



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #102  
Wednesday, June 21, 2017**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Pat Hanson  
Chris Reed  
Betsy Williamson

**Regrets**

Claude Cormier  
Brigitte Shim

**Recording Secretaries**

Rei Tasaka  
Tristan Simpson

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
James Parakh, City of Toronto  
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto Board Liaison

---

**WELCOME**

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

1. Union Station Rail Corridor Project (for information)
  2. Gardiner East Public Realm
  3. Jack Layton Ferry Terminal Phase 1A
  4. Cherry Street Lakefilling and Design
  5. Hanlan Boat Club
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the June 21 meeting. The Chair noted that the minutes did not mention the appointment of the new Vice Chair, Betsy Williamson and asked for a revision. The minutes were then adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Chris Reed declared that he had a conflict with the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and Harbour Square Park Project and would recuse himself for that review.

The Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek noted that on June 6, 2017, community members gathered at George Brown College Waterfront Campus for a Town Hall with Waterfront Toronto CEO, Will Fleissig. This was a great opportunity for Mr. Fleissig to introduce himself to the community and give an update on what Waterfront Toronto has been up to over the last two years, including the major transformational projects that will determine Waterfront Toronto's future, including Quayside and Port Lands Flood Protection. Mr. Glaisek noted that more than 240 people attended the meeting and another 1,800 people watched live on the Waterfront Toronto Facebook page.

Mr. Glaisek then introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that construction of the Fort York Visitor's Centre Extension is currently underway. Work continues to progress on the underground utilities, and stormwater management infrastructure. Ms. Mallozzi noted that work on the Strachan Gate building will begin at the beginning of July. The Conservancy has now hired a Director of Programming, Ilana Altman, and seeking to fill positions for Manager of Communications, Director of Facilities and Operations and Manager of Finance & Accounting.

Mr. Glaisek provided the Panel with an update on projects that were reviewed at the last meeting. Mr. Glaisek noted Bayside's Aquabella submitted their second round Site Plan Approval and the team is about to submit for a building permit. Mr. Glaisek explained that the West Don Lands' River City Phase 4 team is revising the SPA drawings based on comments from the last meeting. Mr. Glaisek explained that Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project team is currently reviewing the comments from the last Design Review Panel meeting.

---

## **FOR INFORMATION**

### **1.0 Union Station Rail Corridor Project**

*ID#: 1082*

*Project Type:*

*Location: Rail Corridor from Yonge Street to Don River*

*Proponent: Metrolinx*

*Architect/Designer:*

*Review Stage: Information*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Jason Ryan, Metrolinx*

*Delegation: Gunta Mackars (Metrolinx), Graham Bailey (Metrolinx)*

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

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by providing site context of the project noting that the extents are from approximately Cooper Street to the east of the Don River. The southern part of the project lies within the Designated Design Review Area. Ms.

Mallozzi referred to the project components map which outlines the locations of the different bridge widenings, the locations of the new retaining walls and the new multi-use trails. Ms. Mallozzi introduced Jason Ryan, the Director of Environmental Programs and Assessment with Metrolinx, to give the project presentation.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Ryan began by noting that the team is leading the environmental assessment piece of the project. Mr. Ryan explained that new infrastructure is required to accommodate increased train movements related to RER/SmartTrack. The new infrastructure will require additional tracks which means that bridge extensions are required to the north and south at certain locations. Mr. Ryan noted that the final façade of all bridge extensions will match the current aesthetic character to maintain the heritage status of the bridges. Mr. Ryan also explained that there will be a new Wilson Yard layover which will need a total of 18 storage tracks within the existing Don Yard and future Wilson Yard to support GO and SmartTrack service. Mr. Ryan noted that design considerations to mitigate negative impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, and motorized vehicles using these north-south at grade connections include lighting and public art. Splaying of the wingwalls has been incorporated into the Preliminary Design where feasible, and the bridge extension aesthetics will consider local heritage and will not preclude the City's future public art plans. Mr. Ryan added that the architectural designs will be reviewed by the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto. Mr. Ryan noted that they are still very early in the process of the environmental assessment and the team will be introducing the project to the public at a meeting on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked about the heritage consideration of the bridges in doing a project of this scale, and asked if there funding to make substantial improvements to the underpasses. Mr. Ryan noted that this is why they are bringing the project to DRP early to allow for the public to react to the current design.

