The Design Review Panel met virtually on Tuesday May 5, 2020 at 1:35pm.
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<td>Adam Nicklin</td>
<td>Principal – PUBLIC WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhee Oh</td>
<td>Director, Sustainability &amp; Energy – WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Rolleston</td>
<td>Principal, Design Director – Quadrangle Architects</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sisam</td>
<td>Principal – Montgomery Sisam Architects</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibylle von Knobloch</td>
<td>Principal – NAK Design Group</td>
<td>✓</td>
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*Conflict with First Session  
**Conflict with Second Session  
†Chair of Meeting  
#Absent for Second Session

**Design Review Panel Coordinator**

Meredith Vaga: Urban Design, City Planning Division

**CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

The Panel confirmed minutes of their previous meeting which was held on March 12, 2020 by email.

**MEETING 4 INDEX**

i. 5 Corporate Drive (1st Review)

ii. FlyOver Canada – 292 Bremner Blvd (1st Review)
Introduction
City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

1. Street Character
   - Streetscape Design
   - Setback and Future Streetwall
   - At grade uses

2. Design and Materiality of the Base Building

3. Pedestrian Connections: Landbridge approach to the existing elevated open space

Chair's Summary of Key Points
The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for their submission, in particular its complete graphic communication and intriguing design concept.

This project is important in that it possesses the potential to strongly contribute to the evolution of Scarborough Centre from a suburban context to a fulfilling urban fabric. However, the design presented is uncomfortably caught between suburban and urban. For the design to become a successful urban exemplar the following areas need further attention:

Response to Context (including local character and heritage)

- The diagonal path is a positive attempt to interconnect with surrounding context.
  - Further development is needed in order to become truly connected and useful.
  - See Site Plan Design.
- Improve built form response to street front context. See Built Form.

Site Plan Design
- See Response to Context.
The idea of a central outdoor space is a positive one but needs further work to become a successful urban court/plaza:

- Avoid "park island" isolated by vehicular routes. Make entire central space an urbane pedestrian-friendly amenity, with vehicular presence secondary.
- Rethink cascading promenade to achieve more useful space at grade level.
- Anticipate sun/shadow impact when programming amenities in space.
- Have single centralized service node.

- Ensure plaza at busy corner of Consilium Place and Corporate Drive is an inviting, useful amenity well integrated with urban court/plaza.

**Pedestrian Realm**

- See Site Plan Design and Response to Context.
- Ensure pedestrian path link to/from southwest is a viable and useful route.

**Built Form (Massing, Height, Articulation, Heritage Conservation)**

- The proposed built form aesthetic concept is fascinating but needs to be distilled and clarified.
- Building façade floating vertical fins expression along street frontage feels tenuous and unresolved in places relative to streetscape (see view on last slide of presentation):
  - Develop further to clarify/resolve.
- Proposed exterior façade expression has potential to include passive shading strategy:
  - Develop design to include.

**Landscape Strategy**

- See Site Plan Design.
- More streetscape information is needed in order to review design intent.

**Sustainable Design**

- Given the mix of new and existing buildings on the overall site provide a site-wide deeply integrated sustainability strategy.

**Comments to the City**

- N/A.

**Panel Commentary**

The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation. Many members commented that the design package was very helpful in understanding the design approach, with some members specifically noting the key plans and sectional perspective of the streetscape and ROW dimensions as especially helpful.

Several members were intrigued by the idea of urban vs natural being explored in the design. Moving forward, the Panel advised further development to the land bridge idea to ensure it remained publicly accessible and connected. The Panel looked forward to seeing the project again.

**Response to Context (including local character and heritage)**

**Existing Adjacencies & Context**

Many Panel members noted there are many significant features near the project site such as Highland Creek and the opportunity for a connection to Scarborough Town Centre.
These members noted that all these connections would be reinforced through the main street typology proposed in the secondary plan, public realm plan and urban design guidelines framework.

**Suburban Context**
The Panel thought the project needed to do more to represent the "new Scarborough" and specifically questioned the inclusion of the drop offs in the middle of the block, rather than at the perimeter.

