



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #126  
Wednesday, July 24, 2019**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Jeff Ranson  
Brigitte Shim

**Regrets**

Janna Levitt  
Fadi Masoud  
Eric Turcotte

**Recording Secretary**

Leon Lai

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

---

**WELCOME**

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

1. East Bayfront Bayside C2 (T3) - Detailed Design
  2. 3C PL1 – Issues Identification
  3. York Street Park – Schematic Design
  4. 178, 180 Queens Quay East – Issues Identification
  5. Quayside: MIDP Overview and Urban Design – Stage 2
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the June. 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for 3C PL1 and York Street Park, Pat Hanson declared conflicts for York Street Park and Quayside, and recused themselves for those reviews.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that Port Lands Flood Protection (PLFP) Parks will be returning to DRP for Detailed Design review in October, the team will address comments such as wayfinding, signage, park and road interface, more prominent entrances to the parks, and the under the bridge shoreline experience. PLFP Roads will also be returning in September for Detailed Design, Mr. Glaisek noted the team is working on comments with focus on accommodating all modes on Commissioners Street, Don Roadway, refining the streetscape character, and reviewing the planting approach.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the fourth Quayside Public Consultation Meeting led by Waterfront had concluded. The public was enthusiastic about the project and provided positive feedback on the structure of the discussions and overall consultation process. Mr. Glaisek noted that the construction for Cherry Street Stormwater Facility continues. While some of the concrete finish is not as aesthetically smooth, the project is still targeting operation by September 2020. At Aitken Place Park, Mr. Glaisek noted the construction continues with all below grade infrastructure completed including earthworks, municipal services, and electrical works. Foundation for the art piece is in place while other hard-scape work continues. Soft-scape is to begin in September and there is no change to the park opening date of September 2019.

Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto has sponsored a temporary public art exhibit in the Toronto harbor right by the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and anchored directly in the Harbour Square Park basin. The art piece, SOS (Safety Orange Swimmers), designed by Ann Hirsch and Jeremy Angier, stimulates dialogue on refugee, migration, and will be on display until mid-September.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair then introduced Stephen Diamond, the Chair of Waterfront Toronto's Board of Directors, to address the Panel. Mr. Diamond thanked the Panel for their time and work that continues to improve the urbanism of the city. Mr. Diamond noted that great cities are defined by their public spaces, recognized that the work of the DRP is an important legacy for Toronto. Mr. Diamond concluded with thanks and is looking forward to hearing the comments from the Panel for today.

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the public session.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 East Bayfront Bayside C2 (T3) - Detailed Design**

*Project ID #:* 1105  
*Project Type:* Building  
*Review Stage:* Detailed Design  
*Review Round:* Three  
*Location:* East Bayfront  
*Proponent:* Hines  
*Architect/ Designer:* 3XN, Janet Rosenberg & Studio, Purpose Building  
*Presenter(s):* Jen Holms, 3XN; Greg Warren, Janet Rosenberg & Studio;  
Luka Matutinovic, Purpose Building  
*Delegation:* Michael Gross, Hines; Angela Li, Waterfront Toronto; Kelly Jones, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

## **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Angela Li, Development Manager, with Waterfront Toronto began the introduction by noting that the project came for Schematic Design review in March earlier this year and is returning for Detailed Design. The project has submitted their first Site Plan Application in June 2019 and is targeting construction start in Q1 of 2020. Ms. Li noted the project site is part of the East Bayfront Precinct Plan and highlighted its Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context. Ms. Li provided a design update for the Panel, noted details on the above-grade parking floor, a high-level parking to office conversion strategy included as part of their SPA submission, ground floor slab adjustment to address Queens Quay and Edge Water grade levels, retail and public realm design changes. Ms. Li introduced Ms. Jones to provide a City Planning update. Ms. Jones noted there has been a lot of discussions on this project- the City is happy with the applicant's improvement on this project's interface with the future R6 and ground floor relationships with plazas. The City is not supportive of the above-grade parking and is looking forward to the Panel's comments. Ms. Li then provided a recap of previous Panel consensus comments and highlighted areas for Panel consideration, these include retail access from Queens Quay, envelope and façade design, design strategy for parking floor conversion, the revised plaza design, animation of public realm with adjacent Bayside buildings, temporary landscape strategy, and the building exterior design in relation to the timber structure visibility and overall glazing performance. Ms. Li introduced Jens Holm to give the presentation.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

### **Building**

Jens Holm, Partner with 3XN, began the presentation by noting that one of the key objectives of the project is the activation of the public realm around the building, incorporating flexibility in its core design, accommodate adjustments over time, and making visible the idea of interconnectivity within the office floors. Mr. Holm provided an updated rendering of the building, seen from Queens Quay East showing façade development, planting and retail at street level. Mr. Holm noted the conceptual design strategies, programmatic layout of the building, the emphasize on connections from north to south, and stepped amenity spaces throughout the building. Mr. Holm noted there are two typical facades, exterior fins for office floors and no fin for amenity spaces. Pointing to the ground floor plan, Mr. Holm noted revisions have been made to

the slab to address Queens Quay and Edge Water Drive grading and public realm animation on all elevations. Mr. Holm noted there are private roof top terraces for the offices that are connected to the mechanical space. In terms of façade development, Mr. Holm noted aluminum in champagne gold colour is proposed to create warmth on the exterior. Exterior louvers, doors, panels, and interior mullions are slightly different in colour to for differentiation, in a natural extra light bronze. Although the grade change is a challenge for retail access, it is important to consider the plazas as part of the building lobbies- urban living rooms that extend public realm landscapes inside out. Mr. Holm introduced Mr. Warren to present the landscape design update.

### Landscape

Greg Warren, Senior Project Manager with Janet Rosenberg & Studio, began the presentation by noting that the talk will focus mainly on the two plazas: east plaza will be built with T3, west plaza will be built with C1 with connection to Aitken Place Park. Mr. Warren noted the plazas serve two functions: spaces for gatherings and provide access to the waterfront. Mr. Warren provided a recap of previous Panel comments and noted the design's updates: overall seating design has been revised to be more playful, the benches invite various types and groups of sitting, paving surface is wood creating visual contrast with concrete pavers, and planting beds are extended creating green stripes that add more colors and tones to the public realm. Sectionally, the plaza negotiates grade change by maintaining the central seating portions flat while the aisles are sloped. Bicycle parking has been reduced and might be further reduced in the future. In terms of materiality, the team would like to find a species of wood that would weather to these tones, the bench concrete is precast, and the paving palette is kept natural to dove tail the Queens Quay red granite.

### Sustainability

Mr. Matutinovic noted that all the sustainability guiding principles have been maintained from last time including biophilia, low carbon, and the next generation of sustainability certifications. As suggested at the previous DRP, the energy performance of the building, both usage and cost savings, have been improved while maintaining the visibility of the façade. Mr. Matutinovic noted the project is targeting LEED version 4 gold, TGS version 3 tier 1, and MGBR version 1.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the interior double-height common space will always be opened or depend on tenant preference. Mr. Holm answered that the option is there for the tenant to decide its use – the architecture is designed to accommodate removal of slab. Mr. Gross noted that the tenant connecting double height common spaces facing the plazas will be built that way, assuming the decks are present but the structure is designed to allow for future removal of those zones. Depending on leasing, it is entirely feasible that a multi-floor tenant may wish to connect the office floors. Mr. Gross noted that the renderings show the slabs in place and the public spaces are always connected.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the reason for above-grade parking and the conversion strategy. Mr. Gross explained that both the market and time-to-market indicate that above-grade parking is preferred, as supposed to underground parking; the conversion strategy has been detailed in narrative form for facilitation the conversions of slopes, drainage, etc – it can be shared with the Panel.

