



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #138
Wednesday, Oct. 21st, 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 10 Indigenous Hub – Detailed Design 2
 2. Lake Shore Boulevard East Public Realm – Detailed Design
 3. 178-180 Queens Quay East – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Oct. 21st, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for 178-180 Queens Quay East and recused himself for the session.

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 **Rees Street Park** is revising the form of the ridge with regards to slopes, walls, and faces. The project is anticipated to return for Schematic Design in the winter of 2021.

Mr. Glaisek began this month's construction updates by noting that the Cherry Street Bridge, part of the work of **Port Lands Floor Protection (PLFP)**, has been painted and will soon be leaving Dartmouth for Toronto. The bridge is anticipated to arrive in Toronto's Inner Harbour in late November. Mr. Glaisek noted the excavation work continues for **PLFP River Valley** and the river liner geo-fabric is being laid down. For the **Stormwater Management Facility**, Mr. Glaisek noted the building has been fully enclosed, electrical and mechanical components are approximately 90% completed, the landscape construction is in progress, and the expected completion and commissioning is March 2021.

Mr. Glaisek noted the search for a new Indigenous Design Expert to join the Waterfront Design Review Panel continues. Receiving only two submissions so far, it was decided to extend the deadline to end of October 2020 to give more time for potential candidates to apply.

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 10 Indigenous Hub – Detailed Design 2

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1093
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design 2
<i>Review Round:</i>	Four
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Anishnawbe Health Toronto, Dream Kilmer Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Two Row Architect, Quadrangle Architects, Stantec, NAK Design Group, ERA Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Matthew Hickey, Partner, Two Row Architect; Les Klein, Principal + Co-founder, Quadrangle
<i>Delegation:</i>	Ken Brooks, Quadrangle; Suzanne Graham, Associate, Stantec; Michael Wolfe, Waterfront Toronto; Aaron Barter,

Waterfront Toronto; Chloe Catan, Waterfront Toronto; Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; Susan Conner, Prism Partners

The Chair began the review by thanking the Block 10 team on behalf of the Panel and noted that the Panel is interested in seeing the project move forward. Since reviewing the design in February 2020, the Panel has completed the Indigenous Cultural Safety training. The Chair noted the training was an emotional learning experience and thanked Waterfront Toronto for sponsoring the training. The Chair then introduced George Baird, Panel member, to make a statement with reference to his signed apology letter addressing the Block 10 team and shared with the other Panel members with regards to the February 2020 review.

Mr. Baird noted his letter has been sent to the Block 10 design team as well as all the members of the Design Review Panel. Given the sharing of the letter prior to today's meeting, Mr. Baird would summarize the letter with a few remarks. Mr. Baird noted some of his comments made in the February 2020 DRP offended the design team. He was troubled to learn that the team found his comments to be offensive as that was not his intention and would like to offer his apology. Related to the issue around the sweat lodge ceremony, Mr. Baird noted he was trying to understand the function of the space as he is not familiar. He noted that this was clarified to him as one of the first topics in the Indigenous Cultural Safety training. Mr. Baird noted he did not acknowledge the spiritual dimension of the ceremony in his commentary and apologized for the serious oversight.

The other issue is related to the motifs employed in the design. Mr. Baird noted his comments were taken to mean that the design was not Indigenous enough. As a non-Indigenous person, Mr. Baird noted he is not able to offer this kind of judgement - this was not his intended impression. In conclusion, Mr. Baird commented that writing this letter and completing the training have been a learning experience for him, especially learning the history of the child welfare policies from the later historical period which were equally as problematic as the residential schools. Mr. Baird appreciated this experience, opportunity, and thanked the design team for accepting his apology.

1.1 Cultural Context Presentation and Discussion

Matt Hickey, Partner with Two Row Architect, began the presentation titled "Decolonizing Design Through Reconciliation", noting that the team sees this opportunity to speak with the Panel again as bridge building, wanting to cross the bridge and meet in the middle. Mr. Hickey noted the 2015 Truth and Reconciliation Commission with 94 Calls to Action, including #57 Professional Development and Training for Public Servants and #92 Business and Reconciliation, through meaningful consultation and building respectful relationships to ensure that Indigenous people would have an equitable access to opportunities and that the history and knowledge are being shared.

