



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #127
Wednesday, Sept. 25, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Brigitte Shim
George Baird
Eric Turcotte
Fadi Masoud
Janna Levitt
Jeff Ranson
Nina-Marie Lister

Regrets

Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Peter Busby

Recording Secretary

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. West Don Lands Block 3,4,7 - Schematic Design
 2. 350 Queens Quay West – Schematic Design
 3. Port Lands Flood Protection Roads – Detailed Design
 4. 162 Queens Quay East – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the July, 24th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict for West Don Lands Block 3,4,7, and recused himself for the review.

The Chair introduced George Zegarac, newly appointed Chief Executive Officer of Waterfront Toronto, to address the Panel. Mr. Zegarac began by noting the large number of ongoing projects and is proud of Waterfront Toronto's objectives towards

design excellence. Mr. Zegarac added that Waterfront Toronto is counting on the DRP's advice to raise design quality while continuing to serve the 5-year Plan. Mr. Zegarac is strongly supportive of the Panel and the work. The Chair thanked Mr. Zegarac for his presence and wished him well moving forward.

The Chair noted that the Panel has been invited by the City of Toronto to participate in a joint review in November for **Next Place**. Mr. Parakh, Urban Design Program Manager with City of Toronto, added **Next Place** is a visioning study for Exhibition Place, exploring public realm opportunities, extension of the trade centre, connectivity to both north and south of the city, and the relationship with Ontario Place. The study began in June and will conclude in December.

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 **East Bayfront Bayside T3** continues to work with the City as the issue of the above-grade parking is not yet resolved, their next DRP has not been determined. For **3C PL1**, Mr. Glaisek noted that the team is expected to return in October 2019 for their Schematic Design review. Mr. Glaisek noted that since the July DRP, the **York Street Park** team has completed Schematic Design and began Detailed Design, they are expected to provide a design update responding to City, Waterfront Toronto, and WDRP comments. The team is expected to return in December 2019 for Detailed Design review.

Mr. Glaisek noted the Panel was helpful in raising the street-wall consistency issue for **178-180 Queens Quay East**, the team negotiated with City staff and landed on a common podium height with **162 Queens Quay East**. The design team is working on a massing study for the lower podium and density swap to the towers - expected to return in December 2019 for Schematic Design review. Mr. Glaisek noted that all comments from the July DRP have been shared with the Sidewalk Labs team. The **Quayside** Buildings, Mobility, and Sustainability Stage 2 review will not take place today as it has been deferred to after Oct. 31st.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto released the Quayside Round 1 Consultation Feedback Report, summarizing the voices of over one thousand citizens and synthesizes feedback from four public meetings, online consultation, thirty-four written submissions received from individuals and organizations, and library drop-in sessions. Mr. Glaisek noted that the design and engineering of the Port Lands Flood Protection Bridges received a Toronto Urban Design Award (TUDA) and the team is excited for the public exposure. One Panel member noted that the unique award category, Special Jury Award for Catalytic Infrastructure, was specifically established for the role of this project. The fabrication for this project is currently taking place in Halifax and Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto completed a site visit this month examining the welding and paint progress details. Ultimately, the pieces will come in barges and will invite the Panel when it arrives in the summer. One Panel member commented that a "living" archive of PLFP progress should be made available for the public. Mr. Glaisek

noted that it is a good idea and the photography team for documenting construction progress has been selected.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the National Association of City Transportation Officials conference took place in Toronto and Waterfront Toronto led two WalkShops with City of Toronto City Planning. The participants showed enthusiasm for Queens Quay, recognized the design challenges and struggle with many of the same issues in their own work. Mr. Glaisek noted that WT has completed the replacement of one hundred and fifty-four trees on Queens Quay that were first installed in October 2018. Due to an airborne fungus active in our climate, the original London Plane trees were made weak and have been replaced with four different species, moving away from monoculture.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the soft-scape work for Aitken Place Park continues, despite value engineering the public art install will take place before the opening which is targeted for the first week of October 2019. Mr. Glaisek also noted that the new public realm work for Bayside streets are ninety percent complete with asphalt, street trees and furniture remaining. The roads and Water's Edge Promenade are expected to be opened to the public in early November 2019. Both Stormwater Facility and Cherry Street realignment work updates will be included in the project updates next month.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7 – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1106
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	COBE, architectsAlliance
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Thomas Krarup, Project Director, COBE; Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Lauren Abrahams, PUBLIC WORK
<i>Delegation:</i>	Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; Tony Medeiros, Dream; Josh Hilbert, Waterfront Toronto; Henry Tang, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
<i>Vote:</i>	Conditional Support - 5; Non-support - 2

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilbert, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the existing site context for Block 3,4,7. Mr. Hilbert highlighted the two planned

adjacent developments, Block 10 and Block 8, have been previously reviewed by the Panel. Mr. Hilburt noted that Block 3,4,7 is part of the Province's Affordable Housing Program as well as the City's Open Doors program and the proponent is proposing 30% affordable units. The proponent team held two design workshops earlier this year to discuss preliminary concepts with stakeholders such as WT, IO, City of Toronto, and Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Although the proponent is bringing the project for a Stage 2 Schematic Design review, a formal application has not yet been submitted to the City. Mr. Hilburt noted the consensus comments from the project's March 2019 Issues Identification review and introduced Henry Tang, Senior Community Planner with the City of Toronto.

