



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #146
Wednesday, September 22nd, 2021
Meeting held Virtually

Present

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

Regrets

Jeff Ranson

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Emilia Floro, 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. Waterfront Design Review Panel Handbook – For Info
 2. Indigenous Affairs Office Placemaking Presentation – For Info
 3. Lower Bay Street Visioning – Issues Identification
 4. Waterfront East LRT Area 1 – Schematic Design
 5. Legacy Art Project – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the July 21st, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict of interest for **Lower Bay Street Visioning** and recused himself for 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 **Rekai Centre** received a vote of Full Support and concluded their review process. At the request of the proponent, the WDRP issued a letter in support of the project and the team continues to advance the design for Site Plan Application. Mr. Glaisek noted **Legacy Art Project** is returning today for Schematic Design review.

Other Waterfront Toronto Update:

Mr. Glaisek provided updates on the construction of **Port Lands Flood Protection**. The river valley excavation is complete in the ice management area and Don Greenway, crews are placing rocks and other materials that will become the bottom of the new river, such as harvested trees and root wads to reinforce the riverbed. Mr. Glaisek noted crews are reinforcing the Atlas Crane, a designated heritage structure that will become a landmark in the new Promontory Park. The eastern half of the Commissioners Street Bridge arrived and is sitting with the western half waiting to be joined. Mr. Glaisek noted crews are working to install the bridge over ground, after which they will excavate the river valley below.

Mr. Glaisek noted the **Cherry Street Storm Water Facility** won a 2021 Toronto Urban Design Award of Excellence in the "Special Jury Award for Inspiring Infrastructure" category. Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, provided the draft 2022 WDRP schedule and asked Panel members to hold the dates for now. Mr. Lai will send out invites when the dates are confirmed with City Planning. Mr. Glaisek then provided an upcoming draft project agenda for October 2021 DRP.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Waterfront Design Review Handbook – For Info

Project Type: WDRP Governance

Review Stage: For Info
Proponent: Waterfront Toronto
Architect/ Designer: Carolina Soderholm, Designholmen
Presenter(s): Leon Lai, Manager, Design Review Panel, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Project Presentation

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, began the presentation by noting that the WDRP Handbook v2 has been released. Mr. Lai provided an update on the timeline of the Handbook development, beginning in Sept. 2020 with the Panel's review of the final draft. Mr. Lai further noted the key updates to the Handbook, including the re-organization of the chapters framing the document as a step-by-step guide for proponents, overall graphics overhaul with photos, diagrams, and images, submission material checklists, a project profile featuring a successful WDRP outcome, and the addition of testimonies from various members and stakeholders of the waterfront design community. Mr. Lai noted that the Handbook will be circulated to City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto staff, proponent teams, and regular updates will be made to the document.

1.2 Panel Questions

No question was raised by the Panel members.

2.0 Indigenous Affairs Office Placemaking Presentation – For Info

Project Type: General Update
Review Stage: For Info
Proponent: Indigenous Affairs Office, City of Toronto
Presenter(s): Jennifer Franks, Consulting Lead, Indigenous Affairs Office, City of Toronto

2.2 Project Presentation

Jennifer Franks, Consulting Lead, Indigenous Affairs Office with the City of Toronto, began the presentation with the land acknowledgement and a quote from Chloe Dragon Smith. Mr. Franks noted the Indigenous place-making framework goals, Indigenous design principles as developed by the Brook McIlroy Indigenous Design Studio, and the four focus areas of place-making framework: public art, places and naming, policy and capacity, and engagement. Ms. Franks provided details on each area with some built examples and noted the importance of the waterfront as an area for Indigenous place-making. Ms. Franks noted the next steps including selecting members of the Indigenous Place-Making Advisory Circle to guide work, a digital mapping exercise, improve coordination between initiatives, create stories, development of a practice and comprehensive place-making strategy, and the Reconciliation Action Plan.

2.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked if the digital map would address the pre-colonial urban form of Toronto. The Panel member is teaching a course on Toronto urban history and would appreciate seeing this information. Ms. Franks responded that the team is working with knowledge keepers and Indigenous academics to share historical records.

Another Panel member asked if there are opportunities to reinforce the origins of words in the design of public realm. Ms. Franks noted that through naming it becomes a way for people to connect history with the current.

