



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #161

Wednesday, May 24th, 2023

Meeting held in-person, hybrid

Present

Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel

Paul Bedford, Chair

Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair

George Baird

Gina Ford

Pat Hanson

Matthew Hickey

David Leinster

Fadi Masoud

Emily Mueller De Celis

Brigitte Shim

Kevin Stelzer

Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Janna Levitt

Nina-Marie Lister

Jeff Ranson

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

Emilia Floro, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

Overview of Review Agenda

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

1. Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm – Schematic Design
 2. 1-7 Yonge Phase 2+3 – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the meeting minutes from last month. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest for disclosure. Eric Turcotte and Matthew Hickey declared conflicts of interest for Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm and recused themselves from the review.

The Chair then asked Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer, and Leon Lai, Manager, 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 for Ontario Place Public Realm Master Plan and West Island have been shared with the Proponent team and the City. Mr. Lai noted City of Toronto issued the Status Report in March, and the Proponent continues with public consultation. Mr. Lai noted the revised design is expected to return to DRP for Stage 2 review after the EA has been filed.

Mr. Lai noted the consensus comments for 153-185 Eastern Ave. have been shared with the Proponent team, the first SPA submission has been made, and the project is anticipated to return for Stage 2 review in Q3/4 2023.

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Chris Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, noted that City and Waterfront Toronto, through an application to the Active Transportation Fund, received notice that the Federal Government would fund \$9 million towards the Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge. The bridge will create a vital pedestrian and cycling connection between Quayside and Villiers Island. Mr. Glaisek noted the grant stipulates completion of bridge by March 31, 2026.

Mr. Glaisek provided a construction update on Love Park: pond bottom poured, finish grading completed, and MEP installation continues. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto held a public open house showing projects in the eastern waterfront, and invited Panel members to see the Destination Playground scale model.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted the 2023 Urban Land Institute Spring Meeting took place in Toronto from May 15-18th and noted that he participated in giving tours of the waterfront along with Chris Glaisek. The Chair noted Jeff Ranson is stepping off the Panel and thanked him for three terms of service.

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1033
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<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
<i>Delegation:</i>	Priscilla Leung, West 8 Michael Wiedow, WSP Yvonne Lam, DTAH Corin Latimer, DTAH Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto Chris Hilbrecht, City of Toronto Steve Barber, City of Toronto Brent Fairbairn, City of Toronto Sonja Vangjeli, City of Toronto Joanna Chludzinska, City of Toronto Merrilees Willemse, 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 Carol Webb, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Adam Novack, Planning and Design Director with Waterfront Toronto introduced the various pieces of the Quayside coordinated public realm program. Mr. Novack noted the design team is led by West 8 and DTAH with WSP. Mr. Novack provided a summary of the project context including Quayside, Queens Quay public realm, adjacent internal streets, Parliament Slip activation, and Lake Shore Public Realm. Mr. Novack noted the project is here for Schematic Design review, the previous consensus comments, and the areas for Panel consideration, including overall design concept, design of streetscapes at Lake Shore, Parliament, and Water’s Edge, integration with adjacent context, and opportunities to support sustainability and resilience objectives. Mr. Novack introduced Shelley Long, Project Leader with West 8, to give the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Long began by recapping the design vision and opportunities, situating the project in the eastern waterfront, and noted the concept of a regenerative urban pocket forest rooted in place with an immersive waterfront arrival experience. Ms. Long noted the team is interested in extending the urban landscape from Parliament to Villiers Island with consistent inner streets, “green lungs”, and a continuous primary waterfront. Ms. Long noted the character aspirations for each street, material and planting palette, and learnings from the Lake Shore Pilot Project.

Ms. Long noted the large open planters flushed with the promenade can take up stormwater drainage, and in maintaining EMS clearance the streets will have a 6m clearance. At the Water’s Edge, the streetscape is designed to accommodate the bridge landing and adjacent buildings. Ms. Long noted the team is interested in raising the grades to increase the resiliency of the planted areas, and the public realm work here is the glue that tie various pieces of the waterfront together.

