



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #100
Wednesday, April 19, 2016**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Betsy Williamson

Regrets

Peter Busby
Chris Reed
Brigitte Shim

Recording Secretaries:

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka
Netami Stewart

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the March 8 meeting. One of the Panel members noted that the Consensus Comments for Hanlan Boat Club did not mention the need to retain an architect to design the building and asked to revise the minutes. The minutes were then adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts were declared.

Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, formally introduced Paul Bedford as the new Chair of the Waterfront Design Review Panel.

The Chair then invited Mr. Glaisek to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek explained that Waterfront Toronto released a Request for Proposals on March 17, aimed at selecting an innovation and funding partner for Quayside that will

join Waterfront Toronto in advancing ambitious, high-level objectives, including sustainability, resiliency and urban innovation, complete communities, economic development and prosperity, and partnership and investment. Mr. Fleissig noted that Quayside will provide a significant opportunity to generate prosperity by continuing to build the emerging technology-based economic hubs on the waterfront, including employers and job creators in the green technology, film and television production, digital media and information technology sectors. Mr. Fleissig noted that when the time comes to review this project at the Design Review Panel, it will require a new level of integration and involvement from the Panel.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the Call for New Members which was issued on March 1, 2017. The Call for New Members sought seven positions, including an architect, a landscape architect, an urban designer, an innovation strategist, two engineers, and a planner. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Call for New Members closed on March 31, 2017, receiving a total of 36 applications. A selection will be made by the Selection Committee near the end of May.

Mr. Glaisek updated the Panel on the Hanlan Boat Club which was last presented to the Design Review Panel in March. Mr. Glaisek noted that the team has retained Lieux Architects Ltd. to design the building. The project will be returning in June for Schematic Design.

One Panel member asked about the trees on Queens Quay. Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto explained that the team is watching them very closely. In the fall, a site walk was held to tag the trees that require replanting. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the tagged trees will be replanted in the spring and the remainder of the tree will be re-evaluated this summer.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Port Lands Framework Plan

ID#: 1069

Project Type: Framework Plan

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: N/A

Review Stage: N/A

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto), Amanda Santo (Waterfront Toronto)

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Amanda Santo, Development Director with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the Framework Plan was previously presented to the Panel in January, 2016. Ms. Santo provided an overview of the context by noting a couple of planning initiatives underway to the north, including the Keating Channel Precinct Plan, East Harbour, South of Eastern, the Gardiner East, Waterfront Transit Reset, and Smart Track Regional Express Rail. Ms. Santo also reviewed the site ownership which

consists primarily of municipally owned land and some privately owned land. Cassidy Ritz, Project Manager with the City of Toronto, explained that the purpose of this plan is to provide a high-level, long term planning framework to guide urban revitalization and redevelopment. This plan will provide an outline of the key city-building directions required to unlock and realize the Port Lands interim and full potential. Ms. Ritz explained that the feedback received from the consultations held in November 2015, comments from the January Design Review Panel meeting, and the Expert Review Panel have been incorporated into the revised Framework Plan.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Santo explained that the plan has one vision that includes twelve objectives, six essential elements and seven transformational moves. The overall vision of the project is to transform the Port Lands into a number of new, vibrant districts with unique and memorable local identities and character, offering diverse opportunities for Torontonians to live, work and play that promote a low-carbon future, social interaction, cultural enrichment, ecological health and a prosperous local economy. The twelve objectives include diverse land use and building typology, public realm, connections to the city, biodiversity, and inclusivity. Ms. Santo explained that there are seven transformational moves intended to unlock the potential of the Port Lands, including the river and greenway, six signature streets, the harbour, the blue-green park network, seven destinations, unique and memorable places, and resilient urban structure. Ms. Ritz explained that the preferred alignment for Broadview has been finalized. This new alignment ensures developable blocks, connects to Unilever and other destinations, and takes advantage of views and destinations. Ms. Ritz explained the three different cores of the Port Lands including the Urban Core, the Urban Fringe and the Outer Edge. The Urban Core will have the greatest intensity and mix of uses in a dense, compact form. The Urban Fringe will consist of multi-storeyed buildings on key frontages that are flexible and adaptable to enable conversion to a wide range of future uses, and capable of attracting creative talent to the Port Lands. The Outer Edge will consist of larger, interim or adaptable industrial type structures and active port uses with an open landscaped character, surrounded by natural areas, beaches, wildlife and water features. Ms. Ritz noted that sustainability is embedded throughout the plan, exploring Passive Design, and other optimal sources for low carbon energy for the Port Lands.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel members raised concerns about the development application at 309 Cherry Street and asked what the timing looks like on getting this plan adopted by Council. Ms. Ritz responded that the Official Plan has been drafted and released to stakeholders. The plan contains a lot of built form detail which will have some pull at the Ontario Municipal Board. Ms. Ritz noted that they will be reporting to Council by the end of this year.

