



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #136  
Wednesday, July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2020**

---

**Present**

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

**Regrets**

Janna Levitt

---

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Deanne Mighton, 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 – Issues Identification
  2. West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7 – Detailed Design
  3. 60 Trinity St. Enbridge Station A – Issues Identification/ Schematic Design
  4. Metrolinx USRCE Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study – For Information
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the June. 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflicts for **West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7 and Metrolinx USRCE Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study** and recused himself for the sessions. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for **West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7** and recused himself for the session.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began the update by noting that the Consensus Comments have been circulated to **Production, Interactive, Creative (PIC) Core UDG's** design team and the project is expected to return to Panel for Stage 2 review in November 2020. For **11 Bay Street**, Mr. Glaisek noted that City staff will be meeting with the proponent team to discuss the project's next steps. Mr. Glaisek noted the proponent team is working to address **43 Parliament Street's** Consensus Comments. The project received a vote of Full Support, completing the final stage of the WDRP. Mr. Glaisek noted the West Don Lands community has raised some issues with the proposed design and the City will determine whether a return to Panel is required.

Mr. Glaisek concluded by providing an update on September's draft DRP agenda.

Chair's remarks:

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 – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1050
<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>	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>	Marc-Paul Gauthier, WSP; Rick Knight, WSP; Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto; Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto; Jayne Naiman, City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat; Vincent Teng, TTC

### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Alex Mereu, Transit Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by providing an update on the status of the EA, noted the policy context of the area, and outlined the Queens Quay East project area relative to the revitalized Queens Quay West. Mr. Mereu provided an update on the Transit Planning Phasing Study for the area, evaluating alternative Phase 1 options for the phased funding and implementation of the Waterfront Transit Network.

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Project Manager, introduced the project background, scope of work, and anticipated timeline of the project with full program 30% design by December 2021. Ms. Vangjeli noted the future phases of design and implementation are subject to funding, and noted the core team comprised of West 8, DTAH, ARUP (Toronto), WSP, and DPM Energy. Ms. Vangjeli noted the supplementary consultant design, and the peer review team including Sheila Boudreau and Garth Armour. Ms. Vangjeli noted the key design considerations including integrating with urban ecology: design for ecological performance, design for safety, convenience, and flexibility. Ms. Vangjeli noted the project is being reviewed for Stage 1 Issues Identification and provided a recap from the Nov. 2012 Consensus Comments. Ms. Vangjeli noted areas for Panel consideration including approach to continuous identity with optimizations, design brief priority areas, intersection concepts and arrival experience, stormwater management and planting approach, accessibility improvements and material choices, and future-proofing mobility concepts. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Shelley Long from West 8 to give the design presentation.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Long began the presentation by providing a recap of Queens Quay West: a waterfront welcome, high demand for access, balance of all user groups, green infrastructure, added public space, ecological function, interim Martin Goodman Trail, and how Queens Quay East will learn from phase 1. Ms. Long noted innovation opportunities include cycle and pedestrian movement at intersections, paver detail for accessibility and maintenance, and green street. Ms. Long provided a recap of adjacent development and planning frameworks, including Lower Yonge Public Realm, Lake Shore Public Realm, Port Lands Framework, etc.

Brent Raymond, Partner with DTAH, noted updated international and local best practices for street design, the 2020 cycling network in Toronto, and COVID-19 implications. Ms. Long noted the six design principles for Queens Quay East: maintain a continuous identity, streetscape section innovation, improvement to the arrival points, balance of the bike trail with the south boulevard, creation of a new urban forest, stormwater management, and future proofing the public realm to allocate space for new forms of mobility and signages.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is anything in the ground that might put any of the five elements described in the design into question. Ms. Mallozzi answered no, there is support for as much continuity as possible.

One panel member asked if the design team is satisfied with the current maintenance strategy for Queens Quay West, and if anything can be learned and improved from the previous work. Ms. Mallozzi noted Queens Quay West has a five year maintenance plan which was reached a few years ago, Waterfront Toronto planned to do maintenance on the more complicated elements – currently Waterfront Toronto is doing everything to keep the work up. Ms. Mallozzi noted maintaining granite is tricky, many cities struggle with this challenge. According to West 8, the granite detail is good, so maintenance is easier than other projects. Mr. Geuze recommended a refresh every six to eight years and is not sure if this can be done in Toronto. However, Mr. Geuze believed the outcome of phase one is tremendous and will persist.

