



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #103
Wednesday, July 26th, 2017**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Brigitte Shim

Regrets

Claude Cormier
Betsy Williamson
Chris Reed

Recording Secretaries

Rei Tasaka
Tristan Simpson

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto Board Liaison

WELCOME

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

1. West Don Lands Block 12
 2. West Don Lands Block 16
 3. Bayside A1/A2
 4. West Don Lands River City Phase 4
 5. East Bayfront Block 3, George Brown College
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the July 26 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts were declared.

The Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the “Call for New Members” noting that the selection committee shortlisted nine applicants and out of those applicants, four have been identified as potential candidates. A decision will

be made shortly and new members should be at the September Design Review Panel meeting.

Mr. Glaisek noted that on June 28, 2017, Waterfront Toronto received \$1.25 billion in funding from the three levels of government to fund the Port Lands Flood Protection project. The project will flood protect the Port Lands and build the necessary infrastructure to unlock the area's potential for new neighbourhoods and employment areas. Mr. Glaisek noted that with funding in place, Waterfront Toronto is positioned to begin design immediately, with construction beginning later in 2017 and excavation of the river valley starting in early 2019.

Mr. Glaisek then introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that work on the sewers and watermains is underway, and this work will be completed this summer. Much of the earthwork and grading has now been completed, most visibly with the lawn area and trail access at Strachan Avenue taking shape. The Bentway Conservancy is currently hiring for the positions of Office Coordinator and Director of Facilities and Operations.

Dillon Consulting and West 8 continue to develop the first phase of public realm work to be included in the design-build contract for the Gardiner re-decking contract between Jarvis and Cherry Street. The scope of this first phase of work has been refined to include the south side of Lake Shore only. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the team will return to the panel later in the fall for subsequent phases including north side of Lake Shore Boulevard and intersection improvements.

Ms. Mallozzi noted that Jack Layton Ferry Terminal Phase 1A is scheduled for completion by May 2018 and the team is on schedule for fall construction start. Ms. Mallozzi noted that simplified signage piece is being considered by the team as an interim solution.

Ms. Mallozzi noted that Cherry Street Lakefilling and Design is still anticipating a September construction start and the team issued 90% design drawings on July 14, 2017.

Mr. Glaisek then provided an update on last month's projects. He noted that Hanlan Boat Club will be returning to the Design Review Panel in October to present detailed design.

Mr. Glaisek noted that Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project will be returning to the Design Review Panel in the fall. Waterfront Toronto staff is working with the Proponent to address the issues raised by the Panel at the last meeting.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands – Block 12

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance

Delegation: Marc Baronette

ID#: 1084

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project noting that Block 12 represents the fourth market residential building in the Canary District. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Canary District has been experiencing strong sales activity and the health and wellness retail strategy is also proving very successful. Mr. Glaisek mentioned that this is the project's first time presenting to the Design Review Panel. Mr. Glaisek added that the Proponent is looking for support to increase the building height by one meter to accommodate a ground floor height increase from five meters to six meters – a move to attract a potential grocer tenants. Mr. Glaisek raised some topics for Panel consideration, including the building massing in the context of the Canary District, the program, and adjacencies with surrounding buildings and open space. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Adam Feldmann, an Associate with architectsAlliance, to give the project presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by providing context of the site, noting that the site is located at the confluence of the Don Valley, is accessible via bike paths and public transit, and is surrounded by a multitude of public spaces such as Front Street, Corktown Common and Underpass Park. Mr. Feldmann noted that the building is following the existing zoning with a total height of 36 meters on Front Street, 26 meters along Mill Street, and is 31,000 square feet with a 14,000 square foot retail space. There are 388 units total with 41 townhouse units. Mr. Feldmann explained that the courtyard space has been widened from 13 meters to 15 meters in response to City of Toronto comments. Mr. Feldmann noted that the townhouses will be two and three bedroom units. In terms of sustainability, Mr. Feldmann explained that the draft approach has a rough Energy Use Intensity estimate of 120 kW/h.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked for clarification regarding the townhouse units and whether the two-bedroom units were located facing the courtyard and the two and three bedroom units are located on the outer portion of the building. Mr. Feldmann replied that it does vary but for the most part yes. The Panel member also asked if the courtyard space is private. Mr. Feldmann replied yes, and the entrance to the townhouse is from the corridor. The Panel member also asked about the material of

the end walls. Mr. Feldmann replied that this is still a detail that they are working out but they are expecting a lot of glazing with a unified look. The Panel member also asked what material will be used for the handrails on the balconies. Mr. Feldmann replied that they are thinking about using a fritted glass or potentially a perforated aluminium.

