



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #119
Wednesday, January 23, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Janna Levitt
Brigitte Shim
Peter Busby

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
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. West Don Lands Block 8 – Detailed Design
 2. Quayside: Sustainability – Issues Identification
 3. Quayside Pillars Evaluation Criteria
 4. Waterfront Vision
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Dec. 12th, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for West Don Lands Block 8, Pat Hanson and Eric Turcotte declared conflicts for Quayside: Sustainability and Quayside Pillars Evaluation Criteria and recused themselves for those reviews.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek noted on Jan. 18th a free skate event was held by Waterfront Toronto as part of “A Vision for Toronto’s Waterfront”, a series of follow-up activities at the Bentway to find out what brings people to the waterfront during colder months. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on Aitken Place Park noting that construction continues to move forward while the design was updated for value engineering. One panel member felt that the experience of the park has been maintained given the fundamental principles have not changed. Mr. Glaisek noted there will be a conversation at next month’s DRP to discuss the threshold of change required for post-approval return.

Update on last month’s projects:

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on projects that were reviewed at the Dec. 12th meeting. Following the **York Street Park’s** Issues Identification meeting last month, the team is anticipating a return to Panel for Schematic Design in April. Mr. Glaisek explained that Rees Street Park budget coordination continues and will not proceed in parallel with York Street Park. Rees Street Park is tentatively scheduled for an Issues Identification review in February. For **915/945 Lakeshore Boulevard East**, Mr. Glaisek noted the proponent team will review the Dec. 12th minutes and possibly return to DRP in March given the tight timeline of the project. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **Quayside** and noted that comments from last month’s DRP have been delivered to the proponent team, and they are expected to return to DRP with a revised base plan to reflect the comments. The Panel specifically would like to review how comments on road connectivity and vehicular connection at Parliament Plaza are addressed. Mr. Glaisek explained that following the submission of the Quayside MIDP, Waterfront Toronto will evaluate the submission and if selected, the City will begin an input process. Mrs. Day added that a public process is required if the precinct plan needs to be revised.

Chair’s remarks:

The Chair noted that Ontario Place Revitalization plan, recently in the news, is a multi-faceted, complicated issue. Toronto citizens care deeply about this issue and their voice will be very powerful. The Chair also noted that Ontario Place falls within the Designated Waterfront Area and should be brought to The Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel to unpack issues concerning ownership, heritage, etc.

Mr. Glaisek concluded the General Business segment by introducing a new seating arrangement for staff and proponent team members.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block 8

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1101
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands

Proponent: Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
Architect/ Designer: architectsAlliance, COBE Architects
Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Mark Hallé, Claude Cormier et Associés; Thomas Krarup, COBE Architects; Brandon Law, RWDI
Delegation: Tony Medeiros, Dream; Angela Li, Waterfront Toronto; Kate Goslett, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by explaining it is part of the Province's affordable housing program as well as the City's Open Doors program. Ms. Li noted that Block 8 is proposed as a purpose-built rental building with ancillary retail at-grade with 30% affordable rental housing units. Ms. Li explained that this presentation includes two new pedestrian bridge connections joining the buildings, which have been added since the last DRP. Ms. Li introduced Kate Goslett, Community Planner with City of Toronto, to highlight city planning issues, including concerns over the elevated pedestrian bridges, the stepped alignment of building 8A and 8B with Tank House Lane, and the historic switching tower at Cherry Street. Ms. Li noted this is the third time the team is presenting to the Panel and they are seeking feedback on the revised retail condition, the exterior materials of the three buildings, the landscape strategy, and the project's sustainability objectives. Ms. Li then introduced Thomas Krarup with Cobe Architects, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Building Design:

Mr. Krarup began by noting that since the last review, the design of 8A and 8B have been simplified and revised to reflect the identity of the Distillery District. While the mix of affordable and market units is maintained, bridges that serve as connective elements for ease of all users between amenities have been added. Mr. Krarup added that by having access to parking from one entry, the remaining podium space is dedicated for public use. Mr. Krarup noted that the façade on Tank House Lane is stepped to mimic the meandering quality of the neighbourhood and the exterior material palette of the buildings has been simplified to support this idea. Mr. Krarup pointed to the samples, as displayed at the front of room, that the materiality of the three buildings transitions from coarse to sharp moving up the volumes, and the facades express the different apartment units. Mr. Krarup added that the brick will be hand laid to allow for variation, the sills are composed of precast bricks that are angled inward, and the façades of the tower portions are "scalloped" with depressed window boxes with no balcony. Mr. Krarup then introduced Adam Feldmann with architectsAlliance, who noted building 8C also was revised to reflect the reduced exterior material palette, but applied slightly differently: brick with deep recessed shelves on the podium, alternating angled precast panels on tower to catch light at

different times of day, and recessed details for the windows. Mr. Feldmann noted thermal bridging is minimized by hanging the precast panels and having no balconies.

