



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #131
Wednesday, Feb. 26th, 2020**

Present

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

Regrets

Peter Busby
Brigitte Shim

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto (Morning)
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto (Afternoon)

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. 43 Parliament Data Centre TR3 - Issues Identification
 2. Port Lands Flood Protection Promontory Park South – Schematic Design
 3. Outer Harbour Rowing Facility – Schematic Design
 4. West Don Lands Block 10 AHT – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Dec 11th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflicts for **43 Parliament Data Centre TR3** and recused himself for the project 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 noted that WDL Block 20 completed their Issues Identification review in Dec. 2019 with a focus on site relationships and is now working on the building massing. The project is anticipated to return in April for Schematic Design. Mr. Glaisek noted East Bayfront Boardwalk & In-water Pipe received a vote of Full Support in Dec. 2019's Detailed Design review and the team is looking forward to deliver the boardwalk. Construction is anticipated to start in August 2020 and complete by 2021.

Mr. Glaisek noted GBC The Arbour is working with WT and the City to refine the Queens Quay entrance for their SPA re-submission and received a vote of Full Support in Dec. 2019's Detailed Design review. Mr. Glaisek noted York Street Park received a vote of Full Support in Dec. 2019's Detailed Design review and will not return to DRP. The project is anticipating to complete Construction Documents in summer 2020 and park opening in summer 2022.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek provided a construction update to Port Lands Flood Protection. The new shoreline at Promontory Park North, the fish coves, and the trees replanted in the Drowned Forest area can all now be seen. Mr. Glaisek noted the Water Treatment Plant is operational pumping the lake water out of the soil, bridge foundations are progressing for Cherry St. North, and deep excavation is about to begin in the first section of the river valley work. Mr. Glaisek concluded the update with the January 2020 drone video footage of the construction work.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair asked the Panel members to pick up and review a copy of Waterfront Toronto's Five-Year Strategic Plan. The Chair also encouraged the Panel members to get involved for this year's ULI Conference in Toronto in May.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 43 Parliament Data Centre TR3 - Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1113
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Equinix
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	WZMH
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Nicola Casciato, Principal, WZMH

Delegation: Maryam Madsen, WZMH; Trip Guinan, Equinix; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; James DiPaolo, Urban Strategies; Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the proposal represents the phase two of the 43A Parliament St. and 281 Front St. East property. The subject site was originally City-owned, then swapped via expropriation for First Parliament lands across Parliament St. in 2012. The existing 5-storey TR2 data centre was Council and SPA approved in 2012. The WDRP reviewed the TR2 three times with a vote of Full Support in Dec. 2012. Mr. Hilburt noted TR3 proposes an expansion northward from the existing TR2 with a second-floor bridge connection over a vehicular access driveway and there will no new entry at grade for the expansion.

Mr. Hilburt noted the existing site context, Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policies for the site, West Don Lands Precinct Plan built form guidelines, and introduced Megan Rolph, Community Planner with City of Toronto, to continue the introduction. Ms. Rolph noted the zoning for the site and the City planning areas for Panel consideration. Mr. Hilburt concluded by noting Waterfront Toronto's areas for panel consideration: site context parameters for a data centre, recommendations on the design of the ground floor and frontages, public realm animation, exterior design in relation to TR2, and sustainability strategies. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Nicola Casciato, Partner with WZMH, to present the design.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Casciato began by noting the site context and neighbourhood of the project: future parks, on-going developments as a backdrop to the design, and existing laneway to access both TR2 and TR3. Mr. Casciato noted TR3 will share the existing entrance on TR2 due to security requirements.

Site Response

Mr. Casciato noted that the initial approach is to reference the West Don Lands and create a gateway moment at the corner by building up the volume and stepping back with a pitched roof. Deep recesses on the façade and a permanent exhibition on the ground floor help reflect the historical context of the site and animate the public realm. Mr. Casciato noted the materiality is a counterpoint with TR2, creating dialogue and difference between the two volumes. The mechanical system on the top level influences the design and shape of the pitched roof. The “punched” cladding as a language also provides the necessary porosity for air flow – instead of using louvers in TR2, while providing opportunities for lighting and visual interest at night for a building with no window.

Mr. Casciato recapped the proposed plans, noting the slight inflection at the corner of Parliament and Front St., and that the main floors are designed for server racks while surrounded by mechanical and servicing space. In terms of building height, Mr. Casciato noted the floors are aligned with TR2 with one level of basement for parking and other mechanical spaces.

Mr. Casciato noted the building has a setback at grade anchored by the permanent exhibition area – the overhang is deeper along Parliament and reduced to 500mm along Front St. while maintaining the 6m ROW. Benches are proposed in front of the display area.

Mr. Casciato noted Equinix is interested creating a project that will get close in reaching its renewable energy goals including reduced parking areas, EV infrastructure, shared facilities, and high-efficiency mechanical system.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if an artist has been selected for the digital exhibition and how it will impact the project's sustainability mandate. Mr. Casciato answered that the team is looking to hire an artist and will work to reduce energy use and lower temperature differentials.

Another Panel member asked for the number of workers in the building and rationale for not providing an entrance. Mr. Casciato noted there will be six to eight staff, the entrance sequence is highly secured therefore a second entrance cannot be accommodated.

One Panel member asked if the team has considered the impact of snow on the roof and program in the basement. Mr. Casciato noted the team is considering snow as a deep parapet is proposed to divert the snow. The basement is staff parking and mechanical spaces; the new TR3 parking will share the existing TR2 ramp.