Another Panel member asked if the 13% three-bedroom units was low for the area. Mr. Glaisek clarified that this percentage is high relative to surrounding buildings that have an average of 8% three bedroom units. The City representative asked what percentage of bedrooms are larger than 900 square feet. Mr. Feldmann replied that they were unsure of the exact number of units larger than 900 square feet. The Panel member noted that it would be helpful to understand where sheer walls are located. The Panel member also asked which areas will be accessible roofscapes. Mr. Feldmann replied that the fifth floor will be outdoor amenity space but the green roofs will not be accessible.

One Panel member asked what size the retail floor plate is. Mr. Feldmann replied that it is approximately 14,000 square feet. Mr. Feldmann added that the minimum floor plate for smaller grocers is approximately 10,000 square feet and the biggest issue that grocers face is getting the loading bay to work. Mr. Feldmann noted that this building has a properly designed loading bay for a grocer tenant.

Another Panel member asked why this location is desirable for a potential grocer. Mr. Feldmann explained that the area does not currently receive the foot traffic needed to draw a grocer tenant, however, once the area is built out, it will be very desirable for grocers.

One Panel member asked if there will steps at the front stoops. Mr. Feldmann replied yes, and there will be a hedge for privacy.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that they were supportive of the one meter height increase to accommodate the high ground floor ceiling heights necessary for a grocery store.

Another Panel member felt that on the new balconies this was a great project and strongly encouraged the team to pursue thermal breaks. The Panel member was unsure about the V-shaped columns along Mill Street as they felt disconnected and unnecessary.

One Panel member noted that the interior townhouse units with the rear yards felt like an odd condition for people living above and being able to look down into someone's backyard. The Panel member suggested thinking about making the backyards into one accessible outdoor amenity space for the building.

Another Panel member felt that having a private backyard in a condo is a very sought after amenity, especially for families with children.

One Panel member noted that the backyard space will likely not get as much use if it were turned into a communal amenity space.

Another Panel member felt that the way the building addresses the site is very thoughtful. The Panel requested the Proponent to show views of the side street in relation to the townhouses to better understand the transition between the larger massing along Front Street and Mill Street in comparison to the neighbourhood streets. The Panel member felt that the balcony treatment, including the relationship to adjacent townhouses, should be further explored to ensure they become great neighbourhood street.

One Panel member noted that they would be more prefer a stronger expression to the townhouse units and pushing their verticality.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the public realm is already built in this area so he encouraged the proponents to think about how the building and townhouses interface with the existing trees.

The City representative raised concern over the lack of screening and transition between the commercial part of the building to the residential portion.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall a great project and positive addition to the area
- Support to get a grocer tenant in the ground floor retail space
- Strongly encourage pursuing thermal breaks on the balconies
- More resolution is needed on details, such as the end walls and the treatment of the balconies
- Consider both options for the private backyard space and the public courtyard amenity space
- Bring section drawings at the next meeting to help describe the side streets
- Make sure the existing public realm is considered in the building design
- More detail is needed on the transition between the commercial portion of the building and the residential portion
- Explore flexibility for combining unit

