



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #121
Wednesday, March 20, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Eric Turcotte
Janna Levitt
Peter Busby

Regrets

Brigitte Shim

Recording Secretaries

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, 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) - Schematic Design
 2. 30 Bay – Schematic + Detailed Design
 3. West Don Lands Block 347 – Issues Identification
 4. 350 Queens Quay West – Schematic Design
 5. Waterfront Transit Reset: Union-Queens Quay Link Study – Information Session
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Feb. 20th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. 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 comments from Feb. 2019's DRP have been delivered to the **162 QOW** team, the project is targeting SPA submission in early March and is expected to return to DRP in May given City approval. Mr. Glaisek noted that following the Toronto Green Standards seminar at the last DRP, a summary of the Waterfront Toronto Resilience and Innovation Framework for Sustainability has been made available in this month's Panel documents and Waterfront Toronto will work closely with the City on aligning the next version of MGBR with the TGS. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **York Street Park**: the contract is in place with Claude Cormier, technical & stakeholder advisory committees have met with the designers, public art funding has been identified by City of Toronto while timing and amount are to be determined. The next steps for the project are consensus design based on input and competition schematic design targeted for April DRP. Mr. Glaisek noted that **Rees Street Park** continues to work with City PFR to refine phasing and funding parameters related to stormwater infrastructure, negotiations with designers on scope to assist in phasing continues, and schematic design is anticipated in summer to fall of 2019.

Mr. Glaisek noted construction continues for **Port Lands Flood Protection** including at Cherry Street Lakefilling (Essroc Quay), excavation, tree removal, demolition and site preparation at the greater site. The crew continues with lakefilling and creating new shoreline and fish coves, marine landscaping work was ceased over the winter months and will resume in the spring. Mr. Glaisek noted **Gardiner Public Realm** is expected to return to DRP for design development of the North Side Boulevard, Corridor Vision and Design Guidelines in April 2019. The Pilot Project has advanced to Construction Documents, final approvals and construction procurement is also in progress. Mr. Glaisek noted that **Aitken Place Park's** construction is in progress: below grade sewers have been installed, cement work has commenced, and it is on schedule for September opening. **Jack Layton Park's** pavement construction is in progress and Mr. Glaisek noted it is targeted to finish by end of April with planting installed. For East Bayfront, Mr. Glaisek noted dockwall reinforcing is complete, public realm construction is targeted to start in April for the **Water's Edge Boulevard (WEB)** and the road. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on EBF buildings: **R1/R2 (Aqualina)** occupancy started in Sept. 2017, **R3/R4 (Aquavista)** occupancy started in Feb. 2019, **R5 (Aquabella)** construction started in Feb. 2018, and **Waterfront Innovation Centre (WIC)** completed shoring wall and tiebacks on Block 2 while bulk excavation is underway as the foundation permits have been obtained.

Mr. Glaisek added that Post-approval return criteria has been added to the latest DRP Handbook revisions following last month's discussions, drawing submission requirements are being revised, and further submission requirement alignment with City's DRP is being considered. Lastly, the Handbook has been circulated to the City for comments to be returned by May 2019 and targeting to adopt the new Handbook in June 2019. Mr. Glaisek concluded with an overview of the tentative April DRP agenda.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted that all joint-panel members present will participate in the vote for support, conditional-support, or non-support of a review.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 East Bayfront Bayside C2 (T3) - Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1105
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Hines
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	3XN, Janet Rosenberg & Studio, Purpose Building
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Audun Opdal, Jen Holms, 3XN; Janet Rosenberg, Janet Rosenberg & Studio; Luka Matutinovic, Purpose Building
<i>Delegation:</i>	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, introduced the project by noting that Hines was selected from a two stage FRQ/RFP process as a development partner and this is their first commercial building in Bayside. Ms. Li noted the project was reviewed previously in January 2018 as part of Stage 1 Issues Identification for the C1 site and Waterfront Toronto agreed for C2 to proceed to Schematic Design review given similarities of C1/C2 and the architect's familiarity with Bayside. Ms. Li added the remaining development in Bayside are R6, a purpose-built rental building with affordable rental units, and C1, a second commercial building –the target construction start for C2 is Q4 2019.

Ms. Li highlighted the East Bayfront policy context as summarized in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and provided an update on the project's design architect. Ms. Li noted that Hines selected Hollwich Kushner in Q1 2018 while in advanced negotiations with College Boreal and a future francophone University for a long-term lease for the entire project – Hines was on a very aggressive timeline and selected Hollwich Kushner based on quality of work without a typical RFP with design competition process. However, in Q2 2018 discussions with College Boreal came to an end, the specific design in development with Hollwich Kushner was no longer relevant, Hines reassessed the project and conducted a new design competition amongst four firms including Hollwich Kushner. In the end 3XN's design was selected. Ms. Li added that there is no underground parking or basement at C2, and there is parking proposed on the second floor with future option of converting into office space. Ms. Li provided a recap of the Jan. 2018 DRP consensus comments and introduced Kelly Jones, Senior Planner with City of Toronto, to present preliminary city planning issues.

Ms. Jones noted that the City finds the following issues important: 38m step back line, mass timber building constraints, sunlight on north sidewalk, east-west driveway delivery and consistent treatment with public realm, interface with future R6 building in terms of landscape and privacy, above grade parking visibility from street, treatment of space, viability of conversion, and overall fit of the building within the existing and approved context. Ms. Jones noted that the proponent has to submit site plan application for the City's review.

Ms. Li highlighted areas for Panel consideration and then introduced Audan Opdal, Senior Partner with 3XN Architects to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Building

Mr. Opdal began the presentation by noting that 3XN's approach to office design is focused on creating synergies between people and spaces, bringing daylight deep into the building, programming spaces for people to connect, distribute amenities vertically not just horizontally, and utilize the staircase as a key element. Mr. Opdal noted that buildings should offer more to the public realm, the design team aims to have the ground floor programmatically relate with Bayside and use social spaces to attract people to the plaza. The plazas spill into the buildings diagonally to follow the stacked double height spaces through the building, creating a string of public spaces that break down the scale of the volume. Mr. Opdal noted the building provides views to the water and back to the City, the timber structure is visible from the street and the active rooftops with terraces reinforce the Bayside masterplan vision. Mr. Opdal introduced Jens Holm to provide further details on the building. Mr. Holm added the team is three-quarter into schematic design and is really focused on finding ways to activate the public realm three-dimensionally. The retail at the base will emphasize activity happening along Queens Quay and connect to the plazas that are anchored by both buildings. Depending on the tenant, the social spaces can be single or double height. Mr. Holm noted that the roof landscape utilizes the mechanical rooftops as well and reinforce the design language of the plazas. Mr. Holm added it is important to bring warmth and tactility of the timber structure to the façade, the team is exploring glass curtain wall with fins in either wood or toned aluminum. Mr. Holm then introduced Janet Rosenberg to present the landscape design.