One Panel member asked what the projected density will be. Ms. Ritz replied that Villiers Island will have a Floor Space Index (FSI) of 5 times coverage and the rest of the Port Lands will range from 5–11 FSI.

Another Panel member asked whether the Precinct Plan will look at the streets, particularly the smaller scale fabric. Ms. Ritz replied yes. The Panel member asked if there was a high level way to incorporate this into the plan. Ms. Ritz replied that one of the policies is making sure that they are creating visual connections and providing guidance on the local street network. Ms. Ritz explained that the plan will enable blocks to have a good upfront urban structure but also enough flexibility to be refined at the Precinct Plan level.

One Panel member asked whether the land use direction maps will be Official Plan designations or for illustration purposes. Ms. Santo replied that it is a designated Regeneration Area but we will be prescribing some direction based on the maps.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the notion of diversity is key but it is also important to ensure flexibility. The Panel member noted that a dedicated event space for large festivals would be a good way to draw people to the area. The Panel member also felt that buildings in Toronto look the same which is why a more diverse style of architecture and built form needs to be introduced into this space.

Another Panel member agreed with the sameness and predictability of the previous comment but disagreed that Toronto is all the same. The Panel member noted that some cities have a sameness that gives it the gravitas of being, such as Paris.

One Panel member commended the team for the very clear and succinct presentation. The Panel member agreed with the previous comment that we don't want to make the Port Lands look completely different and felt that there was a need to ensure some continuity throughout. The Panel member noted that smaller scale and finer grain fabric is difficult to break down, however, it shouldn't be left out of the plan. The Panel member asked how to counteract the homogeneous potential to avoid the area looking like all other planned areas in Toronto.

Another Panel member congratulated the team on the comprehensive presentation. The Panel member cautioned relying on retail to animate the streets as future generations will have a whole new way of shopping than we do now.

Mr. Fleissig noted that there is so much change with building technologies and we need to allow for the possibility of things to change and evolve over time.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- There needs to be a good balance between powerful streets and finer grained streets
- Ensure that the streets, blocks and open spaces are scaled correctly
- It is critical that this plan provides sufficient direction but also allows for the diversity and flexibility of things to evolve over time

- Think about dedicating a large open space for festivals and other events that draw large crowds
- The built form identity needs to have a good balance between sameness and differentiation

1.6 Vote of Support/Non Support

This project did not require a vote, however, the Panel did unanimously support the project.

2.0 Villiers Island Precinct Plan

ID#: 1072

Project Type: Precinct Plan

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Urban Strategies Inc.

Review Stage: N/A

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies Inc.

