



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel

Minutes of Meeting #147

Wednesday, Oct. 20th, 2021

Meeting held Virtually

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Matthew Hickey
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Kevin Stelzer
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Claude Cormier

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Emilia Floro, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

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

1. Queens Quay East Area 2B + 2C – Schematic Design
 2. West Don Lands Block 20 – Detailed Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Sept. 22nd, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared conflict of interest for **West Don Lands Block 20** and recused himself for the review.

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

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the consensus comments from Sept. 2021 WDRP have been circulated to the **Lower Bay Visioning** team. Both options and other potential hybrids will be further studied for feasibility, the team will seek direction from City Council to study the options and achieve 30% design as part of the **Waterfront East LRT** project. Mr. Glaisek noted the project is anticipated to return to WDRP in Spring 2022. For **Waterfront East LRT Area 1**, the consensus comments have been circulated to the proponent team and Mr. Glaisek noted that the team is working towards the final 30% design submission while looking at cost optimization. The team will report to City Council with a business case for implementation funding and direction to proceed with detailed design in Dec. 2021. Mr. Glaisek noted **Legacy Art Project** is expected to return for Detailed Design in the winter and the delivery agreement is currently being developed.

Other Waterfront Toronto Update:

Mr. Glaisek noted the **Gardiner Logan Ramp Removal** has been completed, including all deck, twenty-two girders, eighteen concrete bents, and six steel bents. The concrete bents are sorted for recycling and crews will be working in the median of Lake Shore Boulevard East to finish cleaning up materials and begin preparing the area for the construction of a temporary lane. Mr. Glaisek noted this is required to allow for the commencement of the **Lake Shore Boulevard East Public Realm work**, three lanes in each direction and improved public spaces, sidewalks, and multi-use trails on either side. Mr. Glaisek noted the upcoming project agendas for November and December 2021.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair congratulated Chris Glaisek on the success of the 880 Cities WebTalk and asked Leon Lai, Design Review Panel Manager, to provide a link for the recording. The Chair concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Queens Quay East Extension & Cherry St., Waterfront East LRT Area 2B/2C – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1125
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	East Bayfront, Keating Channel, Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto
Architect/ Designer: Public Work, Stantec
Presenter(s): Adam Nicklin, Principal, Public Work
Delegation: Marc Ryan, Public Work
Mary Liston Hicks, Public Work
Kenneth Poon, Stantec
David Sauve, Stantec
Brent Fairbairn, City of Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
Sonja Vangjeli, Waterfront Toronto
Alex Mereu, Waterfront Toronto
Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto
Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sonja Vangjeli, Planning and Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by recapping the project background, the addition of area 2C into the scope of work which will extend the LRT from Union Station to Polson Quay down the new Cherry Street. Ms. Vangjeli noted the existing context of Queens Quay West, East Bayfront, and Cherry Street design as per Port Lands Flood Protection. Future and interim context includes the landscaping and bridges on Cherry Street, Ms. Vangjeli noted the Cherry North Transit Portal alignment options are being studied and the team will provide an update on the Distillery Loop Plaza while integrating with the Lake Shore Public Realm.

Ms. Vangjeli noted other adjacent major design projects including the Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity Study, Stormwater Management Facility, 3C PL1 and 3C Master Plan. Ms. Vangjeli recapped the design brief, the June 2021 Issues Identification consensus comments, and the Areas for Panel consideration including balance of objectives between ecological performance, transit, and placemaking, the capacity for the design to connect different neighbourhoods, continuity with Queens Quay West, material palette, and the planting strategy. Ms. Vangjeli then introduced Adam Nicklin, Principal with Public Work, to continue the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Nicklin began the presentation by noting the project is a hinge between the city and the waterfront connecting multiple neighbourhoods, and noted the zones of material palette influence on Cherry Street. Mr. Nicklin recapped the proposed interim street section, the addition of the LRT with green track, and the pavement options. Mr. Nicklin provided an update on the planting strategy for the Distillery Loop Plaza, employing a diverse spectrum of flowering fruit trees.

