



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #128
Wednesday, Oct. 23rd, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Outer Harbour Rowing Facility – Issues Identification
 2. East Bayfront Boardwalk & In-water Pipe – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the July 24th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. The Chair noted there was no conflict of interest with today's projects.

The Chair asked Waterfront Toronto to provide an update briefing on the Ontario Line and impact to West Don Lands at the next meeting. The Chair asked to provide updated photos of the Hanlan boat club at the next meeting.

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 **West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7** completed their first Site Plan Application submission. Waterfront Toronto (WT) is in the process of providing comments and the design team is expected to return for Detailed Design review. Mr. Glaisek noted DRP consensus comments have been delivered to the **350 Queens Quay** team, and the project is not expected to return given the Panel voted Full-Support at the last review stage and it is a Stream 1 review. WT is in discussions with the Proponent on next steps for the Peter Street Basin improvements.

DRP consensus comments have been delivered to the **Port Lands Flood Protection Roads** team. Mr. Glaisek noted the design team is working to improve mid-block crossings, park entrances, and complete the remaining Detailed Design work. The project is expected to return in February of 2020 for Detailed Design review. For **162 Queens Quay East**, Mr. Glaisek noted the design team is refining the canopy design in response to Panel comments, developing the loading bay art work, and as a Stream 1 project with major issues addressed, the City is not planning to refer the project back for a fourth review.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek noted that **Aitken Place Park** was unofficially opened in early October 2019. The park's future public art piece, Light Keeper, is currently in fabrication and installation is expected to occur in November.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the construction progress for the **West Don Lands Stormwater Facility** is at 44%, the design team is considering options for improving the concrete finish- the sandblasting sample is expected to take place after scaffolding for roof formwork is removed. The building is targeting July 2020 to complete construction and October 2020 for operation. Mr. Glaisek noted **Bayside Aquabella** in construction, and concrete top off is targeted for April 2020.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the first series of documentation photos for **Port lands Flood Protection** have been received, and explained that multiple photo series will focus on various facets of the work: construction staff, textures, close-ups, and documentary style footage. WT is working on putting them on information websites, and blogs, and considering other public exhibition opportunities such as the Contact photography festival and Ryerson Image Centre. Mr. Glaisek presented a small curated selection of photos and noted that WT has produce a video, called **Port Lands 2024**, to help the public understand the work starring Waterfront Toronto's very own staff. One Panel member asked Waterfront Toronto to provide access to the photos for academic research.

Mr. Glaisek then noted the upcoming tentative DRP agenda for November 2019.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the public session.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Outer Harbour Rowing Facility – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1110
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Outer Harbour Marina
<i>Proponent:</i>	Ports Toronto and Upper Canada College
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	SvN Architects and Planners, VJAA
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Anthony Greenberg, Associate, SvN; Vincent James, Principal, VJAA
<i>Delegation:</i>	Chris Sawicki, Ports Toronto; Patti MacNicol, Upper Canada College; George Pantazis, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting that the project is a new 10,700sf single storey rowing facility for Upper Canada College and is located at the Outer Harbour Marina owned by Ports Toronto. The use of the site was approved at the Committee of Adjustment earlier this year and Ports Toronto entered a voluntary Site Plan Approval process with the City of Toronto. Waterfront Toronto provided a letter to the Committee in support of the project as part of the Minor Variance application and requested the project to attend the WDRP when the design proceeded. Mr. Lai noted the proponent is anticipating submission of their first Site Plan Application by the end of the year and construction is to start in late spring or summer of 2020.

Mr. Lai noted SvN Architects and Planners are the planning agents, and the design of the facility is being led by VJAA architects from Minneapolis with RDHA Architects in Toronto. Mr. Lai highlighted the site context of the Outer Harbour Marina, site ownership, the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context, the Port Lands Planning Framework policy context, and the proposed Lake Ontario Park (LOP) Master Plan. A boat club at this site was contemplated in the LOP Master Plan and the Hanlan Boat Club was originally proposed, but in the end stayed at their current location. Mr. Lai noted the Hanlan Boat Club was presented at the DRP three times in 2017, receiving Full Support in Oct. 2017 for Detailed Design. Mr. Lai recapped the key Panel considerations from the Hanlan Boat Club reviews and noted the Outer Harbour Rowing Facility would return to DRP for Schematic Design after their SPA submission.

