



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #130
Wednesday, Dec. 11th, 2019**

Present

Nina-Marie Lister, Acting Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Paul Bedford
Betsy Williamson
Peter Busby
Janna Levitt
Brigitte Shim

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. West Don Lands Block 20 – Issues Identification
 2. East Bayfront Boardwalk & In-water Pipe – Detailed Design
 3. George Brown College (GBC) The Arbour – Detailed Design
 4. York Street Park – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the November 20th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared a conflict for **West Don Lands Block 20**. Claude Cormier and Pat Hanson declared conflicts for **York Street Park**. They recused themselves for the project reviews.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting **3C** met with Waterfront Toronto to review consensus comments from November's DRP and discuss next steps. The team is working to respond to Panel comments and will provide updates on facade paneling, terrace landscape design, and Queens Quay streetscape integration. Mr. Glaisek noted the team is expected to return to DRP in February 2020.

Mr. Glaisek noted that **Eireann Quay's** dock wall rehab broke ground on Oct. 25th, 2019 and the demolition of the concrete cap is in progress. Mr. Glaisek noted the project is expected to return to DRP in February 2020.

One Panel member provided an update on the joint review of **NEXT PLACE Master Plan** which took place on Nov. 28th, 2019. The Panel member noted the study compartmentalized the site into three main areas: a park-like theme for Liberty Grand, an active zone around BMO Stadium, and a major public gathering space at the parking lots. The Panel member noted the study contemplated a land bridge over to Ontario Place.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek noted that the art piece "Light Keeper" has been installed at **Aitken Place Park** and provided a video of the work in action. Mr. Glaisek noted the art piece was commissioned by Waterfront Toronto and designed by Studio North.

Mr. Glaisek then noted the upcoming tentative DRP agenda for January 2020, including **West Don Lands Block 10** Detailed Design, **Rees Street Park** Issues Identification, **Outer Marina Rowing Facility** Schematic Design, and **Quayside Mobility, Buildings, Sustainability** Stage 2 review.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block 20 – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1112
<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>	Henning Larsen Architects
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Michael Sørensen, Partner, Henning Larsen Architects
<i>Delegation:</i>	Leon Lai, Waterfront Toronto; Jordan Kemp, Dream; Benjamin Hoff, Urban Strategies; Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer Infrastructure Developments Inc.; Bori Kang, Henning Larsen

Architects; Henry Tang, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leon Lai, Design Review Panel Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting this is the Issues Identification review for West Don Lands Block 20. Mr. Lai noted the District Energy building described in the 2006 Precinct Block Plan is no longer contemplated for the site, and the Proponent is speaking with the City about options for developing the site. Mr. Lai noted rail protection is required along the southern boundary of the site and that the historic Cherry Street Switching Tower south of the streetcar loop will be relocated to the east side of Block 20. Mr. Lai provided a summary of the development context: Block 20 is south of future Block 8, west of future Block 9's school and community centre, and southeast of future Blocks 3,4,7, 10, and 12.

Mr. Lai provided a recap of West Don Lands policy context from the CWSP and the Precinct Plan vision for the site. In 2006's Block Plan, Block 20 was envisioned to include a 15m parking garage and a 24m tower, it later had a District Energy building proposal, and the roof as a green semi-public accessible terrace. Mr. Lai noted the District Energy building came to the DRP in 2006.

Mr. Lai provided a recap of Jan. 2019's Detailed Design review of Block 8, highlighting the view of Tank House Lane looking west with the townhouse facades and Blocks 8A and 8B towers on top of the podium. Mr. Lai then introduced Henry Tang, Senior Community Planner with City of Toronto to present City issues.