Another Panel asked for the typical life cycle of data centres, heat use modelling and energy use precedents. Mr. Guinan answered that the facility will operate for a minimum of five to seven years before a full technology upgrade, the team is projecting a lifespan of fifty years plus and is speaking with Enwave for heat recovery. Although the heat recapture systems are similar, Enwave's implementation schedule does not currently align with TR3 – the opportunity remains on the table. One Panel member asked if it is possible for Quayside to take advantage and leverage the heat from TR2 and TR3.

With reference to TGS Tier 2 and 3, one Panel member asked if the team has considered the use of bird friendly glass, especially given the nearby parks. Mr. Casciato noted TR2 has bird friendly glass and the team will investigate it for TR3.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the service lane between the two buildings. Ms. Casciato answered that a screen is being contemplated to deter pedestrians from confusing the lane as a mid-block connection.

One Panel member asked for the primary source of heating, backup power, the heat recovery systems for internal use, and a best practice benchmark to help understand

the energy model of the proposed building. Mr. Guinan answered that the heating is electricity based and the backup is diesel powered. Mr. Casciato noted energy modelling will be completed for Site Plan Application.

Another Panel asked for clarification on the four feet wide ground floor installation space. Mr. Casciato noted it is a vitrine with a digital projection installation viewed from outside.

Ms. Day asked if the proposed trees on the sidewalk have a conflict with overhead hydro infrastructure. Mr. Casciato answered the team will investigate this and will find a balance between security and pedestrian friendliness for the design of the public realm.

One Panel member asked if the team has explored replicating the existing exterior strategy to TR3. Mr. Casciato noted the team has tested but felt replicating TR2's exterior strategy for TR3 was too much of the same and is intrigued with creating another aesthetic.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member congratulated the team on the clear presentation and concurs with the design strategy that should be different from TR2. The Panel member is concerned with the building's pedestrian animation strategy, noting that as the neighborhood evolves utility buildings are no longer situated at the periphery of communities and must consider security with an active ground floor. Utility buildings will have to evolve to become an integral part of the city fabric. Similarly, with the issue of heat recovery for this type of building, the Panel member noted future policy and regulation are required to address the challenges.

Another Panel member commented that the digital art might feel dated over time, consider exposing the interior to give the public an honest and transparent understanding of the data centre, eliminating the need for curating or programming. The Panel member appreciated the overall direction of the design and it is important for the team to consider overhead wires in the public realm.

One Panel member appreciated the presentation and noted the ground floor conundrum. With reference to the future park across Parliament St., consider using this project as precedent to celebrate the use of bird friendly finishes. For heat recovery, consider how landscape features like trees can take advantage of the excess heat output and set precedent for a new language for heat recapture and cohabitation.

Another Panel member commented on the importance of confirming the program of the public art component to ensure it is in the budget. The Panel member noted the project has the role of creating a much larger dialogue with the city.

One Panel member commented it is important to consider the building as viewed from the future park and the long-term relationship with the larger district. Consider engaging artists sooner to register the inner workings of the building and express the program didactically. The Panel member asked the team to consider positive implications of the building's micro-climate, such as heating nearby elements in the public realm and the sidewalk.

Another Panel member noted the connection piece between TR2 and TR3 is too neutral and requires further design resolution.

One Panel member would like to see more information on the re-circulation and use of hot air, consider using excess heat for snow melt, and provide more information on fan power compared to displacement ventilation. The Panel member suggested considering smaller site district energy system to possibly offset gas use, store water underground to cool during night-time, stormwater reuse, and flushing cool air at night to cool the building. The Panel member noted to look at battery backup instead of diesel fuel and further re-think the ground floor animation strategy, such as introducing a separate stand-alone retail space that does not intervene with security issues.

Another Panel member suggested to iterate the public realm design and ensure there is consistent pedestrian activation. Instead of the metal panel, consider a perforated terracotta panel strategy that will change overtime, like TR2.

One Panel member suggested to hire an art consultant as the proposed vitrine strategy is not art and refine the public realm design to have a stronger connection with pedestrians. The art piece in front of the Rogers Building on Bloor St. is a precedent for this project. The ground floor design requires syncopation with the upper volume to ensure a unified animation strategy. Finally, select a cladding material that will perform on various levels.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the presentation and impressed with the work done so far on the design.
- It is important to recognize that there is consensus support for the various proposed architectural treatments of TR2.

Building

- The project is a 21st century utility building that is located at an important corner, the team is encouraged to go beyond the traditional model of a data centre: ensure the design is part of the city fabric and support the long term vision of the corner and neighbourhood.
- Strong emphasis on picking cladding materials that are considerate of the surfaces' reflectivity and ensure bird-friendliness.
- Continue to explore the need for underground parking due to its high cost.

Public realm

- Consider pedestrian flow in the design and placement of the benches and trees along the sidewalk.
- Concerned that the proposed ground floor digital animation strategy will get dated, encouraged the team to consider alternative animation strategies or select an artist early in the design process to help curate the vitrine work.
- At the corner, consider the alternative of a detached, micro-retail unit that can activate the corner while not jeopardizing the security of the data centre.
- Continue to develop and push the design of the envelope to animate the public realm.

Sustainability

- Provide a full energy model for the building at the next review for further comments.
- Provide more information and details on the energy performance “best practice” benchmark for data centres.
- Continue to explore partnership heat recovery opportunities with Enwave, Sidewalk Labs, and adjacent developments, i.e. the future park west of project.

