



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel (WDRP) Minutes of Meeting #177

Wednesday, Sept. 24, 2025

Meeting held in-person hybrid at Waterfront Toronto

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Emily Mueller De Celis
David Leinster
Janna Levitt
Pat Hanson
Pina Petricone
Kevin Stelzer
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Matthew Hickey
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Brigitte Shim
Betsy Williamson

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Nasim Adab, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai, Waterfront Toronto

OVERVIEW OF REVIEW AGENDA

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

1. Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge – Stage 3: Detailed Design
 2. Quayside: Zoning and Master Plan – Stage 2: Preliminary Draft Plan
 3. Quayside: Public Realm – Stage 2: Schematic Design
 4. Quayside: Building 1C – Stage 2: Schematic Design
 5. Quayside: Building 1B + Block 2 – Stage 2: Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest for disclosure. Matthew Hickey declared conflict for **Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge** and **Quayside** due to his firm's ongoing work on those projects and recused himself from the review. Eric Turcotte declared conflict for **Quayside** due to his firm's ongoing work on the project and recused himself from the review.

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

Design Review Panel Report Back:

Mr. Lai noted that the Consensus Comments for **Ookwemin Minising Enabling Infrastructure: Streetscape, Design and Massing**, have been shared with the design team. Workshops have been held to advance design and address Panel comments, and the project is scheduled to return for a second round of review in October 2025,

Waterfront Toronto Updates:

Mr. Lai presented two temporary floating art projects that have been installed. "It Comes in Waves" by artist Ben Johnson is installed in Harbour Square Basin from July to October 2025. Coming up in September, another art project "Water Wonders" will be installed at the Spadina Pier from September to October 2025.

Chair's remarks:

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

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge – Stage 3: Detailed Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1142
<i>Project Type:</i>	Infrastructure
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Detailed Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Parliament Slip / Port Lands
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	WilkinsonEyre Architects Zeidler Two Row Architect
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Dominic Bettison, Director, WilkinsonEyre Elliott Krause, Associate Director, WilkinsonEyre Erik Skouris, Architect, Two Row Architect
<i>Delegation:</i>	Matthew Firestone, Zeidler Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto Anna Ingebrigtsen, Waterfront Toronto Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto Kasia Gladki, Waterfront Toronto Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto



1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Senior Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by first noting the RFP objectives, project goals, existing context and the future context of OoKwemin Minising. Ms. Mallozzi noted the project completed Design-Assist and value-engineering, the 60% design set was submitted in July 2025, and presented to the Community Advisory Committee and Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC). Mr. Mallozzi noted the design optimization progress, the project is here for Stage 3: Detailed Design review, AAC key comments, and previous Panel consensus comments. Ms. Mallozzi concluded by noting the areas for Panel consideration including design integration with context, accessibility and circulation, refinement of design elements, sustainability and resilience strategies. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Dominic Bettison, Director with WilkinsonEyre, to continue with the design presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Bettison began by reiterating the six project goals and the design concept of the Equinox Bridge. Mr. Elliott Krause, Associate Director with WilkinsonEyre, explained the design development of the north landing on Water's Edge Promenade, reorientation of the bridge and reduction in length to fit on barge, reduction in bridge width, and the omitting of nosing and seating areas. Erik Skouris, Architect with Two Row Architect, noted the Indigenous voice of the project, teaching and knowledge sharing, Equinox and Solstice views from the bridge, Black Cherry marker trees, celestial alignments and the cables that reference lunar cycle, and the perforated parapet. Mr. Krause noted accessibility and comfort design details, accommodation of different modes of mobility,

lighting, materials and sustainability, and the bridge abutments in relation to the landing points.

1.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked if it is possible to increase the frequency of the cables to more fully capture the harp-like image. Mr. Krause noted the team debated on the best spacing of cables while expressing the Indigenous narrative and felt the current space strikes a good balance – enough to recall the inspiration concept image from the artist Brian Jungen, but also to align with the cycle of the moon. If the number is doubled then only half the cables are needed to read the cycle which does not make sense. Mr. Bettison added that more cables mean more structure needed.

Another Panel member asked if there is a wind break and where is the location of the Cherry tree. Mr. Krause responded yes but for the guard rails to be a true wind break they would have to be much higher – currently they will create some sort of shelter right on the nosings similar to a parapet. Mr. Skouris responded that the trees are located on both ends of the bridge.

One Panel member asked if signage and wayfinding are part of the design scope. Mr. Krause noted it is but the design is not there yet. Pina Mallozzi, Vice President of Design with Waterfront Toronto, responded that there is an intention to integrate the wayfinding of the bridge with Biidaasige Park since there is an interpretative wayfinding program.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member thanked the team for the presentation, commended the design optimization process with design and structural efficiency synthesized, and suggested to start with these key strategies. The Panel member asked the team to provide more information on the vision around the arrival thresholds on both ends of the bridge, and suggested the arrival experience be different on either side to articulate this moment. The Panel member recommended to celebrate where the arch meets the ground into a strong narrative moment.