1.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked to confirm that the pilot project does not include any trees. Ms. Long noted that is correct.

The Panel member noted the pocket forest concept depends on a high degree of success of all the adjacent plantings and asked if the proposed planting areas are sufficient for this kind of relationship. Ms. Long noted it is something the team will continue to study at a finer scale as it relates directly to the dimensions of the streetscape – if the planter gets too narrow, the opportunity create significant planting disappears. Currently, the 2m width meets world class soil volume requirement; the buildings are setback to allow for sidewalks, and a narrow sidewalk gives way to a wider planter.

Another panel member asked for more information on the resiliency of the landscape because many people and dogs will impact these sensitive landscapes and asked if there is armoring provided to help protect the soil beds. Ms. Long responded that it comes down to edge details, a toe rail around all planting has been approved for Port Lands streets in hopes of keeping some foot traffic out; the team will do more research on dog tolerance.

One Panel member asked for the maintenance requirements for the pilot project, and if there is any commitment from the City or nearby developer for maintenance of these streetscapes. Ms. Long noted everything within the right-of-way is property of City of Toronto, maintenance requirements have not been developed yet, but it will not be maintained by the developer – the Quayside POPS will be maintained by the developer. For the pilot, the team studied different species to see what works well, ability to self-seed, and thrive in a hardy environment.

Another Panel member asked the team to provide more information on mobility, laybys, the public realm program, and if the team has contemplated other ideas for activation beyond streetscape design. Ms. Long noted the team sees an educational value to the

public, interested in poetic storey lines such as curated walks around Quayside to highlight those layers.

One Panel member asked if there is progress for disseminating the research done for the pilot project. Ms. Long noted the team sees the pilot project as a living laboratory, monitoring and sensors can be integrated. The Panel member asked for how the streets are named. Pina Mallozzi, Senior Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, responded that naming is a City-led process, the team will follow existing City policy and the Councillor's directions. The Panel member commented that the north-south connectors will be visually stunning and hope to see some Indigenous layers in the project.

Another Panel member asked how flexibility is built into street planning, and how the streetscapes will meet the adjacent public realm designed by other teams. Ms. Mallozzi noted the team will have extensive coordination with adjacent developer to coordinate the edge conditions. At the same time as the buildings adjacent to Parliament Plaza will be delivered later, Ms. Mallozzi noted the team will have to be nimble to address any issues that come up, such as utilities. Ms. Long noted that West 8 will also deliver Parliament Slip and the landscape design for Street D can be adjusted based on the final building footprint.

One Panel member asked if there is a soil management plan in place and if remediation is required. Michael Wiedow, Project Manager with WSP, noted the new streets will have a clean cap with existing soil to remain and existing streets would have new cap only where utilities are replaced.

The Chair then asked the Panel members for comments.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member commended the strong concept of the project and appreciated that the design does not rely solely on soil cells. Given the length of these planted areas, the Panel member felt the project is a sustainable model and it is important to ensure planter sizes are not reduced later compromising the overall sustainability. The Panel member noted that this project, along with Port Lands Flood Protection's naturalized approach to streetscape, form a well-connected neighbourhood that is unique and will support Quayside's overall ambition. The Panel member noted maintenance and management are important and should be coordinated to ensure long-term success. The Panel member is concerned with people and pets migrating into the planter beds and asked the team to develop strategies and details to make those areas more resilient.

Another Panel member appreciated the concept of the urban forest and showcasing the narrative of innovation. The Panel member supported the ambitious structural approach for maximizing soil volume, encouraged the team to develop the other facets of the project including urban life, seasonal transformation, relationship with building entrances, and connection with retail – to ensure the streetscape will enhance the urban life around it. The Panel member felt the renders are somewhat disconnected from the real context of the project and the urban perspective should be better

represented. The Panel member supported the performative aspects of the design, and encouraged the team to focus on how these green innovations can transform and add social and urban values to the site.