Mr. Lai introduced George Pantazis, Community Planner with City of Toronto, to provide an update on the Zoning and City SPA review. Mr. Pantazis noted while the site is zoned “Gr”, which permits conservation and bathing station uses, the remainder of the

Outer Harbour is zoned “Gm”, permitting recreational boating, marina and related uses. Mr. Pantazis noted through Site Plan Application the City will review areas including the public realm, building location, design, materials, circulation, stormwater management, functional servicing, environmental impacts and adherence to TGS. Mr. Lai concluded by noting areas for Panel consideration: siting of the building, building massing and orientation, relationship with water and landscape, public realm strategy, and sustainability targets and features. Mr. Lai then introduced Anthony Greenberg, Associate with SvN, to begin the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Greenberg began by noting the application history of the project, from preliminary consultations with the Waterfront Secretariat and Community Planning in early 2018, to the approval of the variance in April 2019, to the start of the design in summer 2019. Mr. Greenberg provided a summary of the site context, views from the peninsula, and historical satellite photographs of the Spit. Mr. Greenberg introduced Vincent James, Principal with VJAA, to continue the design presentation.

Building

Mr. James noted VJAA previously designed the University of Wisconsin Porter Boathouse with RDHA. Although that project is a 4-season facility, the UCC rowing facility will be only be operated in three seasons. Mr. James noted the design strategy and project parti which revolves around the orderly storage of long, delicate, rowing shells in an indoor environment with supporting programs. The staggering of the forms breaks down the scale of the building and the team is interested in receiving feedback on the logic of the schematic design. Mr. James noted the optimal location is chosen based on the calmness of the water. The building east of the site is another indoor boat storage facility.

Mr. James noted the design team is advocating for a soft pattern of movement for the boats, from drop-off to water, requiring no turning. The section demonstrates the low scale of the building, opportunities for clearstory windows, and the relationship with the existing storage building. The size of the building is being developed and because it is a 3-season facility, the primary concern is cooling in the summer months. Mr. James noted the team is interested in creating a beautifully built, crafted, simple, and economical design.

Landscape

Mr. James noted the site has a rich, existing ecosystem, supporting pollinators, flowers, and plants while providing great views of the Marina. The team respects and understands the importance of this site. Mr. James noted the intention of the landscape is to preserve the natural qualities of the site: planting native species, provide bird friendly glazing, integration of bird houses to improve the ecosystem, and educational signages for the public.

Sustainability

Mr. James noted the building will be naturally lit, electrical lighting will only be needed during shoulder seasons and after hour operations. The building will be naturally ventilated, and the team is currently exploring green roof and water management strategies that will avoid heavily paved surfaces.

Mr. James concluded the design presentation with early conceptual design renderings of the building seen from the Marina and interior views.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the site is public. Mr. Greenberg explained the site is accessible by the public and Ports Toronto is enhancing informal public access. The Panel member asked if the site can be accessed by walking. Mr. Greenberg noted the site is very opened, the gate at the entrance of the Marina is meant to control vehicular access only.

Another Panel member asked if the Martin Goodman trail will be extended to this area, to form a loop. Mr. Greenberg noted it is being considered but not for this project. One Panel member asked for clarification on public access. Mr. Greenberg explained the public can arrive at the site by walking along the gravel path or driving- the team is interested in a balance in providing access and preservation of the existing vegetation.

Another Panel member asked if the intention is to allow public access to the tip of the site that is frequently used for bird watching. Mr. Greenberg noted this can be accommodated. One Panel member asked for clarification on the landscape plan. Mr. James noted the team will begin the landscape design once the boat use and route through the site are determined.