Mr. Tang provided a recap of the existing zoning by-laws for the site and planning issues including rail protection requirements for the site and impact on Block 8, and public realm integration with future Block 9. Mr. Lai noted the Waterfront Toronto areas for Panel Consideration: site parameters to be considered for this parcel, recommendations on the design of the open spaces, public realm interface with adjacent blocks, and sustainability ambitions and targets. Mr. Lai then introduced Michael Sørensen, Partner with Henning Larsen Architects, to give the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Site Context

Mr. Sørensen began the presentation by providing a recap of the site context, noting that the site boundaries are animated by the streetcar loop, which has the potential to tie everything together. Mr. Sørensen provided the context within a 5min walking radius, the objective of carrying forward the historic component of the City into a new era, and existing building heights in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Sørensen noted the site has the potential to add density and create a link between both urban and natural features of the City. The team is interested in creating a pedestrian focused facility with service and loading areas accessed from the east end of the site. At the southern edge of the site, Mr. Sørensen noted the rail corridor has a 3m height difference with the project grade and a crash wall is required to allow for

alternative development potential. The team is contemplating uses that can be offered through the construction of the crash wall, referencing 31A Parliament Street as precedent. Mr. Sørensen noted they are proposing a crash wall that is 7m above the rail level.

Mr. Sørensen noted the team sees potential in leveraging the crash wall to provide service and loading along the southern edge at grade while opening the remaining site for commercial and amenity uses along the streets. Mr. Sørensen noted the team is contemplating potential accommodation of residential program with grade access facing Tank House Lane adjacent to Blocks 8A and 8B.

Sustainability

Mr. Sørensen noted the team is targeting 60% vision glass to solid wall ratio and LEED Gold Certification.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the parking garage, parking provisions for the site, and if built projects can handle their own parking demand. Adam Feldmann, Senior Associate with architectsAlliance, noted that West Don Lands developments mostly meet their own parking demands. The Panel member asked if some of the proposed parking will serve Block 8 and clarification on the Ontario Line alignment as related to Block 20. Mr. Sørensen answered the parking will not serve Block 8. Mr. Tang added that the Ontario Line alignment is in flux and will likely go underground at the site. The Panel member asked if the Proponent is assuming the project can be built without confirmation of the Ontario Line alignment. Mr. Sørensen answered yes. The Panel member asked for the status of the Block 8 bridges. Mr. Feldmann noted the pedestrian bridge between 8A and 8B has been confirmed.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the Block 8 renderings shown in the presentation. Mr. Sørensen noted they show Tank House Lane as pedestrian, the buildings have the character of the Distillery District, and the residential component is proposed on top of mixed-use podiums with underground parking. Mr. Sørensen noted the access to Block 20's loading is off the street adjacent to Block 8C. The Panel member asked if the team is contemplating a program of two to three floors of retail or commercial with residential above. Mr. Sørensen responded yes.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that setting up an east-west pedestrian spine through the site, and treating the public realm as a natural extension of the Distillery District laneway, could create a pedestrian safety concern that the team needs to address.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to consider strategies for improving pedestrian movement and safety. The Panel member suggested encroaching on the air

rights of the TTC loop and integrating the infrastructure into the building. The Panel member suggested adding a crosswalk, slow traffic on Cherry Street, and creating a special entrance on the west façade.

One Panel member noted that interaction with the future school/ community centre is important and while the integration of loading and parking on the south edge of the site is appreciated, the entrance should be designed elegantly, i.e.. a woonerf style transition from the street. Due to the site's proximity to the tracks, the Panel member noted acoustics will be a challenge unless the team is looking at triple glazed units. Indoor air quality and the location of fresh air intake should be considered carefully as well.

Another Panel member noted the project has the potential to deliver a scale and sensibility that is like the Canary District. The Panel member felt the pedestrian lane could be more intimate. In terms of pedestrian safety, the Panel member noted the team will have to work closely with TTC to address the challenges and suggested shifting the entrance of the building further south to avoid the loop.

One Panel member appreciated the project's objective of bridging the urban and the natural. The Panel member noted zoning and open space provisions are critical to the site: avoid casting shadows on the open space and maximize the use of vegetation throughout the building. The Panel member encouraged the team to create a rougher, more urban landscape to address the east end of the site.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the Proponent's conceptual sensitivity to the site for human use and bridging the urban and the natural.
- Ensure the design is sensitive to human scale and materiality.
- Pedestrian safety is a priority concern in Toronto. Provide a strong and safe pedestrian connection to and through the site.