Landscape

Ms. Rosenberg noted it is important to envision the landscapes continue seamlessly into the building and the plazas serve not only workers but people walking down to the waterfront. Ms. Rosenberg noted the landscape speaks to the wood building while referencing other waterfront projects like the Wavedecks. The concept is a playful landscape, with nooks and crannies for active performances, intimate diverse uses, and extends the building lobbies with a potential layer of flexible furniture. Ms. Rosenberg added that accessibility is achieved by having surfaces no higher than 18" tall. Aligning with Aitken Place Park, the trees in the plazas provide order and layering to the spaces – Ms. Rosenberg noted that the trees and design details will provide

contract to the mass amount of pedestrian traffic. Lastly, Ms. Rosenberg added that the benches provided in the interim condition would be relocated in the final build-out.

Sustainability

Mr. Matutinovic began by stating that the guiding sustainability principles for this project are biophilia and human-centered design, lower carbon and low site impact, and next generation of sustainable certifications. Mr. Matutinovic added the design team is focused on embodied carbon in addition to emitted carbon, limiting site disturbance by raising parking and designing for adaptability- biophilia will be incorporated in the later stages of design. LEED gold and TGS v3 are being targeted objectives while WELL standards are explored. Mr. Matutinovic highlighted that the design currently exceeds Tier 1 energy requirements with operational carbon lower than Tier 1 and life cycle carbon outperforming Tier 2; MGBR checklist has also been provided for review.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the treatment of the parking level is the same as the rest of the building. Mr. Holm answered it is. The Panel member asked for clarification on the division of public versus private tenant area in the building and to what extent is the timber system capable of providing this flexibility. Ms. Holm explained the team is focused on high level flexibility, the organization would be tenant driven and the system can be modified to accommodate the result of the tenant negotiation. The Panel member asked if the exterior treatment of the building will change depending on the tenant. Mr. Holm confirmed there will be no tenant impact on the exterior façade treatment.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the 6m by 6m timber system and if CLT is being proposed. Mr. Holm answered that CLT is currently being designed as floors with concrete slab on top, the beams can be glulam dependant on the load; the structural engineer on the project is MKA from Seattle. The Panel member asked for clarification on the parking level structure due to the OBC fire rating requirement. Mr. Holm responded that the team is looking at options of concrete for that level or using timber throughout. The Panel member asked if there is any exposed wood on the exterior. Mr. Holm answered no.

One Panel member asked if the exterior wall is fully glazed and the energy performance impact on the project. Mr. Holm answered the building is fully glazed except for the fins and the team is looking at triple glazed units.

Another Panel member asked if there is value in transferable landscape or trees and if the planters are movable. Ms. Rosenberg answered that the team will relocate the trees depending on timeframe and while the landscape system is all connected in the early stage, the team can consider it as separate pieces of urban infrastructure.

One Panel asked for the key energy performance aspects preventing the project from reaching TGS Tier 2. Mr. Matutinovic answered there are two main reasons: 1) thermal energy demand- Tier 2 requirements for commercial buildings take a huge leap from Tier 1, 2) carbon emission – at Tier 2 heat pumps are required but challenging as the project does not drill into the ground.

Another Panel asked for the rationale of 1.4m spacing on the vertical fins. Mr. Holm answered it is related to the glazing size.

One Panel member asked for clarification on mullion depth as they look deeper on page 37 than in the Queens Quay rendering. Mr. Holm answered that the plaza facades have deeper inserts than the remaining elevations to create a sense of enclosure between C1 and C2- around 300mm on the retail side- the depth depends on how much overhang can be provided. The Panel member also asked for rationale on the 25 parking spaces and parking strategy on future C1. Mr. Gross responded that the team studied one or two levels of underground parking for C2, however due to the ground water condition of the site, the cost was not financially feasible. Instead parking is provided on the second floor to meet leasing requirements. Mr. Gross added there may be parking at C1 thus the interim plaza and although currently opened, the building is likely to attract creative technology tenants.

Another Panel member asked if the team has experience converting garage into habitable space as the environmentally positive idea seems challenging. Mr. Opdal noted 3XN is designing a similar concept in Sydney and this issue is a high priority for the team to address. Mr. Holm added the floor heights will be consistent throughout.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member recommended the team to do two storeys of parking at C1 instead of spending huge effort in converting the C2 level, the parking layout based on the structural grid also seems out of place. The Panel member appreciated the strong, clean design and is not concerned with shadow or building height – a great presentation.

Another Panel member encouraged further animation on the ground plane, sensitivity when doing social connected spaces and reconsider mechanical roof level for more terrace continuity – overall excited by the project.

One Panel member noted second floor parking precedent is not ideal for the waterfront and the team should consider consolidating the parking elsewhere. The latest version of the façade seems flat and the articulation on the volume is lost, the Panel member recommended the team to ensure the building is sculpted and has depth for social and public notes. The Panel member also encouraged for use of colors on the waterfront, particularly the tone of the curtain wall fin. On the east-west laneway, the Panel

member recommended moving loading east to avoid direct interface with the park, and redistributing the bicycle parking spots concentrated currently in the east plaza.

Another Panel member appreciates the clarity, comprehensiveness, and the urban design of the project but not convinced with the near symmetry of the two buildings, suggested to perhaps look at re-organizing the spacing of the fins from a performative aspect to introduce difference in the facades. The Panel member noted the use of market furniture with the designed landscape should be carefully considered.

One Panel member noted the retail in the southeast corner will not be successful, instead the service elevator and bike parking should be relocated for a more continuous retail. On sustainability, the Panel member noted the energy performance will be obsolete in 10-15 years, heating load is high due to curtain wall which might be uncomfortable for occupants- suggested to increase curtain wall performance or modify the window to wall ratio on the current envelope design.

Another panel member appreciated the simplicity and modest approach, however, given the appeal is timber, there is concern for the glass color and transparency which may reduce visibility from the outside – finding the right glazing unit is critical. One Panel member felt urban agriculture opportunities is forward thinking and will benefit the office tenants, suggested to improve access from tenant floors to roofs and consider a transitional landscape on the ground floor. The Panel member felt the plan is strong and complimented the team for considering seasonality in the landscape design.

Another Panel member felt parking should not be above grade, if it does the structure would have to be concrete, the proposed EUI is not adequate, 6m x 6m is not an optimized grid for layout, consider ceramic fins instead of wood on the exterior of the building, and the plazas can use a more aggressive approach to improve landscape presence. The Panel member appreciated the design, social spaces and look forward to more details.

