



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #125
Wednesday, June 26, 2019**

Present

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

Regrets

Recording Secretaries

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Port Lands Flood Protection: Integration – For Information
 2. Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the April 24th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted with amendment made by one Panel member to clarify Block 10's relationship between the Canary heritage building and the condominium volume: to be more emphatic on the new building to respond to the heritage building in an appropriate scale on all four elevations.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Members declared no conflicts for the project review sessions today.

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 Block 10's consensus comments are being considered by the proponent team as they work towards Design Development. The team is refining, simplifying the overall design in response to Panel comments, is on track to return for Stage 3 review in September while targeting a summer Site Plan Approval application. Mr. Glaisek noted that consensus comments have been delivered to the 162 Queens Quay East proponent: working with City staff to step up podium façade to match neighbor, removed benches on Queens Quay, exploring façade options, and anticipating returning for September DRP Stage 3 review.

Mr. Glaisek noted that a PLFP Community Consultation Public Meeting was held at City Hall on June 19-20. The PLFP team provided updates on the design, consulted the public to identify specific areas of interest, and welcoming remarks were made by Member of Parliament Julie Dabrusin and City Councilor Paula Fletcher. Mr. Glaisek noted that WT and the City held an East Bayfront Community Open House on June 11, provided the public with updates on ongoing projects and an informal opportunity to learn about the development progress of their community.

Mr. Glaisek also noted construction updates on Cherry Street Stormwater Treatment Facility, Force Mains, and East Bayfront Public Realm.

The Chair's remarks:

Regarding Bill 108, the Chair noted that June 3rd was the deadline for submission for comments; on June 6th the Bill was passed and is now enforced. On June 21st, the Province proposed three sets of regulations that can be circulated to the Panel for review.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Integration

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1107
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	For Information
<i>Review Round:</i>	First
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	MVVA, Grimshaw, DTAH

Presenter(s): Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal, MVVA; See-Yin Lim, DTAH; David Dennis, Associate Principal, Grimshaw; James Roche, Partner, DTAH

Delegation: Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, WT; Shannon Baker, Director, Parks and Public Realm, WT

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, began with an introduction of the project, noting that this presentation is for information and will not receive a Panel vote. Ms. Mallozzi provided a background update for the Panel, noting that there are twenty-three individual components to the project divided into categories including earthworks/ flood protection, parks, bridges and structures, roads and municipal infrastructure. Waterfront Toronto is interested in creating a cohesive vision as the project moves forward; MVVA has taken on the lead role as integrator thus the presentation will be largely made by Herb Sweeney. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the team has set out goals and is asking how to accomplish these objectives: 1) to ensure a seamless flow of spaces and moments, including seamless connections for cyclists and pedestrians via bridges and trails and a park program designed to connect into these access points, coordination, blurring the lines between streets, bridges, and parks 2) to integrate into the full project a series of unified themes to create a cohesive whole, including the juxtaposition of industrial materials, urban form and natural green space that exists in Port Lands, simple materials throughout all design elements, a unified planting palette, streets that reflect the ecological aspirations of the river, and using bridge design to provide a contrast to the ecological habitat marking these gateways into the Port Lands iconic. Ms. Mallozzi noted updates in the design with the “2024 Day Plan” including Promotory Park South, heritage value at Atlas Crane Island, and kayak access from the City. Ms. Mallozzi noted options of firehall integration are being explored and programming is being optimized with more details next month. Noting that integration is an important topic for the Panel as discussed in the past, Ms. Mallozzi provided a DRP meeting summary for PLFP, and asked the Panel to consider the following: seamless relationship along edges between elements, aspirations for integration, the cohesiveness of the project, material palette and planting, design as armature for catalysing future development, and the approach as a replicable system for remaining Villiers Island and Polson. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Herb Sweeney, with MVVA, to make the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began by noting the three main integration ideas: circulation, materiality, and planting.