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

Mr. Casciato thanked the Panel for the comments and noted the concerns are shared by the team. The ground floor art comments are appreciated and will provide the team other ways to study it further. The team will challenge their engineers to address the energy concerns.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection Promontory Park South – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1114
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA)
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal, MVVA; Emily Mueller De Celis, Partner, MVVA
<i>Delegation:</i>	Shannon Baker, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto; Marc Kramer, City of Toronto; Christian Giles, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Direction of Parks and Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting Promontory Park South, part of the larger PLFP, will be

presented today. Ms. Baker noted the extent of Promontory Park South and that MVVA is responsible for the design of Parks, Flood Protection and River Valley which includes all flood protection elements such as park and wetland design, and integration of roads, bridges and environmental work.

Ms. Baker noted the team is back for Schematic Design review due to significant changes in the design and will return in April for Detailed Design. Ms. Baker provided a recap of previous DRP comments from April and September 2018, as well as June 2019's PLFP Integration review session.

Ms. Baker recapped the goals of the public art plan update: a changing and permanent art platform speaking to the story of water and to identify a potential route with opportunities for the public to engage with art. The story of water will serve as a public art platform that engages with the multiple layers of histories and stories of the site's waterways. Ms. Baker noted the implementation of the public art plan will provide a variety of environments for art, anchoring conditions, infrastructure, and a streamlined permitting system with PF&R. Ms. Baker noted the public art plan is currently in the internal design phase, and will proceed to PF&R review, return for DRP update, PLFP Public Art Strategy, and finally City Council. Ms. Baker concluded with areas for Panel consideration: balance between programmed space and designed nature, articulation of path network, balance of site constraints and design objectives, integration of playscape and heritage elements within the park. Ms. Baker introduced Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, and Emily Mueller De Celis, Senior Designer with MVVA, to begin the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began by noting the full Parks design will be presented in April's DRP and the team received great feedback at the previous DRP. Mr. Sweeney recapped Canoe Cove consensus comments and the goal of balancing cut-fill, keeping excavated volume on site, and that existing site structural and geotechnical conditions mandated a substantial design changes resulting in a return to Schematic Design.

Mr. Sweeney provided a design update: the atlas crane is being preserved, in order to do so, excavation around it must be limited and filling work is required for stabilization, the Promontory has been shifted further south, the lawn has been shifted north adjacent to the crane, and reconfigured the crane to sit on the mainland. The team is excited about the changes.

Ms. Mueller De Celis provided a detailed intent and summary of the design changes. In terms of the overall park character, Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the industrial heritage and connections to water will play a very strong role in creating an intense experience of being in the landscape. The Promontory is the organizing element in the park, requiring the visitor to get up high through an enfolding landscape experience including various paths (smaller, civic, primary, stone scramble) and views of the city. The section drawings demonstrate the elevation changes and the heightening of drama. The team is working closely with PF&R to study lawn space programming. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted WT is fundraising a world class destination play area. In terms of

plantings, the team is extending the forest frames while studying wind comfort, shelter, and shade. Ms. Mueller De Celis presented updated perspective renderings and explained the intent of layering materials and plantings with landscape.

Mr. Sweeney noted the team is studying how Promontory Park South will relate to the greater PLFP in terms of future programming. It is important to hold the Park design against the future developments and the north catalytic site.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for the lake level of the project, noting that last year's update is 76.09m and TRCA is conducting on-going analysis as the project progresses. The Panel member asked for clarification on the forest frame tree species, material source for the rocky scramble and possibility of re-use. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the forest frame is spatially laid out with mostly native species and the rocky scramble is part of the material vocabulary of the rover, made of limestone slabs and many other compositions to transition into a more civic characteristic. The team is looking into the possibility of material re-use.

Another Panel member asked if the soil is imported and further clarification on soil quality and distribution. Mr. Sweeney noted the soil is important because the park is on a brownfield site, the team has identified opportunities for re-use while following environmental standards. The team is proposing to bring soil from a green field site that is already undergoing extraction.

One Panel member asked for the reason for demolishing the MT-35 building. Mr. Sweeney noted the building became unsafe after the fire; the team is exploring commemoration strategies including salvaging the beams.

One Panel member asked for the status of the previously proposed land bridge connection between Promontory Park North and South. Mr. Sweeney noted it is no longer being explored due to soil stability challenges.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the wires around the wood posts, if they are used in the design and the potential for introducing more elevation differences. Ms. Mueller De Celis answered that the wires are used to help guide while keeping the landscape experience in the foreground. Geotechnically, the team has maximized the stability capacity with the current proposed elevation; AODA requirements have also been reached.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the impact of a flood, such as the walkability of the canoe cove after high water. Mr. Sweeney noted that the engineer has confirmed that wet ground is stable and little sediments will be deposited into the coves.

Another Panel member asked for details on winter programming. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the team is in discussions with PF&R on crafting a strategy that will include trails for cross-country ski, snowshoe, and other winter activities.

One Panel member noted the intermediary plants require substantial maintenance and they are vital to the success of the project, provide more information on whether a maintenance strategy has been contemplated. Ms. Mueller De Celis answered that the team is working with PF&R to create a substantive maintenance manual. Since the project requires the creation of a new forest plane and an adaptive, successive, management system, the process will be a challenge.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the value engineering process as related to procurement and planting feasibility. Ms. Baker noted value engineering began eighteen months ago and will continue.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the renderings and consider providing accommodations for dog activities. The Panel member recommended to see more edges of the forest frames and utilize them to weave the urban and plant edges together.

