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CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
The Panel confirmed minutes of their previous meeting which was held on June 8, 2017 by email.
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DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

SCARBOROUGH CENTRE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS:
Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan
Scarborough Centre Subway and Bus Station
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CITY STAFF
Russell Crooks, Community Planning; Alan Filipuzzi, Transportation Planning;

DESIGN TEAM
Station Design:
Aecom – Brian Shaw

VOTE
Station Vote: Refinement with two conditions and description- Unanimous
Given the lack of robust public realm in the Scarborough Centre, the Panel advises the proponent to work closely with city staff to increase that potential.
Conditions:
1. Synchronize ambitions with respect to public realm and connectivity.
2. Better acknowledge the realities of the P3 process in the design.

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

Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan (1st Review)
Staff are seeking the Panel’s comments on the following:
1. **Connectivity**: Connectivity among the four Precincts is of vital importance for the Centre area. Are the proposed north-south connections over the Triton trench appropriate and sufficient? How can the east-west connections be strengthened?

2. **Progress Avenue/McCowan Road at Grade**: The City sees bringing Progress Avenue to grade as one of the most important elements of the SCTMP. Please comment on its impact to the public realm and the development potential of the adjacent sites.

3. **Borough Drive**: Please comment on the function and design of the street - What is the appropriate number of lanes and ROW width? Are the proposed 4 lanes of traffic and 36m ROW appropriate? Can the east and west boulevards of the street have different widths and characters?

Scarborough Centre Subway and Bus Station (1st Review)
Reference Concept Design (RCD): While the size and location of the subway box below grade and the bus terminal are established, the station design is conceptual. Please provide advice regarding:

1. **Public Realm & Surrounding Areas**: How can the station, especially the roof of the bus terminal, be designed to address the connectivity issue (including the north-south and east-west connections), and improve the overall conditions in the surrounding areas?

2. **Station elements**: roof, long walls of the trench, access to natural light, ancillary facilities, public art opportunities, accessibility, and other elements that impact the rider’s experience.

3. **Development potential**: block sizes and configurations, key development sites, integration with the mall.

4. **McCowan Road Entrance Area**: How can the design of the entrance and its surrounding areas be improved?

The consultant for the station provided background information, design rationale and responded to questions.
Panel Comments
Panel members were enthusiastic to review projects affecting the transformation of Scarborough Centre and appreciative of the opportunity to view multiple projects in the area.

Request for further design input in the process:
The Chair noted that the Panel was included in the confidential bid team selection process and the development of design standards for the PSOS, for the New Toronto Courthouse by Infrastructure Ontario. “As we have fought to gain more design input into the Courthouse, we will fight to get more input in the quality of this civic moment, and elevate it so that any public transit project is just as civic as a Courthouse or hospital.”

Panel members were supportive of the change to regularize city fabric that will encourage a more pedestrian and bike friendly environment, which will also encourage development. The enhanced land value that the station can provide was noted. The streets being brought to grade were commented on as being crucial to the future development and success of the area. Plans to establish connectivity north-south across the trench were supported.

However, Panel members expressed significant concerns of the vision for the future of the area and advised attention to this important city-building moment with long-term impacts, “[It] demands that we pay attention to the notion that we only get a once-in-a-lifetime chance to do this…[the projects] will have their impact, positive or negative for hundreds of years.”

They advised the following:
Provide a comprehensive master plan:
“[It]’s timid and we can’t afford that…in Scarborough we need strong strong moves.”
Panel members advised that instead of only these 2 pieces, the Transportation Master Plan and Subway/ bus station before them, a comprehensive overall master plan and vision for the centre must be undertaken. A Panel member summarized, “It would be an absolute travesty if we can let this go ahead and people look at the largest bus facility in Toronto - It seems completely absurd to lose sight of what this project really should be which is infrastructure, public realm and connectivity.”

Many members advised that the following should be undertaken:

a. A comprehensive master plan for this area should be generated to guide the future: Panel members advised public realm connections and open spaces, built form study, and community facilities to be provided in order to set principles and structure for the station and future development.

A Panel member noted,
“In the city’s drawing showing the 3d potential I didn’t’ see any park, any community facility…this is an amazing piece of infrastructure that is really transformative – it has got to be ambitious. It has the potential to create connections, public realm and wonderful sense of place.”

b. A parkland and open space strategy for future development that ties with the existing public realm plans such as Bushby Dr.