Circulation

Reviewing the overall circulation of the project, there is a hierarchy in the various modes of travel, from vehicular, sidewalks, bike routes, primary parks network, secondary trailers, to paths that one can access the water. Bridges, roads, and park connectivity are designed to provide connections that can get down to the Keating Channel and water in the future. At Commissioners Street, the bridge meets with existing roadways, dropping points for water connections are created, and future LRT

space is reserved. Mr. Sweeney noted that the various modes of transportation are overlapped, with bike lanes sliding underneath bridges, and natural paths connect seamlessly with parks.

Materiality

Mr. Sweeney noted the hierarchy of pavement materials in the project, with concrete pavement starting at the City streets, ranging to more specialized materials such as asphalt, timber decking, paleo-tec, screened limestone, exposed aggregate, and various engineered play surfaces. There are three pavement threshold transition strategies that respond to small, medium, and large conditions leading into program areas. The site furniture is different for the three thresholds. Mr. Sweeney noted that the roads design will quickly catch up to the progress of the park design south, Commissioners Street, and river valley park. It is important for the pavement transition between parks and roads to feel like a unified gesture. The team is investigating grading relationships between bridge pier caps and pavement as the locations of future bridge piers are being considered. The approach to seating is simple, clean and have different seating designs- the benches down to the Levy Lake are aesthetically more natural. Mr. Sweeney noted with the lighting layout diagram that pole lights are used along roadways to direct entry and highlighted the park lighting at bridge underpasses to provide pedestrian safety.

Planting

Mr. Sweeney noted the objective is to create a unified planting approach that includes all planting types including wetland, forest frame, lawn, LID/planters, and LID bioswales. The planting palette is designed to extend into the right-of-way, and special tree species will recognize the roadways. Furthermore, the planting palette from the park is brought into the streets. At the top of bank condition on street level, a naturalized edge is created in anticipation for future development. Mr. Sweeney noted that the Don Roadway rendering and axonometric diagram capture all three conditions of park, road, and natural edge.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for material and design clarification on the bench and railing. Ms. Lim explained that the wood bench on concrete is a special condition to accommodate the elevation change. Mr. Sweeney noted that there are various railing conditions and details: bridge railing, park railing, park to public realm, etc – the material is painted steel.

Another Panel member asked how the park entries are marked in plan and clarification on the discrepancy in grid pattern on sidewalk between south and north side. Mr. Sweeney explained that the strategy is to take the sidewalk pavement inward until it intersects with one of the main circulation paths of the park, with bench bridging the gap; parks has to catch up to the roads design due to recent programmatic change – parks will return for detailed design review

One Panel member asked for clarification on the integration of signage, snow storage, crossing. Mr. Sweeney answered that the team will provide parks signage details at the next DRP review for Parks, snow removal is not planned except for few areas with winter programming and near the main entrances off Commissioners Street. Mr. Sweeney added that Parks will return with a robust management strategy with PF&R. Ms. Lim explained that there is standard snow removal for the roads with meter buffer from face of curb. Mr. Dennis added there is no signage requirements for the bridges.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on whether the design discourages entry into the park other than the designated entry points. Mr. Sweeney noted that is correct.

One Panel member asked if the columnar trees are placeholders or specifically specified. Ms. Lim answered that they are currently specified as Oak. Another Panel member asked if every street have street tree specifications. Ms. Lim noted yes.

One Panel member asked if there is massing height considerations for the adjacent future development areas. Ms. Mallozzi answered that the Villiers Island Precinct Plan indicate mixed-use developments along Commissions Street at six to eight metres, commercial and office uses along Cherry Street.

Another Panel member asked if bike parking, other municipal elements are part of the furniture layout. Ms. Lim answered that most municipal elements will abide with City of Toronto guidelines, bike racks will be coordinated with the benches, utility boxes will adopt the Queens Quay design, benches will appropriately follow parks typology – no new typology is being introduced.