Another Panel member asked if snow ploughing has been considered in the edge details around the granite, skateboarding damage on the double-sided benches, and the rationale for a narrower sidewalk on the north side when typically there is more sun exposure on the north side. Mr. Geuze noted the south sidewalk connections to the various waterfront destinations, key programs, and early on it was decided to place the traffic on the north and people on the south – it is not changeable and pre-determined. Mr. Raymond answered that snow ploughs tend to damage the granite less than traditional concrete; at the same time the unit paver is very easy to repair. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the skateboarding damage is only problematic on the south side close to the Martin Goodman Trail and Waterfront Toronto does not want to discourage skateboard use as a legitimate form of mobility.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the replaced trees on Queens Quay West and the research on non-tropical wood species suitable in our climate zone for the current scope of work. Ms. Mallozzi answered that the trees on Queens Quay West were replaced due to a fungus that attacked London Plane Trees in the Toronto climate which caused them to lose their first leafing. The trees were replaced with more mixed species to avoid further monoculture. This will be studied further on the east side. Ms. Long added that the replacement trees were Honey Locust, Maples, and Elms in blocks and transition through the waterfront. On the exterior wood species, Ms. Long noted the team has researched three alternatives of Canadian woods and one is used on the boardwalk so the weathering effect will be observed.

Another Panel member asked if the vegetative buffer between TTC and the trail goes throughout the entire street or only at segments between buildings. Ms. Long answered the green strip is meant to continue throughout the entirety of the street and the team is exploring options at the intersections. The Panel member asked how high-water table impacts stormwater management and passive irrigation. Ms. Long noted it is interesting that sometimes the Wavedecks are under water. Mr. Geuze noted the design must be timeless, the team will need the best record for water table and actively think about climate change. The team will continue to evaluate the water table and update the design.

One Panel member asked for confirmation on a biodiverse approach to the mixed alley planting, and if there is diversity in form in addition to species. Mr. Geuze noted the team is interested in diversity, not married to a single planting distance, do not want repetition, and plans to create more organic and ecological mixes. Ms. Long noted the team is interested in creating a well-drained environment for the vegetative zones.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the intersection design of Yonge slip and why it is not considered as a primary intersection. Ms. Long noted it is currently not identified as a primary intersection because of high traffic load due to the new proposed portal location and public space on the north – the team will further study.

One Panel member asked if trees grow better on the north side and difference between north and south planting in terms of species. Ms. Long answered that a different species was planted on the north side of Queens Quay West. The two sides of the street do not share the same root zones so their planting will be designed differently.

Another Panel member asked if the team considered running the TTC tracks over greenery, clarification on the salt management strategy, and the embodied carbon and life cycle performance of granite pavers. Ms. Long noted the team does not recommend a vegetative surface for TTC because the lane must also accommodate bus traffic, however the team is interested in making it less bleak. Ms. Long noted the team has not looked into embodied carbon metrics but will conduct the study.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended Waterfront Toronto for revisiting the project with the same design team and the great presentation. The Panel member noted shared space signage future proofing is a challenge and recommended the team to provide more information as a study at the next review. The Panel member is in support of the project.

Another Panel member noted the project is very promising and discouraged the use of rolled curbs as a detail for flexible curb-side design in making the surfaces for cars and pedestrians coplanar.

One Panel member commended the great presentation and was pleased to see the same design team return. The Panel member noted the red granite is a timeless element, unique to the city, and will create the vision of the project. The Panel member noted plants are a living material that require constant learning to do right, and excited to see the team demonstrate knowledge from phase one like wider bike trails.

Another Panel member noted the continuity of experience is important and commended Waterfront Toronto in retaining the same design team. The Panel member recommended the team to provide photographs of issue areas of phase one to discuss in detail learnings and improvements. The Panel member felt granite is a good carbon alternative to concrete for the sidewalk. The Panel member felt the project is positive and is supportive of the project.

One Panel member noted the key issues for Waterfront Toronto revolve around the continuity of the public realm and it is equally important for the second phase of Queens Quay. The Panel member recommended lessons learnt be disseminated for future knowledge sharing. The Panel member asked the team to consider research on

tree species in an urban setting which will help selection of trees in other parts of the city. The Panel member asked the team to consider a Canadian wood source for Queens Quay, which can help foster local manufacturing and become a proud moment for Toronto.

Another Panel member commended the extension of the passive irrigation system, noted the importance of Queens Quay especially during a pandemic, and appreciated leading with landscape and resilience design. The Panel member asked the team to consider making the project's registration with the changing water table more obvious to ensure it is visible and highly communicated. The Panel member cautioned against the thinking that the proposed green strips would deter jaywalking, instead consider the resilience aspects of these elements.

One Panel member thanked the team for a thoughtful presentation and noted the importance of learnt feedback as there is typically not enough opportunity to reflect and discuss failures. The Panel member asked the team to continue to challenge the alley by introducing biodiversity and diversity in form and aesthetics –the vision of a contemporary mixed alley. The diversity will provide added value for the public realm and animals. The Panel member commended the notion of an adaptive alley, bioswales under trees, and the eventual opportunity for gravel beds to become gardens. The Panel member asked the team to consider a stronger strategy to communicate the values of the underground infrastructure to the public.

Another Panel member noted reflecting on past work is critical and is supportive of the overall approach moving forward. The Panel member endorsed the diversity in landscape design, asked the team to provide more details on the Yonge intersection design, and consider additional green strips to soften the approach to the water's edge.

Two Panel member commended the project and expressed full support.

