



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #118  
Wednesday, December 12, 2018**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Fadi Masoud  
Jeff Ranson  
Brigitte Shim  
Eric Turcotte

**Regrets**

Janna Levitt

**Recording Secretaries**

Tristan Simpson

**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. Quayside – Issues Identification
  2. York Street Park (Love Park) – Issues Identification
  3. 915/945 Lake Shore Boulevard East – Issues Identification
- 

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel member to adopt the minutes from the November 21, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier and Pat Hanson declared conflicts for York Street Park (Love Park) and Eric Turcotte and Pat Hanson declared conflicts for Quayside and recused themselves for those reviews.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that on November 28<sup>th</sup> a

groundbreaking ceremony was held by Waterfront Toronto and all three orders of government to mark the start of excavation for the Port Lands Flood Protection Project. Mr. Glaisek noted that on December 8<sup>th</sup> Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs hosted a fourth public roundtable meeting on the Sidewalk Toronto project with over 500 attendees. Mr. Glaisek noted that the four break-out sessions focused on the Quayside site plan and transportation, affordable housing and social infrastructure, digital governance. and sustainability.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on projects that were reviewed at the November 21<sup>st</sup> meeting for the Port Lands Flood Protection Cherry Street design, productive conversations are ongoing with City Urban Design and technical staff regarding the integration of green medians (either planted or LID bioswales). The team intends to return to the Panel for Commissioners and Don Roadway and will provide an update to the DRP at that time. The Port Lands Flood Protection Bridges team continues to work on resolving Panel comments including anti-climbing strategies, further refinement of the bench, the colour and the lighting strategy. Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto will report back to the Panel with resolution on their feedback in the new year. Mr. Glaisek explained that a design integration team has been struck across all aspects of the broader Port Lands Flood Protection project. This team is meeting bi-weekly and will make a presentation to the Panel on how all projects are integrated. Mr. Glaisek noted that the 350, 370, 390 Queens Quay team was very pleased with the review and are working to respond to the comments made by the Panel. Mr. Glaisek noted that the comments made by the Panel regarding the 101 Commissioners Street project are in line with the City's comments and will need a response to the issue of the north-south view corridors before resubmitting their application.

---

## PROJECT REVIEWS

### 1.0 Quayside

*Project Type:* Site Plan

*Location:* East Bayfront / Keating Channel

*Proponent:* Sidewalk Labs

*Architect/Designer:* Beyer Blinder Belle

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Jesse Shapins, Sidewalk Labs; Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants; Neil Kittredge, Byer Blinder Belle

*Delegation:* Pino Di Mascio, Urban Strategies; Leslie Gash, Waterfront Toronto

*ID#:* 1100

### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leslie Gash, Senior Vice President of Development with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by explaining that the Quayside site straddles the East Bayfront Precinct and Keating Channel Precinct. Some of the principles for these precincts include: a publicly accessible water's edge promenade, encourage pedestrian, cyclists and transit

users over private automobile use, establish Queens Quay as an urban boulevard, foster connectivity to adjacent waterfront neighbourhoods, create a district that serves as a model for environmental sustainability, and support a wide variety of residential and employment uses and flexibility across the precinct. Ms. Gash explained that there are five criteria for success, including priority outcomes, buildings, mobility and transit, community support and inclusivity and public realm. Ms. Gash then introduced Jesse Shapins with Sidewalk Labs, to give the presentation.

## **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Shapins began by noting that the essential catalysts for the project are foundational and sustainable infrastructure, improved quality of life accessible to all, sustainable economic development and targeted real estate development. Mr. Shapins added that the evaluation framework for the MIDP has some key objectives which include, job creation, climate positive, housing affordability, new mobility, data privacy and digital governance. Mr. Shapins noted that this is an opportunity to catalyse the timber industry, adding that the end-to-end process is important. In terms of being climate positive, Mr. Shapins explained that this neighbourhood will go further than existing neighbourhoods on the waterfront with 75% reduction in GHG emissions. Mr. Shapins noted that the housing mix at Quayside is specifically designed to address the housing shortage facing the city today and will provide options and opportunities to more Torontonians, enabling an inclusive complete community on the waterfront. Mr. Shapins walked the Panel through the current zoning permissions noting that the proposed massing is as-of-right. Mr. Shapins explained that Parliament Slip is envisioned as a plaza that brings water all the way up to Lake Shore. Queens Quay is proposed as a one-way street so that the north side has a wide sidewalk to match the south side. Mr. Shapins explained that the block north of Queens Quay is proposed as a pedestrian walkway. Mr. Shapins added that the ground floor spaces will be animated through market-like environments.

