

CITY OF TORONTO DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

MINUTES: MEETING 1 – January 27, 2022

The Design Review Panel met virtually on Thursday January 27, 2022 at 12:30pm.

Members of the Design Review Panel

Members Present

Gordon Stratford (Co-Chair): Principal – G C Stratford – Architect	✓ †
Michael Leckman (Co-Chair): Principal – Diamond Schmitt Architects	✓ ††† **
Meg Graham (Co-Chair): Principal – superkül	✓ ††
Margaret Briegmann: Associate – BA Group	✓ **
Dima Cook: Director – EVOQ Architecture	
George Dark: Design Partner – Urban Strategies	✓
Ralph Giannone: Principal – Giannone Petricone Associates	
Jim Gough: Department Manager, Transportation Planning – WSP	✓
Jessica Hutcheon: Principal – Janet Rosenberg & Studio	
Viktors Jaunkalns: Partner – MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects	✓
Olivia Keung: Architect – Moriyama & Teshima Architects	✓
Paul Kulig: Principal – Perkins & Will	✓ *
Joe Lobko: Partner – DTAH	✓ #
Anna Madeira: Principal & Business Head – BDP Quadrangle	✓
Jim Melvin: Principal Emeritus/Advisor – PMA; Owner – Realm Works	✓
Juhee Oh: Director, Sustainability & Energy – WSP	✓
Heather Rolleston: Principal, Design Director – BDP Quadrangle	✓
Eladia Smoke: Principal Architect – Smoke Architecture	✓ *
Sibylle von Knobloch: Principal – NAK Design Group	

† Chair of 1st Session

†† Chair of 2nd Session

††† Chair of 3rd Session

Absent 3rd Session

* Conflict 1st Session

** Conflict 2nd 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 December 9, 2021 by email.

MEETING 1 INDEX

- i. Dawes Road Library – 416 Dawes Road (1st Review)
- ii. 300 Progress Avenue – Net Zero Multi-Function Station (1st Review)
- iii. 1125 Markham Road (1st Review)

DAWES ROAD LIBRARY – 416 DAWES RD

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW	First Review
APPLICATION	City Infrastructure
<i>PRESENTATIONS:</i>	
CITY STAFF	Kasia Kmieć, Community Planning; Joseph Luk, Urban Design
DESIGN TEAM	Perkins & Will, Smoke Architecture
VOTE	No vote



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. **Fit into surrounding context:** Does the proposed building adequately fit into the area context? (e.g. scale, design and materiality)
2. **Impact on adjacent properties:** Does the proposed building design adequately limit potential built form impacts to adjacent properties? (e.g. privacy, overlook, landscape buffer, etc.)
3. **Landscape/public realm:** Does the proposed landscape/streetscape design adequately improve the overall public realm experience along Dawes Road and Chapman Avenue?
4. **Sustainability:** Does the proposed building adequately achieve sustainability goals through its active and passive design features?

Chair's Summary of Key Points

Many thanks to both the City team and the proponent team for their presentations today. I think you have heard from Panel members that they are intrigued by the concept of this library. Stepping back for a moment, since 2007 we have seen a number of libraries come before the Panel. They have always been high points in our reviews, and when considered together they form a thread of civic jewels woven throughout Toronto. It is great to see that through the efforts of a considerate client this democracy of creativity is being applied across our city, forming a wonderfully cultural connective tissue.

This project's potential extends far beyond its small size. It is mighty in terms of the possibilities that come with its concept, and it really is a crucial contribution to this area of Toronto.

The presentation was very well done and feels much like it embodies the process that you have followed. The resulting design has a sense of elegance, empathy, engagement; all of the characteristics that you want a library to be. On top of that you can literally/figuratively wrap yourself in a blanket of significant indigenous heritage and learn about the world.

Many of the comments that have come through during our review focus on developing the design further, in particular the blanket. The concept is so powerful, and now, how do you fully realise it in built form? In looking at the presentation's view from the southwest it could be that the material that forms the blanket should not be used in other parts of the building, so that you can really accentuate the warp and weft of the blanket itself.