1.6 Vote of Support/Non Support

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

2.0 West Don Lands Block 16

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: KPMB

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Four

Presenter(s): Bruno Weber (KPMB), Michael Guadagnoli (Ecovert)
ID#: 1071

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that Block 16 represents the third market residential building in the Canary District. The project is 100% sold. Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of Panel comments from May 2017, which included strong support to move forward with the outdoor amenity space, resolution on the thermal breaks, structural solutions to enable unit conversion, a simplified material palette, the upper residential component continues to feel disjointed from the base, and the size of the resulting aperture between balcony screens should be reviewed to make sure that it does not feel too small. Mr. Glaisek described areas for Panel consideration, including the lowered balcony heights and detailing, the proposed material palette, the groundfloor details and treatment of the screen wall, and the servicing layout. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Bruno Weber, Senior Associate with KPMB Architects, to give the project presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Weber began by walking the Panel around the ground floor level of the building. Mr. Weber noted that the major entry to the condo is on the west side and the entry to the parking garage is on the east side. The ground level bicycle parking with windows into the area is also on the east side of the building. Mr. Weber noted that the second level of the building consists of a second level of retail, an outdoor amenity space and additional bicycle parking. Mr. Weber explained that the existing public realm has been built up to the property line and they have introduced a permeable paver to absorb rainfall. The coloured glazing located above the retail space is a dichroic film material. Mr. Weber noted that there is an LED strip located behind the dichroic film and will function as a true lightbox providing colour, even at night. Mr. Weber explained that the rear of the building is composed of stacked concrete brick, with a polished face instead of the previously proposed sanded beige brick. This will help unify the upper portion of the building with the lower portion. Mr. Weber explained that the loading bay is a front in/reverse out layout as it is such a tight city block with little room for a drive through layout. In order to accommodate a drive-through garbage pick-up, they would have to remove part of the bicycle parking, which is not ideal. Mr. Weber explained that they are seeking support from the Panel to pursue the front-in/reverse-out layout. Mr. Weber then introduced Michael Guadagnoli from Ecovert to present the sustainability portion of the presentation.

Mr. Guadagnoli explained that they modelled the impacts with thermal breaks and without them. Mr. Guadagnoli explained that Block 16 is a window-wall system with relatively low effective spandrel wall R-values (R-3.4) and the results showed that the addition of balcony thermal breaks improved the overall R-value to R-5.8 yielding only a 6% savings in annual space heating. Mr. Guadagnoli explained that the manufactured balcony structural thermal break products are costly with an estimate of \$500,000 with approximately \$1,200/year in savings which would result in a payback longer than the life of the building. Economically thermal breaks are a large investment for this project and do not produce a significant enough savings in energy, utility costs, peak demand or GHG reductions to warrant using them in this case.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the client was willing to pursue private garbage pick-up. Mr. Weber replied yes and added that there would be a list of requirements needing to be met for private pick-up, in order to avoid the drive-thru servicing requirements. The Panel member asked for clarification of the material on the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Weber replied that the previous version was a combination of solid and perforated material and it now just solid with a raised skirt.

Another Panel member asked for more clarification on the garbage pick-up. Marc Baronette with Dundee Kilmer replied that the City of Toronto would like them to meet city standards and asked the design team to look at alternatives that would meet those standards. Mr. Baronette noted that they tried accommodating a drive-through method but it eliminates a large portion of the bicycle parking.

One Panel member asked for clarification on one of the roof plans regarding the balconies kicking out and whether this varies on each floor. Mr. Weber replied that from a plan view, the balconies are saw-toothed and alternate on each floor.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was supportive of the front-in/reverse-out service bay and felt that the alternative solution would negatively impact the building.

Another Panel member felt that animating the site using the bike storage is a win for the building and taking that away would be unfortunate. The Panel member also felt that the white concrete brick is hugely successful and brilliant in response to the cohesion of the top half the building to the bottom half.

One Panel member was also supportive of the front-in/reverse-out layout as the alternative would make this end of the building feel like the back end of the building. Eliminating the bicycle storage to accommodate garbage pick-up would compromise the project from a series of perspectives and undermines the scale and Waterfront Toronto's public realm investments that have already been established.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Strong support from the Panel that the front-in/reverse-out layout is the most appropriate option given the size of the block and the fact that bicycle storage and the public realm would be compromised
- Supportive of the white concrete brick in response to cohesion of the top half of the building to the bottom half
- Supportive of the balcony heights and material

2.6 Vote of Support/Non Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in full Support of the project.

3.0 Bayside A1/A2

Project Type: Building

Location: Bayside

Proponent: Hines / Tridel

Architect/Designer: 3XN Architects

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Audun Opdal, 3XN

Delegation: Michael Gross (Hines), Salvatore Cavarretta (Tridel)

