



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #105
Wednesday, November 15, 2017**

Present

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

Regrets

Peter Busby

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka
Netami Stuart

Representatives

Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Port Lands Flood Protection Enabling Infrastructure: River Valley Flood Protection and Parks
 2. TOcore (for information)
 3. West Don Lands – Rekai and Options for Homes
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the October 18 meeting. One of the Panel members asked to include a comment in section 2.3 to the consensus comments in section 2.5. The minutes were adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte noted a conflict for the Port Lands Flood Protection Project and recused himself for that item.

The Chair noted that the Waterfront for All summit was held on October 26 and 27, with over 300 people signed up. The two-day summit consisted of a number of great key note speakers including Will Fleissig.

The Chair also noted that the Port Lands Planning Framework went before the Planning and Growth Management Committee on October 12 and was deferred to November 15. The Chair noted that a letter was submitted by representatives from Waterfront for All explaining that they support the adoption of the mixed use residential designation for Villiers Island, but recommend that the draft Official Plan Amendment for the remaining lands be deferred as it does not represent the best way of achieving that goal.

The Chair noted that a report to introduce an amendment to the Official Plan to protect the lands required for the Cooper Street Extension will be considered by Council in early December. The purpose of the amendment is to establish a policy framework that will allow construction of the Cooper Street Extension at an appropriate time in the future.

Will Fleissig, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, provided a brief update on Waterfront Transit Reset, noting that the moving sidewalk option has been rejected. The staff report recommends further focused analysis of light rail and automated funicular technology options in order to reach a solution for this portion of the transit network, and high-quality integration with the east west light rail transit along Queens Quay must be part of the solution.

The Chair then invited Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the skating trail has now reached the end of its 28-day cure, and the water has been drained from the blue skin surfacing. Refrigeration equipment is now being commissioned with the aim to begin making ice in December. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the wood decking on the Events Dock is being installed, and the liquid landscape in front of the Fort is being planted. Hardcape work has progressed with sandblasted exposed aggregate numerals installed along the length of the trail. Ms. Mallozzi noted that a summer 2018 opening event is now in the planning stages.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure: River Valley Flood Protection and Parks

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MVVA

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Michael Van Valkenburgh (MVVA), Herb Sweeney (MVVA)

Delegation: Emily Mueller De Celis (MVVA)

ID#: 1090

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by noting that 290 hectares of southern downtown Toronto are at risk of flooding from the Don River watershed. The Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure Project is a comprehensive solution to flood protection. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the project has previously presented the Environmental Assessment and Master Planning process to the Panel. This is the project's first time presenting the River Valley and Parks Design to the Panel. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the project scope consists of parks, flood protection and river valley, roads and municipal infrastructure and bridge. The focus of today's presentation will be on the parks, flood protection and river valley lead by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA). Ms. Mallozzi raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including terrestrial habitat design and function, aquatic habitat design and function, wetland habitat design and function, park programming, park design, flood protection features such as weirs, channel and edge conditions, and the draft schedule. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Michael Van Valkenburgh, President and CEO of MVVA and Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began by noting that this project started over 10 years ago with the Lower Don Lands Master Plan Competition and has evolved significantly since. The amount of impervious surfaces has increased greatly, which is driving the need for flood protection in the area. Mr. Sweeney noted that flood protection will be achieved through a three-tier system. In terms of localized site analysis, Mr. Sweeney noted that there is a need to address the river flow, prevalent winds, waves and ice direction. Soil remediation is needed to address contamination, and CH2M will continue their environmental work on community based risk assessment.