Another Panel member noted granite is the best possible option in terms of embodied carbon. The Panel member noted to leverage the procurement process to bring in local wood products and support local manufacturing technologies. The Panel member noted the multi-use trail does not currently have enough signage and provide more information in understanding the overall bike strategy with the redesign of Lake Shore at the next review. In general, the Panel member supported the continuity but is unsure whether Queens Quay will become a great urban street in the long run.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

### **General**

- Supportive of the team continuity from the Queens Quay West project and appreciated the design continuity by carrying the vision forward.
- Support for the overall project.
- Appreciated the “lessons learned”, consider showing photos of critical areas at the next review to provide greater understanding moving forward.

- It is important to share the knowledge base from the project in the future, such as street tree biodiversity, to help the public understand the role of public realm infrastructure.

#### Public Realm

- Signage will be an important, consider further studies and provide more information at the next review.
- Supported the overall design strategy of the north and south streets meeting Queens Quay.
- As an iconic point of interest, provide more information and the rationale on the design of the foot of Yonge Street at the next review.
- It is important to ensure Queens Quay East will be a great urban retail street.
- Focus on the intersections as they are major points of movement with various modes of mobility.
- Although not currently proposed, rolled curbs are discouraged.

#### Landscape

- Supportive of the proposed urban ecology strategies to include diverse tree alley, increased green strips, and continuity in the public realm.

### 1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

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

## 2.0 West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7 – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1106
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	COBE, architectsAlliance, PUBLIC WORK
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Thomas Krarup, Project Director, COBE; Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Emmeily Zhang, PUBLIC WORK; Brandon Law, RWDI
<i>Delegation:</i>	Jordan Kemp, Dream, Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Henry Tang, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Jason Lester, Dream; Stephen Hasko, Dream; John English, Tricon

### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilburt, development planner with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by providing a recap of the existing site context, project background, and that today's review is Block 3,4,7's final appearance at the DRP pending Panel approval. Mr. Hilburt recapped the West Don Lands precinct context, block plans, adjacent development

context including Block 10, Block 8, and the Schematic Design Consensus Comments from September 2019. Mr. Hilburt noted the areas for Panel consideration: revised massing with respect to major street frontages, corners, and POPS, revised ground floor design, updated material palette, revised public realm, courtyard, east-west street, courtyard programming, and updated sustainability targets and strategies. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Emmeily Zhang, designer with PUBLIC WORK, to begin the design presentation.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

### Public Realm

Ms. Zhang began by noting the project's relationship with The Esplanade, Distillery District, and Front St. Promenade. The project's public realm proposes a sequence of complementary spaces to complete the district streets, frontages, and local street network. Ms. Zhang provided details on the ground plane including the civic corners, diverse residential gardens, the POPS courtyard, passive green zones, and active public edges. Ms. Zhang further noted the stormwater gardens, tree decks, ground textures that delineate ground thresholds, and the vegetation species. Ms. Zhang provided a summary of the upper terraces and the interface with residential spaces.

### Block 7

Adam Feldmann, Associate with architectsAlliance, provided an update to Block 7's design strategies, including massing revisions, building base material expressions, addressing the historical context, envelope details, typical unit layouts, and the revised building top. Mr. Feldmann summarized all the updated building plans, elevations, sections, and updated rendering perspectives. Mr. Feldmann noted the sensitivity with 80 Mill St. and noted their primary windows are north-south facing which do not face the new Block 7 units, at the same time the building maintains the 7.5m setback from the existing building face.

### Blocks 3 and 4

Thomas Krarup, Project Director with COBE, provided the design update for Blocks 3 and 4 including massing revisions, corner conditions, courtyard changes, and retail distribution on the ground floor. Mr. Krarup noted the updated floor plans, building sections with revised amenity spaces, and revised materiality and façade changes. Level differentiation on the amenity levels help provide a sense of privacy. Mr. Krarup noted the team challenged themselves on further refining the expressions of the brick base and cloud top at a detailed level.

### Sustainability

Brandon Law, Strategic Director with RWDI, provided an overview of the sustainability solutions, energy performance goals tracked against the current model, key low-carbon solutions such as the SolarWall at Block 7, and the LEED score card. Mr. Law noted Blocks 3 and 4 will have provisions for future Enwave connection.

## **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the metric for determining seating amount in the open space and if it is dependent on a percentage of residents – provide more rationale on the balance of seating versus un-occupiable landscape space. Ms. Zhang noted the team uses a standard width for per individual seating allocation, is interested keeping the activity towards the centre of the courtyard, and will follow up with the team to provide more information.

Another Panel member is concerned with the uniformity of the façade and asked if the team has considered different finishes and colours for the various blocks. Mr. Krarup answered that the team explored differentiating the massing with colours but it ended up looking like a series of compressed towers. The team felt that strategy did not serve the ambition of the project. Mr. Krarup noted it is a challenge to visualize the metal panels so physical tests were done with different profiles and surface treatments to create a sparkling effect.