Another Panel member asked if they plan on reconstructing the bridges needing expansion. Mr. Ryan replied that the team is not looking to reconstruct the bridges but to simply extend the bridges.

One Panel member asked about the site ownership of the areas beneath the bridges. Mr. Ryan replied that the railway company is responsible for the structure and the City of Toronto is responsible for the lighting and drainage below. The Panel member asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the underpasses, to which the Proponent replied they were unsure.

## **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member asked the Proponent to consider complete reconstruction, similar to what happened at York Street. The Panel member felt that it's difficult to imagine a

significant improvement without a significant widening of the pedestrian and cycling facilities.

Another Panel member noted that the ownership and maintenance of the pedestrian space needs to be resolved. The Panel member also suggested adding significant landscape improvements such as a steady row of trees.

One Panel member commented that the current situation of the pedestrian spaces are dark, loud and miserable. The Panel member suggested opportunities to poke natural light through and to add artificial lighting. The Panel member also cautioned the use of brick and steel to replicate the heritage look as it can feel artificial.

Another Panel member asked that the future north-south connections at Church Street and Trinity Street be folded into this work.

Mr. Glaisek noted that this project will be coming to back to the Design Review Panel but likely as a joint process between both the City of Toronto, Metrolinx and Waterfront Toronto Panels.

The Chair noted that the fundamental goal is to remove barriers and make connections and this project is an opportunity to upgrade the existing conditions. There will be a significant increase in pedestrian and bike traffic once development begins so it is critical to get this right.

### **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Determining the ownership of the underpasses and maintenance responsibilities is critical
- Consider the possibility of natural light penetration through bridges to the underpass and adding artificial lighting
- There is an opportunity to rethink the bridges in order to open up the space and create something new
- Improvements to the underpasses are necessary as the current situation is far from good
- The retaining walls should be understood as part of the landscape treatment and not just a wall
- An integrated public realm plan is fundamental

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **2.0 Gardiner East Public Realm Plan**

*ID#: 1083*

*Project Type: Public Realm*

*Location: Gardiner/Lake Shore Corridor*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto / City of Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Dillon Consulting, West 8*

*Review Stage: Issues Identification*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Don McKinnon (Dillon Consulting), Jelle Therry (West 8)*  
*Delegation: Pinelopi Gramatikopoulos, City of Toronto*

## **2.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by providing an overview of context noting that the study area extents are from Lower Jarvis to Leslie Street along the Gardiner and Lake Shore corridor. Ms. Mallozzi provided an overview of the recommendations of the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment and Integrated Urban Design Study (EA), which included public realm improvements as part of the Hybrid 3 configuration undertaking. The improvements defined in the EA consist of, corridor-wide design elements, pedestrian networks and cycling connections, open space/linear greenway, public realm, public art and animation, streetscaping, and intersection improvements. Ms. Mallozzi outlined the scope of work for Dillon Consulting and West 8, who were retained to advance the conceptual public realm improvements, identify short-term improvements and take them to 15% to 20% schematic design between Jarvis Street and Cherry Street. They were also asked to identify a long-term vision and take it to 10% schematic level of design detail for Jarvis Street to Leslie Street. Ms. Mallozzi added that these deliverables will be fed into the design-build contracts for the re-decking between Jarvis Street and Cherry Street and the Hybrid 3 implementation respectively. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the areas for Panel consideration include programming priorities for this corridor, conceptual approach to landscaping, and connectivity between the city and the waterfront. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Don McKinnon, Partner at Dillon Consulting Limited, and Jelle Therry, Project Manager at West 8 to give the project presentation.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. McKinnon began by noting that the EA showed the public realm plan at a conceptual level, and now is the time for a more detailed design with stakeholder input. Mr. McKinnon noted that the community interest for this project is very important and a Stakeholder Advisory Meeting was already held and another meeting is scheduled for this evening. Mr. McKinnon noted that most of the work completed to date has focused on the area between Jarvis Street and Cherry Street. The conditions east of Cherry Street are very different as Lake Shore Blvd. is not directly below the Gardiner Expressway, and there are multiple projects in the area that require coordination.