Mr. Hickey noted the contemporary territories of Indigenous lands, languages, and treaties, situating the waterfront in relation to the important Don River Watershed. Mr. Hickey noted the importance of Indigenous iconography, motifs and how The Indian Act

prohibited the gatherings and celebrations at which Indigenous dancing was central both off and on the reserves. Mr. Hickey noted important cultural iconographic elements such as the jingle dress, the shawl on clothing, the four healing grasses, and birch trees as both medicine and construction material, signalling spring, rebirth, survival, and ensuring that the treaty rights are being acknowledged. Mr. Hickey noted these are not singular ideas but layered concepts in many years of history and hugely recognized by Indigenous people.

Mr. Glaisek noted he learned the motif of a fringe can be read as hanging from the bottom and over a material –there are many ways of application. Mr. Hickey responded that there are many ways of applying indigenous knowledge.

One Panel member noted the presentation reminds the Panel the deeply rooted context of the project and guides the conversation for elements even as rudimentary as bricks and mortar.

Another Panel member appreciated specifically the heritage framework which is often lost in our reviews. The presentation is a reminder for the Panel, through sharing of stories that are intrinsic and endemic in your culture, that these are hugely important elements in the contemporary discourse.

One Panel member noted the richness of the context is astonishing.

Another Panel member noted the industry often looks towards localism, vernacular for climate and regionality, and asked if Mr. Hickey can expand on the contemporary Indigenous designer mindset on sustainability. Mr. Hickey noted he belongs to “mound” people, sometimes operating not so lightly on the land but it was a complex culture – Indigenous people are not historic and static, but very contemporary.

One Panel member was intrigued by the reference on the shawl, fringe, and jingle dress, noting that a point was made to bring them more to the foreground, and asked how this may be accomplished in architecture and buildings. Mr. Hickey noted the fringe is used for simplicity and the concept will be used as a cladding. The team has been looking at the metaphor as clothing, a protective layer, find a balance to be both subtle and bold. It is important for it to not be a gimmick; this is a fine line for the team to accomplish.

Mr. Klein noted that working with Mr. Hickey has helped him develop a sensitized vocabulary and that the notion of the metaphors is like a secret language where experience can help true appreciation. Mr. Hickey noted that simplified motifs like the medicine wheel and the four colors are tried and tired.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Hickey began by noting that there are five buildings on the site: the Anishnawbe Health Toronto (AHT) building, the Training, Education, and Employment Centre (TECC), the market condo, rental condo, and the Victorian industry building. Mr. Hickey reiterated the concept of prominent buildings versus more background, fabric

buildings, the importance of directionality considerations and experiential qualities as people move through the site and the buildings.

At the facades, Mr. Hickey noted the importance of the three stratas: base, middle, and top, with the birch tree reference confidently represented in the building base condition. The weaving pattern wraps around the windows, implying the significance and history of craft. Les Klein, Partner with Quadrangle Architects, noted that Mr. Glaisek suggested to allow the use of brick colors to reinforce the pattern; the team is happy with the results. Mr. Glaisek thanked the team for trying his suggestion.

Mr. Hickey noted the lightly reflective metal wall panels recall the sky, drawing our gaze upward. At Front and Cooperage St., the railing on the wrap around balconies create a reflective effect, combined with fritted glass, to recall a strong cloud imagery. For the TECC building, Mr. Hickey noted the design allows views into the ground floor spaces, the second level contains pre-school and childcare – the team studied fenestration pattern to benefit the interiors with daylight. The interior of TECC acknowledges everything from ground to sky, the main entry way is about water and delta. At grade, a petroglyph mural connects AHT with the TECC.

Mr. Hickey noted the ground floor of the AHT building is activated by community spaces, kitchen, and the park across the street. The concept evokes the idea of pebbles in the stream, where visitors can walk through the traditional healing spaces. The upper floors contain clinical treatment rooms, the shawl wraps the buildings and opens on the east side towards the sun as a sign of rebirth. The raised landscape is a space for enjoyment, the plaza to the south is for gathering, and the plaza to the north ensures there is enough space to hold round dances or drum ceremonies. In terms of plant species, the team see them as teaching opportunities, such as increasing planting along the edges of the south plaza which will tie in with Waterfront Toronto's public realm streetscape design. The team strives to find a happy medium to demonstrate the efforts of truth and reconciliation.