One Panel member appreciated the good chemistry between client and design team, the second-floor parking is an interesting solution based on site conditions creating a beautiful experience for both driver and visitor – it is an attempt to do parking differently by celebrating it and giving it the potential for future conversion. The Panel member felt the stepping of the social spaces provides natural wayfinding and that the team should consider finding opportunities to break the grid, perhaps with more trees randomly placed, and connect the two plazas. The Panel member recommended avoiding greys in the material palette.

Another Panel member recommended the team to study Peter Dickenson's above grade parking building on College Street and agreed that the structure should be concrete for code reasons. Triple glazed curtain wall on a parking floor seems overkill in the interim and the Panel member felt the louver box is conceptually in conflict with the structure – a glazing module with good solar heat gain coefficient will have big impact on the design. The Panel member is concerned with the building's eastern relationship with the future R6 affordable housing block and recommended the team

to provide preliminary thinking of how the buildings will interact and consider the corner relationships. Lastly, consider if the retail can be further displaced deeper into the floor and suggested to split the difference in the façade depths to reduce the sense of visual discrepancy among the elevations.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel is supportive of the presentation and the level of design detail.
- Encourages further design exploration on the articulation of massing, symmetry, colors and materiality of the project.

Parking

- Concerned with above ground parking setting precedent for future developments.
- Provide design details for parking level, including structure and finishes, in response to the OBC fire-rating requirements, parking functionality, and future adaptability.
- Provide clarification on C1 and C2 parking strategy rationale.

Ground Floor

- Retail is vital for this site- consider reconfiguring ground floor to maintain retail continuity along Queens Quay East and provide design strategy to ensure ground floor and street animation.
- Reconsider the Southeast corner retail as current space feels orphaned.
- Consider shifting the loading entrance to avoid a direct visual alignment with the park.
- Relationship between C2 ground floor and future affordable housing block R6 on the east is unclear- provide more information and carefully consider interface including access, program adjacencies and facades.

Plaza Landscape

- Supportive of the idea of a transitional landscape design.
- East plaza has high number of bicycle parking, consider alternative distribution
- Consider a more aggressive landscape design approach that will ensure a strong identity and integration of landscape as part of the public realm experience.
- Encourages more colors, tones and less greys in the material palette.

Energy and Sustainability

- Appreciates the preliminary energy performance study; consider pushing the sustainability strategies further to ensure high performance in the future.
- Ensure the wood structure is highly visible from the building exterior while maintaining performance criteria of the glazing system.

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

Mr. Gross noted that the team is committed to above grade parking, exploring stackers and optimizing the floor to floor height.

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.

The Panel voted in Full Support of the project.

2.0 30 Bay - Schematic Design + Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1098
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design + Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Oxford Properties Group
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners, Gillespies
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Andy O'Neil, VP Development, Oxford Properties Group; Graham Stirk, Partner, Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners; Eugenia Grill, Partner, Gillespies
<i>Delegation:</i>	David Jansen, Adamson Associates; James DiPaolo, Urban Strategies Inc.; Leontine Major, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leontine Major, Senior Community Planner with City of Toronto, began the introduction by highlighting the site context in relation to the greater downtown area, the views of the major intersections that bound the site, new developments in the area and the transit connections to the project. Ms. Major noted there is huge opportunity for the project to bring value to the area under the Gardiner.

Ms. Major noted the key planning policies in the area from The City of Toronto Official Plan and Central Waterfront Secondary Plan that specify Regenerative Areas and Heritage policies – the City will send report to heritage conservation board. The site has major pedestrian connectivity to Bay Street, Union Station, and Air Canada Centre from the Path network. Ms. Major noted the project is targeting a City council meeting for rezoning and is returning to the DRP for a hybrid Schematic Design and Detailed Design review. Ms. Major provided a recap of comments from the previous DRP: supportive of the heritage approach, push the elegant simplicity of the proposal by articulating the fundamental pieces clearly, consider a singular expression of the podium, ground floor space should activate Bay Street with porosity and a finer grain, extend the site context analysis to a greater area, and ensure the sustainability strategy is robust and will carry through the value engineering.

Ms. Major noted the City is supportive of the strong connection to PATH, the triple glazed curtain wall, and the evolved water feature at grade. Ms. Major then introduced Andrew O’Neil with Oxford Properties Group to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. O’Neil began the presentation by noting that Oxford Properties Group is both the owner and developer for this project; the designers present today are Graham Stirk from Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners, and Eugenia Grilli with Gillespies. Mr. O’Neil noted the presentation has three areas of focus: sustainability, public realm and architecture.

Sustainability

Mr. O’Neil noted the four sustainability goals as: 1) LEED v4 Gold Core & Shell Certification, 2) Toronto Green Standards v3 Tier 1, 3) Waterfront Toronto MGBR, and 4) CaGBC Zero Carbon Building Certification. The zero-carbon goal is the most ambitious due to key obstacles including natural gas being the most common heating energy source and the low roof to floor area ratio of the building- an important challenge and focus for the team to continue to work on. Mr. O’Neil highlighted key sustainable design features: triple glazed curtain wall to reduce the GHG emission, LED lighting with sensors, rooftop PV array that contribute to two percent of total energy due to small area, and a low carbon heating system that is to be confirmed.

Public Realm

Ms. Grilli provided a recap on the wider site context, linkage to city initiatives, site opportunities, and the conceptual design narrative of the public realm design. Ms. Grilli noted that the site is connected to the natural and historic portside landscapes of the Toronto waterfront while linking back to the dense urban grain of the financial district. The landscape design provides three thematic layers to the public realm experience: articulating the ground plane and the building grid, extrusion of the ground plane, and natural elements such as planting and water that animate the public realm. Ms. Grilli noted that the landscape masterplan provides a planting strategy that links the site to local tree planting rhythm, a sculptural plaza along Harbour St., an interactive water feature, a forecourt at 60 Harbour St. frontage, and a retreat landscape under the along Lake Shore Boulevard to enhance the public realm adjacent and under the Gardiner. Ms. Grilli noted the site has great opportunities for introducing high quality public art, connecting internal and external ground planes, and versatile rich uses. Ms. Grilli added that shades of granite help define pedestrian pathways, maple trees along Harbour establishes a relationship with existing adjacent trees, and an interactive water scrim feature with diverse lighting and seating express where water once flowed – 3 to 5mm of water that is programmable to respond to seasons. Ms. Grilli noted planting selected bar shade, pollution and traffic in the area, providing a strong visual backdrop for the building atrium. Lastly, by working closely with City staff, the Bay Street curb line has been extended eastward to provide a wider pedestrian footpath and additional trees.

