



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #132
Wednesday, March. 25th, 2020**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Regrets

Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Jeff Ranson

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. Union Station Rail Corridor Underpasses Architectural Design – Schematic Design
 2. 3 Eireann Quay Ireland Park Foundation Building – Schematic Design
 3. 1-7 Yonge Corner Open Space – Schematic Design
 4. Quayside Technical Evaluation Recap – For Information.
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Feb. 25th, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflicts for **Quayside Technical Evaluation Recap** and recused himself for the session.

The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began the update by noting that the Feb. 2020 DRP Consensus Comments have been circulated to the **43 Parliament Data Centre TR3**, the Proponent has completed pre-consultation meeting with the City, and is anticipating submitting the first Site Plan Application in May.

Mr. Glaisek noted the **Port Lands Flood Protection (PLFP) Promontory Park South** is expected to return for Detailed Design in April, along with the remaining parts of **PLFP Parks**. For the **Outer Harbour Rowing Facility**, Mr. Glaisek noted the Proponent team has received the Consensus Comments and is working to determine the next steps, including a subsequent return to Panel.

For **West Don Lands Block 10**, Mr. Glaisek noted the Proponent has received the Consensus Comments. Waterfront Toronto and the City are working with the Proponent team to identify next steps and possible schedule for return to DRP. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto will keep the Panel posted on the return of some of these projects.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek provided a construction update on **East Bayfront Aquabella** and the **Waterfront Innovation Centre**. For **Aquabella**, Mr. Glaisek noted the upper floor slabs are being formed, curtain wall is in progress, and the anticipated occupancy is April 2022. For the **Waterfront Innovation Centre**, Mr. Glaisek noted the above grade floors are in progress and the anticipated interim occupancy date is September 2021.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update of the upcoming April 2020 DRP agenda and then introduced Lynnette Postuma, Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, to give a brief design update on the **Bentway Bridge**. Mr. Glaisek noted the City has decided that the previous **Bentway Bridge** design was not approved to proceed and the design team is trying to address the City's comments while preserving the design as much as possible. Since this project has already received DRP approval and is making further design revisions, Mr. Glaisek would like the Panel to consider if a post-approval review is needed.

Ms. Postuma noted that since the last DRP review, several design changes are being contemplated and the construction of the project has been deferred to after the scheduled rehabilitation maintenance of the Gardiner structure. Ms. Postuma noted the City has many concerns on the suspended structure and recommended the team to ground the design. While the spirit of the bridge is the same, the team is studying an alternative strategy with an asymmetrical design.

One Panel member asked for the timeline and if design changes will continue to occur until 2026/2027. Ms. Postuma noted the team is tasked with completing the design. Another Panel member noted it is a big enough change and it should return to Panel. One Panel member felt it is a substantial change in structure, materiality, and landscape. Various Panel members also agreed that it should return. The Chair noted

that there is unanimous support for the project to return for another DRP review and to address the long-term design given the updated timeline.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted that time will tell how long the COVID-19 impacts will last and hoped that it will get better so the Panel can convene in-person again.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Union Station Rail Corridor Underpasses Arch. Design – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1082
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Lower Yonge, East Bayfront, and West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Metrolinx
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	IBI
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Warren D'Andrade, Project Manager, Metrolinx; Trevor Anderson, Metrolinx; John Potter, Manager, Design Excellence Division, Metrolinx; Chris Calabrese, Associate Manager, Landscape Architecture, IBI; Bo Lu, Project Designer, IBI
<i>Delegation:</i>	Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Lisa D'Abbondanza, IBI; James Burchell, Metrolinx; Kevin Chan, Metrolinx; Nicole Panchal, Metrolinx; Jeff Yee, Metrolinx; Syed Hassan, Metrolinx; Mike Bogias; Metrolinx; Julia Murnaghan, City of Toronto; Casey Craig, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto began the introduction by noting the project's location, site context, and Central Waterfront Policy Context. Ms. Vangjeli noted that the raised Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC) berm and Gardiner act as side-by-side barriers on the east end, rail underpasses are important gateways to the waterfront, and coordination is required with adjacent projects including Wilson Yard, Lake Shore Public Realm, Gardiner Rehab and Reconstruction, Port Lands Flood Protection, and Sediments and Debris Management Area. Ms. Vangjeli provide a summary of the project's design coordination opportunities with Lake Shore Public Realm: portals and wing walls, special concrete paving, lighting, future proofing for public art, gateway signage, red bin wall and reflective graphics, vine screen, and planting palette. Ms. Vangjeli noted the existing site conditions of the Jarvis and Sherbourne underpasses, the project's DRP review stage, and provided a recap of the DRP consensus comments from June 2017. Ms. Vangjeli provided the areas for Panel consideration including topics such as underpasses as gateways to the waterfront, integration with adjacent work, future-proofing teamway at Jarvis and HONI