One Panel member asked for details of the sealed unit and the composition of glass. Mr. Matutinovic explained that the final product has not yet been determined, the performance studies are based on a typical module performance specification, trying to balance the level of light transmittance with low solar heat gain coefficient to reduce cooling load, and believe the team is within range to achieve the study figures.

Another Panel member asked for the fireproofing details of the above-grade parking floor. Mr. Holm answered that the parking floor would be a concrete built-up floor; the decking above is concrete as well. Mr. Holm added all the timber will be visible. Mr. Gross noted that in the end, the timber structure might not be CLT, the drawings are developed to be MLT, CLT, NLT, with details that can accommodate all those types of decking. The Panel member asked if the south-facing double height spaces will be shaded by for example internal blinds, and if the objective of transparency might be nullified by the reality of blinds. Mr. Holm explained that the stepping of the double height spaces is visible even if the blinds are partially down, office areas will also have blinds, and anticipate the double height spaces will be activated whether there is sun.

One Panel member asked how the building corner mullion is detailed. Mr. Holm noted that the corner mullion sits at a forty-five-degree angle.

Another Panel member asked if daylighting studies have been done and what bird-friendly strategies are being proposed. Mr. Matutinovic answered not yet but a study can be completed in the future; frit on glass is being explored, the team is meeting with façade consultant- the integration of a foil that can only be seen by birds can be explored.

One Panel member asked for more information on the parking conversion strategy. Mr. Gross explained the conversion strategy includes details on various building elements: management of drainage locations, elevation and slopes of slabs relative to parking elevators, exit stairs, mechanical louvers, preservation of mechanical and electrical rooms, etc. The parking ramp removal will depend on whether there is retail already in place, which means pouring the slab on top of the ramp and losing the potential retail space on the ground floor.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that more information should be provided on the double height spaces to understand the impact of interruption in the sequence – provide permutations of how these spaces can accommodate different tenant needs.

The Panel member noted that blinds is a wildcard that has huge visual impact, further exploration is required.

Another Panel member commended on the simplicity and elegance of the project- it is a great building and will contribute greatly to the site. However, the Panel member noted the above-grade parking will set a bad precedent for the city. The Panel member questioned the reasons behind timing and cost savings – and consider moving the parking underground to leave the above ground portion purely as wood which might provide other savings.

One Panel member noted the project is beautiful, timeless, and modern. Understanding that the above-grade parking might set precedents, the Panel member noted Toronto as a city is improving because good architects are hired to offer different solution to address challenging conditions- pushing the boundaries of this building's condition of parking is progress, great, and is supported. The Panel member noted to consider Black Locust for the seating instead of less durable Ipe.

Another Panel member commended the design as a major addition to the waterfront. The public realm felt more developed – continue to explore robust green species for winter seasons. The Panel member noted the bird frit is a question and confirm this requirement for TGS Tier 3 standard.

One Panel member appreciated the building, noted the idea of vertically connected public space is fascinating but questioned whether conceptual clarity is important if the façade design is married to the program inside. The Panel member noted the team should provide mock-ups of the exterior envelop to explain the glazing type, materiality, and degree of light transmission, as part of their design development review.

Another Panel member noted that bicycle parking is still parking, consider relocating more of the parking space at grade for retail and explain the need for number of bicycle parking. The Panel member commented that the energy performance is better- the design currently is a compromise between aesthetic and performance as the wood has great life cycle performance, but the transparent façade creates glare and solar heat gain issues over time, especially on the south side. Consider alternative shading opportunities, exterior shading, dynamic glass, to deal with overheating as tenant satisfaction in glass façade buildings is always an issue. Overall, the Panel member felt the building is great with some performance concerns.

One Panel member appreciated the presentation and noted C1 and C2 should consider connecting the parking and share parking entrance to prevent double loading bays on Edge Water Drive, compromising the public realm in the end. When both projects are done by the same developer, the team should consider sharing the parking infrastructure. The Panel member noted that if parking is to disappear as the final goal, the parking strategy for both blocks should be clarified and more information on the phasing be provided. The Panel member felt that while the stepping is good, the current thinking behind the blinds and shading is a cope out – consider blinds as part of the architectural response that express publicness even when closed. It is important to avoid a default position on this as a creative solution can project the interior to the

outside. Lighting along the public realm in the waterfront is a signature element, the Panel member felt the current light fixtures are underwhelming – consider further development for the lighting and bicycle parking. The Panel member also noted the detailing between wood and concrete requires more work to address the contrast and changing conditions.

Another Panel member noted to maximize trees in the plazas, especially on the west side of the building. More robust, larger trees can help bring natural shading on the south side of the building. On the east plaza, consider double-stacking bike parking to form clusters and free up space for other use. The Panel member noted retail entrances on Queens Quay is very important- provide an additional entrance. Lastly, the Panel member commented to look at the façade design in detail as the symmetry is only a graphic at the moment, and is also supportive of the positive, progressive thinking on the above-grade parking strategy.

### **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The Panel expressed strong support for the project and building

#### Parking

- Concerns for the above-grade parking setting an undesirable precedent in the downtown area – however commended the current design for pushing the envelope of parking design
- Generally not supportive for above-grade parking, consider underground and off-site solution
- Consider opportunities for connecting and sharing parking between C1 and C2 to split the excavation cost and reduce the area of loading and service entrances facing Edge Water Drive.
- Conversion of the above-grade parking is critical – provide more details on the strategy

#### Landscape

- Consider further improvements to landscape design: more trees, the detailing of the concrete and wood, and seasonal vegetation
- Lighting fixtures do not reflect the quality of the building – consider higher quality specifications
- Consider Black Locust, or other non-tropical hardwood, instead of Ipe

#### Building

- Concerns with south side solar gain, consider exploring different shading solutions such as exterior fixed shading and more elegant/ comprehensive interior shading system
- Commended the elegant, vertically continuous, envelope design for creating a very powerful character for the building
- Clarify tenant impact on the double-height social spaces by providing permutations of different scenarios

- Provide more information on the envelope at a detailed design level such as material sample and façade mock-ups at next review
- Find an alternative to the 45-degree corner mullion detail
- Provide an additional access into the northwest retail space from Queens Quay to support the primary street frontage

Sustainability

- n/a

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

Mr. Holm thanked the Panel and noted that the process of design is a constant give and take – the team appreciated the concerns and will explore those opportunities. Shading element require high cost but will develop more renderings to explore the options. Mr. Holm also noted that associating program with the façade is necessary and exciting, at the above-grade parking in particular- the key is to understand how the building will change and develop overtime.

**1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project excluding the issue of the above-grade parking. The Panel voted in Full Support for the project.

The Chair took a separate vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support on the issue of above-grade parking. The Panel voted 4 Conditional Support and 5 Non-support.

