



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #133
Wednesday, April. 22nd, 2020**

Present

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

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Regrets

Jeff Ranson

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. 3C PL1 – Schematic Design 2
2. Port Lands Flood Protection: Parks – Detailed Design

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the March. 25th, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for **3C PL1** 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 by noting that Waterfront Toronto has three projects that fit within one or more of the categories of Essential Workplaces as set out by the Province, including Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure, Cherry Street Stormwater Treatment Facility and Sanitary Pumping Station, and Bayside Phase 2 Streets and Services. The construction of the river valley is slower, but work continues. Other projects included in the Rolling Five Year Strategic Plan will be deferred and not continue into construction, including Bonnycastle Public Realm, Waterfront Reconnect, Lake Shore Boulevard Pilot Project, East Bayfront In-water Pipe, and Bentway. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto is working remotely under the leadership of George Zegarac.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the consensus comments for **Metrolinx Union Station Rail Underpasses Architectural Design** have been circulated to the design team. Waterfront Toronto is providing coordinated design input with the City and will set up a follow-up coordination meeting to advance the design. Mr. Glaisek noted the consensus comments for **Ireland Park Foundation Building** have been circulated to the design team, the new plaza and remaining public realm design are expected to return for Detailed Design once the RFP is issued in the summer and a landscape architect is selected. For **1 Yonge Corner Open Space**, Mr. Glaisek noted that City staff agrees with the Panel's comments and is working with the Proponent on revising the design.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on Quayside, noting that the Plan Development Agreement vote by the Waterfront Toronto Board of Directors has been extended to June 25th, 2020 due to COVID-19. Further to this, Waterfront Toronto has extended the deadline for the Quayside online public consultation survey to April 9th, 2020 and gave notice that the preliminary Human Rights Impact Assessment (pHRIA) of Sidewalk Labs' MIDP would also be delayed until early to mid-May. Mr. Glaisek noted Quayside will return to Panel to review the masterplan and individual projects – the timeline is not determined.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek provided a construction update on **Port Lands Flood Protection**, noting the lake-filling is almost complete and the river valley cut-off walls are in progress. Mr. Glaisek noted that the concrete shell for the **Cherry St. Stormwater Treatment Facility** has been completed as of March 30th, 2020. The team is addressing the concrete quality issues, evaluating sandblasting option to correct quality deficiencies. Despite COVID-19, Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto issued the RFP for **Sherbourne Water's Edge Public Art "Destination" Artwork**. To ensure participation, Waterfront Toronto has called all the galleries that represent the artists.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 3C PL1 – Schematic Design 2

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1108
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design 2
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Keating Channel Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	3C Lakeshore Inc.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Adamson Associates Architects, PMA Landscape Architects, S+A Footprint
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Greg Dunn, Adamson Associates Architects; Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects; Lyle Scott, S+A Footprint
<i>Delegation:</i>	Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Jasmine Frolick, 3C Lakeshore Inc.; Elsa Fancello, 3C Lakeshore Inc.; David Koren, Adamson Associates Architects; Andrew Ferancik, Principal, WND Planning; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Colin Wolfe, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the existing site context, project history, and proposal summary. Mr. Hilburt noted this project technically already completed DRP with a conditional support vote at the first Schematic Design review but would like to return for hopefully a full support and specifically address Panel comments. Mr. Hilburt noted the adjacent Gardiner East Public Realm design that should be integrated as part of the site plan and provided a recap of the previous Consensus Comments from November, 2019: provide more details on ground floor retail, passageway, fenestration, façade, and cladding materiality, consider a stronger landscape design that leverages a singular strategy to activate the open space on day one, provide more details on building landscape features, and seasonal opportunities. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Colin Wolfe, Community Planner with City of Toronto, to present planning issues.

Mr. Wolfe noted the City is working with the Proponent and will continue to pay close attention to the design's interface with public streets, Martin Goodman Trail, future phases, and flood projection considerations. Mr. Hilburt noted the areas for Panel consideration: capture of Queens Quay vista, interface with future plaza, ground floor retail space, façade materiality, functionality as a day one site, outdoor amenity and terrace spaces. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Greg Dunn, Principal with Adamson Associates, to continue the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Dunn began by thanking the Panel for carrying on during these times and provided a brief recap including the site overview, the context master plan, and the project parti.