Architecture

Mr. Stirk began the presentation by reinforcing the key principles of the building design and how it relates to the Harbour Commissioner heritage building. The podium design responds to the adjacent building heights and creates simple yet legible disruptions to the volume. Mr. Stirk noted an important modification to access of the lobby from the Path - the revised circulation is simplified and brings a single descent of the public from Path directly to the building retail, eatery, and lobby, complimenting the full scale of the heritage building to the north. A strong axial connection from PATH to Bay Street is established with clear logical spacing for entrances while more freestanding retail spaces are provided at grade in the lobby to animate Bay Street frontage. Mr. Stirk noted the building aims to sit lighting on the ground that seamlessly transitions to the exterior landscape. Mr. Stirk added the height of the building is reduced by 7m structurally and 14m from the top, exaggerating the primary cruciform and inform the visual impact on the skyline. Furthermore, the unique structure contributes to the skyline at a super-graphic level. Mr. Stirk noted the cleaning cranes are integrated into the roof structures, while any remaining roof area is applied with PVs. Primarily a precast concrete structure, the design is to show testament to construction

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the revitalization of the heritage building is part of the project and clarification on the outline of the tower and podium. Mr. Stirk answered that the heritage revitalization is not part of the project, the podium is an L-shaped building with indents along the way that relate to where the building shift. Mr. O'Neil responded that the tower is a perfect square and overhangs the heritage building.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the City's role in the curb design. Mr O'Neil responded that the team has been working with transportation services to gain pedestrian space with curb cut extension- full SPA details are to be submitted for detailed review of the public realm.

One Panel member asked if the façade glazing has been further developed. Mr. O'Neil responded that the team is focused on building performance, providing great occupant experience and balancing the LEED qualities with tenant demands. Zero carbon target for this type of building is unique to Toronto being lead by Oxford: 1) eliminate GHG emission of the building through low carbon heat energy, this is work in progress and a focus for the team to resolve. 2)triple glazing is a fundamental component in the sustainable strategy in achieving net zero GHG operational emission.

Another Panel member asked for the energy analysis consultant on the project and preliminary numbers for energy demands. Mr. O'Neil answered WSP is the consultant; the energy performance of the envelop is beyond TGS v3, triple glazing is a key contributor to the strategy and there are other elements to the sustainably strategy that have not yet been fully resolved.

One Panel asked for clarification on the underground parking shape, percentage of POPS on site, the seasonal operations of the public realm and the tree specie in the courtyard. Mr. Stirk answered the underground parking matches the site of the building

and there is around 200m² of POPS on the 7000m² site. Ms. Grilli explained the seasonal operations of the public realm is schematic, will work with tenant manager on programming the water feature while the surface is non-slip same as the main pedestrian path- it is not derelict and heated when off. Ms. Grilli clarified the tree in courtyard is a Amelanchier x Grandiflora Cole's Select.

Another Panel member asked for clarification and rationale on the back side of the main mega-column structure. Mr. Jansen explained that due to fire-rating, the volume is glazed on the exterior and solid panel on the interior. One Panel member asked for clarification on the elevator strategy in the revised scheme of PATH connection to the lobby. Mr. O'Neil noted the elevators are shifted west to bring PATH pedestrians down to the ground.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the zero-carbon target for the building and noted it is an aspirational challenge. The Panel member suggested looking at district energy and cooling to lower heat source carbon emission, reduce window to wall ratio, and investigate renewable natural gas options for this scale of building. Since roof PVs will be shaded by the roof unit, the Panel member suggested exploring building integrated PVs, such as in the upper portion of the vision glazing in lobby, and utilize the entire window package to improve performance: silicon glass, triple glazing, PVs, and frit.

Another Panel member appreciated the layered narrative, robust analysis on public realm and the overall presentation, the landscape and planting strategy for the north plaza that helps attenuate sound, and the colors the design team is proposing to introduce to the public realm. The Panel member suggested the team to consider more natural processes for water management and work with processes of snow melt.

One Panel member was supportive of the building access organizational changes, water feature development in contrast to the super-structure, and refinement of the public realm edges. Although supportive of the top detail of the super-structure, the Panel member suggested to re-consider the interface of super-structure with interior, perhaps another material for the inside face.

Another Panel member commented that the thin water feature provides a powerful psychological condition of the public realm, in contrast with the absoluteness of the building corners- this will contribute to Toronto's list of architectural vocabulary. The Panel member commented the soffit and ceilings should be further developed, consider new technologies for the façade development to provide solar shading and capture energy.

One Panel member commented a testing pilot for the water feature is critical to avoid black ice and consider renderings that depict winter seasons. The Panel member commented the planting strategy under the Gardiner is aspirational but extremely challenging, instead of a heritage inspired landscape the team should consider a more

performative alternative that can help mitigate pollution, salt, etc. The Panel member suggested to echo the use of colors in the exterior landscape, demonstrate the uses in the public realm, provide solar cells for the trees, and that the green wall in the interior should not be value engineered.

Another Panel member commented that the narrative of the water's edge is unclear and disappears in the design, the intention of the shore is difficult to read, the landscape is fragmented into separate zones, and overall too timid and overburdened by the architecture- suggested for landscape to be stronger, less compromising. The Panel member noted that the team should be prepared to work closely with the City, such as the new Pavers group, on designing the public realm finishes. The Panel member commented the team should demonstrate that underground infrastructure has been considered in relation to the public realm design, such as tree locations, and is concerned with the harsh conditions that exist for the north plaza.

One Panel member felt that the proposed landscape under the Gardiner is not feasible, and the team should re-consider the revised PATH elevator location since it currently disrupts the clarity of the podium volume. The Panel member also felt that coplanarity between the entrance super-structure and line of façade is inconsistent with the remaining building language. Referencing view 03, the Panel member felt the current elevator location disrupts the restaurant and perceptibility of the discreetness of the atrium void volume.

Another Panel member commented project is beautiful and the improvement of the circulation on the public levels are important, the team should consider a more robust landscape strategy and provide more detailed responses to the envelope performance strategy: shading should be provided for different facades as cooling typically exceeds heating requirements, provide EUI numbers, and clarify strategy on achieving carbon zero. The Panel member concluded that it is important for a beautiful project to also perform from an environmental perspective.

One Panel member commented that the project is fundamentally a flat glass building and should not have dark glass. The Panel member felt the south landscape seems harsh, less accessible and transparent than the north/east plazas – more refinement is required. Another Panel member appreciated the public realm design, felt the proposal is currently under-planted, and more trees could be included to increase site planting capacity especially at the north end of Bay Street. Consider including trees as part of the water feature design, utilize planters as pedestrian control and seek out large tree species.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel appreciates the presentation and feels that the building is a statement for the city and the skyline of Toronto.