There have been several Panel comments about whether the blanket could be more colourful. What is so astonishing about the precedent blankets that you shared with us in the presentation is the vibrancy and colour. You can imagine walking along Dawes Road in a snowstorm and have the brilliance of pattern and colour instantly captivate you, while also having an amazing influence on the surrounding community.

Perhaps as the design is developed there may be the need for optical illusion to give a clearer sense of the fabric. It may be that some of the colours are stronger and some of them are not, as if the light is catching a blanket that is billowing a little bit. Is it possible to move beyond the current concept which has a stiff, heavy weight to it, and capture the freer flowing and wafting movement of a blanket? Cost will be a factor, but if part of this blanket was more transparent/translucent at night (as the evening light falls and the glow inside the library builds) so that you can actually see some of the interior shaping that has been hidden as a bit of a mystery during the day?

In closing, the Panel members have all universally said that there's wonderful hope in your proposed design and there is much yet to be done, but it is a unique and intriguing contribution... yet another civic jewel from our public library. Thank you very much for this.

Panel Commentary

The Panel thanked the project team for their "wonderful" presentation and for invited the Design Review Panel into the design process. The Panel thought the design team was "terrific". Many members thought the library design was beautiful and various members noted appreciation for being able to focus the discussion on architecture.

Many members noted specific appreciation for the Toronto Public Library for their ongoing "stewardship" of libraries across the city, as well as their consistent, high level ambitions around all the projects they are involved in.

The Panel thought the proposed design was a very interesting and culturally sensitive proposal. Moving forward, the Panelists advised further refinements to the blanket design expression to ensure it was reading as a textural, three dimensional object in the round, as well as further consideration of scale/massing and how the building would fit into the existing neighbourhood. Many members additionally recommended further refinements for the public realm and internal vertical circulation.

The Panel looked forward to seeing the project progress.

Response to Context

- The Panel was deeply appreciative of the inclusive and in depth engagement process.
- Many members commented that the design was doing an "excellent" job of weaving cultural themes into the architecture.
 - o Some members thought the project team presented a wonderful story about the making of a place.
- Many members thought the new library would be a "welcome addition" to the neighbourhood.
 - o However, various members cautioned that the scale and design of the building needed careful consideration to ensure it fit in with the neighbourhood.

- One member pointed out the existing residential neighbourhood, the nearby commercial strip and the school were all at a lower scale.
- Some members noted that the very important Indigenous iconography of the star blanket could have a secondary universal aspect of safety, rescue, and protection.

Existing Public Realm Conditions

- Various members pointed out that the existing public realm conditions, in terms of poles and guy wires etc., were significantly worse than the renderings implied.
 - The Panel strongly hoped that this infrastructure could be buried.
- A member noted that if the hydro infrastructure is not able to be buried the wires would block the entrance.
 - Another member commented that it was the proposal juxtaposed against all the hydro wires and poles was "ridiculous".
- A member encouraged further examination of the project that places it in a realistic context, in terms of the hydro wires.

Public Realm & Landscape Strategy

- The Panel thought the generous forecourt at the front of the building was a great provision of open space.
- Many members noted appreciation for the proposed amount of public space at grade.
 - However, various members were concerned by the proposed amount of hardscape and advised investing in stormwater management strategies as much as possible.
 - A few members suggested that future bumpouts and curb extensions could be designed to be bioswales to help with stormwater management.
- Some members wondered whether there was an opportunity to reduce the pavement width and move the curb on Chapman Avenue south to create a bumpout on the corner.
 - A member pointed out that this would allow the creation of a layby on Chapman, which could in turn potentially accommodate the parking requirements.
 - A member noted that narrowing the pavement on Chapman Ave would allow more space for the building, and could help mitigate the 3 storey wall expression.
- A member noted appreciation for how the sidewalk meandered and at points was near the building, then moves away.
- Some members additionally appreciated how public seating had been provided both against the building and at the garden spaces.
- One member pointed out that on the south side, the 3 shown deciduous trees would align with the centre of the star graphic and potentially hide the graphic.
 - This member noted that the trees should not be eliminated, but perhaps they may need to be reallocated to ensure the graphic language is able to be perceived.