Architecture

Mr. Dunn provided a recap of previous panel comments and identified the team's responses, including massing changes to capture the Queens Quay terminus, the

triangular retail volume and lobby relationship, introduction of the green wall and details, alignment of the exterior cladding panel pattern and details, and the façade materiality. Mr. Dunn noted the team is interested in delivering a crisp, precise façade system with anodized aluminium. Mr. Dunn noted the roof volume and landscape have been revised as part of the Site Plan Application process. As a result, the mechanical volume height is reduced, roof is flattened, and amenity space on the western side is increased. Mr. Dunn noted the terraces allow for a spiralling, meandering experience up the building all the way to the roof, as an alternative to the traditional access through the core of the building. Mr. Dunn introduced Fung Lee, Partner with PMA Landscape Architects, to present the landscape design.

Landscape

Ms. Lee began by noting that the team revisited the driving concept of the landscape design and believes the result is stronger. Ms. Lee noted the overall landscape design and approach: from refined materials of the building to a raw experience in the outdoor space. Ms. Lee noted the overall design update in plan, identifying the revised pedestrian path, temporary and permanent landscape areas, plaza programs, linkages to adjacent future revitalization projects such as the Lake Shore Public Realm plan and Martin Goodman Trail realignment, refinement to materiality, fast growing planting approach, and the furniture elements. The team would like to encourage spill-outs along the building edges to appreciate the panoramic views offered by this pioneer building. Ms. Lee introduced Lyle Scott, Principal with SA Footprint, to continue the presentation on sustainability.

Sustainability

Mr. Scott noted the project is registering for LEED gold and the energy performance is close to Tier 2. With the significant outdoor amenity spaces, the project complies with the green roof by-law but finding space for photo-voltaic or other form of renewable energy is a challenge. Mr. Scott noted the team is exploring ideas to meet TGS Tier 2 for stormwater. There is no district energy connection available and temporary planting selection is made to ensure ease of transplant into future permanent locations.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the revised landscape design includes extending the pedestrian path to Queens Quay. Ms. Fung noted yes that is correct.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the soil depth of terrace plantings. Ms. Fung noted the design is still in early stages, the team is working with the architects and structural to manage loads from the plantings. There are high canopy trees on terrace level four and five which will require raised planters to accommodate 3' of soils. The remaining planters will be 2.5' deep for smaller trees and large shrubs. The team is interested in creating shade and microclimate for the terraces.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the interior and exterior changes to the passageway since there was an indentation at the entrance in the previous DRP design. Mr. Dunn noted the entrance has been shifted to the west, depth has been reduced in response to Panel comments. The Panel member noted there is a deep

recess for the loading and parking entrance and asked if it has been changed. Mr. Dunn noted both conditions are the same. The Panel member asked for clarification on the northern indentations in plan. Mr. Dunn noted they are service entrances and the next to the east entrance is an exit stairwell.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the permanent landscape area and the timeline for the temporary landscape area. Ms. Fung noted the permanent landscape area is there as labelled, the vegetation in the temporary area will be removed and the team will salvage as much as possible for the permanent install.

One Panel member asked if ground floor retail on the east side can spill out into the outdoor landscape area and if the architecture anticipates animation. Mr. Dunn noted the building allows for animation along the edge.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the interior green wall, feasibility in Toronto, and maintenance requirements. Mr. Dunn noted the team is still at schematic design on the green wall, but the green wall consultant will ensure its operation.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member thanked the team for the incredible amount of work, thinking through the Panel comments, and positively responding to them. The Panel member is supportive of the project, asked the team to carefully consider the design of the building greenery so they can be seen from street level – consider the railing design and depth of planters.

Another Panel member commended the team for the responses. The Panel member suggested to use a heavier gauge aluminium on the front face of the mullions where crinkling is most common. Mr. Dunn agreed with the comment and is pleased with the improvements.