Several members felt there were many missed opportunities in the public realm framework and the Panel advised looking at transit road diets, an emphasis on place and connections across the landscape parcels.

**Site Plan Design**

**Streetscape Identity**
The Panel wanted to see more information on the streetscape, which many members called "undefined". Several members felt the street edge was improperly defined and inaccessible. Some members thought the raised planters along the street edge were a good idea.

Overall, the Panel felt the streetscape was lacking character and had a weak landscape identity.

**Retail & Ground Plane Accessibility**
The Panel had concerns with the general accessibility to the retail spaces and lobby entrances. Many members felt the retail may fail in the current proposal because it doesn't come out to the sidewalk and engage the pedestrian due to the proposed arcade.

**Opening at the Corner**
Many members questioned opening up the corner due to the undefined public realm and street edge. Some members commented that Scarborough didn't need more voids on corners. Other members suggested that natural elements should "leak out" into the corner, commenting that it currently had only hard surfaces.

These members noted that the corner could become a great place for pedestrians to stop at the corner of an incredibly large intersection. The Panel suggested further developing the corner at a human scale.

**Proposed Lamella & Podium Architecture**
Looking at the streetscape on Corporate Dr. many members noted that there was a conflict between the move to create a large sidewalk and having the lamella blocking access at grade.

Some members felt this was making the sidewalk "too hostile". Other members felt this was creating an indeterminate zone that wasn't serving the lamella well.

The Panel wondered whether instead of having the colonnade come down to fins that split the sidewalk in two, if the colonnades could instead go down the side of the building.

The members noted that this would then allow for a wide unified sidewalk weaving between public space and open amenity spaces.

**Land Bridge**
While the Panel liked the overarching idea of the land bridge and thought it was really great to see a large stakeholder take a strong interest in doing something this complex, they strongly felt the space needed to be accessible and provide connectivity. The Panelists advised that if the proposed mound wasn't publicly accessible and if it didn't connect across it shouldn't be built.
Many members advised it was important to ensure there was better clarity on who was able to use the raised space. Some members were concerned that the land bridge would create a dark and uncomfortable area underneath and wondered if the bridge should be narrower.

As an overarching idea, many members thought it presented an interesting dialogue between urban and natural. Several members liked the potential multi-directional connections to the park and Highland Creek.

Some members suggested the other side of the land bridge could be a fantastical place for public art and animated spaces, and a few members suggested using the mound to gear towards other transportation options including cycling.

**Multi Modal Hierarchy & Mobility Priority**

The Panel questioned how the different transit modes would work together, including who would be given mobility priority. Several members pointed out the hierarchy at the corners of the promenade needed particular clarification.

Some members suggested moving the bike lane inbound from the street and incorporate a landscape buffer on either side as opposed to having the bike lane right against the roadway.

**Drop Off & Circulation**

Many members appreciated that trucks had been kept to the edges of the site, but the Panel thought there should be two smaller drop offs on the street itself instead of the loop road in the courtyard due to the ground floor landscape identity and open space being interrupted by vehicular circulation.

The Panelists thought it would be preferable to have the space for pedestrians only. Many members pointed out that there were long frontages on the main streets that should be used for drop offs rather than the internal drop off zone in the middle of the site.

Several members noted that the driveway currently cuts up 3-4 landscape areas and advised there were ways that could be minimized, such as through the material treatments across those areas, greening up the edges of the spaces, and more attention to how the edges feel along the driveway.

**Reconsider Private Road as a Street**

Many members pointed out that the proposed private road was very large and wondered whether there was an opportunity to redevelop it as more of a "crossable street". The Panel felt the scale of the road should be reduced.

**Pedestrian Realm**

**Pedestrian Experience**

The Panel noted that the significant large streets around the site would have a huge impact on the pedestrian experience. Many members questioned what the experience on McCowan Rd would be for pedestrians.

Several members thought the raised planters were a good approach and should be continued around the corner along Consilium Place.

