



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #108  
Wednesday, February 21, 2018**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Janna Levitt  
Jeff Ranson  
Brigitte Shim  
Eric Turcotte

**Regrets**

Chris Reed  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Mazyar Mortazavi  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair

**Recording Secretaries**

Tristan Simpson  
Rei Tasaka

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

---

**WELCOME**

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

1. Gardiner East Public Realm – Schematic Design
  2. Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure – Issues Identification
  3. Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges – Issues Identification
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair declared that approval of the minutes from the January 24 meeting would be deferred until the March 21 meeting as they were distributed late.

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

The Chair provided an overview of the ULI Hines Student Competition which is based on the BMW site located between the West Don Lands and East Harbour sites. The

Chair noted that over 60 submissions have been made from Grad students in Canada and the United States.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that January 11, 2018 marked the start of construction on the Cherry Street Stormwater and Lakefilling project (CSLF), part of the Port Lands Flood Protection Project. CSLF is designed to optimize water and stormwater infrastructure by stabilizing the shoreline under flood conditions, enhancing aquatic habitat, and ultimately, forming part of the proposed Promontory Park. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide an update on the York Street Park and Rees Street Park public meeting.

Ms. Mallozzi noted that on January 23, 2018, over 170 members of the waterfront communities attended the drop-in consultation on the future designs of York Street and Rees Street Parks. Community members, City Parks staff, and local councilors, Joe Cressy, Lucy Troisi, and Mary Margaret McMahon, all raved about the innovative and engaging set of activities designed to solicit input on people's hopes, desires, and concerns for these two important parks.

Ms. Mallozzi also provided an update on the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal Phase 1A construction. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the excavation of the southern portion of the promenade is complete and the concrete foundations for wall and stairs are also complete. The subsurface conditions are poor, with buried building foundations and the soil cells have been delivered with installation set to begin, weather permitting.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Gardiner East Public Realm**

*Project Type:* Parks and Public Realm

*Location:* Gardiner Expressway East Corridor

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* West 8 and Dillon Consulting

*Review Stage:* Schematic Design

*Review Round:* Two

*Presenter(s):* Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto

*Delegation:* Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

*ID#:* 1068

### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by noting that this is the project's second time presenting to the DRP, previously for Issues Identification, and today is seeking approval for Schematic Design. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the scope of work for Dillon Consulting and West 8 includes advancing the conceptual public realm improvements which include the Lake Shore Boulevard streetscape, bicycle network, linear public

space and improvements to intersections. Ms. Mallozzi noted that some of the key comments received from City staff include unimpeded inspection access for the underside of the Gardiner structure, need to resolve space constraints on the north side between Parliament and Cherry Street, and separated bike and pedestrian trails are preferred. Ms. Mallozzi raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, including the revisions to the Gardiner Corridor vision, the perceived safety, aesthetics, and comfort of the separated multi-use trail in the north side of the landscape, and the strategy for managing stormwater. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Sonja Vangjeli, Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, to give the presentation on behalf of Jelle Therry from West 8.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Vangjeli began by noting that the team has been working on updating the vision to be more specific to the southern Ontario landscape. Ms. Vangjeli explained that some of the design elements include lane width reductions to create more public space, clearly defining zones for every user, adding armour stone to create a continuous edge detail and elevated path, adding pioneer vegetation under the Gardiner deck, stormwater management, a greenwall, and improved pedestrian and cyclist crossings. Ms. Vangjeli noted that a new user experience will emerge through these design elements. Ms. Vangjeli walked the Panel through the cross sections of the design moving from west to east, noting that the space begins to narrow as you move further east.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked how the coordination with Metrolinx is going. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the team has been working closely with Metrolinx regarding the underpasses and location of the retaining walls, the bike paths and the sediment management area.