One Panel member asked if other transition points from street down to park will be presented. Mr. Sweeney noted that more intersections will be shown at the next review.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the project for overall positive changes and approach to planting and benches. The Panel member has concerns with some outstanding items and looks forward to further information on signage, wayfinding, and complete street furnishing. The Panel member has concerns with the durability of the painted steel and mesh on the railing design, and would like to hear more about the system of moving stormwater from private developments under streets to parks via bioswales.

Another Panel member commended the team for working on an amazing project and suggested some rigor for the multitude of elements can be considered. Continuous, variable, unique elements should be categorized to ensure design rigor. The Panel member noted that the natural shoreline is the most remarkable element of the design and it is important to leverage this against the more engineered elements to strengthen the overall reading. The Panel member noted to consider forest plantings be applied to street side trees, to embrace the opportunity for these streets to be different than other Toronto streets.

One Panel member encouraged the team to work in section critically, integrate hydrology, and typology into the design- surface layers can use more investigation. A continuous sectional investigation will help dissect materiality, experience, soil types, plantings, etc. Consider looking at how the adjacent developments will impact the design in terms of shadow.

Another Panel member commended on the development of the project and for providing many thoughtful integration strategies. The Panel member noted the planting framework is very strong and legible, however, wherever possible consider loosening the planting framework near the park where possible to make the park's wilderness legible to the city and communicate both the design and performative qualities of the strategy to the public. The Panel noted it is important to identify, represent green infrastructure so the value can be accessed and communicated, and integrate streetscape stormwater management. The project can discuss the issue of changing mean lake water levels and the Panel member suggested to consider employing a gradient lake levels as another factor in the design and integration.

One Panel member noted to consider how the entry points connect back into the city, and can be made larger and stronger, like Olmsted entrances, currently feels too timid. The Panel member felt the road design shares too many characteristics with Queens Quay, consider more diversity in spacing closer to the park, create one unique edge of the city where park blurs with transportation. A blurred landscape is a unique opportunity – it is important for the design to be less “perfect”. The Panel member noted the Honey Locust trees will age beautifully.

Another Panel member noted it is a pleasure to see the design. The Panel member felt the bridge underpass is missing a strong narrative and can be drastically improved with a concept that relates the visitor with the bridge. The Panel member is not convinced with the armour stone paving wrapping around the bridge pier as indicated on the drawings.

One Panel member noted that the northwest corner of Cherry and Commissioners Street is very important and should be provided with an entrance. It is important to blend the park's wilderness with the City gradually; the handrail design that stops at the bridge can be better resolved.

Another Panel member noted that the integration is in progress, there should be an understanding of the relationship between the design element families, the place, and with existing design standards that the team does not have control over. The Panel member noted to consider various futures, including the integration of LRT with the family of elements.

One Panel member noted that planning for the LRT is essential to include all the transit accessories that must be integrated such as transit shelter, waiting areas, etc. The Panel member felt the railing design is part of the bridge and road infrastructure but not yet integrated with the park. The Panel member noted while the project is the most dynamic neighbourhood in the city, the design representation feels static- it is

critical to consider the landscape and edges as a living element. The Panel member noted to consider the park as a continuation of a network of trails that bring visitors down to the water and the bridge underpass is an important urban gateway from the city- integration requires recognizing these threshold condition.

Another Panel member noted to consider merging the material palettes of the two systems, pairing seating types with other families, and complete the taxonomy study of the family of elements. The Panel member noted the street and edge element designs should embrace robust materials that will age through use, in reference to the character of the Portlands, that will soften both park and road systems and help with further integration.

One Panel member noted that it is important to define the family of elements, include municipal elements and ensure there is no loose elements.