One Panel member asked for clarification on roof access, approach to public art, and the sidewalk proportions of Front Street versus Cherry Street. Mr. Glaisek noted this project does not have an art proposal because they are within the West Don Lands Precinct and Waterfront Toronto has a precinct level public art plan. The Panel member asked if the new east-west street has a name, and if the ground floor of Block 7 has a thorough loading bay – in from one end out the other. Mr. Feldmann answered that the building is required to provide a Type G loading with exiting in a forward manner, if the design is a turnaround then it would take up more than two thirds of the site therefore the team went with the thorough option. Mr. Feldmann noted that the City has flagged this but there is not much the team can do. Mr. Krarup noted the roof is not accessible.

Another Panel member asked for the estimated number of residents. Another Panel member suggested there will be thirteen thousand to fourteen thousand residents according to the number of units.

One Panel member asked if the planters are self-sufficient or they require maintenance. Ms. Zhang answered the woodland fern would have a self-irrigation system, but details will have to be further explored.

Another Panel member asked for the floor to floor height of the units, sizes, and the percentage of glazing in the overall building. Mr. Feldmann noted that in Toronto the ceilings are mandated to be at nine feet for affordable housing, and the heights for the remaining units shift based on the floor.

One Panel member appreciated that the EUI and TEDI figures are descending and asked for the total envelope connectivity analysis, balance of heating and cooling, GHGI, and impact of potential connection to Enwave. Mr. Law noted the figures highly depend on whether a chiller plant or deep-sea cooling is employed and noted the project will likely have a slight improvement in performance.

The Panel member asked if the team is comfortable with the high amount of retail on the ground floor. Mr. Kemper responded that there have been numerous discussions on the amount of retail and the client is comfortable what is presented.

Mr. Glaisek asked for clarification on the tower separation distance from adjacent Mill Street residence and if it has to meet the City's 11m minimum. Mr. Feldmann noted 11m is for facades with primary windows, historically the distance is split between the two properties and Block 7 has met the requirements.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted metrics are important in quantifying the balance of outdoor programming. While the more generous courtyard is certainly appreciated, the Panel member struggled to understand the size requirement and the driving idea that ties the open space with the buildings. The Panel member noted the design is pavement heavy and various elements are slightly disconnected. The Panel member felt the historical context strategy is a reach as the datum line is inconsequential with it fluctuating across the block and not clearly read. At Block 7, The Panel member noted the loading bay and metal glazing do not transcend to relate with the brick material. The brick at grade is the important continuity element but is currently flipped to the top of the building. Since brick is a richer material than metal and its presence on the public realm should be made stronger at Block 7, the Panel member recommended to flip the material palette between the ground and the top of the building. The Panel member appreciated the revised corner massing proportions and noted the revised cladding strategy on Blocks 3 and 4 is not as successful as its previous iteration in expressing the "cloud" analogy. The Panel member thanked the team for the presentation.

Another Panel member appreciated the team's responsiveness to Panel commentary and is overall supportive of the changes. The Panel member was sceptical at the last review that the new east-west street could be domesticated – revisions to the courtyard clearly demonstrate general public and communal public spaces are improvements as well. The Panel member support Mr. Krarup's concern of not changing the material palette too much given the articulation of the massing. Even with another Panel member's challenge, the Panel member felt that the manipulation of the façade was indeed a well-considered response to community concerns.

One Panel member appreciated the resolution of the project and noted the green roofs appear to not be used. Relative to other roof spaces in the area, this green roof is low and less windy – suggested the team to reconsider its use and programming.

Another Panel member thanked the team for revising the courtyard, showing interesting precedents, and hoped that the project will create a hugely successful public residential courtyard. The Panel noted the constructed landscape courtyard is a new typology for Toronto and that the green roofs can be made habitable. For the new east-west street, the Panel member asked for a more detailed north-south section through the street from Mill Street across to the townhouses. The Panel member is not convinced with the current design and noted the north side of the street should be further developed. The Panel member noted the loading bay design at Block 7 crossing over the sidewalk is not supported.

One Panel member appreciated the improvements in the design of the public space and landscaping. The panel member noted the demand for public space in different seasons is important and the planter maintenance can become a serious challenge, worried that good intentions would eventually be colonized by weeds. On-site water retention is supported, however in a harsh urban condition they are difficult to maintain, consider using species that require little maintenance to ensure success. The Panel member recommended the team to develop a robust maintenance plan.

Another Panel member commended the great project and exciting content. It is important to understand the metric for determining outdoor programming because of the proximity to the Distillery District and balance between residents and visitors. The Panel member asked the team to provide ratios, required areas, and analysis, to help make the case for an occupiable green roof. The Panel member noted it is exciting to use different materials, the revised massing is convincing from the street and as an overall urban project.

One Panel member noted there is a Toronto Green Standards requirement to provide 2sqm of outdoor space for every interior space, if the POPS was not part of the design then the project would only have the roof – to that end, the POPS is a bonus and the Panel member is in support of the overall project. At the same time, the Panel member noted while the balance of built form and biomass is an innovation, the design can be further improved.