Relationship to Adjacent Context

- Various members noted that one of the challenging aspects of the project was the close proximity between the buildings to the north and east, and how to make the building less imposing.
- Some members commented that the north side of the building was too close to the adjacent supportive housing complex.
 - One member advised that the area between these two buildings seemed "dark and close". This member wondered whether there was an opportunity to improve the environment at the ground and along the façade. Otherwise, this member cautioned, the project will feel oppressive for the residents in the existing buildings.

- Looking at the Façade on the east side of the building, some members advised that it was important to maintain the relationship to the existing commercial strip and chain of public spaces in the neighbourhood along that part of Dawes Rd.

Architectural Design

- The Panel thought there was a lot of "richness" to the design. Some members additionally complimented the clear design organization.
- Many members noted support for the three key elements of the design parti: the symbol of the blanket, the roundhouse and the platforms.
 - o The Panel appreciated the sense of equity being generated by the roundhouse as well as the iconography of the star blanket providing a connection for Indigenous people.
 - o Various members commented that the east view was the most compelling because all three elements are made visible.
- Several members noted that the rendering of the south façade was very important to the success of the project. Various members wondered if there was a way to create more porosity on the south elevation.
- Some members pointed out that there would be a lot of vertical movement in the library as it was spread out over four levels. These Panel members advised further developing the stairs and elevators to be part of the experience of the building beyond functional egress points.
 - o Some members additionally advised including a stair in the atrium to connect floors one and two. One member noted that this could help further the experience of the atrium space in addition to improving circulation.

Blanket Expression

- The Panel strongly felt that the metaphor and imagery of a star blanket wrapping the building as a three dimensional object could be a really remarkable spatial experience.
 - o Various members additionally thought the blanket was a great architecture metaphor.
 - o Some members really appreciated the idea to capture texture in the building expression.
- The Panel felt that the current design was reading a bit two dimensional, planar, and solid. Moving forward, many members advised further developing the design to ensure it was reading as three dimensional object in the round.
 - o Various members thought the blanket expression was losing some of the amorphous shape that was being expressed in the design team's earlier maquette studies.
 - o Other members wondered whether there was an opportunity to open the blanket expression more to the south to create more of the three dimensional expression as well as more public space.
 - o Some members wondered whether the south and east faces of the blanket could wrap or interweave into the building to reveal more platforms and curves. These members felt the blanket was hiding too much of the roundhouse and platforms and pointed out that the richness of the east view was so compelling because all three elements (blanket, roundhouse and platforms) were revealed together. These members wondered whether there could be another reveal or "slice" through the blanket on the south facade to both enable another moment of richness as well as help break down the massing on that face.
 - o One member commented that the building was reading as having two rigid flanks. This member suggested the Alsop Peckham Library as a good precedent.

- Various members noted that "structural brilliance" will be required to ensure the curls of the blanket work as intended.
 - o Some members acknowledged that, although it was early days, these details are currently underdrawn and would take time to make them work.
- A member pointed out that while the "powerful gesture" was of a blanket encircling a building, the way it was being expressed was resulting in a conflict with two layers. This member noted that this was putting a lot of pressure on the soffit condition between these two layers.
 - o If the soffit condition was eased, this member thought it might help it read as a singular surface.
- Looking at the entrance on the east face, various members pointed out that the building extended as a triangle below the blanket. These members suggested using the flexibility of the massing gesture to conceal this triangle.
- Some members wondered whether there was a way to push and pull the form of the blanket even further to get a stronger connection to both the corner and to the city garden.