Public Realm

- Given that Toronto is experiencing pedestrian safety challenges and this project will further increase the demand for pedestrians to cross Cherry St. mid-block, it is recommended that special attention be paid to the design of the public realm to ensure pedestrian safety in accessing the project.
- It is important for the materiality and scale of the west side of the project to address the TTC area and characteristics of the Distillery District.
- Given the location of the proposed loading on the east side of the site, provide an elegant and safe strategy for connectivity with the future School and Community site.

Sustainability

- Given the site's proximity to the rail tracks and overall sustainability objectives, it is recommended to provide an even greater window to wall ratio.

- Consider air quality and acoustic control in the design of the building with respect to the proximity to the rail tracks, i.e.. location of air intake, exterior envelope design, etc

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

Mr. Sørensen commented that the team has discussed many of these issues internally. Although the team does not see the east interface as the primary link for school children to enter the city, it is nevertheless an important issue. Mr. Sørensen noted the team sees the potential of including affordable housing which will further animate and highlight the site as a stopping point for the City. Mr. Sørensen thanked the Panel for the comments.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was presented for Issues Identification.

2.0 East Bayfront Boardwalk and In-water Pipe – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1111
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	DTAH, West 8
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Shelley Long, Project Leader, West 8
<i>Delegation:</i>	Bryce Miranda, DTAH; Ayako Kitta, DTAH; Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Chloe Catan, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting the boardwalk is located adjacent to Sherbourne Common, sitting above an in-water pipe that will connect the storm drainage from Dockside to Bayside. Mr. Novack noted the project site has been identified for the Destination Artwork piece, and noted it is important for this project to not limit the area. Mr. Novack provided a timeline, options for the future art piece, context on the Easy Bayfront Precinct Plan including existing and proposed boardwalks along the Water's Edge Promenade, and site photos. Mr. Novack noted the project is at Stage 3 Detailed Design and recapped consensus comments from the previous Schematic Design review. Mr. Novack noted the areas for Panel consideration: boardwalk wood selection and pattern, elimination of boardwalk access point near water outfall, and boardwalk handrails at the ends. Mr. Novack then introduced Shelley Long, Project Leader, with West 8 to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began by recapping the previous design approach, today's proposed design development topics for discussion, and the project design principles. Ms. Long noted the proposed access points, 6m wide, are designed to continue the scalar experience as one moves closer to the water. The access is step-free as the walkways are sloped. Ms. Long noted the potential attachment to future finger piers and boardwalk extensions, edge conditions that include a guard rail, and the access hatches for the in-water pipe.

Ms. Long provided a recap of the concept design, completing the public realm for interaction and animation, and noted the proposed bench foundation details. Ms. Long noted the bench is 2m deep, same depth as the York Quay bench to maximize design continuity. Ms. Long noted the lighting strategy is designed to provide light safe routes, from access points to edge of boardwalk and toe rails, from a single source recessed below the bench – far exceeding the existing bench lighting levels. Ms. Long presented research of various options for the east and west termination points, noting the team is interested in the safest approach. Ms. Long noted that the wood decking details emulate the Wavedecks, and a sample of the thermally modified hardwood “Thermowood Ash” has been provided for Panel's review.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the team considered Black Locust as a decking material. Ms. Long answered that at Brooklyn Bridge Park, the Black Locust installed about ten years ago is being replaced five years earlier than anticipated, therefore it is not being recommended. The Panel member asked if the boardwalk can be extended eastward. Mr. Glaisek noted the long-term plan is to extent it, but there is no funding currently.

Another Panel member asked if there will be a second phase to this project. Mr. Glaisek noted there is no next phase planned yet for the boardwalk. The Panel member asked if it is possible to create a bench along the edge of the promenade. Mr. Glaisek noted this can be studied but suspected it will not work since the edge fascia beam does not provide enough depth for a bench.

One Panel member asked for the status of the finger piers and if parts of the boardwalk can lower to get people closer to the water. Mr. Glaisek answered that there is no schedule for the implementation of the finger piers.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended Ms. Long on the great presentation and the thorough research.

Another Panel member appreciated the ease of the presentation and the sensibility of the offset boardwalk pattern that brings personality to the waterfront. The Panel member felt the shape of the bench is too corporate, and suggested more

roundedness and a soft quality in the form. The Panel member is unconvinced with the lighting strategy and recommended pinpoint lights at low nautical bollards. The Panel member noted the consistency of tree species is critical to the waterfront and the vision of the promenade must be preserved.