Another Panel member felt the design is still elegant, iconic, beautiful, and will become a postcard moment. The Panel member suggested a “living landscape” to address where the abutment meets the ground. The Panel member felt the meeting between ramp and stairs was too much hardscape and suggested a softer approach to help transition from one moment to another. The Panel member appreciated the subtlety of the lighting of the deck but asked the team to consider how the design will be perceived from a distance and amplify the reading of the arch with light.

One Panel member felt the symbolism of the cables is significant from the Indigenous perspective and the lighter approach is supported. The landing points feel underwhelming and not integrated, and suggested layering Indigenous narrative at those moments, consider a connection to the river and shoreline of the lake as a way of placemaking.

Another Panel member appreciated the beautiful bridge and noted that it is distinguished by its minimal and controlled approach and the simplicity of how it touches the ground. The Panel member appreciated the sinuous relationship with the park to the south, blurring with the park. The balustrade stands out as a very generic element when everything else is minimal and special, and asked if the team can make the design more unique, such as vertical railing members rather than an Ontario Building Code appearance. The Panel member felt the constellation pattern is not fully integrated with the bridge details, like an applique, and asked the team to continue to develop the detail.

One Panel member commended the design for its lightness and setting a new standard for accessible public realm. While there is a powerful economy for all the other elements, the Panel member felt the landings should work more closely with the narrative and help amplify the connection and integration of the bridge with the landscape. Also consider the addition of colors to help ground the project contextually – something that should appear at every scale to build on the context.

Another Panel member felt inspired by the revised design which maintains the project thesis. On the structure, the Panel member asked the team to consider a minimal or sculptural move to mark the tension peak of the arch and the abutment landings. The Panel member recommended doing more to light the design so the arch can be visible further down along the waterfront, consider subtle ways like small pin lights to illuminate the cables to give equal presence to the arch at night and during the day.

1.5 Consensus Comments

- Supported the overall design and commended the project as a fantastic addition to the waterfront.
- Supported the successful design optimization process in maintaining the original goals of the design competition.
- Commended the development of details that overlay the design with Indigenous narratives.
- Commended the rescaling and repositioning of the bridge to enable a simpler barge delivery and install.
- Consider the following to enhance the bridge design:
 - Further develop the landing areas and define the thresholds with a stronger landscape strategy to make them more inviting.
 - Develop the balustrade detail further to continue the themes of minimalism and contextualism.
 - Increase the frequency of the tension cables to strengthen the reading of the arch and reinforce the project concept.
 - Utilization of colors to help contextualize the bridge with the surrounding.
 - Illuminate the bridge arch to ensure the project can be seen from afar.
 - Refine the bridge surfacing materials.
 - Celebrate the details where the arch meets the ground.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support unanimously for the project.

Mr. Krause responded that the Panel's comments resonate with him, and the team is currently thinking about sequence of landing and threshold experience. Lighting is really important as well as nighttime symbolism, Mr. Krause noted the team will consider this and the balustrade detail.

2.0 Quayside: Introduction to Master Plan Update

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1137
<i>Project Type:</i>	Master Plan/ Building/ Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Stage 2: Preliminary Draft Plan Stage 2: Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Quayside
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Alison Brooks Architects Allies and Morrison Henning Larsen Purpose Building Teeple Architects SLA USI
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Benjamin Hoff, Partner, USI Brandon Law, Purpose Building Alison Brooks, Principal, Alison Brooks Architects Rasmus Astrup, Design Principal, SLA Tomer Diamant, Principle, Teeple Architects Christopher Dial, Associate Principal, Henning Larsen Alfredo Caraballo, Partner, Allies and Morrison
<i>Delegation:</i>	Juliana Rocha, Alison Brooks Architects Luka Martutinovic, Purpose Building Tony Medeiros, Dream Joyce Lau, Dream Andre Antanaitis, Great Gulf Adidharma Purnomo, Great Gulf Henry Bloemen, Great Gulf Benjamin Waters, City of Toronto Merrilees Willemse, City of Toronto Hugh Clark, City of Toronto Carly Bowman, City of Toronto Raymond Lee, City of Toronto Kaari Kitawi, City of Toronto Anthony Kittel, City of Toronto Meg Davis, Waterfront Toronto Michael Wolfe, Waterfront Toronto Graeme Kennedy, Waterfront Toronto Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto



Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto
Carol Webb, Waterfront Toronto
Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto
Jed Kilbourn, Waterfront Toronto
Rei Tasaka, Waterfront Toronto
Kristina Verner, Waterfront Toronto
Angela Li, Waterfront Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Michael Wolfe, Director of Development with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the project responds to the urgent need for housing, through collaboration with QILP and Governments, the housing project of Quayside has been modified to deliver more affordable housing and new purpose-built rental homes to replace half of the condos. Mr. Wolfe noted master plan updates including two towers at Block 1A, the acceleration plan to include Block 2, and new architect for Block 1C. Mr. Wolfe noted the revised sustainability requirements, project timeline, planning policies, and recapped the vision of Quayside.