- Welcomes the internal organization changes that respond to the previous DRP comments; the suggestions today are subtle considerations as the project moves toward SPA.
- Supportive of the revised water feature design and the appealing concept of recalling the historic shoreline; carefully consider cold climate impact and pedestrian experience of the landscape when it is not in use.
- Supportive of the strong use of colors in the project.
- Encourages the team to address the realities of the under Gardiner conditions such as lack of sun, salt, noise, pollution, and consider a more performative landscape for both warm and cold seasons.
- Consider more robust landscape details to consolidate the various landscape “zones” together while strengthening and anchoring the corners of the building.
- Encourages the team to work closely with the City to avoid any policy surprises, like new paver requirements, as the design continues to develop.
- Appreciates the project’s participation in the CaGBC Zero Carbon Pilot Program, however, more information on the strategy, such as EUI targets and a pathway to zero carbon, should be provided at the next review.
- Encourages the team to continue to investigate sustainable envelope design strategies to reduce the heating and cooling loads of the building, including reevaluating the proposed window to wall ratio or employing shading strategies on the East, South and West facades.

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

Mr. O’Neil noted that the team is appreciative of the Panel comments. While recognizing the challenges of developing the north plaza, the team would like to create a high quality experience for the front entrance of the building. Responding to the comment on fragmented landscape zones, Mr. O’Neil noted it was important to respect the pedestrian clear ways on Bay and Harbour and not deviate from that condition. Mr. O’Neil concluded that the cost for window PVs is extremely high with low energy efficiency, will continue to investigate but unlikely to be included in the project, however frit and other shading elements have potential.

2.6 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 of the project.

3.0 West Don Lands Block 347

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1106
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	COBE, architectsAlliance
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Thomas Krarup, Project Director, COBE
<i>Delegation:</i>	Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; Tony Medeiros, Dream, Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Kate Goslett, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager, with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by noting it is part of the Province's Affordable Housing Program, the team proposing a purpose-built rental building with affordable units that make up thirty percent of total gross floor area, and the delivery timeline is tight as per agreement with Infrastructure Ontario. Ms. Li noted the project site is a combination of Blocks 3, 4, and 7, located at the southwest corner of Front St E and Cherry St. The West Don Lands precinct plan has provided built form guidelines and an indication of new roads that are located on the site. Ms. Li highlighted the policy context of West Don Lands: excellence in design of buildings, quality, beauty, protection of view corridors, and support for adjacent public realm. Ms. Li noted that the project is presenting Stage 1: Issues Identification and would like the Panel to consider the following: 1) has the team adequately identified all the major site features and constraints including building heights, setbacks, frontages, massing & density, servicing, site access, open space, etc? 2) are there other key design considerations that team should be aware of moving forward? 3) Can the Panel provide feedback on integrating these blocks with surround context of Corktown Common, the West Don Lands and the Distillery District? 4) Does the research and thinking support Waterfront Toronto's public realm strategy? Ms. Li introduced Thomas Krarup, Project Director, with COBE to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Krarup began the presentation by providing a review of the project timeline: potential rezoning and SPA submission after the DRP review, community & stakeholder consultation, CMHC financing submission in 2019, and proposed start of construction in Q3/Q4 of 2020 – a tight delivery schedule for this project. Mr. Krarup noted various policies inform the current site plan, from the West Don Lands EA Master Plan (2005), Block Plan and Urban Design Guidelines (2006), Precinct Plan (2005) to Public Realm Master Plan (2011). The design guidelines for Blocks 3,4, and 7 were reviewed and Mr. Krarup added the project has a target of approximately 480 residential units (40%

1-bedroom, 40% 2-bedroom, 10% 3-bedroom, 10% 4-bedroom), with roughly 200 units, 30% of total GFA, being affordable units. Mr. Krarup noted in addition to affordable housing component, responding to the height datums to Corktown Commons and corner conditions of the site are important focuses for the team. Speaking to the site photos, Mr. Krarup noted the site has a diverse context including heritage buildings, car dealership, low-rise condo and mixed-use programs. With reference to the TOCore planning guidelines, Mr. Krarup noted Front St. E is identified as one of the “great streets” with priority retail and culture, Cherry St. is a priority cycling route, and the entire site is located within the “Shoreline Stitch” that should improve physical and visual north-south connections for pedestrians and cyclist. Mr. Krarup concluded the site analysis by noting the characters of adjacent streets and development heights.

Site Analysis

Mr. Krarup noted the two linear public spaces on the site are generous and important: a north-south street and a east-west lane that abuts three condo developments on south of the site. Mr. Krarup noted Front Street is planned as a green boulevard, Trinity St is a future connection to the waterfront, and Cherry St. is a tree-lined tramway. As a start, COBE’s team provided the precinct plan massing as a point of reference. Mr. Krarup noted the design guidelines for the site: efficient built form, good quality residential experience, integration into broader community, strong retail strategy, and compatibility with the block plan.

Site Context

Mr. Krarup noted the project is situated among five neighbourhoods with very unique characteristics: St. Lawrence, Old Town of York, Corktown, Distillery District, and West Don Lands. Furthermore, the site has a rich industrial history with interesting corners at Front, Cherry, and Trinity Streets. Distilling from these findings, Mr. Krarup noted four design principles unique to the site: brick base & glass add-ons, accent corner, mix of scales, and remarkable ground floors.

Public Realm

Mr. Krarup noted that WDL has precedent for high quality public realm; through a urban form comparison, the team is investigating nearby open spaces and how it might inform the project. The team is also looking at the built-form and open space relationship that a courtyard typology can offer for the site by superimposing other projects onto the site.

Sustainability

Mr. Krarup concluded by outlining the broad sustainability strategy for the site- the team is targeting 60% vision glass to solid wall ratio and LEED BD+C v4 Gold certification.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the team is anticipated to challenge the height and density of the Block Plan and if more density is needed to make the affordability housing

component feasible. Mr. Medeiros explained that the team is exploring various options and no decision has been made; there is no need to increase density to make affordable housing feasible.

Another Panel member asked if the team looked at the relationship between open space, built-form, and the neighbourhood – provide study on the required area in order to serve this site. One Panel member asked if the project mix is the same as WDL Block 8. Mr. Feldmann confirmed that it is the same.

Another Panel member asked the team to clarify their thinking on the courtyard precedents in relation to the precinct plan and if they are suggesting to approach the site as one large block. Mr. Krarup explained there is large parking component embedded in the project, the courtyard could be a good option providing a more animated interior public space and street frontages; the team felt natural to study courtyard precedents but are also exploring other options.