At Queens Quay East, Mr. Nicklin provided an update on the design approach, planting strategy, and the 100% stormwater runoff capture. To improve resilience, an Opti monitoring system is proposed to analyse tree health. Mr. Nicklin noted the team is not interested in a heavy maintenance approach and will select more naturalized

strategies with evolution and succession. The team is working with RWDI to leverage tree systems to create comfort in shoulder seasons and microclimates. In response to previous Panel comments, narrow planters are widened and landscape infrastructure at the intersections have been revised. Mr. Nicklin noted the opportunity for green track at the LRT, up to 2.6km, and the reduction in carbon emissions.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification if the planting is completely successional or managed. Mr. Nicklin responded that the strategy is envisioned to have light maintenance, a less intense version than a formal garden and will be closely monitored, can be adjusted. The team thinks of the design as requiring a guiding hand.

Another Panel member noted the guiding hand approach is essential. Mr. Nicklin noted it is not a meadow, the planting here will be low and shrubby.

One Panel member asked if the OPTI monitoring system is achievable within the current scope of work. Mr. Adam noted there is no huge upfront cost, easier to do now, and is within the scope of work.

Another panel member asked for clarification on the guiding hand approach and the typologies of benches. Mr. Adam noted the guiding hand is the city, and there are two benches: a longer version with a back that currently exists along the Water's Edge Promenade, and a granite bench.

One Panel member asked for the edge condition of the bike path and if it is a rolled curb. Mr. Nicklin noted the detail is required to get the water across, shown better in the drawing package.

Another Panel member asked if the team can specific the concrete mix to lower the carbon content for the project, such as higher use of SCM. Mr. Nicklin noted the team is trying to restrict the use of concrete to only the foundation, trail will be asphalt, curbs are granite, Paleoteh for the sidewalks, and other areas are green systems – the team will try to lower carbon output of the concrete.

One Panel member asked for clarification on underground utilities and if the team has located the placement of hydro, water, and other utilities. Mr. Nicklin noted the project is a complete street re-design so the utilities will be coordinated with the design.

Another Panel member noted the presentation identified the project as the “hinge” between the city and the Port Lands, and asked if there is information on Commissioners Street forming a future connection eastward and extend to Cherry Beach. Ms. Vangjeli noted that Commissions Street LRT is future scope, the current scope ends at the Polson loop.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the Cherry Street planting timing and if there will be tress in the interim condition. Ms. Vangjeli noted it depends on the

funding timing of this project, there is a chance the meadow will be built first then is replaced by this project's LRT scope. Ideally, the trees are constructed right at the start throughout the interim condition, however this is a challenge as the eventual LRT construction might damage the adjacent trees – trees on the west side of Cherry Street are possible though.

Another Panel member asked for the location of the double rows of trees shown on p.34 on the site plan. Mr. Nicklin noted the double rows are not shown here because they are located at the segment of the street with a POPS.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member thanked the team for a comprehensive and thoughtful presentation, appreciated the calm pace and reflective manner in presenting the complex work – also very prepared and confident in the reflections. The Panel member noted the below grade work, despite not being visible, is very important, and that the integration of landscape with transit into a performative street with functional mobility is critical. The Panel member commended the project that landscape and transit are conceived as a single element here. The Panel member noted a more stratified shrub meadow with the green track is essential and appreciate the precedent for the use of green track – maximizing the use is supported. Consider both sedum and turf for the green track planting because Toronto winters are harsh, and research has shown good results with sedum. The Panel member appreciated the intention of reducing urban heat island, heat capture, and the diverse tree strategies including flowering fruit trees and pollinator-friendly species. The Panel member noted that stormwater capture at this extent along a transit corridor is supported and commended the great planting strategy of robust and resilient species. The Panel member recommended the seeded succession should be most intense at the intersection of the new river. The design team should provide a maintenance handbook to help transfer the knowledge from the designer to the maintainer and ensure that the vision is realized, and succession is captured. The Panel expressed strong support for the project.

Another Panel member appreciated the different foliage qualities shown in the drawings by the tree canopies, it is demonstrative that street trees are living objects that create an experience. The care and research on the trees are noted. The Panel member asked the team to provide more information of the relationship between the planted areas and the ground floor programming, including mid-block connections, building access points and uses. The Panel member noted the seating areas should not only respond to the buildings but also seasonality, sunlight, and microclimate. The Panel member asked the team to visualize the successional drama of the plants over time during interim conditions.

