



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #105
Wednesday, October 18, 2017**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Chris Reed
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Bayside A1/A2
 2. Hanlan Rowing Club Boathouse
 3. Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project
 4. West Don Lands – Block 12
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the September 20th meeting. One of the Panel members asked to clarify one of the comments in section 1.3 on transit presentation. The minutes were adopted as revised.

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

The Chair noted that on October 12, a joint Design Review Panel was held at the City of Toronto to review the 1-7 Yonge project. The Chair provided a summary of comments made by the Panel, including the balcony conditions at 96 storeys, the need for more open space and greenspace at grade, the energy performance of the building, and the cohesion of all three towers.

In light of the recent announcement of Waterfront Toronto partnering with Sidewalk Labs as Innovation and Funding Partners for the Quayside development, Will Fleissig, President and CEO at Waterfront Toronto, introduced Dan Doctoroff, Founder and CEO of Sidewalk Labs, to the Panel. Mr. Fleissig noted that the Quayside project will be reviewed by the Panel in November or December this year for Issues Identification.

The Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Port Lands Planning Framework, Villiers Island Precinct Plan and the Official Plan Modifications went before Planning and Growth Management (PGM) on October 12. Committee Members requested that the items be deferred until the next PGM.

Mr. Glaisek then introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that at the end of September, the skating trail concrete was poured, marking an important milestone for the project. The refrigeration equipment has arrived on site, and after being craned into the building from the roof, it is now being installed. The floor and walls of Strachan Gate have been formed up and poured, allowing for work to begin on the interior.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Bayside A1/A2

Project Type: Residential Development

Location: Bayside

Proponent: Hines/Tridel

Architect/Designer: 3XN

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Audun Opdal (3XN)

Delegation: Salvatore Cavarretta (Tridel), Michael Gross (Hines), Suzanne Cook-Woodland (City of Toronto)

ID#: 1085

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that this is the fourth building to be developed in Bayside and the last market residential building. The building program will be primarily residential with animation uses at grade such as retail and a community centre space. Mr. Glaisek noted that this is the project's second time presenting to the Design Review Panel and they will be presenting Schematic Design. Mr. Glaisek provided a recap on comments made by the Panel at the last meeting, including:

- Overall support of the through-block connection
- The expression of the building needs further resolution, particularly the varying balcony treatments
- The architectural relationship between Aquabella and this building needs to be strengthened
- Encouraged to pursue thermal breaks on the balconies
- Consider the relationship between the ground floor and the public promenade
- Consider the possibility of relocating the community centre
- The proposed building height may be a challenge

Mr. Glaisek raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the modified approach to the building massing regarding height distribution, the relationship to adjacent and surrounding buildings and open space, including Parliament Slip, Bungee Park and Aquabella, the balcony orientation and treatment/materiality, the building program and groundfloor treatment, including the relationship to the water's edge, and the sustainability approach. Mr. Glaisek introduced Audun Opdal, Partner with 3XN, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Opdal began by noting that this project seeks to maximize water views from the residential units and the amenity space while also being considerate towards the views for the neighbouring buildings and streets. Mr. Opdal noted that the A1/A2 site marks the east corner of the Bayside development. Mr. Opdal explained that the middle portion of the building was redistributed to the north and south peaks allowing for maximum views to the lake. Since the last review, the southern peak was lowered by three storeys and the northern peak received one additional storey. Mr. Opdal explained that the ground floor programming consists of retail frontage towards the water's edge that continues along Merchant's Wharf. The loading bay and parking is centralized minimizing the impact on the ground floor façade. Mr. Opdal explained that the movements of the balcony respond to views to the lake and creates a dynamic expression between balconies. In terms of the material palette, Mr. Opdal explained the material palette will have very warm tones with the contrasting white soffit. Mr. Opdal then introduced Craig McIntyre, President of EQ Building Performance Inc., to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Mr. McIntyre explained that they are aiming to achieve LEED v4 and Waterfront Toronto Minimum Green Building Requirements v1. Mr. McIntyre noted that they are committing to thermal breaks on the balconies and the adjacent development, Aquabella, will also be committing to thermal breaks on the balconies.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if the soffits will be painted white, to which Mr. Opdal replied yes.