One Panel member asked if the team is considering single access ramp for underground parking. Mr. Krarup answered that single access would be optimal and the team would want to strive for this efficiency, however, given the north-south lane this strategy does not work. The Panel member asked for clarification on the status of the east-west lane. Mr. Krarup noted the team is working with the City to determine the planning aspects of the site; ideally there would be some form of large linear public space at the neighbourhood scale.

Another Panel member asked if the team studied the courtyard buildings in the St. Lawrence neighbourhood to inform the mix and density of project. One Panel member suggested there are two courtyard buildings in that neighbourhood: Sherbourne and Esplanade, and Market Square. Mr. Krarup noted the team can investigate further. One Panel member asked if the team considered active and passive amenities for kids and families, and if larger family units can be associated with grade. Mr. Krarup noted the courtyard is one option of a clearly defined semi-private or public space, it is too early to know but the team is very focused on creating good spaces for kids and families.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented diversity in massing is encouraged, and a courtyard on top of parking requires great access to sunlight. The Panel also commented that the method of accessing parking, quantity of parking, should be considered by the architectural team.

Another Panel member commented that typically open space in a courtyard is private and does not contribute to the continuity of the public realm, consider something on Front St. that pulls the public realm generously into the block. It is imperative for the project to have great public space and encourage the team to resist the temptation of bridging the blocks.

One Panel member commented that there is an imminent deficit of open space and parks in the area; the proposed public realm will be heavily used. The team is encouraged to provide active greenspace programs that will allow children and family use. The Panel member noted open space is scarce and there is a need for more pocket green spaces.

Another Panel member noted concern for the quality of courtyard spaces and suggested the team to study other nearby courtyard typologies and identify the design values that create high quality courtyard spaces. The Panel member commended the team on providing precedents at this stage of review.

One Panel member encourages the team to provide retail plan at the next review, push the retail deep into the block to deliver “main street” quality with narrow frontages on Front St. The Panel member noted the south half of the east-west laneway is currently used for servicing and is not attractive- suggested to shrink that down to maximize pedestrian active uses in the remaining area. 60% window to wall ratio is a good start, the Panel member noted affordable housing projects in Ontario are achieving good envelope designs with inexpensive mechanical systems leading to low energy use and low cost – invest in envelope at this stage is a great foundation for affordability and will provide flexibility in building performance targets. The Panel member encourages to further lower the window to wall ratio and provide EUI, energy modelling breakdown, and usages at the next review.

Another Panel member noted the relationship between site and the south area is not clearly understood and suggested to provide a more comprehensive site analysis that contemplate the impact of Cherry St bend at the site in relation to built-form, the location of the north-south street as it relates to the design, the concentration of density on site as it relates to the precinct plan, Cherry St. frontage continuity as it relates to the proposed east-west lane.

One Panel member commented that every outdoor space on the site is valuable potential program and open space, consider the front yard as a strategy to enrich the public realm and add to the sense of community for people who do not have access to the courtyard.

3.5 Consensus Comments

No consensus comments were made.

- While the presentation is a good starting point for the project, the Panel feels a more thorough site analysis exercise should be completed.
- The Panel is unclear on the design direction of the site and encourages the team to complete a more exhaustive project and massing analysis to provide clear key take-aways and clarify their intentions for the site.
- Provide more information on the St. Lawrence neighbourhood in relation to density, family-sized units, programming for diversity, and grade relationships with courtyard and streets.

- Encourages the team to provide a full range of comparative massing studies for the site at the next review.
- Animation on Front Street is critical, consider deep retail units at grade to create a “main street” experience.
- Consider introducing greenery, landscaping and outdoor play spaces at the base of units to help animate streets.
- Provide information and rationale for underground parking, including quantity, access and servicing.
- Provide energy performance modelling, breakdowns and EUIs at the next review.

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

Mr. Krarup noted the project is moving quickly, work is being developed in parallel and the team looks forward to the return review to share more information.

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

4.0 350 Queens Quay West

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1073
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Pacific Reach Properties Development
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Quadrangle
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Les Klein, Principal, Quadrangle
<i>Delegation:</i>	Scott Torrance, Forrec; Shehzad Somji, Pacific Reach Properties Development; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Katherine Bailey, 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 that the site is currently developed with two 21-storey rental apartment buildings, linked by a 3-storey commercial and amenity building, surrounding the Peter Street Basin. The project was subject to a LPAT ruling in 2018 including height and building separation restrictions- a parkland dedication in the northeast corner is also established. The project is returning to the DRP for the second Schematic Design review following the first Schematic Design review in November 2018 which responded to increased separation, reduced height and preserving views. Mr. Kim introduced Katherine Bailey, Community Planner, with City of Toronto, to speak.

Ms. Bailey noted the team has submitted SPA in December 2018 and rezoning is complete- the presentation today focuses on the building design as there is no change to the approved zoning. Ms. Bailey highlighted key comments from the March 2018 Panel review: consider adding north-south and east-west connection through the building, consider using a unit paver of asphalt on the driveway to slow down traffic, create the image of what Peter Street Basin could be, provide grade-related landscaping in lieu of green wall, consider façade materials that have acoustics and thermal insulation qualities, and consider narrower retail spaces connecting the front and back of the building. Ms. Bailey noted the proponent team has a budget allocated for the improvement of Peter Street Basin, revised the plan to include a revised north-south passageway at grade, and confirmed removal of public realm fences except for section still under negotiation with TTC.

Ms. Bailey highlighted City planning issues including the appropriateness of ground plane connections through the site, building relationship to Lakeshore Blvd, façade treatment and landscape design of the public realm. Ms. Bailey concluded with areas for Panel consideration: do the building and landscape designs meet or exceed Waterfront Toronto's objectives of design excellence, do the proposed connections provide public realm continuity and support pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicular circulation throughout the site. Ms. Bailey introduced Les Klein, Principal with Quadrangle to present.

4.2 Presentation

Mr. Klein began by introduction by noting the project engages unique remnants of the 1970s, the client has invested in upgrading the interior and exterior of the buildings to bring them to a new level of asset- changing their exterior aesthetics is an important strategy. Mr. Klein noted the existing buildings with a 4-storey garage to the west form a large complex with no rear elevation that is well located in the city, with emerging parks and the Martin Goodman trail nearby.

Mr. Klein noted the decision to place the new building in between the two existing towers allows views down the west side of the Rogers Centre to the waterfront – the original design was well received by the DRP but not in terms of City policy so the massing was later revised and resubmitted. Mr. Klein noted that the comments from the last DRP have been considered given it falls without the scope of the presentation today. Mr. Klein added that the northern fence has been removed while west fence is still being negotiated with TTC, the removal improves the northern public realm adjacent to the Gardiner, allowing a “woonerf” style streetscape and the team aims to do the same with the west side. Mr. Klein noted the color and pattern of the pavers are important design opportunities. The team is committed to work with Rees Street park design to align with the public realm on the east.