Another Panel member asked if the proposed building is for Upper Canada College (UCC) use only or shared, and for clarification on the adjacent storage building. Mr. Greenberg noted the proposed building is dedicated for UCC use, the adjacent storage building rents out space for boat storage and UCC would use their parking lot. All the existing infrastructure of the Marina like parking and access can be used by the proposed facility. The Panel member asked if other sites were considered for the building. Mr. Greenberg noted the current site was chosen for its ease of access.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the project's servicing needs like parking, maintenance, outdoor storage, plumbing, water and power. Mr. Greenberg noted servicing is anticipated to be extended from the existing boat facility and there will not be any new outdoor storage on the site.

Another Panel member asked if the roof slopes are effective in slowing down water for stormwater management and flexibility in the building module length. Mr. James noted the convex curvature helps manage and keeps water away from the clearstory

windows, the team will investigate a potential retention strategy. Mr. James explained that 42m holds two 8-person boats, if the arrangement is augmented then the length could be shortened.

One Panel member asked for clarification on UCC's commitment to sustainability, if it will be applied at this site, and the sustainability consultant on the team. Mr. Greenberg noted both UCC and Ports Toronto desire to be net energy zero. Mr. James noted VJAA has a reputation for sustainability and will explore all opportunities.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the degree of publicness of the site. Mr. Greenberg explained that south of the gate is an operational marina as opposed to the narrower Spit on the east which is a fully public area. The gate regulates access to parking- Ports Toronto is working to amend site access as a separate process. Mr. Greenberg noted that specialized and public use are fully compatible, creating a point of interest- the project as a public gesture can raise the expectation of a Marina.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the white area in the site plan and if there is a marked rowing course. Mr. Greenberg noted the intention is an extension of the building such as a deck or terrace and the site is for training, so no marked course is required. Another Panel member asked for considerations on the lake water level. Mr. Sawicki explained the area of the site did not flood this year and the team is speaking with TRCA to confirm lake level.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the use of the outermost tip of the marina peninsula. Mr. Greenberg noted it is currently a gravel parking area for boats. Ports Toronto intends to formalize public entrance and improve access over time.

Mr. Glaisek asked for clarification on the pedestrian path to the site. Mr. Greenberg explained pedestrians can walk on either the main vehicular road or on the side road to access the site.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the team for coming early for advanced thinking, and appreciated that the project is envisioned as a light touch on the land. It is important to provide public access to the site and prioritize the environmental quality of the area. The Panel member suggested providing mitigation in case of future high-water levels and consider a nuanced vision of the landscape design to ensure that rowing and breeding seasons coexist. The Panel member suggested the landscape could be seasonal wet meadows, and recommended the team recognize the privileged view of the site, and respect other GR zoning uses.

Another Panel member supported the active use being proposed for the site as a way to communicate the ecological value of the site to young users. The Panel member recommended bringing in a landscape architect at schematic design to ensure high

level of integration between landscape and building, such as sculpting the land and terraforming. The Panel member recommended leveraging the research done in the proposed Lake Ontario Park Master Plan on planting species and considering the educational value of the project by having the users actively engaged as stewards of the site.

One Panel member commended the net energy zero target but suggested focusing on carbon zero instead. The Panel member noted the building footprint is less of a sustainability issue and the project has an exemplary site to achieve carbon zero. Since the building is cooling dominant, consider reversing the sawtooth roof direction to maximize indirect light and provide optimal south-facing roof angle for PVs. The Panel member emphasized envelop design, passive design, and engaging building scientists to possibly create a net positive building. The Panel member also suggested considering reducing overall site disruption by positioning the design for minimal construction waste and impact.

Another Panel member supported the use of a rowing facility at the site, but asked for clarification on private versus public circulation and use including servicing, accessibility, bike and vehicular parking. Overall, the Panel member felt the location of the building privatizes the site and the public will be intimidated to go through- consider occupying only one side of the peninsula and provide generous, continuous, uninterrupted public access. The Panel member suggested the team understand both macro and micro relationships of the movement around the facility.

