if the project has engaged a sustainability consultant. Mr. Davies answered yes.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the Toronto Green Standards tier 2 targets. Mr. Davies noted the team has yet to complete the preliminary energy

simulation because the size of the building was only recently confirmed, and the number of air exchanges are big so energy use will be a challenge. The Panel member asked if the screen is an insulated envelope system – a sandwiched panel, and if the team is considering a decentralized HVAC system. Mr. Davies noted yes, and we will provide more information on HVAC at the next review.

Another Panel member asked if the ground floor flexible space can consider other uses like facilities for fitness, painting, concerts, cooking, bars. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted the proposed program includes horticultural therapy, music and art with OCAD, and baking classes.

One Panel member asked if residents who do not have dementia can leave the building. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted that is correct, they would be on the streets and in the neighbourhood – the nearby amenities are very important for the residents.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented the north and south facades require further development as they currently feel like party walls. The Panel member appreciated the east and west façade designs, and noted operability is highly encouraged along the Cherry Street façade to physically bridge the ground floor with the street.

Another Panel member was impressed by the presentation, encouraged the team to complete wind studies on the terraces with RWDI. The Panel member noted the terraces at Bridgepoint Hospital were more related to noise than wind because glass screens have been placed on the west side for mitigation, making the spaces highly used by residents.

One Panel member commended the design of the project. From personal experience, the Panel member noted the residents are eager to sit and watch city life. The Panel member asked the team to consider greenery opportunities at the suite windows to greatly add pleasure for each unit.

Another Panel member appreciated the important design and presentation – it is an essential post-COVID building typology that needs to be improved. The Panel member appreciated the plasticity and depth of the east and west facades; however the north and south facades require more work. The Panel member noted the communal spaces would benefit from having even more support spaces such as storage and that they should contribute to the public realm along Cherry Street, this way the residents would benefit from the daily activities of the street. The Panel member noted the overhang on the top floor can be further cantilevered towards the south to increase protection for the outdoor terrace. The Panel member supported the design of the window and desk combination, asked the team to ensure it can be operated by residents in wheelchair as the degree of control one has over their environment is what would separate this project as a home than an institution. The Panel member noted that balconies can be added at the east and west elevator lobbies. Mr. Davies noted that there are outdoor spaces at the elevator lobbies and the team will explore the east lobby as well.

One Panel member appreciated the recessed windows and the expressions of each individual unit on the façade. Success of the outdoor spaces is critical for mental health, it is important to ensure there is a strong microclimate of water, light, and plantings. The Panel member asked if there is opportunity to rethink the sidewalk design: furniture, paving, etc, to add to the benefits of the residents, improve ease of circulation, and encourage at grade interaction – consider this as a potential design challenge with the OCAD partner. Ms. Graham-Nutter noted there is a concept that the George Brown team is interested in exploring. Mr. Glaisek added some of this public realm might already be built, not sure what degree of intervention is possible, Waterfront Toronto has a public realm design for continuity and encouraged the team to keep that in mind.

Another Panel member commented the north and south facades can be further developed to be better integrated with the rest of the building. The east façade feels long and monolithic, the Panel member asked if the white grid can take a “pause” at the centre core of the facades to help break up the length of the elevations. The Panel member noted the main entrance is underdeveloped and asked the team to consider improving visibility and street presence. The Panel member noted the laneway is very wide and asked the team to consider more green landscape treatments, as well as lighting and garage door designs.

One Panel member felt the column of windows on the north and south facades lacked the finesse of the east and west facades – consider further improvements.

Another Panel member appreciated the repetition and unique identity of the facades for the building, and noted it is a challenge to deinstitutionalize the mono-program building. The Panel member encouraged the team to soften the north and south facades, thus softening and scaling the building down to the individual. The Panel member noted the lower floors of west façade should respond to the different facing condition. The use of masonry is very effective in bringing a residential feel, the Panel member supported an increase use of brick. On the ground floor, consider more bay windows on the north and south ends to open the space.

One Panel member noted an energy analysis will be very helpful in understanding heating, solar energy, heat gain, and shading strategies. Due to the modular nature of the façade and units, consider exploring prefab construction to improve cost and expedite construction.