Another Panel member appreciated the design as a strong fabric building and appreciated the project's supply of rental housing. Consider future flexibility in the sustainability strategy.

One panel member commended the team for completing the building thermal bridging calculation as the proposed performance figure is exceptional for the building. The Panel member commended the solar wall initiative and the decentralized ventilation system. The Panel member recommended the team to carefully consider the details of the envelop so the real performance can be assured to meet the model figures based on the fifty percent window to wall ratio. The current design, if evaluated for the passive house qualification, is not enough – consider more insulation in the soffits with the thermally broken clips and air tightness. Since the project is well above the minimum requirements for TGS Tier 1, the Panel member suggested further minor tweaks to the passive measures to reach Tier 2

## **2.5 Consensus Comments**

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

### **General**

- Appreciated the team's effort in responding to previous Panel comments positively.
- Strong support for the overall project with some refinements.
- Commended the design of a strong fabric building providing much needed rental apartments and the distribution of affordable units into the mix.

### **Building**

- Consider subtle materiality differentiations on the “cloud” building facades.

- Supported the corner massing revisions.
- The inaccessible roof is a missed opportunity. Consider programming the green roof as an additional amenity space for residents – the space will likely be highly utilized.

#### Landscape

- Inadequate rationale is provided on the design of the courtyard, particularly the amount of seating and planted versus paved areas. Further analyze the balance of uses, capacities, visitors versus residents, and revise the design to adequately accommodate the appropriate needs and space allocation. Provide more illustrations to help understand the utility of the courtyard.
- Paved area appears to be too much, consider shifting some of the area for planting.
- Consider a strategic maintenance plan for planting and pavement upkeep.

#### New East-west Street

- Provide more illustrations to help understand the quality of the new street in detail and how it relates to the buildings in the Distillery District.

#### Sustainability

- Continue to pay close attention to the detailing of the building envelope to assure that the targeted sustainability performance can be met in practice.
- The current performance targets are very close to meeting the requirements of the next tier of the Toronto Green Standards, consider pushing the design further to meet Tier 2.
- Strongly encouraged the team to plan for a future district energy connection.

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

Mr. Feldmann thanked the Panel for the comments and noted the team worked very hard to respond to them. Mr. Krarup thanked for Panel for pushing and motivating the team to improve – the team will continue to address today’s comments.

### **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 unanimously for Full Support.

### **3.0 60 Trinity St. Enbridge Station A – Issues Identification/ Schematic Design**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1117
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification/ Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Enbridge
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Enbridge
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Michael Abate, Program Manager, Enbridge
<i>Delegation:</i>	Aron Murdoch, Enbridge; Leon Lai, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto;

Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

### **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Leon Lai, Design Review Panel manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the project is a secured station facility with very limited above grade features with an open-air decorative masonry security barrier. The project was recommended by the City to come to the DRP, it is at an advanced stage of design and expected to return to DRP to address changes. Mr. Lai noted the 60 Trinity Street context, the West Don Lands precinct block plan, and specifically Block 2. Mr. Lai noted the project is here for Issues Identification/ Schematic Design and areas for Panel consideration: addressing the context of the neighbourhood, interface with adjacent future development sites, expression of the secure perimeter, street design, and lighting. Mr. Lai then introduced Michael Abate, Construction & Project Management, Enbridge, to continue the design presentation.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Abate began by noting that the project is a critical station for Enbridge and provided an overview of the project description and background. Mr. Abate noted the history of the site, existing conditions, and the key requirements for the design development. Cognizant of the site area and the Distillery District, Enbridge is interested in designing the building to address the context and adjacent aesthetic influences. Mr. Abate noted the exterior renderings, mechanical layout, exterior cladding mockup, building elevations, and details of the open-air decorative masonry security barrier. Mr. Abate noted the colour options that is being considered by the design team. Mr. Abate provided a summary of the public consultations process, permit requirements, environmental and sustainability considerations, and the overall project timeline.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the underground structure occupies the entire site and if there is room for adjusting the location. Mr. Abate answered that Enbridge is finding the site challenging to fit everything, the valves require a separation distance from adjacent buildings, and there is not much flexibility. Mr. Murdoch added the site is made even smaller to allow future Street B to be constructed.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the rear entrance access, materiality, and potential on green roof. Mr. Abate noted the entrance is for future proofing the site and the team will negotiate with Block 2 to create a laneway to provide access. Mr. Abate noted the roof is pre-cast masonry dyed green and the wall is also pre-cast painted. The Panel member asked if the proponent is responsible for implementing the future street details, furniture, and lighting. Ms. Mighton noted the City will implement the work.

One panel member asked why a green roof is not feasible for an industrial building. Mr. Abate noted the policies around the building design are very constrained, but not

impossible, the team is asked to work within the box from an engineering perspective. The Panel member noted to consider the green roof as a value-add, like selecting heritage materials on the cladding to match context.