Another Panel member appreciated the great presentation.

One Panel member noted the organization of the park works well and it is important to ensure the stage lawn size is maximized for large events and associated equipment like support infrastructure and services.

Another Panel member noted it is important to consider innovative garbage collection solutions for the large gathering spaces, accessibility and maintenance of the winter programming, and provide more illustrations on the park edge interface with the city.

One Panel member asked for more information on the park's hard infrastructure, i.e. mapping out the location of retaining walls that are required to support the path network. The Panel member congratulated the team for a great presentation.

Another Panel member noted the revised design is much improved and asked the team to provide a soil quality map that correlates with planting – it is important and will set a design precedent. The Panel member asked the team to consider further allowing the park to shape the design of the adjacent buildings and roads. Given lake level is already higher, it is important to future proof instead of value engineer to build in the appropriate contingencies in the design.

One Panel member thanked the team for the work, appreciated the stronger forest frames, improved transition between programmed landscape and habitats. The Panel member noted legibility of the renewed river is critical in helping the public understand the river life, consider investing in plant materials to tell the story. Provide a nature-

based play space concept and design as it is essential to children development and public health requirement. Since the geotechnical capacity has been maximized, consider leveraging the use of native soil, species diversity, and plantings to help future proof and experiment safely to improve resilience capability of the design – this is the single largest opportunity for the project.

Another Panel member congratulated the project for raising the bar of park design in Toronto on many levels: people’s expectations, perception, and contractor’s level of construction sophistication. The team is recommended to refine the vision to emphasize the beauty of the manufactured, natural, and the transition from park to urban. It is important to be more inventive and daring with the planting, consider bringing more magical moments by using magnolia trees, black locusts, to emphasize that the experience is a MVVA park, not a forest. The Panel member noted the geotechnical constraints made the project better. In order to understand the full range of programming and diversity, it is important to see Promontory North. The Panel member asked to provide a rendering of Zone 6, The Water’s Edge Promenade, and noted the fence is fundamental in preventing dogs from damaging plant roots - reference the precedent in Chicago. The Panel member felt the proposal for MT-35 feels timid, consider a bolder commemoration strategy that is stronger in scale.

Referencing Corktown Commons, one Panel member suggested the team to opt for fewer, but larger design motives in the park design. The Panel member felt the catalyst building will not be easily incorporated into the park and the building will have many blank facades – it will not usurp the site but animating the ground edges around the building will be a challenge. Instead, consider moving it to one of the adjacent development parcels and have it come first as a true catalyst project. The Panel member suggested the big lawn should be enlarged for the sake of being big and having a strong presence. Mr. Glaisek noted there has always been an assumption that there would be a free-standing building that is not part of the development parcels. However, given there is currently no funding for the catalytic building and the risk of leaving a void in the design, it was decided to move forward with other areas of the park first.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Strong support for the revised and improved plan.
- Consider the design of the edges of the park. Given the importance and uniqueness of this site, consider letting the park shape the adjacent building developments.
- Strengthen the industrial heritage presence in the park, consider bolder design gestures in knitting the past with the park.
- Given the unbelievable transformation that will take place at the site, it is important for the design to communicate the ecological impact of the project.
- Consider the utilization and operations of the park, i.e. staging area for concerts at the big lawn.

- Important to separate dog area with fencing.
- Encouraged the team to be bold and develop surprising moments in the design.

Landscape

- Develop bold strategies to improve climate resilience for the park, consider inventive planting, wide range of species, and forest framing to help build resilience. It is important to not value engineer this part of the project.
- Embrace the impact of rising lake level on the design, consider strategies where higher water positively improves the experience of the park.
- Consider the winter conditions and programming.
- Consider the scale and presence of the great lawn, suggestion to make it even larger.
- Provide renderings of “Zone 6”, the water’s edge promenade.

Future-proofing the park design

- Consider the impact of rising lake levels.
- Consider the long term vision of the precinct and nearby future developments.

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

Mr. Sweeney thanked the Panel for the comments and noted the team will work towards bringing back other components of the park in April.

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 (Unanimous) for the project.

3.0 Outer Harbour Rowing Facility – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1110
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Outer Harbour Marina
<i>Proponent:</i>	Ports Toronto and Upper Canada College
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	SvN Architects and Planers, VJAA, NAK Design Strategy
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Anthony Greenberg, Associate, SvN; Nathan Knutson, Managing Principal, VJAA; Elizabeth Birks, Project Coordinator, NAK Design Strategies
<i>Delegation:</i>	Kelly Graham, SvN; Chris Sawicki, Ports Toronto; Patti MacNicol, Upper Canada College; Kasia Kmiec, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting that this is the project’s second DRP appearance. The building is

a new 876m² single storey rowing facility for Upper Canada College and is located at the Outer Harbour Marina owned by Ports Toronto. The use of the site was approved at the Committee of Adjustment earlier this year and Ports Toronto entered a voluntary Site Plan Approval process with the City of Toronto. Waterfront Toronto provided a letter to the Committee in support of the project as part of the Minor Variance application and requested the project to attend the WDRP when the design proceeded. Mr. Lai noted the proponent submitted the first Site Plan Application earlier in Feb. 2020.