**2.0 3C PL1**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1108
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Keating Channel Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	3C Lakeshore Inc.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Adamson Associates, PMA Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Greg Dunn, Adamson Associates; David Jansen, Adamson Associates; Leslie Morton, PMA Landscape Architeccts
<i>Delegation:</i>	Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Jasmine Frolick, Castlepoint Numa; Lyle Scott, Principal, Footprint; Andrew Ferancik, Principal, WND Planning; Colin Wolfe, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

**2.1 Introduction to the Issues**



Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project site and context, noting existing transit lines that serve the site and relationship to other nearby neighbourhoods. Mr. Hilburt outlined the project history which started with a master plan in 2011, to 2016's OPA and ZBA, Plan of Subdivision application submission, and to May 2019's pre-application consultation with the City for PL1. The project is anticipating first SPA submission in September 2019 and target construction start of late 2020. Construction of the new Cherry Street through the larger 3C site is in progress. Mr. Hilburt highlighted key policies from Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and the Keating Channel Precinct Plan, noted the planning policies approved in the LPAT settlement, and explained the As of Right Zoning Post-Settlement envelope. Mr. Hilburt introduced Colin Wolfe with the City of Toronto to present city planning issues: alignment with the Draft Plan of Subdivision, including servicing, New Cherry Street ROW widths, and identification of the development parcels, impact of additional proposed height, building massing step-backs, temporary and permanent elements of the public realm design, pedestrian routes, and interface between the project and the adjacent towers and plaza. Mr. Wolfe added the City would like to specifically hear about how the proposed design fits within the precinct in the future. Mr. Hilburt noted the site is part of the emerging Gardiner East Public Realm improvements, with planting and permeable pavers on the south side of Lake Shore Boulevard East. Mr. Hilburt noted the project is coming to DRP for Stage 1 Issues Identification review, and concluded with areas for Panel consideration: building as a stand-alone development on day 1, fit within future master plan and urban fabric, support of Waterfront Toronto's objectives of existing and future public realm, sustainability goals, and the temporary landscape design in relation to Waterfront Toronto's public realm objectives. Mr. Hilburt introduced Greg Dunn to present the design.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

Greg Dunn, Partner, with Adamson Associates, began the presentation by noting the project is a purpose-built office building of approximately 200,000sf. It is the first one to come to DRP for the 3C sites. Mr. Dunn noted the proposed design is two storeys higher than the As of Right zoning, but it makes the project financially viable. Mr. Dunn noted the stepping back of the massing along Queens Quay creating terraces is an important part of the project objectives, along with contributing positively to the public realm. Mr. Dunn noted the client has instructed the team to move quickly to capture the market and create comfortable, collaborative workspaces that have a "tech fitout". Mr.

### Sustainability

While following high level LEED and WELL Building Standard requirements, the team has not set a specific goal. Mr. Dunn noted the team is interested in going beyond checklists: healthy and productive workplace, highly energy efficient, well-balanced solid to vision glass ratio for building envelope, stormwater management strategies, brownfield remediation, and synergies between site and massing.

### Site Context and Response

Mr. Dunn presented various site context studies in Day 1 and Final Phase conditions as both scenarios are critical for the project: street access, proximity to public transportation, proximity to green spaces and trails, and pedestrian walking radii.

Mr. Dunn noted the design responds to existing site context including the Gardiner structure, silos, and nearby built-forms. As a “pioneering development”, Mr. Dunn noted successful single “ground-breaking” precedents that serve as a catalyst for subsequent development and setting the urban standard for future projects, such as the Dakota Apartment House in New York, TD Centre, and 25 York in South Core. Mr. Dunn presented the key massing moves that respond to the site: zoning height, building separation, set back from Lakeshore, introduction of corner chamfer to rationalize the rounded property line corner condition, Queens Quay required step-backs, carving southeast corner to address street with an interior passage, creating amenity terraces and lifting green up onto the building, and addressing the plaza to the east. With its subtle geometrical shifts, the team is exploring a more “solid” aesthetic in elevation including precast, Corten steel, and other solid panel claddings. The building becomes more dynamic as you move around it eastward along Queens Quay while the north façade is relatively flat responding to the Gardiner and to provide views back to the city.

#### Building proposal

Mr. Dunn began by noting that the landscaping is critical for Phase 1 condition success- while the building will be complete on day one, the landscape will be different but still generous. Looking at the site plan, Mr. Dunn noted the interior passage through the building lobby creates a three-sided retail unit on Queens Quay with views and access- ground floor retail will be maximized. Mr. Dunn noted the joint parking and loading entrance is set on off Trinity St. due to the existing Martin Goodman Trail along Lakeshore.

#### Landscape

Leslie Morton, Principal with PMA Landscape Architects, presented the landscape design. Ms. Morton noted key landscape concepts to creating a robust rich streetscape include: quality ecologies, spatial comfort, resilience, and dynamic spaces. The team intends to bring the scale down at spaces adjacent to the Gardiner and focus on creating a pioneer landscape, using temporary and dynamic species of vegetation, that will evolve as neighbourhood urbanizes. The project’s materiality will celebrate heritage of the historic waterfront area and be designed to connect to future landscapes. Ms. Morton noted the landscape design includes an outdoor pavilion, landscape berms for traffic buffer, plaza, outdoor work areas, seating and benches, and an interim landscape east of the site- from more permanent landscape at Lakeshore and Trinity St. to pioneering landscape on the southeast corner.

### **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the timeline of the temporary landscape. Mr. Dunn explained that realistically it will last for a few years, depending on the start of the next phase of work.

Another Panel member asked where the passage through the lobby leads to. Mr. Dunn noted the lobby is an extension of the main street, a visitor can walk through the lobby

to get to the plaza or go from the street – it monopolizes the natural bend of Queens Quay.

One Panel member asked for clarification on whether the landscape on Trinity St. is temporary or permanent. Ms. Morton noted that corner is seen as more permanent.

Another Panel member if there is a waterfront streetscape design for new Trinity St. Mr. Glaisek noted that there is no design.

One Panel member asked if the team has considered provisions to allow for connecting and sharing of loading and parking with the future blocks, pushing the elements below grade to allow for these opportunities, essentially having one common entry for a series of building by one developer. Mr. Dunn noted that master plan conceived distinct loading bays and the teams has debated this issue – it is ultimately a development decision as it would mean including the development cost of the future network of shared loading/parking infrastructure earlier into the first project.

Another Panel member asked if the team has an idea of the programs for other sites. Mr. Dunn noted that the immediate blocks are mixed-use and towers are residential.

One Panel member asked if part of the landscape proposal will include soil remediation in the area and if the berms are strictly for screening. Ms. Morton answered the intention is the break down the scale and create pockets; soil remediation is a reason for the design.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member asked the team to explore geothermal energy as an option to reduce overall mechanical requirements and the need for additional height, especially since the mechanical floor is currently not included in the height calculations. For environmental and sustainability targets, it is important to aim for higher tier requirements and demonstrate some real innovation and benefits in the façade design. The Panel member commented to not over-invest in the temporary landscape but instead consider temporary uses for the plaza, like the Stackt Market, retail popups, cultural exhibitions, etc, to draw visitors.

Another Panel member suggested the team to look at Scandinavian waterfront temporary sites as precedents for the temporary landscape design – it is important to signal an incredible destination with interesting programming such as art and sports at low costs. The Panel member commended the pioneer landscape but noted berms is counterintuitive to drawing people into the site. Noting a connected loading and parking infrastructure is not only compatible with Waterfront Toronto’s public realm objectives, but will also provide savings for future site.

One Panel member noted the passage through the lobby does not have a clear intention, more development is required. The Panel member added that Queens Quay provides a long vista to the site, making it is a critical pivot in the urban planning of the

area – the project should leverage the site’s potential as a foreground building. Trinity St. streetscape can appreciate a stronger identity. The Panel member suggested the team to look at a phased approach in designing shared parking and loading. The Panel member noted the four elevations are similar, consider developing the facades to address southern sun exposure and improve sustainability performance – provide more information at next review.

Another Panel member noted to ensure that site context documentation is most current, show the new Gardiner alignment and Queens Quay streetscape for the whole block. The Panel noted for more clarity on temporary versus permanent landscape, avoid obsolete photographs for site context, and ensure the design information is consistent throughout the presentation. The Panel member also noted to consider building more permanent landscape and exploiting public realm opportunities on day one.