**Built Form (Massing, Height, Articulation and Heritage Conservation)**

**Built Form Massing**

Some members appreciated the moray effect on the towers that the fins were providing as well as the lenticular effect on the podium. However, other members felt the massing was over sized with one member remarking that it felt like a "cruise ship".
Some Panelists commented that it was a challenge balancing between what is an urban scale in Scarborough versus in other parts of Toronto.

**Building Orientation**
Many members questioned whether the tower set-up and orientation was correct. These members were particularly concerned with how the angling of the towers would affect the thermal comfort of the units.

**Facade Articulation & Glazing**
Several Panel members noted that the creation of a finer grain for the glazing and ground plane would provide for a more interesting experience. These members felt that the articulation was currently very "corporate" at grade.

Many members questioned whether the proposed glazing would create glaze issues. These members suggested bringing the glazing closer together rather than the random articulation. Other members thought there should be less glazing on the east-west facades to minimize sun exposure for the comfort of those units.

**Building Fins**
The Panel had concerns about how the fins touch the ground, including the potential for damage from snow clearance and proximity to the landscape. Many members pointed out that bringing the fins up from the ground would allow more space for trees.

Several members wondered whether there were too many fins and suggested introducing another material or colour on the podium. Many Panelists wanted to see typical floorplans to understand how the fins correspond to the units and whether there was any rationale to the placement.

**Landscape Strategy**

**Open Spaces & Landscape Design**
The Panel felt that the landscape design needed further development, including more attention to what happens in the various spaces. Several members noted that the site plan was very car oriented and the Panel advised developed more pedestrian oriented ideas.

Some members pointed out that the park will be in shadow. The Panel advised having as many green spaces as possible, including at the edges, as well as more accessible green spaces at grade.

Many members noted that the layers of landscape presents risks around how the landscape will be occupied. Other members questioned where kids would play in the landscape, noting that while a lot of landscape was being proposed there was not a lot of space to run around.

**Central Courtyard**
The Panel strongly felt the courtyard should be a pedestrian courtyard first where cars were invited in. The members noted that the curved drives suggested the dominance of the car and many members pointed out the width of the road was overly large.

Some members commented that this was especially apparent on pg. 36 of the presentation. The Panel advised using different pavers in the courtyard and driveway to signal the pedestrian priority.

**Sustainable Design**

**Impact of Architectural Response on Thermal Comfort**
Several Panel members questioned the impact of tower massing and orientation on the thermal comfort of the units. The Panel was also concerned about the impact of the high window to wall ratio and continuous wraparound balconies.
Some members pointed out the balconies were of a fairly limited depth which was not particularly useful for the user.

**Toronto Green Standard**
The Panel thought it was great to see the Tier 1 TGS submission included in the drawing package, but noted that Tier 2 will be in effect in two years. The Panelists advised conducting a study into how the upcoming changes would impact the project.

Many members hoped the design team would use these considerations to guide their next project as well.

*Vote*

The Panel voted in conditional support of the proposal. The key condition stipulated by the Panel was that the land bridge is publicly accessible and that there is the ability to use it to cross over the space. The Panel voted 9-1. One member had to leave prior to the vote.
FLYOVER CANADA – 292 BREMNER BLVD
DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

Introduction
City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

- Does this design proposal appropriately fit into the existing palette of open space elements, such as paving, seating, planters and lighting?
- Existing grades and required program elements of the proposal limit accessible pedestrian routes. Does the Panel have suggestions how to improve pedestrian circulation? Does this design proposal provide adequate space for pedestrian flow, queuing and crowding?
- Please comment on the proposed architectural form and materials of the proposal.
- Do you have any comments on the relationship between the existing public art Salmon Run and the FlyOver proposal?

Chair's Summary of Key Points
The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for their great submission package and presentation. The team's efforts to create a unique design statement that evokes Canada's identity, while dealing with a particularly challenging site and surrounding context, are much appreciated.