“We can’t make that mistake again…”: Panel members noted the lack of parkland and open space information integrated in the renderings. Many members noted the current problems in the downtown that should not be repeated here- where open space and parkland has not kept pace
with development and the enormous difficulties in correcting that condition. “The city is bemoaning the fact that there was lots of green space in the 70s they could have gotten.”

The quantity of parkland dedication was advised to be planned for in advance with the demonstration massing densities proposed. A Panel member noted, “in amongst the roads what is the green system that will actually connect it and provide park space for 40,000 people, which is a lot of people?”

c. A built form study coordinated with the public realm plan was advised. Provide open spaces, building locations, heights and densities, separation:

“Overlay this with an open space master plan...it should [also] be overlaid with a density diagram that talks about location, heights and densities, and separation of future development - because that comprehensive masterplan gives us a framework to judge this or other development projects within a framework of what Scarborough Centre should be in the future.”

Many Panel members were interested in the City’s demonstration rendering and a Panel member advised that it should have been included in the briefing package due to its significance: “finally after 10 year of looking at these plans, looking at project after project... there is actually some real potential that shows the ambition people have ...For this part of the city - ambition is the key.”

Provide sun and shadow studies:
A Panel member advised concurrent study of these to guard for sunlight on public spaces which should include the transit station.

Consider other building types versus tower on podium:
A Panel member noted that the demonstration massing shows “the standard of tower on podium as the answer for it — maybe there are other forms.” With the more intimate pedestrian-oriented blocks, the smaller resulting lot sizes were observed to be suited to accommodate different building types.

d. A public realm plan focusing on connectivity:
A Panel member noted that the need to connect the Commercial and Civic Precincts is “the obvious direction from a master plan that would be a starting point.”

Another Panel member advised looking at the greater context of all the Precincts as well studying the edges and centre.
More public realm plan comments are in the Station sections that follow.
Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan

Note: The abbreviation TMP is used for the Transportation Master Plan

Connectivity
For comments regarding connectivity please refer to the section for the Station that follows.

Progress Avenue/McCowan Road – Transformation to at-Grade Streets:
Panel members identified these transformations as important moves for Scarborough Centre and were supportive of ‘normalizing’ the streets and bringing them to grade, “the flattening of the grade-separated automotive streets ...it’s a really great benefit to undo the automotive focus.” A Panel member noted that the negative current conditions such as on Progress Ave, where people get lost after a few turns will be fixed by “squaring up the intersection.”

Borough Dr:
A Panel member noted that the challenges in making the 4 lanes and 36m width of Borough Dr pedestrian-friendly. Providing more thought in the buildings adjacent the ROW as shown in the building sections may be helpful to create a stronger space. Further study into increasing room for pedestrians and cyclists by reducing the vehicular roadway was advised. A Panel member noted, for “I enjoyed the road diet expression - The diet is needed more.”

Consider more distinct alternative options:
A Panel member noted that the 3 options could be more distinct, in that the other two options are not realistic, and the 3rd is the obvious option.

The ‘wow’ factor that would distinguish the study and make it stronger could be further considered, for example, it could be the fine grain network or the travel demand management that could set it apart.

Consider the future users:
A Panel member advised more thinking of the end users that would round out the vision and tailor the strategy more specifically to the future users of the Centre.

Explore if PPUDO will be required:
A Panel member noted that it would improve the plan if it were known whether or not a passenger pick-up and drop-off (PPUDO) area will be needed by users. An observation was that although urban mobility is the goal, the new mobility will likely have more Uber type services and micro transit services in the future, such that a shared PPUDO may come back as an urban element. "If you don't anticipate it, it may be a potential problem."

Establish a consistent main street:
A Panel member questioned what the main street is and noted that it is likely Borough Dr, and advised more emphasis given to that street to make a place where the public will want to go - a main street environment should be created.
It was noted that "the challenge of the Centre is that nothing is the same – there are short little bits of street that do something in one part and then something else in another."

Consider a connection to East Side of McCowan:
A Panel member raised the importance of connecting to the east side of McCowan and that the development should build-in that connection.
Scarborough Centre Subway and Bus Station

Public Realm Plan and Connections
Revise the design to consider connectivity and public realm first:
Several members commended the ambition and energy in the architectural expression to celebrate transit. A Panel member noted the importance and positive aspects of bringing daylight down into the concourse and the tracks, which will also serve to create a spatial character for the building.

