



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #142
Wednesday, March 24th, 2021**

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
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Kevin Stelzer
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, 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. Queens Quay East Revitalization – Schematic Design
 2. Waterfront East LRT Area 1: Union to Queens Quay Link – Issues Identification
 3. Port Lands Flood Protection Construction Update – For Information
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Jan. 27th, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict for **Waterfront East LRT Area 1: Union to Queens Quay Link** and recused himself from the review.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the Consensus Comments from Jan. 2021 have been circulated to the **200 Queens Quay West** design team and they are working with the City to focus on the public realm design, podium relationship with the Gardiner, and separation distance from WaterClub Condos. The project is anticipating a resubmission this Spring and tentatively scheduled to return to DRP for Schematic Design in June 2021. Mr. Glaisek noted the **Leslie Street Lookout** team is updating the design to address DRP comments, public and stakeholder feedback, and the project is scheduled to return to DRP in April 2021 for Schematic Design.

Waterfront Toronto Project News

Mr. Glaisek noted the Western Channel Dockwall Rehab and Promenade at **Bathurst Quay** has been completed and opened to the public in late Dec. 2020. In addition, the Ireland Park Foundation Building received two major contributions and construction is scheduled to begin in late Spring or early Summer 2021 with Phase 1 anticipated to open in the Fall of 2022. At the Silo Plaza, the detailed design and contract admin work has been awarded to PFS Studio, the team will begin stakeholder advisory committee and plans to return to DRP in June 2021 for the plaza Schematic Design.

Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto has issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for **Quayside**, seeking development teams to shortlist for the subsequent Request for Proposal (RFP). Each proponent will bring a multi-disciplinary team with the vision and qualifications to deliver the Quayside objectives. Mr. Glaisek noted the RFQ and RFP timelines. One Panel member is excited for the design of Parliament Slip as it will be a unique feature on the waterfront. Another member noted the design of Parliament Slip is well timed. Mr. Glaisek noted it is a shift in reorienting the focus to the water given the large number of people using the waterfront and a desire to get close to the water. It is a first step towards a larger marine strategy, transit, and expanded waterfront access. One Panel member asked for the status on the pedestrian bridge to Villiers Island. Mr. Glaisek noted there is no funding associated, the Parliament Slip work will seek to be fully funded, there is confidence that we can deliver the slip then turn attention to the bridge. The Panel member is thrilled that this design will foreshadow the work to come. Mr. Glaisek noted Block 5 hopes to become a public anchor venue with a draw to bring upwards to half million people down to the waterfront with year-round animation, i.e. museum, performing arts centre. With another catalytic building site at Promontory Park, a connection will be inevitable with Quayside, forming a cultural cluster like many other great waterfronts around the world. Mr. Glaisek concluded with a summary of the tentative April DRP agenda.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted Lorna Day, Director of Urban Design with the City of Toronto, is retiring and would like to take this opportunity to recognize her work. The Chair summarized

Mr. Day's tenure and highlighted notable aspects of her thirty-two-year career, especially for bringing an urban design lens into the design of the neighborhood. Mr. Glaisek agreed with the Chair and congratulated Ms. Day's career and contributions with the Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel. Ms. Day thanked the Chair and Mr. Glaisek for their remarks and appreciated her time with the Panel.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Queens Quay East Revitalization – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1050
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8, DTAH
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adriaan Geuze, Director, West 8 Shelley Long, Project Lead, West 8 Brent Raymond, Partner, DTAH
<i>Delegation:</i>	Yvonne Lam, DTAH Liam Mahoney, West 8 Apparao-Das Suma, TTC Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto Jayne Naiman, City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting the Queens Quay East 2A scope area and design and engineering schedule relative to the East Waterfront LRT. Ms. Vangjeli provided a recap of the project background, scope of work, and anticipated project timeline with 30% design of Area 2A by May 2021. Ms. Vangjeli noted the design brief, containing the identity with Queens Quay West with enhancements, and the design team. Particularly, the project will focus on the arrival experience to the water at various slips and improving the clarify at intersections between cyclists and pedestrians. Ms. Vangjeli noted the project is here for Schematic Design and recapped the consensus comments from July 2020's Issues Identification review. Ms. Vangjeli introduced the areas for Panel consideration: continuity of identity and design language for entire Queens Quay as one cohesive