Another Panel member appreciated the proposal and noted excellent opportunities to achieve advanced level of Toronto Green Standards compliance and a low TEDI approach. The Panel member recommended a whole building air flow connectivity analysis to mitigate the spread of pathogens – a great opportunity for mechanical designer to finetune a system to compartmentalize and decentralize while providing high quality low energy delivery of fresh air. Filtration will have a very positive impact. The Panel member encouraged the team to look at the preliminary energy model, focus on a high-quality ventilation system to deal with COVID and increase comfort.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the design and presentation.
- Supportive of a state-of-the-art long-term care facility built in the city during the COVID crisis.
- Supportive of the project vision of creating not just an institution but a home for the residents.

Building

- Further develop the north and south facades, consider bringing them closer to the quality of the east and west elevations.
- The west elevation has a different facing condition from the east, consider finetuning the west façade treatment to the context.
- Further maximize the Cherry Street façade for opportunities of animation and interaction with the street, including:
 - Improve the front door entrance design and visibility from street.
 - Consider operable openings to allow program spill out onto Cherry Street.
 - Further explore the range of programs and uses contemplated for the ground floor common space.
- Consider the benefits and importance of natural light and sun exposure, especially during the winter, on the interior design and layout of the common spaces.
- Consider further improving the amenities for the rooms, i.e. opportunity for plantings on the balcony.

Landscape

- Ensure the streetscape design along Cherry Street maximizes opportunities for sitting and watching city life for the residents.
- Ensure outdoor terraces are comfortable for residents and protected from heavy winds.

Sustainability

- Explore solar wall as a strategy.
- Recommended a wind study for the building.
- To ensure best practice for air quality design, an air flow connectivity analysis is recommended.
- Explore prefab construction to reduce cost, construction waste, and the potential of expediting the construction process.

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 Panel voted Full-Support for the project.

Mr. Newman thanked the Panel for the support, many of the issues raised have been discussed, appreciated the comments on ground floor animation, and will investigate prefab options. Mr. Newman noted Mr. Davies' team continues to do great work.

2.0 Rees Street Park – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1092A
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	wHY, Brook McIlroy, Phyto Studio
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Mark Thomann, Design Director, wHY; Colin Berman, Principal, Brook McIlroy; Thomas Rainer, Principal, Phyto Studio
<i>Delegation:</i>	Kira Appelhans, wHY; Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Katie Andrachuk, Waterfront Toronto; Lori Ellis, City of Toronto; David O'Hara, City of Toronto; Amanda Coen, wHY; Alex Mut, City of Toronto; Ann-Marie Nasr, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by providing the updated project background: Waterfront Toronto and Parks, Forestry, and Recreation are co-leading the project, the project is in Consensus Design Phase, the post-competition scope priorities, the reduced priorities, and an updated project budget from ten to six million dollars. Mr. Novack provided a recap from the Jury Report, the site context, key views of the site, and the John Street cultural corridor improvements. Mr. Novack noted the project is here for Issues Identification review and provided the areas for Panel consideration: design of the ridge, integration of the stormwater shaft, site permeability, urban connections, the Queens Quay frontage, and the relationship with Lake Shore Boulevard. Mr. Novack then introduced Mark Thomann, Design Director with wHY, to present the design.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Thomann began by nothing the design concept from the competition phase: bringing the bluffs to downtown, the existing issues of the site, and how the proposed design can frame the skyline, screen the Gardiner, create urban rooms by folding surfaces, carve and connect to the lake. Mr. Thomann noted the landscape adds visual dynamics to the park and competition renderings.

Design

Mr. Thomann noted the team is adjusting the overall scale and design of the ridge to the revised construction budget, not hiding the Gardiner but using the ridge and vegetation to create a buffer that is original to the competition scheme. The revised ridge peaks at the centre to create an iconic moment and tapers down at the east and west ends, at the same time creating different pockets of play on both the Lake Shore and Queens Quay frontages. Mr. Thomann noted the location of the proposed Toronto Water shaft, topographic precedents for the design team, their respective slopes, and the possible vegetation solutions including green wall, vines, and trees at base.