3.0 Lower Bay Street Visioning – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1128
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8 + DTAH
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Shelley Long, Team Lead, West 8 + DTAH
<i>Delegation:</i>	Yvonne Lam, West 8 + DTAH Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto Vincent Teng, TTC Suma Apparao-Das, TTC Cassidy Ritz, Manager, City of Toronto Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto David Hunter, City of Toronto May Wang, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the scope areas of the East Waterfront LRT Project and specifically the scope for Area 1 Union to Queens Quay Link. Ms. Vangjeli noted the existing conditions of Bay Street, functional requirements, user groups and space needs, and the adjacent major projects in the area. The project is appearing in front of the DRP for the first time for Stage 1: Issues Identification review. Ms. Vangjeli recapped the Bay Street Consensus Comments from Waterfront LRT Area 1 Issues Identification review in March 2021. Ms. Vangjeli noted that two workshops have been held by Waterfront Toronto with West 8 + DTAH to begin to look at two conceptual visions. So far, a Class 5 costing has been completed and a Class 3 costing will be done along with Schematic Design at the next phase. Ms. Vangjeli noted that technical feasibility work including multi-modal network analysis, coordination with underground work and other infrastructure, public consultation, environmental approvals, and implementation strategy, are future requirements for the project. Ms. Vangjeli provided the areas for Panel consideration, including Bay Street as a key connector from the City

to the waterfront, the arrival experience, integration with current and future context, user groups and functional demands, and additional public realm opportunities. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Shelley Long, Project Lead with West 8, to continue the design presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began the presentation by recapping the evolution of the waterfront and the characteristics of Lower Bay Street from towers in the Downtown to the waterfront. Ms. Long noted the existing conditions of the key intersections along Bay Street corridor: Queens Quay, Jack Layton Ferry Terminal, Harbour Street, Lake Shore Boulevard, Union Station, Rail Underpass, Financial District, and Old City Hall. Ms. Long introduced the ambitions for an improved, unobstructed public realm between Downtown and the waterfront via Bay Street, and the preliminary design vision principles from the workshops: world class pedestrian priority street, equitable, efficient, and memorable transit experience, BRAT (bio-retention above transit), light, and block and context sensitivity.

Ms. Long noted the various zones and provided the detailed site analysis of each segment. At zone 1 and 2, Ms. Long introduced the Welcome Plaza and The Light Room, starting in zone 3, the team developed two options. The first option called “La Rambla” has a centre green promenade, while the second option, called “West Side Bioscape” has a wide green boulevard on the west side of Bay Street. Ms. Long provided the summary of the preliminary design vision concepts and recapped the differences between the two.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if one option is transit only and the other option retains vehicular traffic. Ms. Long responded that both options were tested, more work will have to be done to determine the appropriate strategy. The Panel member noted that sunlight would suggest that the West Side Bioscape would work better on the east side and asked if the team studied an east side bias option. Ms. Long noted the east side bias was considered but the team chose to proceed with the west side bias option due to a wider sidewalk can benefit Union Station’s high flow.

Another Panel member asked if there is a site plan of the entire Bay St. corridor that shows the remaining development sites both east and west. The Panel member is trying to understand the evolution of the adjacent lots including 30 Bay, 11 Bay, and 141 Bay. Ms. Long noted the status of the sites and will include more information at the next review.

One Panel member asked if the team is considering the possibility of closing off the roads in either options to address heavy traffic, such as during events or heavy pedestrian flow. Ms. Long noted that the team has not considered this option.

Another Panel member noted the project is very challenging and appreciated the notion of the tree strategy. The Panel member asked what is one element that the team sees as a huge gain in functionality and fluidity for the site, and if 1-way traffic has been studied in terms of feasibility. Ms. Long noted that Bay St. and adjacent streets should be studied together as a network to analyse flow as they are interconnected and that the 1-way traffic remains to be studied.

One Panel member noted both options are delightful and that University Ave. currently has a similar “La Rambla” median and that the space is not well used because it is inconvenient for pedestrians, and asked if there is any research on University Ave. Ms. Long responded that University Ave. is a much wider road designed with fountains and celebration monuments - crossing at Bay would feel very different from this precedent. Another member noted that the plan to change University to an east side bias is gaining traction. The Panel member asked if Toronto pedestrians seek sun or shade, given the city is now cooling dominant instead of heating. Ms. Long responded that the trees provide not only shade but also weather protection and agreed that shade is more important. One Panel member commented that Torontonians prefer shade in the summer and sun in the winter, and thus we have deciduous trees.