street, enhancing ecological performance, arrival experience at intersections and heads of slips, resilient planting and ecological infrastructure, trail refinements, and accessibility enhancements. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Shelley Long, Project Lead with West 8, and Adriaan Geuze, Director with West 8, to continue the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began the presentation by thanking the Panel for the continuous support for their work for 15 years and noted that the team defines success with creating a cohesive identity for the entire Queens Quay. Ms. Long detailed the five design principles for Queens Quay East Refresh: maintain a continuous identity, improve arrival experience, enhance Martin Goodman Trail, green and climate resilience, and open and accessible.

Ms. Long noted the changing water levels and the team's evidence-based approach in double checking groundwater conditions to improve site resiliency, such as waterfront tree grades and their response to extreme water table. The team is proposing to install shallow groundwater monitoring wells to collect groundwater data to inform grading and groundwater benchmarks. Ms. Long noted the planting species will focus on bio- and genetic diversity, multiple cultivars, and sustainable sourcing of trees. Ms. Long noted the team is exploring space for bike share, other future forms of mobility, heated paving, and wayfinding for blind users. Ms. Long provided a walk-through of the all the key segments of Queens Quay East and slips, beginning with Bay and Yonge, Redpath Factory, Jarvis Arrival, Sherbourne Arrival, Bayside and Quayside, and Parliament Slip.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the water table and drainage pattern research and confirm if the water table at Queens Quay East is actually lower than East Bayfront. Mr. Long noted on page 17 that East Bayfront Promenade is higher than the roadway of Queens Quay East because it is serving as an overland flow route, with $\frac{1}{4}$ of watershed stormwater flowing to the recently built stormwater treatment facility.

Another Panel member asked if the team has incorporated recent findings on the lake level research because it adds another level of uncertainty to the design. Ms. Long noted the research allows the team to conclude that the streetscape must be designed resiliently, 76.2m water level is not for the future – it could be higher or lower as the Great Lakes are under threat of global warming. The team will build in redundancies in the system and design as resiliently as possible.

One Panel asked the team to provide more details on materiality in the design of the bike and pedestrian crossings. Ms. Long noted the grading is the same as Queens Quay West, the area in front of the bike is now in blue asphalt, not red granite.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale of the single bike lane at Parliament and provide perspective views down Yonge Street at the next review. Ms. Long noted separate bike lanes are not in the city's official plan so the team is showing single bike

lanes. Nigel Tahair, Program Manager of Transportation and Planning with the City of Toronto, noted there are concepts for including bike facilities in the underpass at the rail corridor and stemming from that bike facilities both north and south of the corridor - a big factor is the future Ontario Line which will bring traffic into this area.

One Panel member asked why there are vehicles located at the foot of Yonge Street. Ms. Long noted the current proposed location of the streetcar portal requires a new home for the taxis and buses at Westin Hotel since the existing parking entrance has to be closed and the on street buses do not fit into the parking structure. Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, with Waterfront Toronto, noted the project includes the new east driveway for Westin Hotel and will provide parking for the displaced street vehicles. Mr. Tahair noted one of the driveways being moved serve the ferry terminal.

Another Panel member asked who is responsible for the work of the future park at Yonge and clarification on vehicles that access the ferry terminal on the east side of the hotel. Ms. Mallozzi noted the design park is currently unfunded, the property is owned by Waterfront Toronto, and until such time it is likely to remain as largely parking and interim activation uses such as food trucks and water taxis. Ms. Mallozzi noted the driveway provides access to the gated zone of the ferry terminal, there are plans in the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal master plan this location will be moved and evolved.

One Panel member asked if there is a pedestrian connection on the east side of the Westin so one can walk from the sidewalk to the hotel. Ms. Long noted there is no sidewalk, the ambition is to make the entire plaza very pedestrian, so cars drive slowly.