One Panel member appreciated the different layers of consideration at this stage of design. The Panel member felt the site creates a private threshold to a public area, the proposed facility does not seem to welcome the public and suggested a larger biking and pedestrian master plan on the peninsula is worth doing- the City should assist with this long-term goal to support a more pedestrian future and celebrate the Marina. The Panel member expressed disappointment that other already gravel and asphalt sites were not considered for the building. The Panel member noted the opportunity to improve the parking lot and transform into a contributing part of the landscape. The Panel member requested a lighting plan at the next review and supported the landscape aspects of the project as didactic moments of a sustainable ecological zone.

Another Panel member supported the landscape comments, and noted the renderings show a sparse interior, and suggested the team consider consolidating some of the program into two stories to reduce building footprint. The Panel member suggested bringing the building closer to the water side by eliminating the deck area, and having operable doors along activity space that can be opened when weather permits. It is important to be light on the land.

Another Panel member also suggested considering a double storey building, stacking the exercise or fitness area on the second floor, and removing the deck from the water's edge to allow for pedestrian access. The Panel member suggested to reverse the direction of the sawtooth roof, provide operable windows to allow heat to escape, and involve ecologists on the green roof design to support a "heavy" green roof

with various plant species. The Panel member asked the team to provide a plan for pedestrian access and a parking strategy.

Another Panel member noted potential concerns during non-operational seasons, as there is no public oversight. Consider questions of security and upkeep in the design. The Panel member asked the team to provide an approach to secure the building envelope during the off seasons.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the opportunity for input at an early stage of design.
- Consider security and upkeep of project during off-season when the facility is not in use and the site is less publicly frequented.
- The Spit has other areas that are paved and have access to water, provide rationale and commentary on the team's decision not to use other possible sites.
- Provide a habitat/bird-friendly lighting strategy for the building and landscape.
- Provide an overall parking strategy for the Marina.

Public Realm

- Public access to the site should be preserved and directly related to the siting of the building, providing uninterrupted public access that does not conflict with the operations of the facility.
- Strong support for Ports Toronto to ensure continuous pedestrian and bicycle access to the tip of the site.
- Recommendation to use this opportunity to consider the larger question of access of the Marina and plans for future growth.

Building

- As a 3-season facility, cooling is the building's primary need - consider reversing the orientation of the sawtooth ceiling to reduce solar gain in summer and provide optimal roof angle for solar PVs.
- Provide servicing and storage strategy for the facility that will discourage on-site parking.
- Consider reducing the footprint of the building by consolidating some of the required program, such as the fitness area, into a two-storey building.
- Consider pulling the building away from the edge of water to provide space for continuous pedestrian access.

Landscape

- Lead with a strong landscape design that recognizes the uniqueness of the site.
- Consider further enhancing the landscape and natural features of the site.
- Emphasize the use of plantings and vegetation in the design.

- Consider a “hairy” green roof with wild vegetation other than just sedum.

Sustainability

- Appreciated the objective of a net zero project- consider shifting the mandate to net carbon zero through incorporation of PVs for example.
- Strong support for the project to be at the leading edge of green/sustainable design and minimize impact on the landscape.
- Consider the environmental quality of the project, from landscape to interior.

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

Mr. James thanked the Panel for excellent comments and looked forward to revising the design to respond to the feedback. The sawtooth logic has already been a subject of debate in the office, and adjustments will be made to accommodate public access, and the team will consider the cost implications of a double-storey building.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 East Bayfront Boardwalk & In-water Pipe – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1111
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two (Last presented in 2011)
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8 + DTAH
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Bryce Miranda, Partner, DTAH; Shelley Long, Project Leader, West 8
<i>Delegation:</i>	Ayako Kitta, DTAH; Adriaan Geuze, West 8; Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Chloe Catan, Waterfront Toronto; Ilidio Coito, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the 130m long boardwalk is located adjacent to Sherbourne Common, sitting above an in-water pipe that will connect the storm drainage from Dockside to Bayside. Mr. Novack provided a timeline and noted the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context for the area. Further context was provided on the East Bayfront Precinct Plan, existing and proposed boardwalks along the Water’s Edge Promenade, and site photos. Mr. Novack noted the project is being reviewed at Stage 2 Schematic Design and recapped previous DRP presentations on the East Bayfront public realm design. Mr. Novack noted the areas for Panel consideration: width and scale of boardwalk, the setting of precedent for the future boardwalk network, elevation of the boardwalk

relative to water level, edge profile, interface with future bridges, bench profile, materiality, and coordination with future public art. Mr. Novack introduced Chloe Catan, Public Art Manager with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the public art element in the area.