Mr. Hickey recapped the four sustainability principles that are embedded in Indigenous culture and noted the initiatives: green roofs, automated building metering system, EV stations, bicycle parking, and operational manual for all occupants.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member is interested in deepening the understanding and meaning of the symbols and asked if the team has considered working with Indigenous visual artists to articulate the narratives of the metaphors. Mr. Hickey noted the team is working with artists and working on the public realm.

Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto is engaged in a public art plan that will involve the Indigenous community and introduced Chloe Catan, Public Art Manager with Waterfront Toronto, to detail the art plan. Ms. Catan noted the RFP call for an Indigenous curator has been released, in the process of finding some public art that will reinforce the notion of the southwest plaza, and develop a public art plan to take to the TPAC at the City.

Another Panel member appreciated the precast birch cladding and suggested more of them. The Panel member noted the shawl creates a great space and encouraged the team to explore alternative finishes to ensure powerful reading. The Panel member suggested a unique soffit finish for the condo above the Victorian-era building to help knit the buildings together, and remove the columns for even greater effect, if possible. Mr. Hickey noted the team is proposing a stainless-steel chainmail that will dangle under the soffit as the shawl.

One Panel member asked if there is a possibility to slightly rotate the paving pattern at the southwest plaza to amplify the importance of the space, so both walking there and seeing it from up top would have a unique feeling. The Panel member asked if there are opportunities at this hub to have Indigenous names to bring the histories and narratives to the surface. It is both a subtle and powerful gesture.

Another Panel member thanked the team for sharing the important cultural context and asked for more information on the impact and narrative of the design's relationship with rain as the raised roof is such a strong symbol for the project. Mr. Hickey answered that rain is seen as a gift - there is a water story here, we do not only see rain as stormwater that needs to be managed; the landscape features a waterfall. The Panel member is supportive and appreciative of these stories and the work to make them legible, noting that the stories are important for capturing the diversity of Indigenous voices, perhaps less important is to make the stories understood by non-Indigenous people.

One Panel member appreciated the precast panels and asked which color is preferred as the renderings seem to show both concrete which mirrors the glow in the forest and a darker alternative. Mr. Hickey noted the panel finish should be the brighter version and a sample has been produced. The Panel member suggested that the reflectivity of the cladding be extended up to the mechanical penthouse volumes.

Another Panel member suggested to ensure there is a budget for a graphic communication strategy to help tell the stories that are not immediately obvious to non-Indigenous people. Consider using an alternate material to Corten steel for exterior cladding as it can have negative impacts on the environment.

One Panel member appreciated the separation of the building volumes, the ground floor design, and the linkages of stories with the greater community. The Panel member asked if the cladding wraps around the AHT volume and continues to the rear. Mr. Hickey answered yes. The Panel member appreciated the textures along Cooperage Street and suggested to introduce some articulation to break up the façade to refine the residential scale and character of the street and further help celebrate the project.

Another Panel member noted standing out in a subtle way - retain the identity of each element but knitting them all together - is complicated but a very interesting objective. The Panel member suggesting using the public spaces along Cherry Street to showcase the sectional level change from grade to terrace, a topographical condition, that knits all elements together. Ensure the raised courtyard reads as a geological landform

feature and is legible from both north and south so visitors will see it again and again. The Panel member suggested to strengthen the reading of the exterior surfaces of the raised courtyard so Cherry Street will have many opportunities to experience the most insightful part of the project.

One Panel member suggested further strengthening the expression of the landform feature.

Another Panel member supported the chainmail use at the shawl and noted that all the proposed changes are moving in the right direction.

One Panel member noted that the Canadian Green Council is not familiar with Indigenous sustainability principles and felt more dialogue would allow the design team to do more. The Panel member asked the team to consider two key relationships moving forward: embodied carbon, and the health and wellness of the materials which will impact indoor air quality and the use and performative qualities of the spaces.