Mr. Lai noted SvN Architects and Planners are the planning agents, and the design of the facility is being led by VJAA architects from Minneapolis with RDHA Architects in Toronto. The landscape design is led by NAK Design Strategies. Mr. Lai highlighted the site context of the Outer Harbour Marina, site ownership, the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context, the Port Lands Planning Framework policy context, and the proposed Lake Ontario Park (LOP) Master Plan.

Mr. Lai introduced Kasia Kmiec, Community Planner with City of Toronto, to provide an update on the Zoning and City SPA review. Ms. Kmiec noted while the site is zoned “Gr”, which permits conservation and bathing station uses, the remainder of the Outer Harbour is zoned “Gm”, permitting recreational boating, marina and related uses. Ms. Kmiec noted through Site Plan Application the City will review areas including the public realm, building location, design, materials, circulation, stormwater management, functional servicing, environmental impacts and adherence to TGS. Mr. Lai concluded by noting areas for Panel consideration: public pedestrian access, siting of building, relationship with water and landscape, material palette, landscape design in response to uniqueness and natural features of site, and the proposed sustainability strategies. Mr. Lai then introduced Anthony Greenberg, Associate with SvN, to begin the design presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Greenberg began the presentation by noting that the team has provided a memo in response to previous Panel comments and highlighted the revisions made for this DRP. Mr. Greenberg noted Ports Toronto will be doing a separate study on the design and development of the entire length of the marina path network. Mr. Greenberg introduced Nathan Knutson, Manager Principal with VJAA, to continue the presentation.

Building Design

Mr. Knutson noted the parti of the building has been updated, from four bars to three, reducing overall program area requirements. Mr. Knutson provided updated section drawings showing revised heights and relationships with adjacent public realm and landscape. Mr. Knutson noted the form and structure of the building are inspired by the graceful movement and sliding of the rowing hauls next to one another, precedents include the Minneapolis Rowing Club Boathouse, University of Wisconsin Porter Boathouse, and the Welland International Flatwater Centre, all previously completed by VJAA. Mr. Knutson noted the design challenges the design team is investigating: foundation system given existing site fill, resolution of the program and circulation, accommodating potential future expansion, seasonal operations, and using landscape

to support the natural habitat. Mr. Knutson then introduced Elizabeth Birks to present the landscape design.

Landscape

Ms. Birks noted the team is interested in using trees to flank the building and frame views back to the city. The green roof soil volume has been increased to accept taller sedum and grasses.

Materiality

Mr. Knutson noted the interior has polished cast concrete floor, plywood wall panels for the ease of attaching hooks and storage, and a metal cladding roof with a wild green roof. At the highest point of the roof, the building interior has a clear height of 12ft. Mr. Knutson noted the structural strategy employs engineered steel truss and a nail-laminated timber NLT roof decking system.

Mr. Knutson noted the project lighting is dark sky compliant and provides adequate lighting for the dedicated pedestrian pathway and entry. Mr. Knutson noted the grading of the site will be elevated to provide a smooth transition from the pedestrian path to the building.

Sustainability

Ms. Birks provided a summary of the project's sustainability strategies, targets and an energy model of the proposed building. Ms. Birks noted the roof structure has been revised to provide additional structural support for a deeper soil depth which will improve bird habitation and stormwater management.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if new soil is required for the planting scheme and the design's considerations on the rising lake levels. Ms. Birks noted the site is not brownfield however new soil will be imported where new planting is required. Mr. Sawicki noted the site did not flood last year.

Another Panel member asked if the proposed lighting is adequate for the light levels required for a public space. Mr. Knutson noted the lighting scheme is sufficient and includes lighting on the path while avoiding the landscape.

One Panel member asked for the location of boat storage during off season and the rationale for the design of windows and openings. Mr. Knutson noted the ergometers will be brought back to the school and the windows are designed for security while providing views and required natural ventilation.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the metal cladding on the side elevations. Mr. Knutson noted the siding is imagined to be detailed like the precedent photo shown on page 32 of the presentation.

One Panel member asked if the building profile in the section is the same as the renderings because the roof line looks sharper in the section. Mr. Knutson responded the profiles are the same in both drawings and think the difference is due to a perspectival illusion.

Another Panel member asked if the building is entirely electric powered. Mr. Knutson noted the ventilation will require some heating before bringing in fresh air into the space.

One Panel member asked for more information on the security of the building and protection of glazing. Mr. Sawicki noted the marina has security year-round and is monitored for the occasional visits.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the massing revision from four bars to three, but the form requires further development. The Panel member recommended the team to set a datum line or establish an area on the building elevations that can be replaced if vandalized.

Another Panel member appreciated the formalism of the massing but suggested further refinement to ensure the metaphor of boats sliding against each other is maintained through detailed design. Currently, the symbolism is lost as the volumes are notched into each other. It is important to allow the autonomy of each bar to be legible. The Panel member noted the planting strategy needs to be strengthened.

One Panel member recommended that it is critical to have anti-graffiti and vandalism strategies and be locked up during non-operational hours.

Another Panel member noted the project is located at a wild point of the marina and has the potential to be an elegant building. Consider the site being an important bird habitat an asset to the design and continue to develop the landscape design not subservient to the architecture and relocate the trees out of the single line formation to frame the landscape. The Panel member noted to consider the tension between a rough landscape and high-quality building materials.