Mr. Tang noted that the City has three main inter-related planning issues for Panel consideration: 1) the Precinct Plan's vision for a north-south connection and clearways on street frontages at this street,, 2) massing and built-form for all three blocks including height, step backs, and street frontages, 3) the design of the POP space and other public realm areas in the project. Mr. Hilburt then noted the Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel consideration: building massing in response to site features and constraints, integration with surrounding context, the affordable housing strategy, ground floor design in promoting street animation, POP space configuration and landscape design, and the sustainability targets with respect to Waterfront Toronto's objectives. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Thomas Krarup, Project Director with COBE Architects, to present the design.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Krarup began by recapping the consensus comments from the Issues Identification review and noted that Adam Feldman from architectsAlliance will present the design for Block 7.

Mr. Krarup highlighted the distinct site corners, edges, and adjacent brick buildings, The planning rationale of the site, the Precinct block plans, urban design guidelines, were all reference by the design team to understand the site, address compatibility with the neighborhood and challenges of 2020. Mr. Krarup noted the design iterations produced four approaches: the "diagonal", the "snake", the "round corners", and the "cloud". The "cloud" is the selected strategy.

Building

Mr. Krarup noted that the "cloud" strategy puts people first with an articulated heavy base, and leverages high quality apartments on the top to address today's challenges. The massing creates a courtyard building with strong relationships between interior and exterior, utilizing varying heights to mark corners and respect neighbours. The north-south connection is jogged to create an interesting experience for pedestrians. The four corners of the block are designed as public spaces that will give back to the city.

At the highest corner at thirteen stories, the massing terraces down toward the north-south POP space. Mr. Krarup noted the top volumes utilize metal panels to create visual flickering, interacting with the sky and reflecting light even in overcast days. Mr.

Krarpur then introduced Adam Feldmann, Senior Associate with architectsAlliance to present Block 7.

Mr. Feldmann noted Block 7 takes clues from its context, including 70, 80 Mill Street, to determine its design language of setbacks, shifting of volumes, and material expression. Mr. Feldmann noted the forty to sixty window to wall ratio of shifting grid building façade on the elevations from Cherry Street, and the relationship with the existing 80 Mill Street building. The exterior materiality consists of metal clad brick with light glass elements that alternate up the building. Mr. Feldmann noted there is no primary windows facing the adjacent Mill Street building.

Mr. Krarpur noted that the three blocks operate as one combined project. There is one underground parking entrance shared below Blocks 3 and 4, the units are double loaded with fifty percent window to wall ratio. In summary, Mr. Krarpur noted the development statistics, affordable unit mix, and unit size breakdown.

Public Realm

Ms. Abraham noted that the opportunity for the public realm starts with connecting and linking both the old and new neighbourhoods. There are three primary types of connections: perimeter, neighbourhood, and courtyard connections. The north-south connection pulls the Mill Street experience north, while serving as the front door for the ground floor townhouses. There are four layers of landscape concepts and they increase in privacy as they move up, beginning with the POP space, communal courtyards in both Blocks 3 and 4, upper terrace, and finally the amenities rooftops. Ms. Abrahams noted the POP space landscape proposal is a refuge for biodiversity, celebrating shade with plantings and gardens. The planter is optimized for orientation to maximize light exposure and the POP space courtyard offers a contemplative space for residential buffer. Ms. Abrahams noted the team has an interest in bringing the warmth of clay, the ravines, the clay bluffs, into the landscape design.

Sustainability

Mr. Krarpur provided an overview of the sustainability measures. The project is aiming for LEED Gold and Toronto Green Standards Tier 1.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the relationship of the interior courtyard and the grade level townhouses. Mr. Krarpur answered there are lobbies on either side of the courtyards and bike parking is located on ground level.

The Panel member asked if the terrace can be accessed from the grade level townhouse units. Mr. Krarpur answered the terraces are accessed from level 3 but the residential units facing the terraces do not have direct access. The Panel member asked if there are any principal rooms on the existing 80 Mill Street building facing east. Mr. Feldmann explained that there are four windows per floor on the east elevation of 80 Mill.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the height strategy and if there is vehicular access around the perimeter of the POP space. Mr. Krarup noted that the massing marks the corners at Cherry and Trinity Street at the entrances of the neighbourhood, then steps down closer towards the Mill Street residences. Mr. Feldmann noted the POP space is designated for bikes and pedestrians.

One Panel member asked if there will be sidewalks on the east-west street, understanding that currently it is primarily a service street for the existing buildings, and why the connection was planned in the Precinct Plan as it dead ends. Mr. Parakh explained that the right-of-way of that street will be increased and that it used to be an “L” connection to Cherry Street. The Panel member asked if the affordable housing distribution is spread out or concentrated. Mr. Krarup answered it is completed dispersed.

Another Panel member asked for the amount of land that will be determined as POPS through the Zoning By-law Amendment application. Mr. Feldmann noted the team is working with the City to come to an agreement on that issue. Mr. Tang added that the north-south street, the Precinct Plan, was intended to be a pocket road- this is a question that the City would like the Panel to provide comments.