Landscape design:

Mr. Feldmann then introduced Mark Hallé, who presented the landscape design. Mr. Hallé noted the landscape design borrows language from the Distillery District for hardscape and West Don Lands for greenery. Mr. Hallé explained the courtyard “carpet” is made of three types of pavers, differentiating between private townhouses and streets with a raised plaza in middle of lane. Native tree species are planted in the courtyards and the paving is brick laid in a narrow, herringbone weave pattern. Mr. Hallé noted that the podium amenities have both passive and active focus programs, while the bridges allow for sharing of these experiences across buildings and consolidating the amenities as one.

Sustainability strategy:

Mr. Hallé then introduced Brandon Law who explained that the buildings have a comprehensive sustainability strategy that prioritizes passive measures and focuses on local plants. The buildings have solar cavities on the south façade and Mr. Law explained that the cavity air will get heated by the sun to warm the corridors. Mr. Law explained that the project exceeds required green standards. The team is currently in early conversations with Enwave for geothermal use and is targeting LEED Gold.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is a drawing that explains the height relationship between the rail corridor and the bridges. Ms. Goslett explained that the rail corridor is typically 4m above grade and slopes up towards the east side. This Panel member felt the relationship between the bridges and the rail corridor is important to understand in assessing them.

Another Panel member asked if the grout colour of the brick has been selected, given it is an important part of the detailing of the facade. Mr. Feldmann replied that the grout is meant to match the brick colour.

One Panel member asked for the plan layout of the three-bedroom unit and would like to learn how it functions from a family perspective, as the design looks rather confined. Mr. Krarup noted the plan layout is not included in the presentation. Ms. Goslett noted that the City is reviewing the unit sizes and layouts and the process is on-going. The Panel member also asked if there is a diagram of the self-shading device and how much shading is provided. Mr. Law explained that there is no diagram of the element, however the windows are setback 600mm. This allows for protection from high sun in the summer which reduces solar heat gain while reducing the cooling load. The south facades are shaded slightly due to the recess, and lastly both 8B and 8C buildings are shaded on the west slightly – all of which will help reduce the cooling load. Mr. Law noted that the optimal depth would be around 600mm. The Panel Member asked what the typical EUI is in Denmark. Mr. Krarup noted that it would be roughly 30% windows, with a 300mm overall assembly depth. The Panel member noted 150 EUI seems high-

Mr. Law explained that it was reduced from 190 to 150, with 170/180 being the typical T1 benchmark. Mr. Krarup noted that in Denmark it is not legal to design single exposure window units.

Another Panel member asked for the solar heat gain coefficient, if the pool is heated, and if the detailing, thermal bridging and girts are continuous in the façade. Mr. Feldmann noted that the pool is not heated, the façade is thermally broken with clips, and the team is exploring the use of spray foam to improve thermal resistance of envelope.

One Panel member asked for the tree species in the courtyard and around the bridges. Mr. Hallé explained that the trees are meant to be equally intermixed, including black locust.

One Panel member asked for the motivation for the bridges given the obvious concerns. Mr. Krarup explained it is because of overall usability, mix of affordable and market units with centralized amenity spaces, providing connectivity to mix of spaces, ease of use and conceptually interesting for the community and tenants to meet. Mr. Krarup noted from the applicant's perspective the bridges add to the beauty of the neighbourhood and are not an intrusive element to the City. Mr. Feldmann also noted that the amenities are building specific, and the project was always conceived as being linked and the budget for the bridges and in some way, possibly below grade.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the bridges don't feel well integrated into the architecture and look awkward. The Panel member felt since the buildings are already well integrated below grade, the money for the bridges can instead be spent to further improve the underground, elevator and lobby experience which can be used throughout winter to foster community. The Panel member was excited by the landscape and felt townhouse gardens in the courtyards would function well and activate the public spaces.