One Panel member noted it is exciting to imagine the next phase of the project and where it might take place. The Panel member supported the horizontal under-bench recessed lighting as it complements the integrity of the bench and boardwalk. The Panel member is supportive of the use of warmer light temperature.

Another Panel member appreciated the warmth and simplicity of the proposed details, and supported the proposed access points, noting their relationship to the width of streets. The Panel member asked the team to consider reconfiguring the tree layout so there is no tree in the centre of the access way. The Panel member is supportive of the asymmetrical boardwalk pattern and asked the team to consider using the language of the nautical bollards to create more integrated edge details.

One Panel member commented the bench granite finish does not sufficiently reference the Canadian Shield and consider providing more roughness or live edges to the bench. The Panel member is supportive of the use of local Canadian wood and asked the team to consider providing viewing balconies at the boardwalk interface with future finger piers.

Another Panel member commended the presentation and is supportive of the integrated bench lighting as it helps declutter the public realm. The Panel member recommended the fabrication of a mock-up to test the lighting detail and encouraged the team to address skateboarding concerns for the benches. While the Panel member is supportive of the Herringbone boardwalk pattern, making the off-centre look deliberate is very important. The Panel member is unconvinced with the analogy of the Canadian Shield, instead recommended the team to focus on a Toronto narrative to enhance the local geography.

Mr. Glaisek asked if the concrete edge at the base of the bench will be exposed. Ms. Long answered that the concrete edge will be visible, however the sides and the ramp will have granite finish.

One Panel member commended the team for responding directly to previous Panel commentary and for providing carbon output results on the material research. The Panel also agreed that perhaps the story, although successful, does not necessarily have to be about the Canadian Shield, instead focus simply on trees, rock, and water.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Commended the team for the great presentation and thorough research.
- Appreciated and supported the overall design sensibility: warmth, elegance, simplicity, and bringing those principles to the details.

- Consider how the design can provoke and inspire the strategy for the next phases of the boardwalk project, i.e.. finger piers, subsequent sections, etc.
- Supportive of the location of the access points, ensure enough clearance for pedestrian movement, i.e.. the location of trees in relation to access points.
- The design maintains an interest to have the ability to touch the water.

Bench

- Consider introducing more “organic-ness” and roughness in the design of the bench.
- Consider carefully the under-bench lighting strategy with respect to the built vision of the East Bayfront promenade, i.e.. lighting strategy and the bench base detailing.
- No consensus on the bench lighting strategy, suggested to consider both options of pin lights on low nautical bollards and under-bench horizontal line light.
- Consider strategies to discourage skateboarding and grinding.

Landscape

- When replacing trees on the waterfront, it is important to carefully consider the tree species to maintain the vision that was put forth.

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

Ms. Long noted the team is appreciative of the comments and that the organic quality of the stone will be considered to create a more tactile “rock” experience. Based on previous experiences on working on other waterfront projects, the team has strategies to address the skateboarding issue. Mr. Glaisek added that WT does not discourage skateboarding but grinding on the benches is not supported.

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 (Unanimous) for the project.

3.0 George Brown College (GBC) The Arbour – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1086
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	George Brown College
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Moriyama & Teshima Architects, Acton Ostry Architects, Studio TLA, R.E. Millward + Associates, Transsolar Kilma Engineering, Integral Group, Fast + Epp, Stantec
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Carol Philips, Partner, Moriyama & Teshima Architects Krista Palen, Director, Transsolar Kilma Engineering

Delegation: Angela Li, Waterfront Toronto; Rick Huijbregts, GBC; Anne Sado, GBC; Sunil Sharma, GBC; Veronica Madonna, Moriyama & Teshima Architects; Jason Kwok, GBC; Clara Shipman, R.E. Millward + Associates; Eliza Oprescu, Studio TLA; Nader Kadri, 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 the project history and that George Brown College (GBC) continues to play an important role in activating the waterfront. Construction is anticipated to start in Q1 2021 and complete in 2024. Ms. Li noted The Arbour will house GBC's School of Information Computer Technology, Architectural Studies, Mass Timber Research Hub, and a Child Care Centre. It is Ontario's first 12-storey mass-timber, low carbon institutional building and is one of the two projects in the City that is pursuing TGS Tier 4 certification. Ms. Li noted Waterfront Toronto is responsible for the design and construction of the Dockside Drive public realm - coordination with the City and GBC continues and the design is being updated. Ms. Li noted this is likely the final review stage for The Arbour, and provided a recap of July 2018's Schematic Design review consensus comments. Ms. Li then introduced Nader Kadri, Community Planner, with the City of Toronto, to present City issues.