Another Panel member asked about the north-south connections. Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Designer with the City of Toronto, explained that they are undertaking an analysis of the underpasses, including which ones should get priority. The Panel member asked about the stormwater management strategy. Ms. Mallozzi replied that there is a large quantity of water coming off the Gardiner Expressway and the idea is to divert this water off Lake Shore and into swales. The Panel member asked if this water will be infiltrated into the ground to which Ms. Mallozzi replied, yes.

One Panel member asked who owns the underpasses. Ms. Mighton replied that the bridges are co-owned by the City of Toronto and Metrolinx. Don McKinnon, Principal with Dillon Consulting, added that the Gardiner Public Realm scope does not include the widening of the underpasses, however, the vision piece of the work aspires for continuity along the corridor and they would like to see this stretch into the underpasses.

Another Panel member asked if the armour stone is limestone. Ms. Vangjeli replied that they have not yet specified a particular stone, but the stone depicted in the renderings is limestone. The Panel member asked whether the bike paths will be maintained in the winter. Mr. McKinnon replied that they are part of the MGT, so they will likely be plowed in the winter.

One Panel member asked how West 8 and Dillon are working together. Mr. McKinnon replied that West 8 is the sub-consultant to Dillon and their scope involves the overall vision piece and the south side of Lake Shore Boulevard between Jarvis and Cherry Street. Dillon is providing the engineering support and led the Environmental Assessment for the Gardiner Expressway Re-alignment.

Another Panel member asked how much influence the team will have over the design of the downspouts on the re-decking of the new Gardiner re-alignment. Ms. Mallozzi responded that they will have a say in this and the existing downspouts will be replaced.

One Panel member asked about the nature of the buildings on the south side of Lake Shore and what the frontages will look like. Mr. Glaisek responded that Waterfront Toronto tries to encourage public realm animation for all development applications that are reviewed. Mr. Glaisek added that the buildings should be responding to the public realm and not vice versa. The Panel member asked why some of the renderings are showing so much sunlight. Mr. Glaisek responded that they have asked the consultants to undertake a sun and shadow study and update the renderings to reflect that.

Another Panel member asked if all the cross sections look west. Ms. Vangjeli replied yes. The Panel member also asked if the pedestrian trail and bike trail converge at any point. Ms. Vangjeli replied that the trails combine between Cherry and Parliament Street where it narrows. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the space located north of Lake Shore and east of the Don Valley Parkway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that that condition is based on the East Harbour development and the location of two stormwater shafts.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member asked the Proponents to bring precedents of greenwalls that have been successful to the next review. The Panel member was also sceptical about the long-term durability of using wood on the underside of the Gardiner.

Another Panel member commended the team for a great presentation. The Panel member felt that it would be helpful to understand the existing and proposed conditions by overlaying the proposed design on an aerial map. The Panel member felt that the proposed monoculture will be insufficient and suggested introducing a greater diversity of species into the landscape. The Panel member also felt that more clarity is needed on stormwater management and how it seamlessly fits into the design. The Panel member noted that the armour stone needs to be salt tolerant to avoid cracking. The Panel member liked the overall idea of transitioning from gritty to natural.

One Panel member felt that the no-go zone has not been given enough consideration yet. The Panel member also noted that the armour stone design shown at the last meeting felt more like linear benches and this version looks less organized. The Panel member noted that lots of attention was payed to the east-west conditions but felt that the north-south connections should be equally important.

Another Panel member explained that Metrolinx owns the retaining wall and the design has to be engineered and allow for inspection. The Panel member suggested designing the retaining wall within their set of parameters. The Panel member also felt that the landscape does not feel robust enough.

One Panel member questioned whether putting the pedestrian and bike trail on the north side is the best idea. The Panel member suggested getting rid of the path on the north side and focusing on carving out more space on the south side to accommodate a pedestrian path. The Panel member also suggested depressing the centre median rather than raising it.

Another Panel member felt that the downspouts from the Gardiner deck are an important design consideration. The Panel member also requested that more detail on the intersections are brought to the next review.