Another Panel member asked for the height of the wall, if it is possible for the two sides of the fence to be different in height. Mr. Abate noted the height is set to mimic a one-storey building and any higher might be unfeasible in terms of engineering.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the zoning and timing of the adjacent development. Ms. Rolph noted Infrastructure Ontario has a lease with JEEP to the end of the decade so it will remain undeveloped for some time.

Another Panel member asked if the cladding is brick or pre-cast and if it is possible to add more trees at the corner. Mr. Abate noted it is pigmented concrete to mimic brick and Enbridge has done this with other facilities. It is also not feasible to add trees inside the perimeter wall. The Panel member asked for the rationale for the chain-link fence as it seems to be a lot lower than the security wall, is it possible to replace it with removable panels instead of chain-link, and if the building can accommodate opportunities in bringing views from the outside. Mr. Abate noted the wall serves multiple purposes including security and the height is based on these functions. Mr. Abate noted the chain-link is not operable but it is something easy to remove and views from outside into the property might not meet the performance requirement from a corporate policy perspective – feasibility and practicability are important concerns. The Panel member asked if a green roof is feasible as the pre-cast concrete sub-structure is idea for this kind of roof treatment.

One Panel member asked for more information on the integrated site security system. Mr. Abate noted it is a radar detection system for anything or anyone that enters the site, with point and zoom cameras, and notify central security point. The Panel member asked for more information on the cladding and the pattern of openings which look randomized from panel to panel. The Panel member asked if the team is concerned with the climability of the walls. Mr. Abate noted there is barbed wall at the top of the wall to prevent climbing over.

Another Panel member asked if the team has reviewed development proposals and designs for the projects adjacent to the site, such as Blocks 3,4,7, the Stormwater Management Facility, and other hydro buildings close to River City. Mr. Abate noted the designs have not been reviewed and will reach out to Waterfront Toronto to follow up.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted it is a difficult project to review and the team's unfamiliarity with the design review standards puts the project at a slight disadvantage. The Panel member noted Waterfront Toronto has a different level of standard for design excellence, especially at the public realm. The Panel member cautioned against stamped concrete, consider real brick, relate to a really high-quality public realm component. The Panel member sympathizes with the project team but noted the design standard quality is not yet there. The Panel member noted the exposed chain-

link fence with barbed wire is not supported, consider a real material to provide the function. Nearby, Block 3 is a multi-storey residential project done by a great team of designers and recommended the team to reference this project in finding a way to move forward with the design.

Another Panel member is surprised that the perimeter wall is precast and not real brick. Gathering that this strategy has been employed in other sites, the Panel member is not convinced it is an apt visual representation of brick and it will look phony. For the building, the Panel member recommended straightforward precast. For the wall, the Panel member would support some design element, but being in the Distillery District makes it even more heightened that the brick is not real. The Panel member recommended the team to further develop the appearance of the street to integrate the design of the exterior wall.

One Panel member appreciated the team for coming to the DRP, suggested some punched windows at the perimeter wall and consider a green roof on the building.

Another Panel member noted that he experienced a similar kind of resistance when reviewing work for BC Hydro and in the end it can be done. The Panel member noted the suggested change to real brick is feasible and affordable. The chain-link fence with barbed wire is unsupported and should be removed as it will make the project feel inhospitable adjacent to residential projects. The request for a green roof is also reasonable in terms of structure and for improving water management. The Panel member noted there are unused corners in plan and consider additional trees. The Panel member encouraged the team to challenge the engineers and make commitments to improving the project.

One Panel member suggested the proponent to review drawings for Blocks 3 and 4 to understand the visual presence of the project within the Distillery District community and that the neighbourhood is a simulacrum of brick, as one of the largest Victorian brick districts in North America. Consider using a good, compatible brick, not just in color but in type for the exterior wall. At Cheery St. and Eastern Ave, the Panel member noted there is an art piece that is also a wall at the corner, it is important consider this dual condition for your project. The Panel member noted chain-link fence is unacceptable, consider replacing with a rolling gate or alternative strategies to address the pragmatic issues. The Panel member appreciated the team for coming to the DRP and the Panel's comments are meant to be constructive and positive.

Another Panel member appreciated the team's initiative in coming to the Panel and the robust conversations. The Panel member noted material integrity is important for the Distillery District, consider treating the wall as a public face and as a piece of art, such as opportunities for wall murals. The Panel member suggested to carefully develop the wall to give back to the community and cultural heritage of the site.

One Panel member noted a green roof is an important statement to suggest positive trade-offs and as a performance beyond service. The Panel member is unsupportive of the barbed wire and encouraged material authenticity. The Panel member asked the team to think more creatively and solve problems differently.

Another Panel member noted the City has a legacy of great utility buildings and they represent unique opportunities for innovative designs, to revise standards and take a different approach. The Panel member pointed out that the precedents shown have a certain depth in their façade - a base and a top and asked the team to consider more three-dimensional strategies in making the façade more real and authentic. The Panel member asked the team to also consider lighting on the wall.