Another Panel member asked if the team considered drainage or surface permeability in the design, and if there is any design continuation from Lake Shore Public Realm such as the crossing designs which were also designed by West 8. Ms. Long answered that drainage will be studied closely, the team is interested in infiltrating some water to prevent flash flooding, and that West 8’s scope for Lake Shore ends at Jarvis St. but there is no reason the designs cannot be better coordinated.

One Panel member asked if the cut and cover work is north of Lake Shore and south of Harbour St. only. Ms. Long responded yes.

3.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member supported the West Side Bioscape. Based on Queens Quay and the future University Ave., Torontonians will have an easier time adjusting to either a west or east side bias public realm. For an elderly person, the central median feels unsafe; it is important to introduce less unfamiliarity to the urban environment that has a high possibility to become a successful Toronto urban typology. The Panel member supported the mixed traffic option in favour of sheer animation from urban life incorporating different types of vehicles. The Panel recommended the team to look at how the public realm can tie in with the design of the Area 1 pedestrian link and consider moving the pavilion to the west side of the parking entrance on Queens Quay. This is a topographic challenge but will greatly improve the arrival experience. With the great deal of pedestrian traffic on Bay St, the design needs to consider east-west turning and suggested the team to incorporate the study of advanced right turn signalling,

Another Panel member appreciated the overall design clarity and supported the expanding of the study scope to include Yonge and York Streets which will help make decisions as part of the greater framework of streets. The Panel member noted the thresholds between transit, city, and the waterfront, all must be understood together.

The Panel member supported the “La Rambla” option because as adjacent developments advance, they can evolve their public realm without impacting the core pedestrian experience. The Panel member is excited by the possibilities and asked the team to ensure all strategies are properly assessed and integrated with the greater framework.

One Panel member noted the inclination for pedestrians to spill out into the immediate sidewalk is very strong compared to crossing to the central median. At Queens Quay, people want to be on the water, so we placed the width on the south side. By the same logic, the Panel member supported the West Side Bioscape. The Panel member supported the advanced right turn signalling and noted that is the reason for the removal of the Bay St. and Bloor St. pedestrian diagonal crossing – if there is vehicular traffic, there needs to be a strategy for their movement. The Panel member asked the team to put more trees on the east sidewalk and balance the experience and supported the work thus far.

Another Panel member agreed with expanding the scope to look at the bigger street network and noted that efficiency and fluidity are important. The Panel member sees “La Rambla” as a bolder typology and asked the team to consider a hybridized option. The Panel member is concerned with the naming of “Bioscape” as it is not horticulture but a paved street with tree canopies, consider alternatives.

One Panel member supported the West Side Bioscape because pedestrian traffic is predominately on that side. In Vancouver, 1-way streets are discouraged and celebrated when they revert to 2-way, they become livelier and more animated for retail. The Panel member noted the east side should have more trees and encouraged the team to work with TTC to bring light down to the transit station. The Panel member appreciated the debate that the Panel is having related to the vision of Bay.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to have a forward-looking traffic consultant to advance the studies. The Panel member noted it is important to ensure some version of this becomes a reality, even if compromises must be made. The Panel member felt the West Side Bioscape is likely more successful in the long term, discouraged above grade planters with flowers and instead focus on tree species that are natural to this area – the planters are too suburban and do not fit the context. The Panel member asked the team to reconsider the names of the two options.

One Panel member appreciated the thoughtful presentation and noted it is enjoyable to think about BRAT and also bringing natural light into the station below. The Panel member recommended to use this project as a demonstration of great multi-modal street planning that accommodates all forms of use and slower speeds. The West Side Bioscape has a strong chance in becoming successful, giving space to the busier side. The Panel member felt the edges of Bay Street are different from edges of La Rambla and the comparison is too fine-grained for Toronto.

Another Panel member noted Bay Street is one of the most paved areas in the city, flooding and urban heat are issues, and supported BRAT as it is a great demonstration of how we can build for the future. The Panel member suggested the team to capitalize on performance gains, such as how much stormwater the street can store and degrees

of heat it can mitigate. The Panel member noted it is comprehensive and critical to show relationship with adjacent streets, supported a hybridized option, and agreed that the names are not representative of the core concepts. The Panel member suggested the team to experiment with curb cuts, closing streets for special events, and other flexible approaches to test features.