One Panel member appreciated the revised passageway with alignment down Queens Quay, noted the inclusion of the retail triangle will improve transparency and animation of the lobby. The Panel member is interested in a high-quality metal cladding to prevent oil-canning, pleased with the glazing ratio, and the shading that is provided by the projections in the building elevations. The Panel member is supportive of the project.

Another Panel member commended the team on the design efforts. The Panel member noted Waterfront Toronto has developed the mid-block connection as a typology in creating good public space, consider strengthening the signal of the passageway to the public, such as carrying a consistent ground pavement material throughout. The unique publicness of the design should ripple through the building. The Panel member appreciated the emerging landscape and noted the metal chairs appear to be too fragile for this windy site. While the chairs may be a visual counterpoint to the heavier timber benches, consider alternatives that are sturdier and can help make the space feel more permanent.

One Panel member appreciated the background information to help contextualize the site and the evolution of the design. The Panel member commended the planting palette, furniture, and paving, in showcasing the pioneering quality of the project. The Panel member recommended applying the same approach to the rest of 3C in dealing with the various in-progress sites as the district develops.

Another Panel member appreciated the revisions especially the nuance on the outdoor space. The Panel member recommended the team to select plant species that are appropriate: nimble landscape where the gradient can be designed, explore non-urban palette. The Panel member noted the team rose to the comments for a very difficult site.

One Panel member noted the edges are well treated, including the corner of the passageway. The Panel member noted the building is simple, jewel-like, and the green appears to be essential. Ensure the greenery can mature to be very visible and the ground floor retail can spill out to the outdoor in warm seasons. The Panel member noted it is a fabulous project.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider public circulation, such as a taxi waiting area, sidewalk, and the adjacent landscapes as part of the passageway experience. The Panel member noted the doors on the east end of the passageway is blocking an important view corridor, consider alternatives.

One Panel member appreciated the rigor of the façade design, recognizing that it unifies the project mass. The Panel member suggested the team to look at an aluminium cladding product that is used for the Guggenheim museum in France, noting that it has a very mild shimmer. The Panel member asked the team to ensure adequate planting depth for appropriate growth and survival, at the same time consider the façade impact, i.e. at the entrance of the portico. It is important to maintain the rigor and appearance of the building as you consider the depth of structure and planting.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the Proponent team's serious responses to previous Panel comments.
- Supportive of unique nature of the site and the building as a pioneer project.

Architecture

- Appreciated that the public passageway is a connection consistent with the typology of public mid-block passageways in the waterfront area.
- Maximize ground floor openness to the future plaza and Queens Quay, consider further improving permeability of the building's edges with the adjacent open spaces, i.e. ensure views to Queens Quay from the triangular retail space, ensure spill out opportunities from retail, and emphasize the signalling of the public passageway with continuous material from exterior to interior.

- Further emphasize the publicness of the passageway by enlarging the west-end exterior entrance area.
- Provide more doors at the east-end of passageway to connect to the outdoor space.
- Consider the use of thicker gauge aluminium cladding on the front faces of the mullions to avoid oil canning from wear.

Landscape

- Supportive of the revised design and appreciated the clearly communicated distinction between temporary and permanent landscape.
- Appreciated the use of tough and resilient landscape and planting strategies.
- Appreciated the revisions and details on the green roofs and terraces, ensure the impact is not lost and visible from the street level, consider carefully the design of planters and provide adequate soil depth.

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

Mr. Dunn thanked the Panel for the comments and noted credit should be given to 3C's team for engaging in the design review process. The team got pushed on certain elements and it is proof that the process worked.

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.