## **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what their strategy is for addressing the Lake Shore frontage. Neil Kittredge with Beyer Blinder Belle replied that they are interested in this interface and payed a great deal of attention to the view corridors. Mr. Shapins added that the underpasses are an important part of the project as the experience begins on the north side of the underpasses.

Another Panel member asked about the interface of the future community centre at Bayside and how they are addressing the connectivity across main streets and the water's edge promenade. Mr. Kittredge replied that this is going to be one integrated space. Access north and south will be made much easier and the slip will be a way to get people down to the water. The bridges crossing the Parliament Slip could be configured in a way to angle towards the community centre.

One Panel member asked who the design teams are for architecture, retail and transportation. Mr. Shapins replied that Beyer Blinder Belle is working on the master

plan, Public Work is the landscape architect, Stantec is the transportation planner, Golder is the environmental engineer, and they are not at the stage of doing any architecture, but Michael Green has been designing the tall timber proto-models. The Panel member asked how the team is responding to the 2006 Queens Quay design competition regarding consistency of language. Mr. Shapins replied that the right-of-way is consistent throughout the 38 meters. The MGT is widened slightly to 5 meters to accommodate increased demand for cyclists. Mr. Shapins added that the language and vocabulary of the MGT and southern promenade are all consistent in their approach to stormwater. Ken Greenberg with Greenberg Consultants added that there is also an important difference, which is what we've learned from Queens Quay.

Another Panel member asked whether the traffic engineers have studied the impact on adjacent properties and where traffic will go, adding that closing off streets has historically impacted retail. Mr. Shapins replied that traffic modelling has shown that there is an anticipated balancing and cars would move to Lake Shore Boulevard, but the impact is minimal. Mr. Greenberg added that the King Street Pilot Project has proved that retail has improved as traffic on the street decreased.

One Panel member noted that a key principal for the site is GHG reductions and asked why they are targeting a 75% reduction, not carbon neutral. Mr. Shapins replied that they would require a larger scale site to achieve a carbon neutral neighbourhood. The Panel member asked about the economic proforma and the impact of these proposals. Pino Di Mascio, Partner with Urban Strategies, replied that it's about getting the program right. If the mix and uses are fundamentally sound, the proforma will work. Mr. Di Mascio added that the intent is to make a project that works.

Another Panel member noted that the team is showing 250 units that are 300-square feet and asked the team where these get distributed and what the overall approach is. Mr. Shapins clarified that they are not introducing drastically smaller units than what's currently in the housing market. These smaller units are intended to perform more effectively, through the use of off-site storage and more flexibility within the unit. Mr. Shapins added that the housing is intended to be distributed throughout the building. Mr. Di Mascio added that more communal space will be provided to offset the smaller units. The Panel member asked what the role of transit as a catalyst is in this project. Mr. Shapins replied that transit is foundational to the approach and they are doing everything possible to make transit in this area happen.

One Panel member asked the team to speak to the active storm water management strategy as it relates to the street experience. Mr. Shapins replied that the street design itself has significant tree planting both on the north and south sides and the plantings on the north side are all bioswales. Mr. Shapins added that the overall stormwater approach is to look at one integrated system. The Panel member asked how the stormwater approach relates to Parliament Slip to avoid it becoming stagnant. Mr. Shapins replied that they will put some thought into that question and get back to the Panel with a response.

Another Panel member asked the team if they have considered how the exposed wood will weather over time and how it will respond to longevity, salt and maintenance. Mr.