Another Panel member felt the design changes are positive, particularly the revised material palette on the buildings. The Panel member was also excited by the outdoor amenities and bridges. The Panel member felt that more options for connectivity should be explored such as introducing exterior stairs that bring people down to the courtyard level. On the amenity levels, the Panel member noted that there is an opportunity for integrated storage with the landscape, and roof water storage can reduce water use for watering plants. The Panel member noted that the project is a good sustainability example and while it is significantly ahead of the incremental improvement that is current happening in most developments, the Panel member encouraged the team to push some elements even further, including the knee wall at windows to improve insulation, selecting glazing with higher solar heat gain coefficient to ensure no overheating in summer, domestic hot water load, selecting low flow fixtures and implementing centralized waste water heat recovery for high use like

change room showers. The Panel member also noted the district energy system with Enwave will provide huge energy gain.

One Panel member felt convinced of the provocative design and noted the Distillery District is unique for its lack of uniform streets and idiosyncratic pinching of urban blocks – it is important to maintain sightlines and visual interest in the immediate transitional areas out of the Distillery. The Panel member felt while the bridges do not take away from the underground connection, a public amenity argument could be made that they should offer great artistic and aesthetic value. The Panel member noted the use of micro-topography in landscape design is a great way to introduce variety in public streetscapes, stormwater and soil management. They expressed enthusiasm for the landscape textures selected.

Another Panel member felt the landscape design is very comprehensive and competent; biodiversity is a smart strategy and the strong palette helps urban landscaping. The Panel member noted one tree species has not performed well and the team should consider alternatives. The Panel member liked the idea of walking through tree canopies on the bridges, and that irrigation storage on roof can be integrated into the garden experience. However, they were not fully convinced the bridges were appropriate as they would be functional only few months of the year and feel like a luxury indulgence for a few.

One Panel member noted that there are advantages to both the straight and stepped options for the Tank House Lane façade. The straight option provides potential for more at grade landscape for townhouses, whereas the stepped option provides for more roof podium space. The Panel member did note the greater benefit to have more landscape at-grade than on the podium. The Panel member was concerned that bridges are in the way of the view corridor. The Panel member was not convinced by the underground connection as an alternative, however the Panel member was interested in the idea of making the lower podium rooftops public. The Panel member felt, due to the particularities of this site, more support for the bridges than the stepped façade.

Mr. Krarup thanked the Panel for their comments, wondered if introducing gardens would make Tank House Lane more private or public, and lastly re-iterated that he believes the bridges are valuable to the City.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel is impressed by and supportive of the design of the buildings, including the revised materiality and improved sustainability strategies.
- Although the buildings are designed to exceed today's sustainability requirements, consider maximizing passive strategies, such as further reducing window to wall ratio, to ensure strong performance in the future,
- Support for the micro-topography in landscape design and community gardens

- Consider alternatives to London Plane trees, and more landscape variety for winter seasons.
- Consider including storage areas in the landscape strategy.
- The Panel appreciates and supports the revised retail design.
- Items where consensus was in question and straw poll was taken:
 - Some Panel members felt that the current bridge design lacks integration with both the project and public realm, and felt alternative circulation should be considered, either in the basement or at grade in the public realm. However other Panel members were supportive of the bridges with the condition that they be better integrated. The straw poll was evenly split.
 - Some Panel members liked the stepping alignment on Tank House Lane given that sightlines are preserved, yet others felt there should be consideration for straightening the edge to yield more outdoor space for townhouses at grade. There was no agreement amongst the Panel members during the discussion and arguments for both straight and stepped alignments were made. The straw poll showed support for the stepping alignment from all members present.

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 of the project.