ID#: 1085

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that A1/A2 is the fourth building to be developed in Bayside, and the last market residential building. The building program will be primarily residential with animation uses at grade such as retail and community space. Mr. Glaisek explained that the remaining developments in Bayside are/ R6 an affordable rental housing building with approximately 260 units, and C1 and C2 are commercial uses such as office or academic space. Mr. Glaisek noted that the team is presenting Issues Identification and the developer is targeting to start construction in September 2018. Mr. Glaisek raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including building massing in the context of the Bayside master plan, with the impact on R6 and surrounding areas, the location of additional height elements, and the program and adjacencies with surrounding buildings and open space, including Parliament Slip and Bungee Park.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Opdal began by noting that this project seeks to maximize water views from the residential units and amenity spaces. At the same time, the project volume is sensitive to views from the neighbouring buildings and streets. Mr. Opdal explained that the massing was taken out of the middle of the building and put on both north and south ends to allow for minimal impact on the public realm. The grid creates a series of terraces, stepping down towards the water. Mr. Opdal explained that the facades and terraces are angled to create better views and sun conditions. Mr. Opdal explained that the loading bay, located on the ground floor, is in the middle of the building to allow for the least impact on the public realm. A through-block connection is created as an extension of Edgewater Drive. Mr. Opdal introduced Craig McIntyre, with EQ Building Performance Inc., to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Mr. McIntyre explained that they are targeting LEED v4 system which is a first for the Bayside development. This system involves newer credits and a different methodology.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the width requirement is for the through-block connection. Mr. Opdal replied that the through-block connection is 9 meters but they are only required to provide 5 meters. The Panel member then asked the Proponent to show a drawing that shows where the height limits are exceeding the zoning envelope. Mr. Opdal noted that the exceedances are located at the north end of the building by 17 meters and the south end of the building by 25 meters. Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto is comfortable entertaining these exceedances in exchange for the lower height in the mid-block section. The Panel member also asked what the legal ramifications would be for exceeding the height limits by 25 meters. One of the Panel members replied that this would likely be a re-zoning and not just a minor variance.

Another Panel member asked what size the floor plates of the north and south towers are. Mr. Opdal replied that they are approximately 8,000 square feet. The Panel member also asked how many units there will be in this building, to which Mr. Opdal replied roughly 400 units. The Panel member asked about the unit mix. Mr. Opdal replied that they are continuing the trend of providing higher volumes of larger units, similar to Aquabella.

One Panel member asked about the rationale for the shaping of the balconies. Mr. Opdal replied that the variations in balcony edges create the dynamic exterior while the façade is stacked to create a simple envelope. The balconies are built out from a modular approach linked to the unit type.

Another Panel member asked about the loading and servicing. Mr. Opdal replied that it will be a drive through layout.

One Panel member asked how high the ground floor is. Mr. Opdal replied that it is 7 meters. The Panel member also asked if they were using the terrace to use up the width of the building envelope. Mr. Opdal replied yes. The Panel member also asked if there are balustrades that are independent of the balcony series. Mr. Opdal replied that they would like to keep the same language. The Panel member then asked what size the community centre is. Mr. Opdal replied that it is approximately 25,000 square feet includes a gymnasium, however, this is still under discussion.

Another Panel asked what the physical relationship between this project and Aquabella is. Mr. Opdal replied that it was important to create something different while also keeping some similar qualities to the adjacent building. The activation of the balconies is one of the biggest similarities along with the façade treatments.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member liked the massing and the “valley” that is created through the massing. The signature pedestrian passage through the buildings gives it more of a neighbourhood feel and frames views to the lake. The Panel member noted that they understood the massing similarities between the two buildings but wanted to better understand the identity and connection between the two.

Another Panel member noted that they were also supportive of the massing, however, questioned the architectural relationship between the two buildings. The Panel member felt that Aquabella spoke to the domesticity but this building feels like it's showing off. The Panel member was supportive of the terracing of units to create balconies, but found the projecting balconies less convincing.

One Panel member felt that the proposed height, particularly the increase in 25 meters for the south tower, is too high for the waterfront and should be reconsidered. The Panel member liked the balcony terracing but noted that the solid part of the balcony terracing is in line with the view looking out to the water and therefore the transparent portion should be in line with the view instead. The Panel member felt that overall the building looks flashy and feels out of sync with its surroundings.

Another Panel member felt that the gold shade of the building is what feels out of place and noted that the adjacent Aquabella development has a general tone of sobriety, however, this project does not. The Panel member felt that splitting the tower works well but noted that it would be more convincing if the taller tower were at the north end. The Panel member also suggested careful consideration of the activities and programming at the ground floor and street edge.