Star Blanket Graphics & Materiality

- Some members wondered whether the patterning chosen for the blanket expression was derivative of actual blankets or if it was more of a graphic abstraction.
- Many members advised ensuring the chosen materiality read as a texture.
 - o Various members advised that it was important that the materiality was associated with the different colours so that the colour doesn't become a paint finish on a single surface.
- Many Panel members commented that the materiality and colour of the star blankets shown during the presentation were "gorgeous" and "bright and vivacious" colours. Many members additionally noted appreciation for how one was able to see the individual pieces that come together to make the blankets.
 - o The Panel then had differing opinions on how the star blanket inspiration should be expressed on the façade. Some members thought the current design was too muted and there was an opportunity to incorporate more vivacious colours. However, other members noted support for the subtle colourways that had been chosen.
 - o Some members wondered whether there was an opportunity to incorporate changing graphics or colours on the blanket expression.

Sustainability Strategy & Architectural Expression

- Various members thought that the sustainability strategy was promising.
 - o Members strongly encouraged the pursuit of achieving CaGBC Zero Carbon and hoped that the aspirational targets are executed.
- Some members pointed out there were a lot of opportunities to improve sustainable performance for this scale of development, including in the material selections.
- Many members appreciated that the blanket gesture was also being used as a sustainable tool and advised continuing in depth materiality studies, particularly on the south façade, to ensure the façade was achieving a high sustainable performance standard.
 - o Some members wondered whether perforated panels could be a device to visually break up the façade.
- Various members felt that mass timber should be pursued.
- A member pointed out that the project team needed to consider the carbon impacts of the demolition of the existing building. This member noted that a mass timber structure could help with embodied carbon.

Rooftop Garden

- Various members noted appreciation for the proposed city garden on the roof.
 - o A member commented that the experience of going through a round gathering space to the garden would be exceptional.
- A member questioned whether having an open fire on the roof would be of any concern.

300 PROGRESS AVENUE – NET ZERO MULTI-FUNCTION STATION

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION City Infrastructure, Site Plan Application

PRESENTATIONS:

CITY STAFF Kelly Dynes, Community Planning;
Sasha Terry, Urban Design

DESIGN TEAM Diamond Schmitt



VOTE No vote

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:

- Appropriateness of the proposed access, address and visibility of the development to Schick Court in the short term and long term
- Design and visibility of the development from the 401
- Opportunities to combine public art into the design of green infrastructure

Chair's Summary of Key Points

How wonderful to view two municipal civic projects one after the other; it's wonderful to see the ambition in both of them. To elevate municipal and civic architecture to a new level in Toronto is really something to take a moment to recognize and to celebrate. They are quite different and they are in different sites, and are both responding very well to their context and the particularities of their site, as we've talked about today.

On the issue of access, one Panelist felt that there was a higher order question about the original site selection for the project, given the access constraints on the site which many members felt were problematic and of some concern. Of course, that was not delved into in the presentation in any great depth and it is something that the Panel will leave to the City's discretion. But it is something of note by the Panel members.

In terms of design and visibility from the 401 and in general, there was some concern that the exterior of the building was, to use the words of one Panel member, "cold" or "forbidding" and there was the idea that there may be some joy or intrigue added through the use of more colour on the building, although this comment wasn't universally expressed by all the Panel members.

Something that was perhaps more universally expressed was that the provision through the landscape of an outdoor gathering or healing space for the building and for its occupants would be something that would be beneficial for the occupants and would speak really beautifully with the idea of the marriage of form and landscape. This could be a place that really embraces both the

building and its occupants, in a way that elevates the landscape and its purpose there at the building.

Some ideas were expressed about integrating signage on the 401, but then really a greater idea was posited about the building itself, and the landscape, being the public art. As the site will be viewed from above and viewed from the 401 this is the perfect opportunity to make the building, particularly its roofscape (which is already quite beautiful and sculptural) designated as the "public art" for the building. Unconventional, for sure, but something to be further explored along with that marriage of form between the sculpture of the building and the landscape to provide greater landscape amenity for the users of the building.