Another Panel member asked if the terraces are accessible to residents. Mr. Krarup noted that the team will investigate the edge condition between the units facing the terraces – all residents can access the terraces.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that the POP space leaves very little publicness with the jogged form, townhouse frontages, and dog park for residents. It is a very private street. The Panel encouraged the team to consider the spatial quality of the park precedents as Paley Park is very different from the proposed courtyard. The Panel member noted the corners are weak when the top masses are pulled out to provide space for cafes – consider rethinking the red brick volumes, refer to precedents such as Amsterdam School style projects to greatly improve the corners and serve small scale use for residences. The Panel member noted it is important to provide the adjacent context blocks in the physical model with articulated service entrances for comparison with the proposed massing – return with the revised model next time.

Another Panel member appreciated the development, the conceptual urban brick base and lighter top volumes to address site challenges. The affordable housing strategy is a major step forward and it should become the status quo for other new projects. The Panel member noted it is a challenging site with no back side, felt the Block Plan is a leftover from a different planning vision and the team should consider the suggestion of having the POP space prioritize serving Front Street and not connect to the east-west street. The Panel member is disappointed that given the same developer is working on the adjacent blocks, the site plan is not showing the complete context. Waterfront

Toronto's key focus is on the public realm and this site is a critical linking piece. Together with the other developments by DKT, this is a huge portion of City building and the corners and context must be reinforced. The Panel member recommended a section drawing through the block that captures all key relationships between public and private. The Panel member questioned the glazed corner on Block 7 as an appropriate response to Souleppper Theatre. The Panel member noted each elevation has to address very different street conditions, all context elements must be represented, and Block 4 has the potential to improve Cherry Street which is the real litmus test for the public realm design.

One Panel member noted that the intentions are very strong but the result is static. The stepping and massing variations are too subtle, leverage the massing changes to signify a stronger publicness of the POP space connection. It is important to leverage landscape opportunities to address the POP space and all corners of the site. The Panel member suggested to work from private to public articulating the relationships of all the interfaces between townhouse, apartment unit, POP space, and street.

Another Panel member appreciated the subtlety of the design, the concept of base and top, and the treatment along the Front Street ground floor façade. The Panel member appreciated the cosy POPS courtyard as the city lacks intimate spaces, the risk of privatisation can be addressed with great landscape design and indicators to the public. The Panel member advocated for public spaces with different scales, recommended moving the bike parking from the ground floor to below grade and moving the Block 7 main entrance from Mill to Cherry Street. In terms of sustainability, the Panel member noted the proposal does not currently meet greenhouse gas requirements, it is nowhere near the design excellence for TGS Tier 1, and suggested to reference LEED 4.1 for carbon metrics for carbon credit strategies. Decarbonization of the development should be a priority.

One Panel member appreciated the project and the thorough design. The Panel member commended the micro identity of the project transitioning from historic to a new neighbourhood- consider a micro district plan that demonstrates how the interconnected public spaces are designed together. The Panel member was concerned with the massing impact on the public realm, the team should provide a simple diagram that overlays shadow impact on the public realm. The Panel member noted that the townhouses, in need of privacy, will have blinds down and be detached from the courtyard- suggested to utilize high quality landscape design to create publicness, transitions, and let retail spill into the POP space. The Panel member recommended to elevate sustainability goals if biodiversity is celebrated- both priorities should be robust.

Another Panel member thanked the team for the many design iterations and thoughtful presentations. The Panel member noted providing wider site context will speed up the Panel's understanding and conversations. The POP space can leverage a stronger landscape connection strategy to improve sustainability and increase carbon points- consider expanding the concept of biodiversity to beyond the central planter. The Panel member suggested to thje City to update the TGS requirements to allow more of the bike parking to be moved below grade. The Panel member noted that the POP space

does not signify publicness and consider using landscape design to give the blocks a cohesiveness. The overcast and winter perspectives showing the project are appreciated.

One Panel member was convinced and commended the clarity of the heavy base, lighter top strategy for Blocks 3,4, and endorsed the glass massing for Block 7. More site context is strongly advised, including the Soulpepper building. The current POP space strategy is ambiguous, the courtyard is over-complicated sectionally, the Panel member suggested to consider the south POPS entrance become a firm service back street while providing a larger opening onto Front Street for pedestrian access only. On the ground floor, consider moving the bike parking underground thus eliminating the need for the ground floor podia and allow further massing simplification. The Panel member noted the team is overly optimistic about the roof terrace conditions as the current proposal will require a thick slab and soil volume. Lastly, the Panel member noted the ground conditions should be coordinated with sunlight and the building corners should be designed differently to address unique urban conditions.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- The Panel commended the team for the constant evolution of the design and appreciated the helpful presentation.
- Many private versus public relationships in the project are unclear, including transition zones, thresholds, and townhouses that front onto the POP space, townhouses facing the east-west service street, townhouses on Mill St., and units that look onto the third-floor roof amenity terrace.
- The current townhouse and courtyard relationship creates a very private POP space while introducing privacy concerns for the townhouse residents, consider alternatives and rethink the placement of units. ie. A larger Front St. facing public space that does not connect to the east-west street if a through-block connection is not necessary.