One Panel member recommended the team to embrace the landscape instead of resisting the wild nature, break away from the linear urban notion of trees, vegetation, and consider stronger species like Cottonwood. The Panel member felt the lighting strategy is too delicate, rethink the strategy where building and landscape lighting can reinforce each other.

Another Panel member noted to consider the potential fourth bar as a hybrid indoor and outdoor structure and future proof rising lake level with hydrophilic landscape organization, such as a hardier planting palette that function in extreme conditions.

In addition to eliminating the formal gesture of notches between massing bars, one Panel member recommended the additions of architectural reveals to further distinguish the volumes. The Panel member noted to consider sliding doors instead of hinged so the horizontal door tracks would help establish a datum line for further details and massing refinements. The proposed trees are timid for the site, consider embracing a wilder metaphor for the landscape design.

Another Panel member noted that the siting of the building and the landscaping treatment does not sufficiently encourage public access to the tip of the peninsula, consider integrating a clearly demarcated and accessible public path, such as a simple gravel path. The landscape strategy and treatment should reinforce and support this public access.

One Panel member appreciated the revisions and the carbon neutral project target. Given that, consider further improving the sustainability goals to create a carbon positive project. Finally, provide an irrigation strategy and further improve the sectional design of the massing to ensure no self-shading on the green roof.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the presentation and the team's responses to previous consensus comments.
- Continue to refine the design and consider the uniqueness of the site, the completed building will become a jewel of the outer harbour bringing interest to the peninsula.

Building

- Further fine-tuning is recommended for the building massing to improve the three "gliding" bars, consider the volumetric legibility and formal qualities of the multiple smooth haul shapes.
- Security is a concern when the facility is not in use. It is important to lock the facility and introduce shutters that lower to protect the glass from graffiti and vandalism.
- Consider replacing swing doors with sliding doors.

Landscape

- Consider a more fluid relationship between building, landscape, and water.
- Consider a "freer" tree planting strategy and embrace the natural features of the site, i.e. more native species, specimen trees such as Cottonwood to help break away from the norm and embrace the wild landscape.
- Further improve pedestrian access and delineation of the path to the entry of the building and to the point of the peninsula, ensure that the landscape strategy supports this public access.
- Consider a more unique, subtle, and durable lighting strategy for the site that will stand the test of time.

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

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 Conditional Support (Unanimous) for the project.

Mr. Knutson appreciated the architectural suggestions; the team will continue to develop some degree of “reveal” between the bars and address the concerns for vandalism. Mr. Knutson noted the team believes that a hyper functional building and aesthetic will help stand the test of time on this site. Regarding landscape design, the intent is to return the site back to its more natural state.

4.0 West Don Lands Block 10 AHT – Detailed Design

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

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the project context including precinct vision, block plans of the West Don Lands (WDL), project height, and setbacks. Ms. Li highlighted the key policy context for West Don Lands: the redevelopment of a diverse mixed-use communities, excellence in the design of public and private buildings, protection of view corridors, frame and support the adjacent public realm, coherent framework of public realm, and take part in the Waterfront Toronto coordinated public art program. Ms. Li noted the Proponent plans to construct Block 10 as one project, anticipating a SPA re-submission in Feb. 2020, and a construction start of Q2 or Q3 2020.

Ms. Li noted the project presented Stage 2: Schematic Design at the May 2019 DRP. Since then, the southwest plaza has been revised to match existing West Don Lands public realm design standards. For the AHT and TEEC, Ms. Li noted a customized sustainability plan has been created to focus on Indigenous design principles, in addition to the majority of typical MGBRs requirements. For the residential and retail

components, LEED Gold and Waterfront Toronto Minimum Green Building Requirements with key amendments to GHG emissions will be targeted.

Ms. Li provided a summary of May 2019's DRP consensus comments and provided areas for the panel consideration: public plaza between Victorian heritage building and the TEEC, ground floor animation, residential massing along Cooperage St., separation distances, sunlight, privacy, and material and envelope details. Ms. Li then introduced Matthew Hickey to give the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Hickey began the presentation with an indigenous acknowledgment and provided a detailed summary of indigenous design principles that are embedded in the overall design. Mr. Hickey recapped previous Panel comments, provided a brief context update and introduced Les Klein, Principal with Quadrangle, to continue the presentation.

Buildings

Mr. Klein highlighted design changes through plans of the project and noted that the Panel helped the team focus on key issues. Mr. Hickey provided an update to the "Prominent Buildings", including AHT and TEEC, and the "Fabric Buildings", including the remaining residential components. Mr. Hickey noted the block is unified by a conceptual weave, taking the form of a two storey podium that is connected to the earth. Mr. Hickey noted the team is exploring a texture pre-cast concrete to reference birch trees, the podium level is clad with brick with simple reveals and colors to bring together various elevations. Mr. Hickey noted that the townhouses, streetscape, and rental units along Cooperage St. have all been revised. Mr. Hickey the TEEC building also has the "birch" pre-cast cladding

Mr. Klein noted the team is working with ERA Architects on simplifying the Canary Building facades and interface with public realm. The heritage building will have food-oriented use on the ground floor to take advantage of the adjacent plaza. Mr. Klein noted that the highest residential volume is meant to evoke the metaphor of clouds and has a visually prominent place in the block. Mr. Klein provided the programs in the TEEC building, noting indigenous programs throughout, and an exterior terrace for the childcare centre which is raised five feet above the north plaza level. Mr. Klein introduced Suzanne Graham, Associate with Stantec, to present the landscape design.