One Panel member asked the team to research other projects in the area closely and study their approach to exterior details. The Panel member noted to consider a combination of precast concrete with embedded real masonry to achieve the effect.

Another Panel member noted COBE is using precast panel faced with real brick at Blocks 3,4,7 and asked the team to refer to their presentation.

One Panel member asked the team to consider speaking with COBE as a team to develop a similar approach for the wall and gate.

Another Panel member noted imitation of materials in a historic style can fall into the uncanny valley. The Panel member noted there are other aspects of performance that can be improved, such as using lower impact materials for the building and the wall, different mixtures of concrete with lower carbon impact, to showcase other types of innovation with regards to climate change and resilience. The Panel member noted this strategy could be employed across the province.

One Panel member noted the roof is another elevation for the building and should have a green roof. The Panel member asked the team to imagine themselves as residents adjacent to the project and consider strategies for softening the design – either great precast, or strong real brick. The chain link fence is not supported. The Panel member noted the gate is a great opportunity and suggested openings located high up to provide urban intrigue. Lastly, the Panel member noted the concrete should be heavily offset with a mix of SVFs to reduce carbon load.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

#### **General**

- Appreciated the Proponent and the City bringing the project to the Panel.
- Reference the design of adjacent development Blocks 3,4,7 with regards to the street frontages, façade materiality, and landscape context; Waterfront Toronto to share the documentation with the Proponent.
- The site is located near the most historic district of Toronto, the Town of York, where a lot of people will be living, working, and visiting the area. It is important for the project to fit in with both existing and future context.
- There are precedents of highly contextual hydro facilities, consider carefully how this project can evolve the typology to respond to the site.
- It is important for this project to set a precedent for a well-integrated, contextual, public infrastructure facility building in the West Don Lands.

#### **Building**

- Consider the visual impact of the building and site as viewed from high up such as adjacent future residential developments.
- While a green roof is not a typical feature for this type of facility, it is appropriate for this context and can greatly improve the visual presence of the entire project. Consider revising the design of roof structure to accommodate a green roof.

#### Perimeter Wall

- Not supportive of the use of barbed wire and chain-link fence, alternative strategies should be considered to better respond to adjacent future residential buildings and public realm.
- Recommended the perimeter wall utilize a real brick finish and not painted precast. With the project's proximity to other historic brick buildings, in order to properly respond to the context, it is important to employ the actual, real materiality.
- Consider the opportunity for integrating animation strategies at the perimeter wall to engage with the public, such as view windows into the site.
- Consider the visual identity and signage use - it is an opportunity for Enbridge to set a new precedent for a highly urban hydro facility building.

#### Landscape

- Consider planting trees in the corner of the lot to improve street level and aerial presence.

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

Really appreciate the comments, take them as positive commentary. Enbridge will take these back, review them all internally, practicability and feasibility, and room for creativity.

### 3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

The Panel voted unanimously for Non-support. The Chair noted the Panel looks forward to working with the Proponent to achieve a great result.

### 4.0 Metrolinx USRCE Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study – For Information

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1118
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	For Information
<i>Review Round:</i>	-
<i>Location:</i>	Lower Yonge, East Bayfront, and West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Metrolinx
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Urban Strategies
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Craig Lametti, Urban Strategies
<i>Delegation:</i>	Kevin Chan, Metrolinx; John Potter, Metrolinx; Sonja Vangieli, Waterfront Toronto; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Julia Murnaghan, City of

Toronto; Casey Craig, City of Toronto; Neil Loewen, Urban Strategies;

#### **4.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting the history of the Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study (PCCS). The project is led by Metrolinx in consultation with City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, and a Community Advisory Committee. Ms. Vangjeli noted the site area, existing ground conditions at the underpasses, future proofing and coordination with adjacent design work, and the public realm coordination with Lake Shore Public Realm. Ms. Vangjeli noted the areas for Panel consideration: waterfront connectivity between established neighbourhoods to the north and the eastern waterfront, extending the Lake Shore public realm identity north to include the underpasses and down to Queens Quay, and the advancement of the work. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Craig Lametti, Partner with Urban Strategies, to continue the design presentation.

#### **4.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Lametti began the presentation by noting the project context, scope, and major infrastructure improvements that are coming to the area. Mr. Lametti noted the project considers how pedestrian and cycling improvements can align with area infrastructure improvements, broadening of the cycling network, and improving overall connections. Mr. Lametti summarized the toolkit of improvements, including both structural and non-structural options, and the themes of the evaluation framework, including connectivity, place-making, safety, city-building, and financial. Mr. Lametti noted the evaluation steps, from understanding the structural opportunities within the broader corridor, assessing the benefits, assessing the costs, to selecting the preferred structural options.