Mr. Glaisek noted three areas of concern: the condition where the bridge pier meets with the armour stone paving, alignment of bench types, and the arbitrary paving threshold conditions where the City paths meet the park circulation.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel is pleased with the successful evolution of the project; commended the team for the great work and overall very positive comments
- Consider these reoccurring key comments moving forward: how to improve the seamless connections, blur the park edges, develop a catalogue of families of design elements, consider the project as an astonishing and most unique place of the City

Integration:

- Develop a catalogue of families of elements such as handrails, and consider the designs as a collective whole
- Develop a strategy on how to achieve continuity and leverage discrete elements in the park
- The project has license to “blur” - consider making the edges less distinct by breaking the grid, mixing diversity, departing from the norm of Toronto streetscape, exploring how wilderness can interface with the City and vice versa
- Consider bringing concrete paving on the entry paths all the way to the interior circulation paths
- Consider the effects of lake water level change, seasonal variety, and snow storage as part of the integration process
- Consider the relationship with the future building edges, provide long cross sections from Commissioners Street to the park to help understand the interface

Design:

- Provide more information on signage, wayfinding, bicycle storage, City street furniture, and their relationship with the park
- Suggest revisiting the durability of the handrail design and fence mesh material
- Consider the LRT as part of the integration strategy and align pedestrian crossings with transit stops
- Consider a larger, stronger and more direct entrance to the park, at the corner of Commissioners and Cherry St.
- Consider a strongly expressed under-the-bridge shoreline experience
- Develop materiality that captures the roughness of the Port Lands, specifically the meeting of the bridge piers with the armour stone paving and integration with the other families of elements

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1095
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Four
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	DTAH, WSP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	See-Yin Lim, DTAH; Aaron Small, WSP
<i>Delegation:</i>	Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, WT; Shannon Baker, Director, Parks and Public Realm, WT; James Roche, DTAH

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Director, Parks and Public Realm, with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting the project is part of the efforts of enabling the infrastructure for the Port Lands roads and municipal services. Ms. Baker noted that WSP with DTAH are the core team in producing the public realm design including Cherry Street, Don Roadway, Commissioners Street, and all municipal services. Ms. Baker noted that Roads has a cascading anticipated construction schedule completing in 2024. Cherry Street has completed 100% construction documents, construction has commenced, will likely take four months due to poor soil conditions and large amount of settlement to occur- landscape finishes will be tendered. Commissioners Street is split into two and it is on the same stream as the new Cherry Street. Ms. Baker noted that the road right-of-way was decided in previous Villiers Island Precinct plans and EA masterplan- the width is set. Ms. Baker summarized previous Panel comments and noted areas for Panel consideration: the design's success in creating identities for each street,

humanizing the streets to improve perception of connectivity between neighbourhood and park, the streets' capitalization on opportunities for sustainability, and the design's success in making visible the management of water. Ms. Baker then introduced See-Yin Lim, with DTAH to give the presentation and thanked City staff for their continued support of the project.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Lim began the presentation by noting today's presentation will provide a brief update on Cherry Street and focus on Commissioners Street and Don Roadway.

Cherry Street:

Ms. Lim noted Cherry Street is conceived as an urban green spine with strong tree typologies, creating public "urban" rooms, visual continuity along the street, resilient and tolerant of urban conditions, and appropriate for bioretention planters/ bioswales. The design has been peer-reviewed by North-South Environmental Inc. based on urban tolerance and as green infrastructure for the public realm.

Ms. Lim noted simplification to the street materiality: water drains into the open pit planters that hold water, found materials such as steel are reclaimed and refinished to create the post-industrial green spine. Future social spaces and site furnishing zones with timber benches support a major pedestrian street.

Commissioners Street:

Ms. Lim noted that the Commissioners Street has a more "park" identity relative to Cherry Street: larger more robust planters, bioswale systems, laybys on the north side for ride share, additional vegetated buffer at the centre curb, and coordinated transit stops for visitors to entre park. An important integration strategy is to slow down vehicular traffic by narrowing streets and bending cycle tracks to create new vegetation view sheds and pull park closer to street. Pointing to the street axonometric drawing, Ms. Lim noted mid-block crossings provide connections to the park and underground utility coordination ties solar cells into storm lines. At the platform crossing section, the two-lane street becomes three lanes to accommodate turning lane and there is temporary landscape near bridge abutment for future LRT track construction. Green infrastructure along Commissioners integrate more screening for public realm including three types of bioswales: enhanced grass swales, bioswale, open pit planter with solar cells, plus ROW edge drainage and porous asphalt. Ms. Li noted that the tree typology along Commissioners Street is similar to Cherry Street, with added species that tie into park edge planting. Columnar trees provide strong visual cue.