Program

Mr. Thomann provided a section by section walkthrough of the park from Entry Plaza & Ravine Run, The Scramble & Woodland Play, Upland Overlook & Restrooms, Landslide Seats & Lawn, and The Grove. Mr. Thomann noted the various catalytic capacities of the ridge: filter, host, program spine, and infrastructure. Mr. Thomann provided updated perspectives of the lawn, woodland play area, multi-sport courts, Rees grove, and the Queens Quay edge. Mr. Thomann noted the new ridge brings the project into budget while improving the design, and that Indigenous place-making at this site would include a co-design process with the region's Indigenous communities to create space that welcomes everyone.

Horticulture

Thomas Rainer, Principal with Phyto Design, continued the presentation. Mr. Rainer noted the vegetation strategy with typologies inspired by the bluffs, the planting zones including a dry upland forest, dynamic open cliffs, open edge plantings, mesic woodland, and ravine woodland.

Design Features

Mr. Thomann provided a high-level update on the washroom designs, lighting, and maintenance strategies. Mr. Thomann noted the structural design and sustainability strategies, as well as early concepts of finishes, furniture, and fixtures.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the construction currently at the site. Mr. Novack noted it is a separate construction project for underground work with a small manhole that is unrelated to Rees Street Park.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the rationale for the prominent concrete vertical walls, the greenery on top, and the team's openness to exploring alternative options for the design of the ridge. The Panel member noted it is a considerable amount of concrete in front of the Gardiner structure. Mr. Thomann answered that the budget change is a big reason, balancing the challenging slopes and unusable spaces is another. The team is looking at ways to reduce the concrete. The Panel member asked if the original competition design was more slope than ridge and lawn. Mr. Thomann noted the team continues to explore the right balance, the contrast between the cut face and greenery is an interesting and important iconography from the Bluffs that we would like to retain.

One Panel member asked if the sloping lawn addresses the possibility of a small building for the water shaft infrastructure work and eliminates the need. Mr. Thomann noted the water tunnel has flexibility for its placement and can curve, the slope is expected to obviate the need for a small building, any required exhaust can be managed by the ridge form.

Another Panel member asked if the ridge is part of the phase 1 construction and if there is a chance the small building might come in front of the ridge – overall clarification on the construction timeline and if the Rees Street streetscape is part of phase 1 work. Mr. Thomann noted the team would like to include the streetscape but it depends on subsequent discussions with Toronto Water. The team has plans for the Toronto Water staging ground and hope to construct the foundation of the Queens Quay frontage as well as part of phase 1. Mr. Thomann confirmed that phase 1 will inform whether sufficient space is provided within the ridge for the stormwater program. Mr. Novack noted 2022 to start phase 1, and late 2020s to construct the shaft – there is a big gap between the two projects.

One Panel member asked if the top of the water shaft is a vent or covered with landscape, and the materiality of the vertical walls. Mr. Thomann noted the top of the vent can be covered, there are several vents on the site which will be coordinated with Toronto Water. wHY has experience with different types of architectural concrete, budget is a driver – shotcrete can also be very nicely drafted. The Panel member asked if acoustic impact of lowering the ridge has been studied, noting that a raised ridge will greatly mitigate traffic noise – trees help but they do not stop traffic noise. Mr. Thomann noted the team will revisit the acoustic analysis.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the seasonal aspect of planting materials, if the team has reviewed the proposed design on the east side with Peter Street Basin, and the timeline for design mock-ups. Mr. Thomann noted the team has discussed with Waterfront Toronto on the connections with 350 Queens Quay West, Peter Street Basin, mock-ups might have to be done earlier in Design Development, and winter planting is something the team will continue to explore.

One Panel member asked for the height of the lawn along Queens Quay, if fall protection or AODA measures are required, and the consideration of snow load on the ridge design as it can lead to a majority of the park being closed off in winter. Mr. Thomann noted the snow consideration is a great point that has been prevalent since the competition entry and the team is interested in creating an all-season park. Programming is also being considered in the winter months.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the budget changes and scope. Ms. Stuart noted the budget for construction of the park improvement has been overall reduced: phase 1 is everything presented today – the \$6 million includes design to construction, without soft costs and contingencies. Essentially, for the foreseeable future, the value for park improvement is \$6 million.

One Panel member asked if costing has been completed on the design. Ms. Stuart noted a Class D estimate has been completed as part of the competition design – the consensus design has not been priced.