Mr. Therry walked the Panel through the site by showing site photos of the corridor. Mr. Therry noted that walking through the space is uncomfortable and loud yet there are many areas that have great potential for programming. Mr. Therry explained that this space will be transformed into a pedestrian friendly environment. Mr. Therry walked through some precedents including Engelsplein in Belgium which is a public space that incorporates soft and rougher landscape elements. Schipol in Amsterdam was another example of public realm space under expressways. Mr. Therry explained that they are looking to incorporate more wood elements instead of concrete and clearly delineate soft and hard landscapes. Mr. Therry explained that the inspiration for the design comes from the forgotten lakeshore as this area was once the lakefront. The theme

draws from ideas from the Canadian Shield. Mr. Therry explained that stacking rocks and creating height elevations will take people away from the noise and traffic. Mr. Therry also explained that adding colour will help brighten the corridor.

### **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there was coordination happening with Metrolinx. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the team is working collaboratively with Metrolinx and there are lots of technical issues that need to be worked out.

Another Panel member asked if the elevated multi-use trail will come back down to grade at the crossings, to which Mr. Therry replied yes. The Panel member also asked if the Proponent could speak to the experience of the automobile user. Mr. Therry replied that part of the scope of this project is traffic management and right now drivers use the space as a miniature highway. The goal would be to reduce the speed by making drivers aware that this is a city landscape and they should be controlling their speed in this corridor.

One Panel member asked if the team has considered winter conditions. Mr. Therry replied that the team has been thinking about this, particularly with how the landscape will react to seasonality.

### **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that a lot of time was spent reviewing the Bentway project at DRP. One of the big focuses of that project was lighting and the Panel member felt that lighting should also be a big focus of this project. The Panel member felt that the metaphor of the Canadian Shield should be separated from this project as the Toronto waterfront is more sand than large rocks. The Panel member also noted that the cycling path is critical and definitely a good move for this project.

Another Panel member noted that there should be some coordination between the landscape and light reflectivity, incorporating both natural and artificial lighting. The Panel member noted that it would be worth investigating acoustic absorption. The Panel member also cautioned against the use of bright paint due to the longevity and maintenance.

One Panel member agreed with moving away from the Canadian Shield theme as it is more representative of northern Ontario than southern Ontario. The Panel member noted that this is a huge opportunity but cautioned that retaining walls are highly technical and there is a need to coordinate with Metrolinx at the engineering level.

Another Panel member noted that they were very intrigued by the crafting of this continuous experience in a car and as a pedestrian. The Panel member raised concerns about the loss of natural lighting once all of the trees have grown along the

corridor. The Panel member also felt that the north/south corridors are just as important as the east west connections should also be as thoughtfully considered.

The Board Liaison noted that this project should take into consideration the layering of linkages with the Bentway, which will set a new standard for how we begin to use these spaces. The Board Liaison also suggested considering the changing role of the car in the next 20–40 years.

One Panel member noted that the more you build around the corridor, the more the elevated highway disappears, such as the York Street underpass.

## **2.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall support for the boulevard concept
- Removing barriers and making connections should be the foundation of this project
- Natural and artificial lighting is critical to the space
- Consider exploring the use of acoustic absorption
- Look into programmatic considerations
- The need to coordinate with Metrolinx is imperative particularly with the vertical retaining wall
- There should be just as much consideration given to the north-south connections as the east-west connections.
- There is a need to redefine how drivers use the corridor
- The identity of the corridor should be representative of the southern Ontario landscape

## **2.6 Vote of Support/Non Support**

The project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage and therefore no vote was taken.