There was also a question about whether there was a need to add more fenestration in the building with respect to providing a better environment in terms of health and wellness. This point is not just about light, but also about view. There's beautiful light coming into the building from above but the view out of the building would be something to look for as well.

Another final point about reviewing the landscape material for its viability, and a note that the project team should really prioritize the use of native plants on the site for long term viability.

The members thanked the project team again for bringing this to the Panel; it's wonderful to see the ambition here and the results of the ambition on so many levels (sustainability, landscape, architecture and amenity). The Panel looked forward to the possibility of seeing it again.

Panel Commentary

The Panel thanked the design team for the presentation of an "incredibly interesting project". Many members thought the proposed building design was "beautiful" and the presentation thoughtfully put together. Several members noted that this project will help elevate public infrastructure projects in terms of civic stature and many members commended the design team on their sustainability ambitions.

Moving forward, the Panel advised further development of the landscape design and outdoor spaces, as well as further study of the primary access route and whether the more direct, western connection would be preferable to the current access point off Schick Court. Some members additionally suggested further refinement to elements of the building design, such as the fenestration and cladding.

The Panel thought the "whole ensemble" of the design had been treated with enormous care and had the potential to become a beautiful material building.

Site Location & Access

- The Panel questioned the primary access route off Schick Court. Several members felt that the western access road adjacent to the Toronto Police Services building would be preferable as it would provide a direct connection. The Panel strongly advised further study regarding whether a traffic light could be added.
 - o Some members suggested that perhaps other things in the community could change to allow this direct connection.
 - o One member commented that perhaps the site needed further consideration if direct access couldn't be achieved.
 - o Various members noted that there would likely be more traffic with the potential future development to the east.
 - o Some members pointed out that for ambulances, seconds count when trying to reach the patient. These members questioned the "circuitousness" of the eastern

- access point. Other members remarked that the hard turns seemed "hard to navigate".
- Various members noted that the western access would enable a logical sequence of entry for visitors as well.
- A member thought there was an opportunity to reduce some of the surface parking on the west side such that there was better proximity to transit as well as pedestrian connections.
- One member commented that at the Scarborough Town Centre to the east of the site a complex road system was being developed, while the broader area surrounding the proposal felt almost "unofficial" and "rural" in its access. This member hoped that in the future the road alignments and grid is able to be unified for the whole area.

Outdoor Amenity Spaces

- Many Panel members suggested incorporating outdoor healing spaces for the paramedics, staff and students using the station.
 - Various people commented that it was critical for the people working at the station to have places where they can replenish themselves, given the stressful nature of their profession.
 - The Panelists suggested incorporating both outdoor gathering spaces, including places to eat lunch, as well as opportunities for repose or reflection, including trails.
- Some members noted admiration for the evolution of the form and architecture of the design together with the intention of the landscape.
 - Many members noted that the building being designed will be a beautiful place to work, and so likewise the landscape needed to be equally beautiful.

Landscape Design

- Various members noted appreciation for the reforestation efforts.
- Some members commented that it wasn't necessary for the building to relate to the 401. Instead, a member advised, the landscape design needed to be very robust to survive next to the highway.
 - Various members pointed out that there would be a large amount of salt spray from the highway which would impact both the plant species as well as the photovoltaics.
 - A member was concerned about the selection of trees chosen, noting that the 401 is "brutal" for plant material. The member advised further consideration of the plant material, including specifically recommending:
 - Advised against using *Liriodendron tulipifera* species due to the proximity to the highway; and
 - Introduce approximately 50% coniferous material along the border with the 401 to try to help buffer the pv cells from dirt and salt spray.
 - Another member thought incorporating trees as a buffer from the 401 would additionally serve as a way to counterbalance the "enigmatic" building design.
- For the arrival landscape, a member noted that the while the proposed rain gardens were using the correct *betula* birch species, the birch trees will be "pure yellow" in the fall, similar to the highlighted ginko tree area.
 - This member additionally pointed out that ginko trees are introduced species and encouraged a different native species in place of the ginko trees.
 - The member also observed that this area seemed to employ a grid orientation planting scheme and wondered whether the grid could be developed as an orchard.
 - This member pointed out that this would reference the former orchards of Scarborough and would be a productive landscape as it would provide fruit.