One Panel member noted the added height is not a concern. The Panel member felt there is currently too strong of a divide between building and public realm – the passthrough is a good idea in plan but the same openness should be reflected on the massing. The Panel member is unconvinced with the chamfered corner as main entrance, instead focus on a singular, large, bold place for the temporary landscape instead of a series of small pieces.

Another Panel member suggested the team to consider a phased site plan strategy to address parking and loading sharing, think of the full buildout and work backwards to understand how the sites are interconnected and whether the current loading entrance is appropriate on Trinity St. It is positive if opportunities of sharing is exploited. The Panel member noted the mechanical floor should be celebrated as a signature of Waterfront Toronto. The Panel member noted the project as an opportunity to create the highest quality of public realm, urban spaces, views, identity, and a place where huge amount of pedestrian and transit will move through. The passthrough as a midblock connection is another signature element of the waterfront and should be further developed – consider public programs that relate to the passthrough that can create an identity for the area, Queens Quay, and the City. Finally, the Panel member asked for image credits for all precedent images.

## **2.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall very positive impressions on the project – appreciated the project coming to the Panel and discussing issues that are relevant at Issues ID stage
- The Panel felt that the building is likely to be stand-alone development for the near future, consider this as a unique opportunity to create something that is bold, exciting, more than just an office building
- The Panel felt the proposed height of the building is not a concern

## Context

- Context is one of the most important starting points of the project, provide up-to-date context showing all buildings and appropriate location of Gardiner without the sweep
- Provide a phased site plan analysis that shows the “big picture” relationship as it relates to adjacent blocks and their ultimate vision
- Consider alternative approaches to take advantage of the bend of Queens Quay and capture the vista and animation east along the street
- Consider aligning the proposed ground floor passageway more directly to the plaza
- Provide more information on the future Trinity Street pedestrian connection from Distillery District and clarify proponent’s commitment to delivering it

### Building

- Since the nearby developments are all owned and will be developed by a single developer, it is important for the team to consider a high-level strategy for sharing parking and loading, perhaps underground, or phased, to maximize valuable ground floor real estate for programming and reduce servicing frontages facing public realm
- Concerns with the proposed use of precast and glass, consider material that is unique and exceptional

### Landscape

- Consider the importance of good temporary uses of the public realm such as displays, cultural activities, pop-ups, to get people to visit the area- leverage the opportunity to reclaim this site with year-round activities
- Take advantage of the element of surprise and discovery when designing the public realm

### Sustainability

- Provide more information on innovation and sustainability strategy
- Consider alternative strategies of energy use such as geothermal

## **2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

## **3.0 York Street Park**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1092B
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Claude Cormier + Associes
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Marc Hallé, Senior Associate, Claude Cormier + Associes

*Delegation:* Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

### **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by providing a project description and background update, summary of the competition jury report and the park's context with some recent site photos. Ms. Stuart provided a recap of Central Waterfront Secondary Plan policy context for the project and a design update: the pavilion design has been updated, the design team is back to developing the pond, and the pond edge will incorporate seating the address the desire for more usable space. In terms of project milestones, Ms. Stuart noted design completion in 2020, Environmental Risk Assessment, Issue of Tender Documents, and Award Construction Contract in 2021, construction start target 2022, and completion in 2023. Ms. Stuart provided a recap of December 2018's Issues Identification Panel comments, and highlighted areas for Panel consideration: relationship of York Street Park edge to 88 Queens Quay office building, integration of park circulation and pavement with Queens Quay, for example pinch points, material transitions, thresholds, and identify design elements that are critical to the project vision as expressed in the design brief in the event of value engineering. Ms. Stuart then introduced Mr. Hallé to present the design.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Marc Hallé, Senior Associate with Claude Cormier + Associes, began the presentation by noting that the competition design brief focused on passive park programs including immersive green, lunchtime activity, water feature, event space, public art, architectural pavilion, and accommodations for dogs. Although the basement of the pavilion is removed and structure simplified to a shading device, the team believes in this feature and would like to keep it moving forward. In thinking of an iconic color and material for the heart shaped pond, Mr. Hallé noted the team studied Barcelona precedents and is proposing a red ceramic tile to capture an abstracted notion of a rose. Mr. Hallé noted that raising the edge of the pond creates a dual direction seating for additional gathering space; a foot railing discourages people from stepping into the pond- be close to the water but not enter. Mr. Hallé noted other pond precedents for their size and soft bottom design including the Barcelona Pavilion pond and the Central Park Conservatory Water in Manhattan- the team is interested in a natural pond that can allow for skating in the winter. The bench will be heated and the Catalpa island has a soft shoreline condition. Narrating while the animation video plays, Mr. Hallé noted that the grass mounts are not enough to block sightlines and the three weeping willow trees help anchor the poles of the heart.

Mr. Hallé provided a walkthrough of the construction and maintenance sequence of the project, beginning with preservation of existing trees, removal of bents, excavation, soil remediation, grading strategy, creating of pond, water management and soil recharge. Looking at the sections of the project, Mr. Hallé pointed to the details that intercept run-offs, interconnected soil patches for growth of roof networks. Mr. Hallé

explained that trees frame the inner trail with a few proposed coniferous species, mid-level plantings will focus on pollinators, and a consistent shrub base on all mounts. For maintenance and soil preservation, temporary fencing will be created for sod areas for approximately one month every two years.

Mr. Hallé noted the hard surface areas and materiality, benches and seating, area for freestanding furniture whose budget will hopefully come from community stakeholders and BIAs. Mr. Hallé noted the team is creating higher barrier at the dogs on-leash area to prevent jumping over. Garbage and recycling bins have a proposed color camo color scheme for blending in with the park. Mr. Hallé highlighted the sustainable design approach, shadow impact on the park, lighting strategy that utilizes adjustable spotlights and directional lighting to allow the glowing heart to thrive and maintain darkness towards the outside of the park. Mr. Hallé described the suspended “glowing heart light and finally the animal sculptures that are currently outside the budget.

#### Pavilion Update

Mr. Hallé noted that revised pavilion is made of tubular steel pipe, footprint has been reduced by half, programmatically simplified removing café and washroom, and mimic other open structures with dense vegetation filigree. The team believes in the pavilion as it forms a midground and destination at the corner of the site while accentuating the mirage quality of the pond.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for the total number of additional trees in the proposed design. Mr. Hallé answered that there are sixty-eight trees in total with eight preserved existing trees, it is a ratio of trees per area.

Another Panel member asked if the team considered integration of birds into the park, leaves cleaning strategy, and the overall pond maintenance strategy throughout the seasons. Mr. Hallé noted the team will investigate bird integration.

One Panel member asked how pond usage is controlled including people’s feet, children, and model boating. Mr Hallé noted that pebbles is not comfortable to walk on, it will help deter people from going into the pond, perhaps some aquatic vegetation can also help indicate that the pond is not for swimming.

Another Panel member asked for clarification whether movable furniture is in the budget because it is a critical element. Mr. Hallé noted that is it not. One Panel member asked to confirm all the items proposed that are not currently included in the budget. Mr. Hallé answered the animal sculptures and movable furniture are not in the budget.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on why people are discouraged from entering the pond. Mr. Hallé explained it is a public health concern as the pond is not chemical free.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that groups regularly meet at the street corner, the design should consider congregation and circulation of large groups. As a lot of office workers smoke at the existing open space, consider a cigarette control strategy.