The Chair requested that the Proponents reconsider the distribution of the height and noted that going to the Committee of Adjustment with a minor variance of 25 meters is going to be a problem and will likely delay the project.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall supporting of the general massing
- Supportive of the through-block connection
- The expression of the building needs further resolution, particularly the varying balcony treatment
- The architectural relationship between Aquabella and this building needs to be strengthened
- Encouraged to pursue thermal breaks on the balconies
- Consider the relationship between the ground floor and the public promenade, and consider and the possibility of relocating the community centre
- The proposed building height maybe challenging

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

4.0 River City Phase 4

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Urban Capital

Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architectes, ZAS Architects

Review Stage: Construction Documents

Review Round: Four
Presenter(s): Paul Stevens, ZAS
Delegation: David Wex (Urban Capital)
ID#: 1085

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that this is the fourth and final phase of the River City development project. Once complete, River City will consist of 5 market residential buildings. Mr. Glaisek explains there are two considerations for this project. First is the bus ramp easement, which needs to be removed to accommodate the underground parking. The second is that the downtown relief line has a proposed option that impacts the site. The team has revised the P3 level to accommodate a 3 meter buffer zone for the proposed tunnel alignment. Mr. Glaisek noted that the team is presenting Construction Documents and construction is scheduled to start this fall. Mr. Glaisek walked through the summary of Panel comments from May 2017, including the type of retail on the ground floor, will be critical to the activation of the public realm, explore the possibility of unit adaptability, the cladding on the public stairwell needs to be explored further, the treatment of the underside of the soffit is an important detail as it will be visible from the pedestrian level, the relationship and transition between the soffit and the balconies is critical, and the Energy Use Intensity seems high. Mr. Glaisek then raised a number of topics for Panel consideration such as the detailed design for the landscape, the stairwell detailing, materiality and detailing of the soffit and interface with the balcony, and the appropriateness of the materials.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Stevens began the presentation by walking through the building at the ground level noting that River City Phase 3 is well under construction with the adjacent Lawren Harris square becoming a busy public space. The base of the building is made up of glass and metal which was used in River City Phase 1 and 3. Mr. Stevens added that a new glass material has been added, which is a warm yellow shade that will transition from solid opaque to fritted. The Underpass Park elevation can be seen as the back of the building, but it's really the front of the building as it faces the park. Mr. Stevens noted that a 70 foot long and 8 foot high glass curtain wall has been added to screen the out the garbage, loading, and gas meter at the edge of the site from the adjacent park. Mr. Stevens proceeded to walk through the site plan, which consists of the replacement of a number of trees with the continuous trench. The ground plane will be a continuation of Underpass Park. Mr. Stevens explained that the benches will be modular with the ability to change shape and size. Mr. Stevens noted that the building consists of 154 units total and unit convertibility is already happening in the purchasing. Mr. Stevens introduced Anna Kazmierska, Sustainability Manager with MMM, to present the sustainability portion of the building.

Ms. Kazmierska noted that the current modelled Energy Use Intensity for the building is 147 ekWh/m². Ms. Kazmierska noted that the energy efficient measures include, enhanced thermal breaks in the walls, increased soffit insulation, higher insulating levels for glazing and increased spandrel/metal panel insulation (net R-15).

4.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member pointed out that on the unity flexibility slide , the area on the right converges to a point and the other side doesn't. Mr. Stevens replied that it has to do with the sculptural form of the building as the building floorplate rotates.

Another Panel member asked if there was a sample of the cladding of the stairwell. Mr. Stevens replied that there are two pieces of glass that transition from black to silver, essentially a curtain wall to create an effect. The Panel member also asked about the garbage pick-up. Mr. Stevens explained that the bins are rolled out and are picked up by way of a through system layout along the service road.

Another Panel member asked about the staircase transition. Mr. Stevens replied that it's a frit starting from an opaque black to mirrored at the bottom.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member felt that the wall should be lengthened slightly to cover the doors. The Panel member expressed disappointment that the Energy Use Intensity values are still too high.

Another Panel member felt that the smoked glass guardrail to the high gloss metal panel detail is very important. The Panel member noted that the challenge is the large overhang and hopes that this will make a positive contribution to the wall.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel was understanding of and appreciative of the work that has gone into making such a challenging site work
- Overall the team responded well to previous comments
- The smoked glass guardrail to the high gloss metal panel is a very important detail
- Consider extending the screen wall to cover the garbage doors

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 majority in full Support of the project.