## **3.0 Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and Harbour Square Park – Phase 1A**

*ID#: 1066*

*Project Type: Parks and Public Realm*

*Location: Bay Street and Queens Quay Boulevard*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto / City of Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: KPMB, West 8 and Greenberg Consultants Inc.*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design and Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Jelle Therry, West 8*

*Delegation: Bruno Weber, KPMB*

## **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by noting that this project was last presented to the DRP in January for Schematic Design and gained Panel support. This project is being presented for two separate items, Detailed Design for the promenade and Schematic Design for the wayfinding and signage at the Bay Street entrance. Ms. Mallozzi

reviewed Panel comments from the last meeting which, included strong support for the pavement design and the continuation of the waterfront vision, confidence that the proposed design will respond to the queuing/operational needs, wayfinding and signage needs to be developed further to ensure that its unique and reads well, and integration of public art needs to be demonstrated in this phase or the next phase of design. Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on Phase 1A which includes a budget of \$2.8 million to extend the walkway to the existing ticket booth. The informal play elements have been replaced with wayfinding and signage due to the feedback indicating how crucial wayfinding is to the success of the ferry terminal and park redesign. Ms. Mallozzi reviewed areas for the Panel to consider including the appropriateness of the promenade alignment, materiality and grading, relationship between the proposed work and existing edges, appropriateness of the wayfinding and signage as a strong, clear marker at the Bay Street entrance, and the location of the wayfinding and signage. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Jelle Therry with West 8 to give the presentation.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Therry began by walking through the existing conditions noting that the promenade needs to address the large crowds at the entrance to the park and the people waiting in the queue at the ticket booth. The scope of work includes upgrading the existing light features, wayfinding and signage, and the promenade. Mr. Therry explained that the area between the tunnel entrance and the Westin Harbour Castle is 14.5 meters. The granite promenade will be 9.5 meters wide with a sequence of trees and light poles every five meters. Mr. Therry explained that due to the current grading of the walkway, there are constricted views to the lake. By lowering the existing grade, the new promenade will increase the view to the lake. Mr. Therry explained that the soil system for the trees is a new system that has a smaller cell but a higher soil volume. Mr. Therry also noted that the Jack Layton statue will require steps and a ramp due to the new site grading.

Mr. Therry then introduced Carolina Solderholm and Kristina Lubanovic to present the wayfinding and signage portion of the project. Ms. Solderholm noted that the entrance to the Ferry Terminal lacks clarity and often leaves visitors confused as to the location of the terminal. The goal is to make the entrance to the site at Bay and Queens Quay a key moment to announce that you are at the terminal and bring clarity and joy to the foot of Bay Street. Ms. Lubanovic explained that the colours of the island represent a nautical language, a nautical inspired typeface was developed for the signage. Ms. Lubanovic noted that views to the island are desired so a periscope was incorporated into the signage piece. The interactive island periscope will be a glulam wood post and evoke the nautical theme with typeface that reads "TO ISLAND FERRY". Ms. Lubanovic noted that the location of the periscope will be at the foot of Bay Street but the exact location is still under review.

### **3.3 Panel Questions for landscape**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked why the allee of trees will not be planted up to the ticket booth. Mr. Therry replied that operational requirements need to be met and the

alignment of the trees could conflict with the queuing of the existing ticket booth location.

Another Panel member asked if the bench/retaining wall detail runs the entire length of the promenade, to which Mr. Therry replied yes.

### **3.4 Panel Comments for landscape**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member disagreed with omitting trees from the ticket area, and felt added that having trees near the queuing area would provide much needed shade in the summer months, and would not conflict with operations.

The Board Liaison encouraged the idea of connecting this space with the Westin Harbour Castle façade and noted that with the new hotel ownership this could be great opportunity.

Another Panel member was very supportive of lowering the grade to get the views of the lake.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments for landscape**

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

- Supportive of the grading plan to maximize views to the lake
- Consider planting the trees near the queuing area now
- Connect this site with the Westin Harbour Castle

### **3.6 Panel Questions for Wayfinding and Signage**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the passerelle can be used as a mounting option for wayfinding and signage. Mr. Therry replied that the fate of the passerelle is unknown.

Another Panel member asked if the periscope will be functioning. Ms. Solderholm replied that the idea is to make this a fully functioning and interactive periscope with views to the lake.

One Panel member asked if the typeface “TO” is meant to be read as “Toronto Ferry Terminal” or “To Ferry Terminal”. Ms. Solderholm replied that it can be interpreted both ways. The Panel member felt that the sign should read as “The Jack Layton Ferry Terminal”.

Another Panel member asked about the height of the periscope viewer and whether it would accommodate people with accessibility needs. Ms. Solderholm replied that viewers with accessibility needs will be accommodated and there will likely be two different viewing heights. The Panel member asked if the team considered using more colours. Ms. Solderholm replied that more colours were considered but due to maintenance and legibility issues, limited colour was chosen.