One Panel member supported the West Side Bioscape and noted that water management strategy is critical for the vision.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider pedestrian safety and identify strategies for the safest bike or walking route. There are existing concrete barriers at Front and Bay, for example, that should be addressed in the design.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the detailed presentation, the Panel is very excited by the project.
- Supported the approach of the six “rooms” as a conceptual approach to the project.
- Consider the long-term future of Bay Street, pedestrian experience, and safety as priorities.
- With increasing Union Station traffic, ferry terminal, and new residential complexes in the area, it is important for the design to anticipate the future levels of traffic.
- Consider every opportunity to maximize new trees.
- Expand the study area and consider the role of Bay Street in the context of York and Yonge Streets.

Bay Street Concept Design Vision Options

- Strong support for the West Side Bioscape option as it offers many benefits including wider sidewalks next to Union Station and Scotiabank Arena.
- Some Panel members felt that the bias option is more consistent and familiar with other existing Toronto urban street typologies, such as the asymmetrical precedent of Queens Quay, compared to the “La Rambla” option.
- In the context of east vs west side promenade, consider that shade is generally preferred for pedestrians rather than full sun in an urban context in a changing climate, especially during peak season where the streets are most used.
- Concerned with the “La Rambla” option since the University Ave. centre median is not very successful nor heavily used. The city is considering changing University Ave. to an east side bias promenade.
- The names of both options do not feel appropriately representative of their key design features, consider alternatives.
- Consider a third option which is a hybrid of options and incorporates flexibility in closing streets for special events or seasons.
- While more traffic study is needed, there is strong support for retaining vehicular traffic as it is an important feature of a complete street.

- Some support for 2-way streets – design for a diverse future that accommodates mixed traffic and pedestrians.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

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

Ms. Long thanked the Panel for the comments and appreciate the constructive comments. Ms. Long noted the team will look at the big picture, identity, and branding of the project, as well as dedicated right turn signalling.

4.0 Waterfront East LRT Area 1 – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1122
<i>Project Type:</i>	Infrastructure
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	TTC
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Wood, SAI, PMA
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Vincent Teng, Project Manager, TTC Richard Shaw, Principal, Strasman Architects Inc. Jason Stahl, Project Engineer, Wood
<i>Delegation:</i>	Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Suma Apparao-Das, TTC Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto Cassidy Ritz, City of Toronto Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the scope areas of the East Waterfront LRT Project and specifically the scope for Area 1 Union to Queens Quay Link. Ms. Vangjeli noted the project is here for Stage 2: Schematic Design review and recapped the Consensus Comments from the March 2021 Issues Identification review. Ms. Vangjeli noted the areas for Panel consideration, including the design of the station and integration with the public realm, the wayfinding and signage strategies, the streetcar portal designs, the pedestrian link enclosure on the south side of Queens Quay, and opportunities for integration with the future vision of Lower Bay Street. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Vincent Teng, Project Manager with TTC to continue the introduction.

Mr. Teng began by providing a recap of the project overview, design, and engineering status, estimated construction timeline, existing street and station context, and the

existing and future adjacent major project context. Mr. Teng then introduced Richard Shaw, Principal with Strasman Architects, to continue the design presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Shaw began by presenting the Union Station design and passenger experience including circulation, wayfinding, accessibility, materials and finishes, and atmosphere and interest. Ms. Shaw noted circulation and platform clearance have been maximized, the updated interior design palette, and the artwork feature located in the center of the station. Mr. Shaw noted the Bay Street enhancement opportunities related to Union Station such as daylighting, integrated venting, and connection to future plaza and public realm.