One Panel member felt that addressing the building facades and their treatment above and below the Gardiner are important considerations. The Panel member felt that an urban design approach on how to address this interface is required and felt that bringing elevations that look south to the next review would be helpful. The Panel member also felt that there should be a sense of the Lake Shore's history and understanding of the Lake Shore memory.

Another Panel member felt uneasy about the bicycle and pedestrian trails combining between Parliament and Cherry Street.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The overall vision of transitioning from gritty to natural is good and clear
- Continue to engage Metrolinx in conversations about the north-south connections
- More detail is needed on how the intersections are going to look, feel and function
- Overlay the proposed design onto the existing conditions of Lake Shore
- The relationship of the public realm to future development on the south side of Lake Shore is important
- Consider integrating public art into the design
- The stormwater management should be built into the overall scheme
- Further refinement of the materiality and species selection is required

## **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 of the project.

## **2.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure**

*Project Type:* Roads and Public Realm

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* WSP with DTAH

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Herb Sweeny, MVVA, Gullivar Shepard, MVVA, Shawn Walters, WSP

*Delegation:* James Roche, DTAH

*ID#:* 1095

### **2.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by noting that this is the Port Lands Flood Protection's first time presenting the roads, bridges and municipal infrastructure. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the Port Lands Framework Plan notes that bridges will be an important element of the overall transportation system, providing connection across the Port Lands' utilitarian and naturalized waterways. Ms. Mallozzi referred to an excerpt from the Port Lands Framework Plan regarding roads, noting a few of the complete streets principles. Ms. Mallozzi raised a number of topics for Panel consideration on the roads, including the appropriateness of the approach to Commissioners Street as the spine of the Port Lands and shift in the Don Roadway cross section, the appropriateness of the proposed character, and feedback on the innovative ideas. Ms. Mallozzi also raised a number of topics for Panel consideration on the bridges, including the assessment of views from the city versus views within the river valley, feedback on the proposed family of bridges, the appropriateness of consistency versus a mix of both industrial and natural bridge family. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Herb Sweeney to give a brief overview of the project.

### **2.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Sweeney began by noting that there is a lot of design integration involved in this project. Mr. Sweeney also noted that there is a significant amount of cut and fill and lots of parameters that are being informed by the flood protection project that the roads and bridges teams need to address. Mr. Sweeney then introduced Gullivar Shepard, Principal with MVVA.

Mr. Shepard began by describing the roadway morphology, which has a rich history and story. Mr. Shepard noted that Cherry Street used to be the original access to the Toronto Islands. Mr. Shepard explained that Commissioners Street is the skewer with Promontory Park at one end and the water tower at the other, creating a visual spine. Mr. Shepard then introduced Shawn Walters, with WSP.

Mr. Walters explained that WSP is the lead engineer specifically looking at the roads. Mr. Walters noted that the Villiers Island Precinct Plan set the framework for the typical

sections of roadways. Mr. Walters explained that Cherry Street will require a drop in grade in order to accommodate the LRT through the railway underpass. Mr. Walters explained that one of the constraints of Commissioners Street is the alignment between Villiers Island and the Film Studio Precinct. Another constraint along Commissioners is the location of the HONI towers, which will have to be raised to accommodate grading and flood protection work. Mr. Shepard noted that the unique character of the street will follow the idea of having softer edges, while exploring expressions of the post-industrial landscape.

### **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked whether the fire station will remain a fire station or just a historical building. Mr. Glaisek responded that it is currently not used as a fire station. The Panel member asked if raising the hydro towers versus moving them completely is onerous. Mr. Sweeney replied that moving the towers is extremely difficult and the towers may have to be physically raised. The Panel member asked if the raised grade will extend to the Ship Channel. Mr. Sweeney replied yes, but not south of the Ship Channel, as it is not in the flood plain. The Panel member asked what will happen to the existing film studio buildings. Mr. Glaisek replied that those buildings were raised when they were built to get them out of the flood plain.