One Panel member encouraged the team to develop a strategy to integrate pet management into the overall ecological strategy, and address the experiential qualities of the project at the next review, such as sitting on a bench under a tree.

Another Panel member appreciated the clarity of the presentation.

One Panel member appreciated the poetics and narrative of the project, however felt that the design missing a human layer, such as how one can occupy the forest, programming ideas – all of which will make the project more compelling.

Another Panel member supported the exciting project that pushes the envelope of streetscape design. The Panel member is concerned about maintenance and operation, encouraged the team to be innovation and address long-term maintenance. It is important to learn from the successes of the Lake Shore pilot project and ensure the operations required will support the full vision of the design.

One Panel member thanked the team for an excellent presentation, appreciated the leafy and green north-south streets that stitch the neighbourhoods with the waterfront, and was pleased to see that the pedestrian bridge is advancing. The Panel member appreciated the benefit of coordination done by the team between this project and adjacent public realm – there are many mini projects within a larger project, but what really matters is the continuity shown in the public realm. The Panel member underlined the comments on maintenance and encouraged the team to focus on this aspect because the project will set precedent for other parts of the city.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to specify low carbon concrete, develop a strong soil management plan, and explore strategies to reduce transportation and any associated carbon emissions during construction.

1.5 Consensus Comments

- Overall strong support for the work presented today, appreciated the high level of design at Schematic Design – some technical issues to be resolved as the design advances.
- The presentation scope did not include the design for Parliament Plaza, the team will return with that scope for review.
- Appreciated that the project is advancing the standards for street design. Appreciated the urban forest narrative and encouraged to see the soil depths and volumes meeting the highest standards for plant health.
- Strong support for the north-south street designs that enhance the connections to the waterfront.
- The design appears to be missing a layer of programmatic ideas, consider bringing another layer to the design that addresses street life with novel

programs, such as ecological art, bird boxes, movable furniture, etc., to emphasize the didactic notion of the project and the importance of sharing experience.

- Consider an Indigenous narrative, such as craft and/or Indigenous planting approach, to help the design advance and solve urban challenges.
- Work with Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PF&R) to develop a clear maintenance and operations strategy to ensure the implementation of succession planting. Specifically provide more details for managing pets at the planters to ensure long term success of the landscapes, i.e. plant rails.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support for the project.

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

Ms. Long thanked the Panel for their comments, agreed that the detailed design elements are yet to be development, and will return with maintenance manual. Ms. Long hoped the neighbours will use the street because it would be amazing for Quayside residents to feel a sense of ownership on the landscape and plant there.

2.0 1-7 Yonge Phase 2+3 – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1064
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two (For Phase 2+3)
<i>Location:</i>	Lower Yonge Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	Pinnacle International
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Hariri Pontarini Architects WSP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	George Pantazis, Senior Community Planner, City of Toronto David Pontarini, Partner, Hariri Pontarini Architects Jacqueline Da Rocha, WSP
<i>Delegation:</i>	Jodi Buck, Hariri Pontarini Architects Kate Cooper, Bousfields Michael De Cotis, Pinnacle International Grace Kwok, Pinnacle International Anson Kwok, Pinnacle International Sonja Vangjeli, City of Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

George Pantazis, Senior Community Planner with City of Toronto, began the introduction by noting the site context, the various phases of the project, status of the

development applications, policy context, implementation of the Lower Yonge EA, and Lower Yonge Precinct Plan. Mr. Pantazis summarized the proposal to increase height and residential density of the previously LPAT-approved Phase 2 and 3 mixed use buildings. Mr. Pantazis noted the current site photos, adjacent context of 55 Lake Shore Boulevard East, and proposal's relationship to the CN Tower and skyline.