Leon Lai, Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, continued by noting the RFP World Class Design principles, ground floor design objectives, and design context including Waterfront East LRT, Quayside Infrastructure and Public Realm, Lake Shore Public Realm, and Keating Channel Pedestrian Bridge. Mr. Lai summarized the WDRP process so far for Quayside, the review components for today, and the future returns to the WDRP. Mr. Lai noted the 2024 Zoning that was presented to the WDRP, previous Consensus Comments, and areas for Panel consideration including at-grade circulation and pedestrian network, public realm programs, Community Forest landscape design, massing of Block 1C, ground floor retail, urban farm, revised design of Block 1B, new design of Block 2, the proposed massing concepts for Block 1A in relation to the rest of the master plan, and overall sustainability strategies. Mr. Lai then introduced Ben Hoff, Partner with USI, to continue the design presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Hoff noted the design team, the 2024 Quayside master plan, expediting Block 2 as part of current phase of work, revised master plan with increase of affordable rental and purpose-built rental, and the components that are being reviewed today. Mr. Hoff recapped the master plan principles including a green armature, defining edges with Queens Quay, connecting to the water, a green “heart”. Mr. Hoff noted the pedestrian public realm circulation, revised built form and massing, impact on skyline, sun and wind impact, and the overall master plan programming.

Brandon Law, Decarbonization Consultant with Purpose Building, summarized the sustainability vision and targets for Quayside. Mr. Law noted Quayside is a zero fossil fuel, energy efficient, inclusive community, designed to succeed in a changed climate and adjust to a future circular economy. Mr. Law summarized the Waterfront Toronto Green Building Requirements and that the project is on track to meet them. Mr. Law noted operational values, embodied carbon values, and that the designs will present details on landscape sustainability, tool sharing and repair space, and cycling

infrastructure. Quayside will provide more details at the next review including construction waste, operational reporting, and sustainable materials.

Alison Brooks, Principal with Alison Brooks Architects, presented an update to Block 1A. Ms. Brooks noted the site constraints and opportunities, ground floor approach, and the concept of a pairing of two forms that share a formal language relating to each other in both positive and negative space. Ms. Brooks described the three massing concepts: “stem towers”, “branching towers”, and “carved towers”.

2.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked if the Zoning is “shrink wrapped”. Mr. Hoff responded that the zoning is a flexible envelop with base building and tower transition zones, providing a wireframe within which a detailed building can be developed.

Another Panel member asked for the community programs that are built in for Phase 1. Mr. Hoff noted all the programs listed in Phase 1 will be completed in the same phase of work.

One Panel member asked if there is a difference in Toronto Green Standards approach between the condo and rental buildings. Mr. Law responded the approach is the same, driven by Waterfront Toronto’s sustainability requirements, and added that 1A is in concept design so no analysis has been done for that building yet.

Another Panel member asked for the unit distribution strategy for larger units. Mr. Hoff noted they are generally distributed across all the buildings – 10% of rental units are 3+ bedrooms, and 12% of affordable units are 3+ bedrooms. Merrilees Willemse, Project Manager, Waterfront Secretariat with City of Toronto, responded that the City has a higher demand for family sized units and there is pressure to deliver more.

One Panel member asked if all the buildings in Phase 1 will be built at the same time. Ms. Willemse noted there are funding targets tied to CMHC, a combined program including purpose built rental (PBR) and affordable rental housing (ARH) so all the rentals will come at around the same time.

Another Panel member asked if the 1A lobby has a strong relationship with the PUDO. Ms. Brooks responded that the connection between the two lobbies is crucial and will get into that detail at the next stage of design, it is important to have a safe and visible route with legible address – the focus will be on pedestrian and cyclists.

2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member appreciated the pursuit of CaGBC Zero Carbon and asked why the team is not pursuing version 4 instead of 3. Mr. Law noted that when design work started the target was still version 3.

Another Panel member noted the original 1A design at the RFP stage had a lot of planting up the building and asked if the new design will achieve those plant ledges.

Ms. Brooks responded the intention is to design the building to support the dense forest idea and achieve those plant edges.

One Panel member noted a lot of the 1C Queens Quay frontage is residential lobbies and amenities, and asked if they can be reduced or have access be provided from the north side.

