



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #141
Wednesday, Jan. 27th, 2021**

Present

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

Regrets

Claude Cormier
Janna Levitt

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. 200 Queens Quay West – Issues Identification
 2. Leslie Street Lookout – Issues Identification
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Dec. 16th, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict for **200 Queens Quay West** and recused himself from the review. Pat Hanson declared conflict for **Leslie Street Lookout** and recused herself from the review.

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 **1-7 Yonge Phases 4+5** received a Non-Support vote for the above-grade public realm and building base, and a separate Conditional Support vote for the general massing. Mr. Glaisek noted the proponent has made good progress on addressing Panel comments and the City is interested in bringing the project back to DRP. The date is not yet determined.

Construction and Project Update:

Mr. Glaisek noted that David Kusturin, Chief Project Officer with Waterfront Toronto, will provide a detailed construction update next month on **Port Lands Flood Protection (PLFP)** for DRP. Mr. Glaisek noted the **West Don Lands Stormwater Facility** has been selected by Azure Magazine as one of the top ten "Striking Architecture Projects Shaping Design in 2021" and we are excited to see the project completed. Mr. Glaisek concluded by noting the draft DRP agenda for next month and introduced Shannon Baker, Director, Parks & Public Realm, with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) update on **PLFP Roads** for the Panel to decide whether this post-approval change warrants the projects to return for another review.

Ms. Baker began by recapping the key streets for the Port Lands and their characteristics, noting that today's presentation will focus on adjustments made to Cherry Street to accommodate the deletion of the BRT lanes. Ms. Baker noted the former plans with dedicated transit lanes and the proposed plan including temporary landscape filled with native pollinator meadow planting, the new plan incorporating bus stop at the Commissioners St. intersection and reducing pedestrian crossing distance. Ms. Baker noted the updated street sections without the transit lanes, intersections at Commissioners and future Munition Street, and mid-block crossing details.

One Panel member asked if the construction of the road and timing of the occupancy of the first block of buildings on the north side of Commissioners St. are coordinated. Ms. Baker noted the timeline for the development of the buildings and the construction of the LRT are not determined, the LRT will hopefully be funded and implemented soon. Ms. Baker noted most of the blocks are owned by CreateTO and they will develop once flood protection has been achieved. The Panel member noted the revised design looks more comfortable to traverse. Another Panel member noted it is a positive move for the project. One Panel member agreed and felt a return review to DRP is not required. Mr. Glaisek asked if all Panel members agree. Panel members expressed consensus that the project does not need to return to DRP.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted that Matthew Hickey has been appointed as a new member of the Waterfront Design Review panel. The Chair noted a call was issued in August 2020 for a new Indigenous Design Expert to join the Panel. Together with a representative from

the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Matthew Hickey was selected as the new member. Matthew is Mohawk from the Six Nations of the Grand River Reserve and he is a partner at Two Row Architect with 14 years of Indigenous design experience. The Chair noted Matthew has broad first nations perspective, has experience negotiating between different groups, is a great listener, comfortable teaching, and sharing knowledge. The Chair welcomed Matthew Hickey to the Panel as a new member.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 200 Queens Quay West – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1120
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	DiamondCorp; Lifetime Development
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Wallman Architects; DTAH;
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Kelly O’Hanlon, Development Manager, DiamondCorp; Rudy Wallman, Principal, Wallman Architects; James Roche, Partner, DTAH; Michael Wong, Energy Analyst, EQ Building Performance
<i>Delegation:</i>	Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Aviva Pelt, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Laurie Payne, DiamondCorp; Alun Lloyd, Principal, BA Group

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Caroline Kim, Urban Designer Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the site context, adjacent developments, and destinations. Ms. Kim noted the project history: land previously owned by Canada Lands Corporation, two towers connected by a base building, a Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces (POPS) located on the west corner, and City Planning has provided the application with formal comments indicating issues relating to height and massing. Amendments are required. Ms. Kim noted the proponent proposes to remove and/or reduce parking requirements with number of nearby properties, and that the team has submitted a rezoning application in June 2020.