AHT Building and Landscape

Ms. Graham noted that the overall landscape is driven by the idea of pebbles in the stream, creating community rooms that include kitchen, healing spaces, and outdoor ceremonial spaces. The intention of the southwest plaza is an extension of the AHT lobby. Ms. Graham noted the atrium acts as a central reference datum, with views from all levels and areas of AHT. Ms. Graham noted the shawl is a perforated metal screen and the outdoor ceremonial space has access to the kiln and shower rooms. Ms. Graham noted the team is coordinating the planting species in the raised courtyard for shade and privacy.

Public Realm and Landscape

Mr. Hickey noted that the team has incorporated all Waterfront Toronto public realm standards and is interested in further blurring the property line limits of the project. Along Cooperage St., Mr. Hickey noted the street paving is brought right up to the parking garage area, and private front yard areas are protected by trees and planters. Mr. Hickey noted the southwest plaza is a place to drum, gather, and the landscape design ensures that it is a usable space for ceremonies. The landscape here tries to evoke the allegory of a forest edge, and the space is lit at night to highlight the landscape.

Sustainability

Mr. Hickey noted that the TEEC team has met with Waterfront Toronto to discuss top markers of indigenous design principles that inform sustainability, including directionality, access to lighting and views, allegory and metaphor, and craft.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the indigenous principle of directionality and if it is a consideration only for the AHT and TEEC buildings. Mr. Hickey answered that there are seven directions in indigenous thinking and the team is embedding the ethos in all design aspects, i.e. materiality, light, and reflections.

Another Panel member asked if a water feature is planned for the southwest corner plaza. Mr. Hickey answered no, however the previous iteration featured a paving pattern design that symbolizes water ripples.

One Panel member appreciated the idea of carrying the pebbles in the stream metaphor throughout the design and asked for more information on the rock benches as the renders show larger designs than the drawings. Mr. Hickey noted the rocks have to be smooth for sitting but will have size variations.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the screen at the back of the north plaza and the precast concrete cladding. Mr. Hickey noted it will be an artist design, currently envisioned as a perforated installation that screens the mechanical space behind. The rendering shows a design inspired by indigenous bead work. Mr. Hickey noted the TEEC is still early in design development and precast concrete is currently conceived as a vertical system.

One Panel member asked for the status of the south façade of the Canary restaurant building and the sweat lodge ceremony. Mr. Klein noted most of the Canary building façade is existing and restored. Mr. Hickey noted the sweat lodge ceremony begins with the process of cutting wood, making the fire, meditating, healing, sweating, and ending in a delusional state. In an urban environment, the process is tailored to function with a ceramic kiln that heats up rocks which are then moved into the outdoor lodge structure. The ceremony then continues in the lodge.

Another Panel member asked if the shape and position of the courtyard took priority over the design of the remaining block. Mr. Hickey answered the courtyard design is

intentional, located at the optimal part of the block with appropriate directionality – it was a design priority for the team. The Panel member asked for the rationale on balconies for the rental volumes. Mr. Hickey noted the proforma of the project does not recommend balconies for the rental volumes.

One Panel member asked if the AHT building is the only building in the block without a green roof. Ms. Graham noted the AHT building does not have a green roof – the raised courtyard is dedicated outdoor space for client use.

Another Panel member asked if it is possible to reduce one of the two entrances into the parking area. Mr. Klein noted two entrances is appropriate for the program in the parking area.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member thanked the team for the presentation, appreciated the indigenous voice that is embedded in the images that bring another level of understanding to the project. The Panel member noted it is important for the Panel to understand the intent of the design. The Panel member felt the ordinary language of the architecture does not reflect closely the metaphorical intentions. While supportive of the TEEC precast concrete cladding, the Panel member felt the current design, interrupted by the lines of metal spandrel, can be further refined to accentuate the verticality of the precast presence. Consider reducing the size of the windows, subsume more of the ordinary elements of the building such as the curtain wall, let the unique façade features be highlighted and communicate the birch metaphor. The Panel member recommended further refinements to the overall design to scale back the ordinary parts of the design and let the allegory shine. The Panel member noted the mechanical components can be further hidden, consider bringing the façade higher to conceal the roof volumes.

Another Panel member felt the shawl feature is not well integrated with the building, consider redesign to bring the shawl metaphor to the foreground so the architecture originates from the building. By comparison, the Panel member felt the landscape design is less constructed than the built volumes, consider strengthening the unique elements of the public realm.

One Panel member thanked the team for explaining the design focus of the project, the overall presentation, and noted it is refreshing to see the landscape as the main pivot of the design. The Panel member commented to consider the use of native species of vines that can grow quickly on walls and fill gaps. At the southwest plaza, consider opportunities for providing shade with clusters of large trees around the “pebbles”.

Another Panel member suggested to enlarge the rock benches to become strong statements for gathering and seating. The Panel member asked if it would be possible to drop the slab at the southwest corner plaza to provide the appropriate soil volume for larger trees. At the rooftop, the outdoor pool seems to be strangely located and cut off from a large part of the outdoor amenity area, consider relocation.

One Panel member appreciated the opportunity to learn about indigenous principles and recommended to communicate the values familiar with this project for everyone. The Panel member felt the balconies stand out as being too ordinary and suggested to rethink the design in the same spirit as the more special features of the project. The Panel member suggested to enhance the “pebbles” in the southwest plaza, develop a bold strategy that is true to the vision of a gathering space that is uncompromised. While the tension between the innovative design elements and the more fabric components is appreciated, the Panel member noted it is important to let the special features shine and not let the normative elements overtake.