Another Panel member asked if there is an overarching experience of the slip arrivals that is consistent across all the slips? Ms. Long noted the slip experience should be unobstructed, pulling people towards the water with features like the WaveDeck that encourage users to get close to the water. The Panel member asked if the team has studied the energy consumption of heated sidewalk. Ms. Long noted heated sidewalk feasibility studies from Montreal and St. Johns have shown that the installation cost is too high for it to be an energy conscious choice.

One Panel member asked for the impact on the steep ramp that leads up to the current Westin Hotel garage. Mr. Glaisek noted the change in the entrances do not impact the ramping inside the structure. Adrian Geuse, Partner with West 8, noted the new driveway locations will allow the hotel to animate Queens Quay in a new way.

1.3 Panel Comments

One Panel member noted Queens Quay is an urban active street and all the ground floors should have an active character. The Panel member commended the design for showing clarity of the vision and persistence from both Waterfront Toronto and West 8. The Panel member questioned if the high traffic zones have too many trees and appreciated the strategy of testing planting in an environmentally harsh location. The Panel member does not support the design of Yonge Slip, noting the design is fragmented, heavily driven by vehicles, and does not reinforce the imagery in the original competition design of Georgian Bay, cottage country, and rocks. The Panel

member felt this motif should be reintroduced to acknowledge the identity of Toronto regionally, consider other examples in the City such as Yorkville, Sugar Beach, and Trillium Park. The Panel suggested to remove the trees in the slips as they do not reinforce this identity and are at risk due to the high-water table. At Jarvis Slip, the Panel member supported the shape of the WaveDeck but asked the team to ensure no pinch point at the access between the Waterfront Innovation Centre and the WaveDeck. The Panel member appreciated the strategy of raising the ground slightly at Parliament but is not yet convinced with the integration of the three spaces into one big idea - Parliament Street, Silo Park, and the Slip – and a coherent design language with other major elements like Yonge Street and Sugar Beach. The Panel member suggested to ease the tree spacing to encourage views to the lake and improve the reading and resilience of the slips.

Another Panel member appreciated the concerted and clear research, noted the monitoring and testing of the plants are critical investments for green infrastructure, further supporting the notion of leading with landscape and set examples for urban resilient design. The embedded monitoring is critical for the long-term success of the project. The Panel member noted the swings in the water table is a challenge and appreciated the plant species diversity and genome mix. While a deviation from the original design, the proposed selection is appropriate and provides a new way to experience Queens Quay. Visually it reads rich and strongly. The Panel member encouraged the team to use the monitoring data to strongly inform the design, selection, and ensure the landscape will show overall robustness and urban resiliency.

One Panel member commended the research on green infrastructure and public realm resilience, and noted that it should be a standard for the city at large. The Panel member felt the project and city is in good hands despite the extreme fluctuations in lake water level and impact on trees and public realm being real challenges. The Panel member felt the design of the heads of slips can be amplified, consider the shore experience as a continuous, coherent narrative. The rocky outcropping is a potential way to redirect flooding and should be considered as a design language. The Panel member asked the team to consider how the winter season, snow melt and visual experience, can be further ameliorated with the design.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider the streetscape design from the perspective of pedestrians coming down to the waterfront from the rest of the city, i.e. walking from the Gardiner. The Panel member asked the team to consider how the urban ecological elements can improve the city's relationship with animals and water. The Panel member asked the team to consider if there are alternative landscape treatments, in place of bollards, to deter cars from leaving the road at Parliament.

One Panel member thanked the team for a great presentation, appreciated the Queens Quay design, and noted Yonge slip is a challenging area. The Panel member encouraged the team to bring the same level of excitement and exuberance at the Yonge Slip while having to negotiate the traffic and vehicular requirements. The Panel member felt the Jarvis slip design is incomplete, not fully developed, and supported the configuration of the separate bike lane from sidewalk at Redpath to maximize the public realm in the interim condition. The Panel member suggested the team to

reconsider the energy equation of heated bike path provided the elimination of snowplough and salt are great benefits for the city.