Kittredge replied that they are aware of the issues with exposed wood exteriors and this is something that the team is working through.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that interim transit on Queens Quay will likely be a BRT for the near future. The Panel member noted that it's important to show what's going to be possible on day one compared to the future. The Panel member suggested a phased approach with legacy vehicles on day 1 transitioning to A/V's in the future once the LRT is delivered. The Panel member was sceptical about the success of the retail on Queens Quay given that there is a proposed pedestrian mews half a block north. The Panel member noted that the internal east-west retail mews creates a rival retail locus to Queens Quay, which could be a repeat of the Eaton Centre which killed retail on Yonge Street. Treat Queens Quay as the primary retail spine, with additional retail on north-south streets.

Another Panel member noted that this is a very capable team but felt that there is still a lack of specificity in the presentation. The Panel member suggested that the team show the volumetric composition of neighbouring buildings and their ground floors to better understand the context. The project needs to feel more outward facing and engaged with its neighbours. The Panel member liked the idea of the Parliament Plaza being the arrival on the water but felt that it needed further thinking. The Panel member added that sideways stepping water feature creates a problematic set of relationships when it engages the walkway.

One Panel member felt that the value loss that the proforma is likely to show will be a problem. The Panel member asked the team to bring evidence of value preservation to the next review. In terms of achieving a carbon neutral neighbourhood, the Panel member felt that it is attainable with the current size of the site, and the 75-85% reduction is not ambitious. The Panel member felt that the drawings should show more detail and the commitment to design excellence should be better described.

Another Panel member was excited to hear about the water management approach with respect to the climate positive strategy, and specific references to the slip. The Panel member added that the canopy as its currently shown is confusing and felt that it stands in the way of opening views and poses challenges in dealing with rainwater.

One Panel member felt that the idea of the Parliament Slip Plaza is very exciting, but the broader water systems need to be understood, such as how the flow coming from the Keating Channel affects how people will interact with the water. The Panel member asked the team to consider new sustainability targets with a focus on public realm and marine life. The Panel member asked the team to show views of the project from the north looking south to the lake and how the project relates to the Lake Shore corridor and the Gardiner Public Realm project. The Panel member asked whether any innovations can be applied to the north side of the buildings fronting on the Gardiner rather than having their backs turned. The Panel member also suggested that the team

experiment with the hexagonal patterns to take on similarities of the existing Queens Quay pavers.

Another Panel member was interested in seeing the sustainability and metrics and why net zero can't be achieved. The Panel member wanted to see further detail on the ground floor distribution and the stoa. The Panel member felt that the subsurface garbage collection is a fantastic idea but was concerned that if this doesn't get implemented it will affect the rest of the project. The Panel noted that the south-west portion of the site is very intimate and encouraged the team to create more intimate pedestrian spaces. The Panel member felt that the team needs to consider how the pedestrian bridge over to Villiers Island relates to the future Cherry Street north bridge and the Keating Channel. The Panel member also asked the team to consider consolidating the bridges to avoid overhearing structural presence underneath multiple crossings.

One Panel member noted that this site has a lot of potential and its success is essential. The Panel member was interested in seeing a more traditional urban design analysis of the site. The Panel member asked the team to consider the experience of pedestrians coming down from the city to meet the water. The Panel member noted that there was no discussion regarding public art and felt that this needs to be considered in the plan. The Panel member also felt that movement from Parliament street down to the water is a crucial urban experience and should be better understood. The Panel member asked the team to bring sections to help understand how you move from the city to the lake.

Another Panel member felt that the pedestrian bridge needs further consideration as it is currently lifted high above the water's edge promenade. The Panel member added that it was important to encourage the continuation of the water's edge promenade as it is a district and system-wide issue. The Panel member asked the team to consider more variety in living options and not just the micro-units. The Panel member also felt that it was important to demonstrate diversity starting with the composition of the design teams.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Bring sections and plan drawings to the next review that are to scale and show neighboring sites to better understand the context.
- Project needs to be less introverted and more engaged with its neighbors.
- Parliament Slip should feel more related to Keating Channel given the investment in flood protection. Reconsider location of Villiers Island bridge and accommodate for continuous water's edge walk across Parliament Slip.
- Preserve connectivity on Queens Quay for legacy vehicles, to avoid East & West feeling cut off from one another.
- Consider a phased approach with legacy vehicles on Day 1 transitioning to A/V's in the future once LRT has been delivered.
- BRT is likely to be the reality for some time and this needs to be accommodated on a traditional right-of-way until transit arrives.