One Panel member noted the project continues to enhance the experience and resiliency of the waterfront, and supported the Queens Quay granite pavement palette applied at Cherry Street – wrapping the waterfront and bringing it south – it felt logical and sensitive to the context. At Queens Quay, the Panel member supported the larger planters while minimizing maintenance, the long benches should not become barriers – consider breaking them up and carefully coordinating them with the destinations. The Panel member asked the team to ensure that the planting areas along the bike

path have gaps for pedestrians to pass through to maintain access and not jam specific openings. The Panel member did not support the bollards at the laybys and recommended more normalization of the pedestrian sidewalk. The Panel member supported the green track and asked the team to consider all aspects of maintenance in its implementation.

Another Panel member appreciated the presentation cadence and details, commended the landscape informed sidewalk re-design – this is a truly unique 21st century street design typology. The Panel member recommended the team to continue to be bold with the street design and maximize green track application.

One Panel member commended the transition from formal to informal which makes the overall experience from Queens Quay West to East more interesting, and appreciated the carving of the street space, such as the edge of the sidewalk and planters in the maple leaf pattern. The Panel member supported the green track.

Another Panel member asked the team and the City to consider improving the pedestrian area under the bridge overpass, which based on this transit arrangement would become the vital link between the Cherry Street south LRT and the Cherry Street Loop. The overall design is appreciated.

One Panel member asked the team to show the interface between buildings and streets more clearly and ensure it has an intimate characteristic. The Panel member supported the public realm and pedestrian right-of-way design, felt that the adjacent developments are under coordinated and represented.

Another Panel member noted that reinforced concrete has a large impact on carbon emission and asked the team to consider specifying a low carbon concrete mix to begin to change the industry – some simple changes to the specifications will have a big impact on the industry.

One Panel member appreciated the strategy of leading with landscape and noted the design is a beautiful study of giving back to our relations with nature and animals. The Panel member felt the design can be bolder and asked the team to consider next steps to continue pushing the design.

Another Panel member appreciated the cumulative knowledge brought by the team. The Panel member noted the vision of integrating transit as part of our daily lives, such as taking the TTC to the Chery Beach, is amazing and should be carefully considered. The work shown today will lay the foundation for transit to be more enmeshed with daily life and Commissioners Street should be included as part of that vision. The Panel member asked Waterfront Toronto to provide an update on the greater concept of transit serving as a hinge to tie the entire city with the waterfront. The greenness of buildings is difficult for the public to see as they are not always accessible, but the Panel member noted that greening of transit infrastructure is important in making visible and demonstrating the values of Waterfront Toronto to the public. The green track is supported, and the Panel member encouraged extending the application from the city to Cherry Beach, establishing a green link to the waterfront.

One Panel member recommended Waterfront Toronto to develop a specification where carbon in concrete is a publicly measured amount to encourage projects to reduce their carbon emissions. The Panel supported the overall design.

Another Panel member was impressed by the project scope and supported the design. The Panel member is satisfied with the undulation of the planting bed shapes in relation to the sidewalk, which provides for both thorough movement and meandering movements, establishing a right balance. The Panel member noted that the planted alcoves should not be developed in the sacrifice of clear walkway, the narrow edges of the planting zones are difficult to maintain and should be more robust to avoid people trampling over the features.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated the detailed and comprehensive presentation and supported the inclusion of the extension down to Polson.
- The project is an excellent example of leading with landscape.
- The project is an important “hinge” that connects the city to the waterfront, ensure the design signifies to visitors that you are entering the waterfront area.
- The integration of green infrastructure with transit should be studied beyond this corridor, possibly down Cherry St. through Commissioners St. – the city becomes well connected with the waterfront via green transit corridors.
- Appreciated Metrolinx and TTC’s use of green tracks at Eglinton Crosstown, strong support for this to be implemented here.
- Ensure the pedestrian crossing under the railway bridge will have an opportunity for improvement - important to address this segment of the public realm now.
- The project is demonstrative of the importance of transit from the city to the waterfront - from urban to nature - and this should be emphasized as a priority for the future.

Landscape

- Supported the concept of flowering and fruit trees at the cherry plaza.
- Supported the stormwater capture and monitoring strategies.
- Ensure the streetscape design is well coordinated with street furniture and development frontages in the next phase of design, consider:
 - breaking up the length of benches
 - be bold and continue to refine the design of the planters and landscape while maintaining an unimpeded pedestrian right-of-way - some Panel members felt that the proposed planting to circulation ratio strikes a good balance.
 - laybys without bollards

Sustainability

- Consider low carbon concrete mix in the specification to reduce overall project emissions.