One Panel member asked what size the periscope will be. Ms. Solderholm replied that it will be approximately be 12 meters in height with a diameter of 70 cm. Ms. Solderholm added that they would like this to be a substantial presence on the site.

### **3.7 Panel Comments for Wayfinding and Signage**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member raised concerns over the legibility of the vertical typeface and felt that the signage should be read horizontally. The Panel member also felt that the overall idea of a periscope is great, however, the location of the periscope will encourage a moment of pause at the entrance creating an obstruction.

Another Panel member felt that the design is too busy and wanted to see a new, simpler approach.

One Panel member liked the use of the wood post which ties in with the signature Olivio light poles along the waterfront. The Panel member agreed with previous comments regarding the vertical typeface and its illegibility.

Another Panel member felt that the playfulness around this idea is nice and liked the materiality choice.

One Panel member felt that there is a lot of visual clutter to break through and didn't feel that this piece achieved that. The Panel member also felt that just using "Island Ferry" is easier to read without the "TO". This should be about creating a piece of public art that would become a wayfinding component and beacon. The Panel member noted that this would be a very photographed and shared piece on social media which draws lots of attention. The Panel member also felt that creating clutter at the entrance to the park is all part of the ferry terminal experience.

Another Panel member felt that the nautical theme gets lost and noted that more work needs to be done with alternative concepts.

One Panel member cautioned the use of Glulam wood especially when exposed to sun elements which degrades the wood fibers, involving some maintenance.

### **3.8 Consensus Comments for Wayfinding and Signage**

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

- Overall support for of the interactive periscope concept
- Re-consider the vertical typeface of the periscope as most people relate to horizontal typeface
- Think about incorporating more colour as described in the nautical theme concept

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

The Panel voted in support of the landscape piece but voted in non-support for the wayfinding and signage piece.

#### **4.0 Cherry Street Lakefilling and Design**

*ID#: 1078*

*Project Type: Parks and Public Realm*

*Location: Port Lands*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto / City of Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: MVVA*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Herb Sweeney (MVVA)*

*Delegation:*

#### **4.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Ms. Mallozzi introduced the project by noting this is the project's third time presenting to the Design Review Panel. Ms. Mallozzi recapped the scope of work, noting that the detailed design scope is focused on aquatic habitat and the park edge only. Ms. Mallozzi reviewed the Panel comments from the last meeting noting that how the cove meets the dockwall including size, placement, and integration of soft landscape with hard stone armour is critical. Ms. Mallozzi raised a few additional topics for the Panel to consider such as the integration of the causeway and harbour overlook staircase, character of the beach, and the use of the dimensional stone. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates to present the project.

#### **4.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Sweeney began the presentation with a description of the project area including some existing site condition images and diagrams indicating the context of the project within nearby planning and development initiatives. Mr. Sweeney explained that on May 25, 2017, the MT35 building was partially destroyed by fire. The structural integrity of the remaining building is uncertain, so previous design concepts may have to change. Mr. Sweeney explained the material for the North habitat cove which consist of armour stone (1 m), habitat stone (25-200 mm), shallow aquatic habitat (cobble to small riprap) and wood and boulder habitat. Mr. Sweeney pointed out that one of the changes since the last meeting is the vocabulary of the path network, which was originally a straight engineered solution and now has an inflexion. Mr. Sweeney explained that the material of the west habitat cove is similar to the north but this cove has integrated dimensional stone which provides an opportunity for seating and for people fishing to move closer to the water's edge. Mr. Sweeney explained that the lower portion of the carp gate will be constructed as a pre-cast assembly and then another pre-cast piece would be dropped in at a later date to create the bridge condition. The fish gates are there to keep out carp which is an invasive species. Mr. Sweeney noted that some vegetation will be constructed as part of the aquatic habitat such as the submerged wood and boulders. There will be four different plant types which includes, deep submerged, wetted fringe, shallow submergent and low lacustrine. Mr. Sweeney explained that the large wood details will be dropped in the river with an anchoring detail to prevent the wood from shifting during storm events.