2.0 Quayside: Sustainability

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1100
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Sidewalk Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	n/a
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Charlotte Matthews, Sidewalk Toronto
<i>Delegation:</i>	Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Shayna Stott, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Aaron Barter, Innovation and Sustainability Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Quayside is situated at the intersection of the East Bayfront and Keating Channel precinct plans. Mr. Barter noted that sustainability is a core objective for Waterfront Toronto, but despite continued leadership, there is still much to do to reach the Toronto 2050 GHGs and 80-50 target. Waterfront Toronto's ambitious goal of Climate Positive seeks to meet an emissions target of net-negative operational greenhouse gas emissions associated with energy, waste and transportation. Waterfront Toronto's sustainability and climate positive development

objectives include exemplary building standards, sustainable mobility, affordable utilities, a circular economy establishing a pathway to zero operational waste, and resilient infrastructure to better prepare buildings and infrastructure to survive and thrive in the face of future changing climate and emergencies. Mr. Barter asked the Panel to focus on two areas of consideration in the presentation: does Sidewalk Toronto's draft sustainability proposal meet or exceed Waterfront Toronto's objectives, and are there other strategies or technologies that Panel would like to see included? Mr. Barter introduced Charlotte Matthews with Sidewalk Toronto, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Charlotte Matthews, Director of Sustainability with Sidewalk Toronto, introduced herself and noted having prior experience pursuing sustainability in corporate real estate. Ms. Matthews introduced the consultants that have been engaged for the MIDP development including Smarter Grid Solutions, Stantec, WSP, Deloitte, etc, as well as an Advisory Group with representation from MaRs Cleantech, Canada Green Building Council, among others to provide feedback throughout the process. Ms. Matthews noted that the sustainability vision builds upon Waterfront Toronto's work to show a pathway to a climate positive community. Ms. Matthews explained that ongoing greenhouse gas modelling shows a 75% reduction for the Quayside project and introduced six components that will be discussed, including advanced power grid, thermal grid, low load buildings, advanced energy management, active stormwater management, and smart disposal chain.

Ms. Matthews noted a focus on using green in lieu of grey infrastructure to manage storm water and affordable electrification can be achieved by reducing load, optimizing pricing and eliminating energy waste. An onsite energy grid is proposed for resilience and provide capacity to move and share power from one building to another. Ms. Matthews noted that a study was conducted on alternative models of heating without the use of fossil fuels, leading to a new thermal grid concept, at the same time the team continues to find alternative sources of waste energy that would be cheaper than geo-exchange. Ms. Matthews explained that driving efficient energy use requires enabling control of energy use by tenants, not building operators. Another advanced energy management strategy is to create tools that will provide tenants with predictable utility bills. Ms. Matthews added the team is developing another strategy to offset the energy bill by provide purchasable solar and other shared energy credits. Ms. Matthews explained the approach to storm water management is on-site retention, including a focus on green urban infrastructure.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked how organics work within the recycling ecosystem. Ms. Matthews answered that while it was studied, Quayside does not have enough capacity to do an independent system, instead a separate chute can send organics to the City for collection. The Panel member asked for the next best option outside of ground

sourced energy for district energy. Ms. Matthews answered other commercial properties can offer rejected heat year-round, such as nearby data centres.

Another Panel member asked how passive heating and cooling strategies related to building massing informs the overall sustainability goals. Ms. Matthews answered the Quayside Building pillar will handle this scope.

One Panel member asked if the thermal grid can be thought of as a geothermal application that is neighbourhood wide, and if the proposed storm water management meets the newly proposed provincial standard of 90%. Ms. Matthews answered that the thermal grid can be understood as geothermal fields that can serve the neighbourhood and the storm water management strategy meets the current residential standards.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on “pay as you throw”. Ms. Matthews explained that firstly landfill is expensive, and the proposed system would create incentives to reduce waste by billing based on weight and volume, ultimately providing better value for the system and reducing processing costs. The Panel member asked for the main factor not allowing the project to reach full carbon neutral. Ms. Matthews explained that the electricity source is not fully green, neither is mobility nor the waste stream. If there is fossil fuel in the systems, carbon neutral cannot be reached. The Panel member asked for the HVAC strategy for units. Ms. Matthews answered central ventilation, heating and cooling will be delivered with radiant ceiling panels, the most efficient strategy, explaining that independent geothermal systems have many pumps which add to the already expensive cost of drilling, therefore waste recovery is a valuable offset. Hybrid heat pumps and heat ventilation recovery will also be studied.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the City’s concern with using Ashbridge’s Bay for waste energy. Ms. Matthews believes the City is very concerned with potential problems arising from adding a heat recovery system into an old system.