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Ms. Santo introduced the project by noting that the Precinct Plan was previously reviewed by the Panel in December 2015. Ms. Santo explained that the Villiers Island Precinct Plan study area is within the context of the Port Lands Framework Plan study area. Ms. Santo reviewed feedback received from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, the Landowners Advisory Committee and Public Feedback which suggested refinements such as, enhanced connections from the island to the rest of the Port Lands, sufficient population density and distribution of uses, diverse built form and massing, and a need to push sustainability. The feedback received from the Panel at the December 2015 meeting, included more variation in built form and massing, creating a sense of place, and sustainability. Ms. Santo explained that 309 Cherry Street has submitted a rezoning application for the northern half of the site for a 26-storey tower on Villiers and a 52-storey tower on the southern half of the site on Old Cherry Street. Ms. Santo explained that some of the refinements made to the Precinct Plan include integrating directions from the Port Lands Framework Plan, revised built form approach and tower locations, with considerations for sun, shadow, wind, views, and passive solar gain, greater emphasis on Villiers Street and Keating Promenade as the central “living room” and, focus of climate positive precinct plan design. Ms. Santo introduced Melanie Hare, Partner at Urban Strategies Inc. to present the Precinct Plan.

2.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Hare explained that in this transformation we have to be responsive to the scale and form of creating a distinct Island in the Port Lands. More detailed design and refinements have been made to the plan in response to community comments and from the previous Design Review Panel meeting. Ms. Hare noted that this is an island with four water’s edges. This context helped inform and shape the public realm. Ms. Hare explained that the Keating Promenade and Villiers Street are to be thought of as the Island’s “living room”. The promenade is seen as a seam between Villiers Island and the Keating Precinct to the north. Ms. Hare noted that the Island has a mix of low

and mid-rise buildings with the towers moved to the north of the site. The vertical and horizontal expression of the buildings are very important. Ms. Hare also explained that optimization of sunlight on key areas of the public realm was maximized.

Ms. Hare invited Mr. Glaisek to present the sustainability portion of the presentation. Mr. Glaisek noted that sustainability is embedded throughout the plan. Mr. Glaisek explained that the carbon modelling tool showed that we need to reduce carbon by 23% which is when Waterfront Toronto retained Sustainability Solutions Group to undertake a sustainability audit. The results of the audits showed that solar benefits would be better captured by moving the tall towers to the north. Mr. Glaisek noted that if we are able to build to Passive House standards, we can reduce carbon by 7,700 CO₂. Since the precinct will be surrounded by water, more solar energy can be captured. Mr. Glaisek explained that if we are able to implement these elements into the precinct plan, Villiers Island could be carbon positive.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if we can enforce the 309 Cherry Street application to apply Passive House standards to their buildings. Ms. Ritz replied that we do not have any legislative ability to hold them to this standard, but they would have to contribute to Passive Design.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the solar heat gain. Mr. Glaisek replied that the energy modelling was done using 60%-70% glazing. Mr. Glaisek noted that heating costs are much more expensive than cooling costs for residential buildings.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the meaning of catalytic use. Ms. Hare explained that a catalytic use is meant to be something distinctive, undefined but thought of as iconic in architecture and design, a distinct activator and animator.

Another Panel member asked about the scale of Villiers Island relative to other neighbourhoods in Toronto. Ms. Hare replied that it would be approximately double the size of the Distillery District.

One Panel member asked if there was any consideration given to change the block size as you get closer to the park. Ms. Hare replied that over 20 versions of streets and blocks layouts were studied and there is a need to keep the critical mass with the mid-rise framework.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member brought up a study done by architects on the material used on building facades having a huge impact on heating during different seasons. The Panel member also noted that the Distillery District has done a great job integrating new

buildings with the existing heritage buildings. The Panel member felt that the finer grain nature of the block plan needs to be implemented.

Another Panel member felt that the pedestrian mid-block connections need to be institutionalized in the plan. When views are terminated by built form, you get an interesting spatial situation.

One Panel member asked if any thought was given to make finer grain north south streets noting a couple of areas where the blocks could be divided by a pedestrian mews.