#### **4.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked where they will be getting the trees that will be submerged in the river as part of the habitat. Mr. Sweeney replied that TRCA is working on other projects that involve the removal of trees which could be coordinated with this project.

Another Panel member asked about the wood and how it will weather. Mr. Sweeney replied that the wood siting above the water will weather and may fall into the river creating debris. The Panel member also wanted clarification as to whether the trees are being cut down for this project. Mr. Sweeney replied that only fallen dead trees will be used for this project.

One Panel member noted that cobble beaches tend to accumulate debris and asked the Proponent if they expect to see accumulation of debris in this case. Mr. Sweeney replied that there have been lots of discussions about a maintenance strategy. Mr. Sweeney noted that in Brooklyn Bridge Park the park maintenance staff pick up any floating matter. The Panel member also asked if the southern edge of the habitat is a bulk head. Mr. Sweeney replied yes and noted that it would be meeting grade.

Another Panel member asked if there was a metric used to determine how much seating to provide with the dimensional stone. Mr. Sweeney replied that they did not quantify this but there would be room for approximately 40-60 people to sit on the edge of the dimensional stone.

One Panel member asked what kind of expert advice is being sought on this project as it is highly technical and unprecedented. Mr. Sweeney replied that they have many sub-consultants including Interfluve, a firm that specializes in rivers, lakes and wetlands, Limnotech, a firm that specializes in water sciences and environmental engineering, and CH2M, a multi-disciplinary engineering firm, all providing insight on the technical aspect of the project.

Another Panel member asked why there will be one meter of settlement. Mr. Sweeney replied that there is a significant layer of silt so when you drop it down, the silt gets pushed out.

One Panel member asked if Climate Change and rising water levels was taken into consideration. Mr. Sweeney replied that they have been looking at low, mean, high, and recently freeboard water levels.

#### **4.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member noted how interesting this project is. The Panel member was unclear how the undulating surface will meet the concrete surface. Mr. Sweeney clarified that this is an intentional move and the team is excited about the juxtaposition of the architectural relationships of retaining the industrial edge and merging that with an undulating surface. Mr. Sweeney noted that the legacy of the dockwalls will remain. The Panel noted that they were supportive of this idea of referencing the history of the site.

Another Panel member felt that the proposed dimensional stone on a coast will look very engineered. The Panel member suggested thinking about how the two types of stone can combine to make something more natural or not natural, but at the moment it feels like an engineered solution.

One Panel member commended the team for a very well thought out project that is beautifully detailed. The way the different stones are combined alluding to the human hand and natural makeup. The Panel member noted that without the dimensional stone, the dockwall is out of character. The Panel member also really liked the root balls and the intimacy at each cove.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to look into how people are going to use the dimensional stone for seating, particularly families using the space. The Panel member noted that the trees sticking out of the water will look unusual at first, but once the surrounding landscape starts to grow, it will look good.

#### **4.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall support of the project and the beautifully detailed habitat coves.
- Integration of the bulk head and the undulating surface needs to be carefully considered.
- Avoid making the park edge look overly engineered with the dimensional armour stone.
- Think about a maintenance regime to avoid excess debris buildup along the shore.

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

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

### **5.0 Hanlan Boat Club**

*ID#: 1079*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: Regatta Road*

*Proponent: Hanlan Boat Club*

*Architect/Designer: Lieux Architects*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Robert Macpherson, Lieux Architects*

*Delegation: Patrick Okens, Hanlan Boat Club*

#### **5.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Netami Stewart, Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by providing an overview of the site context. Ms. Stewart noted that Hanlan Boat Club is one of several boating clubs that lease land along Regatta Road. All of the lands south of Unwin Avenue are part of one undivided park parcel and part of the land is subject to TRCA planning controls and regulations. Ms. Stewart reviewed Panel comments from

the March 2017 meeting which, included support for the industrial greenhouse concept, exploring the possibility of having a weather protected waiting area, the need for a presence on Regatta Road through signage, windows or a front door on the north side, preserving the existing landscape features and thinking about strategically planting more trees onsite, making the building design more than a pure catalogue product that is driven solely by budget, and consider using the building to provide some indoor amenity space. Ms. Stewart raised a number of areas of the project for the Panel to consider such as the appropriateness of the materiality and colour of the weather protected waiting area, the materiality and colour of the building, the treatment of the landscape and ground plane, and the revised building location. Ms. Stewart introduced Robert Macpherson with Lieux Architects to give the presentation.