1.4 Consensus Comments

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

General

- The Chair thanked Two Row Architect for a comprehensive presentation, in particular for the cultural context dialogue that compliments the Indigenous Cultural Safety training recently completed by the Panel members.
- The Chair congratulated the team for a unique project with a strong theme that connects buildings, the environment, program of health and training, together in a positive experience.
- Appreciated the learning experience, part of the process of reconciliation and provides Torontonians wide exposure to issues that are long overdue.
- Consider naming and other highly visible communication opportunities to emphasize the Indigenous voices and stories that support the identity of the project.

Building Suggestions

- Appreciated the precast birch cladding, consider slight modifications, such as greater color consistency and more panels to further emphasize the symbolism.
- Consider a unique finish for the soffit of the residential volume above the Victorian-era building, and if possible, remove the columns, to further emphasize the formal “reveal”.
- Consider more massing or cladding articulation along the Cooperage St. façade to break up the long, block-length, façade and further align with the massing granularity of the building across the street.
- Consider alternatives to Corten steel as that material can have negative environmental impacts.

Landscape Suggestions

- The raised courtyard landscape unifies the project and the reference to topography can be further amplified. Consider providing more opportunities

along Cherry Street to see the different elements of the raised topography, including retaining wall patterns.

- Consider subtle rotation of the pavement at the southwest corner plaza to further emphasize the importance and unique identity of the landscape.
- Appreciated the worldview of rainwater as gift, consider legible strategies to capture runoffs at various landscape opportunities.

1.5 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.

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

Mr. Hickey thanked the Panel for their words, noted that dialogue matters, the importance of this process and the idea of sharing knowledge to ensure the story is accessible and understood by all. Mr. Hickey also noted it is about healing and thanked Waterfront Toronto for continuing the story with the team.

2.0 Lake Shore Boulevard East Public Realm – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1083
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Fifth
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront, East Bayfront, Keating Chanel Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8, Dillon Consulting
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Shelley Long, Project Leader, West 8; Jonathan Ho, Senior Engineer, Entuitive; Michael Ormston-Holloway, Principal, The Planning Partnership
<i>Delegation:</i>	Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Simon Karam, Waterfront Toronto; Mira Shenker, Waterfront Toronto; Ishan Garg, Waterfront Toronto; Christian Giles, City of Toronto; Prabir Das, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the project was last reviewed in May 2019 and today's presentation will focus on Phase 1 work from Don Roadway to Carlaw Ave. Ms. Vangjeli recapped the Lake Shore Boulevard (LSB) Public Realm design objectives, the implementation plan, update on the completion of the pilot project at 12 Bonnycastle St., and the opportunity of integrating the design and delivery of two EA scopes as part of PLFP: the PLFP EA and the Gardiner EA. Ms. Vangjeli provided the project scopes: PLFP Lake Shore Bridge Base Case, Gardiner Hybrid 3, and the combined LSB East. Bridge and Public Realm – Accelerated Option. Ms. Vangjeli detailed the Accelerated Option, the reconfiguration of LSBE, and recapped the previous public realm design

shown at the May 2019 DRP. Ms. Vangjeli noted the design updates, previous consensus comments, and areas for Panel consideration, such as consistency with the public realm plan and cohesive boulevard identity, intersection designs, planting and stormwater strategies, landscape treatment, protective barrier design for bike rail, and future proofing. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Shelley Long, Project Leader with West 8, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began by noting the five main design categories: space dedication, planting strategy, systemic stormwater strategy, materials, and intersection design. Ms. Long noted how the new Lake Shore Trail marks the Old Lake Shore, recapped the four sections of the Lake Shore Public Realm, and specifically noting the context from Don River to Logan Ave. Ms. Long noted the key design principles: biodiverse palette to maximize infiltration, balanced pedestrian and cyclist experience, and a sensual landscape experience in the city. Ms. Long detailed the proposed row-of-way space dedication in various areas, from Lake Shore Bridge to Carlaw Ave. Ms. Long then introduced Michael Ormston-Holloway to continue the presentation. Mr. Ormston-Holloway detailed the planting strategy zones that will green the corridor, preserving the Elm trees in the future condition, and the side by side trail protected by the green buffer. Ms. Long then noted the larger road sections which consider the balance of the car, bike, and pedestrians. Ms. Long noted the jersey barrier is proposed as both an opportunity for art and safety by taking something that is normally for traffic and embracing it as part of the language of the trail.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the jersey barriers are permanent and if there are any seating components incorporated in the design. Ms. Long noted there is no seating on the east side of the public realm and the barriers are meant to be permanent installations.