Another Panel member appreciated the thoroughness of the design work and noted that urban design can lead to problems in the future, i.e. existing Westin Hotel driveways. The Panel member agreed that the views should be more opened, consider cars and pedestrians coming from the north, and increasing the cone of vision to the lake as you enter Queens Quay.

One Panel member commended the team for a great presentation and noted the design of the foot of Yonge street is not satisfactory. The plaza design is not resolved, consider removing standing vehicles as a temporary fix for managing Westin's vehicles is not good enough for the slip. The Panel member suggested the team to work closely with the Quayside proponent to celebrate the entrance to Queens Quay from the north.

Another Panel member appreciated West 8 for continuing the design and research, supported the proposed location of the streetcar portal as it offers an opportunity to resolve a longstanding problem along Queens Quay. The Panel member noted it is important to develop the park east of Yonge slip to ensure the public realm is well connected to the new park – there is an opportunity to see both designs well-coordinated. The Panel member felt the design of the WaveDeck proposed at the end of Yonge is not enough of a feature to mark the termination of the street and suggested that the new park might be a key piece in unlocking the problem. The Panel member noted it is important to ensure that the city will have a great experience at the foot of Yonge that is deserving of the street termination.

One Panel member commended the project for a great evolution of Queens Quay and the team for creating a legacy that is meant to last. The Panel member appreciated the resilience and precedent setting qualities of this design and noted key sightlines and wayfinding should be well designed and maintained through the entire street. Yonge Slip requires improvements, consider prioritizing pedestrian access and use. The Panel member asked the team to consider all the slips comprehensively across the length of the site and ensure landscape is well integrated.

Another Panel member appreciated the research and considerations on flooding and resiliency.

One Panel member appreciated the design and the team for re-iterating the main principles. The Panel member felt that while the WaveDeck is a unique element, the experience at Jarvis and Yonge can be further amplified and made more bold. At the same time, it is critical the design will ensure mature trees in the future.

Another Panel member asked the team to provide cost analysis benefit for the heated bike path as it is important to understand the energy requirement and impact on reducing services like road salt in the winter. The Panel member asked the team to provide more design details on the York street intersection for the next review.

One Panel member asked the team to study the carbon intensity of the energy consumption for heated sidewalk and consider a partnership with Enwave.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the detailed presentation, West 8's deep knowledge of the project, and continuing the relationship with the design team many years after the competition.
- Appreciated the complete "big picture" presentation of the project from Bay to Cherry, Gardiner to the lake, and the heads of slips.
- Commended the research on the changing lake level, high water table, and planning urban ecological resilience for an unpredictable future, i.e. selection of diverse species of trees.
- Consider further development on the heads of slips. It is important for the heads of slips to have a common design language as special places related to the cottage country and Georgian Bay concept developed in the competition.
- Consider the slips as "windows" to the lake as they are key vista opportunities for pedestrians and ensure the designs strongly support this idea.
- Provide views down the key slips for review.
- Ensure the mandate of "leading with landscape" is at the forefront of the design.
- The winter experience of the street is important, ensure specific design elements such as the heated bike trails are thoroughly considered, and the cost benefits are carefully evaluated.

Yonge Slip

- Yonge is a special street and its termination deserves a great design.
- Supported the general approach of moving the access points of Westin Hotel, however the actual design solution requires redevelopment. Consider prioritizing pedestrians while lessening the presence and devotion to cars, taxis, and buses.
- Important for Yonge Slip to reinforce the original competition concept of bringing the geography and imagery of the cottage country and Georgian Bay down to the waterfront, i.e. elements of rocks and berms. Given the significance of the foot of Yonge Street, an opportunity to commemorate that idea should be embraced.
- The revitalization of the Westin Hotel Queens Quay frontage is critical to the future success of the street. With the moving of the existing Westin Hotel driveways, it is important for Westin Hotel to redesign their Queens Quay façade.
- A design concept for the future park east of the slip should be prioritized to ensure integration with the street design, i.e. connections, landscaping, and pedestrian.