Mr. Shaw then presented the Queens Quay Station, portal structures, and pedestrian link and enclosure design details, while noting other opportunities to enhance the Bay Street public realm. Mr. Shaw noted that the public art feature here shifts to a “wrapper” where users will experience walking through and along. Mr. Shaw presented the weather protected southeast entrance design and the revised streetcar portal canopy structures. Mr. Shaw noted timber was considered but the team is concerned with it being unprotected from the weather, and explained that the profiles of a steel structure would allow a lighter and more opened design. Jason Stahl, Project Engineer with WOOD, then provided an update on the ecology, energy, and sustainability objectives of the project, and detailed the stormwater management strategy at Queens Quay.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the new platform strategy means four streetcars load and unload in tandem. Mr. Teng noted there are bypass tracks that allow each streetcar to operate independently and provide flexibility to reflect ridership. The Panel member asked if the team considered escalators. Mr. Teng responded that the project is a tight downtown corridor, the space limit contributes to the decision, TTC prefers escalators for passenger convenience and cost is not a concern. Mr. Shaw noted there is also the height constraint limit, however the team is trying to incorporate escalators into the 11 Bay lobby. The Panel member noted that while the pedestrian link pavilion is visually unobtrusive, it is not any less interrupting to the at grade pedestrian flow which remains an issue. The Panel member is intrigued at the option of relocating it to the west side but noted that it does not work well with the underground vault. The Panel member asked if there is a future connection with 11 Bay which may negate the need for this underground link. The Panel member asked the team to devise a west side biased pedestrian route then the enclosure can be on the east side, or an alternate where the link and enclosure are not part of the scope at all provided the generous sidewalk width. It is important to develop the west side crossing.

Another Panel member asked why there is a platform level crossing in the station. Mr. Teng noted the crossing is maintained for users and staff, during busy time this crossing may be closed to minimize delays while access from street level will be

maintained – there are other platform level crossings in the TTC station network. The Panel noted the existing streetcar portal west of Bay is not covered and asked if it is necessary to have a covering as a functional requirement. Mr. Teng noted both portals are architectural gateways that do not have transit functions other than integrating the electrical wiring above streetcars from above to below grade. The Panel member asked if the team is working with an artist on the lit color panels. Mr. Teng noted that as the progress continues, TTC will go through the public art procurement to select an artist for both the underground and portals. Mr. Shaw noted the intent of the design stage is to identify opportunities for art that can support the circulation strategy. The Panel member asked if there are flood concerns with the station. Mr. Vincent noted the design accommodates the worst-case scenarios, i.e. the 100-year level storm.

One Panel member asked for clarification on maximizing tree planting strategy. Mr. Stahl noted the team will work with Lower Bay Visioning to maximize tree planting and not conflict the outcome of the study.

Another Panel member asked for the procurement model of the project. Mr. Teng noted options are being evaluated, design-bid-build is considered as a base for comparison against other models subject to the conclusion of 30% design with a cost estimate to secure funding. The Panel member asked if the station would have natural light. Mr. Teng responded that the intention is yes but will depend on the outcome of the Lower Bay Street Visioning and next stage of design. The team will coordinate with the Bay St. team.

One Panel member asked if the team is designing for the future pedestrian volume. Mr. Shaw noted clearances are maximized based on testing, if that cannot be met then the team will revert to TTC minimum requirements. The Panel member asked for clarification on the intention of the art and lighting elements. Mr. Shaw noted the element, from an experiential perspective, is a singular element in the center where you circulate around at Union Station, then move through at Queens Quay.

Another Panel member asked if the columns could shift to align with the service room edges to increase traffic capability. Mr. Shaw noted the structure is very constrained by developments above and track overpass, but the point is well taken. The center platform is conceived to maximize openness. Mr. Teng noted the streetcar doors are aligned away from the structural lines to maximize loading area. The Panel member asked how the cables will be integrated with the portal structure. Mr. Shaw noted the connection points will rely on the structural ribs and detailing will be coordinated.

One Panel member asked if the design is designed for the 100-year storm levels. Mr. Stahl noted there are pumps attached to the station which accommodates the 100-year level storms. The Panel member asked if the Queens Quay station has flooded before. Mr. Teng noted it has not flooded to his knowledge, beyond the station itself the team will coordinate with City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto to mitigate water levels beyond the 100-year storms with simple features. The Panel member asked for the pedestrian link rationale. Mr. Teng noted that the project is a collaboration with the City and it is the City's desire to expand the underground path network in the area, it also offers an alternate mean of access into the station. The Panel member asked for clarification on the color panel materiality. Mr. Shaw noted the intent is a dynamic

surface, the options of back-lit and projections will be explored in the future, also depends on the procurement of the art program as either part of the station scope or separate.

Another Panel member asked if the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal link can have an escalator or run straight and the rationale for the current design. Mr. Shaw noted the intent is to minimize run as required up to the surface, there is also a minimum clearance between the face of the elevator and stairs.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the Bremner line connection note on p.10. Mr. Teng noted that line is still in the City's official plan. Nigel Tahair, Program Manager of Transportation Planning with City of Toronto, responded that the City has been protecting that for the long term and there might be further feedback at the next transit review.