- A member pointed out that *Fagus sylvatica* indicated along the small strip of landscaping was also not a native plant. They suggested instead looking at a *carpinus caroliniana* blue beech or a coniferous *juniperus virginiana*.
- A member noted that the understory of *Euonymus fortune 'Coloratus'* in the ginkgo zone as well as along the side of the building would introduce a monoculture that is also an aggressive plant, and suggested again choosing a native species instead.
- A member suggested incorporating bioswales into the parking areas.

Architecture & Sustainability

- The Panel strongly supported the high level of sustainable features included in the architecture. Many members appreciated how the sustainable considerations informed the massing and design of the building.
 - o Various members were pleased to see the rigorous approach to form follows function from a sustainable perspective.
- Some members commended the carbon sequestering techniques being employed, and other members thanked the design team for the inclusion of a net zero report.
 - o One member pointed out that the proposed photovoltaics would cover all electric requirements for the entire ambulance fleet.
- A member noted that the introduction of these ambulance vestibules/doors would be a significant precedent for other paramedic stations.
- Some members noted that human health and wellbeing was another crucial aspect of sustainability.
 - o These members advised that daylighting and ventilation, along with the inclusion of additional landscape gestures will help address and improve this aspect of sustainability as well.
 - A member commented that it is known that daylighting and ventilation are important for cognitive health.
- The Panel thought this project was simultaneously an exemplary approach to sustainable energy production and a refined approach to architecture.

Architectural Design

- Many Panel members thought the proposed building fits well into its surroundings, was not overbuilt, and would be a beautiful material building.
 - o Various members thought the project represented a "great piece of civic architecture".
 - o Some members commented that the building was in some ways reflective of an early 20th century Ontario industrial vernacular.
 - A member additionally noted that this iconography worked well for a sustainable design language.
- Various members commented that there were lots of possibilities to play upon in terms of how the building would be perceived from the 401 including the inclusion of hints or "flashes" of colour.
- One member, looking at the alternative massing presented on pg. 34 of the drawing package, noted a preference for the options where the ambulances are welcomed into the buildings, as shown in the current design, rather than a super canopy or a loading bay.

Views to Nature

- A member suggested including more daylight and views into the interior spaces for occupant health and wellness. This member noted that although the fenestration allowed on the facades was constrained, there should still be a visual connection to the landscaped area.

Materiality

- A member wondered whether the copper accents on the east elevation could be pushed further. This member suggested this could be a way to bring more softness and colour to the façade and reflect some of the warmth of the building interiors.
- Looking at the view from the 401, a different member suggested further consideration of materiality accents that could be viewed from the highway.

Signage from the 401

- Some members felt the signage as viewed from the 401 could be integrated into the architecture more carefully than had currently been proposed.

Building as Public Art

- The Panel strongly felt that the architecture constituted "public art".
 - o Many members additionally thought the pairing of the building within the designed landscape filled the public art component.
 - o Some members called the building, and specifically the roofscape, "sculptural".
- Various members pointed out that it was a public building achieving a very high quality of design and sustainability.

1125 MARKHAM ROAD

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION Rezoning

PRESENTATIONS:

CITY STAFF Tyler Hughes, Community Planning; Sasha Terry, Urban Design

DESIGN TEAM Turner Fleischer Architects, STUDIO tla



VOTE Non-support – unanimous

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:

- Provision of an integrated public realm network including Privately owned Publicly accessible Open Space
- Provision of a mix of Tall and Midrise buildings on the site
- Design of the building including:
 - Base Building Height
 - Tower Floor Plate Shape and Articulation
 - Tower Height

Chair's Summary of Key Points

Panel members' comments captured key concerns in the design of 1125 Markham Road, in particular: the sidewalks are too narrow; there is a lack of porosity; the public realm is insufficient; and the ingredients necessary to create a successful sense of community don't seem to be present.