Mr. Sweeney then invited Mr. Van Valkenburgh to speak to the character of the park. Mr. Van Valkenburgh noted that this project is a seamless collaboration with designers and scientists. Mr. Van Valkenburgh explained that the design is informed by the natural landscape of Canada. Mr. Van Valkenburgh walked the Panel through a series of precedent images noting that the team will be drawing inspiration from parks designed

by MVVA and others. Park elements that should be considered include, vibrancy during the day and night, a play area for children, water access, preservation of important views, winter programming such as skating and tobogganing, picnic areas and outdoor barbeque spaces, and playground elements that are interwoven into the natural habitat. Mr. Van Valkenburgh concluded by noting that the area must be a landscape of irregularity that will absorb natural effects of storms.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if the southerly extends of the river go all the way to Lake Ontario Park. Mr. Sweeney replied that the regulatory flood event will bring the water over the spillway into the Ship channel but not over to Lake Ontario Park.

Another Panel member asked whether the record lake levels seen this past summer are being factored into this project. Mr. Sweeney replied that they are reconceiving wetland habitats because five-year-old assumptions must be reevaluated regarding high lake levels.

One Panel member asked what will happen to the areas in Villiers Island that are not within the project boundary. Ms. Mallozzi replied that MVVA's design respects the Villiers Island Precinct Plan.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale behind the eastern edge of the river being such a hard-fast line rather than meandering like the west bank of the river. Mr. Sweeney replied that the boundary is defined by where the Don Roadway has to sit, which has been informed by the Don Mouth Naturalization Project Environmental Assessment. The Panel member added that it's an interesting edge since the flood protection is coinciding with the edge of the roadway.

One Panel member asked how TRCA feels about the soft edges given that they generally prefer hard edges. Mr. Sweeney replied that TRCA is an active team member and as we move through the design process they will continue to be involved in conversations.

Another Panel member asked what kind of criteria was included in the bridges Request for Qualification (RFQ). Ms. Mallozzi responded that the RFQ is for the design of three bridges, one of which being a signature bridge. Ms Mallozzi added that the teams will be multi-disciplinary consisting of civil engineers and architects.

One Panel member asked what the requirement is for programming the park. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that programming is what the team is thinking about the most right now. Mr. Van Valkenburgh added that Promontory Park will afford the most character. Successful parks provide something essential, timeless and enduring, complemented with population programming and determining what the local urgencies are. Mr Sweeney added that they will be engaging with the Parks, Forestry and Recreation department along with various stakeholder groups.

Another Panel member asked, if the rights-of-way can be less hard, less of a boundary and more integrated into the naturalized features given that this is a landscape-driven project. Ms. Mallozzi noted that in addition to MVVA designing the green area, they will also be the integrator. Ms. Mallozzi explained that they will be potentially undertaking design guidelines as a set of parameters to make the precinct feel seamless. The Panel member also asked about maintenance of the park. Ms. Mallozzi noted that they are discussing this right now and it will be a combination of Parks, Forestry and Recreation, TRCA and Ports Toronto.

One Panel member asked if the team forecasts a seamless transition to the water's edge or will there be pieces of the park that will be off limits. Mr. Sweeney replied that they will be striking a balance between the off-limits areas and areas that are accessible. Mr. Sweeney added that there will be performance criteria for habitat and ecological services.

Another Panel member asked if it was possible to use the flow control weirs for renewable energy. Mr. Sweeney replied that they will start to unpack the technical questions as the project moves forward. The Panel member also asked whether the project will address water quality. Mr. Sweeney replied that the wetlands will help improve water quality along with the new storm water quality facility.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was very interested in seeing the early approach to programming. The Panel member was also supportive of the approach to exposing some of the edges and keeping some edges raw.

Another Panel member noted that Corktown Common gave the West Don Lands its identity and felt that this park should do the same for Villiers Island. The Panel member was concerned about the Villiers Island Precinct Plan getting implemented 10 years from now and already being dated. The Panel member felt that some flexibility needs to be built into the precinct plan. The Panel member noted that there needs to be a good interface between the built form and the park space.

One Panel member felt that there was a lot of focus on the landscape but would also like to see some retail in close proximity to the water and the relationship of the buildings to this.