Another Panel member felt that there is a need to ensure that this neighbourhood doesn't resemble any other neighbourhoods in Toronto. The Panel member also raised concern over the designated laneways turning into service lanes.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- There needs to be finer grain elements incorporated in to the plan by clearly setting mid-block pedestrian connections and promenades
- There is a high importance on the Keating Promenade piece of the Precinct Plan
- Ensure that this Precinct Plan is unique and doesn't resemble any other neighbourhoods in Toronto
- Consider putting more emphasis on the north-south streets rather than Centre Street

2.6 Vote of Support/Non Support

This project did not require a vote, however, the Panel did unanimously support the project.

3.0 Cherry Street Lakefilling and Design

ID#: 1078

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MVVA

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Michael Van Valkenburgh (MVVA), Herb Sweeney (MVVA)

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting this is the project's second time presenting to the Design Review Panel. Ms. Mallozzi reviewed the evolution of MVVA's design competition plan from 2007 to the most recent refined design. Ms. Mallozzi also explained the announcement of \$65 million from the government for the Cherry Street Stormwater and Lakefilling (CSLF) project. Ms. Mallozzi reviewed the scope of work and project schedule indicating that the CSLF must be complete by 2019 due to conditions of funding. Ms. Mallozzi provided an overview of the MT35 building which is a listed on the City of Toronto

Heritage Register. Ms. Mallozzi explained that City Staff would like to see the heritage attributes of the building preserved. It has been agreed that the southernmost third of the building must be removed in order to accommodate the floodplain of the new Mouth of the Don River. Ms. Mallozzi explained that MVVA has been asked to review conceptual options for integrating the building into the future Park. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the building and its preservation within the Port Lands context will be re-visited during detailed design of Promontory Park South, which is included in the Port Lands Flood Protection scope. Ms. Mallozzi raised a number of issues for the Panel to consider, including the appropriateness of the park conceptual design, the relationship of the park to adjacent streets and buildings, the size and scale of the proposed park infrastructure (north-south pedestrian bridge) and topography, the relationship between the proposed fish habitat compensation and park programming, the quality and variation of the edge condition, and integration of the MT35 building and proposed program. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Michael Van Valkenburgh, President and CEO of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, and Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates to present the project.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began the presentation with a description of the CSLF Project Area, including some existing site conditions images and diagrams indicating the context of the project within nearby planning and development initiatives. Mr. Sweeney noted that the design team has expanded their design study area to include conceptual integration designs outside the limits of work for the CSLF.

Mr. Sweeney went on to describe the habitat and shoreline treatment design. He described how habitat metrics and values are in large part driving the design of the water interface. Mr. Sweeney described two coves within the project area. The North Habitat cove will include a canoe and kayak launch, shallow habitat, and will provide access to the water for park users.

The West Cove will include a wave break to shelter the habitat within the cove from waves & wind. Carp gates integrated below two pedestrian bridges will support hydraulic connectivity of the cove with the lake while preventing the habitat from being degraded by invasive fish species. North of the west cove will be a harbor overlook connected to a large event lawn by a park stair.

Michael Van Valkenburgh then presented the expanded design study scope, showing a conceptual design of how Promontory Park North and South could be integrated and how Marine Terminal 35 could be selectively repurposed. Mr. Van Valkenburgh also stated that although they design of the coves is largely driven by ecological requirements, they add value to the landscape experience. Humans enjoy the experience of other species in their midst.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh explained that the design of Promontory Park North was designed to celebrate the views of the City and the inner harbor and how the southern park included more active program, including an ice skating rink and architectural opportunities within MT35. A pedestrian bridge connects high promontories on either

side of the park and frames the view from Centre Street, in Villiers Island. Mr. Van Valkenburgh presented a walk-through of views to and from the park.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the stone used is Brooklyn Bridge Park was armour stone. Mr. Sweeney replied that armouring stone was not used for this project. Regular quarried stone was used.

Another panel member then asked whether there were opportunities for year-round outdoor use and shelter from weather, winds in the MT 35 building. Mr. Van Valkenburgh answered that there are certainly options for shelter provided by the selective reuse of MT35. The building's reuse can offer microclimates that can be comfortable and special.