Mr. Klein noted that due to existing tenant leases, the east-west mid-block connection is currently stymied. However, the team has studied other public right of ways on private property to provide an alternative north-south response- an enclosed passageway on the west side of the servicing area of the central podium connects Lakeshore Blvd. with Peter Street Basin.

Building re-design

Mr. Klein noted that the re-design of the building elevations emulates the skyline where “thin” side profile of buildings are viewed, the team looked at precedents of “vertical villages” and developed a new strategy in expressing verticality and adjacencies in an urban context. Mr. Klein noted that the new facades articulate clear stepping of roofs, vertical expressions instead of the previous horizontal orientation, and the expansion addition on the north façade has been revised to emulate the treatment as the rest of the building- the team is studying precedents of cladding strategies with varying materials and colors forming a unified façade while differentiating the buildings. In contrast to the taller, larger volumes, Mr. Klein noted the low building is framed and highlight the proposed passageway connection. Mr. Klein added the façade strategy would naturally inform the fabric of the retail at the Peter Street Basin public realm.

Landscape

Mr. Torrance shared Mr. Klein’s appreciation that the fence has been removed and would like to see TTC approve the removal of the west side to further improve the public realm design. Mr. Torrance noted that the landscape design has not been updated since the last DRP presentation – the team is listening for feedback on the current architectural submission and will incorporate with previous comments at the next revision.

Mr. Glaisek noted it is to the team’s credit that they targeted to elicit Panel feedback on whether the new elevation strategy and building changes respond to previous DRP comments, before committing to updating the landscape and continuing development progress. Mr. Glaisek commended the team for high level of engagement and response to Panel feedback.

4.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member noted the site is a remarkable area and if any analysis has been done to understand the current subpar retail condition. Ms. Klein explained the initial retail under previous ownership did not work, the client is very interested in providing successful retail: introduce ramps to bring people down to the Basin, remove substandard retail with low visibility, curate the retail, and increase access and frontage presence. Another Panel member noted the first retail on the site was an antique market which was a successful destination retail, however no comparable retail came after – continuity of retail and double facing retail are critical to the site.

Another Panel member asked if the façade change impacts the potential lease lines of the ground floor retail units and the City has great precedent for large residential buildings, such as recent condos on Ossington, with vibrant small retails at grade.

One Panel member asked if there is possibility of a basement in the building. Mr. Klein answered no that is not possible because of the water.

Another Panel member asked how much of the services at grade in the east building are currently in place and existing. Mr. Klein answered they are all existing. The Panel member also asked if the public can access the Peter Street Basin from the bridge. Mr. Klein answered that the City has fenced the below bridge connection off after it became a habitat for the homeless, so currently one cannot access the basin from Queens Quay West south side. Mr. Klein noted ramp and stairs have been provided flanking the Basin as a response.

One Panel member asked if the team can work on land outside of the property line and if negotiation with Parks is in progress. Mr. Klein answered there is very limited control on the improvement of the public realm; the team wishes to see portion of Section 37 money to go towards the Peter Street Basin park improvement. Mr. Bailey added that the Peter Street Basin is owned by Parks, they have policy with regards to commercial use of park area and would like the improvement to the Basin be part of a larger, comprehensive exercise that will be coordinated with Rees Street Park and the rest of waterfront. Mr. Glaisek clarified that Waterfront Toronto is working closely with Parks to figure this out.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the west tower northern façade. Mr. Klein explained that the expansion of the west tower was suggested but not included in the zoning settlement; three bays were added to the east tower.

One Panel member asked if the team is retaining the elevated commercial on the east side, if a new stair on the north side can help provide access, and has the team completed any preliminary energy study based on the new scheme. Mr. Klein responded the stair was never discussed but the team will consider it, energy performance modelling will be done as the team is much happier with this revised strategy.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the facing distance between the new building and the existing east buildings. Mr. Klein explained that the zoning settlement determined the current massing.

4.2 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented to consider putting ramps on both sides of the Basin, provide a glazed system for the passageway that can be fully opened to allow for constant throughway in the warm seasons. The Panel member felt that the new façade strategy seems ingenuine and pastiche, as the exterior does not relate to the interior.

Another Panel member noted the team should provide clarification on why the current retail and public realm area are not animated and identify improvement strategies. This Panel member felt how the building touches the ground is a concern and is not convinced: the doors to the passageway does not encourage public use as it seems private, suggested to offload servicing program to a below grade and provide more animation on north façade- both sides should feel public. The Panel member felt the City should collaborate closely with Parks on the design as there is retail potential to

spill out from the south façade, yet it might be dismissed based on policy- the animation helps the Peter Street Basin public realm dramatically and will greatly benefit the City. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Peter Street Basin is a unique site for Parks.

One Panel member felt perhaps the façade redesign has gone too far and asked the team to consider a more moderate approach to the split elevation façade concept, suggested to do a double-height deviation in the same language to highlight passageway instead of completely different design. The Panel member shared the feeling that the passageway can be fully opened in the summer.

Another Panel member felt there is a green space deficit in the city and access to well programmed open space has to be provided, the intersection with the Basin, bridge and streetscape can be embraced and leveraged to emphasize this importance. The Panel member noted Parks should be involved in the project and would like to see an evolution of the definition of “park space” of our time and ultimately accelerate the development of the ground plane.

One Panel member shared that Parks need to be more involved. The Panel member felt the revised façade strategy is a good starting point in the sense that it is not a generic glass façade, suggested the team to focus on refining the proportions of the buildings, retain more design rigor in the façade development, and study precedents by David Chipperfield where facades are differentiated with many similarities.

Another Panel member appreciated the vertical shift in facade design and the revised retail strategies. The Panel member is concerned that the cladding material will look slightly aesthetically dissimilar to the old building, contrast might not be obvious, the team is encouraged to explore other grid patterns. The Panel member appreciates the passageway conceptually but noted that the precedents look like condo lobbies.

One Panel member appreciated the revised façade, would like to understand the impact on building interior, suggested to reconfigure the ground floor services to create more north-south porosity and visual connectivity between inside and outside. Working closely with Parks, the Panel member felt the Basin and the network of public realm can create a more “promenade” identity.

Another Panel member appreciated the improvements in the design, felt the passageway should be opened for safety and views from both sides of the building. The Panel member felt it is critical to collaborate with Parks on the Basin development.

Should direct access and retail spillage not be provided at the Peter Street Basin open space, one Panel member advised to allow ground floor retail unit adjacent to the north-south passageway to spill out to the passageway and animate the public realm with an operable glass plane.

4.3 Consensus Comments

- The Panel commends the Proponent for responding to previous DRP review comments and is supportive of the revisions.