Another Panel member explained that there is a tension between resistance and resilience. The Panel member noted that they are interested in seeing aspects of the dynamic and adaptive landscape. The Panel member added that with monitoring data, this will allow the team to address and respond to ecomanagement strategies.

One Panel member felt that the site boundary should be revised as the Don Roadway edge is too hard. The Panel member felt that the project should incorporate wider spaces.

Another Panel member felt that the streets feel too wide and too hard and finer grain pedestrian connections should be incorporated.

One Panel member commended the team noting that they are the Olmstead of our era. The Panel member encouraged the team to maintain elements such as the Keating Channel and blur the lines of urban, historic, industrial and natural features.

Another Panel member argued that at an early stage, the built figure of Villiers Island should be simple and subtle and not bump around too much. The Panel member was interested in the population and the program noting that there will be lots of places where intimate and interesting moments will exist. The Panel member felt that a lot of the precedents shown were smaller spaces and felt that some examples of larger spaces for inspiration should be included. The Panel member also noted that they were having a hard time comprehending the scale and suggested bringing scale comparisons to the next review.

Another Panel member wanted to see a deep dive into the what the landscape would look like before and after a big flood and how long it would take to bounce back.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- This is a fabulous and unique opportunity and one of a kind in the country
- Ensure seamless integration of all urban, historic, and natural features
- Allow for the flexibility of how Villiers Island will integrate with the park over time
- Ensure the landscape has a balance between resilience and resistance
- There should be a balance of active and passive programming of the parks
- Maintenance of the parks over time is critical
- Delineated which areas of the park permit access to the water's edge and which areas are restricted
- Consider the potential for renewable energy generation
- Demonstrate what the landscape will look like after a significant flood and how long it will take to recover
- Bring scale references of the park with known parkland and urban areas to the next meeting

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 TOcore (for Information)

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm Study

Location: Downtown Core

Proponent: City of Toronto

Architect/Designer: Public Work

Review Stage: N/A

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Andrew Farncombe (City of Toronto), Adam Nicklin (Public Work)

Delegation: Shawna Bowen (City of Toronto)

ID#: 1091

2.1 Project Presentation

Andrew Farncombe, Project Manager with the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that they are currently in phase three of the process. The study consists of one vision and a series of goals grouped around the themes of complete communities, connectivity, prosperity, resilience, and responsibility. Mr. Farncombe explained that the plan provides detailed direction on the appropriate scale and location of future growth. Mr. Farncombe noted that the next steps include more stakeholder and public consultations for the 2017 fall and winter. Mr. Farncombe then introduced Adam Nicklin, Principal at Public Work, to present the parks and public realm piece.

Mr. Nicklin began by noting that it is important to understand the multiple scales of our public realm experience, including the civic scale, the district scale and the local scale. All three scales need to work together towards a holistic and connected system. Mr. Nicklin walked through the 3 scales of interventions and explained the six transformative ideas, starting with the core circle. Mr. Nicklin explained that the core circle is to re-imagine Toronto's encompassing framework of valleys, bluffs and islands as a fully interconnected 900-hectare landscape system. Another transformative idea is great streets, which is meant to identify emblematic Toronto streets, amplify their unique qualities and make them outstanding civic places and connectors. Some examples include re-imagining the isolated green space of University Avenue by anchoring it to the east side creating a 9-acre park along University Avenue. Another example includes the King Street pilot project which launched on November 22 which does not allow through movement for private vehicles, providing priority to streetcars. Mr. Nicklin explained another transformative idea called the stitch, which re-connects the city to the waterfront neighbourhoods and links the east and west core circle with a supersized park district. Another transformative idea is around Toronto bay, which recognizes the Inner Harbour as a civic scaled water-room that connects a diverse network of places that encircle the bay.