- Consider preserving connectivity on Parliament south of Lakeshore for legacy vehicles, given the limited points of connection between the waterfront and the city.
- Ensure some continuity with the other parts of Queens Quay. This does not preclude improvements like widening the MGT to accommodate the large numbers of bikes. Learn from and build on what has been done in the west.
- Internal east-west retail mews creates a rival retail locus to Queens Quay, which could be a repeat of the Eaton Centre which killed retail on Yonge Street.
- Stormwater management should be described better, including an understanding of how the water concept at Parliament Plaza connects to the larger, advanced stormwater system
- Need to understand sustainability strategy and why net zero can't be achieved.
- Commitment to design excellence needs to be integrated throughout the project.

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

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

### **2.0 York Street Park (Love Park) – Issues Identification**

*Project Type:* Park

*Location:* Central Waterfront

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* Claude Cormier et Associés

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Mark Hallé, Claude Cormier et Associés

*Delegation:* Yannick Roberge; Claude Cormier et Associés, Marc Kramer; City of Toronto

*ID#:* 1104

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

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager Parks with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this project is a partnership between Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto Parks, Forestry and Recreation department. Waterfront Toronto will manage the design and construction of York Street Park. Ms. Stuart noted that the design competition winning design was announced on October 9<sup>th</sup> and Love Park by Claude Cormier et Associés was chosen as the winning design for York Street Park. Ms. Stuart explained that the Jury appreciated the simple and timeless nature of the design and agreed that its natural elements and elegant forms created a contemporary and inviting space for visitors. Ms. Stuart added that the team provided them with some recommendations, including animating the water feature with year-round uses, removing the pavilion, reducing the size of the water element to create more gathering space, add tables and chairs for eating, increase the tree canopy considerably and include sustainability features such as bioswales and integrated stormwater management.

## **2.2 Project Presentation**

Mark Hallé, Senior Associate with Claude Cormier et Associés, explained that the project was inspired by Love Lake in Japan, which is a heart shaped lake. Mr. Hallé added that the heart symbol is universally appreciated and recognized. The park aims to serve the local community, office workers, tourist and visitors. Mr. Hallé noted that the site is only 100m by 100m which inspired the notion of follies and having moments of concentrated interest and detail. Mr. Hallé explained that the water feature will be a highly reflective gathering space. Mr. Hallé noted that the pavilion responds to the curved pathways of the park and will contain storage, a cistern, a control room, a washroom and room for a café. The mirrored façade gives the pavilion an ephemeral and invisible presence.

## **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked how the team feels about removing the pavilion from the design. Mr. Hallé replied that they like the pavilion and feel strongly about keeping it in the project. Mr. Hallé added that the pavilion is not in the budget but felt that it's a key element of the design. The Panel member asked if they are proposing to remove six of the existing trees on site. Mr. Hallé replied that they are removing the six of the twelve trees because some are invasive, and others are in poor condition.

Another Panel member asked if the Norway Maple is blocking the ability of the tree understorey to grow. Mr. Hallé replied yes. The Panel member asked if the jury requested more trees for shade or just more trees in general. Mr. Glaisek replied that it was more about the critical mass of the trees.

One Panel member asked how many trees are along the promenade at Sugar Beach. Mr. Hallé replied that there are approximately 42 trees. The Panel member asked if there is a lighting strategy. Mr. Hallé replied that they are currently thinking about that.

Another Panel member asked if there will be year-round uses for the water feature. Mr. Hallé replied that they love the idea of model boats in the summer noting the need for modified depth. However, the Panel member felt that a skating rink in the winter would be unnecessary due to its proximity to the Harbourfront skating rink.