Building

- The Panel appreciated the site context studies
- Recommended the team to fully represent contextual information and key neighbouring sites in the presentation, including the Soulpepper Theatre and other buildings on Mill Street.
- Appreciated the 3D rendering of the project in the winter and on a cloudy day.
- Supported the massing concept of brick base with lighter colored volumes on top.
- For Block 7, given the site context to the south, rethink the appropriateness of townhouse units at grade.
- Consider shifting more of the bicycle parking underground and free up more ground floor activation space.

- The project corners are underdeveloped, consider further developing Blocks 3 and 4 building massing to create great public corner spaces.
- The Panel was concerned with the relationship between Block 7, Block 4, and the Cherry St. curve, provide more site context to the east.
- Based on the shadow studies provided, the Panel is concerned that the courtyard POP space will have little sunlight even during noon hours in the fall and spring, rethink the POP space strategy and/or building massing.

Landscape

- Although the biodiversity “round planter” concept in the POP space is appreciated, consider a more robust ecological landscape strategy that can contribute to improving the sustainability performance of the project.
- Consider a stronger landscape strategy in the public realm to improve connectivity, such as at the corners of the site.

Sustainability

- The sustainability targets are too low for the project, it is important for the team to consider more ambitious objectives.
- The Panel members that voted Non-support expressed sustainability objectives as a key concern.

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

Mr. Feldmann thanked the Panel for the comments. Mr. Krarup noted the team is aware and has been working closely with the larger site context, however due to shipping logistics they are not able to bring the 2m by 2m site model to the review – will improve the communication of the site context at the next review.

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 Conditional Support for the project (Conditional Support: 5; Non-support: 2).

2.0 350 QQE

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1073
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<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; Brad Keeler, Forrec

Delegation: Ken Brooke, Quadrangle; Shehzad Somji, Pacific Reach Properties Development; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Katherine Bailey (not present for review), City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Vote: **Full Support - 7 ; Non-support - 1**

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the third review for the project, the focus will primarily be on the public realm design and an update to the building elevation design. Ms. Kim provided a recap of previous Panel comments from March 2019 and noted the key design updates: public realm at grade, new ramps from Queens Quay to the basin level, and minor changes to the massing and elevation design. Ms. Kim noted that Waterfront Toronto is in conversation with PF&R on the design of the Peter Street Basin and surrounding public realm work. Mr. Glaisek reminded the Panel that the basin and surrounding public realm is City owned and is not part of the proponent's responsibility. The proponent has committed, through Section 37, \$0.5 million to its improvements and Waterfront Toronto is working with PF&R to leverage that amount into a larger effort. Ms. Kim noted the Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel consideration: the interface between building and ground plane, passageways through the buildings, revised material palette and elevation design, street interfaces, public realm continuity, and the landscape strategy. Ms. Kim then introduced Les Klein to present.

2.2 Project Presentation

Les Klein, Principal and Co-founder with Quadrangle, began the presentation by recapping the history of the project, highlighting the designs presented at the previous two DRPs, and reiterated that Rees Street Park is a key element for the ground floor design to address. Mr. Klein introduced Brad Keeler, Assistant Director with Forrec, to present the public realm design.

Public Realm

Mr. Keeler thanked the Panel for past comments and noted that the existing condition of the public realm is car dominated. In outlining the public realm, Mr. Keeler noted opportunities to create north-south strong connections from Queens Quay to basin and a passageway to connect with the northern areas. Mr. Keeler noted the existing site context: granite steps from Queens Quay and existing trees which must be relocated to maintain the 3m clearance. Mr. Keeler noted the tabletop crossing in the public realm calms traffic and improves safety for pedestrian connections to **Rees Street Park**, north to Lake Shore Blvd., and to the TTC transit stop. At Lake Shore, the existing sidewalk and multi-purpose trail are swapped to give pedestrian priority without passing over the trail. Mr. Keeler noted a low curb is proposed along the property line, with bollards and lighting to improve pedestrian safety, while the same red granite pavers will continue through the passageway to ensure a strong connection to the sidewalk. Mr. Keeler noted a new fence design is proposed to replace the existing TTC safety fence. Layby parking is proposed on the east side interfacing with the future **Rees Street Park**. Mr.

Keeler noted the team would like the Panel's feedback on the existing public art piece at the basin.

Mr. Klein noted that the north-south passageway could be closed due to climate and the east-west connection is a commitment by the client after the existing retail lease expires. Mr. Klein noted that the bridge in the passageway is glazed to ensure transparency, and the long façade along Lake Shore will be cladded in a graphic featuring the skyline of the city. Lastly, Mr. Klein noted that the overall building material palette has been simplified and the lower tower mass has been revised to a lighter colour.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is a glazed screen proposed above the openings of the north-south passageway and if retail is planned next to the passageway. Mr. Klein confirmed there is a glazed screen and the retail will have addresses on both frontages.

Another Panel member asked if the bollards are primarily for providing lighting to the public realm. Mr. Keeler answered that their intent is to separate cars from the pedestrian sidewalk and trail. One Panel member asked for the rationale on the planter sizes. Mr. Keeler noted that the planters are designed to maximize sidewalk space.