Don Roadway:

Ms. Lim noted Don Roadway is conceived as a "river's edge" street- on the east side is a temporary landscape, on the west side with close proximity to the Don River, bike path, sidewalk, planting similar to Cherry Street, the road design has more habitat forming elements and plants that encourage urban animals to inhabit. At the River Valley Wall section, the multi-use bike trail is raised to preserve views to the river. Seating with walls help negotiate sectional elevation changes at these moments. At the

River Valley section, seasonal interested is supported by a range of vegetations including evergreens, color-changing trees, berry plants, etc.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the red marks on the final slide, integrated plan. Ms. Lim explained the red paint signifies vehicular traffic left turning lane.

Another Panel member asked if the columnar trees allow buses to pass through and if the team has explored other tree species that allow for height and passage of large vehicles. Ms. Lim explained that the columnar trees do both while creating urban rooms along the road, visual connections.

One Panel member asked if there is more infrastructure than shown. Ms. Lim confirmed the team is coordinating all known infrastructure, including decommissioned older lines and new ones, be shown in both plans and sections

Another Panel member ask what will happen to the existing yellow markings on the asphalt, and if a complete future plan drawing will be developed. The Panel member is looking forward to seeing more of the future condition with al turning lanes. Ms. Baker explained that the team is tasked to complete 30% schematic design and begin design development phase.

One Panel member asked for confirmation of transit stop location along Commissioners Street. Ms. Lim answered there is only one stop and it is shown.

Another Panel member asked if the westbound transit lane is accessible by buses and if the team has explored the integration of stormwater management from development sites north of Commissioners Street into the park. Ms. Lim answered that bus will do a crossover. Mr. Small noted the team is not consideration the consolidation of stormwater from development sites due to value engineering and understanding the strategy would complicate other site decisions.

One Panel member asked for the public art plan, lighting information, and if areas beyond Don Roadway has been explored. Mr. Glaisek answered the information would be presented when it is ready. Ms. Lim noted that the pedestrian light is not part of Hydro Toronto's standards, the team will proceed with meeting the lux level, introduce a LED light and transition – coordination with Hydro is in progress. Ms. Lim answered the team has not looked beyond Don Roadway.

Another Panel member asked for the width of the crosswalks and if they are temporary. Ms. Lim noted the midblock crossings are permanent designs that will accommodate the future streets.

One Panel member asked if the existing streets will be removed. Ms. Lim answered that Old Cherry Street will stay but made more narrow, Future Foundry Street, and Villiers Street to the east will be added.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that the cross-section drawings are informative, but the scale change from plan to section is too large. While the planting looks convincing, street tree plantings can be further maximized: stretch from Trinity Street to bridge, and along Commissioners Street.

Another Panel member commented that the project has licence to use solar cells; important to provide great quality and volume for the trees – an argument for more trees can be made as well. The Panel member suggested to stay away from formal arrangements of trees where possible and create a different experience for the street.

One Panel member felt that the columnar trees is not a nod to the industrial heritage of the Port Lands, much like a historic architectural detail not being re-created. The Panel member appreciated the road “bump outs” with more trees, noted to ensure light lux level is maximized in the pedestrian realm and provide comfortable lighting as deep into the park as possible. Consider safe paths at night and zones where lighting level purposely falls off. The Panel member noted to ensure Cherry and Commissioners Street have adequate entrance from both east and west for robust connections with the city.

Another Panel member noted that the road cross sections are convincing, but the street character has not been addressed adequately. Park entrances must be enhanced. Pointing at the street sections, the Panel member felt the tree volumes are inadequate and recommended to provide Silver Maple trees instead of Sugar Maple or Pine as they will not perform.