- Encouraged Waterfront Toronto to examine establishing a specification for low carbon concrete for waterfront projects.

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

Mr. Nicklin appreciated the feedback and support from panel. The project is not a traditional streetscape design, on behalf of the team it has been a fun process while realizing the importance of the opportunity.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted unanimously Full Support for the project.

2.0 West Don Lands Block 20 – Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1112
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	West Don Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Henning Larsen Architects, Claude Cormier + Associes, RWDI
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Christopher Dial, Lead Designer, Henning Larsen Architects Marc Hallé, Senior Associate, Claude Cormier + Associes Brandon Law, Principal, RWDI
<i>Delegation:</i>	Bori Kang, Henning Larsen Architects Gregory Haley, Henning Larsen Architects Bharti Vithal, architectsAlliance Jordan Kemp, Dream Joyce Lau, Dream Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer Infrastructure Megan Rolph, City of Toronto Katherine Bailey, City of Toronto Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leon Lai, Design Review Panel Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by recapping the project background, affordable housing requirement of 30%, sustainability requirement of LEED Gold certification, and community benefits as directed by City Council. Mr. Lai recapped the programmatic overview, anticipated project timeline, and the existing and future site context of Block 20. Mr. Lai noted the project is here for the final review, at Stage 3: Detailed Design, unless the Panel does not provide full support. Mr. Lai recapped the consensus comments from April 2021's Schematic Design review, and the Areas for Panel consideration including the palette from towers to podium, window and façade configurations of the podium and ground floor, animation of the new Tank House Lane, public realm vision and circulation,

landscape species and details, and the sustainability ambition of the site given the site's previous use and future objective of net-zero-carbon. Mr. Lai then introduced Christopher Dial, Lead Designer with Henning Larsen Architects, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Dial began by noting the key takeaways from the April 2021 Schematic Design review and a recap of the design objectives. Mr. Dial presented detailed design updates on the podium windows, exterior cladding and details, and the strategy of extending the colors from the towers to the podium. Mr. Dial noted the crash wall sits right at the property line and the team is interested in a sealant to prevent graffiti while exploring public art opportunities. The articulations of the facades will reduce wind impact on the ground floor and improve microclimates in the public realm. The intent of the anodized bronze and copper panels is to capture light and create a shimmering effect. Mr. Dial noted the tower and podium façade sections and introduced Marc Halle, Senior Associate with Claude Cormier Architects.

Mr. Halle noted the updated tree locations on the ground floor plan, the materiality and details of the planter and benches, planting palette, interconnected tree soils to ensure plants are always verdant, and passive stormwater reuse system. Mr. Halle presented the updated green roof and terrace landscape designs for both residential and commercial amenities. Mr. Halle then introduced Brandon Law, Principal with RWDI, to continue the sustainability presentation.

Mr. Law provided an update on energy performance and metrics since participating in the Savings by Design program charrette in June 2021. Mr. Law noted the window to wall ratio of the building continues to stay low and the team is specifying the highest performing opaque wall envelopes. The team is still evaluating the feasibility of other strategies such as geothermal, domestic hot water heat recovery, building integrated photovoltaics.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there is any durability issue with the double-glazing unit with low-E coating. Mr. Law noted it is no longer a concern and the team has looked into that with subject matter experts. The Panel member asked if the team is targeting LEED Gold v4.1 for the energy pathway and if Building-integrated Photovoltaics (BIPV) have been considered because there are some interesting financing models. Mr. Law responded that they will likely follow LEED Gold v4.1 - Dream achieved that with Block 8. The team will continue to explore the BIPV financing models, the main challenges are aesthetic and durability of the systems.

Another Panel member noted that the overall TEDI values are decent, the system is primarily gas fired and asked if the team has considered a decentralized heat pump system, a 2-pipe solution, to take advantage of the ambient loop and run on electricity. Mr. Law responded the team looked at a water sourced heat pump through Savings by

Designs but did not select it due to cost and will ask the mechanical team to consider the decentralized system. The Panel member noted if the team is considering some connection to a future low carbon network, the central conditioning of the loop, can be considered as an expedient renovation. Ultimately greenhouse gas is the main metric and it can be a lot lower.