Another Panel member asked if the site limit is the building itself. Mr. Opdal replied yes, that the building will be built to the property line. The Panel member also asked for the height and width of the pedestrian passageway. Mr. Opdal replied that the height is six meters tall and nine meters wide.

One Panel member asked about the site plan and whether or not Queens Quay will be straightened at the Parliament Street intersection. Mr. Glaisek replied that the site plan shown reflects the current Queens Quay configuration, however, it will be straightened in the future. The Panel member also asked about the height differences between this building and Aqualina. Mr. Opdal replied that this building is approximately nine meters higher than Aqualina. The Panel member also asked if any wind studies have been undertaken for this project. Mr. Opdal replied not yet, but they will bring this to the next review.

Another Panel member asked about the dimensions of the balconies. Mr. Opdal replied that it's still quite schematic, and the intent is to provide more balconies and larger balconies for the larger units.

One Panel member asked if there are any plans for Parliament Slip. Mr. Glaisek replied that nothing has been designed yet, but marina uses have always been contemplated such as a gangway and floating dock.

Another Panel member asked whether 3XN Architects would be designing the Community Centre. Suzanne Cooke-Wooland with the City of Toronto, noted that this will be a City of Toronto run centre. The City would recommend four architecture firms to the developer to choose from to design the community centre. The Panel member also asked what material is proposed for the balconies. Mr. Opdal replied that the plans are still schematic, but durability is important, so they have been considering aluminium. Mr. Opdal also added that you can get a very precise colour from anodizing.

One Panel member asked if there was an elevation drawing along Queens Quay. Mr. Opdal replied that they will provide some drawings along Queens Quay at the next review.

Another Panel member asked about the balconies and whether there was a pattern. Mr. Opdal replied that the design intends to avoid too much repetition of the balconies and the number and shape of balcony is based on the different unit sizes.

One Panel member asked if the south side of Queens Quay is proposed to be lined with retail. Mr. Glaisek replied yes, but the C1 and C2 development blocks have not been designed yet.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member congratulated the Proponents for demonstrating how this building integrates with other Bayside developments. The Panel member was still uncomfortable with the height of the south tower and asked the Proponent to consider

shifting a couple storeys to the north tower or showing some context drawings with Aqualina where relationships can be compared and assessed.

Another Panel member was impressed with what the Proponent has achieved on this site, particularly the valley created between towers. The Panel member suggested adding publicly accessible rooms on the two top floors. The Panel member also felt that the community centre should be designed by 3XN.

One Panel member was appreciative that the Proponent addressed the notion of building cohesion. The Panel member noted that they now see the two buildings as cousins and added that having some differences are also important. The Panel member was eager to hear about the material strategy at the next review. The Panel member was also thrilled that the Proponents are committed to thermally broken balconies and felt that this was a precedent setting move for Toronto.

Another Panel member felt that the presentation was very thoughtful. The Panel member had reservations about shifting the height to the north as it will set a precedent for subsequent buildings on Queens Quay. The Panel member suggested to shift some of the building density to the middle portion instead. The Panel member also suggested looking holistically at the location of the lobby on Queens Quay in relation to the retail proposed along Queens Quay. The Panel member suggested moving the lobby entrance to the side street, giving prominence to the retail along Queens Quay.

One Panel member felt that the massing was very generous from an urbanistic standpoint. The Panel member felt that the passageway is positioned well, but how it's designed will be crucial. Elements such as lighting and public art will be critical to its success. The Panel member also noted that the edge along Parliament Slip is rather long and suggested providing some sort of relief through building articulation.

Another Panel member noted that they would like to see the public realm conditions from a pedestrian perspective.

One Panel member felt that the mid-block connections are a signature of the Bayside developments and suggesting looking at all these connections as a continuous emerging public system. The Panel member also felt that where the community centre is located is such a pivotal corner and needs to be integrated well into the building.