Another Panel member asked the team to reconcile the scale of 1C ground floor with the buildings on the south side of QQ which have a larger scale, because it is important to keep the two sides in balance. The Panel member noted that a residential building ground floor has a different scale than a commercial ground floor.

One Panel member asked if there will be more patio opportunities at 1C since currently there are only patios on the north elevation of 1C. Mr. Hoff noted yes there will be more, under bylaw 75% of the retail should be protected as retail frontage, there is also bylaw on size of retail which the team will follow. Mr. Hoff noted that if we remove the amenities from the ground floor, then they will have to be relocated elsewhere.

Another Panel member asked if there is any opportunity in the zoning to enshrine a fine grain retail ground floor. Mr. Medieros responded that the team has a desire for finer grain retail and will present more strategy. Nasim Adab, Urban Design Manager with City of Toronto, responded that the City works with applicants in the fullness of time to secure multiple entry points to provide flexibility.

One Panel member noted all the doors imply through-type retail which is very prescriptive and asked the team to confirm if this is being proposed. Mr. Hoff responded that the corner units is about the width of two Type B parking spaces, which is to say that these units are small due to the natural breaking up due to the lobbies.

Another Panel member commended the 1A project concepts and asked the team to consider which scheme works better in accommodating balcony and fenestration. The Panel member appreciated both the two tower scheme and the original RFP proposal.

2.5 Consensus Comments

- Support for the conceptual massing ideas for 1A and consider the following in the next phase of design:
 - Define a clear relationship between the PUDO and 1A ground floor
 - Prioritize pedestrian movement by designing a legible pedestrian route.
 - While there is support for the plant ledges on the podium, ensure they are well designed with sufficient soil volume to ensure plant growth.
- Consider reducing the 1C residential frontage on Queens Quay. Study the feasibility of flipping the residential lobbies to the north half of the building and relocate residential amenities elsewhere in the building to provide more opportunity for retail frontage along Queens Quay.
- 1C ground floor should respond to the context on the south side of Queens Quay, provide this context and ensure the retail strategy appropriately responds to this.
- Consider targeting CaGBC Version 4 for operational and embodied carbon.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken for this project update.

3.0 Quayside: Public Realm – Stage 2: Schematic Design

3.1 Project Presentation

Rasmus Astrup, Design Principal with SLA, presented the public realm by noting the concept, overall approach, and MCFN input in developing the design. Mr. Astrup noted the public realm is a green link, the revised footprint and increase to softscape percentage, planting strategy, soil plan, planting details, and site programming including layout, uses, circulation, pedestrian and cycling connections. Mr. Astrup presented the landscape design at several programmed areas including seating, sports, amphitheatre, dog off-leash area, overall material palette, and specific landscape details.

3.2 Panel Questions

One Panel member supported the Community Forest and asked how the team would deal with the lower tier of soil volume areas which provide only half a meter of soil underground. Mr. Astrup responded the strategy is to maximize the dark blue areas, by building upward to make up the difference such as retaining walls around raised topography to make the forest spatially more interesting.

Another Panel member asked how water is collected. Mr. Astrup noted there are large storm water tanks to be used for irrigation.

One Panel member asked if the ground floor area for the Forest is more compressed between Block 2 and 1C than the previous plan. Mr. Astrup responded that while that area is compressed the overall area and number of trees remain the same. The Panel member asked if there is less soil in the condo phase. Mr. Astrup noted that there are not enough details right now to show that side.

Another Panel member asked how the spill out spaces are determined in the more pinched areas of the Forest and clarification on the location of the programs in relation to retail. Mr. Astrup noted that the team is trying to design without an active retailer, the DOLA is protected in a corner, and the playground is the most protected, centralized and visible. Mr. Astrup added there is a need for seating due to the traffic to on the east with Small Street, and the lawn is placed where there isn't deep soil volume for trees.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the green area along the north boundary of the site. Mr. Astrup responded that it is a line of green buffer.

3.3 Panel Comments

One Panel member recommended the team to study the availability of natural light with the full buildout of buildings as you advance the planting design, so buildings don't end up blocking light for key areas. The Panel member felt that soil volume is very fundamental and the public realm right now is working with a very slim margin, suggested to explore all strategies to maximize soil volume so growth is not limited in the long term. One suggestion is to consider raising the walkways to increase soil volume. The Panel member asked the team to amplify the Forest spilling into Queens Quay and consider a different strategy for dog off-leash area (DOLA) since pets will go wherever it is closest as soon as they enter the Community Forest, consider several small DOLAs. The Panel member appreciated the north elevation of 1C as a social edge that is not dedicated retail patio.