bridge at Sherbourne, public art integration, interior and exterior design treatments. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Warren D'Andrade, Project Manager with Metrolinx, to continue the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. D'Andrade began the presentation by noting that the team is looking for feedback on the design of the underpasses and Metrolinx will provide an overview of the adjacent work for the Panel. Mr. D'Andrade provided an overview of the underpass work, benefits for Union Station and GO services, and Metrolinx's benefits and assessment and project specification categories. Ms. D'Andrade introduced Trevor Anderson, Union Station Enhancement Program Sponsor with Metrolinx, to provide details of the USRC track enhancement work. Mr. Anderson noted the project scope, schedule, status, design principles, items not included in the current scope, and introduced Chris Calabrese, Associate Manager of Landscape Architecture with IBI, to continue the design presentation.

Underpass Design

Mr. Calabrese noted the sustainability objectives of the project, design features of the underpasses, a summary of the proposed design specifications and materials, and the landscape design strategy. Mr. Calabrese noted the landscape design is consistent with the material palette of Lake Shore Public Realm and it is the intent of the team to fully integrate the two. Mr. Calabrese explained the proposed lighting in the interior of the underpass, anticipation for future teamway, and the wing wall linear pattern panel options to be selected – the concrete panels allow future removal without demolition. Mr. Calabrese noted the extension of the heritage railing from track level down to the sidewalk.

Adjacent Work

Mr. D'Andrade introduced John Potter, Design Excellence Division Manager with Metrolinx, to provide updates to adjacent projects. Mr. Potter noted it is important to define Metrolinx's definition of good design and keep in mind future projects to come for today's review of the underpasses. Mr. Potter provided an update on the design of the retaining wall at Cherry Street, the HONI utility bridge at Sherbourne Street, Wilson Yard and Hydro One relocation work, and the ongoing Pedestrian and Cyclist Connectivity Study, and a high-level vision of Ontario Line. Mr. Potter noted the design of the Union Station backup generator enclosure is an example of Metrolinx's enhanced design specification, and noise and vibration mitigation work including door and window replacements are part of Metrolinx's investment on mitigating negative impact outside of the underpasses to ensure residents can live adjacent to the rail corridor.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for the anticipated timeline for the HONI bridge and if the cladding is as tall as the railing above the underpass structures. Mr. D'Andrade answered that the HONI work is slated to begin end of 2020, completion in the fall of 2023, and the cladding height will meet the requirements of the bridge structure blocking the railing – the integration of the HONI cladding will be resolved as Metrolinx

moves forward. The Panel member asked for clarification on the requirement of the fence along the embankment. Mr. Potter noted that the retaining wall is set back from the property line to allow for landscape, there has to be a security fence adjacent to the retaining wall or the embankment and the design is adapting the landscape treatment to help blur that boundary. The Panel member asked if the existing historic fence is required to be reused due to its heritage value. Mr. Potter noted that some form of security fence is necessary.

Another Panel member asked for specification on the utility lighting, the origin of the heritage fence and why it is required to be preserved. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the backup generator cladding design and how it relates to Union Station. Mr. Potter noted the team is looking for feedback on the heritage fence treatment. For the backup generator cladding design, Mr. Potter noted the team is focused on creating a horizontal datum between the two buildings for the pedestrian experience and a reflective material offers colors of the sky. On the utility lighting, a consultant is working on the lighting photometric levels of the underpasses. Mr. D'Andrade noted given there is no existing standard for underpass pedestrian lighting, the team is going beyond street lighting standards and is currently in the process of working with Toronto Hydro for approvals with subway lighting standards.

One Panel member asked if the concrete pattern shown throughout the presentation has the same specifications and if the protective railing at the retaining wall can be installed closer to the rails thus reducing the visual impact from the pedestrian path.

Another Panel member asked for the timeline of the items that are listed outside of the current project scope. Mr. D'Andrade noted the items are currently being studied and there is no timeline of including them.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was not convinced by the heritage railing design, noting there is not sufficient argument for extending the feature down the wing wall clashing with the pedestrian level railing and the contemporary concrete panel expressions. Furthermore, if the HONI bridge and cladding are to be implemented in the future, the heritage fence is redundant and should be reconsidered in anticipation of the HONI bridge. The Panel member noted the utility bridge should also anticipate the future teamway, a higher level of coordination between the underpasses and other related future initiatives is required. The Panel member recommended to instead focus the project budget on a more robust market fence.

Another Panel member did not support the fence railing extension to pedestrian level. Instead of imitating the heritage language of the old fence and creating a new fence that is out of place, consider a different, more contemporary fence design. The Panel member asked the team to consider a more syncopated and irregular concrete pattern, so the result is less utilitarian. Consider further referencing West 8's designs for the concrete panel work.