Another Panel member noted the issue of privacy for townhouse units along Cooperage St. is a concern and suggested to further develop the frontage and landscape to reduce views into units, i.e. front yard steps. The Panel member noted the less visible nooks in the north and southwest plazas are security concerns, consider refining the configuration and circulation to improve those conditions.

One Panel member is concerned with the formal language of the project, noting that while both the shift towards simpler “fabric” buildings and the brick “weave” are legible and positive, there is still too much variation on the various facades – further simplification is recommended, such as the patterns and colors of spandrel panels, glazing types, and reference the language of the opposite block on Cooperage St. The Panel member felt the volumes of the upper Cooperage façade and the taller residential are conceptually ambiguous, consider bringing the primary façade features out to the face of the balconies and up to the parapet to further accentuate the formal figure of the “cloud”. With regards to the Canary heritage building, the Panel member felt the resolution of the south heritage façade is unsatisfactory. The Panel member is not convinced with the design of the pre-cast concrete cladding as an architectural representation of the birch tree analogy, noting the communicative capacity of the design is not enough. Similar legibility concerns are raised with the various indigenous patterned Corten screens, and the “shawl” which is interrupted by the more prominent vertically oriented healing volumes. The Panel member noted the southwest plaza stones can be further refined to articulate the smoothness of the “pebbles” as implied in the metaphor.

Another Panel member suggested the team to study other successful concrete pre-cast precedents, such as bamboo relief cast, to help further refine and improve the legibility of the birch analogy.

One Panel member suggested other optional methods at achieving higher environmental sustainability objectives and appreciated the project’s commitment of putting the needs of people first, such as the connection to the ground and nature, as these are commonly difficult to resolve in a proforma. At the same time, because there is no commitment from a proforma perspective, the Panel member is concerned that some of the sustainability features will be value engineered. While the visual symbolism is understood and appreciated, pre-cast concrete and Corten are not sustainable materials, consider both carbon output and the health impact of selected materials. With the 2030 carbon goal in mind, it is important to improve the carbon emission for this overall project and consider further improvements to the project

sustainability targets. Finally, the Panel member noted the business model needs to be reconsidered to appropriately meet the project's sustainability goals.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the team's responses to previous consensus comments.
- Appreciated the design of the block prioritizes indigenous values, placing people and connection to nature in the foreground, i.e. residential components are designed around the needs of AHT and the elevated garden.
- Encouraged further documentation, sharing, and communication of the indigenous design guidelines.
- Given the allegorical and metaphorical references in the project, consider strengthening their translation into the building and landscape designs to further enhance the communicative qualities of the project, i.e. the pebbles in the stream, the shawl, the birch bark, etc.
- While the tension between the innovative design elements and the more fabric components is appreciated, it is important to let the special features shine and not let the normative elements overtake.

Buildings

AHT

- The shawl does not feel well integrated with the building, the vertical expressions of the healing volumes also compete with the reading - consider further refinement.
- Consider providing a green roof.
- Provide clarification on how the rooftop mechanical volumes are treated and consider further refinement to downplay them.

TEEC

- Consider further accentuating the unique architectural treatments to highlight the values they bring to the project, i.e. bring the TEEC special cladding down to the ground, reduce the size of the metal band at the base that interrupts the continuous reading, refine the precast concrete texture to make the birch reference more legible, downplay the curtain wall expression and other ordinary façade elements to let cladding stand out, etc.
- Consider hiding more of the mechanical rooftop volume by projecting the façade above the roof line.

Residential

- While modifications to the fabric buildings are appreciated, including the brick podium weave, further simplification of the "ordinary" architectural elements, such as the pattern of spandrel, is recommended to let the AHT and TEEC stand out as "jewels" of the project.
- For the Front St. residential volume, rethink the treatment of the "cloud" balconies which make the building look squat. Consider internalizing the balconies within the greater building volume to improve the reading of the "cloud".

- The uninterrupted elevation along Cooperage is too long, consider further articulation to break up the volume and better respond to the character of a local street.
- Further refine the cladding strategy of the rooftop mechanical volumes.

Landscape

- Appreciated the improvements made to the Cooperage frontage, consider further landscape refinement to elevate privacy and character of the local street.
- Select planting species that will minimize the shade coverage in the raised courtyard.
- The less visible nooks in the design of the southwest plaza are a security concern, consider the public experience of the plaza carefully.
- Consider larger and bolder stones for seating and more trees in the southwest plaza.
- Consider using tree clusters to frame the southwest plaza to provide opportunity for shade.

Sustainability

- Consider exploring other optional strategies at achieving environmental sustainability goals with reference to indigenous principles, i.e. consider less carbon intensive alternatives to materials such as precast concrete, and healthier materials for healing spaces than Corten steel.
- Encouraged to not value engineer aspects of sustainable design.
- With the 2030 carbon goal in mind, it is important to improve the carbon emission for this project. Consider further improvements to the project sustainability targets.

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

Mr. Klein noted there are many other parameters that are not part of the design team's control and is not prepared to assure the Panel with substantive changes after the review. Mr. Klein noted the team will weigh the comments and evaluate the degree with which revisions can be made.

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 Conditional support for the project, with the possibility of a return review for the team to address specific issues.

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.