Jarvis Slip

- General support for the design, consider further amplifying the unique experience of the head of slip.

- Reduce the pinch point at the east corner, i.e. extend the dock wall to continue the promenade to widen the access.
- Consider the pedestrian experience from north of the Gardiner down to the lake.

Parliament Slip

- Ensure Parliament street and plaza designs are closely coordinated with the Parliament Slip design.
- Consider a stronger connection between the north plaza, south slip, and park.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted **Full Support** for the project unanimously.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response. Ms. Long thanked the Panel for the feedback and will work to address them with the team.

2.0 Waterfront East LRT Area 1: Union to Queens Quay Link – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1122
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	TTC
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Wood PLC, Strasman Architects, PMA Landscape Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Jim Strasman, Founding Principal, Strasman Architects Richard Shaw, Principal, Strasman Architects Fung Lee, Principal, PMA Landscape Architects
<i>Delegation:</i>	Gurukar Anurita, Wood PLC Richard Shaw, Strasman Architects Vincent Teng, TTC Apparao-Das Suma, TTC Scot Fraser, TTC Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting the Queens Quay East Area 1 site and scope of work. Ms. Vangjeli noted Bay Street is a key north-south connection from the City to the waterfront and showed existing photos from Front to Queens Quay. Mr. Vangjeli noted this work will have to integrate adjacent projects to improve the above grade conditions upon rebuild, including 141 Bay, east Teamway enhancement, 30 Bay, 11 Bay, City cycling improvements, and Lower Yonge Precinct and Street Network design, Queens Quay East Revitalization, and Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and Harbour Square Park Master Plan. Ms. Vangjeli noted the previously designed streetcar portals from West 8, that the project is here for Stage One Issues Identification review, and the areas for Panel consideration: station design, exits to street at Union and Queens Quay, design approach for the portals and canopies as gateways, overall design language continuity with Queens Quay, and opportunities for enhancing Bay Street as a key connection to the waterfront through integration with adjacent developments, planting and materiality. Ms. Vangjeli introduced Vincent Teng, Project Manager with TTC, to continue the introduction. Mr. Teng summarized the project team, scope of the Union and Queens Quay LRT stations, phasing options, and the project engineering design timeline. The project is estimated to commence construction in 2025 and complete in 2030. Mr. Teng then introduced Jim Strasman, Principal of Strasman Architects, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Strasman began by noting the site context and providing a station and tunnel design overview. Mr. Strasman noted the existing Union Station tunnel photos, existing platform level plans, the proposed design, cross section, and renderings of the interior. Similarly, Mr. Strasman noted the aspects of the Queens Quay station, with the proposed ferry terminal connection under Queens Quay. Richard Shaw, Principal with Strasman Architects, provided the updated locations, precedents, and designs for the streetcar portal structures. Mr. Shaw noted the cross sections of the two portals and details of the structure including glass enclosure. Fung Lee, Principal with PMA Landscape Architects, presented the Bay Street public realm redesign, noting the key restoration design investigation locations, current scope, challenges and opportunities tying into adjacent developments including Lower Yonge Public Realm Plan, connections to the PATH network, and Queens Quay Revitalization. Ms. Fung noted the team is interested in exploring public realm, heritage reference, intuitive wayfinding, and sustainability opportunities.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for the minimum width required for pedestrian circulation, specifically at corridor adjacent to the angled foundation wall on page 9. Mr. Strasman responded the dimension is 4m and the columns are required to hold up the east façade of the union station.

Another Panel asked if the construction will be cut and cover, whether timber has been considered as a material for the portal structure, and the resilient approach to high water table and flooding. Mr. Shaw noted timber has been considered for the ribs and tiebacks for the portal structure, the team is also considering fire code and TTC maintenance required for the catenary system. The portal cannot be sealed, the team is planning to elevate the electrical equipment but finding the space in the station is a challenge. Mr. Strasman confirmed the construction on Bay will be cut and cover.