Another Panel member asked if there are other guards or raised curb condition separating the public realm from the train tracks. Ms. Long noted the Harbour Lead train is infrequently used and slow, the design is an uncontrolled crossing for pedestrians and bikers which adhere to Ontario Safe Crossing guidelines for highway crossings.

One Panel member asked for clarification on whether the reconstruction of the bridge would require first the relocation of the overhead expressway structure to provide enough room to do the bridge work. Ms. Vangjeli answered that with the accelerated option, the ramps must be taken down first for the bridge to be built in its ultimate condition.

Another Panel member asked if there is street furnishing for this long stretch of road and their location in the presentation drawings. Ms. Long noted the team is working with the City on the right amount of public realm furnishing, improving night-time accessibility, shoulder seasons, and resolving ownership and maintenance issues. The Panel member asked if for the status and health of the large Elm trees. Mr. Ormston-

Holloway responded that an arborist report has been completed, the Elms fall into two different *Ulmus* species, and the team is interested in including both performative and opportunistic plant species.

One Panel member asked for the long-term maintenance plan and if the team can imagine a plant palette with almost no maintenance required. Mr. Ormston-Holloway noted the team is interested in designing the plants based on a level of anticipated management, to promote a successional model, the ground has a canopy layer that will get stronger over time, and that the team sees a wild model.

One Panel member asked for clarification on structural soil. Ms. Long answered the structural soil maintains voids in the soil bed even with weight on top, it protects the voids from being fully compressed – an alternative to soil cells, which allows for fewer voids.

Another Panel member asked if it is possible to source *Ulmus* “cosmopolitan” species at a young age and if the team already has an inoculated source. Mr. Ormston-Holloway noted plant genetics is important and the team will try to favour true inoculated *Ulmus*. The Panel member noted this is Toronto’s infrastructure and investment, asked for the paving material of the rail and the ground cover on either side. Ms. Long noted the rail bed will be rail ballasts, consistent with the existing cover. Mr. Ormston-Holloway noted the species will be selected based on performance and will drive a line at non-native invasives, will provide more details when we have commitment from Parks.

One Panel member asked if there is a stop signal at the train crossing for westbound vehicles. Mr. Ho noted the team is proposing gates to stop traffic when the train runs.

Another Panel member asked if the team has strategies to mitigate salt spray from the road. Ms. Long noted in addition to selecting the right tree, draining the soil with non-salted water is important – a well-draining soil and flushed frequently. Mr. Ormston-Holloway noted the planting will match the right soil and the team is looking at the bio-mats technology.

One Panel member asked for the timeframe of the bridge reconstruction and rollout of project. Ms. Vangjeli noted the reconstruction is expected to take place between 2021 and 2024, and it will be aligned with the Port Lands Flood Protection completion.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted the project is much needed and thanked the team for a great presentation. The Panel member recommended a traffic signal at Don Roadway to control the high traffic coming from the north and to ease flow. Further to the east at Leslie, consider furniture for people to rest and pause, and provide a natural way for slower bikers to pull over – a layby or bench would greatly set the tone. The Panel member noted the jersey barriers feel temporary, consider extending the height of the guard with art piece, or a planted buffer which also helps with noise and pollution.

Another Panel member appreciated West 8's design which mixes the banal with the remarkable, especially with the use of the jersey barriers.

One Panel member commended the team for a clear presentation and felt confident with the design. The Panel member suggested more diversity and experimentation with the planting strategy, consider non-native and resilient species to open the palette and be opportunistic. With plants that require no maintenance, they can also create an aesthetic that can alter the public's perception of infrastructure planting. Consider turning the banal into something remarkable. The Panel member appreciate the soil cells.

Another Panel member noted the strength of the design is the reinterpretation of the banal: low maintenance that works at low costs, a wild planting aesthetic, resilient biodiversity, and leading with landscape. The Panel member suggested linking legibility and learning opportunities on biodiversity into policy and this project can be exemplary as it amplifies the importance of legibility of a new, robust, aesthetic, and the need for great public open space.