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

2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Parks – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1114
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA)
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal, MVVA; Emily Mueller De Celis, Partner, MVVA
<i>Delegation:</i>	Shannon Baker, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto; Lisa Taylor, Waterfront Toronto; Kathleen Niccols; Richard Conte, MVVA; Lara Prebble, MVVA; Marc Kramer, City of Toronto; Christian Giles, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto; Eric Stadnyk, City of Toronto; Ann-Marie Nasr, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Project Director of Parks and Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by providing the project background and noted Port Lands

Flood Protection (PLFP) Parks is here today for Detailed Design review. Ms. Baker provided a recap of the PLFP Enabling Infrastructure boundary, and the extents of Promontory Park and River Park. To ensure there is design continuity, Ms. Baker provided an updated anticipated design schedule, and summarized the previous consensus comments from the Schematic Design review in September 2018, February 2020, and the PLFP Integration review in June 2019. Ms. Baker noted the areas for Panel consideration, including the balance between programmed space and designed nature, clear articulation of the path network within the parks, balance of responding to site constraints and achieving design objectives, integration of heritage elements, the range of programming, operations and maintenance, and the consideration for the dynamism of the river system and creation of the resilience strategy. Ms. Baker then introduced Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, and Emily Mueller De Celis, Partner with MVVA, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began the presentation by noting the various parts of the park that are being reviewed and the team has previously received many great comments from the Panel. Mr. Sweeney provided a recap of the detailed consensus comments, the previous design iterations of the River Valley and the Promontory park. Mr. Sweeney provided a recap of the design approach and strategy: retaining and commemorating industrial heritage, the relationship between the river valley and forest frame, establishing a forest frame, reusing existing soil, risk management measures at Park and River Valley, framing a comprehensive vision, and an integrated network of paths and trails.

Promontory Park

Ms. Mueller de Celis noted the updated 3D perspectives of the park, the full park program types and features by 2024. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the updated designs of the event lawn, plaza, Esplanade, and the MT-35 light columns in Promontory Park. As a commemoration for MT-35, the team is proposing to expose the pile caps and construct a series of light columns that would mark the scale and volume of the building. Ms. Mueller de Celis described the Promontory Park stone types, wall sections, Atlas Crane design, and park entrances.

River Valley Park

Mr. Sweeney noted the updated designs for River Valley Park North and South including connections and porosity to the urban context, views at urban interfaces, repositioning of the fire hall, dogs off-leash area, nature play zones, picnic terraces and lawn, and the bike bridge.

Park Wide Components

Ms. Mueller de Celis provided a design detail update on other park-wide components, including gathering space seating and locations, art trail strategy, art infrastructure, fencing and barriers, lighting, wayfinding and signage, and the pavement types and materials. Snow removal locations, stormwater management infrastructure, and servicing were also updated. Mr. Sweeney noted the operations and maintenance needs, including an overall strategy, current and future facility locations, and working with PF&R on managing the assets.

Mr. Sweeney noted the park planting microclimate, planting types, zones, and how they reference the various Ontario vegetation communities such as the woodland, bluff, floodplain forest, barren, and island thicket. Mr. Sweeney noted the range of landscape experiences in Promontory Park, including entrance tunnel, bosque, crane grove, larch lawn, catalpa promontory, sheltered woodland, willow grove, the oak lawn, etc. Mr. Sweeney concluded with updated views of the Promontory Park in different seasons.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the park's demographics and if older teens have been considered in the design of the park, natural, and resiliency areas. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the nature spaces are broken up into three areas: active, quiet, and edge zones for kids that want to look out, to satisfy imaginative, narrative, and active play. The Owl is an example of imaginative play. Mr. Sweeney noted the in-between demographic is greatly discussed, there are plenty of gathering spaces for socializing and hanging out, including the picnic areas. The Panel member noted those areas make sense if the caregivers are not completely occupying the areas and asked for more information on the overscale animals. Mr. Sweeney noted the animals are artists-created elements that are set into plant beds. They are climbable. The Owl is 8m tall and allows kids to reach the level of the eyes.

