



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel

Minutes of Meeting #155

Wednesday, July 27th, 2022

Meeting held Virtually

Present

Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel

Paul Bedford, Chair

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair

George Baird

Peter Busby

Gina Ford

Pat Hanson

David Leinster

Janna Levitt

Fadi Masoud

Emily Mueller De Celis

Brigitte Shim

Kevin Stelzer

Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Matthew Hickey

Nina-Marie Lister

Jeff Ranson

City of Toronto Design Review Panel (for the Joint-review of Ontario Place Public Realm)

Jessica Hutcheon

Joe Lobko

Juhee Oh

Representatives

Pina Mallozzi, 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. Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm – Issues Identification

2. Ontario Place Public Realm Master Plan – Issues Identification (City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto Joint-DRP)

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the June 22nd, 2022 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest for disclosures. George Baird declared conflicts of interest for Ontario Place Public Realm and recused himself from the review. Eric Turcotte declared conflicts of interest for Quayside Infrastructure and Public realm, and Ontario Place Public Realm, and recused himself from both reviews. Matthew Hickey declared conflicts of interest for Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm, and recused himself from the review.

The Chair then asked Leon Lai, Manager of the Waterfront Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Design Review Panel Updates:

Mr. Lai noted the consensus comments from June 2022 have been shared with the **1-7 Yonge Phase 4+5** proponent team. The project received a Full Support vote at the Detailed Design review, completing the design review process, and will continue to advance the Site Plan application review process with the City. Mr. Lai noted the consensus comments have been circulated with the **Basin Media Hub** proponent and the project is anticipated to return for Schematic Design review in Q4 2022.

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Mr. Lai noted the pond perimeter mosaic installation is in progress at **York Street Park**. The tiles are delivered in pre-laid sheets which are adhered to the precast curbs, the sheets are stitched together using small tiles, grouted, cleaned, and sealed to give shine and protection. Mr. Lai noted the Cherry Street North bridge has arrived in early July at **Port Lands Flood Protection**, pedestrian bridges in the park have also arrived and lifted in place by a crane. Mr. Lai noted the excavation of Canoe Cove on the north side of Polson Slip is complete, crews are now creating small islands in the cove, which will be part of Promontory Park South and feature a place to launch small watercraft.

Mr. Lai concluded by noting the upcoming WDRP agenda for September and October 2022.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Quayside Infrastructure + Public Realm – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1033
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Quayside
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	West 8 + DTAH WSP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Shelley Long, Team Leader, West 8 Adriaan Geuze, Partner, West 8
<i>Delegation:</i>	Priscilla Leung, West 8 Michael Wiedow, WSP Yvonne Lam, DTAH Corin Latimer, DTAH Brent Raymond, DTAH Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto Chris Hilbrecht, City of Toronto Bhavik Patel, City of Toronto David O’Hara, City of Toronto Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto Carol Webb, Waterfront Toronto Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto Debora Lima, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the project consists of infrastructure, internal streets, Parliament Street, Parliament Plaza and Water’s Edge Promenade components of the larger Quayside project. Waterfront Toronto will lead the design and construction of this project as master developer and delivery agent to the City of Toronto, and in coordination with the preferred development partner for Quayside. Ms. Mallozzi noted the project team and the public realm principles include equity, accessibility, new standards for sustainability in the public realm, health and wellbeing, activation and engagement, continuity with the broader waterfront, design excellence and resilience. Ms. Mallozzi noted the design context include Quayside Impact’s proposal, Queens Quay public realm, waterfront internal streets, Lake Shore Public Realm Implementation, and Parliament Slip.