One Panel member noted the Sumach is beautiful this time of the year, consider incorporating it into the planting strategy. The Panel member recommended a train-activated gate as an appropriate safety feature at the crossing.

Another Panel commended the Lake Shore Pilot Project and the integration of systems. The Panel member noted slowing traffic down at crossings is important, Don Roadway intersection is challenging but appreciated the design concept. The implementation must be rigorous to ensure all concerns are addressed. The Panel member supported the crossing at Booth Street to slow down traffic as the north-south intersections are vital for the success of the area – excellent work overall.

One Panel member noted the future of infrastructure design, specifically road reconstruction is more and more about the blurring between linear park and the right-of-way – recommended to continue this design thinking moving forward. Consider more furniture elements to ensure coupling between the various design elements, new planting thinking to complement the new road, and leverage this project as an example for planting policy changes.

Another Panel member felt the decorations at the barriers are not necessary, authentic, and consider alternatives to jersey barriers, or simply celebrate them as is. The Panel member suggested raising the curb at the train tracks to enhance safe paths for pedestrians and bikers.

One Panel member congratulated the team on the landscape design and was not supportive of the jersey barrier design, consider removing the decorations or replacing with other less “traffic engineering” buffers.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- The project is an important green link for the City, commended the team for demonstrating the strong approach of leading with landscape.
- Consider the long-term impact and use of the Boulevard, it is recommended to incorporate furnishing, fixtures, and provide seating opportunities throughout the entire corridor.
- Recommended dedicated signals to manage the high traffic of bikers and pedestrians at the Don Roadway intersection as it is a vital intersection that requires careful design management.
- All the north-south crossings are very important and should be carefully designed and managed.

Design

- There were mixed opinions on the use of the jersey barriers. Some Panel members felt that they provide an interesting contrast against other more refined elements in the design. Some Panel members recommended alternative strategies, such as taller more extensive barrier, planted buffer, or art pieces, instead of the decorating a banal design element.
- Carefully consider landscape maintenance and explore a wider palette of plants including countryside species.
- Provide a gate at the at-grade train crossing.
- Consider a raised curb detail at the train tracks to help prevent bikes and pedestrians from entering them.

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.

The Panel voted Full-Support for the project.

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

Ms. Long thanked the Panel for supporting the landscape-led infrastructure, the team will reconsider the jersey barriers. Ms. Vangieli noted the team will try to incorporate comments given the timeline for procurement and would prefer to follow up with an internal update for the Panel.

3.0 178-180 Queens Quay East – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1109
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Rom-Grand Waterfront Ltd.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	architectsAlliance; B+H
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adam Feldmann, Senior Associate, architectsAlliance; Chris Bohme, Senior Associate, B+H Architects

Delegation: Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Stefano Tognarelli, Owner, Newpoint Developments

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by recapping the site context, project program, development application history, and the East Bayfront Precinct Plan. Ms. Kim recapped the urban design guidelines, adjacent developments including 162 Queens Quay East and 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East, and introduced Paul Mule, Senior Community Planner with the City of Toronto, to continue the introduction. Mr. Mule noted that the alignment of the podium height datum between 178-180 and 162 Queens Quay East has been achieved, and the massing revisions from the 2016 LPAT Zoning are supported by the City. Ms. Kim noted the project is here for Schematic Design review, recapped the consensus comments from July 2019, and noted the areas for Panel consideration including façade expressions, massing, ground floor design, POPS landscape design, and sustainability strategies. Ms. Kim then introduce Adam Feldmann, Senior Associate with architectsAlliance, to present the design.

3.2 Project Presentation

Building

Mr. Feldmann began by recapping the context of the site, notable nearby open spaces, and the site dimensions. Mr. Feldmann noted the revised massing from the as-of-right, noting the alignment of the podium datum with 162 Queens Quay East, and the intention of having the entire block read as one with a layered façade. Mr. Feldmann noted the various green spaces and detailed the façade design with the wrap around balconies. At grade, Mr. Feldmann noted retail animation, landscape connections, and the interfaces with Queens Quay and the new east-west street. Mr. Feldmann provided a summary of the programs on each floor and noted the building and street sections. Mr. Feldmann then introduced Chris Bohme, Senior Associate with B+H Architects, to continue the presentation.

