



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #166

Wednesday, March 27th, 2024

Meeting held in-person hybrid at Waterfront Toronto

Present

Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel

Paul Bedford, Chair

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair

Pat Hanson

Matthew Hickey

David Leinster

Janna Levitt

Nina-Marie Lister

Fadi Masoud

Brigitte Shim

Kevin Stelzer

Eric Turcotte

Emilia Floro, City of Toronto

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

Regrets

Gina Ford

Emily Mueller De Celis

Pina Petricone

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

Overview of Review Agenda

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

1. McCleary District Precinct Plan – Issues Identification
 2. Basin Media Hub – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest for disclosure. No conflict was declared.

The Chair then asked Leon Lai, Manager, Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Design Review Panel Report Back:

Mr. Lai noted **Quayside Master Plan** completed Stage 2: Preliminary Draft Plan review last month and the consensus comments have been shared with the proponent team; the final rezoning application is anticipated to be submitted later this month. Mr. Lai noted that once zoning approval is received, the team will begin designing the first building, anticipating a Q3 return to DRP for Schematic Design review.

Mr. Lai noted **Parliament Slip Activation** is in the process of updating project cost estimate as the final step of completing 10% design, and the project will be paused until funding becomes available. Mr. Lai noted the tentative agenda for April and May 2024 WDRP.

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Mr. Lai provided an update on **Queens Quay East Lakefill**: the head of Parliament Slip is in the process of being filled in and a new dockwall will be constructed, once the dockwall work is complete the lake filling will begin.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 McCleary District Precinct Plan – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1141
<i>Project Type:</i>	Precinct Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	CreateTO
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Perkins and Will DTAH Diamond Schmitt
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Paul Kulig, Principal, Perkins and Will Brent Raymond, Partner, DTAH Duncan Bates, Senior Associate, Diamond Schmitt
<i>Delegation:</i>	Paul Arkilander, CreateTO Scott Pennington, CreateTO

Susan O’Neill, CreateTO
Anna Iannucci, Perkins and Will
Vinaya Mani, Perkins and Will
Julie Bogdanowicz, City of Toronto
Eric Sehr, City of Toronto
Colin Wolfe, City of Toronto
Steven Barber, City of Toronto
Nasim Adab, City of Toronto
Danny Brown, City of Toronto
Sarah Henstock, City of Toronto
Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto
Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto
Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Colin Wolfe, Senior Community Planner with City of Toronto, introduced the project by providing an overview of the district as identified in the Port Lands Planning Framework (PLPF), the existing and future context. Mr. Wolfe noted flood protection work is anticipated to be completed over the next three to four years enabling residential development, and City has received a private development application for 685 Lake Shore Boulevard. The precinct planning work will be advanced in two phases with Environmental Assessments for the new east-west street, Broadview extension, and Bouchette alignment, which will inform the precinct plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted the planning context, urban design vision, uniqueness of the district, and Port Lands Planning Framework (PLPF) policies including transit, cycling, streets, parks and open space plan, retail and animation, and PIC (production, interactive, creative) Core uses. Mr. Wolfe noted the sustainability planning priority areas and that an RFP to procure a sustainability consultant is in progress. Mr. Wolfe noted the project team, engagement strategy, overall project timeline, and highlighted areas for Panel consideration including built form, a high-quality public realm and open space network, sun access and microclimate comfort, and scale. Mr. Wolfe then introduced Paul Kulig, Principal, Urban Design with Perkins&Will, to give the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Kulig began the presentation by noting the historical, existing, and future context of the precinct. Mr. Kulig noted the key three areas of explorations today: vision and guiding principles, resilient urban fabric, and height, density, form and PIC uses. Mr. Kulig noted that McCleary District is a nexus – a vibrant, inclusive, mixed-use community with PIC uses, and summarized the guiding principles from PLPF.

Brent Raymond, Partner with DTAH, noted the PLPF public realm and open space plan, the TSMP stormwater system, below grade infrastructure, and a scale study of the McCleary Park compared with other notable park spaces. Mr. Raymond presented precedents including St. Andrew’s Playground Park, David Crombie Playground & Basketball Courts, 2150 Lake Shore Ave., Downsview Hanger District, Cloverdale Mall

Redevelopment, and Scarborough Junction. Mr. Raymond noted the exploration objectives, proposed deviations from PLPF, and other concept options.

Duncan Bates, Senior Associate with Diamond Schmitt, noted the overall PLPF density and use split, land use allocation explorations, retail strategy, PIC use allocation, and built form typologies. Mr. Bates noted the parking considerations, podium heights, current private development application massing, and overall site sections. Mr. Bates noted built form precedents and added that one of the key considerations is the location of height and density in the precinct.

1.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked how the project is responding to the City's Reconciliation Action Plan and which Indigenous communities have been engaged. Eric Sehr, Project Manager Waterfront, City Planning with City of Toronto, noted the team is currently working with Minokamik and the Indigenous Affairs Office to advance action items including renaming initiative, a broader vision to Port Lands looking at economic development, housing, WEP, etc. Mr. Sehr noted one of the priorities in the next six months is to highlight the priorities in a detailed package building on the Reconciliation Action Plan. The current priorities are cultural revitalization, economic development, land stewardship, and residential – suffice to say the team has a lot of work ahead. The Panel member commented to ensure that the guiding principle of integration of Indigenous cultural knowledge is being addressed. Mr. Sehr noted the team is bringing a circle of elders together next month.

Another Panel member asked for team to confirm the density split. Mr. Wolfe noted the Port Lands Planning Framework suggests 25% PIC uses, 70% residential, and 5% non-residential, and that it is somewhat an open question as the work continues. Mr. Kulig noted the team will study how this split will evolve as density increases working with the City's real estate development team.

One Panel member asked the team to clarify the process related to the development of streetscape and the Environmental Assessment (EA) and the two are related in the design process. Mr. Arkilander noted there are opportunities such as the conceptual and detailed design of the streets, and because the Precinct Plan is split into two phases, the EA will have time to be advanced to inform the design. The Panel member asked if there is a street that will run through the EA study area. Mr. Arkilander confirmed yes. The Panel member asked why the view to Keating Channel is not highlighted as a priority view. Mr. Kulig noted that the view is protected, just not shown in the presentation. Julie Bogdanowicz, Senior Urban Designer with City of Toronto, added that there should be a star at the terminus of Don Roadway and the team will add this to the drawing.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the character of the new east-west street. Mr. Arkilander noted it could be a blended street. Mr. Kulig noted the PLPF shows the need, and the EA will study how it can be implemented. The Panel member asked if the density uses is based on policy. Mr. Wolfe noted it is in the secondary plan. The Panel member asked for more information on the hydro corridor and how it relates to the future development. Mr. Arkilander noted it is intended to be buried, the team is

contemplating an interim period where it remains as is. Mr. Kulig noted buildings will have a setback for flood protection so they will not go to the corridor.

One Panel member asked if the team must conform to the existing road infrastructure and streets, and how these elements will be balanced with your overall vision. Mr. Raymond noted some below grade infrastructure will remain that fall in the street and grid framework; there is work north and south of the site that builds on the existing street network, the team is not proposing major changes to the rights-of-ways, but the Precinct Plan will inform ongoing development of green and water infrastructure. Mr. Raymond noted the team is familiar with the soil content and ground water context and will explore at a precinct planning level. The Panel member asked if the location of the central park is inherited from the Planning Framework. Mr. Raymond noted the option that proposes shifting the park south is the only one option that deviates from the Planning Framework.

Another Panel member noted there are hydro pylons in the right-of-way of Commissioners Street, which in another project that has been noted as heritage elements, and asked the team if they can be listed as heritage structures and identified in drawings. Mr. Kulig responded that the structures along the south border of the site will be a consideration. The Panel member noted the dotted lines indicating a future channel crossing and asked when that work will take place. Mr. Sehr noted the planning work now, will inform this which is anticipated for 2040.

One Panel member asked for the rationale for specifying secondary retail around McCleary Park and more information on the uses of McCleary Park. Mr. Kulig noted the PLPF suggested this strategy to ensure the primary retail area would be first developed. Mr. Wolfe noted the location and programs such as the large sports field will remain as they have high demand and there will be opportunities to extend some of the programs.

Another Panel member noted the mews and finer grain of pedestrian spaces and asked how they interface with the streets. Mr. Raymond responded that the design is not ready to answer that yet.

One Panel member asked for more information on the retail logic near the southeast corner of the site. Mr. Bates noted the current framework suggests retail along Commissions Street, the team is exploring pulling it in to animate the public realm within the precinct instead of at the perimeter, maintaining retail along Broadview and bringing it into the blocks. The Panel member asked for clarification of the big idea on built form because the studies show a rather typical built form of podium-tower blocks, and asked how the built form will create a unique precinct. Mr. Kulig responded that the team is here to seek feedback on this topic.

Another Panel member noted the carbon targets are great and if there is consideration for a district energy system. Mr. Kulig noted there is currently an RFP for a sustainability consultant to join the team to progress this work.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member commented that green spaces should be prioritized for each block, and the team should focus on restoring the natural history of the site instead of the industrial history so all visitors and residents will be able to live and work here.

Another Panel member is excited by the potential of something unique at this site, and commented that all the options still hinge on the established PLPF grid and if the PF is being updated today, the priorities should be different and encouraged the team to consider soil permeability, topography, water table, etc., and give those elements same priority as protected views. The Panel member admired the precedents because they dissolve the grid and respond to their waterfront context near the water, and encouraged the team to focus on developing how the sequence of public and private public realm spaces are connected and build on this network to derive the building blocks.

One Panel member felt it is important to honour the PLPF in keeping with the Precinct Plan but also evolve it strategically. The Panel member asked the team to study the site's Indigenous context and evolve in specific ways, namely that it is a confluence of water, wetlands, and land, as well as the terminus of the biggest water shed in the area. The Panel member asked the team to question how the built form can reflect and amplify these underlying conditions by considering biophilic design as it emphasizes relationships and not just shapes in a grid. The Panel recommended to let the park, its canopies and diverse species, exhale into the street. The Panel member commented it is important to consider these in the context of climate resilience and focus on these areas during the consultation meetings.

One Panel member felt the public realm strategy should drive the design, with one of the main objectives of expanding the central park space. The Panel member asked the team to consider Broadview Ave. as a special place because it has the same right-of-way width as Spadina, and activating it with retail will require special effort – it is important to first identify the character of the street. The Panel member noted that Broadview Ave. should take on a lot of density given its size, and any less would detract from the street animation. The Panel member asked for more information to understand the public realm character along Commissioners Street and Don Roadway. The Panel member felt that the street between the McCleary Park and the Transfer Station Stack should be removed so the park can directly abut the industrial heritage site. In terms of retail strategy, the Panel member supported retail along Broadview and suggested more amenities at-grade along dead-end streets. On the built form, the Panel member felt that the podium floor plates that cater to PIC uses may be too large for residential so it is important to have a vision of where the PIC uses will be concentrated and propose a few options for developers to build on, i.e. along major streets. The Panel member commented that the interior of the blocks should be public realm, and that the street widths should be calibrated for programs, i.e. non-residential programs don't need as much sunlight therefore the right-of-way can be narrower.

Another Panel member commented that the necklace of open spaces is not only a park system but an identity for the precinct, and commented that to combat the large perimeter roads the project needs a network of intimate public realm. Furthermore, the parks will anchor the district before the developments are built and supported this strategy of leading with landscape which has been very successful in the waterfront

area. The Panel member is excited by the development of a new building typology and suggested exploring ideas like no underground parking, or what to do with spaces once parking is no longer needed. The Panel member noted Lake Shore is a harsh street, study and consider how the smaller streets like Bouchette and Logan can better connect the project with neighbourhoods from the north – it is important to create a character that connects with the existing neighbourhoods.

One Panel member noted the project vision is not clear, especially at the parks and edges of the site. The Panel member suggested to describe the character of the landscape, such as the material and environmental vision, to help inform the experience of the precinct. Through a material and spatial exploration exercise, the Panel member felt the blunt vision can then be evolved and developed. The Panel member asked the team to provide a simply stated vision for the precinct at the return presentation.

Another Panel member felt that the public realm and streets requires careful thought and development. The Panel member noted David Crombie spoke about locating residential entrance along David Crombie Park and encouraged the team to consider this level of detail with streetscape design. The Panel member felt the network of public spaces that link the blocks together is very important and should drive the design of the built form; prioritize this early in the design phase.

One Panel member was reminded of the ‘condenser’ concept and asked the team to provide more information on the big idea for built form. The Panel member recommended that the buildings should allow the blurring of residential and PIC uses, i.e. buildings with flexible floor plans, and that this could create a neighbourhood with unique character while moving away from the more typical tower and podium typology. The Panel member commented that the mid-rise height can be raised to gain more density and the team should study the impact on tower form. It is important to not allow parking and service spaces to occupy the courtyard spaces, instead keep the courtyard spaces as open space to create a pedestrian movement network.

Another Panel member suggested for the district to have one single parking structure to handle parking demand. The Panel felt that the final vision should consider maximum density with retail anchoring the corner. The Panel member recommended limiting the street adjacent to the park to pedestrian access only, and when combined with retail focused on the park and POPS, the project will have a layered public realm. The Panel member noted there is contrasting descriptions of the mews spaces and the built form, if the intention is to create a finer grain plan, the team needs to consider how the plan will work with, not against future development work – if this can be achieved it will set an example for the rest of the city. The Panel member recommended a unique solution for the terminus of Broadview Avenue because currently it does not terminate well with closed off film studios and lack of street animation. The Panel member supported the team for reasonably deviating from the PF.

One Panel member is excited to see the flexible and resilient sustainability framework and asked the team to explore increasing density on site. The Panel member

recommended the team to show locations for renewable energy systems at the next review.

1.5 Consensus Comments

General

- The waterfront has a successful history of leading with landscape in the planning of new neighbourhood, encouraged the team to strongly consider how this strategy can be leveraged at McCleary.
- It is important to establish a clear vision to celebrate the uniqueness of the district – provide a clear big idea and demonstrate how the design stands out.
- Consider bold ideas in developing the precinct vision, including:
 - Prioritization of green space and restore the natural heritage in addition to the industrial heritage of the site. The site should build on the relationship between land and water - a confluence of these elements.
 - Go beyond the existing street grid and explore a finer grain block pattern and open space network.
 - Expand the network of green spaces.
- Provide clear rationale on the changes from the Port Lands Planning Framework, present studies and analysis to support the proposed strategies at the next review.
- Provide more information on the energy analysis and sustainability strategy for the district and consider a bold strategy here.

Urban Design

- Reconsider the need for vehicular access between the Commissioners Street Transfer Station Stack and McCleary Park, consider devoting it to pedestrian only.
- Provide a robust retail strategy at the next review. Consider a concentrated retail area along Broadview Avenue and McCleary Park
- Given the width of the future Broadview Street extension, it is important to allocate a high level of density along the street.

Built form

- Explore building typologies that permit flexible uses while creating a distinctive character for the district.
- Study the built form in King West as a precedent, create guidelines and zoning that would permit uses that can be flexible to respond to future market, and floor plates and facades that work with both retail/ PIC uses, commercial, and residential occupancy.
- In response to the high-water table of the site, consider the following parking strategies:
 - Above-grade parking in the podium that is ‘wrapped’ with other programs.
 - Parking structures that can be converted to other uses in the future.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed for Stage 1: Issues Identification.

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

Mr. Kulig, Mr. Raymond, and Mr. Bates, thanked the Panel for the comments and noted the team will explore all options as the design advances.

2.0 Basin Media Hub – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1133
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Hackman Capital
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	SOM, Melk!
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Brian Glodney, Executive Vice President, Hackman Capital Partners James Diewald, Associate Principal, SOM Yifan Qiu, Associate, !Melk
<i>Delegation:</i>	Carol Camp, Hackman Capital Partners Mike Janas, Hackman Capital Partners Ian Graham, RE Millward Chris Wegner, Adamson Associates Nico Unverzagt, SOM Scott Pennington, CreateTO Anthony Kittel, City of Toronto Chris Hilbrecht, City of Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Hilbrecht, Community Planner with City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting the site location, existing context, construction progress on Port Lands Flood Protection, and overall planning policy context. Mr. Hilbrecht noted that the ship channel's Water's Edge Promenade (WEP) will be advanced in a separate phase of work led by CreateTO and Parks, Forestry & Recreation, and City of Toronto. Mr. Hilbrecht noted the project background and planning process.

Leon Lai, Manager, Design Review Panel, with Waterfront Toronto, noted that the project is here for Detailed Design review and recapped the consensus comments from Jan. 2023. Mr. Lai noted the areas for Panel consideration, including studio campus and public realm interface, detailed design of POPS and landscape, design of Basin Street, materiality and building façade designs. Mr. Lai then introduced Brian Glodney, Executive Vice President with Hackman Capital Partners, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Glodney began the presentation by noting Hackman's experience and history with film studio development, the project goals, team, and the application timeline. James Diewald, Associate Principal with SOM, noted the site context today, planning considerations, examples of urban infill production studios, and the overall project statistics and programs. Mr. Diewald noted the studio landscape strategy and art opportunities, updates to Basin Street, and enclosure updates including materiality and elevations of key gateways. Mr. Diewald noted that the enclosure design changes are driven by cost reductions to ensure the project is financially viable. Yifan Qiu, Associate with !Melk, provided an open space design update, noted the studios' ecological identity, planting palette, ground plane materiality, and concluded by noting the key gateway open space designs.

2.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked for the rationale of the location of the waterfront gate and the materiality. Carol Camper, Vice President with Hackman Capital Partners, responded that the team would like to provide some secured outdoor space for studio staff, and with a grade change at that location, the gate has been located there. Mr. Qiu added that the intention is to provide a space big enough for events, and that the fence is galvanized steel.

Another Panel member asked the team to walk through the physical cladding samples shown on the table, and if green roofs are still being planned. Mr. Diewald noted the composite cladding samples and responded that all the production office spaces have green roofs, but unfortunately, they are not feasible on the roof of stage buildings due to weight; there will not be Solar PV panels on the roofs but there is potential for the development to add after day one.

One Panel member asked for the rationale for having a fence between the green metal clad buildings. Mr. Diewald responded that the fence outline secured outdoor spaces for studio staff. Ms. Camper added that the fence addresses the significant grade change and accommodates egress requirements within sound stages.

Another Panel member asked if it is possible to dedicate the artwork budget towards a façade treatment. Ms. Camper noted the team has options, either façade application, 3D element, or lighting, the intention is to complete an RFP process with an Indigenous focus – currently the team does not have a prescribed approach. The Panel member asked if the team tried to respond to the Panel's comment on improving the building massing at the terminus of Carlaw Ave. Ms. Camper responded that the team evaluated stacking, but it is not economically feasible due to the need for a new structural system, in lieu more landscaping has been provided to soften the gateway and the driveway including a new line of trees. Ms. Camper added that the adjacent WEP will be a significant public realm at the terminus of Carlaw Ave.

One Panel member asked for more information on the planting selection and if Urban Forestry Toronto is specifying the species. Mr. Qiu responded that the team received feedback on long-term maintenance concerns through the Site Plan Approval (SPA)

progress, and are currently focusing on developing the understory shrub species, perennials, and large shading trees within the perimeter of the campus. The Panel member asked for clarification on maintenance responsibility. Ms. Camper noted the studio will maintain all landscaping within the studio site as a requirement of the SPA process.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the net-zero carbon strategy. Mr. Diewald noted the campus is an all-electric facility, no gas on site. The Panel member asked if there will be any greenhouse gas offset because while the Ontario electricity grid is clean it is not net-zero. Ms. Camper responded that the project is all-electric, but not exactly net-zero, and will clarify this for future.

One Panel member asked if the WEP will be fenced off in the interim. Mr. Hilbrecht responded that the intent is for the lands to be improved and conveyed to the City, the team hopes the WEP will be completed by the time the studio opens, if that is not the timeline then access control will have to be determined.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the sustainability objectives and noted that there are other opportunities that benefit this project specifically for this site, such as Solar PVs and rainwater collection. Appreciating the acknowledgement of the historic reference of the site being wet, consider using species that are native and hardy. While appreciating this is a private site, the Panel member suggested making the POPS and their gateways generous and public. The Panel member noted that this is a very privileged site and encouraged the team to deliver a project that lives up to the prominence of the site.

Another Panel member is concerned that the waterfront gate area cannot accommodate a five-hundred-person event, and questioned whether the gate is located at the right place. The Panel member noted that while appreciating the economic challenges and the elegant studio designs, the site is very privileged, and the design team should explore all options in improving it.

One Panel member noted SOM Los Angeles has expertise in creating great designs out of unexpected materials. The brick facades in the previous design have now been replaced with composite panels, the Panel member felt that these composite cladding materials do not achieve the same level of design and experience and asked the team to use the art budget creatively to raise the level of uniqueness on the buildings. The Panel member asked the team to study projects that integrate public art, such as The Generation House in Aarhus, Denmark that integrates art into the stairs. The Panel member felt that the buildings should be improved and will be relying on the architects to elevate the design with art and landscaping, especially at the terminus of Carlaw Ave.

Another Panel member noted the design does not reflect the amount of creative work that takes place within the studios. Notwithstanding the thoughtful presentation, the design feels like ordinary industrial buildings. The Panel member recommended to do more with public art and super graphic elements, i.e. a 'landscape' parking lines that

looks less regular. The Panel member is disappointed with the design update and warned the team that as a condition of NOAC, a deposit is required to be provided as a provision on the landscape design, so any value engineering on the landscape after SPA will be challenging.

One panel member felt the design lost some of its shine in the interface with the public realm and asked the team to improve the edges and relationship with the POPS. The Panel member asked for more information to understand the requirements for security and did not support the characteristic of having long stretches of security fence along the buildings adjacent to the WEP. The Panel member asked the team to ensure the galvanized fence specification is well designed and refine the project edges with integration of nature.

Another Panel member noted that since this is one of the first projects in the Port Lands, it will become an important example for future projects in the neighbourhood. The Panel member did not support the proposed planting species and recommended the landscape better relate with the natural heritage of the area by specifying native species.

One Panel member felt the team has misunderstood the term 'net-zero', however, the full-electric approach is still commended because it is a low carbon strategy.

2.5 Consensus Comments

General

- The project is situated on a prime waterfront location adjacent to major public realm and the revitalization of the mouth of the Don River, it is important to ensure the project maximizes its site potential.
- Encouraged the team to develop opportunities that the Panel thinks are still available, i.e. integration of art into facades, design of the perimeter fence, landscape and water collection systems.
- Work with the City to develop a strategy to allow interim access to the Water's Edge Promenade when the studio is in operations.

Buildings

- The updated building design feels less special than the previous design, continue to find ways to push the design to express the uniqueness and creativity of this studio campus.
- Concerned with the value-engineered building exterior and its impact on the experience of adjacent public realm, consider the following:
 - Explore methods to creatively deploy the exterior materials, i.e. more texture through articulation with metal and precast cladding.
 - Considering bringing back some of the more playful placemaking elements, i.e. more graphic treatment of perimeter gateways, articulated signage, etc.
 - Design and specify a high-quality exterior perimeter fence material and avoid industrial chain-link along the important Water's Edge Promenade. Pay close attention to how the building edges meet the public realm.

- Work with the City to deploy public art on the facade to compensate for the lack of articulation.
- Disappointed with the treatment at the terminus of Carlaw and the lack of water view.

Landscape

- Concerned that the proposed trees will not succeed at the site, ensure the specified vegetation species are native.
- Provide clear provisions on rainwater collection in the public realm design.

Sustainability

- Commended the all-electric objective for the project.
- Ensure renewable energy such as solar is maximized where possible.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted unanimous Conditional Support for the project.

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

Mr. Glodney commented that there is tension in the design, there is room for improvement and the team will try to find the right balance. Mr. Glodney appreciated the comments and will take the list into considerations.

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 March 27th, 2024.

Signed--

DocuSigned by:



BC37EAE11BEF41B...

Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair

DocuSigned by:



3513697D8EE74BB...

Emilia Floro, City of Toronto Urban Design Director

DocuSigned by:



AE277B6DC4C740D...

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto Chief Planning and Design Officer