Ground Floor

- The Panel encourages the team to make the north-south passageway an openable or open double-height space that provides a clear view through the project and a safe pedestrian experience.
- Commends the removal of the north fence- a major improvement for public realm access and porosity of the site
- Consider re-configuring the ground floor services to articulate a stronger front entrance and elevation on north façade

Public Realm

- Public realm continuity is critical for the project, ramps on both sides of the Peter Street Basin to bridge the two levels are needed.
- Provide more detailed public realm plans at the next review and a revised landscape strategy.
- The identity and public realm relationships relating to the Peter Street Basin must be clarified and developed as the project progresses to the next stage of design. The space under the bridge should also be considered as part of the network of public realm connections. The Proponent is encouraged to work collaboratively with Parks to address the challenges. The Panel believes this is a top priority for Waterfront Toronto and is a great opportunity for Parks to add tremendous value for the city.

Building

- Appreciates the façade and exterior re-design, however the Panel questions the design rigor of the new strategy- consider further studies to strengthen the design language, relationship between interior and exterior, and inform the public realm.
- For future phases of the project, consider opportunities for wrapping units to the north faces of the west buildings to take advantage of the views looking north like the proposed east building.

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

Mr. Klein noted the comments from the previous DRP were very helpful and thinks the same for this review- the team will have another look at the façades. Mr. Klein concluded that the north entrance is the main access of the building and it is very important for the project.

Mr Somji noted the site has 750m of boundary and not any open space within the property.

4.4 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 of the project.

5.0 Transit Reset: Union Station – Queens Quay Link Study

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1089
<i>Project Type:</i>	Site Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Information Session
<i>Review Round:</i>	-
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Arup
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto; Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto; Marc-Paul Gauthier, Arup
<i>Delegation:</i>	Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Mereu with Waterfront Toronto began the introduction by noting that the study focuses on the options for re-designing the transit link between Queens Quay and the Union Station to accommodate future capacity; currently it is an underground tunnel that accommodates services of two streetcar lines. While the length of the link is 540m, the project has larger implications on transit on the waterfront including connections to East Bayfront and the Portlands. Mr. Mereu highlighted significant policy implications: the link is crucial to realizing the Waterfront Secondary Plan, sustainable mobility, developments unlocking potential, and leveraging future investments on the waterfront. Mr. Mereu noted the presentation will inform the Panel on the latest design and studies on the project. Mr. Mereu then introduced Mr. Tahair with the City of Toronto to continue the introduction.

Mr. Tahair noted the current existing streetcar loop is inadequate to serve ridership needs, to and from the west, and would not function effectively or safely considering future growth- it was identified as the most important link to the waterfront as all trips lead to Union Station. It is important to note that the modelled numbers for the future usage do not take into consideration of the special events that spike ridership and the two primary options being studied are the Automatic People Mover (APM) and streetcar connection. Mr. Tahair provided an update on the project timeline: present preferred overall solution to the Executive Committee, provide the report to City Council and next steps will be evaluated. Mr. Tahair then introduced Marc-Paul Gauthier to present details of the studies report.

5.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Gauthier began the presentation by noting the technologies of the two primary systems: the APM and streetcar vehicles are similar in length with different propulsion system and capacity. The APM has a higher capacity; no mechanical on the vehicle as it is pulled. Mr. Gauthier recapped the previous study which included an option of the APM with surface streetcar connection at Queens Quay and Bay St. but was later screened out due to space constrain. Mr. Gauthier highlighted guiding design requirements: no level crossings of streetcar tracks underground, provide underground connection to Jack Layton Ferry Terminal, the Ontario Building Code, the Accessibility

for Ontarians and Disabilities Act (AODA), National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), City of Toronto PATH guidelines.

Mr. Gauthier noted the streetcar strategy would expand the existing underground chamber to allow for two vehicles to board simultaneously while both strategies would replace the existing streetcar loop. For the streetcar option, Mr. Gauthier noted the new columns would be slimmer, boarding area will be expanded with added entrances and connections. Pointing to the platform renders looking southbound, Mr. Gauthier noted the slimmer columns that replace the existing footings with premium finishes. For the APM option, Mr. Gauthier noted this option does not require extension of the platform area, potential skylights and platform doors will be provided, a sub-level is required for operation and maintenance on the Queens Quay side, and there is no need for the APMs to loop as they can reverse back out. Mr. Gauthier noted that boarding between APM and streetcar would be level.

Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Tahair noted that the construction cost estimates have been updated and the two options are very similar- with 1 year of construction time longer for streetcar option because it is under the structure of the viaduct. After presenting to the public, Mr. Tahair noted the preliminary preferred option is to expand the streetcar services with the following key reasons: flexibility in operating options for the TTC and from a travel demand perspective most trips still start and end at Union Station. Mr. Gauthier noted the existing streetcar line would be out of service during construction; APM option estimated to take 3 years and streetcar is 4 to 5. Mr. Tahair noted that generally the streetcar option is cheaper at Union Station whereas the APM is the opposite.

Mr. Gauthier added the APM has different fire-rating than the streetcar, ventilation requirements for both options are similar – grade grills and other options are being explored. Mr. Gauthier concluded that the streetcar portal on Queens Quay would require reconfiguration of the parking entrance to the Western hotel – vehicles would enter from the east instead of directly from Queens Quay currently. Ultimately, Mr. Gauthier noted it is a cheaper solution than locating the portal closer to Yonge street as it would avoid further construction conflicts.

5.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member commented that the project is dealing with immense complexities and recommended that an architect should be engaged at this point of design to help create a sense of place, conceive the platform area as an urban room and also as physical wayfinding.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the client of the project. Mr. Tahair explained the client is City of Toronto, the stakeholders are Waterfront Toronto, TTC, and Metrolinx.

One Panel member asked if all the trips are assumed to go through Union Station or some bypass. Mr. Tahair explained that some streetcars will bypass the station and some will go into the Union Station loop.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the project timeline. Mr. Tahair clarified that the next steps for the study is to present the report to City Council, will request for approval for funds to bring the streetcar strategy design up to 30%, create an update to the entire waterfront transit network. Mr. Tahair clarified that the projects are grouped to be reported around this time because there is a deadline for federal funding.

One Panel member asked if the project is in competition with other transit projects for funding, in addition to the selection of the preferred link strategy. Mr. Tahair clarified that the team requires City endorsement and their funding, it is imperative to receive funding in order to continue. Another Panel member asked if there is any council support for the streetcar option, noted that this project is critical for the waterfront and is concerned that other transit initiatives might take all the council attention. Mr. Gauthier noted there is no indication of council preference.

5.5 Consensus Comments

No consensus comments were made.

5.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

Motion to go into “in-camera” session

CLOSING

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