Another Panel member asked how research is being implemented in the design. Ms. Matthews explained that finding gaps was a challenge and research was critical in identifying the opportunities.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the team for a passionate and thorough presentation. The Panel member encouraged more nuanced emphasis on how green infrastructure is being treated from an ecological perspective, expanding the focus on not just technology, and more detail on how moving waste water from private to public can add value.

Another Panel member noted the team must confront the realities of working in the City and acknowledge the site context. The Panel member asked to see more site details such as watermains, City no-go-zones and public-private boundary lines which

will inform the system designs and require coordination with the City or land owners of related site systems. The Panel member suggested avoiding jargon to make the material more accessible to the public and simplify the presentation without losing detail – overall the presentation was extremely helpful. Mr. Glaisek explained that more technical language was encouraged to cater to the DRP.

One Panel member suggested beginning the next phase with a map of existing infrastructure and a performance metric comparison of the proposed and status quo. The Panel member was excited to see if this research will become a precedent for the carbon tax and how the political optimism of this project might change the conversation.

Another Panel member commented that a development proposal of this scale is inseparable from the greater City and regulatory context. It will be very challenging to deliver the proposed project without support of the broader system. The Panel member noted that the project won't drive province-level changes on its own, and would like to see more sensitivity analysis on the broader implications of transformative systems like mobility and electricity supply that could get the project to carbon neutral in 2050. The Panel member cautioned gamification on the recycling strategy and suggested building the recycling strategy into contracts with retailers and commercial tenants to drive people towards the highest value recycling categories. The Panel member was interested in seeing if data/server infrastructure on site can help with waste energy offset and play with the geometry of the built-form to optimize surface to floor ratio to further lower carbon emission. The Panel member suggested to let carbon emission drive design and dictate building density if all other strategies have been exhausted.

Another Panel member re-iterated that if carbon neutral is the one pillar objective that is universally agreed upon, it should set the standard for the remaining pillars and override objectives which are not currently aligned – maybe a hierarchy of pillars to deliver on a shared goal of net zero. The Panel member believed that this strategy could work and appreciated the numerous strategies that were discussed in the presentation. The Panel member also suggested reaching out to the University of Toronto's GritLab on integrating green roof and PVs, the two elements are not mutually exclusive.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall the Panel was pleased with the passion and articulateness of the presentation.
- Goal to reach carbon neutral is fully supported and shared by the Panel. The Panel is eager to learn more about how these strategies can be implemented given existing conditions and constraints.
- Consider strategies for enticing cutting-edge developers in making both the carbon neutral and sustainable agendas a reality.
- While the Panel appreciates the depth of presentation, it is important to make the technical information accessible to the general public and non-experts as well.

- The team needs to focus on demonstrating how all the pillars work together
- Encourage further investigation on alternative heat waste recovery options and opportunity to establish green leasing partnership with retailers
- The Panel would like to see a sustainability audit of the buildings in revised development plan.
- The Panel is supportive and encourages the team to articulate clearly both blue and green ecological infrastructure strategies.
- Encourage the team to consider nature equity in the urban resiliency strategy, biodiversity and biophilic designs in the city
- Show a long-term path to climate positive even if it cannot be achieved at Quayside now.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

3.0 Quayside Pillars Evaluation Criteria

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1100
<i>Project Type:</i>	-
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Information Session
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Quayside
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	n/a
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Rei Tasaka, WT; Caroline Kim, WT; Aaron Barter, WT; Alex Mereu, WT
<i>Delegation:</i>	n/a

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto introduced the presentations by noting that the evaluation criteria of Quayside is an important aspect of reviewing the three volumes of the Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP). The evaluation framework looks at how the MIDP addresses three issues: 1) How many of Waterfront Toronto's goals and objectives does the MIDP meet and how well does it meet those targets? 2) Does the MIDP align with the planning framework for the waterfront? 3) Is the proposed business plan viable and in the public interest. Mr. Glaisek asked for the Panel to build on the framework and foundational principles that have been embedded in the RFP, focus on whether the criteria meet the goals set out by Waterfront Toronto, and identify any missing elements. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Alex Mereu, Transit Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto to begin the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Mereu began by noting that the mobility criteria looks at the extent to which the MIDP is applying existing and innovative technology to improve public transportation. Beginning with walkability and active transportation, Mr. Mereu explained a dynamic street network should accommodate all transportation modes and create an inviting pedestrian experience while aligning with City's Vision Zero framework. Cycling infrastructure should accommodate a diverse range of cyclists and introduce strategies for improved safety and user comfort, including through the expansion of the Bike Share Toronto network. For transit and network management, Mr. Mereu noted the proposal should assist in delivery of an innovative funding strategy for the waterfront LRT, and explore options for network management tools to make better use of transit infrastructure and increase use of mass transit, walking, cycling or electric shared mobility.