Another Panel member supported the Community Forest and felt that it would transform Toronto by bringing urban ecology and vegetation layers into the city. The Panel member asked the team to ensure it will be successful by focusing on providing sufficient soil, if there are more ways to push down the structure to increase soil volume, provide soil that can support not just trees but the full density of plants in the entire system. The Panel member noted that natural light is also vital, and encouraged the team to consider opening more gaps in the buildings to allow natural light. The Panel member felt the planting approach should be an "understory" because the buildings are the canopies and it is important for the team to lean into the idea of a Carolinian forest. The Panel member felt that the Community Forest is the main draw at Quayside, retail is a bonus, and people would come here because of the landscape, and encouraged the programming to have a very specific relationship with the landscape. The Panel member questioned if a lawn is needed here, and if it would survive – consider something else that is more appropriate given the Community Forest is unique and unconventional public realm. The Panel member supported the suggestion for pulling the Forest onto Queens Quay.

One Panel member is concerned that the public realm on the north side of 1C is pinched and will inhibit retail success, and recommended a retail and public realm strategy that work together. The Panel member encouraged the team to develop the perimeter of 1A and provide more information on how that edge will be detailed.

Another Panel member asked if the landscape along Small Street should be different and consider bringing the Community Forest out into Queens Quay through the midblock connection. The Panel member commented that the landscape should help create very comfortable and hospitable environments for the public realm, retail, and residential amenities.

One Panel member commented that the Community Forest is the real asset, the programs should be special and unexpected moments that will ultimately enhance the Forest such as special plant species.

3.4 Consensus Comments

- Supported the design concept of the Community Forest.
- Quayside should be conceived as a forest with buildings around it – it is important for the team to prioritize the Forest and ensure it will thrive.
- Concerned that the proposed soil volumes are not sufficient to support the Forest, identify opportunities to increase below grade soil volume (excluding additional soil volume obtained through elevated topography).
- The main attraction of the Community Forest is the landscape design. Carefully calibrate the programs and equipment to ensure they do not dilute the Forest and take away from the landscape experience.
- Consider opportunities and strategies to permit the interim use of the 1A side of the public realm to avoid an abrupt end to the Forest.
- The Community Forest is a special and unique attraction, consider extending the Forest out towards Queens Quay.
- Consider opening more gaps in the building to allow more natural light into the Forest.
- Concerned that pet use will impact the long-term success of the Community Forest, consider an alternative strategy of various, small pet areas, located in convenient locations to capture pet flow at the edges.

3.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support unanimously for the Community Forest design.

4.0 Quayside: Building 1C – Stage 2: Schematic Design

4.1 Project Presentation

Tomer Diamant, Principal with Teeple Architects, presented Block 1C design by first noting the program, massing big moves, and the concept of local Toronto bricks. Mr. Diamant noted the building elevation, ground floor retail loading and animation strategies, the “alcove” as a mid-block connection. Mr. Diamant noted the floor plans, units, amenity areas including the rooftop. Mr. Diamant noted Block 1C is a threshold building, the massing carries a horizontal datum while introducing volume slippage pushing the top half one bay apart as a gesture to increase natural light into the Community Forest. Mr. Diamant concluded with 3D perspectives and more detailed visuals of the cladding materials.

4.2 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked for the dimension between the building and the Queens Quay curb. Mr. Glaisek responded it is about 6m from building face to the curb.

Another Panel member asked how residents access the urban farm. Mr. Diamant responded residents can access via the amenity area. The Panel member suggested to shift doors on the 7th Floor to allow sunlight into the corridor.

One Panel member asked for more information on the building amenities. Mr. Diamant responded there will be bookable meeting rooms, child focus play spaces on the roof, and on the ground floor there will be more visible programs like party room or coworking spaces. Hugh Clark, Executive Director, Housing Development Office with City of Toronto, added that the design is not there yet, it will depend on the selected operator. The Panel member asked if the retail will be curated or left open to the market. Mr. Medeiros replied that the retail will be owned by QILP in perpetuity who will curate the uses with a leasing program, but retailers will not make commitment until opening day, we can only study precedents and design for flexibility – we do not wish to be too prescriptive at the moment.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the ground floor signage and awning strategy. Mr. Diamant replied that there will be a mix of blade and wall mounted signs, and more work will be done.

One Panel member asked why the elevation has more color but the renders are more muted. Mr. Diamant responded the intent is to achieve a degree of contrast and gradient of tones, we want the third color to come through more as right now there appears to only be two tones.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the mix of retail, consider precedents like Honest Eds site that distinguishes small shops along Bathurst from the uses along Markham Street. The Panel member asked if the residential lobbies can be flipped to the north facing the Community Forest, if the colors of the building can be

bolder and richer, and if brick can be used on the lower part of the building instead of metal panel. The Panel member felt the “alcove” is at risk because it is not legible and visible enough, ensure it is amplified as a public connection. Mr. Diamant noted the team will think about retail more, currently not trying to be overly prescriptive. The residential lobbies are designed to be a through condition, and Mr. Diamant responded that the team chose a lighter brick because there was concern that a 12-story dark brick building might be too imposing, but at the same time there is an intention to maintain a strong contrast between the materials – there will be coordination across all the buildings on synchronizing the materials. Mr. Diamant replied that the “alcove” had a larger arch in the concept diagram and the team can study this. Mr. Medeiros added that the Urban Farm is envisioned as an agricultural space, there will be a non-profit selected to operate this as it won’t uncontrolled free public access. Mr. Medeiros noted that the team is excited by the Urban Farm because it will be a space for people to seek out and appreciate, and the team is relying on a group out of New York for advice.