This project is important to Toronto in that it has the potential to become a significant addition to a key civic place, and a signature portal for local citizens and world visitors to explore the wonders of our country. Further work in the following areas will help this project achieve this potential:

Response to Context (including local character and heritage)

- The existing surrounding site and built form context is typically chaotic, confusing, and distracting. For maximum impact in competing with this context create an integrated site plan, landscape and built form presence that is simple, sculptural, and bold.
- The project's location in the broader plaza context is such that all edges of the project site are highly visible frontages. Ensure that there is no "backside" face of the built form.
• The existing pedestrian realm context can be crowded, confusing and wayfinding challenged. Ensure that new exterior pedestrian paths and stairways add a context that is as clear and intuitive as possible.

Site Plan Design
• See Response to Context.
• Provide site/building sections.

Pedestrian Realm
• See Response to Context.

Built Form (Massing, Height, Articulation, Heritage Conservation)
• See Response to Context.
• Reduce and simplify material palette to highlight simple, sculptural, and bold strategy.
• Consider making exterior stairs part of the landscape expression rather than that of the built form.

Landscape Strategy
• The proposed landscape strategy has an ambition that is too large for the limited site space available:
  o Reduce number of landscape settings and create a single, powerful landscape statement.
  o Ensure existing tree coverage removed from site is replaced by equal degree of coverage in new landscape.

Sustainable Design
• Provide a whole-site integrated sustainability strategy that becomes a visible part of the story of Canada and the visitor experience.

Comments to the City
• N/A.

Panel Commentary
The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation, and many members commented that the verbal presentation helped connect the images and precedents included in the package. Several members appreciated the amount of thought that went into the architecture and landscape on such a tight and complicated site.

Moving forward, the Panel thought further development to the architecture and public realm circulation was required, as well as the simplification of the landscape concept. The Panel looked forward to seeing the project again.

Response to Context (including local character and heritage)

Public Realm Context
The Panel noted that the project had a challenging public realm context, including a tight site and very complicated grading conditions. Several members thought that if the project was well executed it could help with an "urbanistic repair" of the existing plaza.

In the current proposal, the Panelists found the space between the Rogers Centre and the FlyOver "disappointing" and lacked animation. Many members commented that while some aspects of the
proposal had been done "quite masterfully", further work was necessary in order to ensure the programming and development improved the public realm.

Reflecting on how the project necessitated the removal of part of the public realm, one member commented that the existing plaza was too big when not being used for egress purposes; however, many other members advised that a generous provision of open space would become even more important in a post-COVID world.

Site Prominence & Iconic Architecture
The Panel pointed out that the project was located in a prominent site with a large amount of existing iconic buildings, including the CN Tower, Rogers Centre, Ripley's Aquarium and the Roundhouse. Other members noted the area was an entertainment node offering many immersive experiences.

The Panel strongly felt this building should also be iconic in its character, with one member commenting that people should want to take a photo of this building too when they visit the site. Many members suggested the building should be bolder and a "jewel" within the "concrete jungle".

Other members noted that the current "shaped" and "facetted" architectural language being explored could be another approach to bring unity to the area.

Attraction / Exhibition Precedents
Some Panel members suggested looking a theme park or exhibition precedents for the simplicity and internally oriented programming of the typology.

These members noted Buckminster Fuller's Montreal Biosphere for Expo 67 and the Rose Planetarium and Museum of Natural History in New York. The Four Seasons Centre for the Performing Arts in Toronto was also noted as a good example of an internally organized building that was still very "engaging and wonderful" from the street.

Salmon Run Fountain
Many members thought it was interesting how the project was peeling away the buffer to the existing Salmon Run fountain, noting it would allow people to reengage with the art piece.

The Panel appreciated how the proposal incorporated the existing pump house component, but thought more work should be done to improve what is "awkward" about how the sculpture sits in the plaza.

Several members wondered whether there could be a grander gesture and connection to the reflecting pool on the second level. Many members wondered whether a different materiality could be used to help rationalize or reflect the "abrupt" north ending to the existing feature.