Another Panel member asked if the planter beds can contribute to stormwater management. Mr. Keeler noted that as there are more planter volumes on Rees Street, that area will capture stormwater. On the north side, the size of the planters are limited by the spacing of the columns. One Panel member asked for clarification of grade bike parking. Mr. Klein noted there is bike parking on the west and north side of the building.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the white material on the building. Mr. Klein noted that it is a precast cladding. One Panel member asked if the retail tenancy is long term. Mr. Somji answered that it is planned to be long term leases.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the different slab edge treatments in the elevation design. Mr. Klein noted the intent is to produce variety in the façade- the tallest tower emphasizes verticality while the lower ones break from the grid.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the work on the landscape improvements. The Panel member noted the glazed screens at the passageway openings compromise the openness of the double height experience, consider removal and ensure the gate, if

necessary, should lie flat on the soffit in the opened position. The Panel member expressed on-going opposition to the heterogenous façade strategy to create a sense of variety.

Another Panel member commented that the public realm design is set up for success however the basin is currently a missing piece. It should be addressed by Waterfront Toronto and the City as it presents a huge opportunity for improvement including possible floating wetlands, shade, public art- a robust spatial public realm strategy to activate an otherwise under-utilized sunken public space.

One Panel member commented that the project is exciting and appreciated the evolution of the design. The Panel member noted that the materiality and details will be critical in demonstrating that the project supports a unique waterfront design standard. On the other hand, the Panel member encouraged the team to consider signage and lighting which will determine the quality of the public realm.

Another Panel member commended the project for greatly improving the design and the bones are present for success. The Panel member questioned whether the passageway doors are required and asked the team to consider the design and experience of the raised retail area on the second floor.

One Panel member noted the public realm is robust and grounded. Ensure there is collaboration between the various stewards of the basin to create a highly used public realm. The Panel member noted the bridge that passes through the north-south passageway should be designed to maximize transparency, further develop the Lake Shore entrance to mirror the south counterpart, and consider reconfiguring the Lakeshore ground floor frontage to create more opportunities for animation between inside and outside.

Another Panel member noted the elevation is too flat and consider further articulating the fenestration, slab edge, and cladding details to add depth to the design while capturing light and shadows. The Panel member noted to consider providing shade, such as with awnings on the buildings, to better respond to environmental challenges and improve the public realm around the basin. The Panel member recommended to look for a more robust bollard specification, create design continuity across the project with consistent detailing, and reduce variation in the building columns and piers.

One Panel member appreciated the reduction in graphic quality of the building elevation, but suggested to create more depth and plasticity from building extending to the public realm. The panel member noted the site is rare with many nearby green spaces that are invaluable in the waterfront area – create an east-west section drawing that articulates the experience from basin to the park. The Panel member recommended to design the east-west connection now so it is ready when the retail leases expire to ensure the investment is maximized.

Another Panel member commented that the perspective rendering labelled “North Entry Drive” reveals the awkward building massing close to the ground level, consider further refinement and simplify the second level massing, expression of the pillars and

maintain the openness of the double height passageway. The Panel member commended the public realm strategy of slowing down traffic.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Public realm is the focus on this review, along with updates to building design shown previously.
- Strong support for the overall project design.

Building

- Appreciated the revisions to the north-south passageway design and consider if doors are necessary for its functionality.
- The east-west connection to future **Rees Street Park** is critical, encouraged the team to consider fully in the design now, not wait until future.
- Suggestions to improve the ground floor and second floor building frontage along Lakeshore to create opportunities for more transparency and public realm animation.
- Encouraged the design team to create depth in the building elevation, consider further articulating fenestration.
- The Panel felt the north wall addition to the western-most tower would be very positive in completing the development and encouraged the City and proponent to pursue it in the future when the parking garage becomes subject for development.

Landscape

- Overall support for the landscape design.
- The Panel encouraged Waterfront Toronto and PF&R to take advantage of this opportunity to advance the public realm surrounding Peter Street Basin.
- Proposed bollards look flimsy, consider alternatives.
- Consider the consistent use of public realm details to create cohesiveness in the design. ie the railing detail.
- It is important to provide shade in the public realm around the basin, consider the incorporation of awnings and other shading devices on the retail facades.

Sustainability

- n/a

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

Mr. Klein thanked the Panel for their comments and noted the specific comments are very helpful for the team moving forward.

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 for the project (Full Support: 7 ; Non-support: 1).