4.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member encouraged the team to make the Queens Quay entrance as straight as much as possible if an escalator is not possible, ensure all options have been tested. The Panel member questioned if the pedestrian link is necessary as TTC appears to be neutral on its position- the Panel does not think the tunnel is necessary. One option is to relocate it on to the west side of the parking entry to improve the pedestrian traffic connection – investigate with the City to see whether the link is needed.

Another Panel member felt the tunnel is not necessary and that the exits north of Queens Quay must be robust. The pedestrian link at grade enclosure is a major interruption to the flow of pedestrians to the ferry terminal. The Panel member asked the team to reconsider the need for the streetcar portal structures. The Panel member noted public art is a cornerstone of Waterfront Toronto, it is important to identify and understanding their role in the project. The Panel member noted it is important to capture all the constraints in the design and appreciated the design progress.

One Panel member appreciated the development of the station design and noted that unless there is a great need, the team should consider removing the Queens Quay south entrance from the scope. If the weather is bad, there is little traffic there which negates the need for the enclosure. The Panel member noted the portal structures recall the BCE Place than the waterfront as they are more about the veil character than the timber structure, consider revisiting the timber proposal that is more in line with the Wavedecks and the waterfront.

Another Panel member appreciated the thoughtful and detailed presentation. The Panel member recommended prioritizing biodiversity in the design of the public realm, provide robust and continuous canopy, and supported the decision to eliminate the Queens Quay south connection.

One Panel member supported the removal of the portal structures if the procurement model is not stipulated sum as it is difficult to control the quality of the structure.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to develop an articulated public art strategy as it relates to the architecture, bring on board an artist early so there is a good understanding of intent and therefore able to make a great contribution to the design. The Panel member suggested to simplify the ceiling plan and design, strive for a simple, clean, ceiling and let the articulated walls, whether tiled or lit panel surfaces, to speak loudly. Currently there seems to be many ceiling variations- let the public art stand out.

One Panel member supported the Queens Quay south entrance as it improves connectivity to destinations but encouraged the team to further improve and integrate the design, whether on the east or west side of parking entry. The Panel member asked the team to provide more information on the experience of the public realm and noted that the interior flooring at Queens Quay should be consistent with Union Station and not mimic the pavement treatment of Queens Quay. The Panel member recommended less is more for the portal structures and remove from scope if not needed.

Another Panel member felt it is essential for the new infrastructure to be future weatherproof and encouraged the team to advocate for protecting the public transportation system from flooding, like the 100-year storms. The Panel member felt public art is critical for the user experience and asked the team to ensure that is done well.

One Panel member recommended the team to consider a strategy to distribute the rainwater to control flow when there is a storm surge. The Panel member recommended that low carbon content concrete should be the basis of TTC's specification. As a big customer, TTC can use this project to advance the industry in the right way.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to consider the portal canopies as infrastructure, strive to push the design in terms of functionality - if there is no function, consider removal.

One Panel member also supported the removal of the Queens Quay link and pavilion if the procurement model is not stipulated sum.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the detailed presentation of a complex project and supported the overall concept design.
- Ensure that all proposed above grade elements of the station be well integrated with the public realm design of Bay St. and Queens Quay.
- Appreciated the visual design strategy including lighting, colors, and public art components, consider further development to deliver a strong, clear, and cohesive design, i.e. maintain a simple interior and let the art features stand out.

- Supported the public art strategy, ensure the work is done with artists and the result is spectacular.
- Ensure design addresses future flooding conditions.
- Consider removing the Bremner connection from the scope.
- Encourage TTC to consider use of low carbon concrete at this station.

Pedestrian Connection and Pavilion

- The design and location of the pedestrian connection pavilion reduces at grade pedestrian flow at the entrance to the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal. The Panel is concerned with its impact on the public realm as designed. Consider the following:
 - An alternate location for the pavilion that is better integrated with the existing Queens Quay public realm, i.e. at the west side of Bay and Queens Quay, west of the parking entrance, which might work well with the new vision of Bay Street.
 - An alternate design that does not impede at grade pedestrian flow, i.e. an open-air access with canopy for rain protection, like other transit entrances.
 - An alternate that does not consider an underground connection and improves the at grade crossing instead as an economical alternative.
- The Panel is unsupportive of the pedestrian connection and has concerns with the tunnel and access design:
 - Concerned with the width of the tunnel not able to accommodate substantial traffic and user needs.
 - Consider a straight stair run into the tunnel for optimal pedestrian movement during peak loads.