One Panel member asked if the glass canopy is a functional requirement and if the existing portal on the west side of Bay has an enclosure element. The Panel member asked if the team is considering additional locations for the at grade entrances. Mr. Shaw responded that the canopy helps lessen the rain and flood loads, and help capturing rainwater for stormwater management. The team has studied other design options, including the enclosure, and will continue to study based on constructability and functionality.

Another Panel member asked how this public realm plan is coordinated with the Lower Yonge Public Realm work led by WSP and one builds on the other. Pina Mallozzi, Vice President of Design, Waterfront Toronto, responded that the Lower Yonge Public Realm work does not go to Bay Street, it stops at Yonge but there are still great lessons to be shared. Ms. Lee noted the Lower Yonge Public Realm has directly applicable treatments and the team is taking cues for Bay Street, 11 Bay's early review seem to

indicate the City is adopting those as standards. Ms. Lee noted the intersection at Harbour and Bay will adopt a similar strategy as a Promenade Street as part of Lower Yonge Public Realm.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the design standards from TTC that have been incorporated into the design of the two stations, and the rationale behind the levelled platform on p.16 for pedestrian crossing. Mr. Strasman noted the levelled platform provides crossing for pedestrian and maintenance crews between the platforms, forming part of the circulation and providing redundancy for accessibility accommodations. Ms. Strasman noted TTC standards for engineering design have been incorporated but there is nothing for customer experience.

Another Panel member asked if the stations are heated and clarification on the HVAC design – fans or passive activation. The Panel member asked if there are other possible locations for station entry at grade. Mr. Strasman noted the station has two huge fans, there is an opportunity for entrance on Harbour Street and limitations on entrance from buildings, the team is speaking with 11 Bay on this issue. Ms. Shaw added the team is interested in strengthening the connection with 10 and 20 Bay to encourage more robust pedestrian flow, and in turn connect with escalators into 30 Bay. Mr. Strasman noted it is highly desirable to connect into the atrium of 10 and 20 Bay, it depends on Oxford's reception to this idea.

One Panel member asked if there is consideration for bringing daylight into the station entrances and wind tunnel impact on the design of the portals. Mr. Strasman noted cross ventilation at the portal is a benefit for the station and as the stations are located under Bay Street and Queens Quay, there is no room for natural light access.

Another Panel member asked if the construction is phased and if a powerful at grade alternative has been considered for the underground connection to the ferry terminal. The Panel member asked if the Queens Quay streetcar service can be maintained through the construction of this project. Mr. Teng noted phasing closures will consider any possible ongoing uses for the streetcar service. From TTC's perspective, the underground path connection is a comfortable alternate route across the street, however it is not a technical requirement.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member thanked the team for the presentation and appreciated the complexity of the proposition. The Panel member is not convinced that a direct pedestrian connection to the terminal at the proposed location is needed. While the wayfinding within TTC is commended, the Panel member suggests investing the underground pedestrian connection budget towards the at grade connection instead to further improve the design and implementation. Alternatively, if an underground connection is needed, it should be designed as an elevated experience. The Panel member questioned the design intent of the TTC portals and noted the design at Yonge will be especially scrutinized given its location and adjacencies with other developments. The Panel member suggested to rethink the design of the intent of the portals instead of it being a composite of other pieces in the waterfront area. The enclosed design might pose maintenance challenges, consider an exposed timber

design, like West 8's proposal, for simplicity. The Panel member felt the paving and trees are not sufficient in capturing the unique experience of Bay Street down to the waterfront, consider a more ambitious idea.

Another Panel member agreed that Bay Street deserves a bigger idea and noted if TTC is not ready to take on a larger design initiative to re-envision the area, consider relinquishing the responsibility to Waterfront Toronto who has a track record of delivery this type of public realm project. The Panel member noted the station pinch points are difficult to design, consider widening the circulation to allow people to walk around the columns and avoid pinch points for the entire below grade experience. There is considerable amount of pedestrian traffic going northward and while the underground tunnel will address that need by providing a direct connection from Jack Layton Ferry Terminal, its impact on the public realm greatly impedes the at grade pedestrian movement. The Panel member asked the team to consider an alternative location for the enclosure or remove the underground connection and focus on improving the at grade connection. The Panel member does not support the elevated bridge on Bay and noted the team should not consider this as part of the circulation for accessing the station moving forward.