One Panel noted coordination between different groups of public realm projects is a hallmark of Waterfront Toronto and it is important to consider how the project helps link the city with the waterfront. The Panel recommended the team to conduct more consultation with other design groups. The Panel noted underpass lighting is critical for the success of the project as gateways for the waterfront and consider an open palette for the concrete panelling in anticipation for future work.

Another Panel member noted darker paint colors are not recommended, provide a mock-up test of the landscape palette to verify feasibility, and noted that while birch is a good design choice it might struggle in a salt heavy environment.

One Panel member recommended the team to first plant a low landscape creating opportunity for succession growth. Metrolinx and Waterfront Toronto should leverage the project mock-up as a learning opportunity.

Another Panel member recommended to extend the treatment of the underpass interior to the outside wing walls, such as the use of a more transitional material palette. The Panel member recommended further exploration for the wing walls to study simpler and smoother surfaces so it can be a canvas for future projects. The Panel member noted it is difficult to grasp the big picture with all the related projects – it is important to future proof by considering public art and lighting together with the current scope.

One Panel member asked the team to provide more visualizations demonstrating the integration of rail related components with the current scope and appreciated the strong focus on the landscape design. The Panel member suggested to test more planting options for the embankment and noted that the current heritage fence extension strategy is a missed opportunity.

Another Panel member recommended to eliminate the heritage fence and instead bring the wing hall higher to provide the required railing. The Panel member asked for more information on the utility lighting specification and recommended the team to borrow West 8's selections for better quality lighting.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the team's efforts in presenting the complex design context related to the underpass work.
- The design of the underpasses including both north and south façades with the future HONI bridges, are important gateways to the waterfront, the design must consider and accomplish this with the one-time opportunity.
- Further consider the principles of removing barriers and improving connectivity in the waterfront for the overall design.
- The underpasses do not yet feel inviting, consider year-round safety and bring a feeling of welcome to the design.

- Continuity and linkages with existing and future Waterfront Toronto projects are imperative, consider further design coordination with West 8's public realm design.
- Better integrate other existing and future design initiatives in the area as it relates to the underpasses, such as the HONI bridges and teamways. Provide a site plan drawing that demonstrates this at the next review.
- Given the list of critical items that are not being delivered in the proposed scope of work, such as the patterned concrete paving, architectural feature lighting, cycle track improvements, etc, provide more specificity on how the various elements will be addressed in the future.

Architectural Design

- Proposed colors as represented in the renderings, such as the black bents, feel dark and not inviting, consider further exploring the use of color and lighting to help improve the experience and "brighten" the underpasses. Provide photometric analysis at the next review.
- Consider better light fixtures than the basic utility fixtures proposed.
- Concerned that the proposed concrete panel options are too utilitarian and not welcoming, consider alternatives that are more irregular, syncopated, and further reference West 8's design palette as inspiration.
- Consider rethinking the strategy of both the heritage and new railing with anticipation for future HONI bridge work, ensure there is a consistent language between the various elements. Extending the heritage railing from the rail corridor to the pedestrian level public realm is unanimously not supported, especially given that the future HONI bridge and protective cladding will obscure the heritage railing at the rail corridor level.

Landscape

- Given the importance of the landscape work and the number of underpasses that will receive the design, it is recommended to complete a mock-up in the summer to study the feasibility of the proposed landscape palette and then further refine the design if needed. Consider the option of a joint mock-up with the Lake Shore Boulevard palette to demonstrate and test the integrated planting strategy and coordinate with Waterfront Toronto.
- Provide the proposed planting palette at the next review.
- While it is referenced from the Lake Shore Public Realm project, the Panel is concerned with the survivability of the proposed birch trees, consider alternatives.
- Provide before and after drawings of the landscape treatment to better articulate the intent and scale of the proposed work.

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

Mr. D'Andrade responded that the team will review the comments. The project is complex with many players, neighbouring projects, and the team will reconvene internally to continue consultation.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted in Non-Support (Unanimous) for the project.

2.0 3 Eireann Quay Ireland Park Foundation Building – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1087
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	City of Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Kearns Mancini Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Bryan Bowen, Project Manager, Waterfront Secretariat; Dan McNeil, Senior Architect, Kearns Mancini Architects
<i>Delegation:</i>	Jonathan Kearns, Kearns Mancini Architects; Robert G. Kearns, Kearns Mancini Architects; Rei Tasaka, Waterfront Toronto; Marina Haufschild, Waterfront Secretariat; Anne Fisher, City of Toronto, Susan McAlphine, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Bryan Bowen, Waterfront Secretariat Project Manager with the City of Toronto, began the introduction by noting the project is the single largest opportunity to improve the site but there has been challenges in the past to get the work started. Instead of starting with the major public uses, Mr. Bowen noted the project splits up the site into multiple smaller projects including new waterfront promenade, transportation improvements, the Corlek Building, waterfront plaza and event space, TDSB sports field enhancements, streetscape improvements, and the Canada Malting Silos rehabilitation. Mr. Bowen recapped the Panel's consensus comments from April 2019 and provided a design update on the taxi corral area and plaza. Mr. Bowen noted the first capital projects to start ground-breaking are the dock wall rehabilitation and the waterfront promenade.