However, many members expressed concern that the proposal “unfortunately puts the cart before the horse” and advised that connectivity and public realm must be overriding goals first. A selection of comments follows:

- “This is an incredibly ambitious project but I think it needs to be really ambitious holistically - not just about itself ...”

- “The image of the building looks great but it may be the wrong place – you have to go back to planning and make sure it makes sense.”

- “The connectivity north-south in the master plan is not apparent in the design solution and is a first principle.”

- “It’s trying to fit this piece of infrastructure in as a piece of infrastructure...and not looking at the entire potential.”

Triton Trench – Bus Station:
1. Synchronize the disconnect between the station design and the objectives of the TMP:
Many members noted that the connectivity shown in the Transportation Master Plan differs from the current station design. All Panel members advised for greater connectivity and public realm objectives as first principles. A Panel member summarized, "There is a disconnect between those two studies [TMP and Subway Station] ... I think the TMP has the bigger picture correct – the transit terminal pieces are being timid and not putting effort to the public realm that is needed."

They advised the following:

- **Provide connections:**
  Panel members were supportive of the clarity of the diagram in the TMP showing the precincts stitched together with red arrow connections. A system of green connections was suggested by several Panel members.

- **Consider covering the trench:**
  The difficulties of the bus station located in the trench were noted by many Panel members. A Panel member summarized, “the elephant in the room is that a trench is not really a great place –it doesn’t really repair anything. If we could we would cover it.”

- **While members commented on the advantages of the ‘land bridge’ to cover the trench in order to provide greening opportunities and critical connections between the two precincts, they asked questions as to the feasibility and issues involved in constructing the decking.**

- **Improve the trench experience:**
  The views outward from the trench by the transit user should be considered in the design, “no one want to be in a trench.”
• **Increase the number of entrances:**
  Noting that there are only two entrances into such a large and long facility, a Panel member advised providing more entrances to improve connections and allow for people to filter through the station and Civic and Commercial precincts in an easier manner.

• **Consider the importance of the edges of the trench in the design:**
  A Panel member noted that one needs to deal with the trench not just through the form of the building but also by addressing and designing the edges, “it’s crucial to the success of the environment – it needs to not be just a precipice to a canyon.”

2. **Strengthen street and connections structure:**
   A Panel member advised clarifying the way one could travel through the area and applying a greater structure to the ensemble of connections. For example, if Progress Ave, Borough Dr and the north-south connections between the precincts were strongly established, there would be a greater wayfinding and consistency in the area.

   **Study how north-south connections over the trench can connect to Borough Dr:**
   Another Panel member advised that in addition to creating north-south connections, the study should also how look at how these connections can connect to Borough Dr, and could result in an interesting strategy.

3. **Elevate greening in Scarborough Centre to establish a new sense of place:**
   Noting the importance of landscape to establish a sense of place in Scarborough, several Panel members advised more thought into softening and greening the public realm. The experience of pedestrians should be transformed within and along the edges of development, and is critical to the success of the area.

**Station Building – Additional Comments**

**Acknowledge the P3 process:**
While appreciative of the energy put into the design to elevate the experience of the transit user, many Panel members were very familiar with the PSOS process and advised more consideration in the design for that reality which prioritizes lowest bid. (PSOS are the ‘Project Specific Output Specifications’ part of the bidding process to select consultants and the design, and sets in detail what the teams are providing and including in their pricing bids.) A Panel member summarized, “You have to worry about the P3 process. This is very ambitious in design. It’s the PSOS that is the big piece here that sets the stage for everything. The PSOS has to be even stronger. That is a huge worry in that whole process.”

**Consider a simplified representation:**
In consideration of the PSOS process, a Panel member advised reconsidering the way the station is represented graphically for a ‘Reference Design Concept’ and noted that the consultant’s ideas wall shown in the presentation indicates that there could be other options, “the veil idea could be simplified and less mannered and specific. [Consider] not such a strong image going into an ideas exercise.”