2.2 Panel Questions and Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions and comments.

One Panel member noted that in the downtown area there are challenges in providing a relief of green space within the built area and asked what policy pieces will make sure to embrace access to parks and open space. Mr. Farncombe replied that there is an ecosystem of policies that are in play that take performance-based approach and

land-based approach. Development on small land requires taking the parkland dedication off site, having multiple developers collaborate on one site, or cash in lieu. Mr. Farncombe also noted that they are transitioning guidelines that were sidebars to policy, into policy. Shawna Bowen, Project Manager with the City of Toronto, added that defining the scales of growth helps clarify where different scales of development are appropriate. The built form section speaks to the performance framework including minimum setbacks, tower separation policies and no new net shadow policies to monitor how the buildings are contributing to the public realm.

Another Panel member asked how the different scales of mixed use differ. Mr. Farncombe replied that mixed use area 4 is local, which is pockets of land that contain low-rise, house-form type buildings, such as Kensington Market. Mixed use area 3, main streets, are streets within Downtown that have similar characteristics to the avenues and are directly related to the Mid-rise Guidelines and generally contain lots of heritage buildings. Mixed use areas 1 and 2 have the highest scale of growth, for example, along the subway spine. Mixed use 2 includes both highest and lower scales of growth such as King and Parliament area.

One Panel member noted that this study is indicative of the importance of a plan that is landscape-led. It is a shift in the mindset. They asked how the issues such as, climate change implications, change in demographics in the downtown, changes in the program of open spaces based on customs that people bring, other services (i.e. grey water, stormwater), can filter into this plan. Mr. Nicklin noted that the biggest landscape systems will be key to unlocking resiliency. Massive number of laneways will have potential to change the larger system. The study led by Jan Gael was also supported by a Calgary-based office O2, who looked comprehensively at how the parks connect to other uses rather than being individual parks. Resiliency can exist within the “core” circle because each open space carries a clear history and future. The east (Don Valley system) is about watershed and management of water. The north system is about the indigenous history. The south (Toronto Islands) is dynamic, shifting landscape that is being articulated over history. Lastly, the west is about the lost ravine, the Garrison Creek.

Another Panel asked that given the rise of open data and monitoring, if it is possible to determine how people are actually using the spaces rather than random spot checks. Open data allows you to pull the data to understand what uses are emerging, and even teach us of some uses that we may not consider as a typical park use. What those new uses are, should be investigated. Mr. Nicklin replied that they are aware that the survey study was limited. Mr. Nicklin added that the City of Toronto has monitored and taken data on 140 locations which will soon be available. Improvised uses migrating to the waterfront would be great. The Bentway has a conservancy set up to look and monitor different activities, which could be an interesting pilot project for TOcore. The Panel member then asked where would all of this fit into the study. Mr. Farncombe noted that the public space and life study was a first step, as City has typically done a lot of mobility counts on cars instead of people. The Gael study was to get a snapshot and a baseline to start the conversation, and use it to get investment of public life, not only mobility.

One Panel member asked what is being done to understand the different revenue flows that goes into the city through development and how it is filtered into amenities and services in the downtown. Mr. Farncombe replied that the market is coming downtown and in terms of the financing piece, they are looking at this suite of policies and will be examining revenue tools.

Another Panel member noted that while there is ambition in this plan, a list of policy changes or by-law changes that will start to make a difference in the short term is warranted. They noted that a list of key pilot projects that support the larger TOcore vision would be helpful. Mr. Farncombe noted that they will not be changing the by-laws as part of this process. One pilot project is the King Street project which will last a year. The Bentway project is a pilot project to monitor public use. The laneway project is also a pilot project.

One Panel member asked how much of the report can be modified at this point in time, whether substantive changes will be made based on comments and feedback. Mr. Farncombe noted that the project is at the tail end of the process. The Panel member noted that they should be realistic and avoid wishful thinking. Enlarging and modifying existing parks should be done carefully as to not destroy the integrity of what is already there. In terms of University Avenue proposal, there had been a study previously to shift the median to one side however there are limitations due to functions of the median, which facilitate left-turns onto east-west streets. No net new shadow does not seem realistic.