One Panel member asked if the crash-wall can be textured. Mr. Dial responded that Metrolinx restricts surface texture of the crash-wall to a depth of 40mm max, it is possible to add relief or grooves.

Another Panel member asked if there is any actual exposed copper and if there are graffiti concerns. Mr. Dial responded no it is all anodized copper aluminium and the team has explored anti-graffiti coating products for the concrete, there is a range of finishes from clear to sheen. The Panel suggested video surveillance for posterity and discourage graffiti. Mr. Dial commented that the team will investigate.

One Panel member asked for the percentage of affordable housing units and the programs being considered for the community benefits. Mr. Dial noted it is 30% affordable rental units. Bori Kang, Senior Architect Design Manager, with Henning Larsen Architects, noted that the team looked at day-care but is not feasible at the site and other programs are being contemplated on neighbouring sites. The Panel member asked the team to clarify the intention of the grey brick. Mr. Dial noted the crash wall occupies more than 50% of the perimeter, the grey brick helps tie in the crash wall, reinforces the datum, and then the copper bifurcates to reduce the scale of the podium. The grey brick also allows the building to add some variation to the context – it does not signal program change. The Panel member asked if the midblock glazed atriums are conceived as transparent volumes. Mr. Dial responded the intention is for the glass to be transparent, allowing various view depths. The eastern atrium might allow one to see through the entire space.

Another Panel member asked for the location of the pine trees at grade. Mr. Halle noted they are placed to bookend the public realm: east next to the dog relief area and on the west side of the new Tank House Lane.

One Panel member asked if the low reflectance glass is fritted or etched. Mr. Law responded the first 18m will be fritted. The Panel member asked if the glass is required to be fritted if the reflectance is less than 15%. Mr. Law noted it is still not enough to meet the requirements of Toronto Green Standards, therefore fritting is required.

Another Panel member asked if the outdoor pool is seasonal or heated. Mr. Halle noted it is for seasonal use.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the sliver of green south of the crash-wall and if it is an area hidden and unsafe. Mr. Dial noted that the project will discourage people from going into that area as much as possible.

Another Panel member noted that in the past the Panel has cautioned against aluminum cladding products disguising as copper or bronze and asked other Panel

members to weigh in if this strategy will deliver the intended result. One Panel member responded that there is metallic paint that can come very close to the intended effect.

One Panel member asked if the team has considered traffic calming initiatives at the loading area, such as a sloped curb making the sidewalk a speed bump. Mr. Halle noted the loading entrance is intended to be the same elevation as the public realm with no grade change, the team has considered speed bump but was concerned about the noise.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member thanked the team for a great presentation and building, appreciated the revisions on the podium in breaking down the scale. The Panel member recommended further lowering the height of the canopies at the glazed atrium facades, to the level of the adjacent awnings to serve as weather protection. The Panel member noted the anodized cladding issue was brought up at the TR3 Data Centre where the material came right to grade, the concern is much less here because it is intended to create shimmer with light and shadows, and asked the team to consider reflectivity and how the material interacts with sunlight.

Another Panel member noted that metallic paint is typically less metallic but it might not be an issue if the Panels are located high up, especially when the focus in the design is the fenestration relief which is already successful in creating visual interest. The Panel member appreciated the finer-grain, vertical proportion façades that make the street feel more cohesive. The Panel member asked the team to reconsider the commercial glazed corner because a finer grain design is preferred.

One Panel member supported the positive revisions in the project design that may have been possible due to the increase in density, such as deeper slabs in the terrace landscaping to accommodate larger plants and trees.

Another Panel member appreciated the changes in the podium design and noted real copper cladding does not shimmer for long because it patinas quickly. The Panel member asked the team to protect the crash wall from graffiti and consider continuous rain protection along the pedestrian pathway – design intimacy is supported.

One Panel member appreciated the updates on the podium and that Tank House Lane is more pedestrian on the west and shifts to vehicular on the east. The Panel member noted Block 8's facades have a high degree of plasticity and encouraged the team to carefully detail and select products that will respond to this context, such as the grey brick. The Panel member encouraged the team to refine the details to extend the Distillery District into the public realm of Block 20 and appreciated the cladding on the top floors of the towers that successfully integrates the mechanical floors into the design as a "lantern".