Mr. Pantazis noted the project's design review history, Phase 2 + 3 is here for Schematic Design, previous 2017 DRP renderings and consensus comments, and areas for Panel consideration: top portion of the towers, architectural design of Phase 3, and sustainability performance and objectives. Mr. Pantazis introduced David Pontarini, Partner with Harini Pontarini Architects, to give the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Pontarini began by recapping the design changes of Phase 2 and 3 from 2017 addressing feedback from the joint review panel, and provided a design overview of the two towers from podium design to exterior expression. Mr. Pontarini noted the market can sustain the demand for additional density, as a result the affordable housing count will also increase, and the team feels that the towers being a part of a holistic city building project, has the capacity to introduce a higher peak and become the pinnacle of the skyline.

Mr. Pontarini noted the podium relationship with adjacent public realm and POPS, 3d views of the towers and street views. Mr. Pontarini noted the additional height and the towers' relationship with CN Tower and the greater skyline of the city. Jacqueline Da Rocha from WSP presented the sustainability vision for 1 Yonge: Toronto Green Standards (TGS) v2 Tier 2 for Phase 1, TGS v2 Tier 2 for Phase 2 and 3, and Phases 4 and 5 are still under review. Ms. Da Rocha noted the energy strategies and performance objectives for Phase 2 and 3. Mr. Pontarini concluded by presenting 3d perspective views requested by City staff.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel members for questions.

One Panel member asked the team to explain how the Phase 2 podium programs. Mr. Pontarini responded that the podium contains the hotel programs and meeting spaces, there is also residential amenity on the roof of the 7th floor.

Another Panel member asked if the chamfered façade is beneficial for wind mitigation and solar performance. Mr. Pontarini responded that it helps with breaking up the wind but not sure if it has impact on solar performance.

One Panel member asked for clarification on pedestrian versus vehicular areas at the ground floor, and if the corner open space will have a design competition to determine the design and a summary on the park design process. Mr. Pantazis responded that he is not sure if the park design will have a competition. The Panel member asked for the status of the Yonge slip park on the east side of the street. Mr. Glaisek noted the foot

of Yonge St. Park is a site owned by Waterfront Toronto, there is no funding, and hope to do it in partnership with Parks at the City.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the tower top lighting strategy, noting that Aura's lighting is too bright. Mr. Pontarini responded that there is no information on the lighting yet, but the team can provide this. The Panel member asked how the towers will create neighbourhoods and if the team has any information on what programs will occupy the ground floors. Mr. Pontarini described the various program zones on the ground floor, including bank, food and beverage components, and office lobbies.

One Panel member has if a wind study has been completed and if the additional stories will have an impact. Mr. Pontarini noted the additional height has no significant effect on wind and shadow impact. The Panel member asked if there is a strategy for rainwater collection in nearby parks to help with irrigation. Ms. Da Rocha noted the water retained on site will be used and managed on site. The Panel member asked for the total number of added units because of the additional height and the status of the public art plan. Anson Kwok, Vice President of Sales and Marketing with Pinnacle, noted there will be a total of 215 units including 19 affordable housing units, and the public art plan has been to the arts council, the team has received 120 submissions for the art and will be delivered as part of Phase 3.

Another Panel member asked what has been earmarked as additional community benefits as part of the additional height and density. Mr. Pontarini noted it is the affordable housing units, beyond that is an on-going discussion. The Panel member asked if there will be more amenity space dedicated. Jodi Buck, Associate Partner with Hariri Pontarini Architects, responded that another floor of amenity space, including a workshop and gym, have been added to the P2 parking level of Phase 3. The Panel member asked if there is a colonnade proposed along Downes Street. Mr. Pontarini noted the glass line has been pushed back here to increase the width of the sidewalk.