Another Panel member asked whether the wide street sections are set in stone. Ms. Mallozzi replied that they are using the most recent approved crossed sections.

One Panel member asked whether 5 mm is the target for stormwater retention. Mr. Sweeney replied that 5 mm is a minor event. The Panel member asked if they will just be considering runoff from the roads or the adjacent properties as well. Mr. Walters replied that there will be separate systems for the roads and adjacent blocks. The water from the buildings' roofs will outlet directly into the river, where as the stormwater from the roads requires an extra treatment process.

Another Panel member asked if there was another possible approach to the hydro tower problem. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the study was undertaken by Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI), and concluded that timing and cost were major issues. Ms. Mallozzi added that the assumptions during the Due Diligence process were to make the towers work in their existing location. The Panel member asked whether the voltage of the towers is too high to be buried. Ms. Mallozzi replied that it is feasible to bury them, but it is extremely expensive.

One Panel member asked about the north-south grading on Don Roadway. Mr. Sweeney replied that there is a 3.5% slope on the wet side and the dry side is limited to 1% slope.

Another Panel member asked whether HONI would update the look of the towers when updating the towers to accommodate more power. Ms. Mallozzi replied that the towers will remain as historic pieces of the Port Lands.

One Panel member asked what the innovative ideas are for the project. Mr. Walters replied that innovative aspects that the project is seeking to achieve include, stormwater management such as bioswales, permeable surfaces, low impact development and sustainable design. The Panel member asked what the proposed character is of the public realm. Mr. Shepard replied that the team is looking to bridge between the industrial character and a park-like character.

Another Panel member asked whether autonomous vehicles will have any implications on the road design. Mr. Walters replied that they have an autonomous vehicle expert on their team that will soon be engaged in the process, but it is still in the preliminary stages of the project.

One Panel member asked whether the size of the road right-of way is a result of accommodating all uses. Mr. Glaisek replied yes, adding that a large portion of the road can be dedicated to pedestrian space.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the combination of the team is great. The Panel member liked the urban infrastructure integrated with the historic industrial context. The Panel member also noted that in terms of cost efficiency, if the underground utilities are placed in the right locations, 30 cubic meters of soil volume for trees is still achievable.

Another Panel member requested that more context from surrounding developments is brought to the next review. The Panel member liked the remnants of the post-industrial landscape, such as the rail tracks, and suggested these elements are put back in place after the re-grading.

One Panel member was worried about the streets being too wide. The Panel member added that the project feels rather open and cautioned that there is a fine tipping point of making the precinct feel suburban.

Another Panel member suggested moving the LRT underground as there will be plenty of soil moving around once construction starts. The Panel member also suggested keeping the separated bike trails on the west side of the street.

One Panel member felt that providing more context of future developments in the area would be helpful. The Panel member also wanted to gain a better understanding of how the table top of the road and the adjacent properties work together.

Another Panel member noted that the design of Commissioners Street from Cherry Street to the Don Roadway will set the template for the rest of Commissioners Street. The Panel member felt that the Waterfront Toronto's principles and the role of public art were not apparent enough and should be clarified for the next review. The Panel member also asked the team to think about the roads as a family, each serving a specific purpose, similar to the West Don Lands.

## 2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- There is concern over the ROW widths being too wide and verging on having a suburban character
- Ensure a strong presence of public realm throughout all these ROWs (leading with landscape)
- Within the 40 m ROW there is opportunity to achieve a very good landscape
- Best practices vs innovation. Think about what is innovative with the design and what makes it different.
- A better understanding of how this is going to look, feel, and work (cross sections) is required
- Ensure the streets integrate well into Villiers Island

## 2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

## 3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges

*Project Type:* Bridges

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* Intuitive with Grimshaw and SBP

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Juan Porral, Grimshaw, David Dennis, Grimshaw,