There were numerous comments about density being too high, as well as the suggestion that a wholly new organization appears needed to unlock the site potential. Looking at slide 12 of 51 in the presentation deck illustrates the problem: the proposal to the south has towers organized around a very generous light filled central green space, while this proposal has three towers and there is no equivalent open space, nor is it green.

There was a lot of commonality among Panel members about the need to look again at the "chess pieces" and prioritize the public realm in the new arrangement of these pieces; it is also likely that this will result in a lower density than currently shown.

In such an important site, where new projects represent a radical change in height and density from the existing context, designs have the additional pressure to be an exemplar, one that sets the public realm off in a good direction. That is really the ambition here for the project: that the public realm experience and the community that is built is not just adequate, but exemplary.

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Panel Commentary

The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation. Many members noted that this would be a significant development in a part of Toronto currently in transition. The Panel remarked that the project was in a position to set a precedent of high quality for the area. However, the Panelists felt that more work was required in order to ensure the project would become an exemplar.

Moving forward, the Panel advised a substantial reduction in the amount of proposed density as well as a reconsideration of the site plan. Many members noted that the proposal needed more ambitious sustainability goals and the project needed to ensure it was creating a complete community. The Panel looked forward to seeing the project again.

Proposed Density

- The Panel questioned the amount of density being proposed for the site. The members strongly felt that too much density was being proposed and it was overburdening the site.
- Various members pointed out that the gross floor area of the tower was resulting in very large podiums.
 - o A member noted that this was in turn putting a lot of pressure on the ground plane by constraining the ability to pedestrianize the broader site or have a public realm.
 - o The Panel additionally advised de-densifying the podiums and density at the ground plane to help alleviate the pressures on the site.

Site Plan Design

- The Panel advised that there wasn't enough permeability through the site.
- Many members recognized that the intent was to pedestrianize the centre of the development, but noted that currently there was too much happening in the middle of the site, which would prevent that intention from being realized. To increase the pedestrian experience the Panelists variously suggested:
 - o Shifting the ramp locations that they are located closer to the public street, or even on the public street;
 - o Orienting the lobbies toward the public street to make the proposal a transit oriented development;
 - o Eliminating the pick up/drop off area, given that there are two driveway connections; and
 - o Reduce the amount of loading by consolidating the refuse and then one parallel loading space close to the core for moving purposes rather than a full additional loading space.
- Many members noted that shifting and reducing many of the programmatic elements currently within the centre of the development would create more space for an urban plaza or a POPS, as well as potentially a connection through the middle of the site to connect to the pedestrian link at the north end of the site.
- Various members advised developing a hierarchy of blocks and primary streets.
 - o Some members suggested it would be beneficial to determine whether the internal street was meant to be for "front door" or "back door" uses. One member noted that the overlapping intentions currently shown were cluttering this interior space.
 - o A member felt that the public road was reading as imposing.
 - o Some members questioned how the site circulation and flow of transportation would work, including for bikes and pedestrians.
- Many members questioned why no block context plan had been shown.

- Various members pointed out that there is a new road, as well as a development parcel to the east that should be shown on the drawings and be informing the site plan of this proposal.
- Several members advised looking beyond the site to better develop connectivity and built form transition.
 - One member pointed out that the nearby hydro corridor would likely be an important green space for residents and advised developing a connection to it.
- Some members commented that the lack of consistent drawing organization in terms of orientation of the drawings etc. was compounding the difficulty in understanding the broader context.
- Many members were concerned about the ground plane and continuity of movement. These members questioned how the park and midblock connections would be activated and pointed out that the spaces could become unsafe for pedestrians if they were not connected to activities.
- Some members commented that the proposal seemed to want to function similar to the Market Square Co-op beside St. Lawrence Market in Toronto. These members noted that this site was too large to successfully replicate that typology. One member additionally noted that the centre the Market Square Co-op wraps around is greener, bigger, and the surrounding built form lower.
- Many members suggested moving the park into the middle of the site for more breathing room.
 - Various members wondered whether two towers on podiums with a series of courtyards with varying characteristics might be a more appropriate approach to the site and density.