Another Panel member asked to see sun/shadow studies on the balconies and if there are areas where softer shading is achievable. The Panel member felt that this building is playful and very energetic and is supportive of the Bayside development as a whole. The Panel member added that 3XN needs to be added to the list of architects recommended to the developer by the City, to design the community centre.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall the building has evolved nicely

- The height of the south tower should be lowered given the current 9-meter difference between this tower and Aqualina's south tower (47 meters)
- Committing to thermal breaks is a precedent-setting move for the city
- The Queens Quay elevation is an important interface. Section drawings should be included to show this condition at the next review.
- The community centre is a pivotal piece of the building and needs to be designed to integrate well with the rest of the building.
- The design of the mid-block connection is critical.
- Explore the possibility of making the top floors of the towers accessible to the public.
- Further analysis is needed on the sun/shadow conditions and wind studies

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 in full Support of the project.

2.0 Hanlan Boat Club

Project Type: Building

Location: Lake Ontario Park

Proponent: Hanlan Boat Club

Architect/Designer: Lieux Architects

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Robert Macpherson (Lieux Architects), Walter Kehm (LANDinc)

Delegation: Lucie Richards (Lieux Architects), Patrick Okens (Hanlan Boat Club)

ID#: 1079

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stuart, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the team's third time presenting to the Design Review Panel and today they will be presenting Detailed Design. Ms. Stuart explained that Hanlan Boat Club is one of several boating clubs that lease parkland south of Regatta Road. Ms. Stuart provided an overview of Panel comments from the last meeting, including:

- Overall support for the revised site plan configuration
- Explore the materiality and colour of the garage doors, keep the landscape rough and scruffy and avoid the suburban look
- There is an opportunity to create an interesting landscape element using the stormwater drainage
- Further details of the canopy need to be worked out to ensure it complements the architecture of the building
- More research needs to be done on the accessibility of the site.

Ms. Stuart raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including further details of the weather protected waiting area, including appropriateness of location, materiality and colour, materiality and colour of the building, including revised doors and roof system, the treatment of the landscape/ground plane, and building location

and relationship to Regatta Road. Ms. Stuart introduced Robert Macpherson with Lieux Architects, to give the project presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Macpherson began by providing an overview of the site which consists of portable washrooms exposed to the street, minimal access for site vehicles and boat trailers, and limited storage space. Mr. Macpherson noted that the site activity is simple and straight forward. When you arrive on site, you get your boat, set up, and row. Mr. Macpherson then introduced Walter Kehm, Senior Principle at LANDinc to present the landscape portion of the project.

Mr. Kehm noted that this site is a vital greenway at the base of the Don Valley ecosystem. The landscape is not manicured. The site has lots of large cottonwoods, 30 meters high, and they are looking to work with this scale. The site is also very wet with natural regeneration. Mr. Kehm noted that trench drains can be built to connect into the new urban wild edge.

Mr. Macpherson explained that for each of the 10 portals, there is a set of sliding doors. The space allows for stacking of boats four high, with enough room between the aisles. Mr. Macpherson explained the pre-fabricated greenhouse building will allow for a quick construction process that will not interfere with the rowing season.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what happened to the washrooms. Mr. Macpherson replied that the portable washroom facilities are still on site.

Another Panel member asked if there was an entrance door to the building. Mr. Macpherson replied that there is no dedicated entrance off Regatta Road, however each bay has a man door, 10 doors total.

One Panel member asked why they chose to locate the building so close to the neighbouring building. Mr. Macpherson replied that it's to maximize the access and space along the west side of the site.

Another Panel member asked to describe the parking and planting on the site frontage. Mr. Kehm replied that the plan is to regularize Regatta Road and the planting strategy is very similar to what exists there today, such as dogwood, red maples, pine, spruce and cottonwood.

One Panel member asked what ground material is on the west and south side of the site. Mr. Kehm replied that it is granular which is good for drainage and compaction. The Panel member also asked what they are referring to when talking about "turf". Mr. Kehm replied that they are referring to the native grasses at the north side of the building. Mr. Kehm added that the porosity of the plantings on the north side of the building is to allow boats to be loaded in and out of the site.

Another Panel member asked about the details of the polycarbonate joints noting that gaps can be a space for mould and condensation. Mr. Macpherson replied that the manufacturer is considering double sealants, however sealing joints can create other issues including pressure issues. Mr. Macpherson added that there are large runs of panels so the joints are limited.

One Panel member asked if there is a chain-link fence surrounding the property. Mr. Kehm replied yes, adding that there is a security issue given that there are millions of dollars' worth of boats.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that this was one of the first projects to present at the Issues Identification stage and felt that this process has been exemplar. The Panel member added that this project has advanced in a good way.