Mr. Lametti recapped the strengths and weaknesses of both structural and non-structural improvement options, responding to specific site conditions identified. Mr. Lametti summarized the renderings that show aspects of the options including lighting, textured concrete, signage, and integrated public art. A final recommendation was provided for each corridor. Mr. Lametti concluded with the next steps for the project.

#### **4.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is coordination with West 8's Lake Shore Public Realm design, recalling a design for the path that is going on the south side of the rail corridor embankment. Ms. Vangjeli noted there is on-going coordination and information is provided to Craig's team. However, due to the tight timeline it has been difficult to coordinate at a highly detailed level.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the scope and responsibility. Generally, Ms. Vangjeli answered that the Lake Shore Public Realm is the right of way that delineates a boundary, but the intent is to blur the line, so the public realm is perceived as one continuous experience. Ms. Vangjeli noted that there is a division of work between Metrolinx and the City, and anything north of Lake Shore public realm

would have to be accounted for by future projects. Mr. Lametti noted the project will inform future partnerships that might take place.

One Panel member appreciated the interesting and thoughtful presentation, and the implication that a lot of benefits can be gained by the not most expensive option, understanding that the less expensive probably is not cheap either. The Panel member asked for the odds of implementation down the road and the political appetite of having this delivered. Mr. Glaisek answered that there is no clear plan but at the very least when other projects are sorted, we will have an idea of what to proceed with based on this study. The Panel member noted the sheer fact that the study is completed will enhance the appetite of it happening.

Another Panel member asked for this project's relationship with underpasses. Mr. Potter noted they are part and parcel of the larger transit assessment project- a Metrolinx commitment. The Panel member asked if the study moves forward with the same basic assumption on the design of the street and how much flexibility there is in the study to improve the design. Mr. Lametti noted the design team worked closely with the City on the street designs, part of the challenge is that applying the standard simply does not result in great design, and in some instances the project is not able to even meet the standards.

#### **4.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the study and the presentation and was encouraged to see the many ways of improving the study area.

Another Panel member noted it was interesting to see the pros and cons with the options,

One Panel member asked if the intention to connect north and south a result of Metrolinx's work to add additional train tracks. Mr. Chan responded yes. The Panel member noted that although the areas are improved, including the public realm, some of the features felt decorative and the quality of the spaces themselves are not yet elevated. Understanding they are placeholders at this point, the Panel member felt the design strategies are add-ons, decorative, motifs, and superfluous, which indicate a lack of infrastructural attitude in improving the city. The Panel member noted it is unrealistic to expect this but nonetheless is a slight disappointment.

Another Panel member noted the site is both blighted and difficult to navigate but there is still great infrastructure potential. Consider looking at the patterns to accentuate the infrastructural aspects of the underpasses and relate the design more closely with the design of Lake Shore Public Realm.

One Panel member commented it is important to ensure there is continuity with Lake Shore in the east-west direction as well as the north-south as shown in the studies. While there are jurisdiction boundaries, the Panel member noted that the design and reality should be seamless. The Panel member noted the Lake Shore Public Realm design is a spatial experience by West 8, that same quality is not yet present in this

study as the pieces currently read as separate elements – consider a more integrated and creative approach. The Panel member noted the Lake Shore Public Realm team should assist with the PCCS study in the future to achieve a more coordinated vision for these critical points in the city.

Another Panel member had mixed reactions to the project. The Panel member felt that since this is not a design exercise, the amount of design criticism so far is a little misplaced. However, the Panel member supported a talented team to proceed with any future design work that is coordinated, and that further design input will be provided. The Panel member was struck by the fact that even for the option of complete rebuild, the design would encounter buildings on the immediate north side of the corridor. At the current state of the study, the Panel member is less critical of the design vision than the previous comments.

Another Panel member noted integration with West 8's work would be great for the project and appreciated that even with the costing version the areas are already much improved. If it will be put forth for further costing, the Panel member asked the team to focus on developing the best bike track, pedestrian experience, and spend money where it is important relative to the huge costs of the overall project. The Panel member advocated for the highest quality of pedestrian and cycling infrastructure even though the widths might not be fully available. The Panel member appreciated the design qualifications built into the study and that the study has gone forward.

#### **4.5 Consensus Comments**

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

##### **General**

- Appreciated the framework of the study and the clear presentation.
- Appreciated the options where improvements can be achieved with minimal costs.
- Commended the valuable work produced and the goal of developing designs that will deliver the optimal conditions for cycling and pedestrian movement.
- City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, and Metrolinx must ensure that aspects of this feasibility study will eventually lead to an actual design project in the future.

##### **Design**

- It is essential for the design team to consider the study with the Lake Shore Public Realm work done by West 8 to ensure a high level of integration and coordination between the two designs. Provide a smooth transition between the two project's jurisdictional boundaries.
- Encouraged the team to provide clear outline of budgets based on the studied options in order to push the project forward to eventual design and implementation.
- When the project returns with further design development, ensure integration is a key priority.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response. Mr. Lametti thanked the Panel, agreed with many of the comments and noted integration is important.

#### **5.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

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

#### **CLOSING**

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.