One Panel member asked whether there would be washrooms or a building within Promontory Park. Ms. Mallozzi responded that the current project will only construct the shoreline and aquatic habitat of Promontory Park North. She stated that the south half of Promontory Park is within the budget of the Port Lands Flood Protection Project and that Waterfront Toronto anticipates advancing detail design for the south half this year. Mr. Van Valkenburgh stated that the goal was to incorporate washrooms into winterized buildings within the park. Ms. Mallozzi added that the land will be City of Toronto Parks.

Another Panel member asked what type of feedback was received from Heritage Preservation Services (HPS) at the City of Toronto. Mr. Sweeney replied that the meeting was positive and that more options were shown to HPS than were discussed here. Ms. Mallozzi stated that HPS asked that a portion of the building be retained as an enclosed indoor space.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member commented that the interface between the curved path design and the orthogonal grid of the buildings and city grid would require special design attention. The panel member asked whether there was a tradition of pathmaking/landscape history that could be referenced in the design. Mr. Van Valkenburgh agreed that this is a difficult interface and referenced Cadman Plaza in New York. He suggested that plant materials, especially rows of trees are a valuable tool in addressing this transition.

Another Panel member noted that the difference at Evergreen Brickworks between the two repurposed industrial buildings was in the possibilities inherent in a roofed outdoor space and one without a roof. Mr. Van Valkenburgh agreed that a roofed outdoor space was delightful, and he would like to include the possibility of being dry outside in a rain event. He stated that ideally the skating path could be fit behind a windbreak, otherwise skating can be very cold.

One Panel member noted that the two hills proposed in the design are a significant design intervention. One would either be on the city or the water side of the hills, very rarely both together. The Panel member requested that future iterations integrate the two sides.

Chris Glaisek requested that the Panel provide input into the pedestrian bridge between the two high points, one in the north park and the other in the south.

One Panel member remarked that the bridge was unnecessary, while another commented that it provides connection between the two parks. Mr. Sweeney remarked that the bridge was designed as a cycling flyover that provides a connection within the cycling network.

Another Panel member congratulated the designers in the clarity of their walkthrough study and the results of the study.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall a strong and clear concept
- MT35 building preservation is supported – further explore how vegetation dissolves into the structure
- Views back to the City, Lake and the neighbourhood are all critical – refine how the linear and curved features of the park elements will enhance the views
- Think about how the cove meets the wall including size, placement, integration of soft landscape with hard stone armour
- Bridge element to be studied before making a conclusion on whether it is necessary
- Think about the integration of the two sides of the hill: the water side and the neighbourhood side

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.

4.0 Lower Yonge Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

ID#: 1081

Project Type: Roads and Public Realm

Location: Lower Yonge

Proponent: City of Toronto/Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MMM Group

Review Stage: N/A

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Bob Koziol, MMM Group

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Ms. Santo introduced the project by providing context of the Lower Yonge area. Ms. Santo noted that the Precinct Plan Study Area is approximately 22 acres and the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study area is approximately 30 acres. Ms.

