



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel

Minutes of Meeting #149

Wednesday, Jan. 26th, 2022

Meeting held Virtually

Present

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

Regrets

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Emilia Floro, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. PIC Core Urban Design Guidelines – Stage 2 Draft Plan
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Dec. 15th, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict of interest for PIC Core Urban Design Guidelines and recused himself for the review.

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

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Mr. Glaisek began by providing an update on the construction progress for **York Street Park**. The excavation of the pond perimeter wall continues, the team is working on the concrete and laid out insulated blankets to keep concrete warm. The excavation for mechanical room is complete, tree protection for existing trees remains in place, and subgrade excavation for environmental cap and garden planters are on-going.

Mr. Glaisek noted the **Quayside RFP** stage has closed and Waterfront Toronto is proceeding with evaluating the submissions and looks forward to sharing the outcome in early 2022.

Design Review Panel Updates:

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, reported back on last month's project **545 Lake Shore Boulevard West**, noted that the consensus comments from Dec. 2021 have been circulated to the proponent team, the City is focused on reviewing the Zoning Bylaw Amendment application for the site including POPS and the updated building massing, and will host workshops on the public realm design later in February or March. The City will discuss if a return review will be required. Mr. Lai noted the upcoming project agenda for February.

Mr. Glaisek noted Claude Cormier decided to step off the Panel last month and thanked him for his twelve years of service. The Chair thanked Claude and noted that his thinking and personality will be deeply missed.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 PIC Core Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) – Stage 2 Draft Plan

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1115
<i>Project Type:</i>	Urban Design Guidelines
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Draft Plan
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Keating Channel, Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	City of Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	DTAH
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Anthony Kittel, Project Manager, City of Toronto

Delegation: Joe Lobko, Partner, DTAH
Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Designer, City of Toronto
Rene Biberstein, DTAH
Yasmin Afshar, DTAH
Keisha St Louis-McBurnie, Urban Strategies
Chris Hilbrecht, City of Toronto
Susan Serran, City of Toronto
Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto
Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto
Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Anthony Kittel, Project Manager with City of Toronto, began the introduction by noting the Port Lands is a place where film, television, and music are focused. Mr. Kittel noted the background, context, and vision of the Port Lands, the Port Lands Planning Framework, implementation, and the PIC Core UDG process. Mr. Kittel noted the other expanding and emerging creative campuses, including Pinewood Studios, Basin Media Hub. Mr. Kittel noted the June 2020 WDRP Consensus Comments and areas for Panel consideration.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Kittel summarized the outline of the Urban Design Guidelines (UDG), guiding principles, character frontages of the site, and noted the film friendliness of the studio building typologies. Mr. Kittel noted that the master plans would encourage an integrated approach.

Joe Lobko, Partner with DTAH, continued the presentation by noting the public realm activation strategies including green space system, the Water's Edge Promenade, public art opportunities, and the hierarchy of activation uses.

Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Designer with City of Toronto, continued the presentation by noting the built form and height strategies. Ms. Mighton noted a lower scale industrial employment activity, mid-scale employment buildings, and taller mid-scale employment buildings that signal higher order transit and mobility on major roads while creating visual prominence. Ms. Mighton noted the tall buildings will be at prominent locations at key major street intersections, key views as they relate to built form, and creative campuses secure perimeters. Ms. Mighton noted the strategies for secure perimeter arrangements, elevated bridge design considerations, gateways, and secure perimeter precedents.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member is interested in rain as a resource in a broader context between public realm and asked for clarification on the long-term sustainability of the site. Ms.

Mighton noted there is policy on water use in the Official Plan which works in tandem with the UDG. The team will look at a clustering system for trees – the standard for that is embedded in policy. The Panel asked the team to provide clarification on the hierarchy on the policies.

Another Panel member asked for the state of the dock walls and if they are anticipated to be updated. Mr. Lobko responded that the team cannot provide detailed condition, but CreateTO has a budget for refurbishment. Mr. Lobko noted the short- and long-term stormwater management here is special and challenging, while these guidelines try to frame the challenges, more considerations will have to be developed. The Panel member asked for the management model of the retail spaces and how they relate to the film studios, operated by one or separate independent owners, because this will impact the type and form of the retail buildings. Mr. Kittel noted the ownership model will be established through the development agreement by the landowners, the guidelines do not reach that level of specificity of how retail will interface with the public realm. There is diversity of owners in the district, and they will make that determination.