Ms. Mallozzi noted the project is here for Issues Identification review and the areas for Panel consideration, including opportunities and integration with the Quayside RFP submission, interface with other major design projects, opportunities to escalate the level of ambition around the seven public realm principles, reduction in embodied carbon, and support Waterfront Toronto Green Building Requirements. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Shelley Long, Team Leader with West 8, to continue the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began the presentation by noting the site analysis, context, and constraints. Ms. Long noted the existing Central Waterfront identity, material palette, and avoiding a suburban style. Looking at the existing Quayside, Ms. Long noted the team is interested in creating a continuous green edge along the water, stitching together the Eastern Waterfront, and connecting communities to water. Mr. Long noted the urban grain, consistent network of streets, sidewalks, promenade, mobility, existing underground utilities, and future Quayside context. Ms. Long noted the design vision and opportunities, including the Central Waterfront Master Plan, innovation and two-eyed seeing, Quayside as the sacred healing forest at the urban doorstep, restorative nature, integration of knowledge and indigeneity, rainwater as a resource, and a carbon neutral public realm. Ms. Long provided a recap of the due diligence concept designs from January 2021, including the concept sketch of five consistent inner streets, “green lungs” the Parliament Plaza, and a continuous primary waterfront.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for more information on the soil importing process to create healthy conditions for the trees. Mr. Geuze noted the ground water level is very high, the design must adapt to climate change where extreme levels will be more frequent, places with some topographical undulation tend to perform well, such as HTO Park, so this is a key part of the soil strategy. The team is interested in delivering large Canadian trees.

Another Panel member appreciated the Lake Shore Pilot Project and asked the team to test the “urban forest” now along Queens Quay to examine tree species and soil samples, and let the laboratory be adjusted over time - it will also be a projection of the future of the neighborhood over time. Generally, the Lake Shore Pilot Project is a great precedent and should be done more. Mr. Geuze responded that learning by trial is a fantastic approach, the team shares the attitude of experimenting and monitoring. Ms. Long noted the tip of the slip has to be filled in, there is an opportunity there to do a small prototype forest. Soil compaction is an interesting condition to be tested and coordinated with the adjacent tall buildings. The Panel member asked the team to propose this and include it as part of the Schematic Design review.

One Panel member asked for more information on the street design from Lake Shore to Parliament. Ms. Long noted a big part of redesigning the intersection is to make it more human-scale and pedestrian friendly, it will include elements like improved

lighting and wider sidewalk. At Parliament Plaza, the large trees will help transition the scale from Lake Shore and the Gardiner, to Parliament Slip, and towards the waterfront. Mr. Geuze noted that the CN Tower and Distillery District are key pieces of the waterfront that are not properly stitched with the waterfront, and noted the team will do their best with Quayside public realm to connect the key pieces.

Another Panel member asked for why raised grades is an opportunity for the project. Ms. Long noted raised grades support health of the trees as they keep the roots away from infrastructure and high ground water. Secondly, it provides opportunity to bring new fill onto the site which also improves soil quality.

One Panel asked for more information on the stormwater management strategy and if there is opportunity to direct stormwater from the private developments. Ms. Long agreed that it is important to develop a strategy to capture runoff from the private developments, and noted the team is interested in maximizing rainwater capture for the streets while following Toronto and Waterfront Toronto green standards. Ms. Mallozzi noted that as part of the Quayside RFP requirement, the ped-way is an opportunity to harvest stormwater as it is required that 75% be permeable and a certain amount of stormwater must be integrated into the design. Mr. Geuze noted Madrid and Tel Aviv have parks that are watered only with grey water, Quayside is an opportunity to build a great neighbourhood.

Another Panel member felt that the project boundaries between Parliament Slip and the green spaces should not be straight lines, but integrated and blended. Ms. Mallozzi noted the green spaces are not part of this project scope, but Waterfront Toronto is not precluding the opportunity to have those elements in that location – City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto are working hard to make those happen.

One Panel member asked for more information on engineering requirements at Parliament Slip, and if the road down Parliament can be something other than straight down. Ms. Long noted the servicing limitations include transit requirement and existing stormwater sewer utility. There is a bus line that goes up Parliament Street. Mr. Geuze noted the view corridor down to the water is important, if the team can work around the constraints, a curve or a meandering path can be explored to improve the design. The east side of the plaza has the most sunlight, so it has the best quality for large gathering.