Ms. Kim noted the site is designated as Mixed-Use in the City of Toronto Official Plan, under the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan the site is designated as Existing Use Areas, and the site is zoned CR – Mixed Use District under the Harbourfront Zoning By-law 289-93 and Site Specific Zoning By-law 609-1998. Ms. Kim noted the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context, existing site context photos, and the project is being reviewed for Stage 1: Issues Identification. Ms. Kim noted the areas for Panel

consideration: ground floor design, intent and design of the POPS, access and services, massing in relation to context and adjacent buildings, and the sustainability principles for the project. Ms. Kim then introduced Kelly O'Hanlon, Development Manager with DiamondCorp, to begin the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Project Background

Ms. O'Hanlon began the presentation by noting the recent projects by DiamondCorp and Lifetime Developments, and the design team. The project began outreach to residents and community organizations in June 2020 and submitted the rezoning application, the team is gathering feedback from the City, community, and DRP, and will continue to refine the plans. Ms. O'Hanlon noted the laneway is owned by the adjacent WaterClub Condos, and the existing site context.

Public Realm

James Roche, Partner with DTAH, noted the site context in detail: adjacent buildings, major public spaces, destinations, and the design options of the project including high-quality public spaces, enhance pedestrian and cyclist connections to the Waterfront and Downtown Core, a range of housing types in an urban context, and the delivery of high-quality architectural design. Mr. Roche noted the intent of enhancing connectivity at the site, connecting with existing streets, and provided a summary of the landscape concept. Mr. Roche noted the proposed street section for Harbour St., the POPS along Lower Simcoe, the midblock drive court, and the landscaping along the north side of the private laneway. Mr. Roche noted the vehicular access options, and the Gardiner Underpass opportunities for public art and activation.

Building and Sustainability

Rudy Wallman, Principal with Wallman Architects, summarized the ground level site analysis, lower and upper tower build zones, sectional relationships between the proposed and existing adjacent towers, and shadow studies with the proposed massing. Michael Wong, Energy Analyst with EQ Building Performance, summarized the energy and sustainability strategies of the project, including high-performance glazing and envelope, high efficiency condensing boilers, green roofs, and a moderate window-to-wall ratio. Other strategies include no excess parking, ample bicycle parking, low-flow plumbing fixtures, and adequate soil volumes. The project is targeting Toronto Green Standards v3 Tier 1.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the back of house uses along the laneway for the adjacent condos and if the intent is similar for the proposed ground floor. Ms. O'Hanlon noted all their services are accommodated off the laneway, the design proposes a landscape buffer for separation. Laurie Payne, Vice President of Development with DiamondCorp, noted the WaterClub servicing and storage vehicles are accessed from the laneway.

Another Panel member asked for the laneway ownership and additional photos of the context. Ms. O'Hanlon noted the laneway is owned by WaterClub condos and showed some additional images of the existing condition.

One Panel member asked if there are existing units facing the laneway. Mr. Wallman noted the lower floors of the WaterClub condos have a day-care centre and other amenity spaces, there are very few units and thus we are pulling back the south line of the podium to maximize distance. The day-care has a rooftop space on the third or fourth level of the podium facing the south between the towers.

Another Panel member asked for the sectional relationship between the towers and the Gardiner Expressway. Mr. Wallman noted the structure curves at the closest point to the site. The Panel member asked the team to provide a complete sectional drawing at the next review.

One Panel member noted the site plan shows the drop-off at the middle, but access has not yet been negotiated off the laneway and asked for clarification on the team's preferred direction and implications on the public realm design. Ms. O'Hanlon noted the team learnt the first option is not possible, thus proposing either Simcoe or Harbour as alternatives. Alun Lloyd, Principal with BA Group, noted curb cut from Harbour St. would provide access for all services, public access, and accessible entrances, and the team has ideas for resolving the bike lane. Mr. Lloyd noted the Simcoe option has impact on the proposed POPS, even with only parking access a second, less intensely used, servicing driveway would be needed off Harbour. The Panel member asked how drop-off works for option 2 and given right-of-way to Queens Quay, why the secondary access is called secondary. Mr. Lloyd noted it would still occur in the central area. Ms. Payne responded the laneway use has legal implications and headroom issues, through an agreement with the neighbours this access must remain as secondary.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the WaterClub condo units that face the proposed site. Mr. Wallman noted the unit plans and the living rooms do not directly face the new tower. The Panel member suggested to show the corresponding unit plans for the proposed building for comparison.

One Panel member asked if the Gardiner Expressway structure is ramping up at the site. Mr. Wallman noted the stretch of highway is flat, approximately 20m above grade – the ramp occurs west of Simcoe St.