3.0 PLFP Roads DD

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1095
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Fifth
<i>Location:</i>	Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	DTAH, WSP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	See-Yin Lim, DTAH; James Roche, DTAH; Aaron Small, WSP
<i>Delegation:</i>	Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, WT; Shannon Baker, Director, Parks and Public Realm
<i>Vote:</i>	Full Support - Unanimous

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Director of Parks & Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that DTAH and WSP are here to present an update to the Roads design. The design team has worked closely with MVVA (the parks and river lead), and the bridge team to ensure all design elements are working well. Ms. Baker presented the updated anticipated construction schedule and reminded the Panel that the ROW width was established through the environmental assessment. One of the key challenges for the design team is finding balance in minimizing the conflict between industrial use such as trucks and pedestrians. Ms. Baker noted that the Low Impact Design streetscapes at PLFP recently become a city-wide standard to ensure sustainability and green measures for future streets. Recapping previous comments, Ms. Baker noted that the team was encouraged to “loosen” the street designs by rewilding the Don and further differentiate the three street characters. Ms. Baker noted that a Port Lands public art plan is being developed and will be deployed with the Parks presentation when they return to DRP. For areas for the Panel to consider, Ms. Baker noted the design’s capacity in blurring the Park and Roads, integration of Vision Zero into the street designs, capitalization of sustainability opportunities, and the unique character of each street. Ms. Baker then introduced James Roche, Partner with DTAH, to give the design presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Roche noted that the presentation will be co-presented with See-Yin Lim with DTAH. Mr. Roche noted that the presentation today will focus on describing the three street characters: Cherry Street is urban, Commissioners is “park”, and Don Roadway is a “river” street focusing on habitat and food. Mr. Roche noted that the street right-of-

way is set at 40m but each street has a different amount allocated for non-auto use, with an average of 71.9%. Mr. Roche explained the six landscape types, the green infrastructure facilities including open planter with passive irrigation and bioswale, and proposed the material palettes. Mr. Roche noted that study workshops were held with MVVA on the planting design and the plant types are illustrated on the large plan drawing displayed on the wall- a physical model was employed to assist with the study.

Mr. Roche detailed the design of Commissioners Street, highlighting the planting strategy, green infrastructure facilities, sectional relationships at Old Cherry and Future Foundry Street, west of future Villiers Street, new Munition Street, mid-block crossings, TTC platforms, and lay-bys. Mr. Roche further detailed the mid-block crossings, intersection design including Wheel-Trans and passenger car pick-up/drop-off, dedicated bus lane, and a traffic movement overlay study. Mr. Roche noted that Don Roadway is characterized as a transportation and ecological corridor, detailing its sectional relationships at the river promenade, transition towards the river, interim and future crossings and lay-bys. Ms. Lim noted that the planting strategy is focused on creating a strong ecological corridor, Commissioners Street's landscape will be visually younger than Cherry Street while Don Roadway will create the experience of walking through a new park established through a unified canopy.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member noted many of the elements have not changed since last DRP and asked for clarification on material consistency across the design as the question was previously raised. Mr. Roche explained that the benches on Cherry Street have been removed while revisions to other elements are still under discussion to reach consensus.

Another Panel member asked if the design is accounting for changes in record lake water levels. Ms. Lim answered that the team is working with the latest lake level, studying each area individually to assess the impact of high water on the design and anticipating that some plantings may be in water. Certain elements, like bioswales, are addressing those concerns. The Panel member asked if the team is reconsidering the columnar trees and the rationale for their design. Mr. Roche noted the trees were discussed with MVVA and it was decided to keep them. The Panel member asked if the team is at the stage to consider cost savings in selecting rotational mowing for the meadows. Mr. Roche noted the team will consider this suggestion. Ms. Baker added Waterfront Toronto has conducted visits recently to discuss meadows and other marine strategies.

Another Panel member asked why a railing is required at the river promenade on Don Roadway and Commissioners Street. Ms. Lim explained that approximately two-thirds of the promenade is railing-free. The Panel member asked for clarification on the hydro pylons shown in sections but not in plans to understand the treatment of remnant pieces from the existing site. Ms. Lim answered that there are two hydro pylons being redesigned by Toronto Hydro while the one on Commissioners Street will remain as is.

The Panel member noted it is important to distinguish the difference treatment of these elements.

One Panel member asked for clarification of the Public rights-of-way space allocation diagram. Mr. Roche noted the diagram illustrates the differences between the streets and highlights the publicness. Ms. Baker added that typically the vehicular dedication is much higher on other city streets- the design condition is unique and extraordinary. The Panel member asked for the rationale behind the small turning radii at the intersection of Commissioners and Cherry Street. Mr. Small, Land Development Manager with WSP, explained that the small turning radii slow down traffic, increase pedestrian waiting space, and reduce the overall distance of the crossing.

Another Panel member asked for the timing of the Don Roadway extension south of Commissioners Street. Ms. Baker noted it is dependent on the developments. The Panel member asked for clarification on the mid-block refuge islands and if they are shown as an interim condition design. Ms. Lim explained that they are permanent designs that take into consideration of the final street conditions. The Panel member asked for the rationale of the cycle lane being in the middle of Commissioners Street as opposed to running on the park side of the street. Ms. Lim explained that the transit bridge will not be completed until later, without which will not allow a continuous line of bike lane crossing the river, therefore the design currently requires the cyclists to cross to the south side to continue their route.

One Panel member asked if the team discussed having the bike lanes together instead of uni-directional. Ms. Mallozzi, Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, noted that the proposed design was selected as faster for commuters. The Panel member asked for the rationale behind the mid-block crossing on Don Roadway that is offset to the east, and the bike trail crossing at Don Roadway and Lake Shore Boulevard East. Mr. Roche noted the offset accommodates the turning radii of vehicles. Ms. Lim explained that the bike trail diverts around the existing bents to stay continuous- this is a temporary solution until the Gardiner is moved.