Another Panel member asked if the pedway will be designed by the Quayside proponent's landscape team, SLA, and if Parliament Plaza will also be designed by the team. Ms. Mallozzi responded that both areas will be POPS, it will be sorted through the RFP agreement, but Waterfront Toronto will likely complete the design and delivery of Parliament Plaza. The Panel member asked what connects to Street D. Ms. Mallozzi noted Small Street connects Queens Quay to Lake Shore, Street D connects to the new street on the adjacent site while the north end connects to Queens Quay.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel members for comments.

One Panel member noted the successful trees along the waterfront are situated in parks such as Sugar Beach and HTO Park. They are not along streets, and reiterated the importance of a prototype to test the health of these streets as street trees. The Panel member asked the team to consider forest succession, urban heat island effect, and quantifying the value of trees in offsetting heat over the years. The Panel member felt raised soil bed is great for seating and creating edges. The urban forest is a real opportunity to break tradition on the urban grid and create rich foregrounds to the tall buildings.

Another Panel member noted that the waterfront work westward has been iconographic, and asked the team to comment on the character shift for this project, and if some of the quality established in the west will be carried over. Mr. Geuze responded that the client is eager to deliver a consistent 3km of waterfront but also wants to adapt to differences and constraints. The team is interested to keep continuity of material, furniture, large trees, Canadian granite, timber, while exploring technology with authentic nature. Ms. Long noted that the iconography has often been characterized by monoculture, such as the Willows at HTO Park, the team is interested in that lineage but further building on succession, supported species, deadwood, etc. – the thinking is more cyclical. Mr. Geuze noted that each site tends to become suburban, the team is interested in creating a downtown experience, delivering a democratic waterfront for all ages and groups.

One Panel member appreciated the five consistent streets because they are the connective tissue for the area. The Panel member felt the project is caught in the conundrum of a series of separated boundaries, which are not perceived by the public, and making the public realm feel continuous is most important. The Panel member noted that consistency and continuity are hallmarks of the waterfront and asked the team to consider the site's connection to Villiers Island and Distillery District, and show them as key context in the drawings. The Panel member felt that setting the table for innovation will allow Waterfront Toronto to remain a leader in innovation.

Another Panel member felt the idea of the urban forest is very powerful and asked the team to develop it carefully to fruition, ensuring the full quality of the urban streetscape and forest are implemented. The Panel member is concerned that the forests are not large enough to provide the experiential quality as envisioned. The Panel member noted that the plaza can have one typology of growth, while the urban forest of the streetscape is different, i.e. continuous canopy versus smaller pockets of canopy, and the wildness of the tree species. The Panel member is excited that the site will become a nexus where the forest transforms into something else. The Panel member noted that the pedestrian bridge to Villiers Island begins to inform the function of Street D, and asked the team to consider the continuous bike network through Parliament Plaza and other north-south connections.

One Panel member is supportive of the restorative nature approach, noted that scale of the urban forest is important because Parliament is a gateway to the waterfront. The Panel member encouraged the team to reference the northern edge of Lake Ontario as part of the landscape palette, and noted that the next phase of design should clarify whether the plaza will be constructed above the parking garage roof. On the north-south connections, the Panel member commented it is a great opportunity to extend

the forest language down to Parliament Slip. The Panel member noted streetscaping standards and urban forest standards are difficult to overcome, and encouraged the team to strive for a wilder character, not just regular spacing of trees and plants, and be prepared for a long development process.

Another Panel member asked the team to utilize low carbon specifications in the construction, from concrete to pavers.

One Panel member noted the importance of the understorey in making the forest experience pleasurable and operative, providing a balance of complexity and permeability, and asked the team to consider the design of the understory carefully. The Panel member noted that Little Island is a recent project that does not create successful interstitial growth – just ground and canopy.

Another Panel member noted Waterfront Toronto has made great strides in narrowing vehicular space and prioritizing pedestrian and bike infrastructure and asked the team to consider narrowing the vehicular lanes, add separated cycling lanes, planting, and continue to lead the city on road design. The Panel member asked the team to consider if Street D can be made into a non-vehicular street.