One Panel member asked if there is more opportunity for investing and improving the ground floor public realm given the increase of the tower heights to create a truly civic character. Mr. Pontarini provided the programmatic strategy for Phase 3 ground floor. Mr. Kwok noted Pinnacle is not in full control of the corner open space as the site owned by the City. The Panel member asked if the glass color will be the same as Phase 1. Mr. Pontarini noted yes it will be the same but rendering the exact color has been difficult.

Another Panel member asked why the Phase 3 podium does not step back as many times as Phase 2. Mr. Pontarini noted the Phase 3 lower podium height maintains the street wall along with other Lake Shore buildings and the program there is affordable housing units.

One Panel member asked how the streetscapes in this area are tied together. Mr. Pontarini noted there is a precinct plan that dictates the design of the streets, trying to tie together all the parcels of Lower Yonge so they have a consistent reading. The Panel member asked for clarification on the project's impact to the public realm at grade. Another Panel member noted that when the Toronto Dominion Towers were

first built, people held onto ropes to cross due to the high downwind, but as the area got developed with more towers the wind level was lifted higher and conditions at grade improved.

Another Panel member asked if the project is targeting version 2 of the Toronto Green Standards (TGS), and the EUI and GHGI numbers. Ms. Da Rocha confirmed that the team is targeting version 2 of the TGS, EUI is 12% better than reference model. The Panel member asked for the percentage of EUI used by the elevators – trying to identify opportunities for the project to reduce its carbon output, and if the team has completed a Life Cycle Analysis (LCA). Ms. Da Rocha confirmed that a LCA has not been completed.

One Panel member noted the highest tower at 105 stories seems to be selected to match the base of the CN Tower pod and asked the team to share more information. Mr. Pontarini noted the structural capacity allows an additional height of 10 stories, thus the 105, and there is sufficient elevator capacity to absorb the additional density.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the podium stepping on Phase 3 and felt the Phase 2 podium is less integrated with the tower. The Panel member felt the Phase 2 bending from podium to tower is too abrupt creating a discontinuity in the reading of the vertical lines, consider a more gradual transition. The Panel member is concerned with the uncertain status of the corner open space and asked the team to work with the City to define a credible process, and potentially bring more Section 37 money to develop a great design for the space.

Another Panel member felt that the additional height is not an issue for the project, instead is concerned with how the tower tops will be lit. Citing the overly bright lights at the top of the Aura building, the Panel member felt an insensitive lighting scheme will jump out of the skyline and break the atmosphere, and recommended that if the tower lighting does not compete with the CN Tower, then the additional height is not an issue. The Panel member recommended that given the additional density, the public realm should be improved to better link the towers with the ground plane and create a unique pedestrian experience, such as less glass and more solid facades on the ground floor to create a less corporate and commercial rhythm.

One Panel member noted that leading with landscape is an important value especially when the project proposes very high-density tall buildings – the robustness of the public realm is essential, and the corner public space should carry the tradition of excellence in design of public parks. The Panel member noted that the Yonge slip park is important because it will connect the network of public realm in the neighbourhood, the high number of proposed units necessitates that the park is not an afterthought for the neighbourhood. The Panel member felt the mid-block connections were not discussed enough in the presentation, ensure they are presented and analysed moving forward to ensure the precinct will succeed long term.

Another Panel member appreciated the more refined design of the buildings, noting it is not an easy task, and did not see any issue with the requested additional height.

One Panel member felt the buildings and public realm should have a stronger connection with landscape, and that the corner open space cannot be left as an afterthought. The Panel member encouraged the team to increase additional affordable housing units to more than 10%.

Another Panel member noted that the Gardiner is the north edge of the plaza and buildings, the condition under the structure is dark, it is very important for the corner open space to have a robust design. The Panel member commented that the Aura tower's lighting looms large on the city, it is very bright and imposing, and encouraged the team to carefully design the lighting at the tower tops. The Panel member felt the Yonge Street streetscape design should have more social infrastructure, as it has a very strong corporate and commercial character, to enhance the overall pedestrian comfort.