Another Panel member asked the team for their level of commitment on the Toronto Green Standards Tier 1 target and if there are ambitions for higher targets such as Tier 2 or 3. Ms. Payne responded the questions will be detailed in the project's Site Plan Application which will come at a later time, it is difficult to give a timeline but it will likely carry into 2022. The Panel member suggested the team to look at Toronto Green Standards Tier 2 since Tier 1 will be eliminated by that time.

One Panel member asked if the team has considered other low carbon approaches as the towers have many divergent exposures. Given the shading and geometries of the towers, the Panel member suggested a decentralized heating loop to allow a much

smaller central plant which will significantly reduce cost – it is important to think about these concerns early on in the proforma.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member congratulated the team for working with a challenging site and addressing the existing issues. The Panel member is not persuaded by the proposed POPS, not against the concept of an open space but doubtful of its benefits. As the location of the POPS is interrelated with the access of the site and the facing distance issues between the towers, the Panel member noted the POPS would benefit from some reconfiguring. The Panel member noted since the towers shifting north is beneficial for your scheme and neighbours, while avoiding flight path, consider making the west building footprint a wedged shape like the east tower to address separation distance issues. The Panel member noted Mr. Wallman’s team is experienced with triangular plans as seen at 10 York across the street. The Panel member is indifferent on the proposed POPS and recommended moving the west tower further west, and expanding the midblock connection in the middle which will provide more leeway for landscaping – it might not be big enough as a POPS but will certainly improve the condition.

Another Panel member noted the importance and usefulness of the laneway for accommodating back of house needs and services, and encouraged the team to restart, if possible, the negotiation with the adjacent condos on a shared laneway that will ensure a consolidated strategy for access and servicing. Consider transforming the laneway open space into a mews which can serve as a POPS. The Panel member noted both options with curb cuts off Harbour St. have larger negative impacts than the positives presented by the proposed POPS for the site. The Panel member suggested adjusting the podium and tower to address separation distance.

One Panel member supported a “Flatiron” shape for the west tower as it will lead to a more pleasant experience for all residents and shifting the landscaping to the middle courtyard area to serve the lobbies of thousands of residents. The Panel member recommended more softening on the public realm.

Another Panel member commended the team for addressing a complex site, creating an accessible public realm, and adding to the public realm to further improve the experience. The Panel member supported that more can be done with the central midblock connection landscape design, especially to make it more visible from Queens Quay. The Panel member asked to ensure the POPS is designed as a community space with micro-climates that are inviting and welcoming for the community. There is value in the POPS providing space for dog relief but the key contribution is the social value in a hostile and intense urban site.

One Panel member thanked the team for the presentation and noted the site is located in an area with many parks, thus the key value for this POPS should be to successfully activate the corner in ways that are in tune with the added density, such as improving mental health. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider creating a clear identity, with visible signs, to bring people to these spaces and down to the waterfront.

Another Panel member commended the team for a great contribution to the site and a fantastic design vision. The Panel member felt the POPS is a landscape forecourt that is not fully connected, encouraged the team to consider alternatives to better address the laneway to the south and create a significant gathering space. The Panel member asked the team to provide more detailed drawings of the laneway to prompt design thinking and consider dog relief areas on the podium roof to spur stewardship, management, and a sense of pride of play for the residents.

One Panel member supported the recommendation of pushing the tower west into the POPS as there are many large green spaces already in the neighbourhood. The Panel member noted a tower at Simcoe can help animate and activate retail. Currently, there is a pedestrian crosswalk that leads directly from Queens Quay into the parking garage – there is an opportunity for this project to enhance the site’s north-south connection capacity to and from the waterfront. The Panel member suggested the team to explore sustainability standards aggressively, keep in mind that Toronto Green Standards version 3 will be dropped next year as version 4 is introduced, to ensure that the project will not be obsolete soon after completion from an energy performance perspective.

Another Panel member noted the massing of the towers will likely have simultaneous cooling and heating, as a result there are ways to move energy around the buildings, consider moving towards a decentralized system to reduce carbon footprint. Consider Enwave connection and a full building conductivity analysis, the savings here can be used in the façade budget. It is important to start early to ensure the project has good carbon and financial performance.