4.3 Panel Comments

One Panel member felt that the design can do more to break down the long mass because the current massing treatment is agnostic to the different orientations, and the “megablock” needs to be fine-tuned vertically as the building rises up. The Panel member commented that light colors push the volumes forward while darker recedes, and currently the building is emphasizing the unity of the block rather than breaking down. The Panel member asked the team to further develop the building envelop and consider if there should be more glazing for some orientations such as the north side, all of which will help make a fine-grained building. The Panel member questioned the feasibility of urban agriculture due to the windy and harsh climate of the area, the small area which might limit proper production, and what happens to the space when the operator decides to not continue. There is also inherent friction between providing public access to a privately operated program, i.e. bee farming in Tokyo requires guided tours – provide more information on the objectives of the urban farm and how the design will help mitigate these risks.

Another Panel member supported the idea of the Urban Farm, consider blending it with the rest of the rooftop outdoor amenity areas to create a cohesive design. The Panel member noted that Queens Quay is set up to be a vibrant retail street, so the emphasis in the master plan in terms of retail should be along Queens Quay. The Panel member cautioned that streets with large residential lobbies do not provide great activation, and recommended a more powerful design and urban gesture at the passageway.

One Panel member asked the team to provide more information to help understand the microclimate around the urban farm, and the success of the space is highly dependent on a strong partnership. The Panel member asked the team to consider more unique programs on the private amenities side of the rooftop that can complement the Urban Farm, such as bee keeping. The Panel member is concerned with the Urban Forest being “pushed away” from the north elevation of 1C and recommended a more targeted approach such as only setting back specific retail to allow for patio but allow the Forest to reach closer elsewhere. The Panel member

supported the idea of curated retail and suggested the team to study Pearl District in San Antonio where curated retail includes makers and artisans.

Another Panel member noted 1C as a building should operate at two scales: scale of Queens Quay recognizing buildings across the street which are much more uniform in massing and datum, and the more granular scale through smaller articulation such as brick. The Panel member recommended making the colors more extreme as smaller masses can take more colorization, and there should be one strategy that supports continuous retail. The Panel member supported the ground floor design on the south elevation with brick piers coming down to introduce variation among glazed portions, however commented that the north side should allow the Community Forest to take priority.

One Panel member noted there is a lot going for this scheme such as the great value in the gradation of earthy bricks to have dialogue with the other buildings creating a concert of earth tones. The Panel member recommended greater saturation and richer colors. Consider Queens Quay facade overexposed with sunlight while the north elevation in low lighting – the facade colors should be refined to provide greater saturation and contrast between the volumes. The Panel member questioned the expression of stacked boxes and asked the team to consider the visual of a textile instead. There is heaviness with the boxes squeezing the ground floor, consider a larger gesture including the awnings to help strengthen the framing of the ground floor. The Panel member recommended to avoid competition between the two sides of 1C because it would dilute the retail experience. The Panel member supported the “alcove”, asked the team to consider a reflective ceiling to bring in light especially during the winter and continue the paving from the Forest side instead of Queens Quay sidewalk.

4.4 Consensus Comments

- Supported the overall massing approach in breaking the building down.
- Supported the strategies so far in trying to make a finer-grain building, consider the following strategies to refine the design:
 - The façade colors should be bolder and more dynamic as the current palette appears to be very similar, washed-out, and reinforces the singularity of the long slab as opposed to breaking it down.
 - Some Panel members felt that there should be more color differentiation between the lower and upper volumes.
 - Continue to develop the window treatment at-grade to create more architectural articulation.
 - Consider how the building elevations can more appropriately respond to the unique context of Queens Quay and the Community Forest.
- Consider strengthening the architectural legibility of the “alcove” to ensure success. There are examples in Toronto where this type of pass-through is not well activated – ensure this adds to the ground floor animation as a key connection between Queens Quay and the Community Forest.