**Integrate entrances with the public realm design:**
A Panel member advised that the entrances should be designed so that the public spaces lead to them and are strongly developed so the public knows where they are going.
Increase sustainability ambitions:
Several Panel members advised that only meeting the TGS (Toronto Green Standards) for the TTC as a public institution is not sufficient as a performance criteria target, "the city needs to take leadership." Increasing sustainability ambitions will create value and efficiency for the public building over the long-term.

a. Include roof performance metrics in PSOS:
The roof for was noted as a significant element that should be looked at for what value it can bring to energy performance. The roof, as it moves into PSOS, needs to have defined performance metrics in the document.

b. Include access to daylight protections:
Noting the ambition to bring light down into the station and bus areas, a Panel member advised that the access to daylight should be protected with the area built form planning. The transit areas should be thought of as public spaces to be protected for. Additional thinking on photovoltaics on the roof was also advised and would also require daylight provisions to be provided for the future.
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Scarborough Centre Public Space + Streetscape Master Plan
Introduction
City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following:

1. **Response to Planned Context**: Given its location within the Scarborough Centre and the changes to the transportation network contemplated through the SCTMP and Scarborough Subway Extension projects, does the proposed development provide an appropriate response to the existing and emerging planning framework in terms of:
   - McCowan/Progress at grade;
   - Connectivity and permeability; and
   - Public realm including parks, open spaces, and streetscape.

2. **Built Form and Design Features**: Scale of development; scale of base building and towers; above grade parking structure and its impact on the public realm.

3. **Overall Advice**: After reviewing the three projects, does the Panel have any overall comments and advice on the planning and design of the Scarborough Centre area?

The consultant provided background information, design rationale and responded to questions.

Panel Comments

While supportive of the benefits of intensification near transit, Panel members noted the significant scale of the project and advised for the necessary provision of public realm, open space and amenities to support the increased population.

The above-grade parking proposal was identified as a major problem to be resolved. In addition, built form revisions were advised. Overall project comments:

Provide amenities:
A Panel member commented, “2000 units is actually a community not a project... It's a whole world people will live in. There are a lot of needs that come with 4000 people...” In addition to open space as described in the public realm section below, the proponent was advised to provide amenities in the project given the density and scale proposed.
Reconsider the density appropriate for the site capacity:
Several Panel members commented that the high density and type of units being sought on the site are driving the large parking requirements which are proposed to be housed above-grade in multiple floors. In addition, the absence of open space provision was an issue raised by all Panel members. A Panel member commented, “In the past when parking goes above-grade at that height, it’s an instance of site capacity failure. The density proposed is [also] exceeding the ability of the site to meet public realm expectations.”

Provide for and anticipate families with children:
A Panel member noted that the density proposed works out to less than two people per unit but realistically the proponent should anticipate that families will live in those units, as per trends downtown. Critical needs for parks and open spaces, and community facilities should be accommodated in the project. “We are seeing [whole] families per unit and they literally have no place to go - with no parks and just one little library.”

Noting that due to the location, proximity to transit and the price point, the area will likely be attractive to families, another Panel member advised anticipating this in the design, “there may be lots of kids in your high-rise buildings.”


Public Realm
Provide significant open space:
“Public realm should be as powerful a driver as density.”: Panel members were supportive of the tall building type on the site in general but advised that, among other elements, a significant open space be provided to support the increase in population. A Panel member summarized, “You have to have open space with a community like this. We’ve learned downtown that not providing open space when you are incrementally adding projects of this size ends up with a problem.”

Provide open spaces at-grade:
The needs of future residents, children and caregivers who need at-grade open spaces was raised. The project was observed to have outdoor amenity spaces only at upper levels. Another Panel member noted that the project “outsources public realm to someone else’s responsibility - Take some responsibility to bring the important civic stuff into the development and work it out ... What is the nature of a generous public open space that people can use?”

Design a public realm network:
Many Panel members advised looking at the open space, midblock connections and street designs as a structure to support the quantity of new residents. A Panel member noted, “This development is large enough to be a community but there is no sense of ‘there’ – it’s essentially two buildings facing a street with towers above – but there are opportunities of open space and connections midblock…”
In addition, the strengthening of Bushby Drive was recommended with open spaces adjacent as per comments below.

**New street**

Create a more intimate new street:
A Panel member noted that it’s a “rare” thing in the city to control both sides of a street and that the project should take advantage of this great opportunity to have intentional street-making.

Many Panel members advised for the careful design of a more intimate, pedestrian-focused new street. They commented that the new street as proposed will feel like a service street. The proponent should relook at the design: the multiple access points to parking, the limited retail, and the presence of limited residential in the form of lobbies only.

Several members advised that the new street should be a residential street as per the city guidelines. A Panel member advised, “Create a centre and a heart” for the project likely on the internal more residential street, with an intimate scale and pedestrian-oriented design.