Landscape

Mr. Bohme noted the high level ground floor neighborhood connections, the characteristics of the three frontage typologies: park periphery, “main” street, and urban axes, and the three streetscapes: new east-west street, Sherbourne St., and Queens Quay. Mr. Bohme detailed the landscape design for each frontage, in particular the new POPS plaza which encourages strong visual and physical connections. Mr. Bohme noted the design working with planting as landform, suspended lighting, precedents for the planting strategy, and the paving materiality. Mr. Bohme noted the functional design of the other private roof and terrace landscapes.

Sustainability

Mr. Feldmann noted the proposed general sustainability strategies, the energy modelling showing 14% improvement over Toronto Green Standards Tier 2, and the anticipated carbon performance which is 18% above required.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

Given the landscape plan, one Panel member was concerned with the relationship between the west and east side of the POPS as the scale of the ground floor retail seems large. The Panel member asked if there is desire to allow for smaller retail facing the POPS to enhance animation. Mr. Feldmann noted the units can be subdivided easily with the design of the service corridor. As for the POPS itself, there are opportunities for retail spilling out as only 6m minimum is required to be clear.

Another Panel member asked if there is a layered façade relationship with 162 Queens Quay East's podium datum and how the balcony aesthetic was developed. Mr. Feldmann noted the datums between the two projects align, the façade was a conceptual draping of the entire site with balconies then cutting out openings to break up the mass. Mr. Feldmann noted the team is interested in finding a massing for this site that is not too tall but still engaging and interesting.

One Panel member noted the ground floor planters have the potential to be really rich and asked for clarification on the planting strategy. Mr. Bohme noted the planting scheme aims for tough, diverse, colorful plants that are not too tall, with many evergreens – the details have not yet been decided. The Panel member asked if the green roofs are decorative or functional. Mr. Bohme noted the terraces are primarily planted as visual patterns for residents' views without access, the green roof however will be functional.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the interim Queens Quay timing. Mr. Glaisek noted the timing is tied to transit funding, which is uncertain now. The Panel member asked if the grey on page forty-four is retail and the POPS is a public contribution. Mr. Feldmann noted the grey is retail, the blank wall on the west side along Queens Quay is the exit for the fire stairs and the team would like to avoid the potential air intake vent along Queens Quay. Mr. Tognarelli confirmed the POPS as public contribution. The Panel member asked if there is a dog area and the use of the roofs. Mr. Bohme noted the roofs are active zones for residents with parapet facilitating views of the streets, the courtyards are quieter in contrast.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the rendering perspective on page 22. Mr. Feldmann noted it is the notch at podium level.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the sustainability strategies to reach TGS v2, such as the TEDI requirements and the approach in the enhanced envelopes. Mr. Feldman noted the team is exploring a decentralized heat pump system and alternative approaches to the continuous balcony slabs to improve performance.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt the proportion of the buildings and the balconies is a big challenge for the design team, noting that the balconies look more like teeth and the carving out analogy is not apparent, consider alternatives. The strong white bands

make the building look squat, consider a finer expression that will support the sleek, formal look your office is known.

Another Panel member agreed that the image of carving is not communicated now, noting the balconies are too dominate over the volume behind, especially the overwhelming sense of horizontality. The Panel member noted the concept diagram is more interesting and the rendering reads too far from the diagram, consider unifying the volumes of the great layer, with the balcony faces, into something that is more volumetrically unified. If privacy separators are required, consider using them to cap the end of the bands at the top just like the podium treatment. The Panel member felt the dominant balcony pattern reduces radical reduction and unification and consider carefully whether tower balconies should read as connected with the podium bands.

One Panel member supported the massing and layering idea but was concerned with the visual impact of the balcony and its lack of transparency, consider refining them to be more opened and delicate, breaking up the volume in subtle ways. The Panel member noted the lack of thermal separation at the balconies is a big energy radiating design issue, consider high energy performance alternatives especially since the cost of thermally broken systems have decreased largely.