Ms. Catan provided a summary of the East Bayfront Public Art Master Plan, noting the future Sherbourne Water's Edge destination piece that will engage with both land and lake. Ms. Catan noted the future art work will be a focal point for the city, and its site boundaries include the foot of the park, the boardwalk, and the water out of the pier line- the artist will have to consider all layers of activities. Ms. Catan concluded by noting various precedents of public art projects that engage land and water. Mr. Novack then introduced Bryce Miranda, Partner with DTAH, to start the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Miranda began by noting the site is at the foot of Sherbourne Common and provided the stormwater management project background, noting the in-water pipe is the final piece of the system. As opposed to running it in the dock wall which would require significant reconstruction, an in-water connection can preserve the existing mature landscape.

Mr. Miranda noted the design of the boardwalk width was originally proposed as 8m to allow the stormwater management infrastructure to run under- the team would like feedback on the dimension as it relates to the greater public realm of the East Bayfront. Mr. Miranda noted the team is refreshing the design, dimension, and height of the boardwalk relative to the water level. Mr. Miranda introduced Shelley Long, Project Leader with West 8, to present the concept design refresh.

Design Refresh

Ms. Shelley began by noting the various aspects of the design, including width, elevation, bench design, edge condition, deck pattern, and wood type, are being reconsidered. Ms. Shelley noted the work began by looking at the existing palette of boardwalks in the waterfront and the 5km of Water's Edge Promenade (WEP) at Harbourfront Centre, with widths from 9.7m to 18m. Ms. Shelley noted the key design principles as iconic, simple, and robust. Reflecting on other boardwalk precedents, the team is proposing a 6m wide boardwalk that accommodates a wide range of uses, and maintains a close relationship with existing boardwalks.

Ms. Long noted climate change may result in a fluctuating lake levels, and the team is interested in making the public realm durable and resilient, while maintaining a grade separation from the WEP and providing mooring capability for boats. The proposed new height provides a more elegant transition with no railing, and the access points for the boardwalk can be aligned with pedestrian paths and finger piers.

Materiality

For the bench concept, Ms. Long noted the team is interested in referencing the Canadian shield, with a robust stone material that requires minimal maintenance over the existing boardwalks. Ms. Long noted the boardwalk edge detail will be strengthened to withstand boats hitting the boardwalk. Ms. Long noted the existing deck pattern is designed to blend in with the surroundings, and the original pattern is too conventional- West 8 would like to introduce intuitive circulation with a short and long side herringbone pattern, creating a slow lane and a 2-way lane along the water's edge.

Ms. Long noted Ipe is no longer an industry standard, as the certified sourcing cannot be well controlled, thus the team is proposing two alternate families: Western Red Cedar and Alaskan Yellow Cedar, used historically for decking with great durability, longevity, and sustainability. Ms. Long concluded with a recap of six aspects of the revised design approach.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for the geographical source of Alaskan Yellow Cedar and if structural damage from ice build-up has been considered. Ms. Long noted the wood comes from Alaska and northern British Columbia, and structural engineering will begin after the completion of conceptual design. She noted that ice impact from the water is much less for lakes than seafronts. Mr. Miranda added that the main structural concern is the force of uplift.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the water level and if the team has consulted with the 2014 Lake Management Plan or other agencies such as the International Joint Commission (IJC) on the fluctuating water level. Mr. Glaisek noted the TRCA sets the lake level standard for Toronto. The Panel member noted the lake level is a politically charged figure and slow to be updated, consider working directly with IJC.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the source of the damage to existing benches. Mr. Glaisek noted the damage is largely due to vandalism and inappropriate uses on the benches.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the status of the proposed finger piers. Mr. Glaisek noted they are notional, and Waterfront Toronto is currently engaged in updating the Marine Use Strategy, which will have specific recommendations on the finger piers. Ms. Long added the proposed boardwalk will accommodate finger piers as add-ons. One Panel member noted the Marine Use Strategy should consider the impact of having boats go under the future foot bridges.