One Panel member asked if each parcel would be analysed in terms of performance deficit which can be addressed in another area of the PIC Core district, it seems essential that the analysis be baked into the process so they can be responded to by each land developer. Ms. Mighton noted there are few landowners on the site and the City expects each owner to address their respective site through the master planning stage. The Panel member asked if there is a strategy to track performance level per parcel and ensure delivery. Mr. Lobko noted that each parcel would have a master plan that addresses the performance at a high level, the development applications then would be measured against that performance established in the master plan.

Another Panel member asked for the strategy for evaluating the existing buildings. Mr. Kettel noted FedEx exists, private property owners will come to their own conclusion on that building's future, there are a few other existing buildings including industrial infrastructure. Beyond that, the site is mostly a clean slate and development will come rapidly.

One Panel member asked for information on consultation done with Indigenous Rights Holders and the film industry representatives. Mr. Kittel noted the team will work with the Indigenous film office and stakeholders.

Another Panel member asked if the UDG is the right document in securing and protecting view corridors. Ms. Mighton noted there are views secured in the Official Plan, it may be a point where through this work those protected views should come forward. The Panel member asked for clarification on how the non-vegetated public realm components will be proposed. Ms. Mighton noted the City will review the Pinewoods proposal in detail, looking at more significant green edges and will bring forward for the Panel to discuss.

With the master planning approach, one Panel member asked if a district energy network can be implemented as a pre-condition to the developments where proposed buildings can plug into the network. The Panel member asked if there is an opportunity

to co-locate programs to share energy and excess heat, such as community uses that need dehumidification, pools, and ice rinks. Ms. Mighton noted section 8 of the UDG has details on carbon and energy use. Mr. Kittel also noted Port Lands Guidelines section 12.

Another Panel member asked if the Waterfront Toronto sustainability guidelines are enforced here. Ms. Mighton confirmed that they are enforced here.

One Panel member asked if there are entertainment venues already in the precinct. Mr. Kittel noted there is none, these are vacant or under-utilized industrial lands. It is part of the planned LRT network. The Panel member asked why the tower separation distance is 40m when it is 25m elsewhere in the city. Ms. Mighton noted the City envisioned PIC Core as a midrise district punctured by tall buildings. Mr. Lobko noted the Villiers Island master plan will also have 40m, as well as the McCleary district. The Panel member asked for the teeth of implementation of the UDG and general clarification on how policies such as the secured perimeter will be enforced. Ms. Mighton noted the intent is the use the master planning process to implement.

Another Panel member appreciated the challenge of designing a public realm and asked the team to ensure infrastructure for a successful Water's Edge Promenade is provided, such as the ability to have pop-up events, hydro, water, both temporary and permanent uses. The Panel member asked if people will be able to touch water at the end of the turning basin, therefore it is important to build in infrastructure for potential marine contact and use.

One Panel member asked why the UDG does not consider how the thousands of inhabitants will use the site, such as access to transit, open space, health, etc. Mr. Kittel noted the focus here is how the developments will have to manage their edges and interface with the public realm. Mr. Lobko noted the guidelines address the growing number of inhabitants, the framework for the public realm that the guidelines are meant to negotiate are established by Council in 2017, the approach to the use of lands here is an employment district. Mr. Lobko noted the opportunities in the public realm is limited, the team tried to identify them and prioritize them. The Panel member asked that clarification be provided on access, usage, and health as they relate to inhabitants.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member noted there should be more leeway to how the guidelines should address the important elements of the public realm around view corridors and the Water's Edge Promenade. It is important to make those pieces explicit which will allow us to contemplate an integrated design approach: bring in future thinking of adaptive reuse, maintain infrastructure that is public, accessible, and opportune.

Another Panel appreciated the complexity of the guidelines in creating a unique district and asked the team to provide clarity on the ownership model to address challenges in the operational details. The Panel member commented that the quality of the dock wall is important, and its repair should be captured in the plans.

One Panel member noted that the guidelines would be better served if they are tied to a master plan, or something that has a more precise architectural language to address questions of built form. The Panel member encouraged the team to use slide 12, the overall massing context, to evaluate the built form of PIC Core moving forward.