Mr. Bowen noted that the Detailed Design for the new plaza will begin once a design team is retained from the RFP which will be issued this summer. Mr. Bowen noted the team intends to move quickly through the schedule, engage with local stakeholders, and push the project forward. The subsequent DRP return sessions for the plaza will be scheduled and the anticipated construction start is spring 2021.

For the TDSB sports field, the design will proceed to Detailed Design later this year, the City will be delivering this through PF&R on behalf of TDSB. Mr. Bowen noted the Silos repair work is planned as two parts with first part funded and the City is looking to find a right partner. The plaza work, in anticipation of the silos start of work, is phased to provide space for construction and staging.

Mr. Bowen noted the areas for Panel consideration and introduced Dan McNeil, Senior Architect with Kearns Mancini Architects, to continue the design presentation of the Ireland Park Foundation building.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. McNeil began the presentation by noting the site context with existing photos of the Corlek Building, its relationship to the water's edge promenade, and walked through the floor plans in detail. Mr. McNeil the existing structure is an art deco building, the team intends to restore the railing, column structure, and concrete floor given budget allowance. Mr. McNeil noted the exterior elevations will have new fenestration including windows, doors, and large openings for the ground floor with operable connections to the landscape south of the building. Mr. McNeil noted the exterior of the building will be clad in light colored masonry with dark trims that accentuate the art deco style – vine growth on the facades are encouraged.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the proposed brick cladding color and the actual use of the ground floor. Mr. McNeil answered that the cladding color should read as dull beige. Mr. Bowen noted that the condition of the lease will determine its use, the City is supportive that the space should be made available for various groups.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the thorough presentation and is excited with the prospect of reusing the building. The Panel member noted the various topography and grade conditions and asked the team to better integrate their functions with the landscape design and the building ground floor uses. The Panel member asked for more information on construction phasing of the building and to consider making parts of the project accessible from the start to help bring more attention and use to the site. The Panel member noted that a green roof should be provided for the building.

Another Panel member commended the thoroughness of the presentation and the clear retrofit of a building on an important site. The Panel member noted the project is a gateway to Toronto: logistics of delivery, drop-offs, parking, overlapping themes of memorial, Waterfront Toronto promenade design, are complex interweaving elements that should be considered carefully and integrated.

One Panel member appreciated the great presentation and Mr. Bowen's stickhandling of the different projects to create value and benefit to the waterfront. The Panel member noted that more interests will naturally appear when construction ramps up and recognize the importance of all the work. The Panel member noted a green or usable roofscape on the lower building should be considered, appreciated the reuse of the existing columns that helps maintain the character of the original building and provide structural bracing. The Panel member commended the team for leveraging the heritage structure to give the ground floor space a unique character.

Another Panel member noted the project is a remarkable property and is supportive for the objective of a bold vision. Through personal experience, the Panel understands the site as an important gateway for downtown and encouraged the team to develop a stronger and clearer vision for the overall revitalization project. The Panel member recommended double row of trees to be planted along the water's edge promenade, provide more green surfaces over pavement, and felt that the overall vision of a special gateway is disconnected from the designed realities of the various initiatives. Specifically, on the slide that compares the existing and future plaza, the Panel member noted that the landscape design has too much hardscape and asked the team to further elevate the design with a bolder, stronger, intent.

One Panel member commended Mr. Bowen's presentation and the tenacious incrementalism in pushing the project forward. The Panel member felt that the east-west ramp in front of the building, with substantial grading changes, does not fit well with the art deco railing details, consider opening up the path and lessen the boundary differentiation between the building and plaza. The Panel member noted that the heritage fenestration has more mullions and the team should ensure that the new glazed doors are well integrated with the existing language.

Another Panel member appreciated the precedents and overall presentation. The Panel member noted it is important at this stage to have a vision for how the building engages with the public realm, including access, flow, and interface opportunities. The Panel member recommended Mr. Bowen to describe these intentions as requirements in the RFP when selecting a landscape designer to ensure all the components will mesh.

One Panel member recommended a second pass at the landscape design and its relationship to other programs as the various components begin to evolve – leverage the landscape language in considering entrances and loading to the building.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Given the complicated history and existing conditions of the site, the Panel commended the team's sequencing strategy and continued efforts in advancing the various scopes of design and delivery.
- Appreciated the clear and concise presentation.
- It is critical to consider the site as an entry gateway to Toronto, from water, air, and land.
- While the current Bathurst Quay masterplan is good, it can be further improved to bring a bolder vision.

Building

- Appreciated the simplicity of the building design and is excited for the prospect of revitalization.
- Appreciated the preservation and the featuring of the existing building structure.