One Panel member asked if the trees on the west side of York Street are Lindens. Mr. Hallé replied yes.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that there was sufficient tree canopy, though there could be more. The Panel member encouraged the team to consider more linear benches. The Panel member noted that this will be an intensely used park and was unsure about the backs of the benches being on the grass. The Panel member felt that the water feature should take priority over the pavilion. The Panel member noted that using the shallow

pond for gatherings could be an interesting idea if operational issues could be addressed.

Another Panel member felt that the park was very subtle but didn't feel that the pavilion has the same appeal. The Panel member added that the functions of the pavilion are important but felt that a more minimalist architectural character would feel better integrated with the rest of the park. The Panel member did, however, like the strong red colour.

One Panel member felt that the park design is beautiful, fun and inspiring. The Panel member agreed that the pavilion feels imposing on the park. The Panel member was more concerned about having quality trees over quantity. The Panel member noted that public art might not be necessary given all of the other elements in the park.

Another Panel member suggested some kind of modular deck system that lets people occupy the water feature while its full of water. The Panel member added that seating in the fountain where people can dip their feet into the water would be a nice feature. The Panel member agreed with the previous comments regarding the pavilion but felt that having some sort of building in the park will help anchor the project. The Panel member asked the team to explore the possibility of integrating the lighting strategy with the heart shape itself.

One Panel member commended the team for an excellent presentation. The Panel member felt that identity is what this park is all about and urged the team to ensure that the identity doesn't get value engineered out. The Panel member suggested making the water feature a red heart. The Panel member also suggested making the water feature year-round with excess heat drawn from the adjacent building or the storm sewers. The Panel member noted that pavilions in parks are extremely challenging and cautioned the team to avoid ending up with a bathroom stall in the middle of the park.

Another Panel member suggested the team design seating that allows for some place to put your coffee. The Panel member noted that the pond should have something that signifies to users that it is okay to go into the pond.

One Panel member noted that public art could be a play feature that kids can engage with.

## **2.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Overall the Panel was pleased with the Jury's selection of this team and project
- The Panel was supportive of the water feature in its current configuration
- Consider making the pavilion more subtle given the scale of the site.
- A skating rink as a form of winter activation is unnecessary given the proximity to the Harbourfront skating rink, but keeping the water year-round is interesting
- Keep it simple. Don't try to accommodate too many uses in the park
- The Panel was eager to hear more about the lighting strategy at the next review

- Consider making the hanging heart a hologram to avoid dealing with cables from buildings

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

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

## **3.0 945/915 Lake Shore Boulevard East**

*Project Type:* Building

*Location:* Port Lands

*Proponent:* Studio City

*Architect/Designer:* RAW Design

*Review Stage:* Issues Identification

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* Roland Rom Colthoff; RAW Design, Matthew Bernstein, Terraplan

*Delegation:* Robert Millward, R.E. Millward + Associates, Natasha Petzold, R.E. Millward + Associates,

*ID#:* 1103

## **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

George Pantazis, Planner with the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that 915 Lake Shore is the existing Showline facility with vacant adjacent lands at 945 Lake Shore owned by CreateTO. Mr. Pantazis explained that 75 Commissioners Street which currently houses a 40,000 square foot steel frame building called the Jumbo Stage will be relocated to the 945 Lake Shore Blvd East site, as it is currently in the path of the new Don River channel now under construction, and will be repurposed as a studio. Mr. Pantazis noted that CreateTO issued an RFP from companies to lease the former Showline property and operate the production facility. Studio City Toronto won the bid. Mr. Pantazis noted that the lease termination is April 2019 and the site must be vacated by March 31, 2019. Mr. Pantazis raised a few areas for the Panel to consider, including the long-term goals of the site and how it will be further developed in the future, the sustainability strategy, the siting, landscape and parking strategy. Mr. Pantazis then introduced Roland Rom Colthoff, Principal at RAW Design, to give the presentation.