Another Panel member commended the team for an engaging presentation and felt the project is an incredible addition to the City. The Panel member commended the team for the green pavilion as it is a beautiful, passive, living green infrastructure; the relationship of the Catalpa tree and the pond is well considered and is central to the park. The Panel member encouraged the team to take pride in the design, recognizing the sophistication lies in the subtle underground strategies with soil and tree roots, also critical is to ensure passive play, which has been a big success at Berczy Park, and movable furniture be introduced here. The Panel member encouraged the team to develop a plan for performances and celebrate the infrastructural gymnastics that support the program.

One Panel member recommended that the design maintain all of the critical elements and details, such as the paving pattern, as the design progresses into the next phase. If the big move is reinforced by strong small details, the Panel member believed that the project will ultimately feel lush and rich.

Another Panel member noted as the waterfront increases in density, high quality public spaces becomes essential for the many office towers, commended the team for an exemplary presentation which should serve as precedent for other DRP proponents, and the breath and clarity are appreciated. The Panel member noted the temporary movable furniture is important and should be considered in the overall budget, The Panel member also commended the team's thoughtful maintenance strategy and recommended that this should be made a standard requirement in all public space presentations. In terms of lighting, the focus is not about making a statement but ensuring safety and a correct light level gradation in the park.

One Panel member noted reservation on the ceramic tile finish, unsure about the material's durability and remedial efforts if required. Another Panel member shared the reservation on the ceramic tile and suggested terrazzo as an alternative. One Panel member commended the presentation and suggested the team to consider birds in the park design.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

#### Landscape

- The Panel is in strong support of the project and commended the team for the design details and presentation



- Consider the impact of large gatherings at the park such as tour groups meeting and pedestrians queuing at the corner of York and Queens Quay and smokers that congregate at the southeast corner
- Consider the park edge interface in with Queens Quay and office building to address pinch points
- High quality details are strongly supported and critical as the design evolves into next phase
- Referencing the experience at Berczy Park, both movable furniture and animal sculptures are important elements
- Commended the team for the proposed maintenance strategy; a good example for future waterfront public space projects
- Maintenance concerns included cigarette waste management and annual pond cleaning method
- Concerns with the long-term durability of ceramic tiles in the Toronto climate

#### Building

- Strong support for the living green trellis pavilion – it will get more beautiful over time

#### Sustainability

- Leverage this opportunity to communicate to the public on the green infrastructure of the project and its benefits to the city

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

Mr. Hallé thanked the Panel for the enthusiasm for the project and will take the momentum moving forward to make the project happen.

### **3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in Full Support for the project.

## **4.0 178, 180 Queens Quay East**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1109
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Rom-Grand Waterfront Ltd.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	architectsAlliance
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Adam Feldmann, Senior Associate, architectsAlliance

*Delegation:* Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

#### **4.1 Introduction**

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the site context, Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and East Bayfront Precinct Plan policy context, transit lines, and adjacent developments including 215 Lake Shore Boulevard to the north and 162 Queens Quay East to the west, both of which have been previously reviewed by the DRP. Ms. Kim noted the vision and character of the future east-west street for this project. Ms. Kim provided a project description summary: project development parameters defined through an appeal and subsequent OMB Minutes of Settlement in 2016, it is the southern portion of what is known as the FedEx Block, 41,850sq. metres of GFA, primarily residential with retail uses at grade, and an affordable rental housing requirement to be provided as housing units, either cash-in-lieu, or land dedication.

Ms. Kim noted this is the first Issues Identification review for the project and introduced Deanne Mighton with the City of Toronto to speak on planning context and issues. Ms. Mighton noted she is filling in for Paul Mule, the City planner on file- both 162 and 178-180 QQE have had lengthy OMB settlements, and have asked 162 QQE's design team to be present to help align both designs. Ms. Mighton noted the As-of-right massing from the settlement and identified key City planning issues: consistency of the proposed streetwall within the development block, site plan composition within the FedEx block, overall built form composition, integration with indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, and the integration of sustainable strategies. Ms. Kim summarized key Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel consideration: massing in support of Queens Quay's frontage datum, consistency with adjacent developments, retail continuity, site corner anchoring, OMA podium step-back height discrepancies, mid-block public realm continuity with 215 LSBE, building relationship with future east-west street, and the project's sustainability objectives. Ms. Kim introduced Adam Feldman to give the presentation.

#### **4.2 Presentation**

Mr. Feldmann, Senior Associate with architectsAlliance, began the presentation by noting the presentation will focus on context analysis, proposal strategies, and massing opportunities. Mr. Feldmann noted the project in the city as part of the East Bayfront Precinct neighbourhood, urban design guidelines, and the site boundaries as established by the OMB process. Mr. Feldmann noted the podium street frontage discrepancy between the two blocks - 178-180 Queens Quay East has a podium height of 24m and 162 QQE was settled at 20m, the site is 130m long with a 15m wide POP space that connects straight to the waterfront, and the sun course in relation to the entire neighbourhood.

##### Proposal Strategies

Mr. Feldmann summarized overall project target statistics and key design approaches: continuity of street and alignment of street wall across block, anchoring the corner,

ground floor animation by minimizing loading and maximizing retail frontages, and using landscape design to improve pedestrian connections and connect with neighbourhood parks. Mr. Feldmann noted key landscape precedents for the POP space and provided typical sections of the future east-west street. On the ground floor, the team is interested in maximizing retail and internalizing loading and parking access to minimize service frontage. Looking at the elevations and sectional drawings, Mr. Feldmann noted the building massing reinforce the terracing of building heights down toward the waterfront. Programmatically, the condo amenities are centralized for each block, with indoor and outdoor areas located on the rooftops to avoid having purely mechanical roof boxes.

#### Massing Opportunities

Mr. Feldmann noted the misalignment of lower podium depth between 162 and 178-180 creates problematic corner units with no light, therefore the team is proposing to carve out these areas from the podium to align both podium depths while bringing more light into the north-facing units. Furthermore, the team sees an alternative massing opportunity to lower the podium height of 178-180 to match 162, creating consistency in street wall datum. The removed density will be added to the tops of the towers to match Empire's development height. Lastly, the team is proposing to rotate the angled west tower massing, the result of a zoning remnant, to align with the podium and Queens Quay – this also increases the tower spacing with 162 QQE. Mr. Feldmann provided shadow studies of the alternative massing option showing additional shadow areas as well as street level views.

#### Sustainability

Mr. Feldmann noted that the project is a very early stage for sustainability obligations, the team is looking at integration of Enwave, targeting TGS Tier 1 and provided a high level summary of sustainable strategies including improving air quality, energy efficiency, green house gas reduction, resilience, water quality, ecology and solid waste production.

## **4.2 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if it is possible for the upper east wing podium massing of 162 QQE to step back to give more breathing room to both projects and clarify the ambition for the new east-west thorough street as it currently has many garage entrances. Ms. Mighton explained that the east-west street is considered a local street that needs to recognize and accommodate servicing and garage entrances.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the north-south public space, if it is privately owned and same status as the northern portion of the north-south street adjacent to 215 LSBE. Mr. Feldmann answered it is a public street with a dedicated 8m wide POPS in the middle and same status as its northern portion; the POPS plaza between the Arbour and the WIC are also private lots where service vehicles have access. Mr. Feldmann noted that the garage level spans under the north-south POPS underground between 178 and 180.

One Panel member asked if the ground floor retail can accommodate a supermarket. Mr. Feldmann noted a small supermarket might be possible.

Mr. Glaisek asked if the project is working with the future alignment of Lower Sherbourne Street and clarify why the proposed follow the street edge- Waterfront Toronto worked closely with 215 LSBE to hold the street wall. Mr. Feldmann explained that both properties lines must comply with corner roundings and will study the condition closely.