Another Panel member liked the relocation of the washroom facilities to the corner of the site. The Panel member still didn't feel that they had a good sense of Regatta Road and how this building relates to the other boating clubs.

One Panel member was pleased by the idea of the urban wild landscape plan with a slightly enhanced version of what exists on the site today. The Panel member felt that the insertion of the parking is not minor and requires more thought. The Panel member also felt that the width of the trench drains might not be enough to handle the water.

Another Panel member felt that the evolution of the building has progressed in a great way.

One Panel member felt that the chain-link fence needs to be given the same amount of consideration as the rest of the site, possible considering alternatives.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall supportive of the way this building has evolved
- The details of the joints need to be resolved
- Ensure that the treatment of the fence is given as much consideration as the rest of the site
- Be cautious of the polycarbonate joints and the possibility of condensation and mould growth
- The parking has a large impact on the site and requires more thought

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 in full Support of the project.

3.0 Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project

Project Type: Public Realm

Location: Tommy Thompson Park

Proponent: City of Toronto

Architect/Designer: DTAH

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Megan Torza (DTAH)

Delegation: John Keane (City of Toronto)

ID #: 1080

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Ms. Stuart introduced the project by noting that this is the team's third time presenting to the Panel and they will be presenting Detailed Design. Ms. Stuart noted that Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development project includes a pavilion and entranceway that intends to establish a new front door to the park that is welcoming, engaging, and ecologically sensitive to its context. The scope of work includes a serviced park entrance, parking, accommodation for bus turnaround, and a serviced public pavilion with an outdoor interpretive area. Ms. Stuart noted that the project builds on the previous master planning, architecture and landscape architecture of Tommy Thompson Park, which includes the staff booth, the environmental shelter, the bird banding station, and the entranceway pavilion concept design. Ms. Stuart provided an overview of comments from the last review, including:

- The landscape design of lush and rough details works well on the site
- The parking lot design needs to be revisited as it still feels suburban
- Consider reconceptualising the pavilion design as it feels unresolved and inconsistent with the nature of the site
- Consider using solar domes and panels on the roof and adding car charging stations to the parking lot.

Ms. Stuart then provided some topics for the Panel to consider, including the appropriateness of further refinements to the parking lot design and stormwater management strategy, and modifications to the pavilion design including materiality, form and scale of the soffit. Ms. Stuart then introduced Megan Torza, Principal at DTAH to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Torza began by walking through the existing conditions of the site noting that the site is relatively flat with tree planting that has been done by TRCA over the years that the landscape design will build on. Ms. Torza explained that the multi-use trail is in poor condition, and there are stormwater management issues on site. In response to the previous comments made by the Panel, Ms. Torza noted that the parking lot has

been revised to reduce the parking and include additional trees to break up the plan. The pavilion roof structure has been redesigned to cantilever, disconnected from the base and the columns were removed. The concrete texture was roughened to expose the aggregate and inset lettering was introduced. Ms. Torza explained that the soffit material has returned to CorTen to relate to other pavilions, as directed by Waterfront Toronto. Ms. Torza noted that the City of Toronto did not agree to adding skylights or solar domes due to budget and maintenance restraints. Ms. Torza explained that one of the main issues of the site is the access control. The tabletop area, which is the raised grade up to sidewalk height that allows for a dedicated pedestrian zone and special events area while still allowing cyclists to bypass. Ms. Torza explained that the stormwater and planting strategy introduces swales which allows for percolation into the baselands. Ms. Torza noted that the material selection for the pavilion includes, chisel-tooled concrete, CorTen soffit, recessed glazing, cast-in lettering and gabion walls.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked about stormwater management. Ms. Torza replied that all roof drains collect below the ground floor slab then into the rip rap drainage area in the adjacent swale. The Panel member also asked where the CorTen is going to drip into. Ms. Torza replied that the details limit the drip off the edge. Ms. Torza also added that the Corten specified is pre-weathered and sealed.

Another Panel member asked what materials are proposed for the interior of the building. Ms. Torza replied that the walls will be clad with unfinished cement board with exposed fasteners with CIP concrete in the storage space and tiles in the washrooms.