Another Panel asked how they selected Great Streets and why the waterfront is not part of the park system. They also asked whether there have been any discussions about the possibility of combining park space and school yards as one open space. Mr. Farncombe noted that the Central Waterfront is key to the connection of all streets.

Another Panel member commented that the parks and public realm piece comes from the City's larger policy moves. The issue of density and living in high-density places should also be part of the public realm strategy.

One Panel member noted that resiliency should be made more manifest in the Core Circle concept to respond to climate change and key urban issues.

Another Panel member suggested that the study needs to describe why this study is essential to addressing social, economic issues more to the forefront. The plan should flag other possible uses which come out of this study.

One Panel member commended the team for addressing public uses and noted that the plan should help advocate long-term use and the continuation of monitoring public life. While data does not drive the plan, it can support and validate it.

Another Panel member liked the notion of making small pilot projects as part of this study. They wondered if we are making the right investment in certain park space, such as the rail deck park, while there are opportunities to invest connect to the solid

inventory of open space such as the ravine. We should be more critical with our existing assets and invest in what affects our public life.

One Panel member noted that we must be careful with the rules that will be put in place in this study, as we do not want to stifle development.

2.4 Consensus Comments

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

- Laneways are key projects that can shape the larger system
- Public life and public space is important and making these resources usable is key to this study
- Further understanding of how public spaces are used currently is needed
- There is opportunity in both existing and new open spaces
- A more aggressive agenda and action items such as zoning changes, benchmarks and a list of key projects that will make change is needed

3.0 West Don Lands – Rekai and Options for Homes

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Rekai and Options for Homes

Architect/Designer: Montgomery Sisam Architects and Architecture Unfolded

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Robert Davies (Montgomery Sisam Architects), Eduardo Ortiz (Architecture Unfolded)

Delegation: Sue Graham-Nutter (Rekai) Heather Tremain (Options for Homes)

ID #: 1092

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the Rekai Centres is a non-profit charitable corporation that owns and operates two long-term care homes in downtown Toronto and Options for Homes is a non-profit developer of condominiums. Mr. Loudon noted that the partnership is proposing to deliver 220-264 much needed long-term care beds and 160-200 affordable ownership condominiums. Rekai has been actively pursuing the site and working with the Province and Waterfront Toronto for the past seven years. Mr. Loudon noted that this is the project's first time presenting to the Design Review Panel and they will be presenting the Issues Identification stage. Mr. Loudon raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the massing on Front Street, the sustainability approach, the groundfloor uses and animation, the Cherry Street animation and relationship to adjacent buildings. Mr. Loudon added that Waterfront Toronto and City Planning have agreed not to consider the proposed height of the Options for Homes building at this time. Mr. Loudon then introduced Sue Graham-Nutter, CEO at Rekai, and Heather Tremain, CEO at Options for Homes, to provide some background on both organizations.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Graham-Nutter began by noting that the Re kai Centres alone have a wait-list of 500 people seeking long-term care beds. There are 30,000 people with dementia in the GTA with the expectation that there will be 70,000 by 2030, 9 years after the Re kai Centre and Options for Homes plans to open. Ms. Tremain added that Options for Homes has 6,300 potential purchasers on their wait-list, which emphasizes the significant need for affordable home ownership in downtown Toronto. Ms. Tremain then introduced Robert Davies, Principal at Montgomery Sisam Architects, and Eduardo Ortiz, Principal at Architecture Unfolded.