Another Panel member asked if the new Sherbourne Street will go back to two-way traffic. Mr. Glaisek noted that it should be two-way.

## **4.2 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member suggested for 178-180 QQE to work with 162 QQE on modifying podium massing to find consistency and support a clear street frontage. One suggestion is for 162 QQE to pull the top portion of their east podium wing westward and in exchange they can share your loading/servicing and eliminate theirs for more ground floor area. Mr. Feldmann answered that sharing loading will be challenging due to condo agreements and clarified that the east loading bay is for both cars and servicing while the west loading bay is only for servicing.

Another panel member suggested to move the east corner residential lobby westward to increase retail frontage on Sherbourne and support animation of the street, another option is to imitate 215 LSBE and create a corridor entrance from Sherbourne Street with access to residential lobby. The Panel member appreciated the underground bicycle parking and advised to continue champion few parking and less loading areas on the ground floor. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider sidewalk cafes at the POP space and focus on activation.

One Panel member noted a east-west pedestrian woonerf street would reinforce the central POP space and would like to see it explored and studied at the next presentation. Mr. Glaisek commented the team should consider leaving the east-west street as a service only street if there is already a high amount of servicing there. Another Panel member suggested to consider the east-west street as a great condominium entry street with wider sidewalks, no street parking, and larger amenity areas for all service entrances and lobbies – possibly with a table-top condition. Ms. Mighton noted table-top option can be considered, including pinching of the road, widening of sidewalk, and reduction of asphalt areas.

Another Panel member suggested the team to aim for TGS tier 3 since tier 1 is inadequate for today's standards.

One panel member recommended that the future east-west street be a pedestrian street in the character of a “woonerf”, allowing servicing vehicle to access from both ends, creating a dead-end for both sides at the north-south POPS.

Another Panel member noted it is important to leverage the north-south POP space as it has view of water, ensure the future east-west street has a name, define a strong public realm character for the street, and support pedestrian accessibility throughout the blocks. The Panel member noted the future loading for the site west of 215 LSBE should be accessed from the north-south street and alleviate the already heavy servicing load on the future east-west street – early conversation to coordinate the smart placement of loading is encouraged. One Panel member suggested for Waterfront Toronto to study a finer grain of ground floor movement through the waterfront, create a map, such as from Jarvis to Cherry Street, with ground floor uses, paths, for scale and connectivity discussions, and request all future DRP proponents to provide designs for incorporation. Lastly, the Panel member asked for clarification on whether the building alignment to Sherbourne Street is a major concern for development lawyers.

One Panel member noted to consider swapping heights of the towers, supportive of the west towers be taller than the east tower for views and shadow impact to the adjacent park.

### **4.3 Consensus Comments**

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

#### Building

- The Panel felt comfortable with the proposed modifications to the street-wall datum in finding a consistent height, and rotation of the west tower massing to align with podium
- Consider setting back the upper podium floors of 162 Queens Quay East (that abut the property line with 178 QQE) westward to create a visual gap between the two podiums and thus clearly define the consistent lower podium street-wall height
- Consider opportunities for combining, consolidating, and sharing parking ramps, loading and servicing areas between the various buildings

#### Landscape

- Explore options for the treatment of the future east-west street – consider severing it at the north-south P.O.P.S. with a green strip that has views down to the water, eliminate traffic through street, and encourage stronger pedestrian use as a common outdoor “lobby” for the various residential entrances.
- Consider shifting northeast lobby to the future east-west street, or provide corridor access from Sherbourne Street, to support the street-wall condition that is consistent with 215 Lakeshore Boulevard East.

- Consider alternatives to rolled curb-edge detail
- Consider mapping the emerging network of east-west pedestrian connections and identify opportunities for continuity

#### Sustainability

- Provide more information and explore improvements in sustainability strategy
- Explore feasibility of building to tier 2 or 3 TGS standards

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

Mr. Feldmann thanked the Panel for very helpful comments and appreciated the feedback received today.

#### **4.4 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

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

#### **5.0 Quayside – MIDP Overview and Urban Design**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1100
<i>Project Type:</i>	Site Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Stage 2
<i>Review Round:</i>	Six
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto + Sidewalk Labs
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Beyer Blinder Belle, Urban Strategies, Greenberg Consultants
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Pino Di Mascio, Sidewalk Labs; Neil Kittredge, Beyer Blinder Belle; Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants
<i>Delegation:</i>	Andrew Winters, Chief Operating Officer, Sidewalk Labs; Meg Davis, Waterfront Toronto; Leslie Gash, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

#### **5.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Meg Davis, Chief Development Officer with Waterfront Toronto began by providing an update on the MIDP, the first round of public consultations, and the threshold issues being discussed between Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs (SWL). With the release of the MIDP, Waterfront Toronto issued an open letter by Stephen Diamond, Chair of Waterfront Toronto’s Board of Directors, which highlighted Waterfront Toronto’s key concerns, such as the IDEA district

Ms. Davis noted that Waterfront Toronto also issued a Note to Reader that was based on an initial, high level review of the MIDP and included a synthesis of what was asked for and the response, priority considerations, and questions for the public to consider. Ms. Davis noted that Waterfront Toronto is currently in the process of synthesizing the public feedback and will be sharing it with Sidewalk Labs. After the Waterfront Toronto’s Board of Director completes their evaluation, other relevant regulatory

authorities including the City of Toronto, Province, and Government of Canada will conduct their own public consultations and review.

Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, began by noting that Quayside straddles two precincts - East Bayfront and the Keating Channel - and highlighted the planning objectives laid out in key policy documents. The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan's policies include objectives like a connected public realm, streets as places, outdoor comfort through the year, and an accessible water's edge. Mr. Glaisek noted the project has been reviewed at the DRP several times, starting in June of 2018 with Stage 1 reviews of the public realm, building innovations, the development plan, the mobility plan, and sustainability innovations. Mr. Glaisek noted the project is now here for Stage 2 as a master plan, and therefore the Panel will not be seeing a full schematic design for all the elements of the proposal. Instead, the Panel should focus on urban design issues and design intent as expressed in the drawings submitted, as well as identify other issues they would like to see when the project returns to the Panel in the future. Today's focus will be in the public realm, followed in the Fall by presentations on buildings, mobility, and sustainability.

Mr. Glaisek introduced Pino Di Mascio to begin the presentation.

## **5.2 Project Presentation**

Pino Di Mascio, Director of Planning with Sidewalk Labs, began the presentation by noting that the intention today is to present an overview of the MIDP, an update on the Quayside development plan, responses to previous DRP comments on the public realm, and an overview on next steps and phasing.

### MIDP Overview

Mr. Di Mascio noted the focus of Volume 1 is on the development model and how the proposal can be implemented and, if successful, the model can be implemented by others in a broader area. Volume 2 focuses on the details of specific innovations, such as moving away from automobiles and onto autonomous vehicles while optimizing how pedestrians and cyclists move around. Other innovation areas include the public realm, buildings and housing, policy innovations, sustainable systems, and infrastructure. Mr. Di Mascio noted social infrastructure focuses on more inclusive cities and making space available for a variety of uses. Digital innovations will explore open standards so other parties can continue to build on the systems. Mr. Di Mascio noted that new governance models are proposed to manage the advanced systems. Mr. Di Mascio noted Volume 3 presents the financial details of Sidewalk Labs' proposal

### Quayside Development Plan

Mr. Di Mascio noted the draft Quayside Development plan has been revised since the Panel last saw it in December 2018. The proposal represents programmatic intent, as specific designs will be commissioned individually for buildings and public realm components. Mr. Di Mascio provided a comparison to the Zoning By-law and Precinct Plans, updates to parcel and open space plans, and noted that more detailed drawings

are included in the Quayside Planning Supplement and Planning Policy Justification Report documents, both of which are in the Panel's review binders. Mr. Di Mascio then introduced Neil Kittredge.