Site Plan Design
Crowds, Movement & the Public Realm
Many Panel members pointed out the public realm would periodically have "intense flows of people" when there is a baseball game or concert at the adjacent Rogers Centre. The members noted these people required both space and a direct egress pathway in the public realm.

However, looking at the daily use of the site, many members felt the public realm should be considered both from the perspective of someone passing through the site and from the perspective of a visitor to the FlyOver attraction.
The Panel advised developing diagrams showing event queuing for all the buildings in the area under different conditions to better understand flow and accessibility. Some members suggested the Union Station work on predictions about movement could be a good precedent.

Many members pointed out that visitors to the FlyOver would be substantially smaller than peak visitors to the Rogers Centre. Some members wondered whether a secondary pathway could be proposed by this project that was more about stopping and engaging with the fountain from a different perspective.

Other members noted that large open spaces outside of gathering venues may need to be redefined in this age of social distancing.

**Wayfinding & Accessibility**

The Panel noted that the project was located in a challenging public realm where "wayfinding is not intuitive". The Panelists felt that improvements to the public realm needed to include better circulation and accessibility in addition to making a beautiful place.

Several members advised breaking down the architecture of the building to make itself more accessible as a public amenity, particularly on the northwest side. Many members wondered whether the building’s form could capture a ramp in one of the upper decks to better shape the northern form and other members suggested the inclusion of a shared elevator.

Some members noted that the need for increased social distancing could have an impact on the accessibility of the building entrance, particularly when the Rogers Centre is emptying out and people are trying to travel both east-west to access the FlyOver, as well as north to leave the site.

**Adjacent Wall of Rogers Centre**

The Panel noted that the adjacent Rogers Centre wall and walkway to the west of the proposal was "grim", "problematic" and lacked animation. The members thought the project should engage more with that façade in the same way it was engaging with the lower area in the south east corner.

Various members suggested increasing the transparency of the lower portion of the west façade or developing a stronger landscape response for that walkway. A few members wondered whether a landscape art piece could be incorporated into that façade.

**Stair Adjacent to Building**

Many members questioned whether the new stair adjacent to the building would actually improve site circulation as they felt it was currently quite hidden and not intuitive from a wayfinding perspective. Some members noted the stairs felt a bit utilitarian and "service like".

However, the Panel appreciated the potential for the stairs to act as a secondary relief route to alleviate pedestrian congestion. Moving forward, the members advised enlarging the landing and redeveloping the stairs to engage more with the building.

**North Garden & Second Patio**

Several members thought the second patio and north garden were great moments in the proposal, and appreciated how the design team had created a "hidden" space within a big plaza. Many members felt further development should go into the programming of the spaces and suggested pushing the café into the north garden to better occupy and animate the spaces.

Some members commented that the north plaza was reminiscent of Cornelia Hahn Oberlander’s response at the Fred & Elizabeth Fountain Garden Court in the National Gallery. These members noted that the Garden Court had a lot more space and cautioned that the north garden would be too small to accomplish everything it’s trying to do.
Built Form (Massing, Height, Articulation and Heritage Conservation)

Built Form as a Public Amenity
Reflecting on the site prominence of the proposal, the Panel thought the design of the building should be approached as a public amenity. Some members suggested developing a processional aspect to the building by looking at it as a piece of the landscape.

Several members thought James Stirling’s Neue Staatsgalerie in Stuttgart was a good example of a building that successfully negotiates two grade levels by having circulation between the grades happen on top of the building.

While the Panel acknowledged the proposal was located on a smaller and denser footprint, the members thought it was a strong precedent for how a building can break itself down and become more accessible.

Other members noted MAAT in Lisbon was another good example of a building where the rooftop becomes another public space.

Materiality & Form
The Panel questioned whether the building skin would actually evoke the Canadian landscape, especially in a highly urban context. Many members suggested developing the texture of the skin with more "ins and outs" such that it felt more a part of the public realm rather than stretched skin around an object.

Several members thought the new stairs needed to be better integrated into the form of the building and suggested making the stairs "more plastic". These members felt this would help the stairs feel friendly, noting that they currently read as infrastructure around the building.