- Further refine the exterior details of the building, such as consider how the new doors can be detailed to match the heritage fenestrations and enhance the existing language.
- Consider providing an accessible green roof on the lower building.
- As the Ireland Park Foundation Building will be designed and delivered simultaneously as other pieces of the greater revitalization masterplan, it is important to future proof the design.
- Consider prioritizing the project's budget on the south facing building features to improve the waterfront frontage and interface with the promenade.

Landscape

- Continuity along the water's edge promenade is an important feature of Waterfront Toronto's public realm objectives. As a major starting point for many pedestrians, the team should consider providing a strong sense of continuity at the project's southern public realm with the adjacent water's edge promenade. It is recommended to reference the design of other segments of the water's edge promenade, i.e. a double row of trees planted along the promenade.
- The raised east-west path does not feel well integrated with the building design. Consider further refinement to the overall perimeter landscape to coordinate the grading, landscape berms, and paths, with exterior building design elements such as loading, fenestration, and access, in a way that supports the art deco language of the building.
- The landscape vision for the project requires further development, consider a much bolder design that maximizes soft ground covers, vegetation, and trees for the area.
- Recommended to engage Waterfront Toronto to continue the design of the public realm.

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

Mr. Bowen thanked the Panel for the feedback and noted many of the issues raised are contingent on finding a landscape architect to tie the project together. The project is waiting for the final team component and looks forward to returning to DRP with another conceptual plan.

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.

On the Ireland Park Foundation Building and immediate perimeter design tied to the building being completed by the Architect, the Panel voted in Conditional Support for the project.

On the public realm of the Bathurst Quay Neighborhood Plan, the Panel voted in Non-Support for elements of the project.

3.0 1 Yonge Corner Open Space – Schematic Design

Project ID #: 1064
Project Type: Landscape
Review Stage: Schematic Design
Review Round: Fourth
Location: Lower Yonge
Proponent: Pinnacle International
Architect/ Designer: NAK Design Strategies
Presenter(s): Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks, Waterfront Toronto; Robert Ng, Principal, NAK Design Strategies
Delegation: Alex Marshall, Pinnacle International; Anson Kwok, Pinnacle International; Nader Kadri, City of Toronto; Ran Chen, City of Toronto; Tonya Crawford, NAK Design Strategies; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; David Pontarini, Hariri Pontarini Architects;

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the project's site context at the corner of Yonge and Lake Shore Boulevard East, part of the greater 1-7 Yonge development. Ms. Stuart noted it is considered an open public space that is being delivered as part of the private development. Ms. Stuart noted that phases two and three of the project are undergoing development application approvals, the program is a mix-use of residential, hotel, commercial, and community centre. The project previously came to the DRP three times for the development scope.

Ms. Stuart noted the corner open space is City owned Right-of-Way that was included in the calculations of the site's Tower Area Ratio (TAR), a design competition for the site was previously contemplated, and Pinnacle is now responsible for the construction of the space with a limited budget scoped from Section 37 obligation. Ms. Stuart noted the proponent is working hard with the City and has tasked NAK Design Strategies, the landscape architect for the 1-7 Yonge subdivision, with the design of the space.

While the project is not a park space, Ms. Stuart noted some of the park policies from the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan that are important for this site. The site is part of the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan, Ms. Stuart noted the Public Realm, Mid-Block Connections, and the Public Art Plan from 2006. Ms. Stuart noted the project is presenting a Schematic Design presentation today, recapped previous Panel comments from October 2017, and concluded with City and Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel considerations. Ms. Stuart then introduced Robert Ng, Principal with NAK Design Strategies, to continue the design presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Ng began the presentation by noting the project site in context: adjacent developments, the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan, and the block plan specifically on its circulation and streetscape character. Mr. Ng noted the red boundary defines the site, an opportunity for a combination of trees, rectilinear paving and planters drawn from the language of the development and expanding the experience from building to the

exterior. Other design drivers include linear forms from adjacent parks such as the Sherbourne Common, and Waterfront Toronto's public realm design standards.

Mr. Ng noted the streetscape design along Yonge and Harbour take on character with Paleo-Tec pavers, the design of the corner open space embraces the pedestrian circulation network and not inhibit movement. The plaza is designed to accommodate the potential of various gathering spaces, such as popup events. Materials like granite and Paleo-Tec give a sense of space that blurs the boundaries of the site with the adjacent elements.

Mr. Ng noted the configuration of the trees have been approved through Site Plan Application. The street and canopy trees create winter interest and help filter air and noise from the Gardiner. Mr. Ng noted the team is cognizant that the planting must be salt tolerant and different colored perennial trees are introduced to support seasonal interests. Mr. Ng noted the planting beds are contained in a steel profile which is designed for water to filter through the planters. The plaza furnishing provides opportunities for permanent granite seating with integrated lighting for a more human pedestrian experience. Mr. Ng concluded with perspective views of the plaza and provided sectional details from Lake Shore to the southern edge of the site.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is program such as parking under the site and clarification on the overall role of the project. Mr. Ng responded there is nothing under the site and the role of the space is to provide flexible, transitional space for filtering people into the building, pause, rest, and temporary program like food trucks. The Panel member asked if one can walk through the open space into the central covered outdoor space. Mr. Ng responded that it is possible.