Another Panel member agreed with the elevational comments on the tower and podium and asked the team to provide straight-on elevations from Queens Quay and Sherbourne Ave. to include adjacent buildings. The Panel member noted the POPS is a new urban typology, important to ensure it is well designed to maximize opportunities, consider studying the way people will move through the site and provide more information on how the POPS can be improved.

One Panel member suggested to provide more comfortable micro-climates in the landscape design, including rain, sun, wind protection. While not every building needs to be a destination design, the Panel member felt this project could use more refinements to make it a great contribution to the waterfront.

Another Panel was not convinced with the large slab planters in the POPS, noting that its super-graphic quality does not provide opportunity for intimacy, animation, and adequately respond to the life of the surround program occupants.

One Panel member suggested to make the POPS more verdant, consider shifting the balconies relative to the core mass especially at the corners to improve its reading. The Panel member noted Queens Quay is a noble street with a bit of formality, felt that it is not appropriate to have second level balconies so exposed to the ground level, consider challenging the adjacencies of all those elements.

Another Panel member noted that in the near future, we will be discussing how to fix existing buildings to improve their energy performance; we still have a long way to go in order to meet the targeted sustainability mandates. The Panel member noted architectsAlliance's strong position in the marketplace and asked the team to consider more leadership in the future in this regard.

One Panel member noted the systems used for the energy modelling on p.59 can help with reaching carbon neutral, such as ERVs in the suites would lower energy use and a possible heat pump loop since the massing seems to be well suited for a decentralized heating system. The Panel member noted this is important for the project to consider as a move to future proof for an alternate, carbon-friendly energy source. The Panel member recommended thermally broken balconies and asked the team to consider thermally separate systems.

Another Panel member noted the ground landscape design is critical, asked the team to rethink, clarify the intent and materials for the POPS and adjacent spaces. The planter landforms are interesting and can help create outdoor rooms, channel views, and functionally link landscape with infrastructure – consider rainwater harvesting and drought tolerant plants. The green roofs are an infrastructure investment and will contribute to both design excellence and sustainability. The Panel member noted these areas might be the only landscape experience for the nearby condo dwellers and that the comments are offered in critical support.

One Panel member appreciated the revised massing and effectively designed ground floor. Provide more views of the project showing both Queens Quay and Sherbourne facades in relation to the streetscape design. The north façade requires more refinement to address the new east-west street. At the POPS, consider further development to create a sense of excitement, uses that will contribute to its animation, and less arbitrary planters. The Panel member noted it is important to consider lighting further and the POPS' relationship with 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

Building

- General support on the revised distribution of massing, consider further refining various details.
- The balconies are too visually dominate, do not resemble the “layering” concept as suggested in the project’s diagram, explore alternate approaches for a more refined and delicate balcony design, such as:
 - Reducing the horizontal nature
 - Reconsidering the degree of transparency of the railings
 - The design of the privacy separators
- Provide Queens Quay and Sherbourne elevations to show the building’s relationship with adjacent projects.
- The proposed façade design feels slightly generic and lacklustre, suggested to further iterate the design while considering the importance of the site, the civic presence and high visibility of the Queens Quay corner.

Landscape

- Appreciated the landscape geometries employed but felt the POPS design is lacklustre: too much of a passageway, not conducive for retail, and sustained ground floor activation. Consider providing comfort, outdoor microclimates, and protection against sun and rain. Leverage the landforms as focus points of the design to create rooms, channel views, and act as functional infrastructures.

- The ground floor landscape is extremely important, provide further clarification and rationale on the design's directionality, views, and material choice.
- This public realm network will serve thousands of residents, the Panel felt further study should be completed on use, access, and circulation.
- Appreciated the specific functional design and use of the roofs and terraces.
- Refine the new east-west street and further provide details on its experiential quality.

Sustainability

- Several Panel members were concerned with the lack of thermal separation at the balcony slabs, consider higher energy performance alternatives and adhering to higher standards with the inclusion of a decentralized heat pump loop.

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.

Nine Panel members voted Conditional Support, and three Panel members voted Non-Support based on the landscape design.

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

Mr. Feldmann thanked for Panel for their comments, all taken in good faith. The green roof comments are well taken and the team is interested in maximizing their efficiency in the area. Mr. Feldmann noted the massing expressions, including the layering of the balconies, will be re-examined.

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.