5.0 George Brown College - Block 3

Project Type: Building

Location: Dockside Drive

Proponent: George Brown College

Architect/Designer: TBD

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

*Presenter(s): Luigi Ferrera, George Brown College
Delegation: Tammy Cook, George Brown College
ID#: 1086*

5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the site was purchased by George Brown College in March 2017. This project will be the expansion of the George Brown Waterfront Campus in Dockside. Mr. Glaisek explained that the building is a proposed School of Computer Technology, which complements the innovation district vision of Dockside and East Bayfront. The team is presenting Issues Identification and is looking for feedback from the Panel on the ambition for a net positive building, the ambition for a tall wood building, guidance/suggestions on how to approach the Ontario Building Code, massing and height, program and adjacencies with surrounding buildings and open space, design competition, and approach to the design brief. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Luigi Ferrera, Dean for the Centre for Arts, Design & Information Technology at George Brown College.

5.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Ferrera began by walking through the project timeline, which involves securing a prime consultant by December 2017, returning to the Design Review Panel in April 2018, breaking ground for construction in March 2021, and completing the project by September 2024. Mr. Ferrera noted that the intention of this project is to create a smart building that is net positive, and future proof. Tall wood structures allow for new and innovative products to be produced, pushing the limits of what can be done with wood. Mr. Ferrera added that the building will utilize high efficiency technologies and processes in the construction phase to lower environmental impact. The building will be developed with net-positive performance and can integrate, adapt, monitor and test the latest technologies and share best practices with the industry and students. Mr. Ferrera noted that the building will be designed to adapt to changing academic uses and withstand potential environmental impacts associated with climate change. Mr. Ferrera walked through the building's preliminary programming which consists of an Applied Research Institute, School of Computer Technology & other academic programs, a child care centre, a fitness facility, and a learning landscape. Mr. Ferrera explained that the energy goals include projected GHG/Energy goals to align with the Ontario Climate Change Action Plan, low GHG construction, net-zero or better operation, leadership GHG footprint, private sector leadership, and living labs for training the workforce on Ontario's low carbon future.

5.3 Panel Discussion

One Panel member asked about the potential building feature of a geothermal field below the building and asked if there is deep water cooling access close to the proposed building. Mr. Ferrera replied that Enwave is currently exploring the possibility of servicing this area, especially in light of the new development occurring. Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto has had many discussions with Enwave in regards to servicing this area of the waterfront. Mr. Ferrera noted that they are exploring other

options such as a distinctive energy intensive tower as a piece of public art. Creative solutions will need to be thought of by the winning design team.

Another Panel member asked if Passive House was a serious consideration. Mr. Ferrera noted that they want to maximize the passive performance of the building while also engaging the users of the building.

One Panel member noted that getting around the building code should not be a major problem if the building is only 10-12 storeys. The Panel member did caution that constructing a tall wood building will likely not result in any cost savings. Mr. Ferrera added that they have engaged Michael Green as an advisor for pursuing tall wood buildings.

Another Panel member suggested treating the experimental technologies, which are realistic, and the experimental programming aspects of the building, predictable, as two separate items. The Panel member also felt that the proposed schedule seems unachievable and encouraged an architecture selection process rather than a design competition. The Panel member also cautioned that the process with the Ontario Building Code will likely not be a fast one. The Panel member explained that they will get much more out of the architects if the program and environmental objectives are further defined. Mr. Glaisek added that investing time in the competition brief will result in better submissions from designers.

Another Panel member also suggested looking into potentially partnering with Redpath Sugar Factory as a renewable energy source.

One Panel member supported the idea of a competition, and recommended that the jury be selected. The Panel member also noted that approximately 25K per design team (\$100-\$150K to TAC) would be an appropriate stipend. The Panel member suggested hosting a series of workshops that involve students as a learning experience. The Panel member also suggested finding a champion at the City of Toronto who will support the project.

5.4 Consensus Comments

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

- Make sure that there are clear expectations of the outcomes
- Integrate learning opportunities for students into the design competition process
- Ensure that the design brief sets out clear objectives
- Ensure that enough time is allocated for the design competition and the Ontario Building Code process

5.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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