### Public Realm

Mr. Kittredge noted the goal today is to review what has evolved in response to Panel feedback including updates on Parliament plaza, Queens Quay, Stoa, and Pedway. Mr. Kittredge noted Quayside is not an isolated neighbourhood, and the new plan provides east-west and north-south connectivity for all modes of transport. The team has evaluated many options for vehicle connectivity at Parliament Plaza and is proposing a Parliament / Queens Quay "loop" with drop-off at the plaza. Parliament Plaza is intended as the heart of the Quayside public realm: multi-functional Parliament Plaza, Silo Park, and the Slip form a major terminus as well as connecting land and water. All modes, including the Martin Goodman trail, pass through the plaza in a slow zone". Mr. Kittredge noted the co-located LRT, bus station, and bike facilities are located west of the Slip

The Slip is conceived as an amphitheatre with desire lines into Silo Park, adaptable areas to accommodate larger community gatherings, and transition from the hard edge to the softscape eastward. Silo Park has experimental spaces connected to nature and environmental programming.

Mr. Kittredge noted the new bridge to Promontory park will create a transitions from the more naturalized slip edge to an elevation that overlooks over the Slip. Mr. Greenberg noted that one of the greatest needs for the City is to provide generous common ground for diversity. The team proposes to remove two inhibitors of using public space – traffic and weather, with mitigation elements that will extend the use into the shoulder seasons. Mr. Greenberg noted that Parliament Plaza embodies the spirit and DNA of the project.

Mr. Kittredge noted the design of Queens Quay incorporates the existing south side elements with innovation - the configuration of Queens Quay is maintained while evolving the edges: dynamic curb for parking/drop-off, green infrastructure targeted to meet or exceed tier 3 water retention standards, and other changes to the 38m right-of-way

Mr. Di Mascio provided a recap on previous Panel comments on Stoa and pedway, noting the new retail is conceived as reinforcing Queens Quay, and a study on Stoa and retail financial viability is in progress. Mr. Di Mascio provided a summary of next steps and a schedule to take the development plan to Phase 1 implementation.

### **5.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked for the percentage ratio of public vs private and servicing spaces on the ground floor. Mr. Kittredge noted that parcels 1 and 2 have a consolidated shipping centre which reduces overall loading areas. Mr. Di Mascio



explained the specific number can be provided and that the intention is for many of the buildings to have more than 50% of their ground floor footprint for public uses.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the ownership of the Parliament Slip area. Mr. Di Mascio noted Ports Toronto is the agency responsible for the Slip, and will have to reach an agreement on land ownership. –Mr. Glaisek clarified that SWL does not own any land at the moment, and it has always been in Waterfront Toronto’s plans to fill in that part of the slip to extend Queens Quay to the east. The Chair noted that RCYC owns a small triangular piece near the top of the slip.

One Panel member asked if the traffic study supports the closing of Parliament Street to vehicles. Mr. Kittredge noted the study does support the proposed design, and the traffic consultant can be invited next time to explain the report in detail. The Panel member also asked why there is a crisscross at the Parliament Plaza lollipop. Mr. Kittredge explained this is to ensure all turns are right turns after turning from Parliament St and so busses can discharge passengers on the north side of the street. The Panel member asked for clarification on the rationale of closing Parliament street to cars. Mr. Kittredge explained that it prioritizes the plaza as a pedestrian-friendly space.

One Panel member asked if the south side of Lakeshore will be within the project boundary. Mr. Kittredge explained the service areas are within the building areas, the consolidation centre on parcels 1 and 2 reduces thirty to forty percent of the loading and servicing requirements on other parcels. The only point where the system is not within the building parcels is where the freight tunnels cross the streets to connect parcels 3 with 4 and 4 with 5.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the elementary school and childcare on parcel 5 and relationship with the Silo Park. Mr. Kittredge noted that currently the ground floor areas in this parcel are all Stoas such as retail, community, flexible space, and the elementary school will have grade access to the second floor school and childcare programs.

Noting that the bridge to Promontory Park is outside of the project boundary, another Panel member asked if it is conceived as part of the project scope. Mr. Kittredge answered the element is subject to discussion, however it is included in the cost model.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the amount of school play area versus public park space - the rendering seems to show public programming only. Mr. Kittredge noted that school play space would have to incorporate outdoor secured play area determined through an agreement between the Parks Department and the school.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the balance of ground floor programming on the plan and when the Stoa study will be ready for review. Mr. Kittredge explained that the team sees Queens Quay to the water’s edge of site 5 as the main spine, the heart of retail, where the primary active facades are located.

Community spaces and retail that cannot take prime retail will inhabit the inner public spaces. Mr. Di Mascio suggested that it can be presented in September.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the character of the new east-west street and the programming. Mr. Di Mascio noted the intent for this street is to connect to the larger waterfront neighbourhood in terms of allowing visitors to meander through from Yonge to Parliament Plaza, it is a street that provides an alternative way for pedestrians and not take away from Queens Quay. Mr. Kittredge noted that connectivity is very important for the street, as well as more mixed-use spaces that are different from the programming on Queens Quay.

#### **5.4 Panel Comments**

One Panel member felt that the MIDP is a slight overload of information as many points are repeated in different areas of the documents. In terms of building on existing landscape and creating a strong community, the Panel member noted it is critical to carefully consider Queens Quay, the water's edge, and Lakeshore as they are directly attached to Quayside. The Panel member recommended adding trees along the water's edge to create alignment with the existing edge such as the continuous line of Jefferson maple trees, to help further anchor the project as part of the waterfront. The Panel member felt the extensive loading frontage on Lakeshore was inappropriate for an urban project, and recommended the proposed canopy roof structure utilize more natural systems. The Panel member noted the current design felt over-programmed especially at Parliament Slip, Silo Park felt generic, and more consideration on addressing the history of the site should be developed to bring more character into the master plan. The Panel member appreciated the direction of the project, but noted that the representation style is inappropriate for trained design professionals. The actual proposed built environment seems unpleasant if the visual embellishments are removed from the representation. The Panel member noted the amorphous design language at Silo Park requires more development as it does not create a unique character for the site, consider other forms of public realm activation as technology does not age well, consider how dogs will participate in the project, and lastly consider shade in the public realm as a key design criteria.

Another Panel member also felt that the cartoon-like representation style is not helpful as a communication strategy for the Panel and would like to review the traffic consultant's report at the next opportunity. The Panel member is concerned that the Stoa strategy will compete with Queens Quay and attract people off the main street, the red hatched "activation zone" will likely be inactive in the winter, and is not convinced that the maker-space component will be financially successful. The Panel member recommended the team consider maximizing the development area as part of the profit will contribute to Waterfront Toronto and the City - this is one of the most valuable areas of real estate in Canada and it is a missed opportunity to forfeit development potential. If this limitation is due to the structural constraints of wood construction, the team should reconsider the strategy and find a way to maximize building areas. The Panel member felt that the childcare programming should not be

located on the most valuable area of the project. Mr. Glaisek responded that the elementary school and childcare locations were part of the requirements of the RFP.