One Panel member commented the project is a great opportunity to act as an agent in connecting the waterfront with the downtown core and encouraged the team to design the public realm in that direction as opposed to creating another destination space.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Commended the team for taking on a challenging site, replacing the parking garage, and improving the living environment of the neighbours.
- The project will create a very urban and dense project, it is important to create a strong public realm with great pedestrian access and landscaping – the team has a unique window now to develop this enhancement strategy.
- Appreciated the team for presenting the project and looked forward for a return review.

Public Realm

- The key public realm decisions, including the location and size of POPS, access, midblock connection, are all interconnected and should be considered cohesively:
 - Unconvinced of the value of the currently proposed POPS off Simcoe St, consider alternative strategy that will allow the footprint of the west

tower to shift further westward while improving the experience of the central courtyard midblock connection.

- The proposed curb cut off Harbour Street will interrupt the new street and bike lane, further consult with the owners of Waterclub Condos to reconsider the option of consolidating new and existing vehicular and servicing access with a shared laneway.
- Consider the project as an opportunity to enhance the existing north-south public realm connections with Queens Quay, both along Simcoe St. and the proposed mid-block connection, to improve pedestrian desirability and draw people through the block.

Building

- Consider a wedged shape footprint for the west tower to improve facing distances with the existing adjacent Waterclub condo tower.
- Provide a north-south sectional drawing that shows the project's relationship with the Gardiner Expressway.
- Provide typical unit layouts on the proposed and existing adjacent towers at the next review to better understand the facing distance issues.

Sustainability

- Encouraged the team to aim higher, be bold, and push the standard for energy use with innovative strategies.
- Consider the upcoming changes for the Toronto Green Standards and future proof the project so its performance will not be obsolete soon after completion.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed for Stage 1: Issues Identification.

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

Ms. O'Hanlon appreciated the Panel's feedback and noted the project is still at an early stage, the team will consider all comments and is looking forward to returning to DRP.

2.0 Leslie Street Lookout – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1121
<i>Project Type:</i>	Park
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	CreateTO
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Claude Cormier Assos; gh3*; ARUP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Marc Hallé, Senior Associate, Claude Cormier + Associes; Vanessa Abram, Architectural Designer, gh3*
<i>Delegation:</i>	Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Jennifer Tharp, CreateTO; Hon Lu, CreateTO; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Marc Kramer, City of Toronto; Anthony Kittel, City of Toronto; Carlos Portillo, Claude Cormier + Associes; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; David O’Hara, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began by introducing Jennifer Tharp, Development Manager with CreateTO, to note the project’s background. Ms. Tharp noted the Leslie Slip Lookout will be a new destination in the Port Lands, located on the Martin Goodman Trail near the entrance to Tommy Thompson Park, the park will provide opportunities for flexible programming and connect the public to the water’s edge with views of the Ship Channel. Ms. Tharp recapped the project timeline: Fall 2020 CreateTO led a design competition and estimated construction to start in 2022. Ms. Tharp noted the design team: Claude Cormier + Associes as the landscape design lead, gh3* as the creator of the lookout structure, and Arup as the lead in engineering and construction management. Ms. Tharp summarized the jury comments from the competition: park is envisioned for year-round events and activities, simplicity and openness provide flexible uses, the elegance and timelessness of the design, and the implementation.

Mr. Novack continued by noting the site context, ownership of the area, Port Lands Planning Framework policy context for land use and open space. Mr. Novack noted the project is here for Stage 1: Issues Identification review and the areas for Panel consideration: design concept support of the Port Lands Planning Framework, evolving character of Leslie Street, performance of the park as green infrastructure and goals for sustainability, mitigation of industrial adjacencies, access, indigenous consultation and placemaking, and phasing and maintenance opportunities. Mr. Novack then introduced Marc Hallé, Senior Associate with Claude Cormier + Associes to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Project Site

Mr. Hallé began the presentation by noting today is an exciting day as the DRP is also the launch of the project after designing for many months for the competition, the team is looking forward to the Panel's feedback. Mr. Hallé recapped the design team members and noted that the site has great tension between industrial and green, the sandbar used to come right to the site and the team is inspired to bring these elements back. Mr. Hallé noted sand is a historical reference, a substrate of the city but also part of a new language of the city. The beach turns an industrial site to an accessible space with amenities while maintaining the mystique of the context.