Another Panel member asked if the building entrances allow any program to spill out into the open space and the rationale for the location of the large benches. Alex Marshall, Development Manager with Pinnacle, noted the hotel bar will spill out into the private outdoor area, not into the corner plaza. Mr. Ng responded that the bench designs are notional, the various configuration options will depend on the specified use.

One Panel member asked if the team has completed shadow, wind, or noise studies since the site is located next to very tall buildings. Mr. Ng noted the team is cognizant of those constraints, noted most shadows are in the morning as there is sunlight onward from noon. The Panel member noted it is important to provide a shadow study as shade is not negotiable at this stage of design and will directly shape the public space design. The panel member asked for how the art and artist are determined for the public art. Mr. Marshall noted the team met with the City to derive a public art plan that can be approved by Committee, the City advised to place the art on the private side for ease of maintenance and the developer is in agreement of this location. Mr. Glaisek noted the location of public art was identified in the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan.

The Panel member noted that since this project is a gateway to the waterfront, more must be done to ensure its necessary success.

Another Panel member asked if there are glazed surfaces and canopies on the building frontages as the context building volumes are opaque in the renderings. Mr. Marshall responded yes there is glazed elevations on the ground floor. Mr. Pontariri added there is a 3m wide canopy that runs along the edge of the building.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the project phases and the program on the other ground floor spaces. Mr. Pontariri noted they are all retail and help animate the ground floor.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the alteration from double to single row of trees on the east sidewalk along Yonge Street and if the double row can be continued. Mr. Ng noted that double rows can be studied.

One Panel member asked for the team to explain the big idea of the project. Mr. Ng noted the team sees the plaza as a green space, relief for the adjacent hot paved areas, gathering, pause, and support small flexible outdoor programs.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that the project is a major piece of land with an unimaginative design. The site is at the foot of Yonge Street, a gateway to the entire waterfront, but the current design is a non-event and banal. The Panel member recommended a re-design to include an element of surprise and a vista to the artwork.

Another Panel member recommended to bend the westerly property line to enable an expanded continuity of the double tree row on the public sidewalk on the east side of Yonge Street. The Panel member share the unease on the freestanding benches as they seem ponderous and obtrusive to the circulation of the site. The Panel member felt the steel planter edge is not adequate and recommended elevating the planter beds for better protection and passive irrigation strategy. The Panel member noted the renderings show an insufficient amount of tree canopy coverage for the site and suggested the team to provide a precise sun study to verify the amount of adequate tree coverage.

One Panel member suggested to break away from the linear pattern, utilize paving and tiling to generate interest, and find ways to funnel people from Yonge Street. The Panel member asked the team to consider other ways to create quiet, oasis-like pockets such as raising planters and using mosaic patterns. The Panel member noted coordination between the immediate public realm and the buildings edge elements, including entrances, vents, loading, are important as they can easily create discomfort for the plaza. The Panel member recommended to overlay sun, wind studies to identify specific zones more suited for program and let the building footprint and edge elements shape the language and design of the plaza.

Another Panel member noted both the public realm and public art are critical components to the success of the waterfront and objects of Waterfront Toronto. The Panel member asked the team to provide shadow study and representation for the next review. On the drawings and visualizations, the Panel member noted the context building and landscape thresholds are misrepresented, not showing canopy and glazed surfaces, and the interface issues between private and public realm are difficult to access. The Panel member noted tree planting is inadequate, intention of the public art is unclear, and there is little indication of a gateway experience. The Panel member noted it is essential for Waterfront Toronto's public art team to be part of the conversation and the overall design of the plaza requires a rethink to establish a clear idea and relationship with the context, therefore creating an identity that supports the greater development.

One Panel member felt the configuration of landscape elements are arbitrary, lacking consideration of adjacent relationships, and recommended the team to clearly define the purpose and vision of the space. The Panel member suggested to increase the amount of green surface and planting and integrate the site vision with the greater landscape masterplan by connecting to the LCBO site.

Another Panel member recommended a rethink of the landscape design that can match the scale of the building development as well as the site being a gateway on Yonge.