One Panel member noted that while contracts have straight lines, the designs should not. The integration of proposed landscape of Parliament Slip should be well integrated with the streetscape and the pedestrian bridge to Villiers Island which will have high bike traffic.

Another Panel member supported the concept of the urban forest and noted that recognizing trees as a sustainability tool is innovation. It is important to think about the urban forest as a real, enhanced, artificial forest.

One Panel member appreciated the high-quality presentation from Mr. Geuze and Ms. Long.

1.5 Consensus Comments

General

- Appreciated the concept and that the Canadian analogy is embodied in the presentation, ensure the design can inspire and innovate on all levels.
- Ensure the various public realm components are well integrated to create a continuous experience, specifically the urban forest must be implemented seamlessly.
- Consider the pedestrian connection to Villiers Island as part of the site context.
- Strong support for the concept of the “urban forest” throughout the project, consider the landscape design carefully to ensure successful implementation.

Public Realm

- The public realm, specifically the five streets, are the connective tissue of Quayside, ensure the streets and public realm are well designed:
 - Maintain important view corridors to the water.

- Consider the human scale and pedestrian friendly design.
- The intersection of Parliament and Lake Shore is a gateway to the waterfront, ensure the public realm design supports this experience.

Parliament Plaza

- A pilot project is recommended to prototype the urban forest and identify specifications that work best for the site.
- Avoid creating a suburban landscape experience, consider accommodating large trees, a variety of species and scale to reduce uniformity, and a robust understory.
- Consider the species and design of the trees carefully as the urban forest is set in an urban plaza and not a park.

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

Mr. Geuze appreciated the DRP’s stewardship, the collective intelligence, hawk-eyed review, and consistency. Mr. Geuze asked the Panel to imagine that the team builds a prototype, with 2-3 versions for evaluation, like West 8’s park in Madrid – create good soil space, plant some species for growth which are then cut after a few years to create succession. Instead of designing, the team would focus more on experimentation and treat the prototype as an installation. Mr. Geuze noted the experiment can be positioned to be more social, such as letting schools and students take ownership, a very down to earth and democratic way to deliver good understory.

1.6 *Vote of Support/Non-Support*

No vote was taken at Issues Identification.

2.0 *Ontario Place Public Realm Master Plan – Issues Identification (City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto Joint-DRP)*

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1134
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Ontario Place
<i>Proponent:</i>	Infrastructure Ontario
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Martha Schwartz Partners LANDinc
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Ross Burnett, Vice President, Landmark Project, Infrastructure Ontario Benjamin Hoff, Partner, Urban Strategies Timothy Nawrocki, Associate Director, Martha Schwartz Partners
<i>Delegation:</i>	Jordan Erasmus, Infrastructure Ontario Eric Pitre, Infrastructure Ontario Patrick Morello, LANDinc Neil Loewen, Urban Strategies

Matthew Gindlesperger, MSP
Mark Lawson, Therme Group
Chris Salloum, Therme Group
Gary McCluskie, Diamond and Schmitt Architects
Jeanette Parker, Diamond and Schmitt Architects
Duncan Higgins, Diamond and Schmitt Architects
Svetlana Lavrentieva, City of Toronto
Colin Wolfe, City of Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto
Meredith Vaga, City of Toronto
Meg St John, City of Toronto
Dan Nicholson, City of Toronto
Simon Bredin, Waterfront Toronto
Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto
Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Svetlana Lavrentieva, Senior Urban Designer with City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting the City of Toronto team, the site context, and planning documents including the Official Plan and Central Waterfront Secondary Plan. Ms. Lavrentieva noted the existing access and entry points to Ontario Place, connections to surrounding context, existing views, and recapped the planning approval process for the master plan and subsequent tenanted areas. Ms. Lavrentieva noted the related City initiatives at the site, a summary of the project timeline, and areas for Panel consideration, including alignment with the original Hough/ Zeidler vision, a continuous public realm, overall tree canopy, enhancing connectivity, a freely accessible public experience, and sustainability. Ms. Lavrentieva then introduced Ross Burnett, Vice President, Landmark Project, Infrastructure Ontario, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Burnett began by introducing the proposal for the revitalization of Ontario Place, the pathway to redevelopment, and the vision of the master plan including Therme Group, Live Nation, Ecorecreo. Infrastructure Ontario, noting they received thirty submissions for the RFP competition. The project will be a phased, multi-partner approach, with potential economic benefits of five million visitors a year, three thousand six hundred new jobs, and a five-hundred million dollar private sector investment for redevelopment. Mr. Burnett noted the application process timeline, opportunities for public engagement and input, and introduced Timothy Nawrocki, Associate Director with Martha Schwartz Partners, to present the public realm plan.