One Panel member noted the intersection designs are the least pleasant at the current moment, require most development and advocate for the public realm especially when there is a lot of engineering being accommodated in those areas. The Panel member felt the columnar trees are a barrier, reminiscent of a classist period of landscape design thus inappropriate, and overall too formal for the site.

Another Panel member felt more urban implications should be provided in the sections and drawings. It is important to envision the project in an urban setting- provide opening day/ temporary and full buildout designs. The Panel member does not understand the split in the eastbound bike lanes, suggested to consolidate them onto either side. The Panel member felt the pedestrian crossings are difficult to navigate and connections require more development: revise spacing, width between crossings, and consider Vision-Zero, putting pedestrian first and future transit.

One Panel member noted the Don Roadway is a unique condition where the park ends with important industrial heritage, it is important for the temporary design elements be conceived as permanent and be good. Reviewing the cross sections, the Panel member noted that the asymmetry created by the river and urban edge is critical for the special public realm. The spill over of roadway lighting into park is a concern that the team should consider moving forward. The Panel member noted each roadway is a termination of a long system, in order to fully understand Commissioners Street, the design should be presented all the way to Leslie Street. The Panel member also noted public art is a key element of Waterfront Toronto's mandate, this component should be represented with a clear position at this stage in both the city and park portion of the design.

Another Panel member noted the Villiers plan is not represented; the street sections seem suburban, difficult to understand it as a future neighbourhood. The Panel member noted the roads should be considered less as transitional, barriers to the pedestrian but as destinations that will add to the public realm and celebrate Villiers Island. The Panel member noted a strong relationship between road green infrastructure and park should be established – a system that slows down water and harness the essence of the Lower Don Lands precinct plan.

One Panel member felt the design is overengineered and questioned mobility design excellence- the team should consider pedestrian movement as priority over the car to create a more seamless public realm experience. On page 5, the Panel member noted the language of the planter is foreign to the area.

Another Panel member noted to consider providing an integrated lighting plan at the next review showing illumination levels, employ the same fence design strategy at the Don River wall throughout the project, and exploring alternative species to the columnar trees. Lastly, the Panel member noted that steel plate on the sidewalk is conducive to slipping and should be avoided.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel emphasized that the project is important to the City and should be designed as such
- The project will set the standard for future development along Commissioners Street – it is critical to create a strong template moving forward
- The Panel felt the design is a little over-engineered, consider “loosening” the design and “blurring” between park and roads as the design progresses
- Provide lighting plan at the next review, consider the experience of the park and demonstrate adequate light levels at south side sidewalk of Commissioners Street to ensure pedestrian safety
- The Panel expects a return to the DRP with more design updates

Context:

- Villiers Island Precinct Plan should be referenced and represented in the design

- Consider both existing and future conditions of the street wall and built form edges; represent the built form in drawings

Streets:

- Supportive of the “bump-out” concept for the street islands
- More attention should be paid to the design of the intersections- consider both functionality and appearance
- Don Roadway is an important street and where it meets at the park should be considered carefully- a stronger, more permanent looking solution needs to be planned in the temporary areas
- The Panel felt the proposed street conditions are too similar, consider further design development and create a stronger character for the park entrances
- Consider the qualities of rough edges and relief for the street material palette; avoid slick materials such as steel plate
- The City has made a strong commitment to Vision-Zero, this mindset should be central to the project and the pedestrian perspective must be prioritized
- Return with full designs of all three streets

Trees:

- Opportunities for more trees were identified, consider maximising the number of new trees and fill gaps especially at the intersections and future intersections
- Consider breaking away from the normal Toronto approach to street trees and distribution
- The Panel is split on the columnar trees, some felt they are too formal, consider other design alternatives
- Some members felt Sugar Maple is not the most appropriate species for the site, instead consider Silver Maple

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 in Conditional Support and look forward to the project’s return review.

Motion to go into “in-camera” session

CLOSING

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting.