



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #168

Wednesday, June 26th, 2024

Meeting held in-person hybrid at Waterfront Toronto

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Gina Ford
Pat Hanson
Matthew Hickey
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Emily Mueller De Celis
Pina Petricone
Brigitte Shim
Kevin Stelzer

Regrets

David Leinster
Eric Turcotte

Emilia Floro, City of Toronto
Pina Mallozzi (for Chris Glaisek), Waterfront
Toronto

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. Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge – Stage 1; Issues Identification
 2. West Don Lands Block 13 – Stage 2: Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

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

Emily Mueller De Celis and Matthew Hickey declared conflicts for Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge and recused themselves from the review.

The Chair then asked Pina Mallozzi, Senior Vice President of Design, Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Design Review Panel Report Back:

Ms. Mallozzi noted the consensus comments have been shared with the **Villiers Island Precinct Plan: Proposed Amendments** team. Since the April 2024 WDRP review there has been loosening of the zoning envelopes with the removal of most of the at-grade setbacks as well as base building and tower stepbacks. The plan was approved at the Planning and Housing Committee and the next step is City Council for approval. Ms. Mallozzi noted Waterfront Toronto will be releasing an RFP for Villiers Island Public Realm and Infrastructure design work.

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on **Queens Quay East Lakefill**, noted the new dockwall has been installed, the infill is 70% complete, underwater rock berms have been placed on the water side, and vibro-compaction for expedited soil consolidation will be starting shortly. Ms. Mallozzi noted **In Equilibrium** by Wendat First Nation artist Ludovic Boney is under construction, the artwork is expected to be completed in August and will be officially unveiled in the Fall as part of the building's opening. Ms. Mallozzi noted **Upcycle: Message in a Bottle** was installed in June and will be in place until September in the basin of Harbour Square Park.

Leon Lai, Design Review Panel manager with Waterfront Toronto, then provided an update on the tentative DRP agendas for July and September 2024.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge - Stage 1: Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1042
<i>Project Type:</i>	Infrastructure
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Villiers Island
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto

Presenter(s): Anna Ingebrigtsen, Senior Project Manager, Waterfront Toronto
Domonic Bettison, Director, Wilkenson Eyre

Delegation: Elliot Krause, Wilkenson Eyre
Erik Skouris, Two Row Architects
Chris Pommer, PLANT
David Collins, Zeidler
Matthew Firestone, Zeidler
Merrilees Willemse, City of Toronto
David O'Hara, City of Toronto
Anthony Kittel, City of Toronto
Clara Romero, City of Toronto
Fred Martin, City of Toronto
Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto
Kasia Gladki, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Anna Ingebrigtsen, Senior Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the RFP objectives, project goals, existing and future site context. Ms. Ingebrigtsen noted the north and south landing sites with photos, adjacent design context including Quayside, Water's Edge Promenade, Parliament Slip, Promontory Park North, and cycling network of the area. Ms. Ingebrigtsen noted the anticipated project timeline, that the project is appearing in front of the Panel today for Stage 1: Issues Identification, and areas for Panel consideration: design integration with the immediate context and greater public realm network, accessibility and active transportation, alignment with the objectives and character of the other PLFP bridges, and strategies for reducing the embodied carbon emissions of the project. Ms. Ingebrigtsen then introduced Domonic Bettison, Director with Wilkenson Eyre, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Bettison noted the design team, project goals, and existing site context on north and south landing points. Mr. Bettison provided a site analysis, including the channel navigable envelope, elevations of the landing points, and the soffit elevation to match the existing Cherry St. Bridges. Mr. Bettison noted the concept design studies, the selected option of 's' shaped deck and arch, the concept plan, the bridge width and seating area evolution from the competition stage. Mr. Bettison noted locally sourced materials, highly efficient arch design reducing steel and carbon intensity, the Indigenous design approach that acknowledges water and the cardinal directions, and lighting design. Chris Pommer, Partner with PLANT, noted the landscape design which will be further advanced in the next stage of design. Mr. Bettison noted the bridge section, studies of the north landing, and the south connection options with the park.

1.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked for the role of landscape in this project because there appear to be some critical transition moments with adjacent landscape projects. Pina Mallozzi, Senior Vice President of Design, responded that while Port Lands Flood Protection has been designed, Promontory Park North is not part of the project scope and Waterfront Toronto has engaged MVVA to help ensure the bridge will land seamlessly with the park before the design is complete – the bridge timing will almost certainly come ahead of the park. Ms. Mallozzi noted Water’s Edge Promenade (WEP) is at 90% design and the two teams have been working closely. Ms. Mallozzi noted the team will look at implementing an integrated strategy. Ms. Mallozzi responded that there is not an opportunity to touch the water, the bridge lands very high on the south side to allow a walkway underneath.

Another Panel member asked if the abutments and foundations are not visible like represented in the drawings. Elliot Krause, Associate Director with Wilkinson Eyre, noted the team studied two options: tied-arc option which results in the smaller foundation, and another option where the foundations are slightly larger but hidden underground without the ties. In the second option, which is preferred, the north abutment straddles the WEP dock wall, and the other half will be under the design of the WEP.

One Panel member asked for the material of the handrail and if night lighting has been studied. Mr. Bettison noted they are stainless steel. Mr. Krause noted the team wants to capture the Indigenous design narrative, either with or without the lighting solution, and is aware of night sky issues. The Panel member asked if the team has considered the movement of at-risk species along this corridor. Mr. Bettison noted the integration of birds will be tackled as part of the landscape strategy, the team has not looked at encouraging bird life but has received comments on encouraging biodiversity at the first Indigenous circle.

Another Panel member asked if the steps on the north side are conceptual and if visitors can touch the water. Mr. Bettison noted the team will discuss with the client touching water while addressing other constraints. David Collins, Partner with Zeidler, noted conversations have been started with Ports Toronto and will inform the work at the next phase of design. Mr. Bettison noted it is a wedge wire product, very robust, doesn’t require much upkeep; it is the same material as the Eaton Centre bridge. The Panel member noted there is an edge where the bridge meets the planting on the south side and asked if there is a strategy for the meeting points between vegetation and bridge. Chris Pommer, Partner with Plant, responded that the team wants to ensure seamless transition and will provide more information at the next phase of design.

One Panel member asked why the bridge width has been reduced from 6 to 5m. Mr. Krause noted the surface is not split but shared between various modes of mobility, the team’s experience is that a narrower bridge slows people down, while allowing the bridge to expand to 8m at the noses.

Another Panel member noted the ties would reduce the truss on the abutments and the presentation outlines a rigorous strategy of spanning, and asked if the team has completed a life cycle assessment of having abutments to reduce midspans versus an

overall lighter structure. Mr. Krause responded the overall approach is to reduce steel tonnage, the proposed structure is very efficient which reduces concrete needed for the abutments. The Panel member asked if the same amount of concrete can be moved into the channel to further lighten the structure while keeping the form, and further reduce embodied carbon – it is encouraged for the team to study overall embodied carbon.

One Panel member asked if the team has studied an option of landing at the WEP without having any abutment into the water, and if there is any drawing that compares the design to the Cherry Street bridges. Mr. Bettison noted the team is studying one option where the abutment is completely away from the water however it does increase the span of the bridge, and that the team can produce a drawing that show the Cherry Street bridges.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the underside of the bridge and if there is an opportunity capture reflection at night. Mr. Bettison noted the team is thinking about the underside and would like it to have a presence and reflect water.

One Panel member asked about graffiti because there is graffiti on the Cherry Street bridges. Mr. Bettison noted it is challenging and the team can investigate this.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member commented the project is set up as a great process and looks forward to seeing the design advance.

Another Panel member appreciated the presentation and looks forward to Schematic Design.

One Panel member encouraged the team to look at integration of the landscape elements, habitat, biodiversity, and look at the bridge underside as a design opportunity.

Another Panel member appreciated seeing the equinox materialize in a physical way in the form of a piece of infrastructural and felt that this is what design competition is all about. The Panel member is excited by the integration of seating and encouraged the team to design steps at the north and south landing points for additional seating opportunities. The Panel member felt the fine threshold between planting the bridge must be carefully considered as there will be a lot of foot traffic.

One Panel member encouraged more focus on the underside and consideration of more habitat especially at any in-water construction areas. The Panel member questioned the 5m width, asked the team to consider further tightening to leave more space for nosing and seating, improve movement and let people enjoy the seating area.

Another Panel member supported the lighting concept and encouraged the team to source low carbon steel, work with suppliers on advanced mixes of low carbon concrete and specify certified wood products.

One Panel member appreciated the presentation and encouraged the landscape take a driving seat in the design.

Another Panel member is concerned that the steps and perforated floor can be very disorienting for people with vision impairment and recommended the team to address this to ensure the design is accessible for everyone.

One Panel member is excited for the bridge and felt this new connection will have a lot of traffic in particular people on bikes. The Panel member noted traffic and transportation signage on other bridges are not well integrated and encouraged better coordination here. The Panel member is concerned with safety at night for women and children and suggested lighting for people's faces. In general, the main question being posed to the team is whether the design can find balance with mass, negative space, fineness, while pushing thinness of the bridge to the maximum with the help of the arch.

1.5 Consensus Comments

General

- Appreciated the beautiful and inspiring design, supported the work done so far to advance the design.
- Ensure the bridge is seamlessly integrated with the design of the adjacent Water's Edge Promenade and Promontory Park.
- Further develop the thresholds of planting areas to ensure the vegetation will be successful long term and not trampled over from frequent use.
- Consider opportunities to touch the water and explore how the bridge underside can be designed to support the underside experience and views of the river.
- Provide a drawing of the Cherry Street Bridge to understand the relationship between the two designs.
- Provide a strategy for graffiti management.

Design

- Consider night lighting and ensure the bridge is lit for safety.
- Continue to study and further develop the width of the bridge. Some Panel members asked the team to consider a narrower path to keep costs low, help reduce opportunities for movement conflict, and create a slower experience. Some Panel members felt that an even wider bridge would benefit the experience in a different way.
- People will bicycle through the bridge, ensure there is a strategy to manage bike traffic and minimize conflicts with pedestrians.
- Ensure the design is fully accessible by considering users of all abilities, such as visual impairment, and design for all ages and seasonality. In particular, the design and materiality of the seating areas need to address these concerns.
- Areas for people to pause and admire the views are critical, the Panel supported the incorporation of seating areas.

- Consider weighting the design options with respect to embodied carbon emissions, specifically the foundation strategies, and explore options that minimizes material volume and carbon emissions.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

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

Mr. Bettison thanked the Panel for their comments and will work with the team to address them.

2.0 West Don Lands Block 13 – Stage 2: Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1129
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Henriquez Partners Architects NAK Design RWDI
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Derek Wei, Development Planner, Waterfront Toronto Gregory Henriquez, Managing Principal, Henriquez Partners Architects Terrence Lee, Associate, NAK Design Sumedha Kumar, Senior Sustainability Consultant, RWDI
<i>Delegation:</i>	Shawn LaPointe, Henriquez Partners Architects Robert Ng, NAK Design Stephen Hasko, Dream Cynthia Shahani, Dream Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer Infrastructure Katherine Bailey, City of Toronto Michael Wolfe, Waterfront Toronto Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Derek Wei, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by providing an update on project program overview, anticipated timeline of development applications, and the existing site context. Mr. Wei noted the site per the 2006 Precinct and Block Plan, the Precinct Plan massing, existing developments in the West Don Lands, the zoning for the site, and immediate design context including Block 12 and Block 8. Leon Lai, Design Review Panel Manager with Waterfront Toronto, noted the project is here for Stage 2: Schematic Design review, summarized the March 2022 Issues Identification massing and design, and recapped the previous consensus comments. Mr. Lai asked the Panel to consider the following areas: the revised massing in relation to the public realm and site context, revised tower location and massing, revised facade design and cladding, ground floor programs, and the sustainability strategies. Mr. Wei introduced Gregory Enriquez, Managing Principal with Henriquez Partners Architects, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Enriquez began the presentation by noting the design team, the comments from the previous DRP, and the evolution of the project massing since then. Specifically, the

massing respects the expression of Block 4 and together form a gateway to the park. Mr. Enriquez noted the tower forms a rhythmical cityscape with the nearby towers, the building tectonic has been simplified to reinforce the massing and further differentiate the elements, the revised expression mitigates the scale of the tower and podium elements. Mr. Enriquez noted perspective views of the project in context, project statistics, sections, key plans, elevations, and shadow studies focusing on shadow impact on Corktown Common.

Terrence Lee, Senior Associate with NAK Design Strategies, noted the ground floor landscape design that enhances the public realm and pedestrian experience, landscape concept of the courtyard, planting ideas of the winter garden, and rooftop features. Mr. Lee noted the landscape sections along Tannery Road, Mill Street, Front Street, and Bayview Ave. Sumedha Kumar, Senior Sustainability Consultant with RWDI, noted the project targets TGS v3 Tier 1, LEED v4 Gold, current minimum EUI, TEDI, and GHGI thresholds. Ms. Kumar noted the energy and climate strategies and LEED credit strategies.

2.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked if the heights are included in the next submission and the timing for site plan application. Stephen Hasko, Development Lead with Dream, noted the team will resubmit both SPA and Rezoning and the heights are included. The Panel member asked why the ground floor shifts from retail to townhouses along Bayview Avenue. Mr. Hasko responded that it is very difficult to lease space along Bayview and there is high demand for residential off the park, so the design is market driven. The Panel member asked if there is retail along Bayview in the block north of Front Street. Mr. Hasko noted that the retail ends shortly after wrapping around the corner.

Another Panel member asked if the first submission included above-grade parking. Mr. Hasko noted it was below-grade.

One Panel member asked if there are opportunities for shade for the daycare outdoor space along the south elevation, and if the daycare has been studied on the east side across the park. Mr. Henriquez responded that the design is not at that level of detail yet, and there is a big grade change on the east side which creates a challenge for the daycare.

Another panel member asked if the memories of previous settlement has been considered in the design. Mr. Henriquez noted the team is focused on making the project financially viable and will work on more of the architecture and design at the next stage.

One Panel member asked for the aspirational soil depths for trees in the project. Mr. Lee noted that the design achieves the required soil depths for Toronto Green Standards and the team will continue to study for the roof planters. Shawn LaPointe, Principal with Henriquez Partners, noted there is room for soil at the transfer slabs.

Another Panel asked the team for the Life Cycle Analysis number. Mr. LaPointe responded that the team is interested in reducing the number as much as possible, will

look at all the strategies such as specifying low carbon concrete. The Panel member asked if the water sourced heat pump is ground sourced. Mr. LaPointe noted it is not currently ground sourced; it has been a long time since the project started but the team is just getting started again after a long pause. Sumedha Kumar, Senior Sustainability Consultant with RWDI, noted water sourced heat pump is the aim and studies for geothermal will be done as well.

One Panel member asked if there is a relationship between the program and the architectural expression and if there is an intent for the architecture to provide flexibility. Mr. Enriquez noted the design is in early days, the daycare location is being explored, and there are two tectonics being proposed. The client requested a similar facade between retail and the townhouses and there is an intention for designing a background building – the design will be developed further.

Another Panel member asked if the daycare program has been confirmed or if the location is being tested. Mr. Hasko noted the daycare has not been confirmed. The Panel member asked for more information on the courtyard's level of solar access. Mr. Enriquez noted those shadow studies have not been completed yet, but the solar exposure of this courtyard is far superior to the previous design. Mr. Lee noted there is a lot more sun and is confident that the vegetation shown in the renderings can be achieved.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member is excited to see the team's commitment in developing the site, and commented that it would be great to see not just private residential fronting the park, instead a level of community or retail use. The Panel member suggested more robust retail on Front Street. If there is retail along Bayview Avenue, then the park can become a part of the public realm, on the other hand it is disappointing to see Front Street end in a series of townhouses – you don't have to match what is happening on the north side of Front Street along Bayview. The Panel member supported the raised courtyard. The Panel member commented that the homogeneity of the architecture and massing is something that should be carefully studied: you can have tall form to create a 'gateway' but at the lower portions there should have horizontal datums that speak to the public realm and contribute to the street, like a continuous horizontal façade that is set up to respond to each key frontage. The Panel member noted that thermally broken balconies is a critical part of the sustainability strategy and should be implemented. Overall, the Panel member felt that the design is an overall improvement, however there should be a more intense and robust public realm to support the increased density and make this privileged site successful.

Another Panel member noted the above grade parking is a big change to the project and did not support this strategy as this eliminates the opportunity to walk through the block. The site is large, and the raised parking makes it impossible to build on the existing fine grain public realm network. The Panel member felt the raised parking is a mistake for the site.

One Panel member noted that it is both important to provide the right to solar exposure and balance shade access, consider this in the location of the daycare and other outdoor spaces.

Another Panel member did not think that the tower at Bayview and Front needs to exactly match the height of the opposing block, that some flexibility in height would still create this experience of a gateway. The Panel member supported the daycare fronting Corktown Common, asked the team to be flexible with the shape of the daycare outdoor space, and noted that having townhouses face Mill Street, which is quieter, may be a better idea. If the raised parking remains in place, consider an indoor/outdoor access through the block to provide the necessary porosity at the site.