Another Panel member asked if there is an idea or greater plan for the oversized animals. Mr. Sweeney noted there is a narrative that stretches from River Valley Park North into the Destination Play area with the potentially funded play equipment. Regarding the operations and maintenance manual, the Panel member asked if there is a strategy that links the stormwater and runoffs from adjacent developments into the park. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted sidewalk stormwater is being brought into the park and the team has investigated bringing in more from the developments. However, in order to manage the large volumes, another layer of infrastructure would have to be added further removing existing soil volume. The park on its own can manage its own output directly out to the river, thus it was decided to forego dealing with development stormwater.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the sub-demographics of the park, such as children and old people, at the nature play and destination play areas, and if they are designed to appeal to the same group or address different constituencies. Mr. Sweeney noted that nature and destination play areas have very different experiences and scales as imagined by the team. In particular, the destination play will be denser, more exuberant, so the areas cater to different interests and play styles.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the location of the fire hall. Mr. Sweeney noted the existing building is located within the right-of-way of the future transit so it has to be moved. Furthermore, the new location outside of the existing footprint will allow for new structural foundation work to take place. The Panel member asked for clarification on the green space that is west of the Don River, north of River Valley north, and if it is part of the design scope. Also clarify the scope of work for the area south of the river bend. Mr. Sweeney noted it is within the limit of work for the

flood protection and will be providing a rough grade for the future park. The team will provide the funded earth work infrastructure, but not the park itself. For the south area, Mr. Sweeney noted the area above top of bank will be future parks and the scope includes stabilizing earth work. The Panel member asked the team to provide a critical section drawing to help understand the high and low water levels of both sides of the river.

One Panel member asked for the rationale for the lack of planting on the area known as the “Esplanade” next to the water and how it compares to Easy Bayfront. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the dock walls along that edge was built in two phases, the tie rods hold the foundation together, so the team is limited by the amount of excavation allowed without destabilizing the dock walls. The current design plans right to the benches and cannot plant further beyond to the west without disturbing the tie rods. The Panel member asked if the light columns are made of salvaged materials. Ms. Mueller De Celis responded that the design is an abstraction of the height of the original volume of the building. Since the original building was demolished, the materials are custom made steel. The light columns are large enough to contain lighting and can be seen from East Bayfront. The Panel member asked for more information on the temporary and permanent O+M facilities. Ms. Mueller De Celis noted the team is working with PF&R to negotiate where the temporary facilities can be located. The timeline of them will depend on the delivery of the permanent facilities.

Another Panel member asked if there are washrooms scattered throughout for activities that require closed facilities. Ms. Mueller De Celis answered that six new washroom facilities are being provided.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member thanked the team for the thorough presentation and commended the MT-35 foundation pieces as interesting ways to commemorate the building, consider marrying those elements with lighting to further articulate the features. The Panel member noted the presentation gave the impression that while the park is large, it is programmatically full, and the street edges have very similar treatments. The Panel member expressed hesitation on the balance of areas with quiet vistas versus active play and noted discomfort with the large animals such as the owl. The Panel member noted the bike bridge foundation support should be better detailed to look embedded with the landscape instead sitting on top of it.

Another Panel member noted that the fencing around the Atlas Crane needs further refinement as it is too pedestrian in contrast with the other more metaphorical design details in the park. The Panel member recommended that the washrooms on the back of the firehall building be carefully integrated into the rear façade as the diagrammatic plan raised potential detailing concerns, consider its composition as it is directly facing the park. The Panel member was impressed by the consistency of the park design but raised concerns on the balance of the active and nature play areas. The Panel member noted that the iconography of the Maggie Daley park is blatant and corny- it is a not a good precedent from that perspective because the playgrounds in your proposal are much better formally integrated with the rest of the design. While they are denser and

more loaded than the nature areas, the Panel member recommended a similar deft use of metaphoric, so it does not seem alien to the park.

One Panel member commended Waterfront Toronto, MVVA, and PF&R for a well-integrated project and noted it is very thoroughly considered. The Panel member noted MVVA is the Olmsted office of our era with careful consideration of the city grid, park entrances, and program distribution. The Panel member appreciated the circulation system with the bridges which avoids conflict with various forms of movement – the entire system is well connected and flows. The Panel member also commended the maintenance strategy. The Panel member noted something is missing along the edge for the area known as the “Esplanade” while the view of downtown from that location is special. The Panel member noted the MT-35 light columns feel timid and should be made stronger. Consider a singular, bold, approach for expressing heritage and embracing the nautical theme.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider introducing pedestrian lighting that is lower, more intimate, in the “Esplanade” and noted rot concerns for timber benches that are sitting directly on the ground as these details would not work in a west-coast climate. The Panel member noted there are many areas elsewhere in the city for less intensive play and felt this is the appropriate site for intensive active play, thus not as critical on the iconography of the design. The Panel member commended the team for an unbelievable presentation and a world class design.