- Ensure successful Queens Quay retail by maximizing animation opportunities, consider the following:
 - Reduce the residential lobby frontages on Queens Quay. Study the feasibility of flipping the residential lobbies to the north half of the building and relocate residential amenities elsewhere in the building to provide more opportunity for retail frontage along Queens Quay.
 - Relocate the ground floor amenities elsewhere and replace with smaller retail units.
- Provide a compelling retail vision and demonstrate how the ground floor design provides the flexibility to support this vision in the long-term. Provide more information on access (if units are through-units), demising opportunities to break down the scale of the units, back-of-house/ loading strategies. Compare the design with other built precedents.
- The new Urban Farm feels more like a private amenity rather than part of the public realm despite ground floor access, strongly encourage the team to rethink the objectives of the Urban Farm and its viability.

4.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Conditional Support for the 1C building design.

Mr. Astrup felt that although the Urban Farm has been reduced in scale, it is still a relevant destination on the waterfront which will provide a lot of social and community value, agreed that the design requires more development, and appreciated the comment on the design of the rest of the green roof. Mr. Medeiros replied that the project will have a more in-depth review of the retail design, the intention is not to do double-sided retail – there will be a front and back, and will provide more information at the next review.

Mr. Diamant added that the widening of the gap between 1C1 and 1C2 made the Urban Farm smaller but the Community Forest has improved as a result.

5.0 Quayside: Block 1B + Block 2 – Stage 2: Schematic Design

5.1 Project Presentation

Chris Dial, Associate Principal with Henning Larsen, presented the design of Block 1B by first noting the site's relationship with the rest of the master plan, tower height, and the design concept of the "Overstory". Mr. Dial noted the massing with various terraces help shape the concept of the valley from the Community Forest, programs including affordable rental and amenity areas, and the transition up to market rental units. Mr. Dial presented the façade concepts, material ideas, integration of vegetation on the ground floor and lower podium floors, and building elevations. Mr. Dial concluded with views of the building from the Community Forest, Small Street, and up the tower.

Alfredo Caraballo, Partner with Allies and Morrison Architects, presented Block 2 by first noting tower and ground floor concepts – a building made of stepped forms while framing views to the City, Quayside, and the Community Forest. The building is composed of both large and small elements, aimed at shaping space while articulating the building itself. Mr. Caraballo noted the concept of "rooms", the façade composition of primarily vertical orders with secondary woven horizontals, and a third order of "jewels". Mr. Caraballo noted the shift in building orientation to respond to Small Street, and façade material concepts as seen from various 3D perspectives.

5.2 Panel Questions

Block 1B

One Panel member asked if SLA is studying the soil volumes and details to support the proposed planting. Mr. Dial responded they will be studied. Mr. Medeiros added the amenity areas have not been designed yet, so the design reflects intent.

Another Panel member asked for the floor plate size and what is informing the horizontal datums and terraces. Mr. Dial responded lower floor plate is 1150sf, upper is 850sf, and the datums and terraces are responding to Building 1C and the transition from ARH to PBR.

One Panel member asked if there is a consideration for using brick at the lower podium. Mr. Dial responded that the current thinking is porcelain or metal panel, brick has not been considered.

Block 2

One Panel member asked for the height of the guardrail on the building roof. Mr. Caraballo replied that it is a 2.5m high rainscreen.

Another Panel member asked for the floor level of the childcare outdoor amenity and clarification on the different approach between the north-south and east-west facades. Mr. Caraballo responded that there are outdoor areas on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors, and

the intention is for the north-south elevations to have a city scale while being contrasted by a more domestic scale on the east-west elevations.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the facade materials and if there are more than one material for each color. Mr. Caraballo replied it is precast concrete on the lower floors then the different profiles on the upper floors above the lower podium will be metal.

Another Panel member asked for the dimension between the south edge of the building and 1C. Mr. Caraballo replied that it is 15m on the ground floor and 19m above.

One Panel member asked for the rationale for the high amount of glazing on the ground floor facing the Community Forest. Mr. Caraballo replied that the interior should feel like you are part of the forest but protected, an intermediate space that isn't too reflective. The Panel member noted 15m is tight and questioned whether it is possible to actually see through the glazing into the lobby.

5.3 Panel Comments

Block 1B

One Panel member appreciated the 1B parti section and how that is translated to the technical section, asked the team to be disciplined in the material palette, and provide more information on how the finishes are selected. In particular, the ground plane is important to have a sense of scale as the public realm demands more intimacy and gentleness.

Another Panel member appreciated that the building feels nested in the Community Forest but was concerned at the technical feasibility of bringing the green up the building because it is very difficult in this climate. The Panel member recommended deep soil volume, a strong maintenance strategy, and provide more information on the overall feasibility at the next review.

One Panel member noted the thin amount of soil shown in the technical section and recommended for more soil volume. Also, the Panel member encouraged the team to look at wind impact and how it might impact the feasibility of the roof garden.