One Panel member asked how the operations work. Ms. Torza replied that the building will be maintained by Parks, Forestry and Recreation staff and the principal users of the building will be TRCA educational staff.

Another Panel member asked about the lighting. Ms. Torza replied that there is a channel set within the soffit containing a wall wash that surrounds the building and the light will graze the face of the chisel tool concrete. There will be recessed lighting within the hallway and entrances to the washroom.

One Panel member asked how the number of parking spots was determined. Ms. Torza replied that there are currently 100 parking spaces proposed and this is based on TRCA's projected number of park users once the park opens seven days a week.

Another Panel member asked about the pedestrian gates and what is driving the need to install them. Ms. Torza replied that the stakeholder groups are the ones requesting the gates in order to slow down access at the thresholds. The Panel member then asked what the stakeholder groups were. Ms. Torza replied that there are approximately 20 groups, including Tommy Thompson User Group, Friends of the Spit, and the Bird Society, among others.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member was appreciative of all the improvements made from the last meeting especially the more robust looking roof. The Panel member suggested aligning the concrete cuts with the soffit geometry. The Panel member felt that the circulation of the entrance works well and was thoughtfully addressed. The Panel member also appreciated the chisel tool concrete adding to the toughness of the site.

Another Panel member was also appreciative of the cantilevered roof. The Panel member felt that the signage could read just as well without the smooth pieces framing it. The Panel member also felt that the material palette is such an interesting experience to be around and suggested continuing the palette into the inside of the pavilion.

One Panel member felt that the site design was nice, with the hint of refined and civilized, but not too much. The Panel member suggested including more trees in the parking lot to give it a grove feel.

Another Panel member felt that this was an elegant design that speaks to the language of the other pavilion structures on site. The Panel member was concerned about the safety of the enclosure created by the gabion wall.

One Panel member was concerned about the chisel tool concrete and the difficulty with removing graffiti from this type of surface.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall support for how the project has evolved
- The site plan is sensitive to different users
- Pay close attention to the drip from the CorTen roof
- Consider incorporating materials from the exterior to the interior of the pavilion

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 in Full Support of the project.

4.0 West Don Lands – Block 12

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann (architectsAlliance)

Delegation: Marc Baronette (Dundee Kilmer)

ID #: 1084

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that Block 12 represents the fourth market residential building in the Canary District. This is the project's second time presenting to the Panel and they will be presenting Schematic Design today. Mr. Glaisek walked the Panel through comments from the last meeting, including:

- Support to get a grocer tenant in the ground floor retail space
- Encourage pursuing thermally broken balconies
- More resolution is needed on details such as the end walls and the treatment of the balconies
- Consider both options for the private backyard space and the public courtyard amenity space
- Bring section drawings at the next meeting to help describe the side streets
- Make sure the existing public realm is considered in the building design
- More detail is needed on the transition between the commercial portion of the building and the residential portion
- Explore the flexibility of combining units.

Mr. Glaisek raised some topics for the Panel to consider, including resolution of the townhouse frontage in relation to adjacent buildings, modifications to architecture, including the end walls, balconies and entrance, relationship to the street frontages, approach to the internal courtyard space, appropriateness of the unit mix, and the sustainability approach. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Adam Feldmann, Associate with architectsAlliance, to give the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by providing an overview of context. Mr. Feldmann walked through some of the project statistics including the unit mix. The project will consist of approximately 18% three-bedroom units, ranging between 930 square feet to 1499 square feet. Mr. Feldmann explained that the building is fully compliant with the zoning by-laws with a height of 36 meters along Front Street and 26 meters along Mill Street. Mr. Feldmann walked through the programming of the building noting that there is still a dedicated space for retail on the north façade with a type A loading bay in case of a grocer tenant. There are also two residential lobbies, one at the north-west side of the building and another lobby on the south side of the building. There will be amenity space on the on the third floor and an outdoor amenity space on the sixth floor of the building. Mr. Feldmann explained that the courtyard space will be dedicated to private backyard space with a landscaped strip through the space. The landscaping along the townhouse frontage consists of CorTen planters. Mr. Feldmann noted that the planters line up relatively well with the doors to the townhouses.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there was direct access from the retail space to the commercial parking. Mr. Feldmann replied that there currently is not, but this will be taken into consideration. The Panel member also asked what the width of the courtyard is. Mr. Feldmann replied that the width is 15 meters.