Mr. Barter began by noting the sustainability criteria looks at six key objectives: ¹climate positive, ²exemplary building standards, ³sustainable mobility, ⁴affordable utilities, ⁵circular economy and ⁶resilient infrastructure. The proposal should enable development of neighborhoods with below-zero annual greenhouse gas emissions at full build-out defined by C40 Climate Positive Framework, enable building design that supports Waterfront Toronto's climate positive aspirations, enable infrastructure and policies that enable electrical vehicles to replace carbon emitting vehicles and achieve zero emissions and climate positive targets. Furthermore, the proposal should ensure affordable utilities comparable to average cost in Toronto, accelerate the pathway to zero operational waste, and address Resilient TO initiatives by better preparing the development in responding to climate change and emergencies.

Ms. Kim presented the public realm criteria by noting high quality design of public realm and public open space system, compliance with AODA, and all dedicated park land should remain in public ownership. Additionally, Ms. Kim noted the proposal should provide public space that totals 30% of overall site, delivers animated ground floor public realm, provides access to the lake and animates the water's edge, enhances urban ecology and utilize natural systems to manage stormwater and reduce runoff. Finally, Ms. Kim added the proposal should propose a mechanism by which a higher level of maintenance of publicly dedicated Parks and Public Realm can be delivered at no additional cost to the city.

Ms. Tasaka presented the building criteria by noting the proposal should ensure buildings embody less energy and improve health and well-being. The proposal should enable adaptable mixed-use of buildings to address needs of occupants, including affordable housing options, amenities that support diverse ground floor and public realm. Lastly, Ms. Tasaka noted that new construction methodologies that promote innovations in the Canadian construction industry should be enabled.

3.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

Mobility:

One Panel member noted that the criteria needs to reference existing plans as a basis and there needs to be more emphasis on connectivity to city context – include the word “connectivity”, and reference to fundamentals of urban planning such as grid, blocks, integrating City neighbours, and elements of plans previously developed. Another Panel member noted pedestrian and cyclist comfort and safety should be included. One Panel member noted high walkability percentage of daily activities should be enabled and on-site mobility to urban connections to and from the site, as well as regional mobility should be priorities. The Panel member also added freight mobility, movement of goods, emergency and service vehicles are good opportunities to re-evaluate these traditional constraints. Another Panel member commented that criteria should include ensuring that various innovative forms of mobility are safe. One Panel member suggested including pedestrian passages of varying publicness and implementing criteria to evaluate the quality of publicness and pedestrian walkability. Another Panel member noted the criteria should evaluate how the mobility elements encourage new ways of behaviour.

Sustainability:

One Panel member noted it is important to future-proof the development requirements, ensure metrics do not fall behind, and perhaps word it so requirements can be raised over time.

Another Panel member noted that more emphasis is needed on landscape, social and ecological systems, and reference to Waterfront Toronto’s values. It is also important to recognize Waterfront Toronto’s efforts and commitment to resilient infrastructure in the form of urban nature and landscape, as a gateway to biophilic streets. Reference literature previously developed for ecological health and highlight separately from resilient infrastructure.

One Panel member noted that this project can serve as a precedent for Toronto to become a leader in surface flooding, mitigation and adapting. Another Panel member suggested more emphasis on eco-system health, air quality, water-quality at Lake Ontario and psychological health.

Public Realm:

One Panel member noted that in addition to street trees, urban ecology should be emphasized, including resilience, habitat, biodiversity, urban wildlife, nature-based benefits – look at metrics previously developed by Waterfront Toronto.

One Panel member added that the words “design excellence” should be included to put more emphasis on quality of place, seasonal comfort and align with Waterfront Toronto vision and City policies. Another Panel member suggested including a target percentage for appropriate ground floor public space to ensure public realm connectivity.

Buildings:

One Panel member noted that it is critical to include both affordable living and working options in the program mix, not just housing. Also replace the word “ensure” with “the extent to which” to measure each proposal.