Another Panel member asked if the firehall building is moved in the proposed design. Mr. Roche confirmed that it is moved.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that the presentation covered many loose ends and was impressed with the development. The Panel member was concerned that the different inventory of street elements and furniture would slowly undergo a process of gradual normalization in time due to maintenance and replacement. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the team is using many similar, standardized components to create character – precious materials are used rarely. Ms. Baker added the planting strategy is the differentiator, work will be carefully coordinated with the City, and there are new resources being dedicated into the maintenance of the Green Streets program at the City, there will be a specialized team to manage these pilot projects.

Another Panel member commended the team for the collaboration work, showing the sophistication of the edges of the project, and long-term view accommodating environmental and seasonal changes – an important infrastructural investment for the City. The planting species diversity is a rich palette that will be an asset to the public realm and example of city infrastructure. On the changing lake level, the Panel member noted that design diversity can accommodate the changing conditions- the challenge is recognized and supported. The Panel member noted the team should celebrate the public cost savings through wild landscapes as it requires less maintenance, grazing, and mowing.

One Panel member appreciated the overall exciting opportunity. Other than the ecological sustainable qualities of the planting design, the Panel member felt the design was too anonymous, lacking a strong sense of place – consider showing both now and future conditions for drawings, and seasonal impacts of the waterfront. The Panel member noted that arguments could be made for something special that goes beyond the normal street standards to create stronger characters. The Panel member noted that the interface between park and road should be made into exemplary, unique moments.

Another Panel member suggested to differentiate pedestrian and bike lane paving materials, and consider stroller use at crossing pinch points. One Panel member appreciated the landscape design and supported the overall approach to the design and character of the park. The Panel member suggested to further slow down traffic with physical elements and further reduce the striped asphalt zones in the design.

Another Panel member commended the improvement to the design. The Panel member suggested for the team to further highlight how the design contributes to one of the most unique opportunities in North America. Consider including a critique of existing road design to further illustrate the contributions- establish new benchmarks for this project and explain the added values.

One Panel member appreciated the thoughtful and thorough presentation. The Panel member recommended to identify the reference point in which the excellence of the street design is measured, point out the advantages of the design relative to regular streets. The Panel member felt the edge conditions where park meets road are still under-developed, consider further clarification on the design approach.

Given the project is entering its final stage of design, another Panel member recommended the design team to focus on a selected few Panel comments and do them well.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Overall support for the project.

- The Panel encouraged the team to identify and strengthen elements that will make the project more powerful and exciting, ie. emphasize the extraordinariness of the streets such as spatial allocation, etc.

Landscape

- The character of the streets could be strengthened by considering long-term and seasonal impact in developing a unique Toronto character.
- Articulate and celebrate elements of the project that stand out from the status quo.
- Climate change will have an impact on the project, consider an approach for design and planting diversity.
- At the crossings and refuge areas, consider the materiality and space allocation to ensure accommodation of the aging population.
- Consider both the interim and future site conditions in the design approach, ie. the cycling path design before and after the moving of the Gardiner structure

Sustainability

- n/a

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

Mr. Roche thanked the Panel for their comments and will work with MVVA to continue to develop the crossing designs.

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 (Full Support: Unanimous).

4.0 162 Queens Quay East – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1104
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	162 Queens Quay GP Inc.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Kirkor Architects, Alexander Budrevics + Associates
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects; Shannon Gallant, Alexander Budrevics + Associates Landscape Architects; Carleigh Oude-Reimerink, Armstrong Planning & Project Management
<i>Delegation:</i>	Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
<i>Vote:</i>	Conditional-support - Unanimous

4.1 Introduction

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the project site context, East Bayfront precinct plan, public transit in the neighborhood, adjacent developments, and the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan Policy Context. Ms. Kim noted that 162 and 178-180 Queens Quay East (QQE) have agreed to the lower 18.5m datum for the Queens Quay podium frontage and resolved the discrepancy pointed out by the Panel in previous reviews. Ms. Kim noted that the team from 178-180 QQE is also present today to observe in the review of 162 QQE. Ms. Kim noted this is the likely the proponent's final Stage 3 Detailed Design DRP, following Schematic Design review in May 2019. Ms. Kim provided a recap of previous Panel comments and introduced Paul Mule, Senior Community Planner with the City of Toronto, who noted that many of the massing and built form issues have been addressed by the proponent- the City does not have major concerns at this point. Ms. Kim noted Waterfront Toronto's areas for Panel consideration: the revised building material palette and elevation designs, proposed landscape treatment, Northwest building corner condition at grade, rooftop design, and the revised sustainability targets. Ms. Kim then introduced David Butterworth, Partner with Kirkor, to give the presentation.

4.2 Presentation

Mr. Butterworth began by noting that the team has responded to the previous Panel comments from last review and tested the idea of shifting the podium volume westward to reinforce the presence of the 18.5m podium wall. The studies indicated that the perceived difference is minor and the move would also require shifting the density up to the top of the tower which is not possible due to the OMB restriction in height.