Public Realm & Streetscape

- The Panel thought the public realm as shown was insufficient and required more space, light, air, green space, porosity and destinations.
- Many members questioned why there didn't seem to be an attempt to make an enriched public realm on Markham Rd, Ellesmere Rd or the new public street.
- Various members pointed out that no indication had been shown of any streetscape improvements on Markham Rd.
 - These members commented that Markham Rd would be the primary elevation as well as the pedestrian access for transit and required streetscape improvements.
- Some members noted that Markham Rd and Ellesmere Rd should be important retail streets and that the proposed streetscape should be redeveloped to reflect this.
- Various members felt that the ROW planting should be more than just 4 ft sidewalks with sod planting in the edge zone.
- A few members noted that the units facing the street would be giving a little space back to the sidewalk, but that the design hadn't resolved any of the landscaping beyond street trees and sod. The Panel advised that the public realm needed to be better developed.
- Some members commented that the public realm appeared to be geared toward getting up into residences and away from the ground plane. These members noted that this approach would not create a community.

Park Location & Size

- Some members commented that the park appeared to be the result of residual space rather than proper site planning.

- Various members thought the park was located in the wrong place on the site and suggested it instead should be located more centrally within the development, potentially where Building C was presently located.

Built Form & Programming

- Various Panel members felt that the programming of the buildings needed further consideration.
 - o Some members pointed out that locating garbage storage on the southwest corner facing a retail street wouldn't constitute eyes on the street.
 - o Many Panel members questioned the decision to have inward residential lobbies.
 - o Many members felt the amenity spaces at the ground level needed more thought.
 - o Many Panel members advised relocating the servicing and loading underground to open up the middle of the site and allow it to become a pedestrian zone.
 - o Some members noted appreciation for the rooftop amenity spaces
- Some members noted appreciation for the "off grid" gestures; however, these members pointed out this type of façade articulation will impact the overall performance of the building envelope in terms of thermal bridging and sustainability performance.
- Some members questioned the usability of the cantilevered balconies at the higher levels. These members pointed out the environment would be very windy and vertiginous at those heights.
- Some members encouraged the use of colour on the facades.
- Many Panel members thought the podiums felt a bit bulky and advising lowering them.
- One member thought the way the building was meeting the sky with respect to the angular plane could be amplified.
- A member commented that the primary building grid design gesture could be made stronger. This member noted that the blinders that were being used to create shadow were diluting the grid form too much.
- A member felt the tower corners were too thick.
- Some members felt the buildings were too monolithic.

Proposed Height & Transition in Scale

- The Panel questioned whether all the towers were necessary, particularly given that the density needed to be reduced.
- Many Panel members thought that the proposed amount of height on Markham Rd could be acceptable, but that the height needed to transition down substantially towards the new road system.
 - o Various members additionally wanted more information regarding what will happen in the adjacent development parcel next to the existing bungalows, commenting that this will also be a crucial transition.
 - o Some members suggested that if the height was kept on Markham Rd, the north-south street could become the transition street with mid rise buildings.

Sustainability Strategy

- The Panel advised that the sustainability targets were too low and not sufficient. Some members pointed out that this approach to building will no longer be acceptable in the short term.
- Some members commented that a development of such significant size requires a strong commitment to sustainability. Various members advised that the project needed to develop a comprehensive sustainability strategy.
 - o Some members encouraged the pursuit of higher TGS Tiers as well as different ways to improve the building performance.

- Some members additionally advised looked at stormwater management and planting strategies.
- From a health and wellness perspective, various members weren't not convinced by the proposed amount of density and questioned whether all three towers were needed. Some members specifically thought the south east tower should be removed.
 - A member additionally pointed out that some of the studio units shown could use more breathing space to improve the quality of life for the future occupants.