Another Panel member noted that the area is very important for Indigenous communities and others as the site has support human life, with connections to land and water, for thousands of years. The Panel member recommend the team to engage with the Indigenous land rights holders in a meaningful way. It is important to include a land and water acknowledgement in the UDG and an idea of Indigenous place-making. The Panel member noted that we should not only consider built form as heritage, but also the site's connections between land and water.

One Panel member noted it is important for the guidelines to offer guidance on sustainability objectives, refer to the Waterfront Green Building Requirements which mandate Tier 3 compliance for operational energy and carbon. Despite the PIC Core buildings not being typical typologies, the Panel member felt that the sustainability targets should be reinforced.

Another Panel member noted that while many projects have discussed interesting secure fencing strategies, their delivery are typically much less ambitious. The Panel member asked the team to ensure that secure perimeters are strong edges, that the key view corridors and views to the water are protected and respected by the developments. The Panel member asked the team to show the view corridor "grid" in all drawings and provide an analysis of the view corridors that will maintain the rhythm of this part of the waterfront.

One panel member noted it is difficult to understand the relationship between the UDG and the master plans but recognize the complexity and effort that has gone into the development.

Another Panel member felt that this planning exercise ignored some very important elements on people and inhabitant experience, did not appreciate that developers can get away with this lacklustre planning.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General:

- Commended the team for the detailed and complex set of guidelines.
- It is important for PIC Core Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) to demonstrate "leading with landscape" as a key approach.
- Due to the scale and complexity, it is difficult to understand how the UDG will work with master plans and other statutory documents that will be developed in the future, provide clarification at the next review.
- Consider embedding the key elements of the UDG, such as protecting views, into the Zoning Bylaws to ensure implementation.

- Continue to develop the UDG as performance objectives to ensure long-term applicability and relevance.
- Provide more hierarchy in the organization of the UDG.

Indigenous Engagement

- UDG did not consult sufficiently with Indigenous communities in its production.
- Panel strongly encourages meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities prior to the next visit to the Design Review Panel.

Key views

- Protecting key view corridors and views to the water are not sufficiently emphasized, consider the following to ensure they will be protected in the long-term:
 - Provide a rigorous study of every north-south view corridor and ensure they are protected in a statutory document.
 - Overlay a clear “view grid” representation of all the protected key views on the site as part of the Guidelines.
 - Overhead bridges over public streets are strongly not supported.
 - Overhead bridges that connect buildings over private rights-of-way should not obstruct views to the water.

Animation

- Ensure the dock walls will be improved as part of the Water’s Edge Promenade work.
- It is important to build in the infrastructure for activities now, such as along the Water’s Edge Promenade, to ensure successful animation in the future.

Sustainability

- It is important to encourage the development proponents, whether through the UDG or another planning framework, to adhere to Tier 3 compliance for energy and operational carbon. The Waterfront Toronto Green Building Guidelines set good standards and can serve as guidance for the UDG.
- Consider implementing a district energy network with heat exchange as part of the development.
- Develop guidelines for co-locating programs and buildings that can benefit from the sharing of heat, such as server centres that can pass heat to a facility with a swimming pool.

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

Mr. Lobko apologized for the long presentation and noted that the SOM master plan for Pinewoods is just a teaser at the moment. Mr. Lobko takes the Panel members’ comments to heart and noted that this planning approach is not driven by landowners, rather the collective public interest – everything that emerges here are decided by decision makers. Mr. Lobko noted a large amount of these lands are publicly owned and contracts will be drafted to help mandate the objectives identified by the guidelines. Mr. Lobko noted that precinct plans are typically completed for residential areas but historically no precinct plan is made for new employment districts, which

makes this initiative unique. Ms. Mighton noted that the team will provide more information on Indigenous consultation and explained that other planning processes and contracts will come in front of the Panel. Ms. Mighton noted the team will update the graphics to better embed the protected view corridors.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Non-Support for the project (5 votes for Non-Support and 3 votes for Conditional 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.

These Meeting Minutes are formally adopted and approved by Panel on February 23rd, 2022.

Signed–

DocuSigned by:



BC37EAE11BEF41B...

Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair

DocuSigned by:



3513697D8EE74BB...

Emilia Floro, Director, Urban Design, City of Toronto

DocuSigned by:



AE277B6DC4C740D...

Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer, Waterfront Toronto