Referring to the branding of the overall development, the Panel member felt the landscape design does not align with the uniqueness and scale of the project. Consider moving away from the strip motif and explore a singular focal point that can grow and indicate the site as an important beginning point. The Panel member noted the site is an opportunity to create a healthy park, with species that can be directly irrigated by the water in the area. The Panel member recommended the design to be reconsidered at a much larger conceptual scale that is seductive, bold, simple, and can maximize trees in the space.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the opportunity to provide comments and excited for the design of the corner open space.
- The magnitude, scale, and significance of the 1-7 Yonge development is not yet reflected in the open space design vision, consider a new approach that can match the boldness of the building development and enormous population that will visit the area.
- It is important to leverage the great site to create something special and unique to the waterfront – this is an enormous opportunity for the city and must be seized.
- Begin with sun, wind, and noise studies to inform the reconceptualization of the design vision.

- Improve the built-form representation in the 3D perspective renderings to accurately describe the project’s interfaces with adjacent architectural elements, such as canopy, entrances, and glazed elevations.
- Although the public art is not within the area of corner open space, it is important to consider how it can be integrated into the design vision using vistas, sightlines, and other design gestures.
- Consider embracing the Panel’s comments as positive and constructive for the next design iteration.

Landscape

- Continue the double row of street trees all the way up the western edge of the open space, consider shifting the property line if need be.
- Since there is no underground program below the open space, consider further increasing the soil volume to provide bigger trees and more canopy coverage for the area.
- Not enough detail is provided for the adjacent ground floor building context, it is recommended to accurately represent the perimeter elements in plan to clarify the open space’s relationship with buildings, i.e. glazing for views, entrances for access and circulation, etc.
- Recommended the team to rethink and provide a better answer to the fundamental question of what the big idea of the open space is, include responses to the following outstanding concerns: purpose, function, safety, day and night use, volume of users, etc.

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

Robert appreciate all the comments, set a different tone for what we have envisioned and recognize all the different comments and will take another stab at this.

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 Non-Support (Unanimous) for the project.

4.0 Quayside Technical Evaluation Recap – For Information

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1100
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	For Information
<i>Review Round:</i>	-
<i>Location:</i>	Quayside
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	-
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Meg Davis, Chief Development Officer, Waterfront Toronto; Leslie Gash, Senior Vice President, WT; Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager, WT; Sarah Craig, Development Planner, WT;

Aaron Barter, Director, Innovation & Sustainability, WT; Rei Tasaka, Senior Urban Design Manager, WT; Kristina Verner, Vice President, Innovation & Sustainability; Vance Lockton, Digital Governance Manager, WT; Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, WT; Alex Mereu, Transit Project Manager, WT

Delegation: Jed Kilbourn, Development Planning Director, Waterfront Toronto; Sarah Craig, Development Planner, Waterfront Toronto; Kevin Greene, Project Management Director, Waterfront Toronto; Vinaya Mani, Project Coordinator, Waterfront Toronto

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Meg Davis, Chief Development Officer with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting that Waterfront Toronto would like to have an opportunity to share the outcome of the Technical Evaluation Overview and recapped the project's timeline up to this point. The Technical Evaluation was completed in January 2020, the public consultation was held in February and the team is bringing the presentation to the DRP today. Ms. Davis noted the site of the project, and recapped that Quayside is important because it tries to address the key challenges facing Toronto as a city. Ms Davis noted the Board of Directors will decide if there is enough to proceed, and if so, the agreement will have to be finalized. At the same time, the City will begin their consultation process and Sidewalk Labs will return to the DRP with each building's development application for further review. Waterfront Toronto will also return with the design of the public realm scopes for Panel review.

Ms. Davis summarized the format of the Technical Evaluation Overview report which was shared at the public consultation in February 2020, including questions that participants were asked to answer, and introduced Leslie Gash, Senior Vice President of Development with Waterfront Toronto, to continue the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Completed Communities and Inclusivity

Ms. Gash began the presentation by noting the urban challenges that the City is facing, including housing for range of income, house type for families, inclusive neighborhoods, and high-quality open spaces. Ms. Gash noted the public feedback supported affordable housing, social infrastructure space, and noted family units and more public realm design details as concerns to be further considered. Ms. Gash summarized the evaluation results, provided examples of the solutions that Waterfront Toronto supports, those that it supports and proposes to make a one-time investment in, and those that it supports and would advocate for policy or regulatory reform, or would advocate for government support through public investment.

Sustainability, Resiliency, and Climate Positive Development

Aaron Barter, Director of Innovation and Sustainability, began the presentation by noting the objectives of greenhouse gas emissions reduction and enhance climate change resiliency for buildings. Mr. Barter noted the public feedback supported heating and cooling innovations, building automation, public sector investment, and solid

waste management. On the other hand, the public had questions on mass timber construction, its sustainability, and strategies on local food productions. Rei Tasaka, Senior Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, summarized the evaluation results, providing details on examples supported with WT investments such as passive house inspired buildings and pneumatic waste collection. Mass timber construction is a solution to support and advocate for government funding, and digital electricity (DE) & mist-based sprinkler system is an example WT supports and advocates for policy and regulatory reform.