Another Panel member commented that while the burnish copper tone is appreciated, metal panel is not friendly on the ground floor and the finish should be considered carefully. The Panel member suggested to further clarify how the lower podium datums relate the building to the rest of Quayside, and how the tree metaphor might be better expressed if the type B facade, the most typical of the three facade types, is removed and replaced. The Panel member noted the beauty of type A facade is that the extrusions run in front of the slab edge - a rare detail.

One Panel member noted the design is very self-referential and encouraged a more contextual approach, such that the various elevations should better respond to the

context and enter a dialogue with the site. The Panel member asked the team to consider the sun exposure and how that can help advance design work for all four seasons.

Block 2

One Panel member supported the rotation of the building because it embraces the Forest, however felt that the pinch point with Building 1C creates a hostile environment with uncomfortable winds. The Panel member recommended devices that can mitigate the strong winds and capture sunlight. Mr. Caraballo replied that the rotation does not shift the tower any more south as there are a series of constraints that determine the location of the core, and tall glass railing on the terraces will provide comfort.

Another Panel member appreciated the idea of fabric for the building facades, but felt that the elevations from afar do not have the same richness as seen up close. The Panel member recommended to add more color or texture or solidity, to enhance the idea of the fabric and textural quality of the tower. The Panel member noted the lack of element that reflects the relationship of the inside to the out, i.e. a Juliette balcony, and encouraged the team to refine the design to make the building look less commercial. The Panel member commended the loggia strategy, and commented that instead of a white color it should be something that contributes to the overall colorization strategy to the building.

One Panel member appreciated the lightness of the loggia at the ground floor in helping to frame the Community Forest, and suggested a light color that isn't white. The Panel member noted 15m separation distance is too tight creating a canyon-like quality, and recommended increasing the distance to provide more breathing room and enhance welcomeness.

Another Panel member appreciated Block 2's dialogue with Block 1B and the potential for the Community Forest to step up the building, however was concerned with the feasibility of plants growing on the facade. The Panel member noted the 15m pinch point and recommended a larger opening to allow more views to the Forest.

One Panel member appreciated seeing Block 2's design progress and felt that Block 2 and 1B should be coordinated to work with each other. The Panel member suggested simplification of the Block 2 design – perhaps one idea too many – and is skeptical of the introduction of another layer of “weaving” on top of the current orders.

5.4 Consensus Comments

Block 1B

- The ground floor façade material should create a fine-grain scale and establish a strong relationship with the Community Forest, avoid metal panel and consider warm materials such as brick.
- Carefully calibrate the building to its surrounding context to finetune its relationship with the site. The Podium and lower building datums do not appear

- to strongly relate to the rest of Quayside, continue to refine and rationalize the building massing.
- Supported the proposed vegetation on the lower portion of the building. Provide more information on soil volumes and ensure they will be technically feasible.
 - Concerned that the rooftop vegetation is not feasible, provide more details and explore strategies to ensure success.
 - Consider impact of high winds and ensure the results of the wind study is informing the building design.

Block 2

- Support for the overall design.
- Support for the rotation of the tower in establishing a stronger relationship with 1B.
- 15m separation is very narrow between the ground floor and 1C, consider widening the space to create a more generous and welcoming public realm and give more room for the Community Forest to connect with Small Street.
- Continue to refine the façade designs:
 - Support for the different approaches between the east-west elevations, which is more domestic, and north-south elevations, which has a stronger vertical expression relating to the city and the lake.
 - Further refine the east-west elevations to embrace a more residential quality, i.e. introduce Juliet balconies, to reinforce the domestic versus robust.
 - Some Panel members felt that the façade “weaving” is one too many moves, consider simplification.
- Overall support for the proposed light color of the loggia contrasting the rest of the facades. Some Panel members felt that it was perhaps too white – continue to study the approach to color and finishes.

5.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support for the Block 1B design.

The Panel voted Conditional Support for the Block 2 design.

Mr. Caraballo thanked the Panel’s comments and debate on color, responded that the team is interested in subtle increase in contrast as you closer to the building. The weaving as a suit for the body and the “jewels” are special accent moments.

6.0 Quayside: Zoning and Master Plan

6.1 Project Presentation

Mr. Hoff presented a recap of the master plan updates and noted that the vision for Quayside is still there. Mr. Hoff noted that reinforcing the Community Forest is very important as well as ensure retail along Queens Quay will be successful, the team will also continue to work on the Urban Farm on the roof of Block 1C, and appreciated feedback on building designs and materiality – all of which will help the team expedite delivery of Phase 1 with 6 applications in total including purpose-built rental and affordable rental units.

6.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Panel voted Full Support unanimously for the master plan and zoning.

CLOSING

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

These Meeting Minutes were formally adopted and approved by the Panel on Oct. 29th, 2025.

These Meeting Minutes have been signed by Paul Bedford, Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair, and Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto Chief Planning and Design Officer. Waterfront Toronto has on record a copy of this document with their DocuSign signatures.