## **5.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Macpherson began the presentation by noting that this project will be a modest yet meaningful improvement to the waterfront. Mr. Macpherson walked through the history and evolution of the waterfront since 1970 noting that there has been an intensification of recreational uses in the area. Mr. Macpherson noted that this is a fully permitted use within the zoning by-law. Mr. Macpherson explained that the team landed on the greenhouse design as it offers ample daylighting and simplified racking for boats. By shifting the building to the north of the site, it creates more of a presence on Regatta Road. Mr. Macpherson noted that the building material is lightweight with translucent panels located on the roof which will minimize heat gain. The existing vegetation and grading will be maintained as much as possible and any new plantings will be native species. Mr. Macpherson explained that in terms of sustainability, the building is a low energy structure, with low energy use, it's daylighted, and requires no gas, water or sanitary service on site.

## **5.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there was a door near the covered waiting area. Mr. Macpherson replied that there will be no door at the covered waiting area as it is not intended to be an entranceway. The Panel member also asked about security and whether they had experienced vandalism in the past. Patrick Okens, Vice President of Development with Hanlan Boat Club, responded that they have not experienced vandalism. If anything, this new building will help create more security. The Panel member also asked if the building material was polycarbonate, to which Mr. Macpherson replied yes. The Panel member noted that this is a highly flammable material.

Another Panel member asked what the material of the garage doors is. Mr. Macpherson replied that it's an insulated opaque metal. The Panel member also asked what is required legally from an accessibility perspective. Mr. Okens replied that the site is completely flat and there would be nothing on site that they foresee as an impediment.

One Panel member asked if the system is pre-engineered. Mr. Macpherson replied that it is engineered but customizable. The Panel member also asked if there was a

ventilation component. Mr. Macpherson replied that the building is designed with gaps so the structure is deliberately leaky. Once the sliding garage doors open, it becomes even more ventilated.

Another Panel member asked what colour the garage doors will be. Mr. Macpherson replied that they are pre-manufactured so they could be painted any colour with surface paint. The Panel member also asked about rainwater collection. Mr. Macpherson replied that the peaks in the roof make this building a gutter structure.

#### **5.4 Panel Comments**

One Panel member felt that the revised site plan is a great improvement from the last review. The Panel member also commended the team for the research and work that was put into this presentation. The Panel member emphasized the importance of the canopy structure is critical, and noted that if anything is pre-engineered you need to make sure that it's special. The Panel member also noted that details need to be worked out between the canopy and the building as a different type of architecture is implied in the canopy than the building. The Panel member also noted that the garage doors are the Achilles heel of the project right now and questioned whether an insulated door is necessary. The Panel member asked the Proponents to bring material samples to the next review. The Panel member also added that they might need to provide an accessible washroom facility on site.

Another Panel member also agreed that the new site plan was a great improvement. The Panel member also liked the greenhouse typology of the building. The Panel member agreed that the canopy structure and the insulated garage doors need some resolution. The Panel member like that the landscape has a certain scruffiness and encouraged the team to stick to this theme and avoid becoming too suburban. The Panel member also encouraged the team to think about opportunities for the drainage system as the roof surface is large and the water will need to go somewhere. The Panel member felt that more research was needed on the accessibility piece of the project and did not think that lawns or loose surface qualify as accessible. The Panel member recommend compacted gravels that are AODA compliant.

One Panel member encouraged the team to think about the stormwater becoming a landscape element on the site. The Panel member also noted that exit doors might be necessary to comply with the building code as this will no longer just be a Quonset hut.

Another Panel member noted that if the roof is translucent there is going to be significant heat build-up in the building and the proposed ventilation might not be sufficient.

#### **5.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall support of the revised site plan configuration
- Explore the materiality and colour of the garage doors
- Keep the landscape rough and scruffy and avoid a suburban look

- There is an opportunity to create an interesting landscape element using the stormwater drainage
- Further details of the canopy need to be worked out to ensure it complements the architecture of the building
- More research needs to be done on the accessibility of the site

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

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