Looking at the overarching form, the Panel thought the building needed to better resolve the edge relationships. Many members commented that to achieve an elegant sculptural form, the materiality needed further development, with one member noting that it currently was "an essay of grey on grey".

Various members suggested incorporating more materials inspired by the Canadian landscape to add texture, colour and warmth. Some suggestions included introducing more wood elements referencing the Boreal forest or introducing a ruggedness to the base materiality, such as by having the building "erupt" out of a piece of granite.

Distinction between Theatre & Apron
The Panel thought the transition between the theatre and the "apron" needed further development. Many members noted that both the theatre and apron felt heavy due to the two different materials.

Many members felt the building was being horizontally bifurcated by two different expressions: the upper portion with the Aurora Borealis and the lower skirt of the building. The Panel noted there lacked hierarchy between the two pieces.

Some members questioned whether the distinction between the two pieces was necessary and wondered whether the design team could play with one material, such as stone, to create "an unapologetic very strong mass".

The Panelists advised further work into the building proportions between these two elements and some members suggested raising the apron so that the Borealis component seems "like a jewel that's growing out of the lower element".
The Way the Building Meets the Ground
The Panel thought the way the proposal was meeting the ground needed further consideration. Some members suggested looking at the Bata Shoe Museum in Toronto for a good precedent of how a building can meet the ground.

These members noted that in this precedent the angles of the glass continued to the ground and the resulting reading of the building is "simple and object like".

Wood Materiality
Many Panel members noted appreciation for the openness where the wooden structure was being exposed. These members thought the wood and glazing were a good addition to the space and wondered whether there could be more porous openings on the side of the building adjacent to the Rogers Centre to help lighten up that façade as well.

However, other members questioned whether the wood materiality was detracting from the expression of the cement and dichromatic shingles. These members thought the timber was preventing the building from being read as a single resolved object.

Some members additionally wondered why the wood section didn't come closer to grade to allow people to see through the space.

Façade Materiality
Several members liked the use of the dichromatic shingles inspired by the Aurora Borealis. Various members commented that from an architectural point of view there was a lot of potential power in the juxtaposition between this tile and the monolithic elements on either side.

Lobby Space & Entrance
Some members thought there should be a canopy above the main entrance, and pointed out that the area is very windy. Other members noted that the theatre space should be echoed in the lobby space, in terms of having an equal area and ability to accommodate the patrons.

Landscape Strategy
Simplify Landscape Concept
Although many members appreciated the design team's ambition, the Panel strongly advised simplifying the landscape concept.

Several members felt the landscape concept should be edited through less variety in the planting, noting that there was not a lot of room to plant things. Some members pointed out this would be compounded by the amount of trees that would have to be removed for the project.

The Panelists felt that there was not enough room for the condensed Canadian landscape narrative to be perceived on the small site and cautioned that concept would be lost. Many members suggested focusing on a couple bold gestures, such as a simple grove of trees. Many other members felt the concept would benefit from further abstraction.

Landscape Variety & Planters
Some members thought the planter edges were interesting, but cautioned that the planting would need to be well protected. Several members felt the landscape would benefit from a less diverse variation of planting and instead suggested selecting something would have a "great presence" for as much of the year as possible to help unify the site.

Other members felt the architecture of the building would be made stronger and more "object like" if the gardens and planting beds didn't directly intersect the building. Some members suggested dividing the spaces around the base of the building to allow for larger landscape quadrants.
Adjacent Plaza Space
Several members commented that they thought the design team should be given the freedom to modify the paving adjacent to the site. A few members liked the proposed undulating benches.

Rooftop Garden
Some members suggested looking at the Scarborough Library for a precedent of a successful rooftop landscape space. Other members thought the rooftop garden should be developed in concert with a reconsideration of the building as part of the plaza circulation.

Increase Amount of Shade Trees
The Panel pointed out that the project was proposing the removal of 30 trees to make space for itself. Several members did not think the replacement trees or replacement vegetation would be adequate for this loss and the Panel advised incorporating many more shade trees into the landscape proposal.