Another Panel member suggested emphasizing high quality materials, architectural quality, high qualifications of designers, and including the word “equity” in target descriptions. One Panel member noted durability as another qualification and emphasizing that building safety cannot be compromised for innovation.

Another Panel member recommended shifting from “climate change” to “everything change”, and how the criteria can protect and not stifle out-of-the-box invention and creativity. One Panel member questioned if the criteria is being applied only within the borders of Quayside, as the development is a catalytic element in the greater city and might become a standard for rest of the Toronto.

3.5 Consensus Comments

No consensus comments were made.

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the presentation was for information and discussion.

4.0 Waterfront Vision

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1102
<i>Project Type:</i>	Site Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Information Session
<i>Review Round:</i>	-
<i>Location:</i>	Toronto Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	n/a
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Christopher Glaisek, WT
<i>Delegation:</i>	Rei Tasaka, WT; Sonja Vangjeli, WT; Lynda Macdonald, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

4.1 Presentation

Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning & Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto presented the project by explaining the Waterfront Vision is incorporated in the upcoming 5-year Strategic Plan, with excerpted pages used in today’s presentation. Mr. Glaisek explained that Waterfront Toronto research has identified at least one key ingredient to successful waterfronts around the world: waterfront promenades that connect people to great destinations. Part of the strategic priority envisions the water edge as a continuum, a waterfront “necklace”. Toronto’s waterfront already has great elements of a continuous promenade, but Mr. Glaisek noted that this discussion is to encourage the Panel to think ahead to the next level of revitalization.

Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto is seeking to advance four new projects that are currently unfunded, including a continuous Waterfront Walk, a new Signature Structure, an enhanced Jack Layton Ferry Terminal, and a Destination Playground for

children. Mr. Glaisek explained that part of having these projects in the plan is to focus the corporation's energy on how to find funding and make the vision possible.

Mr. Glaisek also presented various successful waterfront cities' "postcard" elements, such as the historic island of Stockholm, canals of Amsterdam, urban beach of Rio de Janeiro, etc, and asked to Panel to consider what Toronto's future "postcard" could be.

4.2 Panel Comments

One Panel member commented that a single "postcard" image currently does not exist for Toronto. Panel member suggested "cultural destinations" should replace "signature structures".

Ms. Day explained that it is important to refer to the City of Toronto vision plan and TOCore framework so the ideas will nest into City policy. Ms. Day also noted that the CN Tower is an iconic element for Toronto's waterfront.

Ms. Macdonald commented that Toronto has a sequence of strong spaces embedded in the city while the Toronto Islands are a unique destination.

Another Panel member suggested using dotted line to illustrate connections to the islands to ensure that they are represented differently than other parts of the waterfront promenade. One Panel member noted that major green and landscape projects are leading the vision of Toronto and can imagine a similar experience as Chicago where people come to the waterfront to enjoy the parks.

Another Panel member felt that the relationship between the Port Lands in the foreground, and CN tower in the background, is the unique identity of the waterfront. Also suggested highlighting the meadow ways and ravines in the "ring" map as part of the green infrastructure. One Panel member commented that the landscape elements in the City are not represented strongly enough. Another Panel member noted that how people move through various districts, each with its own unique characteristics, to reach the waterfront is part of the identity of Toronto.

One Panel member commented the fact that the Toronto waterfront is not identified by one singular image is a positive. The Panel member also noted that there should be a drawing that defines the interconnected aspirations of the waterfront, perhaps a "day in the life" foldout with images of different seasons can highlight the quality of spaces around the "harbor necklace".

Another Panel member suggested that even with the "ring", the CN tower and skyline of Toronto is still the centre point. Panel member added the current identity of Toronto is a series of unique "rooms" that are thoughtful to the human scale in each neighborhood, however it is in the in-between spots that lack identity. One Panel member noted many successful waterfronts celebrate public connectivity – Toronto's identity can be imagined as a harbor "necklace" and how the City connects to the edge is secondary.

Another Panel member commented that Toronto has a sense of belonging, ownership and equity for public space along the water's edge. Mr. Glaisek added the next step is to develop an implementation plan for these upcoming projects. Ms. Day noted there is huge potential alignment between City and Waterfront Toronto.

4.3 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the presentation was not a project proposal.

Motion to go into "in-camera" session

CLOSING

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