One Panel member asked for the bench material at HTO park and clarification on the conditions of the east and west boardwalk terminus. Ms. Long noted the bench is poured concrete and the terminus edges will have toe-rails.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the lighting strategy of the boardwalk. Ms. Long noted it will be consistent with York Quay, with lighting underneath the benches shining over the boardwalk, and the team is not considering light poles.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the team for a good presentation that addresses all facets and complexities of the boardwalk. The Panel member noted that Alaskan Yellow Cedar is expensive and rare, considering alternatives and working with the industry to improve other options and suggested thermally treated woods.

Another Panel member commended the team for the detailed research and appreciated the clarity of the presentation. The Panel member advocated for the team to select a wood that is approved with a universally recognized certification system.

One Panel member commended the team for the rich research and noted the design decisions can be made based on the data presented. The Panel member suggested that the public art component tap into the stormwater infrastructural system to further relate to the site and celebrate the ethos of the area: integration of art, landscape, and water.

Another Panel member appreciated the transition details from WEP to boardwalk, noting the simplicity makes sense and improves accessibility. For the shape or form of the bench, consider referencing the nearby context such as the geometries and accents of Sugar Beach.

One Panel member appreciated the research and clear rationale for the design decisions. The Panel supported the proposed elevation of the boardwalk, soft transition from WEP, simplicity of the board pattern, sensitive lighting strategy, and bench design- ensure no handrail is required.

Another Panel member commended the presentation and noted the boardwalk is a positive addition to the waterfront, allowing active use close to the water. The Panel member commented that being close enough to touch water is essential for the boardwalk experience, appreciated the research and options for wood, and noted that each design decision is an important public statement. The Panel member supported reflecting on previous decisions to evolve the design and noted the importance of the Marine Use Strategy as an additional consideration for the project.

One Panel member supported the proposed elevation of the boardwalk, lifting it out of water, and the proposed design of the granite bench. The Panel member noted the shoulder seasons are chilly and the granite will not warm up to be as comfortable as wood. The Panel member suggested the team to consider a tiered boardwalk where a portion of the boardwalk steps down to a lower elevation around the vertical pipe

access points and can be submerged during high water levels, thus allowing the design to serve smaller boats, and both engage the water and protect users during high water levels.

Another Panel member felt that connecting the boardwalk to the public art will register the uncertain relationship between land and water as an artistic infrastructural statement, and emphasize that coordination with the art piece is important.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the well-researched presentation and design proposal.
- Commended the team for taking past boardwalk projects into consideration while offering design options moving forward.
- The on-going update to the Marine Use Strategy is important and should be brought forth for review when ready.

Boardwalk and Bench Design

- Supported the proposed 6m width, herringbone board pattern, and the proposed elevation of the boardwalk.
- Supportive of the gentle transition from Water's Edge Promenade to boardwalk and elimination of handrails.
- Supportive of the granite bench concept with some concerns for the warmth of the material in shoulder seasons and user comfort compared to the wood bench, consider further refinement.
- Suggested considering a tiered boardwalk where a portion of the boardwalk steps down to a lower elevation around the vertical pipe access points and can be submerged during high water levels to serve smaller boats and create a different experience.

Materiality

- Appreciated the exploration and research on materials and samples.
- Concerned with the yellow cedar in terms of sustainability and cost, consider alternatives such as Ash and reference FSC certification standards to ensure sustainable sourcing and processing.
- Test the wood material options through seasonal exposure and consider the effect of weathering

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

Ms. Long thanked the Panel for the comments and noted the wood research was presented as an open debate- the team is interested in making the most ethically appropriate choice. Ms. Long noted the team is looking forward to presenting more findings at the next review.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

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

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.