Another Panel member asked why they are not building to the property line. Mr. Feldmann replied that there is a four-meter buffer that was set to alleviate the potential of damaging the existing public realm during construction.

One Panel member asked to clarify the balcony strategy. Mr. Feldmann explained that there are no balconies at the north and south ends to keep it clean. The spandrel glass at the slab edge drops down eight feet to the ceiling edge. The façade will be vertical patterns of the glass. The Panel member asked if the balconies on the east and west sides have windows on the sides. Mr. Feldmann replied yes.

Another Panel member asked about the lifespan of the coil loop. Mr. Feldmann replied that he was unsure. The Panel member noted that this is critical as the heating for the room is dependent on this and once built, it will be difficult to access.

One Panel member asked if any sun/shadow studies were undertaken. Mr. Feldmann replied that they will bring sun/shadow studies to the next review. The Panel member also asked about the performance of triple glazing. Mr. Feldmann replied that the intention is to build up the glazing performance rather than implementing thermally broken balconies due to the higher life-cycle cost.

Another Panel member asked if the servicing area is screened from the street. Mr. Feldmann replied that the space is fully enclosed.

One Panel member asked if tenants with the courtyard spaces are able to get from one backyard to the other through the landscaped strip. Mr. Feldmann replied yes but that you would have to step up to get to the landscaped piece.

Another Panel member asked what the distance is between the balconies in the courtyard area. Mr. Feldmann replied that the balcony to balcony face is 15 meters. The Panel member also asked if they are planning to introduce any colour into the building. Mr. Feldmann replied that they are looking to get a brighter colour on the soffits.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member felt that the strong conceptual idea on Front Street is not reflected along Mill Street, including the massing and treatment of the taller portion. The Panel member also felt that the mechanical penthouse treatment needs to be given as much consideration as the other mechanical penthouses in the area. The Panel member also asked the Proponents to think of other ways the courtyard landscape can be used if you are unable to grow trees.

Another Panel member agreed with the need for a signature mechanical penthouse treatment. The Panel member also felt that the mechanical penthouse is a signature element in the West Don Lands. The mechanical penthouse needs to work in harmony with the surrounding ones. The Panel member felt that the use of CorTen along Rolling

Mills Road works well. The Panel member noted that there is plasticity between the horizontality of the base with the verticality of the frame. How the horizontality reads with the rest of the building elevation is key to further development.

One Panel member felt that there could be more focus on the public realm where the retail and lobby are and the gap between the loading and residential area.

Another Panel member was concerned about the lack of light penetrating the courtyard spaces and worried that the planted strip down the middle is going to exacerbate the natural light. The Panel member recommended the middle space to be an access point to each other's backyards and to the amenity space. Sociability and accessibility are critical and will require some inventiveness regarding the screening strategy.

One Panel member agreed that the internal courtyard space is undefined as a social space. The Panel member felt that the bar elements should be finer grain to break up the balcony rhythm.

One Panel member felt that a creative solution is needed to ensure that tenants don't feel too trapped in the courtyard space. The Panel member suggested maximizing the backyard space as much as possible and adding trees to the amenity space up top. The addition of trees would also add an element of framing the street with trees.

Another Panel member felt that the long facades need more breaks in the balconies to balance the horizontality and verticality of the façade.

One Panel member liked the continuous façade along the side streets and didn't feel that it should be broken up. The Panel member suggested the landscaped strip down the middle of the courtyard space should be removed altogether to provide more space and natural light to the backyards. The Panel member like the sophistication of the stacked boxes but felt that the curtain wall is muddying the scheme. The Panel member felt that the balconies should stay relatively transparent.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

- More detail is required on the public realm and the experience from a pedestrian scale
- The courtyard space still feels unresolved. Multiple options should be brought forward at the next review
- Ensure that there is a signature treatment to the mechanical penthouse
- Integrate some colour into the design
- The relationship of the front to the sides of the building need more resolution, including materiality and treatment of the horizontal and vertical elements.

4.6 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 in Full Support of the project.