Another Panel member noted kids' activities were facilitated in the sloped portions of the competition design, asked if some of these areas are retained in the revised proposal. Mr. Thomann noted the team is trying to maintain the same proportion of active play, the primary difference is pulling the east end of the ridge up and creating additional play space on the northwest corner. More active play has been pushed onto the back side of the ridge.

One Panel member asked if the net-zero metering refers to energy use for the small building. Mr. Thomann answered that it is a goal for the project.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the team's commitment to the ridge, noted there was magic to the green wall in the competition design, and suggested re-calibrating the slope to connect the lawn with the ridge so it's not an island but an extension. For reference, the Panel member noted Trillium Park has a lawn with a shelter structure and recommended that the lawn becomes part of the slope idea instead of an empty space in front. There is a real disconnect between the two elements and they should be tied together to create a full park vision. The Panel member asked for more information on the back side of the design, and suggested planting trees through the tree to shield the Gardiner.

Another Panel member noted two areas of unease. First, conceptually there is a conflict with preserving the ridge and maintaining an openness to the Gardiner structure – not sure if it is possible to resolve these two conflicting demands. Second, the Panel member noted the high risk of proceeding with phase 1, that the degree of integration between the visible elements associated with the stormwater shaft and the design concept might come apart. The construction schedule indicates that the gap between the two phases is big, the Panel member recommended to slow down and allow the shaft to be completed to ensure the park can be achieved with much less risk.

One Panel member shared the unease that multiple forces are pulling the design in too many directions. The Panel member felt the horticulture design was delightful and is exactly what the park needs. The Panel member suggested to return to a beautiful green wall concept, south facing concrete will be very hot, and provide elements that people enjoy – ensure nature and peace are present. The Gardiner is very noisy, the ridge should be raised to provide quiet and sacrifice some views from the vehicles.

Another Panel member noted the project is the last major site on the central waterfront, it requires a nuanced response to properly address the site context. The ridge should be deliberately artificial, do not create a double-sided ridge, instead express the contrast between the front and back – this was done well in the competition design and should be brought back. The Panel member noted early mock-ups would be helpful for the ridge design, important to address winter months for the vegetation, wind mitigation strategies, and create pockets where people can escape from the wind in the winter. The Panel member noted there is a strong link between Peter Street Basin and this site, ensure a smooth connection – a standard sidewalk is

not enough. The Panel member asked the team to retain the strong idea of a constructed modern ridge as the current design looks more like a planted concrete abutment.

One Panel member appreciated the design, noted the project is ambiguous being both a plaza and a park, and clarification on this conceptual schism would be very helpful. The horticulture design is the most interesting because it has a clear set of guiding principles, the Panel member suggested understanding the ridge geometry in the same way as the current designs looks a little arbitrary. The Panel member noted walls can be very interesting, i.e. Teardrop Park by MVVA, considering that it freezes in the winter, and can be thought of as a microclimate creating relationships with other elements. The Panel member noted the wall and the greenery should work together, and not merely sitting on top of each other.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider stone for the sloped wall treatment and more slopes in general. The Panel member asked to provide more information on the integration of streets and sidewalks, and a maintenance strategy moving forward.

One Panel member appreciated seeing the project come to fruition and supported the previous comments: the idea of the ridge and dissonance with the competition design, the overwhelming presence of concrete. The Panel member noted the location of the basketball court is fundamentally challenged as it both requires fencing and an audience. In its proposed location, people are deterred from watching. Consider bringing the courts onto the south side for opportunities of real activation. The Panel member noted the washroom and office access should not have dead-end corridors. At the moment, it is difficult to understand the episodic nature of the project and the ridge cuts still feel like tunnels, the Panel member recommended bringing the project into a 3D software that would allow design finetuning and provide more effective visual representations. The Panel member is concerned that the extent of the scope will not be delivered within budget, and that the quality of construction will also be diminished.

Another Panel member appreciated the project and the important competition at a critical site. Linking between vegetation and the superstructure will help create zones of respite and it must not exacerbate the urban heat island effect.

One Panel member noted the budget as a real concern as cast-in-place concrete is expensive. The Panel member questioned the savings from embedding the building in the large berm as waterproofing, insulating, soil mound, all still must be dealt with. It appears a lot of construction budget would be required for phase 2, the Panel member encouraged the team to look carefully at the budget.