Park Design

Mr. Hallé noted the park is a fringe, framing the destination of water and sand. The concrete curb serves as a threshold for the beach which will hold large activities. The mounds and swales reinforce permeability of the site, and low fence marks the boundary. The team is interested in creating public moments of intimacy in an unlikely setting, the site is an industrial landscape recycled into a destination of respite and recreation, and sand will be excavated for the mounds then covered with a layer of top soil. Mr. Hallé noted the project aims to minimize reliance on stormwater infrastructure. Mr. Hallé introduced Vanessa Abram, Architectural Designer with gh3*, to present the lookout structure.

Lookout Structure

Ms. Abram noted the central gathering hub, a 10m tall cylindrical concrete structure, is positioned to offer 360-degree view of the Port Lands. The ground level arched entryway is carved from a miniature silo, a visual cue leading to the interior including an accessible washroom and a space for park operations. Ms. Abram noted the roof is a reference to the gear forms scattered around the park and the structure is a landmark to draw people into the central meeting space.

Mr. Hallé noted the planting is imagined as a palette that cleans the soil, the program offers year-round activities, both quiet and loud, that cannot happen in other parts of the city. Mr. Hallé noted the site is already fully serviced and connected to municipal utilities. Mr. Hallé concluded by noting that the urban beach is a successful Toronto typology and has universal appeal, it is perfectly positioned here for watching sunsets, and mounds help push Leslie Street away to create moments of respite.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the team studied water quality. Mr. Hallé noted the sediments at the site are problematic but in the long-term Lake Ontario will become swimmable which would be amazing for this project.

Another Panel member asked for the primary users of the park and if the brief specified the design as more of a destination than a pass-through – the Panel member's experience of the site is a high traffic pass-through point between the Don Valley and Tommy Thompson Park. Mr. Hallé answered that the brief described a destination for local workers and an important stop for bikers, it is a site in transition as Tommy Thompson continues to become more of an anchor in the scene.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the site extent, and the territory south between Unwin Ave. and the park that is shown as a green space. Mr. Hallé responded that the teams see the area as an opportunity in the future to be transformed into a functional landscape with amenities. Given the two concrete plants near the park, the Panel member asked if the site has a dust or air quality issue that should be addressed with plant selection. Mr. Hallé noted species that can help mitigate and filter dust out of the park will be selected.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the Indigenous engagement approach. Ms. Tharp noted CreateTO is looking to bring onboard two consultants focused on Indigenous engagement and will be working with City of Toronto's Indigenous Affairs Office to identify the placements.

One Panel member noted the Leslie Street Green Portal is planned to continue northward as a green strip and if the team has considered how this design, as a first piece, will influence the development of the rest of the portal. Mr. Hallé noted the Green Portal is part of the planning framework with no design yet, currently there is a parking lot occupying the areas north of the site. The Panel member asked if there are areas identified in the design for entering the water to embark on a water journey. Mr. Hallé noted the team has not considered this, will explore options such as bollards at the water's edge.

Another Panel member asked if the design could engage more with the water, for example in Vancouver there are many underwater structures that improve marine life and promote fishing opportunities for visitors. The Panel member asked if park furniture such as picnic tables and BBQs can be provided to accommodate different activities. Mr. Hallé noted these are good suggestions for the team to consider.

One Panel member noted there used to be a non-profit rowing club on the north side of the slip and asked if there is any boat access from the park. Mr. Hallé responded that this was not included in the competition brief but is an interesting idea for the site. The Panel member asked for the lighting approach and if night lighting should be provided for the local shift workers. Mr. Hallé noted simple parking lighting, low levels, have been provided along circulation paths only.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the exciting project and the question at the end of the presentation of whether Toronto needs another urban beach. The Panel member noted Toronto is becoming a seasonal beach city and it is great to have another beach. Since the site is right next to a busy cycling route, this would be an incredible rest stop and a special attraction, consider more infrastructure specifically for biking. The Panel member supported the design of the pavilion but does not understand the oversized gears on the beach. Consider more integrated seating and configurations. The Panel member asked the team to future proof the design for water access, i.e. boat docking if swimming is not possible.

Another Panel member appreciated the wonderful animation the design will bring to the site, the feasible and smart cut-fill strategy, the dynamic ecology of the dunes, and the different ways of engaging with the water's edge. Whether it is kayak or canoe, the

Panel member encouraged the team to embrace any possible water use. The Panel member commented it is important to embrace vernacular plant species.