One Panel member asked the team to map out the underground infrastructure along Bay, provide a PUC plan at the next review, carefully consider the location for new landscaping, including trees close to Front Street. The Panel member noted it is important to fully understand the feasibility of the landscape based on the flexibility of underground infrastructure.

Another Panel member suggested to make Bay Street single lane in both directions as a reduced road width will allow for better pedestrian connections, and improve station entrance designs with natural light and shorter tunnelling by usurping some of the surface sidewalk. The Panel member asked the team to provide more information on the station and portal's water resiliency at the next review and consider the use of timber for the portal structure, citing that a timber sky train station in Vancouver requires very little maintenance in 15 years.

One Panel member commented that accessibility is an important consideration, ensure the station can be easily accessed by large groups and families. The Panel member recommended a broader strategy in dealing with Westin Hotel, develop a holistic visitor experience from Union Station to the ferry terminal which is a critical public link from the city to the waterfront, and also for Yonge Street. The Panel member asked the team to convey more of the physical user experience of the entire journey in the drawings at the next review.

Another Panel member supported a bolder re-envisioning of Bay Street and the lane reduction to one in each direction to address the large number of pedestrians. The Panel member noted that Bay is a special street and the city does not have to treat all streets equally.

One Panel member recommended the team to invest tree canopy, ensure there is proper space and infrastructure provided for proper tree health.

Another Panel member asked the team to clarify and provide more information on the user experience at the next DRP presentation, including sightlines, natural light access, passenger safety, and the entire continuous public realm experience. The Panel member recommended the team to develop a list of design priorities with precedents and illustrate your goals in-situ.

One Panel member noted that it is important to consider the public realm experience as extending all the way to the station entrances.

Another Panel member noted it is much more useful to provide direct entrances into the station from the street than connecting with office atriums and having people double back. The Panel member asked the team to consider how this project will contribute to the City's green standards and net-zero objectives. Given the station is unheated, the project should strive for net-zero. Consider the embodied carbon in construction material, waste management, and employing innovative strategies such as low carbon concrete and tapping into Enwave's geothermal loops. The Panel member suggested the team to strive for higher level sustainable objects, beyond net-zero to energy positive.

One Panel member recommended the team to seriously consider the use of low carbon concrete in the construction and provide a response at the next review.

Another Panel member noted the project is a once in a hundred year opportunity to improve transit and public realm in the area, all efforts should be made to make it great. The Panel member is concerned with the form, reflectivity, and maintenance of the streetcar portals, and recommended including the Gardiner structure in all drawings to demonstrate an understanding both as a threshold and barrier.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the complexity of the project and the coordinating efforts, at the same time this is a once in a lifetime opportunity for Toronto – it is important for the team to be bold and strive for big ideas.
- Important to identify and prioritize the user experience of the design, encouraged to articulate qualitative aspects of the design such as atmosphere, quality of experience, spatial sequences, materiality - beyond the functional requirements of the station – at the return review.
- Consider the design of the public realm as one continuous experience as it extends from the surface to the underground.

Station Design

- Reconsider the Queens Quay pedestrian connection to the Ferry Terminal. Not supportive of the proposed design as it is not a great experience and impedes at grade public realm. With the enormous traffic going both ways, the current proposed pedestrian elevator/stair enclosure structure at the Ferry Terminal constrains the at grade experience. Consider the alternative of supporting a well-integrated, at grade connection.