TTC Streetcar Portals

- With minimal functionality and various design concerns, the Panel remains unsupportive of the proposed design. Consider the following:
 - Whether a portal canopy structure is needed – suggestion that less is more especially if it is not a transit functional requirement
 - The proposed design looks too cluttered, out of place, and does not feel complimentary to the identity of Queens Quay.
 - Concerned with the cleaning and maintenance of the mesh exterior, and that the structure is a visual barrier to the street.
 - Suggestion to either return with an alternative mass timber concept as proposed in earlier studies or simply remove the canopies from scope.

4.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support for the overall design concept.

For the Pedestrian Link and Pavilion, the Panel voted Non-Support.

For the Streetcar Portals, the Panel voted Non-Support.

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

Mr. Teng thanked the Panel for the constructive comments, the team will continue to coordinate with the Lower Bay Street Visioning team at the next phase of design. With respect to water management and public realm, the team will also revisit the designs and integrate with Lower Bay Street Visioning. Mr. Teng appreciated the Panel's recognition for the team's great work. Mr. Shaw thanked the Panel and noted the integration of the entrances are on-going, agree with the art component comments and noted the team will work on an implementation strategy to establish the relationship between architecture and the art. Mr. Shaw agrees less is more on the portal structures, the comments lend themselves to the next round of editing and pulling out elements that don't work.

5.0 Legacy Art Project – Schematic Design

Project ID #: 1127
Project Type: Public Realm
Review Stage: Schematic Design
Review Round: Two
Location: Central Waterfront
Proponent: Legacy Art Project Toronto
Architect/ Designer: Jon Sasaki
DTAH
Art + Public UnLtd
Presenter(s): Jon Sasaki, Lead Artist
James Roche, Partner, DTAH
Delegation: Rebecca Carbin, Principal, Art + Public UnLtd
Craig Jarvis, Legacy Art Project
Judy Jarvis, Legacy Art Project
Chloe Catan, Waterfront Toronto
Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto
Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto
Marc Kramer, City of Toronto
David O'Hara, City of Toronto

5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by summarizing the project background, design team, Waterfront Toronto's role as the delivery agent, and estimated project timeline. Mr. Novack recapped the site context and noted the project is here for Stage 2: Schematic Design review. Mr. Novack recapped the Consensus Comments from July 2021 Issues Identification review, and areas for Panel consideration from Waterfront Toronto and Parks, Forestry & Recreation: landscape design interface with adjacent public realm, topography, planting strategy, AODA compliance, grading and draining for the pathway, and review of planting strategy with the City. Mr. Novack then introduced Jon Sasaki, Lead Artist, to continue the presentation.

5.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sasaki began the design presentation by recapping the key comments from last review and noted that the team was energized by walking the site again to revisit the design. The entry point of the path has been reconsidered to the east side of the lawn, south of the existing concrete retaining wall. Mr. Sasaki noted the before and after entry and the revised site plan including a larger west plaza to highlight the moment of the vista coming together. James Roche, Principal with DTAH, continued the presentation by noting the updated landscape topography that responds to the art, frames views, controls access and movement, and integrates with a planting strategy. Mr. Roche provided an update on the planting strategy, pollinator, spontaneous species, and the material palette for the path and benches. Mr. Roche noted the updated site plan, lighting strategy, and a series of project sections that described the elevational relationship between the elements. Mr. Roche concluded with updated perspective renderings and noted the team will further develop the final moment when Terry's silhouette comes together. Mr. Sasaki showed a video of a scaled mock-up of the silhouette cut-outs in perspective and noted the team will work on the longitudinal grades to ensure the angle of view is considered.

5.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member appreciated the landscape design progress and plant selections. The Panel member asked for clarification on the term "spontaneous planting" and asked the team to confirm if the species proposed are to kick start the planting at first then will allow other plants to emerge. Mr. Roche responded that they are more informal, less designed, and will evolve over time – to be discussed with Parks to determine the species. Mr. Roche added that Tommy Thompson pavilion has an area with spontaneous planting which is already growing with species local to the site.

Another Panel member asked if all the berms are planted. Mr. Roche responded that the design is not at that level of detail, the team will look at both planting and grass depending on whether the slopes of the berms are too steep for Parks to mow and maintain. The team is interested in creating one side that is wilder than the other.