Building

Mr. Butterworth noted the ground floor plan has been revised to include larger public realm context and visions of the new public road that can accommodate pedestrian uses. Mr. Butterworth noted that materiality of the building has been modified: darker panels are shifted away from the corner of the massing introducing a brighter, white corner, and a stainless-steel panel intermittently add reflections and environment colors to the building. The shades of the colour Panels have been reduced from three to two and the scattering of the colours have been simplified. Mr. Butterworth noted the sectional details where the glass meets the panel cladding.

Landscape

On the ground floor public realm, Mr. Butterworth noted that benches and planters have been removed, Waterfront Toronto streetscape design has been incorporated into the drawings, and the retail elevations have been further detailed. The team is exploring landscape options for the rooftop terrace and skylights, and developing a planting palette focused on native species. Mr. Butterworth noted that the corner columns and ground floor canopy help anchor the corners in a consistent language.

Sustainability

Mr. Butterworth provided a building performance update with respect to TGS, energy modelling results, and that the team is still in talks with Enwave for district energy use.

Finally, Mr. Butterworth noted that the animation videos demonstrate the quality and colours from having intermittent reflective cladding panels.

4.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the underside of the balcony slab is insulated. Mr. Butterworth clarified that it is and will be implemented in the renderings.

Another Panel member asked if there is an elevation drawing showing the new east-west street with the loading and parking ramp of the building. Mr. Butterworth explained it is shown on p.29 of the presentation. The Panel member asked for clarification on the Study Room. Mr. Butterworth noted the Study Room is on the second floor above the ramp to the parking. The Panel member asked if the ground floor elevations show proposed art work. Mr. Butterworth noted the team is working towards those details.

One Panel member asked if the wedge triangle shape reflects the correct property line. Mr. Butterworth noted it is part of the OMB settlement. Another Panel member asked how the reflective panels work in terms of bird-friendly requirements. Mr. Butterworth noted it is similar to glass. While the panels primarily exist above the 12m datum line, the team will examine closely with a physical mock-up.

One Panel member asked if the team considered moving some of the loading and service areas to below grade to improve the animation of the north façade. Mr. Butterworth noted it was discussed with the client and the City – the team felt current balance is satisfactory.

4.2 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member recommended shifting more bike parking to below grade to further activate north façade, further development on the north ground level façade, and it is important for the roof terrace to provide a visually desirable view for the residents.

Another Panel member appreciated the team's responses to Panel comments. Further reducing the EUI is encouraged- maximize envelope insulation. The proposed revised palette is a bird strikes concern, consider specifying bird frit throughout. The Panel member noted the design of the underside of the soffit ground floor is haphazard, the wood strips are not cohesive, consider further development. The renderings showing four seasons do not accurately reflect the seasonal impacts, more development is required. The Panel member is concerned that the deep courtyard will not receive enough daylight and felt the renderings can be further improved for accuracy and precision.

One Panel member commended the team for the progress of the project and appreciated the efforts to address Panel concerns. As there is significant frontage for loading and services on the north façade, the Panel member commented the nature of the east-west street should be further developed, consider drawing a complete section from buildings to street – this is an important concern for the City as well. The Panel member noted that the street character provides opportunities that are signature and unique to the waterfront, it is important for the City to provide a clear stance and vision on the street. Regarding the ground floor facades, the Panel member recommended the team show its final intent, including material finishes, details and art components. The Panel member commented that it is important to credit precedent images used in the presentation and provide page numbers.

Another Panel member appreciated the massing response to a challenging site. The animation showed that the courtyard is very deep. The Panel member commended the façade design exploration and appreciated the incorporation of Waterfront Toronto streetscape design to Queens Quay- consider the placement of the “leaf” in relation to the entrance of the building. The Panel member recommended to utilize plantings to form part of the design language and accurately show it in the drawings.

One Panel member noted the rooftop is an important amenity for residents, the rendering of the landscape should match the proposed species. By accurately representing the design intent, the Panel member felt it will also contribute to the selling of the project.

Another Panel member commented that an EUI of 170 is barely acceptable considering the lifespan of the project and recommended the team to further develop the details of the wood canopies meeting the corner columns, noting that the Richardson corner is more tectonically successful than the Queens Quay condition- revise the details for design consistency and conceptual clarity.

4.3 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the serious and detailed responses to previous Panel comments.
- Commended the video animations in illustrating how all the pieces come together.
- Congratulated the team for the continued evolution of the project.

Building

- Consider further refinement to the building corners, specifically the canopy details and interface with corner columns.
- Clarify the final intent of the ground floor facades, specifically the north elevation in relation to the new east-west street, consider enhanced treatment of the loading and service frontages and doors.
- Consider bird control measures for the mirror-finish metal panels.

Landscape

- The roof terrace is an important amenity for residents, consider enhancing the landscape species, provide more accurate representation in drawings of seasonality.

Sustainability

- The project is barely meeting the EUI requirement, consider maximizing insulation throughout the building envelope and other strategies.

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

Mr. Butterworth agreed with the Panel's comments on the renderings and representation. The current drawings are using generic vegetation and will further develop it next time.

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 Conditional Support for the project (Conditional-support: Unanimous).

Motion to go into "in-camera" session

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.