New Mobility

Pina Mallozzi, Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, began the presentation by noting the key urban issues that this pillar tries to address: reduction of vehicle carbon emissions, congestion reduction, affordable mobility options, road safety, and universal accessibility. Ms. Mallozzi noted the public feedback supported the priority delivery of transit, commitment to transit sustainability, and cycling improvements. On the other hand, the public feedback showed concerns for access of the project, safety for priority users, accessibility, and the increasing costs of mobility. Alex Mereu, Transit Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, summarized the evaluation results, providing details on examples supported with WT investments including wayfinding beacons and expansion of active transportation network. Dynamic curbs is an example of a solution to support and advocate for policy and regulatory reform, discounted mobility package is a solution to include and the “raincoats” outdoor comfort system is not supported.

Economic Development, Digital & Partnership Considerations

Kristina Verner, Vice President of Innovation, Sustainability & Prosperity with Waterfront Toronto, began by noting the urban challenge of delivering key economic and social benefits, providing an enduring economic contribution to the City, and establishing an urban innovation cluster. Ms. Verner noted the public feedback supported opportunities for local companies, job creation, community benefits, but questioned the control of digital governance, trust, and the protection of Canadian companies in dealings with Sidewalk Labs. Vance Lockton, Digital Governance Manager with Waterfront Toronto, summarized the evaluation results, providing details on examples supported including internal accountability guidelines and standards of practice, and automated schedulers to reduce energy consumption. Koala standard outdoor mounts for power and network is an example to support and advocate for policy and regulatory reform. Mass timber buildings, modular construction and factory is an example to support and advocate for government funding.

Partnership Considerations

Ms. Verner noted the partnership considerations that have been raised by the public over the course of the last two years. Waterfront Toronto looked at four key areas: organizational capacity and capabilities, partner experience, financial performance, and the public impact of the partnership. WT undertook due diligence in partner selection, and if a decision is made to proceed to next phase, additional round of due diligence will be undertaken before proceeding with implementation agreements. WT is exploring ways to mitigate legal and commercial risks.

Ms. Verner concluded with notes on digital governance and privacy which are foundational in preserving the public good and privacy of the neighborhood should we move forward with the partnership with Sidewalk.

4.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt reassured that Waterfront Toronto has done the due diligence required. Regarding the rejected items, the Panel member asked if any of them are materials that were brought forth previously at DRP. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto will design the public realm and Sidewalk Labs will design the technologies and parts - further discussions on roles and responsibilities will take place.

Another Panel member asked for the status of the Stoa, Queens Quay being the main retail street, and the Panel's previous reservations on Parliament plaza. Mr. Glaisek noted the design specifics will come out in the development plan that is being reviewed by Waterfront Toronto. While the flexible ground floor open space is supported, it will be subject to design review with all other components.

One Panel member asked for DSAP's consensus and their level of satisfaction. Ms. Verner noted DSAP has not completed a consensus report and is still struggling with the level of detail presented by Sidewalk Labs as they are not yet full products or solutions. Ms. Verner noted Waterfront Toronto is pleased with the amount of feedback Sidewalk Labs took to heart and reissuing the digital appendix with revisions – it is an area in their proposal that was intended to be developed later as they did not want to lead with the technology.

Another Panel member felt more comfortable with the project after knowing the details of the technical evaluation led by Waterfront Toronto. The Panel member noted it is important to integrate the design with the last fifteen years of work done by Waterfront Toronto.

One Panel member asked if Sidewalk Labs has provided any preliminary proforma for the project and if Waterfront Toronto is convinced with the proposed. Ms. Davis answered that Sidewalk Labs is a collection of entities with experiences other than development, if the project moves forward, Waterfront Toronto will lead an RFP process to competitively procure a local developer to partner with Sidewalk Labs. Ms. Davis noted this next step was clear from the start of the project. Ms. Davis noted the development partner will have to be very familiar with the City's process and context and each development will return to the Panel in the order the parcels are initiated.

Another Panel member appreciated the evaluation led by Waterfront Toronto's large team and areas of expertise – the due diligence work is highly valued. The Panel member noted the project is ambitious and it is critical that Waterfront Toronto is involved.

Mr. Glaisek noted that before the individual parcels return to the Panel, Sidewalk Labs will bring the revised masterplan back for review. Mr. Glaisek noted timber innovation, at the scale of Sidewalk Labs' development, is instrumental in building a Canadian

industry and help the sector evolve – it needs to be included in the RFP and conceptualized in the buildings.

One Panel member noted it is important to document the leadership demonstrated – in a way teaching the world on navigating the future.

Mr. Glaisek appreciated the encouraging, positive Panel feedback. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto has not considered how to memorialize the process but the team has worked hard on the evaluation, noted that previous public realm issues raised by the Panel helped bring the evaluation to this point, and is happy to hear that there is more comfort on the process and project.

4.4 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was presented For Information.

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.