Mr. Nawrocki noted the RFP objectives, the site extents for the public realm, scope of work, and team composition. Mr. Nawrocki provided a recap of the context analysis including the history of Ontario Place, regional transit connections to the waterfront, open space network, walking and biking paths, and identified the key values for Ontario Place. The site is in need of reinvestment, renewal, and reinvention, and Mr. Nawrocki noted areas of the original Hough landscape, and Zeidler's architecture,

require restoration. Mr. Nawrocki noted the landscape design principles, including the celebration of the Hough and Zeidler designs, Indigenous place-keeping, commitment to sustainability and resilience, biodiversity habits and tree coverage, an immersive natural experience, and meaningful access to the water. A key public realm intention is to establish a consistent, cohesive, and attractive public realm experience, Mr. Nawrocki noted opportunities such as year-round activities, microclimate, habitat, and increasing permeability with planting.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for more information on the existing parking lots as they relate to the comprehensive public realm master plan. Mr. Burnett answered that parking is an important consideration, the team plans to upgrade surface parking and bring in current green standards. There is also a commitment to provide additional parking, parking lot P1 will be relocated to below grade parking and replaced with a central plaza. Mr. Burnett noted there are many competing interests at the lots, including buses, pick-up and drop-off, and last mile transit, so a smart design will be required to accommodate them.

Another Panel member asked if there is a phasing plan for the parking lots to become something else, or a permanent infill strategy. Mr. Burnett responded the intention is to have parking lot P2 remain and redevelop P1 with a below grade solution that will happen concurrently with the public realm construction. The team is working with the City and Exhibition Place on a precinct-wide solution so both areas can meet parking demand. The Panel member asked if the existing trees will be retained. Mr. Nawrocki responded yes, the topography will be retained which will preserve many of the waterfront trees. However, the landscape will require maintenance and infrastructure upgrade. Patrick Morello, Principal with LANDinc, added the team will use the same technique as Trillium Park with shoreline revetment work integrated into the existing planting to preserve the trees.

One Panel member noted the presentation did not include a topography drawing with respect to soil condition and asked if the team has completed a comprehensive topography and soil volume study to start the design. Mr. Burnett responded that the province has completed a full analysis of the trees on site, they will be included as part of the application to inform the landscape design and the remediation strategy. On the west island, the Panel member noted the bridge feels private with little public connectivity and asked the team if there is any flexibility in increasing the public character of the connection because public access is very important. Mr. Burnett noted Therme facility includes a new public access into the west island, which will expand the existing capacity to the west island, improve experience, and handle emergency services. Mr. Burnett noted the team is working with the City to improve access and capacity required on the connection over Lake Shore, it is outside of Therme scope. Mr. Burnett noted the bridge connection to the Therme will be retained as fully public.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the existing ecology of Ontario Place, if there is a strategy being developed for the remaining parts of the site to

compensate for the loss of ecology from the new developments. The Panel member asked if the scale of the developments can be calibrated to accommodate the ecological wellbeing of the park. Mr. Burnett noted a full 4-season survey has been conducted to understand habitat and environment. With regards to the compensation requirement, the team is expected to work with the City on established processes to receive a development permit. Mr. Nawrocki noted the team is aware there is reduced ecology on the west island but will add more on the east island as compensation to provide a net gain. Mr. Hoff noted the team is interested in stripping away circulation and parking areas in favour of landscaped open space. Trillium Park is resiliently designed to accommodate people while creating a high percentage of permeable surface, Mr. Morello noted the team will refer to the Toronto Green Standards for paved surface and deal with runoffs.