One Panel member was encouraged to see the design starting to address practical realities, particularly the loading and garbage aspects of the project. Generally, the Panel member felt that the innovation elements need not be visible in the final design representation – in fact the project might benefit from moving in that direction. In terms of the revised development plan, the refinements show significant potential in the further evolution of the scheme. The Panel member noted every proponent envisions their site as the centre of the waterfront, and it is important to consider this reoccurring question of design continuity. Although the team is arguing for the desirability for the public to enter the water, the Panel member questioned the rationale by pointing to the nearby Promontory Park, which will provide this at a much greater scale. Citing the example of another waterfront development, 3C, who is proposing a plaza space just east of Quayside, the Panel member questioned whether it makes sense for Waterfront Toronto to accommodate the myriad of customized moments along Queens Quay and at what point the degree of specialized particularities and exceptions will begin to erode the public realm to the point of unravelling - the Panel member felt the degree can be reduced. Citing the success of Simon Fraser University's large roof covered public space, the Panel member supported the roof over the plaza idea but advised that the design should accommodate the growing of plant material and address stormwater issues. Although the consolidated servicing and loading scheme is commended, the Panel member asked the team to reconsider the design to avoid dominating the entire façade of two blocks along Lakeshore with servicing. Overall, the Panel member felt the master plan design can benefit from significant normalization.

Looking at the public realm, another Panel member understood the three major components as Parliament Plaza, pavers, and the continuous promenade, and felt the current design intent is projecting a public realm that is created with “objects”, whether esoteric or actual. The Panel member felt the design approach, where any public activity can happen on a blank slate if it is being accommodated on smart pavers, will not translate well to public realm design. The Panel member encouraged the team to edit the proposals to create simple and great public spaces. The Panel member is in support of the plaza design, felt the infrastructure to support a successful bike lane through the plaza is a challenge and encouraged the team to figure out how a higher speed non-vehicular traffic might go through the site in a reasonable way while still creating a great public realm experience. The Panel member would like to support a multi-modal proposal at the plaza that is convincing and can justify the closing of vehicular traffic. The Panel member is unconvinced that the 30-year cost savings statistic for the hex pavers over traditional concrete streets is an adequate reason to justify its use everywhere, especially when its other functionalities such as lighting and heating can already be integrated with more traditional paving systems. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider more intentional uses for the hex pavers, such as in the interior plaza areas or at the Stoa, to create a stronger identity in specific areas and avoid a complete blurring of streetscape pavement languages. The Panel member appreciated the continuation of the Queens Quay streetscape on the south side. At the Slip, the Panel member appreciated the naturalized edge bringing

back vegetation, and felt Parliament Plaza should have more water and park areas, and that the plan can accommodate a significant additional number of trees. Comparing to the larger nearby Jarvis Slip, Parliament Slip is over-programmed and should consider starting the stadium seating further back to increase water area. The Panel member felt the location of the new bridge connection to Promontory Park compromises both the park and the neighbourhood, and the thirty-two adaptive curb parking spots are too few to provide adequate space for dynamic programming. The Panel member is unconvinced that the smaller streets should be paved and allow for vehicular traffic – provide rationale for those street designs. Lastly, the Panel member encouraged the team to maintain the character of Silo Park as a park with fewer objects and one of the best small park sites on the waterfront.

One Panel member thanked the Sidewalk team for the great presentation and felt visiting Sidewalk Labs 307 Lakeshore site and seeing the large-scale model was very helpful. The Panel member noted that continuity of the public realm is the most important part of the waterfront, existing guidelines and planned elements should therefore be extended to the east. The Panel member noted that since the sites do not have a clear back side, the issue of loading and services is a key challenge that the team will have to continue to explore and develop. The Panel member commended the drawing showing primary and secondary streets connecting with the existing systems of the City, noting that the new east-west street, being smaller, more intimate, and bringing waterfront residents and visitors to the waterfront, can offer immense possibilities for the project. The Panel member commented that the winter conditions of the public spaces should be carefully considered, provide further studies on the rationale for the bridge location, and its impact on nearby context to clearly anchor the bridge in the site. The Panel also agreed that the slip should be de-cluttered. Noting that major and neighbourhood public spaces should form a cadence with their differences in scale, the Panel member asked the team to consider the design of public spaces as a choreographed relationship.

Another Panel member noted that the Stoa program seems to lack a sense of scale, currently much narrower in depth than other retail programs, and core elements like stairs and back-of-house services should be represented on the ground floor plans to reveal how much actual retail space is available - the Stoa and retail study is critical and should be provided for a thorough review. The Panel member noted that the childcare is located on a very small and busy part of the site, consider relocation. Overall, the Panel member encouraged the team to simplify the planning as it currently tries to do too much, and continue to focus on innovative strategies that improve project performance.

## **5.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The Panel commended on the amount of work that the team produced
- Appreciated that the project concepts and priority outcomes are all intertwined in the design

- Commended the overall project strategy
- Reservations on overall public realm, and heritage strategy at Silo Park
- Consider keeping the design simple and build on the fabric and continuity started by Waterfront Toronto
- The Panel felt the cartoon style drawings lack precision and are not appropriate for a professional panel – consider presenting with more hard-line drawings and diagrams

#### Public Realm

- Continuity of public realm is critical to the project
- Focus on building a sense of place and community – represent what has been started by Waterfront Toronto and consider following those objectives in the design of the public realm, such as the continuous Water’s Edge Promenade and landscaping treatment
- Concerns with over-programming the public realm- consider simplifying and de-cluttering
- Consider more trees and providing a softer, greener landscape treatment of the open spaces, particularly at Parliament Plaza
- Concerns with the usage of the hex pavers – extend existing waterfront patterns and public realm identity, established for Central Waterfront, throughout
- Appreciated the notion that the proposed east-west pedway is an extension of the existing network of streets – more information to be provided
- Concerns with the east-west pedway competing with Queens Quay and impacting it in a negative way – more information to be provided
- Stoa study/ research to be presented to Panel for further discussions

#### Development Plan

- Consider maximizing the development potential of the site to increase revenues for public uses and affordable housing
- Commended the concept of consolidated loading and shipping infrastructure but consider the impact of the lengthy service façade on the Lake Shore Boulevard frontage
- Provide more sections through the project to understand Stoa, built-form and relationship to immediate site context, ie. North-south sections through Phase 1 cutting through east-west pedway, Stoa and Queens Quay

#### Parliament Plaza

- Provide more details on the design of the roof structure
- Too many “things”- consider a simpler, enduring strategy for activating the plaza
- Not convinced of closing Parliament and severing the street grid down to Queens Quay – provide traffic study that supports the rationale

#### Parliament Slip

- Generally over-programmed, the size of the slip is not conducive for the proposed amount of programming- consider less programmatic elements and more water

- Bridge to Promontory Park requires more study to answer fundamental questions of location and necessity
- Restore the east-west bridge connection along the Water's Edge Promenade across the slip

#### Silo Park

- The Panel felt the proposed design intent lacks identity and character, more development is needed
- Consider the heritage of the site as part of the park design

#### Sustainability

- Commended on the strong sustainability strategy and objectives

### **5.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project's Phase 1 development plan excluding Public Realm. The Panel voted in Conditional Support.

The Chair then asked for a separate vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project's Phase 1 and Phase 2 Public Realm. The Panel voted in Non-support.

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

Mr. Winters noted that the team would love to work through the comments and look at some options, encouraged by the positive feedback and skepticism on the east-west street. Mr. Winters noted the team would continue to unpack the Panel comments. Mr. Di Mascio asked if revisions could be presented September. Mr. Glaisek explained that September's DRP presentation is expected to focus on buildings, mobility, and sustainability, and votes will be taken on those pillars. Not expecting changes in the public realm design to be shown at that time.

### **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.