## **3.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Colthoff began by noting the site fronts onto Lake Shore Boulevard and consists largely of asphalt with an existing building on the 915 Lake Shore site. Mr. Colthoff explained that the proposed concept of the relocated Jumbo Stage consists of interior renovations of the existing facility to modernize and increase functionality and to enhance the energy efficiency and accessibility. Mr. Colthoff then introduced Matthew Bernstein, Partner at Terraplan Landscape Architects, to present the sustainability portion of the presentation.

Mr. Bernstein explained that landscape opportunities are limited and they're currently working with an engineer regarding the high-water table. Mr. Bernstein explained that they are looking at some initiatives that make it more approachable from a pedestrian

scale. Mr. Bernstein noted that they will be adding some plantings but not bioswales. A reflective coating will also be added to the paving areas for low albedo.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the entire site is fenced. Mr. Colthoff replied that there is an existing wrought iron fence along the Lake Shore frontage and the east and west sides of the site will have a frost fence. The Panel member asked if the entrance will be gated, to which Mr. Colthoff replied no.

Another Panel member asked the Proponent to identify the different surface materials. Mr. Bernstein replied that there will be a white coating on the asphalt and the north west corner will be a feature paving zone. The Panel member asked if the Proponent has considered using a permeable paving in that zone. Mr. Bernstein replied that they are still looking into this due to the high-water table.

One Panel member asked why they are keeping the existing fence along Lake Shore. Mr. Colthoff replied that it's in good condition and its functional. The Proponent added that it adds to the site's sense of security.

Another Panel member asked if there will be new asphalt. Mr. Bernstein replied yes, the 915 Lake Shore site will have new asphalt with the reflective coating.

One Panel member asked how many parking spaces are required for the site. Mr. Bernstein replied that the by-law requirement is driven by the office component which only requires one parking space. The Proponent added that when a production is happening, they need all the parking necessary and trucks need space for manoeuvring.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that areas that don't require parking should have a tree added where possible. The Panel member suggested saving money on the silva cells and using the edge condition to plant an aggressive tree species. The Panel member felt that the fence doesn't send the right message and suggested getting rid of the fence and opening up the space since the site is open to anyone anyway. The Panel member urged the team to add any green where they can.

Another Panel member asked whether the building is set back from Lake Shore because it has to be. Mr. Colthoff replied that the building location is driven by the trucks needing to manoeuvre around the site. The Panel member suggested shifting the building north to create a streetwall and leaving just enough room for trucks to pass through. The Canadian Tire and new retail building west of the site have both put all their parking at the rear to better face Lake Shore.

One Panel member noted that this site needs to be seen as a potential streetscape rather than a back-door site. The Panel member noted that even though there are big box stores surrounding the site, this project should still try to project an urban future for Lake Shore. The Panel member also noted that the landscape doesn't need to be precious.

Another Panel member liked the idea of having a feature wall on the building façade and asked the team to push this further by having a mural artist design something. The Panel member asked the team to consider narrowly planted poplars rather than the fence along Lake Shore.

One Panel member felt that the relationship of the two buildings requires further thinking and asked the team to consider making both building entrances more aligned. The Panel member also asked the team to consider where employees will go on their break, how people will get to the site and where the bicycle parking is located. The Panel member also asked the team to provide more context at the next review.

Another Panel member liked the idea of having a super-graphic on the building façade and suggested rolling this graphic onto the ground where the reflective coating will be.

One Panel member felt that the projecting piece of the lunchroom/mechanical piece should have a similar dimension as the band that wraps around the entire building.

Another Panel member noted that a pedestrian sidewalk on Lake Shore would be more amenable with trees on both sides. The Panel member also asked the team to consider projecting the northwest main entry volume to help reinforce the continuous street frontage and engage Lake Shore Blvd.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- Provide more context on the adjacent buildings.
- Explore the possibility of moving the building further north to allow for a better relationship to Lake Shore.
- Consider pushing the mural art further by hiring a mural artist to design something that could potentially spill onto the asphalt.
- Consider alternate locations for the lunch area.
- Consider removing the existing fence along Lake Shore Boulevard to open up the space.

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

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

### **CLOSING**

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the meeting.