One Panel member asked where lake filling is required outside of the west island area. Mr. Burnett noted the team recognizes the west island needs an extensive public realm, the principle is to minimize lake filling or do it selectively along the shoreline for repair. The Live Nation site is being studied to see if any filling is required.

Another Panel member asked for the status on the design work and if there are alternative options that will be presented for the public meeting for input. Mr. Morello noted one of the early slides show public versus private areas, the focus of the next iteration is to provide the public with a series of design options. Mr. Nawrocki noted the design is still in the programming stages with many iterations, a design has not been selected yet. The Panel member noted the west island is shown as a study area, and asked if the team will be able to provide a public area around the island. Mr. Burnett clarified that the secondary study area means LANDinc is working with Therme to work on the landscape and public realm design to ensure the waterfront trail will be incorporated. Mr. Morello noted there is a consistently wide minimum 6m waterfront trail that goes around the entire shoreline crossing over the zones.

One Panel member asked if there will be an Issues Identification review in the future for the buildings. Mr. Burnett responded the plan is to return in the fall for the second review and will speak with the City on the scheduling of the building reviews. On sustainability and resiliency, the Panel member asked if there is as-built information on Ontario Place to help understand the heritage preservation approach versus improvements, specifically information on the Hough landscape and how the existing heritage buildings fit into the three new built forms – this should be presented as part of the next presentation. Mr. Morello noted that evolutionary history is a great topic to present, the team focused on studying the original landscape principles, both to protect the pods and create micro-climatic conditions and use regional landscape principles to design landscape spaces. The principles have been extracted for the design, however Mr. Morello noted the needs have changed with the new tenants. Mr. Morello noted it is intended not to just recreate the same edge, but to use landscape to create the same “glue” that originally existed and made Ontario Place unique.

Another Panel member asked if there is a mapping analysis completed on heritage value and information on the landscaping programming. Mr. Nawrocki noted the site uses evolved over time and that came at the expense of the Hough landscape. While

the team is not trying to recreate what is lost, there is a plan to accommodate Hough's design principles.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the areas that are public versus gated or ticketed, and asked if the private program will spill out into the public area and require the public circulation to be rerouted. Mr. Burnett noted the commitment is that public spaces will be ungated and open to all, such as the beach, public spaces around Therme. Mr. Burnett noted there will also be event areas that will remain completely public. Live Nation and Therme will require payment for entry to the venues, but the rest of Ontario Place will remain open to public access.

Another Panel member asked if the team is using the historic water level or extreme water level, or the new 100-year flood level. Mr. Morello noted the team is using the recent data based on current events, looking at the projected data, and also anticipating higher water levels over time. There is an intention to allow flooding in some areas while boardwalk will protect accessible area. Mr. Nawrocki noted some of the areas will remain low.

One Panel member asked for more information on the Indigenous consultation process and the groups that have been engaged. Mr. Burnett noted there is on-going consultation taking place for the EA. Mr. Morello noted there is a comprehensive consultation plan, including a list of the rights-bearing first nations in the area as a minimum, additional urban Indigenous groups, and other organizations that have access to the site. Shelly Charles, Indigenous engagement specialist from Minokamik, has been leading the consultation work. The first workshop and walk of the site have been completed. Mr. Morello noted the team is at the stage of listening, and realize that the strength of the design comes from being able to recognize the diverse voices.

Another Panel member asked if the Science Centre is setting up program and if the envelope of the buildings will be repaired and restored. Mr. Burnett noted there is no information on the Science Centre and the team has already received the permit to begin the envelope repair work.

One Panel member asked if there is an enclosure around the private venues that will separate the public areas. Mr. Morello noted there will be in some cases, and Therme will have grade separation, and it will be an integrated process of design.