One Panel member appreciated the MT-35 commemoration features but noted the light columns are too slick, consider expressing the rough around the edges quality without mimicking or replicating it in anyway. The Panel member appreciated the various striations of the sedimentary rocks and the clarification of the transitional boundaries between park and the city. The Panel member appreciated the combination of ordinariness and specificities, such as the park benches combined with the more specific landscape elements. The Panel member noted it is important to learn from Corktown Common in setting a new standard for the operations and maintenance strategy. The Panel member felt that the green spaces north of the channel and south of the river bend should be expressed more strongly and noted the importance of public art for the project.

Another Panel member commended the team for a very exciting design and felt lucky for the city to have a project like this. The Panel member noted that the “Esplanade” edge should not have a double row of trees like other water’s edge promenades, instead it should be more civic – suggested an inventive feature on the paving to help indicate the area, such as a variation of the paving pattern. The Panel member recommended a clear strategy to help understand the locations of the oversized animals and questioned the thematic integration of the destination playground within the greater park. Similarly, the Panel member questioned the threshold between street and park, and how both the infrastructural and experiential can be integrated.

One Panel member appreciated the gradient of the planting palette and legibility created from all different directions. The Panel member noted the eco-type analogies are very important and helpful for the project and felt the opportunity for partnership with PF&R on monitoring the succession landscape plan can be adopted by City

agencies. The Panel member asked the team to consider beyond the demographic of kids and toddlers to include youth leadership and development, at the nature play areas where they allow for play that is distinct from the destination play areas.

Another Panel member felt inspired by the design and noted the whimsical design is well structured and has a good balance of plantings. The Panel member felt this will attract many Torontonians to come to the waterfront. At the area known as the “Esplanade”, the Panel member suggested to provide structures for shade and relief. At the firehall, the Panel member recommended to further tweak the building program and interior to ensure integration with the adjacent uses. The Panel member noted the bridge details require further refinement, such as the support for the team and the handrail. The Panel member noted to refine the fencing around the Atlas Crane and the utilitarian lighting does not fit well with the family of park furniture. The Panel member encouraged the team to carefully consider the location and placement of the temporary maintenance facilities as they tend to stay in use for a very long time.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the team’s continued efforts in developing this phenomenal project for the stunning site, it will put Toronto on the map, demonstrate how nature can be brought back while integrating resilient design in our cities.
- Commended the thoroughness of the details and the overall design - no major issues.
- With an anticipated completion time of four years, the Panel is inspired by the eventual opening of the project.
- Ensure the balance of active (including Destination Play) and natural play areas are appropriate for the park demographics.
- Some Panel members thought that the active play areas would only attract very young teens and less area should be dedicated. Other Panel members thought older teens and adults would find it equally interesting to play there.
- Learn from the results of Corktown Common and continue to work closely with PF&R on the operations and maintenance manual – it will be a very important document for Waterfront Toronto and PF&R moving forward.

Landscape

- The “Esplanade” facing the lake is a powerful and unique feature that can be further differentiated and marked from the rest of the project, consider the use of different paving or ground cover materials for the area and a stronger reference for the commemoration of MT-35.
- Consider lowering the light poles to get them to a pedestrian level or provide pedestrian lighting and tweak the design to reflect stronger industrial heritage references to MT-35 – provide more details on the design.
- Refine the beam support structure and railing design of the bicycle bridge.
- Further develop the fencing treatment around the Atlas Crane.
- Carefully consider the south façade of the Fire Hall and ensure washroom elements are well integrated in the architectural design.

- Timber use for the benches is supported, consider rot mitigation strategies for exposed wood over time.
- Ensure public art is well integrated with the park design.
- Consider the narratives of the adjacent green areas that are north and south of the river, their linkages with the site over time will impact the experience of the Parks.

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

Mr. Sweeney thanked the Panel for the comments and the team is not surprised by the areas identified.

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.

Full support: unanimous full support

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.