- Recommended to avoid pinch points by maximizing circulation and platform widths.
- The Panel does not support the station's connection to the PATH network through the above grade bridge on Bay.
- The portal designs require further development, consider the following:
 - The glass canopy helps to offset rain from the portal to adjacent landscape, but the reflectivity and cleaning are concerns. Consider the identity of an opened, transparent gateway, and explore an alternative with no glass enclosure.
 - The portal will frame the important future Yonge Slip public realm. It is important to consider this context in developing a strong identity for the portal designs.
 - Consider the feasibility and design of an exposed timber structure as it may require less maintenance over time and lower the embodied carbon of the project.

Bay Street

- Given the “cut and cover” work required, the project is a once in a hundred-year opportunity for a cohesive re-envisioning of the entire Bay Street. Consider developing a master plan strategy to provide an opportunity to capture all modes of traffic in the area, and connect both existing and future development pieces in a bold design scheme.
- Consider holding a design competition to create a unique vision for Bay Street. With their public realm design experience, Waterfront Toronto can take on this responsibility.
- Consider permanently reducing Bay to one lane in each direction. The road reduction will provide widened sidewalk for accommodating at-grade traffic at the intersections and clearance for improved station access experiences, i.e. naturally lit station access points. A permanent reconfiguration to a single lane in each direction on Yonge Street from Gerrard to Queen was recently adopted by City Council.
- Map the infrastructure below grade to ensure landscaping areas are feasible and maximize the improvement to the public realm.
- Provide cross sections of Bay Street at the next review, along the entire length of Bay Street, to demonstrate how the design ties the public realm together.
- Provide wayfinding and signage strategies at the next review.

Sustainability

- This is an opportunity for an infrastructure project to set precedent for sustainability performance, consider strategies of reducing overall embodied carbon of the project.
- Consider renewable energy opportunities.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

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

Mr. Strasman thanked the Panel for the comments, and endorsed comments including natural light, reduction of Bay Street, alternative for the underground connection to Queens Quay, and the push for an energy efficient design working in concert with TTC. Mr. Shaw appreciated the Panel's comments on the public realm being continuous.

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection Construction Update – For Information

Project ID #: 1123
Project Type: Public Realm
Review Stage: For Information
Review Round: -
Location: Port Lands
Proponent: Waterfront Toronto
Architect/ Designer: -
Presenter(s): David Kusturin, Chief Project Officer, Waterfront Toronto
Don Forbes, Project Director, Soil Remediation and Earthworks, Waterfront Toronto
Delegation: Mira Shenker, Senior Manager, Communications and Public Engagement, Waterfront Toronto

3.1 Project Presentation

Don Forbes, Project Director, Soil Remediation and Earthworks, with Waterfront, began the presentation by noting the key design details: cut off walls, water management, horizontal RMIM, soil remediation, and ground improvements. Mr. Forbes detailed the various cut off wall solutions, water management systems, and horizontal risk management measures. Mr. Forbes noted the team is interested in reusing as much soil as possible, and detailed soil remediation strategies. Finally, Mr. Forbes detailed the ground improvement solutions from surcharging, rigid inclusions, lightweight fill, to the use of geogrid.

3.2 Panel Question

One Panel member asked if Waterfront Toronto has considered a making-of documentary for the construction. Mira Shenker, Senior Manager, Communications and Public Engagement with Waterfront Toronto, noted the team has hired a photographer to document the work and will consider more video-oriented forms of documentation. The Panel member noted given it is a public investment, there is an obligation to share and people will have a much stronger understanding if there is a visual record of how it came to be.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the timing of taking out the plugs. Mr. Forbes noted pressures on both sides have to be equalized before releasing the plug so it will not be a great rush of water damaging the riverbed and landscapes. The team will ensure the planting is established and growing for 12-months before plugs are pulled.

One Panel member asked for the engineering team. Mr. Forbes noted it is Geosyntec, WSP, and MVVA.

David Kusturin, Chief Project Officer with Waterfront Toronto, noted it is important to show the construction technical details because it is a large portion of the actual work involved in the project. The team is happy to present updates in the future.

Another Panel member noted seeing the river in progress is very special.

One Panel member noted a documentary film is a great idea, for example it can be something like “Manufactured Landscape” but showing the construction in a more positive light instead of the cataclysmic tone of the original film.

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.