Another Panel member appreciated the on-site renewal work and asked if there is a possibility to use the existing landform to use wind as a higher power renewable energy. Mr. Morello noted the team studied bladeless turbines and they may have a home at the more exposed areas of the site.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair asked the Panel members to confine comments to the scope of public realm master plan.

One Panel member recommended the team bring more detail on the context for the next review including technical information on topography and flooding. With regards to

the pathways, the Panel member recommended the team refer to the Port Lands Flood Protection parks for the design of bike lanes and ped ways, ensure the bridge is designed for both private and public access, and make sure that the public areas are clearly delineated. The Panel member asked for more information on the west island at the next review including the bridge connection, and suggested relocating all the surface parking below grade, similar to the Harbourfront Power Plant parking lot, to provide more public realm. The Panel member asked the team to consider a water taxi terminal for marine traffic, and other supplemental programs in the public realm such as cafes, kiosks, shade structures, boat launches, bicycle parking.

Another Panel member recommended a series of diagrams that chart circulation for the public, servicing, and private users, and include water access routes to help understand the moments of conflict and intersection. This is important for the experiential quality of the circulation network.

One Panel member appreciated the layered and complex presentation and commented that it is important to see more precise drawings on the existing built condition. The Panel member appreciated the new opportunities being overlaid on the site, and asked the team to provide a full layout of programs, both above and underground, to help understand the uses of the islands.

Another Panel appreciated the shift towards a 24/7 use of the site, asked the team to provide more intention on the role of the public realm, and suggested that the landscape can do more to extend those uses. The Panel member suggested one area of landscape can be purely nature for immersion, and another can be programmed to draw people and give identity to the area – more development of the ideas is encouraged.

One Panel member worked with Michael Hough in the sixties to seventies and noted he was very interested in creating urban ecology, and he would like to see Ontario Place evolve so it is important to not be slavish with the original intent. The waterfront site is important ecologically, the high-level thinking of the project needs to be holistic and clear.

Another Panel member supported the inclusion of amenity programs as previously noted by another Panel member, and asked the team to consider amplifying biodiversity, and address underwater attributes such as stagnation issues that require engineering. The project is complex, the Panel member recommended a full set of detailed drawings at the next review.

One Panel member noted it is important to understand the various zones, from public, semi-public, to private, and there is ultimately an overlap that cannot be avoided, such as the main door entrance of the tenanted spaces. The Panel member recommended the elimination of the surface parking because it would make the public realm much stronger.

Another Panel member supported the other comments on providing more detailed and technical drawings for the next review.

One Panel member appreciated the complexity of the project, the sensitivities around the site, and overall intentions. The Panel member appreciated the team recognizing the Hough landscape as important as the architecture. The Panel member noted Trillium Park is a very exciting project, and Ontario Place should be an evolution of that same spirit. The Panel member asked the team to consider the creation of micro-climate using planting and structures that can help alleviate the harsh conditions. The surface parking lot is a psychological barrier, and the member asked the team to consider relocating the parking underground and replace with a great public realm.

Another Panel member noted the tenants will have to develop net-zero designs and felt the master plan should help tenants in achieving that objective, such as providing wind turbines that can be leased to tenants, sites that can be leased to offset carbon, etc. – find ways for the public realm to support the sustainability objectives.

One Panel member deeply appreciated the presentation, thanked the proponent team, and noted familiarity with the site from kayaking in the area. The panel member noted that in a typical master planning exercise, there is a sequence of operations where one begins with the street and block pattern to determine the location of the private development areas. Given the unusual history of Ontario Place, this project has an operational challenge but the Panel member accepts the state of the project. The Panel member felt there is a gap between the presentation and the drawings, and noted that the aspirational qualities of the original Ontario Place should be embedded in the new design. The Panel member noted the drawings are insufficient in demonstrating that the team has fully analysed the environmental conditions of the site and how the work helps to tackle climate change challenges. At a macro level, the Panel member asked the team and the City to consider how the project will connect to the Ontario Line and generally public access. The Panel member does not see the surface parking lot as a long-term success for the site. The Panel member recommended more work on the west island connection and a more robust public waterfront edge. The Panel member felt the master plan does not have a strong balance of private and public, and noted that Evergreen Brickworks is a great reference model that incorporates non-profit and private programs to a site that still feels very public. There are significant grading issues between the north and the south, the Panel member asked the team to provide more information on the topography at the next review. Additionally, providing an opportunity to swim here would be fantastic.