One Panel member commended the impressive graphics and the presentation and noted that the CN Tower still feels independent despite the additional height of Phase 2 and 3. The Panel member felt that the additional height does not make the project any less desirable, and is confident in the architecture team to create a subtle marking on the skyline that is dignified and does not overburden with overly bright lights, like Aura. The Panel member suggested that the City create a policy around tower lighting. The Panel member suggested to remove the colonnade along Downes Street and push the building closer to the sidewalk. The Panel member felt the access and signal to enter the mid-block connection is under articulated and the design of the gateway should be more highlighted.

Another Panel member noted the plaza and atrium passageway public realm design feel lacklustre and asked the team to find opportunities to amplify these moments of entry so they are commensurate with the tallest residential building in the city. The Panel member commended that the towers feel very elegant.

One Panel member felt the transition from landscape to building is very abrupt and encouraged the team to provide a more gradual landscape strategy that can amplify the civic identity of the development and support the iconic quality of the project.

Another Panel member supported the other comments on lighting and encouraged the team to study the lighting impact from a larger perspective. The Panel member commended the design of the towers.

One Panel member noted that the sustainability performance for the project is a major technical challenge, especially when the project has such a long development timeline. The Panel member felt the current objectives do not demonstrate climate leadership and asked the team to bring more fundamental metrics as completing a reference model study is no longer acceptable, move towards absolute metrics and provide EUI, TEDI, GHGI for review and discussion. Furthermore, the Panel encouraged the team to find opportunities to reduce the carbon output of the project.

2.5 Consensus Comments

General

- Appreciated the detailed presentation and commended the team for continuing to advance the design.
- Supported the increase in height for Phase 2 and 3 towers provided additional investments and improvements are made in public realm and up to date TGS sustainability standards to demonstrate climate leadership.
- Generally felt that the new towers with the additional height do not compete with the CN tower, however it is important to ensure the tower lighting is well designed and executed.

Building and Public Realm

- Given the additional height, strongly consider further improving the building base and public realm, consider the following:
 - Enhance the project's community benefits with additional investments in the public realm, i.e., the corner open space, more community uses, pedestrian infrastructure, and public amenities.
 - The public realm feels very “corporate”, improve the design to support a great neighbourhood, i.e., more smaller retail uses to encourage activation, pedestrian scaled facades, strengthen the presence of the entrance to the covered passageway.
 - Provide more clarity on the at-grade east-west and north-west midblock connections between pedestrian and vehicles.
 - Provide more pedestrian infrastructure on the Yonge Street public realm, such as seating opportunities, to better improve the important connection to the waterfront.
- Increasing the percentage of affordable housing units given the increase in overall density.
- Concerned that the tower lighting will be too bright and overpowering, ensure the lighting scheme is tried and tested, provide fulsome studies to demonstrate the light level is appropriate.
- Consider removing the colonnade along Downes St.

Corner Open Space

- Concerned that the corner public space will be orphaned while other parcels are rapidly developed and constructed, work with the City to urgently define a clear strategy to bring forth a well-designed public realm that appropriately supports the development and serves as a gateway to the waterfront for Yonge Street.
- Strongly encouraged to run a design competition to procure a great design for the corner public space and explore joint-funding options with City.
- Provide the updated design when the corner public space returns to Panel for review.

Sustainability

- Strongly encouraged the team to demonstrate climate leadership and consider the long-term energy performance of the building. Go beyond the required metrics to reduce energy consumption and carbon emissions.
- The presentation did not provide information on EUI, TEDI, and GHGI. Ensure the data is provided for the return review.

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

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support for additional tower height and design, and Conditional Support for base building, public realm, and sustainability.

Mr. Pontarini agreed with the comments and noted the team will make every effort to try to respond to them. Mr. Pontarini noted the team is looking to seek approval on the additional height to continue construction.

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 June 21st, 2023.

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