Mr. Kadri noted the City is supportive of the project, and continues to work with the team on issues related to the child care spaces, lighting strategy in the outdoor play area, barriers and protection for the play area, bicycle parking, and animation of the Queens Quay frontage. Ms. Li provided the areas for Panel consideration: revised main staircase design, dormer changes, exterior envelope details, signage strategy, the importance of an entrance on Queens Quay, interface with Queens Quay streetscape, main entrance bench, and childcare interface with streets and drop-off/pickup. Ms. Li then introduced Carol Philips, Partner with Moriyama & Teshima Architects, to give the design presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Philips began with an overview of previous Panel comments, project timeline, and a general update on the building's exterior revisions. Ms. Philips noted sun shading has been increased on the north and west façades to reduce late sun exposure and the project is still subject to a minor variance application.

Exterior cladding

Responding to a previous Panel comment, Ms. Philips noted the team examined closely the possibility of an exterior wood cladding system. However, given wood is a combustible material that is not code compliant, the team studied pre-assembled custom panels with terra cotta and aluminum, with the latter being selected as proposed, in order to push the project forward. Ms. Philips noted fins are employed to capture panel framing to limit exposed seams, the window frame acts as a guard at the appropriate height, the wall sections are robust with R30 performance at solid sections, and there are larger areas of glazed sections on the ground floor.

Dormer revisions

Ms. Philips noted the revised dormer design reduced southern heat gain at the high levels of the building, increased areas for photovoltaics, eliminated the need for structural beams, and showcased the versatility of CLT structures. The ceiling systems, such as lighting, are now carved into the thickness of the CLT panels.

Queens Quay and Public Realm Animation

Ms. Philips noted the building currently has three entrances and is working with Waterfront Toronto to add a secondary entrance off Queens Quay. The team is interested in animating the frontage with rich signage. Ms. Philips noted the entrance from Knapp Lane has been set back to provide a major access point for students with trees in front. On the west façade, Ms. Philips noted graphic expressions as frit on curtain wall glazing help screen the daycare.

Interior Accessibility and Key Innovations

Ms. Philips noted the team has revised the main staircase significantly, it is now closer to the main entrance and elongated to provide a gentler rise for increased accessibility. At the classrooms, tiered seating has been completely removed to allow for universal accessibility. Ms. Philips noted the structural design has evolved to glulam columns and hybrid slab bands that bond CLT with concrete to meet vibration requirements. The team is working with the City to ensure the building is as safe or safer than regular buildings. Ms. Philips noted this innovative structural design is undergoing peer-review with local engineers such as Blackwell and David Moses. Furthermore, the robust structural testing results will be published to help propel the industry. Ms. Philips introduced Krista Palen, Director with Transsolar Kilma Engineering, to present the sustainability features.

Sustainability

Ms. Palen noted the building engineering and design are driven by the requirements of a passive mode, with elements like a solar chimney, operable windows, solar harvesting, and district energy working in tandem. The natural ventilation mode is further enhanced and extended with ceiling fans. Ms. Palen noted the interior is designed with radiant heating and cooling, all classrooms are located along the building perimeter to ensure comfort and daylight access – electric lighting is provided only if necessary. Ms. Palen noted the building has no fuel-fired equipment and is targeting TGS Tier 4, approximately 10 years before it will become the city standard.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked about the color of the exterior aluminium panels, a life cycle carbon analysis, and the largest carbon contributing element in the project. Ms. Philips answered different mock-ups will be produced to help decide on the final color, the largest carbon contributor is likely to be concrete, and the project is targeting net zero carbon.