Santo explained that Lower Yonge is part of a larger revitalization effort currently underway. The Lower Yonge Precinct Plan was unanimously endorsed by City Council in June 2016 and the accompanying Official Plan Amendment was also approved. Ms. Santo noted some of the key components of complete streets which include, providing a network of continuous sidewalks, visible intuitive cycling facilities, design for growth, sustainable transportation, and safety. Ms. Santo raised a number of areas for the Panel to consider, including balance between cars, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit within the cross section and public realm plan, plantings and furnishings, consistency with larger waterfront public realm vision and alignment of Harbour Street. Ms. Santo introduced Bob Koziol, Partner at MMM Group to give the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Koziol explained that the transportation modelling is based on the City of Toronto's Paramics downtown model. Mr. Koziol noted that four different scenarios are being tested, including Transportation Master Plan's recommended network, preliminary preferred network without the Cooper Street Tunnel, preliminary preferred network with tunnel, and phasing analysis for the preliminary preferred network. Mr. Koziol noted that the modelling results have informed the development of alternatives for each road segment. Mr. Koziol explained that this study is being carried out according to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process, which is an approved assessment approach for municipal infrastructure projects under the provincial Environmental Assessment Act. Mr. Koziol walked the Panel through the key initiatives of the plan which include, converting Harbour Street to two-way operations east of York Street, eliminating the eastbound Bay Street on-ramp from the Gardiner Expressway, shortening the eastbound Lower Jarvis off-ramp from the Gardiner Expressway, eliminating the Harbour Street S-curve at Yonge Street, extend Harbour Street to Lower Jarvis Street, extend Cooper Street to Church Street, and construct a new north-south street between Cooper Street and Lower Jarvis Street. Mr. Koziol explained that the team has developed and chosen the preferred cross sections after evaluating each alternative using the criteria from the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Koziol walked the Panel through the preferred street cross sections. Mr. Koziol noted that the team is currently working to refine a draft Public Realm Plan based on this work.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what analysis was done related to the Cooper Street Tunnel. Mr. Koziol replied that a full traffic analysis was done and justifications were studied. The tunnel is not necessary to accommodate the connections required by the precinct's generated traffic. The tunnel would be a nice-to-have rather than a need-to-have, but it would connect the area to the city.

Another Panel member asked if the cross section recommendations are related to the proposed buildings to date, or if they are working independently of the development proposals. Mr. Koziol replied that the development applications from Pinnacle and Menkes blocks are being reviewed and the team is looking at the implication of the proposed plans.

Another Panel member asked whether there was lay-by parking. Mr. Koziol replied that the team is looking at a TTC bus lay-by on Freeland Street on the park side, and taxi stands on the west side. The rest of the precinct does not have much lay-by parking.

Another Panel member asked what the likelihood of the tunnel actually happening is. Waterfront Toronto noted that Toronto Parking Authority and Toronto Community Housing Corporation who currently have their parking structure and building at the end of Church Street will have to come up with a redevelopment application first. There is however interest from both parties to redevelop this block. The EA team feels strongly about the need for the connection north-south to the lake.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

A Panel member supported the Cooper Street tunnel that is part of the EA so that it can happen in the future. If it is not included in the plan, it will likely not happen.

Another Panel member noted that this is will be a very dense area. The connectivity to the waterfront is critical, and how pedestrians will move through this area must be carefully studied.

Another Panel member noted that what is shown in the typical cross sections are not necessarily continuous. For example, the Freeland Street cross sections show trees on both sides while the public realm plan shows minimal areas for trees. As developers create driveways for loading and parking, these street elements will likely be further eroded. The Panel member suggested that interruptions to the public realm should be minimized as much as possible and the team should coordinate with the proposed development so that the trees are located in the right locations without having the need to be removed.

Another Panel member noted that all infrastructure and servicing must be coordinated.

Another Panel member asked whether there will be time to re-evaluate locations where the trees will flourish and where they won't. While there is a typical notion of the ideal symmetry for streets, the Panel member recommended looking at a plan that reflects the actual growth requirements of the trees rather than simply applying street sections to the plan that does not reflect microclimates.

Another Panel member noted that in the illustrative renderings, Harbour Street seems to have the same weight as Yonge Street.

Another Panel member noted that the renderings currently seem to be driven by circulation.

It was noted that the mandate of Waterfront Toronto is continuity of the public realm. While there will be areas where street trees are not achievable, we are pushing to design for tree planting wherever possible.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall strong support for the Cooper Street tunnel extension to bring Church Street down to the waterfront
- The EA provides an improvement to the street network to support the future development
- Further exploration of the planting strategy in order to clarify the placement of trees (north-south or east-west streets) that will maximize the opportunity for street trees within the precinct
- Lay-by or on-street parking could be useful as a buffer between vehicles and pedestrian realm

4.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.