One Panel member noted the project is exciting, simple, elegant, appropriate for the site, and will set the tone for the rest of the neighbourhood transformation. The structure is in a good location for looking west and the sunset. As the port develops, consider lighting the key structure and elements of the park in an integrated manner to enhance the overall experience. Consider furniture strategy to accommodate families and small gathering events. The Panel member felt the beach and water are far removed from Leslie St. and asked the team to consider framing specific views of the channel from the street. The Panel member noted that park safety, given the context, should be carefully considered in the design as the current siting of the berms does not provide visibility from the street. Direct sightlines from Leslie Street and other key approaches, as well as lighting, should be studied. Consider the evolution of the Green Portal corridor and ensure the park design is well positioned and integrated.

Another Panel member noted the project sets the stage for the Green Portal but also must respond to current site context. There are thousands of cyclists passing the site. At the Port Lands, the Panel encouraged an overt merging of industrial and park. The Panel member felt a big idea is perhaps missing for this project - it is not the park, beach, or the gears – the “hook” is still not clear. The success of Sugar Beach comes from the pink umbrellas, while at Ashbridges Bay people have to bring in their own umbrellas and other equipment for activities like volleyball – these elements seem to be missing and should be considered for this project. The Panel member is indifferent on volleyball as a main program and noted the beach feels unfinished. At Trillium Park, people congregate at the shaded areas, it is important for all the major elements to accommodate sitting and gathering in the shade. The Panel member is highly supportive of areas for food truck and encouraged this to be incorporated at the next stage of review. The Panel member noted it is important to ensure the park is appropriately lit and safe after dark.

One Panel member commended the team for ameliorating a tough site and creating a new green fringe with a unique microclimate with the mounds. It is important to calibrate the form of the mounds from the competition entry and sculpt them to precisely address the needs of the park as infrastructure, shading, framing views, plantings, noise mitigation, etc. The Panel member appreciated the strong project concept and approach, felt the project will continue to get better as the team develops in the right direction.

Another Panel member endorsed the observation that this is not too many beaches as this site will develop its own beach constituents. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider the question of the big idea and continue to develop the unique quality for the design. The Panel member asked if a comparison can be drawn between the big lawn at the Port Lands and this site for hosting large events, consider coordinating the design with respect to relative capacities.

One Panel member appreciated the direction of the design and noted that the site situated between the delta of the Don River and Ashbridges Bay is rich in biodiversity, and recommended the team to consider the non-human uses. The Panel member

appreciated the cleaning of the contaminated soil and encouraged the team to create another layer to accommodate animals and other species. The Panel member is concerned with the Indigenous consultation process and encouraged CreateTO to consult MCFN, local directors, and other appointees. As this is a popular spot for viewing the sunset, consider lighting after sunset.

Another Panel member commended the simplicity and elegance of the design, appreciated the open space, dunes, separation of traffic, and anticipation of the future development. The Panel member is concerned with the hygiene of the sand at the beach, noting that maintenance is critical and asked the team to provide more information on this issue at the next review.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated CreateTO for the on-going partnership.
- The site, the view west, and the experience of the lookout are one-of-a-kind, it is important for the City to ensure that the design is successful and carefully considered.
- Consider both the industrial and natural qualities of the site and continue to develop a direct and strong “big idea” for the design. Provide a response to “what is the culture of this place?”
- Further develop the consultation process to ensure that it will capture not only historical references but also Indigenous and Indigenous geographical histories.

Landscape

- Appreciated the concept of the sandbars and green areas.
- Some Panel members felt the design does not sufficiently reference the industrial character of the site, consider doing more than the currently proposed motifs, i.e. the large gear-shaped seating.
- Consider access of the park from the water and the potential of using the water’s edge as a dock for small inner harbour ferries.
- Consider the high volume of users and cyclists throughout the year and provide park amenities and infrastructure to serve them, i.e. seating, resting areas, water fountains, etc.
- The berms do not provide direct sightlines from the street, consider overall safety of the park in terms of visibility from key approaches and overall lighting strategy.
- Consider the day 1 audience of nearby shift workers, and 24hr nature of the park, and provide a robust lighting strategy.
- Provide a section drawing that extends to the allotment gardens across the street and integrates the full Leslie Street Green Portal area at the next review.

Lookout Tower

- Appreciated the design of the tower. Consider further tweaks to the design to better reflect the local industrial culture and symbols.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed for Stage 1: Issues Identification.

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

Mr. Hallé thanked the Panel for the comments, the team will continue to push the design with these in mind and hopefully address many of the questions at the return review.

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.