Another Panel member asked if the large signage is temporary. Ms. Philips noted the signage showed in the presentation is illustrative and is intended to show the benefit of permanent large signs.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the service and loading access for the building. Ms. Philips answered that service and loading are provided through the tunnel with the existing adjacent GBC building.

Another Panel member asked for the location of the solar chimney vents and the color of the proposed glazing unit. Ms. Palen noted the vents are located inside the building to prevent wind or snow from blocking air flow, the outer secondary vents are located at the top of the north elevation. In terms of color, Ms. Philips answered the team is considering Solarban 70 XL, double glazed, with 40% window to wall ratio – the envelop is being tendered early to ensure there is an understanding of how these elements will be integrated. Ms. Philips noted full height panels are used to reduce seams and the roof PVs are estimated to produce at least 5% of the project energy use.

One Panel member asked for clarification of the bicycle parking strategy. While there are bicycle parking spaces in the building, Ms. Philips noted the team is interested in developing a campus strategy.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commended the team for an impressive design and would like more information on the panelling system. The Panel member noted the location of the vestibule for the Queens Quay entrance will be a challenge and encouraged the team to consider a public entrance that is closer to the main east entrance. The Panel member asked the team to carefully consider the placement of landscape elements to not interfere with the signage strategy.

Another Panel member appreciated the presentation and commended the team for the design.

One Panel member congratulated the team for the project and commended George Brown College as innovation leaders for bringing this opportunity to the Toronto waterfront. The Panel member appreciated the sharing of the research work for the building and was supportive for more porosity at the Queens Quay façade. The Panel member noted the proposed signs are very large and seem designed from the perspective of driving on the Gardiner, not the pedestrian.

Another Panel member thanked the team for the presentation and noted it is critical and fundamental for Queens Quay, an important key street, to have an entrance into the ground floor of the building – signage is not enough as a form of animation. The Panel member asked the team to consider the bicycle parking strategy collectively and comprehensively. The Panel member encouraged that the materiality of the original competition proposal - a certain refinement, verticality, less shiny – be retained as the

design progresses. The Panel member asked the team to study carefully the access and circulation of the childcare spaces.

One Panel member appreciated that the sustainability ambition of the project far exceeds current standards. The Panel member noted potential wind tunnel effects from the west vestibule into the interior - consider off-setting the entrance sequence. The Panel member asked the team to consider further reducing the glazed wall areas on the east, noted the project should receive support for undertaking complicated research to drive innovation, and encouraged the sharing of those research results, i.e.. custom panel fabrication, cladding material testing, etc.

Another Panel member commended the team for staying committed to the competition concept while further evolving the design through a long development process. The Panel member recalled a stronger presence of wood in the building interior originally, and suggested maximizing the usage of wood as a finish material where permitted. The Panel member asked the team to consider strategies to maintain the rawness of the sloped structural third floor wood ceiling, the visual dominance and design of solar panels on the roof, and the use of Solarban Starphire, a less shiny glass, to retain the softness and transparency into the building. The Panel member recommended maximizing the transparency of the ground floor glazing, and allowing the iconic and architectural qualities of the building to communicate as opposed to using large signage.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Commended the team for strong presentation, thorough research, and design.
- Acknowledged the significance of women's leadership of the design team, and its reflection in a carefully designed, innovative, and superlative building which sets a new standard for excellence in sustainable design on the waterfront.
- Appreciated that the design analysis serves as a benchmark and is demonstrative of the innovation aspects of the project.
- Recommended that Waterfront Toronto recognize and celebrate the ambition of this project as a prototype for future waterfront developments.
- Commended the design team for stewarding the project ideas through to delivery.

Building

- Animation on Queens Quay beyond signage is important and required. Recommend adding an entrance on the Queens Quay elevation of the building, not just for staff. Continue to work with Waterfront Toronto on this entrance.
- Consider shifting the main entrance vestibule to the northeast corner to provide a dual entrance from Dockside Drive and Queens Quay.
- Ensure proposed signage is not obscured by trees.
- Concerned with the largeness of signage. Consider carefully the need for signage on this beautiful didactic building, overall signage size, and the view from the highway.