One Panel member commented that Indigenous values and financial viability are not mutually exclusive. It is very important to acknowledge that this site is located at the mouth of the Don, so it is discouraging to see that nothing has been presented on Indigeneity. The Panel member felt that NAK Design should think about the landscape beyond the property line.

Another Panel member felt the landscape design is underdeveloped, i.e. the treeless rooftop, and recommended the team to develop a more complete vision to help evaluate issues such as long-term comfort. The Panel member noted the renders do not match the plans in vegetation quality and encouraged the team to confirm.

One Panel member recognized that this project grandfathers in old TGS objectives and noted that it is important to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Panel member noted that the system selected – a decentralised heat pump system – operates on an ambient loop and encouraged the team to provide a connection for future air sourced heat pump as Toronto heats up, so it is easy to decommission the boiler in the future to further lower the greenhouse gas intensity.

Another Panel member supported the need for a through block connection. The Panel member is intrigued by the idea of a completely uniformly expressed façade focusing on being tectonic and recommended that the tectonics need to saturate through the various programmatic decisions.

One Panel member suggested it is useful to think about the different elevations, streets, and find opportunities that are unique. The Panel member did not support the proposed location of the daycare because the outdoor space creates friction between private and public uses of the street. Similarly, there is not enough sophistication on the other streets between private and public, and recommended more attention in the landscape and architecture thresholds. The Panel member suggested that Corktown Common be better represented in the drawings to show the quality of the park.

Another Panel member felt the townhouses along Bayview privatized the street and asked the team to rethink the landscape design at these edges and consider the various areas together as a connected public realm. The Panel member appreciated the sun shadow diagram and asked the team to consider the topography of Corktown in the design of the building. The Panel member questioned whether the density of the

planting as shown in the precedent images can be delivered in the courtyard, provide more information on overall planting strategy and soil depths.

One Panel member noted the black and grey exterior is not very exciting and asked the team to consider some terracing in the facade and identify opportunities for more vegetation to the building and respond to the park context.

2.5 Consensus Comments

General

- Overall appreciate the long process and development. This is one of the final blocks, so it is important to deliver a great design.
- Supported flexibility in additional height of the tower.
- Support for the revised, taller massing at Front and Bayview
- Appreciated the diagrams that show the massing's shadow impact on the park.
- Consider the memory of the site before European settlement in the design: the heritage of previous Indigenous settlements, animals, and water.

Building

- Consider more unique uses along Bayview that bring more energy and intensity facing the park, such as mixed-use, retail, or work/live units – something unique.
- Consider introducing a finer grain level of porosity through the site and integrate connections with the greater site plan.
- Some Panel members supported the above-grade parking because it improves solar exposure of the courtyard and units adjacent; some Panel members did not support the above-grade parking because it takes up space for other ground floor uses.
- There are many white and grey buildings in the neighbourhood, consider a bolder façade strategy.
- Supported the daycare use and encouraged the team to further investigate the daycare's relationship to the school across Mill Street. Some Panel members felt the daycare outdoor space should be relocated to take advantage of views of Corktown Common or the raise courtyard space.

Landscape

- Appreciated the landscape vision for the courtyard, ensure sufficient soil depths are provided and the density of planting is well studied to deliver this vision.
- Consider native species of plants that respond to the context of Don Lands.
- Stronger attention is encouraged for the landscape design around the block, ensure these thresholds relate to the different street conditions, i.e. the publicness of Mill Street with the future school across, the topography of Corktown Common along Bayview. Some Panel members felt the landscape design along Bayview is too private and does not respond to the context of Corktown Common.

Sustainability

- Encouraged the team to maximize potential for minimizing GHGI.

- Consider providing thermally broken balconies.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Non-Support for the project (6 members voted Non-Support, 4 members voted Conditional Support).

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

Mr. Enriquez noted that the team agrees with many of the Panel's concerns and will take the comments back for consideration – they want to get support on doing something a bit more adventurous.

CLOSING

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

These Meeting Minutes are formally adopted and approved by Panel on July 24th, 2024.

These Meeting Minutes have been signed by Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair, Emilia Floro, City of Toronto Urban Design Director, and Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto Chief Planning and Design Officer. Waterfront Toronto has on record a copy of this document with their DocuSign signatures.