Another Panel member noted the project is trying to do too many things. There are many adjacent activities, such as the lawns across the street at H2O Park. Instead, the Panel member suggested the project to focus on the ridge. The basketball location is not ideal, too hidden, noisy, and has bad air quality from the Gardiner, consider shifting it out to increase visibility from the ridge.

One panel member noted the small amount of building in the program can easily be made into net zero and high performing. The Panel member encouraged to consider renewable energy strategies as an important landscape element in the design.

Another Panel member noted the project's clear idea and needs have to be maintained throughout the design, ensure schematic design and design development would allow for flexibility. The Panel member appreciated the reference to ridge design, the evolution from the competition to the current design is the right direction – clearly not quite there but the ridge is still very intriguing, especially having the highway peeking into the park at specific moments. The concept of the green walls deserves a second look, the plants must be self-sufficient as much as possible requiring little to no maintenance. The Panel member noted the connection to retail on the west side should be further developed, the park feels overprogrammed with the current budget, and ensure there is design flexibility moving forward. The Panel member suggested the waterfall, a complicated and costly element, be eliminated. The bathroom is too hidden, consider making it more visible. The Panel member appreciated the lawn design, asked the team to consider proposed planting relative to the soil type, including street trees. Refer to the landscape of the Holocaust Memorial in Ottawa as a design precedent with architectural concrete.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the design presentation and the team for meeting the challenges of the site.
- Supportive of seeing this special project realized.
- Maintaining the clarity of the park idea is a challenge, continue to develop a deliberate strategy to execute the vision.
- The clarity of the concept, program, and simplicity of the vision are important. Consider the guiding principles that drive the decisions on the built-form and provide a systematic approach on the design intent - a more methodical approach to the design presentation would benefit the design.
- Provide more section drawings, both north-south and east-west through the park, at the next review.
- Ensure planting design addresses all four seasons including winter.

Ridge design

- Recommended a stronger integration of the ridge with the lawn, consider recalibrating the slope so the lawn is more integrated into the overall park.
- The green wall was a winning aspect of the competition design, understanding the team is revising the ridge with regards to the budget, the Panel is concerned with the amount of concrete in this version. Consider stone and rock combination which is more reminiscent of the bluffs, or gentler planted slopes.
- Some Panel members expressed concerns on the noise of the Gardiner and the ridge should be high enough to help mitigate this issue; others have noted that the Gardiner is an important context for the park and it should be addressed honestly, i.e. the park can allow snippets of the Gardiner.

- Strengthen the rationale behind the ridge design: built-form, use, landscaping.
- It is important to produce early mock-ups to test the ridge design.

Program

- Further consider seasonal impacts on the use and accessibility of the park.
- Several Panel members noted that the scope and program will not be realizable within the budget, consider simplifying and reducing scope while maintaining a clear design vision.
- The design feels overprogrammed, consider reducing some activities such as the waterfall which is a high-cost feature.
- Concerned with the proposed location of the basketball courts due to proximity to noise and pollution from the Gardiner, consider shifting it further south to improve the experience, visibility, and integration with the rest of the park.
- Concerned with the location of the washroom and entrance - instead of the backside, consider facing the interior of the park.

Urban Continuity

- Public realm continuity and linkages are important objectives of the project, consider the following in developing the design:
 - Relationship with H2O Park.
 - Relationship with the proposed mid-block connection at the Peter Street Basin development - Waterfront Toronto to provide design team with latest drawings of the project for reference.
 - The Rees/ John Street cultural corridor from Grange Park to the waterfront as an important linkage.

Phasing

- Some Panel members expressed unease with the proposed phasing as related to the budget and the anticipated schedule of the stormwater shaft. Consider allowing the shaft work to complete before phase 1 implementation to ensure the core park vision is not compromised by the uncertainty around the stormwater shaft. Additionally, this will give more time for the design team to complete the design work.
- Provide an update on this at the next review.

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

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

No vote was taken as the project was presented for Issues Identification.

Mr. Thomann thanked for Panel for their comments, agreed on the comments with respect to concrete, program, and phasing. The team is interested in responding to these comments and aligning the design to the budget.

CLOSING

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.