*Delegation:* Herb Sweeney, MVVA

*ID#:* 1096

### 3.1 Project Presentation

Juan Porral, Partner at Grimshaw, introduced the project by noting that Grimshaw is the lead Architect, Entuitive is overseeing the delivery, and SPB is the structural engineer. Mr. Porral noted that each bridge has its own challenges and opportunities. Mr. Porral introduced David Dennis, Associate Principal at Grimshaw. Mr. Dennis explained that the team was inspired by a liveable and walkable neighbourhood, bringing a sense of continuity. Mr. Dennis explained the site analysis for Cherry Street north, which is single phase construction and will need to make way for the tugboat clearance. Cherry Street South will have two phases of construction, has a larger span and is one of the most interesting bridges due to its juxtaposition over the new naturalized river and proximity to the Atlas crane. Mr. Dennis explained that the Commissioners Street bridge will also have two phases of construction and has potential to be more of a natural looking bridge. Mr. Dennis noted that the bridges will be a family of bridges informed by the cultural and natural history of the Port Lands and asked the Panel for their thoughts on which locations are suitable for a natural bridge versus an industrial style bridge.

### 3.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked whether the Atlas cane will remain in the same location in the future. Mr. Glaisek replied yes.

Another Panel member asked if a phasing plan can be brought to the next review. Mr. Porral replied yes. The Panel member also asked if there is a budget. Ms. Mallozzi replied that the budget for phase 1 of all three bridges is \$99 million plus contingency.

One Panel member asked what the span is of the other two bridges. Mr. Porral replied that in the span is in the range of 20 – 30 meters.

Another Panel member asked if fewer bridge columns is better for flood conveyance. Mr. Sweeney replied that fewer columns is better for flood conveyance but not if the columns are larger.

One Panel member asked if the team has thought about sustainability in terms of materiality. Mr. Porral replied that sustainability was discussed in their RFP and they have designed other bridges that are heated to avoid salting. The team also played with the idea of using timber, which was dismissed.

Another Panel member asked if the existing industrial bridge across the Ship Channel will remain. Mr. Porral replied yes, this bridge will be maintained.

### **3.3 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt overwhelmingly in favour of the industrial style bridge. The Panel member felt that once the precinct is complete, the industrial heritage of the area will be less obvious. The Panel member felt that the proposed landscape design will not need a landscape bridge to help it stand out. The Panel member referenced the Pont Transbordeur in Marseille, noting its industrial design.

Another Panel member felt that having two bridge typologies in the precinct would be more suitable than one. The Panel member noted that Commissioners Street bridge and Cherry Street south bridge span from one park to another making two landscape bridges fitting for these locations. The Panel member explained that Cherry Street north bridge is a gateway and connection to the city and is more suitable as an industrial bridge. The Panel member suggested simplifying the design in order to make it more authentic and elegant.

One Panel member felt that the concept drawings of the natural bridge aren't representative of a natural landscape. The Panel member felt that the curvilinear design of the landscape bridge speaks more to muscularity, which competes with the idea of the bridge trying to be a quiet area.

Another Panel member asked the Proponents to bring views of what the bridges will look like once the area is built out. The Panel member also felt that Cherry Street bridge south will be a visible location and could be the next postcard image for Toronto.

The Panel member also cautioned the team to think about how the industrial elements will all speak to each other, rather than being an assortment of disparate elements.

One Panel member asked the Proponents to think about Cherry Street as a spatial experience from end to end drawing people to Cherry Beach. The Panel member felt that Cherry bridge north and south should be a sequence and not a duality.

### **3.4 Consensus Comments**

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

- Consider the Cherry St bridge as a gateway to the city with a very strong connecting role.
- Commissioners Street should be part of the natural bridge design family given its location spanning two parks.
- Cherry Street bridge south could have either a natural design or an industrial design
- Ensure that the bridge design is simple and elegant – bridges should inspire
- Provide more views of the future built form to better understand the context.
- Bring a drawing showing the phases of implementation to the next review
- Consider/show high water conditions compared to low water conditions

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

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