Another Panel member appreciated the presentation, encouraged the project to enhance the ecological performance of the islands, and explore how the functions can be amplified. Innovation is integral to Ontario Place, the Panel member recommended continuing to advance innovation on how people and ecology can be combined, and explain the net gain of biomass and tree canopy on the site. They also suggested providing more spaces for flexible events. The Panel member asked the team to ensure continuous, free, public circulation around the site.

One Panel member appreciated the project, noted there are many interconnected priorities. The Panel member recommended a sustainability mission statement, such as a commitment to net-zero, to help identify the priorities on sustainability and resiliency. The Panel member strongly recommended that Infrastructure Ontario

explore the high-level break wall for flood protection as this is a challenge faced by all communities adjacent to the water.

Another Panel member asked the team to ensure proper input from the Indigenous communities be incorporated into the design, and that Mr. Morello present the consultation process at the next review. The Panel member encouraged the group to look at marine biodiversity, the interface between land and water, and thanked the team for the presentation.

2.5 Consensus Comments

General

- Appreciated the presentation and want to see the project be phenomenal.
- Ensure the project can continue the spirit of Ontario Place and inspire future generations while creating aspirational memories for today.
- Strong support for the year-round use of the site.
- Consider relocating the parking area underground to create a public space. Refer to precedents such as Ontario Square where a public space is constructed in place of the surface parking which is relocated underground.
- The Ontario Line will connect the Science Centre with Ontario Place, and a partnership with the Science Centre is encouraged.
- Indigenous consultation remains important for the project, continue to provide updates on the process at the next review.

Site Context

- Provide more documentation on existing conditions and present the comprehensive site analysis at the next review, including:
 - site topography
 - tree canopy coverage
 - cultural value of the landscape, i.e. how does the original Hough landscape relate to the new built form
- Provide more information on public access and circulation to the site, i.e. from Ontario Line, shuttle service, etc.
- Consider marine access to the site, such as water taxi.

Public Realm

- The proposed master plan does not feel sufficiently public, especially the west island. It is recommended to provide generous, robust, and continuous public access through the site and along the water's edge.
- Refer to Evergreen Brickworks as a public-private partnership precedent that continues to feel very public.
- Provide clarification on public access in and around the tenanted spaces.
- Provide the following to ensure a successful public realm:
 - Support programs such as cafes, kiosks, bathrooms.
 - Biodiversity in the landscape design.
 - Solar, wind, rain protection to support year-round use.

- Clear and robust servicing strategy for retail and event programs that does not interfere with public circulation.
- Maximize soft landscaping, continue the success of Trillium Park that drastically improves the percentage of soft landscaping on the site.
- Consider opportunities to swim.

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

Mr. Burnett thanked the Panel members for their comments and noted that the team wants to create a successful project. The feedback is incredibly helpful for the team to evolve the design and return with more details. Existing conditions, ecology, clarification between public and private, the role of sustainability, meaningful integration with the public access, will all be presented. For clarification, Mr. Burnett noted 6m is the width of the trail that is being contemplated, based on that of the existing William G. Davis trail, and is not the full width of the public realm around the water's edge. Mr. Burnett noted the DRP is a big resource of design, the team is also speaking with stakeholders, community, and Indigenous groups to collect feedback to inform the design.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken at Issues Identification.

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.

These Meeting Minutes are formally adopted and approved by Panel on September 28th, 2022.

Signed--

DocuSigned by:



BC37EAE11BEF41B...

Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair

DocuSigned by:



3513697D8EE74BB...

Emilia Floro, City of Toronto Urban Design Director

DocuSigned by:



AE277B6DC4C740D...

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto Chief Planning and Design Officer