One Panel member asked if the team has looked at options in softening the concrete wall at the northeast corner. Mr. Roche noted the team would like to protect the root zones of the adjacent trees as much as possible but will investigate options further.

Another Panel member asked if there is a need for guardrail at the top of the berms or along the north side next to the edge of the concrete retaining wall. Mr. Roche commented that the team is looking to push the path inward and calibrate the various height conditions so guardrails can be avoided.

One Panel member clarified that Parks is looking for AODA compliance, not the DRP, and asked if it is possible to keep the tree at the north entry. Mr. Roche noted the team is looking at the tree closely, the pavers are buckling at the base, so our work would likely include the repair there – the team will study moving the path to avoid eliminating the tree.

Another Panel member asked if it is possible to shift the sculptures so the silhouette would line up also at the starting point of the path, to extend the narrative that Terry is looking into his future. Mr. Sasaki noted the perspective does not work from the starting point of the path, the idea is that it is once you complete the path and look back the revelation becomes clear.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the maintenance of the park and it is important for the team to consider the robustness of the landscape as they progress with the design details. The Panel member noted that Yo Yo Ma Music Garden has a volunteer group that helps with maintenance. Mr. Roche noted that the team will investigate this strategy.

5.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the poetic and beautiful project and noted it is moving in a good direction. The Panel member appreciated the use of planting as a visual strategy to highlight change and movement and asked the team to consider resilient and robust meadow species to lessen constant curation throughout the seasons. In tandem with topography and movement, the plant selection can be leveraged to help amplify and strengthen the overall experience.

Another Panel member noted the revised design incorporating seating at the west entry is far more resolved. The Panel member asked the team to consider maintenance and management of the landscape – if the north side is not maintained the vegetation might push up on the berms. On the other hand, the berm might trample on the much more delicate meadows so it is important to ensure all the boundaries, path and planting, are integrated and considered together to ensure the right balance in the end.

One Panel member asked the team to consider seasonality since the project might be covered in snow for half of the year and utilize lighting as a great opportunity to highlight the design.

Another Panel member appreciated the beautiful project. The Panel member is concerned that the location of the benches on the same side of the sculptures would diminish the totemic qualities of the objects in the landscape, consider moving them to the other side of the path. The Panel member asked the team to consider using the topography to help with placemaking on the north side of the park, such as further increasing the height of the high points. The Panel member encouraged a high degree of difference in the landscape and high level of biodiversity to make this a successful project.

One Panel member noted that the large granite sculptures sit partly on grass, and partly on the path- this threshold moment is very important, consider the detailing of the base of the sculptures carefully and provide drawings at the next review.

Another Panel member congratulated the team on much improved design tying in all the elements from the water to Queens Quay in an integrated approach. The Panel member supported the material palette and plant selection.

One Panel member noted the south edge of the project might have spill over from the lawn use and asked the team to ensure that the plantings of the mounds south of the path will not be mowed by Parks. The Panel member appreciated the design revisions made by the team in addressing DRP comments.

Another Panel member suggested varying the heights of the mounds on the south side, leave them as grass to avoid any planting as it is too risky being next to the lawn – an undulating grass lawn is the safer option. One Panel member asked if there is a planting strategy that does not require mowing. Mr. Roche answered that the level of mowing is species dependent, and also noted that sedum would not be the correct solution here.

One Panel member supported the design progress of the project.

5.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Strong support for the experiential quality of moving through the path – a unique experience celebrating Terry Fox.
- Supportive of the design’s ability to connect Queens Quay with the water.

Landscape

- Continue to refine the northeast entrance to the path and create a welcoming entry.
- Consider shifting the entry northward and avoid having to remove the existing tree.
- Refine the position of the benches in relation to the sculptures, consider not having benches on the south side of the path.
- Select robust planting species and consider seasonality.
- Further develop the lighting strategy as a great way to activate the park in winter months.
- Consider how the sculptures will meet the ground and provide base details at the next review.
- Work with local community groups and recruit volunteers to help monitor, maintain, and care for the conditions of the landscape, like the Music Garden.

5.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted unanimous Full Support for the project.

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

Mr. Roche thanked the Panel for the comments and the important relationship between topography and planting. The team will work to get that right and explore

subtle slopes in the next phase. Craig Jarvis thanked the Panel for the insightful comments and is excited to see the project happen.

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.