Another Panel member noted that the project's relationship with new Tank House Lane is more important than the crash wall.

One Panel member was excited by the design and noted that it is refreshing to see a palette different than grey and reflective of its context. Tank House Lane will be a great extension of Distillery District and Toronto needs more of this type of streets with an intermediary scale – the team has done a great job in its design. The Panel member noted the towers will reflect light into the street during the day and asked the team to provide more night-time lighting information and details. The Panel member noted the herringbone paving worked nicely at King and Portland and asked the team to refine the half circle benches. The continuous soil trench is appreciated.

Another Panel member thanked the team for the clarification on glass reflectance and commended the revisions on both landscape and building. The plant palette is drought and shade tolerant and commended the continuous soil trench for ensuring strong trees, root communities, and optimal watering conditions. For a park-poor area, the landscape design is great for wind and urban heat mitigation.

One Panel member commended taking advantage of the dropped slabs, the ability to grow larger trees is phenomenal. The Panel member noted the corner condition does not bring the scale down to grade, consider strategies to bring the brick lower and use smaller dimension masonry blocks for a pedestrian character informed street.

Another Panel member asked the team to further reduce carbon emission in material choices and ensure there is fuel flexibility by considering district energy. It is important to reduce carbon emission to achieve higher sustainability goals and appreciated the pursuit of more advanced technologies.

One Panel member is encouraged that the team will look at a low carbon heating system and noted it does not have to change the basic armature of the building. The Panel member recommended the team to look at a decentralized system and its financial impact. Some trade-offs might make the system capital expenditure feasible, such as using an ambient loop and have one potential heat pump or a two-pipe solution, these will offset cost by removing a lot of infrastructure. If boiler and chiller still need to be maintained, the loads can be superimposed. The Panel recommended the team to investigate the transition to decentralized load and financial feasibility which will generate significant savings in carbon.

Another Panel member noted the building is a gateway, it should be designed from top to bottom in support of this idea. The crash wall is still a concern, continue to investigate options of leaving it blank or textured, and consider curating public art, even in the form of graffiti.

One Panel member added that it is important for the City to support a pedestrian crosswalk to provide a safe connection to this site.

4.5 Consensus Comments

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

General

- Appreciated that all aspects of the design, from mechanical floors, tower facades, to podium details, have been improved.
- Supportive of the thirty percent affordable housing rental, accommodating a diverse group of residents.
- The positive evolution of the design through the three-stage review is demonstrative of the value of the design review process.

Building

- Appreciated the terracing and massing refinements at the east and west ends of the podium volume.
- Appreciated the continued efforts to refine the podium façades, consider the following suggestions for further improvements:
 - Shift away from a typical commercial glass atrium façade at the podium corner by reducing the height of the glass curtain wall and create a more intimate entrance expression that better responds to the context.
 - Lower the canopies at the two mid-block glass atriums to further scale down.
 - Provide continuous rain protection along the entire public realm frontage, i.e. more awnings, or canopies.
- Supported the grey brick and anodized copper and bronze facades, and recommended careful consideration of the final products:
 - Ensure the bronze and copper anodized panels have the intended metallic and shimmering effect
 - Ensure the brick is a refined and high-quality product that supports the characteristic of the Distillery District
- The crash-wall forms an important part of the gateway experience, the anti-graffiti paint is one option, but it is recommended to consider a more visual strategy such as the integration of public art.

Public Realm

- Strong support for the ground and terrace landscape strategies.
- Supported the addition of a crosswalk at Cherry Street to provide a safe pedestrian crossing to the site.
- Strong support for the public realm in relation to the podium frontages.
- Strong support for the continuous soil trenches to maintain quality of vegetation.

Sustainability

- Encouraged the team to continue to explore strategies to achieve higher sustainability goals.
- Consider a decentralized heat pump solution and other lower carbon heating options.
- Recommended to perform cost saving calculations to demonstrate potential financial benefits of enhanced sustainability measures.

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

Jordan Kemp, Director with Dream, thanked the panel for the positive and constructive commentary, and agreed that the improvements in the design speak to the value of the design review.

4.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted unanimously Full Support for the project.

CLOSING

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