Mr. Davies provided an overview of context, noting that the project falls within the West Don Lands boundary. Mr. Davies walked through the proposed building program and organization of the buildings noting that the Re kai Centre will consist of retail and potentially a kitchen on the ground floor. There are seven stories of long-term care units and the mechanical will be located on the seventh floor to free up space on the roof for the accessible roof garden. The Options for homes building will also consist of a lobby and retail on the ground floor and 246 residential units. Mr. Davies explained that both buildings will be connected through a bridge connection on the sixth floor and at the rooftop level of the Re kai building.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the distance is between the two buildings. Mr. Davies replied that it is three meters and widens to over six meters. The Panel member also asked if the amount of parking provided meets City of Toronto requirements. Mr. Davies replied that they will be below the requirement as most tenants do not own vehicles. Mr. Davies added that 50 spots is a reasonable number and also helps with the affordability of the building.

Another Panel member asked about the bridge connection between the two buildings. Mr. Davies replied that the link option is primarily for Personal Support Workers to move between buildings and to allow access to the proposed green roof.

One Panel member asked whether two different architecture firms were designing the buildings separately. Mr. Davies replied that Architecture Unfolded is designing the Options for Homes piece and Montgomery Sisam is designing the Re kai piece. Mr. Davies added that both firms are working closely together. The Panel member asked why the buildings are being designed separately. Mr. Davies replied that it is due to the building code classification and it made sense to separate the buildings based on the different systems required and floor to ceiling heights.

Another Panel member asked why they chose to locate the kitchen on the ground floor. Mr. Davies replied that a significant amount of space is required for a kitchen and if they were to move it to a higher floor, they would have to increase the height of the building.

One Panel member asked if they will be achieving LEED Gold for both buildings. Mr. Davies replied yes. The Panel member also asked what the thermal energy demand target is for the building and felt that this project could set a good precedent. Mr. Davies replied that they want to get the zoning issues sorted out before diving deeper into the building design and energy modelling.

Another Panel member asked if they plan on having thermally broken balconies. Mr. Davies replied that they are committing to thermally broken balconies on the Re kai building.

One Panel member asked what property is on the eastern edge of this building. Mr. Davies replied that it is currently a car dealership that will eventually be up for redevelopment.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member noted that having a kitchen on the ground floor can be a challenge. The Panel member suggested considering moving the mechanical to the roof and moving the kitchen above the ground floor.

Another Panel member felt that the mechanical being set back further than the building envelop seems like a throwaway. The Panel member also felt that the through-block passageway doesn't lead anywhere, and a party wall could be an alternative option.

One Panel member liked the composition of the building and preferred having a usable roof space. The Panel member noted that access to sunlight is an important asset.

Another Panel member agreed with having the full roof scape as usable open space. The Panel member also felt that having the kitchen on the ground floor is an interesting way to animate the space. The Panel member noted that all four sides of the building need to be considered to ensure there's no backside to the building. The Panel member was also unconvinced by the passageway and felt that the quality of the space will not be desirable.

One Panel member felt that the ground floor relationship to Front Street is critical. The Panel member also liked the idea of the kitchen being located on the ground floor, however, cautioned that this needs to be done well.

Another Panel member suggested exploring the possibility of ground source heating and the ability to move things underground to help free up space on the mechanical floor. The Panel member also noted that there is an opportunity to collect rain water on site.

One Panel member felt that this site is very important as it is a threshold to the West Don Lands. The Panel member noted that attention to all these urban issues is essential. The Panel member felt that there is so much intergenerational potential

given the proximity to George Brown College and to the YMCA. The Panel member cautioned that without easy access to all of these facilities, it could be problematic.

Another Panel member also advocated for the accessible green roof. The Panel member felt that a party wall connection between the two buildings is a better alternative to the passageway.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The intergenerational opportunity for this building and surrounding facilities is important – ensure accessibility to George Brown College and YMCA
- The accessible green roof is an important asset. Consider the possibility of stormwater collection.
- Consider a party wall condition instead of the passageway.
- The quality of the public realm is critical. Ensure that the design builds on the quality of the existing public realm.
- Explore the possibility of minimizing the parking
- The garbage and servicing area requires improvements to avoid feeling like the backside of the building.
- Continue coordination with the City of Toronto.

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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