- Given the structural timber is a defining characteristic of the project, ensure the material quality is present and retained as much as possible throughout the building, i.e. ceiling detail of the dormer atrium, classroom interior finishes, etc.
- Ensure the softness, material tonality, and verticality of the original design are maintained in the details.
- Consider carefully the access and circulation of the childcare spaces.
- Consider airflow and potential wind tunnel impact with respect to the location and design of vestibules.

Sustainability

- Appreciated the ambitions and leadership in executing the project.
- Appreciated the teaching opportunities that the design and analysis offer to the rest of the industry.
- Commended the project for defining innovation and leading the public sector forward.
- Consider the detailing of the roof solar panels and their visual impact in relation to the overall building.

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

Ms. Philips noted the team appreciated the feedback and support, and will continue to press forward with the design development. Ms. Sado noted innovation is a focus for GBC, the team sees the building as a laboratory, and will continue to innovate and promulgate the work. Lastly, Ms. Sado added GBC is a public institution and design choices must balance costs.

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 (Unanimous) for the project.

4.0 York Street Park – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1092B
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Claude Cormier + Associes
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Marc Hallé, Senior Associate, Claude Cormier + Associes; Vanessa Abram, gh3
<i>Delegation:</i>	Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by providing a project description, brief summary of the site context photos, and key design updates including advancement of the pavilion design, refinement to paths, interface with Queens Quay, etc. Mr. Novack provided an estimated project milestone schedule update: completion of contract documents in Summer 2020, start construction in Fall 2020, and complete in Summer 2022. Mr. Novack noted the project previously came to DRP in July 2019 for Schematic Design and today is at the final review stage. Mr. Novack provided a recap to the July 2019 consensus comments and noted the areas for Panel consideration: the pond edge mosaic, paving layout, pavilion geometry and how it meets the ground, and the design of the mechanical building. Mr. Novack then introduced Marc Hallé, Senior Associate with Claude Cormier + Associes, to present the design.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Hallé began the presentation by noting that despite value engineering and changes since the competition, the updates have improved the design. Mr. Hallé noted the plan has been optimized, edge paths adjacent to Queens Quay have been widened while maintaining high quality paving material, grass cover areas have been reduced, and seating areas have been increased with movable furniture around the park.

Pond Update

Mr. Hallé noted the pond edge detail has been optimized, with a rounded top made of red smalti glass tiles as the surface finish and water repellent grout and mortar. Mr. Hallé provided historic and Montreal precedents showing uses of the material and addressed concerns for longevity and maintenance. Unless the bench is damaged by an implement, the tiles are not likely to dislodge on their own. Furthermore, the color will persist even if the tiles are chipped. Mr. Hallé noted the team is interested in having the pond edge give the park an iconic feature much like the famous Park Güell bench in Barcelona. Mr. Hallé noted the seat geometry has been adjusted to increase comfort and Public Health has not objected to the pond bottom design. Mr. Hallé noted that the team is looking at both quarry off-cuts and river rocks as the pond bottom material to enhance reflectivity and deter walking.

Park Design Update

Mr. Hallé noted the surface grading creates an acoustic buffer and acts as sponge to absorb water to be used on the site. The team is interested in retaining storm water on site. The pond utilizes a non-chemical water system with an active oxidizer. There are three drains in the pond. Mr. Hallé noted the mechanical building has been revised with an electrical panel accessed from the side and clad in polished stainless-steel panels. Mr. Hallé noted there are thirty-eight new trees, with some existing trees retained. Trees have been removed from the paved areas as the budget cannot support the use of Silva Cells. Mr. Hallé introduced Vanessa Abram with gh3 to present the pavilion.

Pavilion Design

Ms. Abram noted the pavilion has been revised to sit flush with grade instead of on a raised platform. The pavement is texturally different to demarcate the pavilion area.

Ms. Abram noted the structure will be painted camouflage green and is designed as a series of modular arches. The team is working on deterring climbing on the structure. Ms. Abram noted one-inch aluminum tubes are intended to produce a fine “scribble” effect with clean bounding lines.

Furniture and Equipment

Mr. Hallé provided updates to the dog area and the heart light which is now located slightly off centre over the pond and supported by three poles. Mr. Hallé noted the team is revising the maintenance routes. Finally, Mr. Hallé provided an update to the temporary fencing strategy and overall sustainability objectives for the project.

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the pond edge mosaic is being prototyped or tested. Mr. Hallé answered the team will be creating a prototype in the summer and will monitor it through the winter. Another Panel member asked about the mechanical building green roof soil volume and height from the street. Mr. Hallé noted the soil volume is 0.5m deep and is located 2.8m from the street.

One Panel member asked how the mechanical building green roof is accessed and maintained. Mr. Hallé answered the design team will hear from the maintenance staff and the roof is currently accessed with a ladder. Another Panel member asked for clarification on the pond water level in the winter. Mr. Hallé noted the water level for the winter is lowered by **30cm** and it will be functional for skating when temperatures drop sufficiently.

One Panel member asked if the suspended heart light is lit twenty-four hours a day and if the team has considered photoluminescent materials that glow in the dark. Mr. Hallé responded that the lighting system has not yet been decided. The team is thinking vibrant white for the color, and will investigate the photoluminescent materials.

Another Panel member asked if the lowest horizontal member is a structural requirement. Ms. Abram answered that it is required for bracing.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One member commented that the pavilion structure appears climbable, and the team needs to address this concern. On the pond bottom, the Panel member noted the option of quarry off-cuts is less effective at deterring walking, and recommended the use of the river rocks instead. On the pond edge material, the Panel member noted that no doubt bonding agents have improved over the years, but whether it is enough to hold the tiles in place is still a question.

Another Panel member commended the team for the great presentation and appreciated the integrity of the pond, pavilion, and overall design. The Panel member

noted the design is an iconic and playful destination for Toronto. The Panel member was supportive of lowering the pavilion to grade and encouraged the design team to select the most durable pond edge details. The Panel member asked the team to consider incorporating public art, such as having an artist design the heart light.

One Panel member thanked the team for a fantastic presentation and a well-considered design. The Panel member appreciated the mosaic tile pond details – it will add a very special, iconic touch to the project, and should be delivered with high quality materials. The Panel member was supportive of the general location of the mechanical building and noted the dog park maintenance strategy requires further resolution.

Another Panel member appreciated the overall design and presentation. The Panel member encouraged the team to further distill decorative elements, such as eliminating any extraneous wiring to the heart light to reduce life cycle cost of the project.

One Panel member was supportive of the sustainability objectives of the project, the well-researched case for long benches, and asked the team to work closely with Parks on a strategy for maintaining the pond edge tiles. The Panel member recommended that any below grade sustainability strategies that are hidden in plain sight be communicated to the public, such as the use of water retention, etc. Lastly, the Panel member noted that the sustainability ambition will add to the iconic quality of the park.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the fun design and the ambition of the project.
- Supportive of the overall design and the light touches that emphasize the overall park.
- Commended the team for a well evolved competition design.

Landscape

- Supportive of the lowered pond water level strategy in the winter.
- Supportive of the red mosaic tile finish if the technical feasibilities can be demonstrated, provide a mock-up of the detail.
- Supportive of the design's connection between architecture and landscape, and the beautiful pavilion design.
- Supportive of the smart use of quarry offcut as a sustainable material example provided it is an effective deterrent to walking on the pond.
- Supportive of the heart light and recognized that it is a vital element. Be reductive and eliminate any extraneous cables or wires in the design.
- Consider the impact of birds aligning on the heart light, and the possibility of using projections or other alternative lighting strategies, and working with artist in "lighting" it as an art piece.
- Supportive of the well-researched case for long benches.
- Work closely with Parks on a strategy for maintaining the mosaic tiles.

Pavilion and Mechanical Room

- Supportive of the design of the mechanical building and the proposed roof vegetation that will provide a great accent in the winter for the park.
- Climability of the pavilion structure is a potential concern that the team should address.

Sustainability

- Ensure below grade sustainability strategies that are hidden in plain sight are communicated to the public, i.e.. use of quarry offcuts, water retention, etc
- Supportive of the sustainability ambitions.

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

Mr. Hallé thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that the team is working with ARUP on developing the stormwater retention capacity.

4.6 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 (Unanimous) for the project.

CLOSING

There being no further business, the Acting Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.