**Bushby Drive**

Strengthen the Bushby Dr Promenade:
A Panel member noted that the urban design guidelines diagram shows Bushby Drive as the main Promenade and main connector linking Albert Campbell Square to the new school and park site to the east. This should be a “grounding element in how to look at the site.” In addition, the guidelines talk about a landmark building at the gateway which gives the proponent the opportunity to develop the gateway to both the transit area and the proposed development.

Reconsider the new street in favour of open space and public realm focus on Bushby Dr:
Observing that the new street is not linked to other streets, a Panel member commented, “I think my biggest problem with your site is that the city is asking that there be a public street there. It’s from an old plan - Not from a new idea of what transit will be.”

It was suggested that the new street area be ‘moved’ to the south to relate strongly to Bushby Promenade, and provide an open space that is family-oriented. This would also potentially help with the parking demands as well on the site due to use of the new street area. “The success of the project could be in making the local residential street go away.” Additional suggestions:

- In addition the massing should transition down to the east to relate to the existing lower scaled buildings.
- The south side of the project could have a different vocabulary that relates to the Bushby Dr Promenade and provide an identity for the project.
- The ‘complete streets’ approach was noted to be already accommodated on Bushby Dr versus trying to fit it in the new street that doesn’t connect to other streets.

**Streetscape**

Acknowledge the importance of the streets to support population:
“Streets need to work for the community and for the large number of people that will be living there.”: Several Panel members advised that streetscaping is extremely important to Scarborough Centre and the project should take the opportunity to set the stage for a transit hub with a strong streetscape approach. The proponent was advised to think of the residents’ experience and use of the streets for recreation that will be needed to support the increased population.
Provide high quality streetscaping standards:
While acknowledging that the project is in early stages, the proponent was advised to provide a more standard repeatable high quality streetscape on this site that can be implemented elsewhere in the Centre with consistency. High standards of tree design should be provided and the proponent was advised by a Panel member to look at the work of the landscape architect Claude Cormier who has figured out “wonderful ways to make street trees grow” that should be explored.

Distinguish street edges responses:
As the project progresses, the street edges should be distinguished – currently they are shown as very similar with trees in grass boulevard. Further developing the design now on the central new street is a great way to provide different experiences throughout the site that are necessary for the scale of project proposed.

Activate and develop corners:
The urban design guidelines were noted to indicate not just the north, south and east corners but also the future connection across McCowan. As a potential area for a gathering space the corner should be looked at for more animation and design development.

Connections
Improve location and design of midblock connections:
- Make them animated, welcoming and pedestrian friendly:
  Many Panel members noted the need for improving the proposed midblock connections. They should be revised to feel welcoming, and visually open. Particularly the north walkway was noted to need more animation and pedestrian friendly design due to the parking and loading situated off of the connections.

- Improve location:
  A Panel member noted that the location of the connection is too close to the street to be meaningful and that the city’s midblock connections diagram shows them more centrally located to the site.

- Make them open to the sky, provide natural light, and integrate them in the massing of the project:
  While acknowledging the changes that would need to be made to the massing of the podium and the above grade parking, a Panel member advised that the midblock connections should be open to the sky. This could go a long way in helping the massing of the podium, allow for articulation of that connection and reduce the impact of above grade parking in the project.

Coordinate Pedestrians and Bus Movements
For further consideration as the project progresses, a Panel member noted that more clarity is needed on how pedestrians will relate to the bus movements. For example, pedestrians will likely not be able to cross McCowan from the new street to the Triton trench due to bus movements. That should be considered in how it impacts the flow of the site for pedestrians and the location of entrances.
**Built Form**

In addition to the provision of open space, the massing was advised to be redesigned as follows:

**Base building design**

Scale down the street massing:
While commenting on the benefits of the different scales on the project as proposed, a Panel member noted that on the new street, “you don’t actually get the long view you are proposing up to 5 and 6 storeys ...and so really scale down elements you are proposing in that street.”

Improve at –grade architecture:
A Panel member noted that the project at present places such “an emphasis in texture and articulation [in upper levels] and the street level looks kind of dark and forlorn.” The proponent was advised to invert this response and improve the level of the pedestrian experience. Then the upper levels are quieter “and texture and indentation and colour - all cool stuff...is celebrated and brought out” in the at-grade experience.

Reduce reliance on retail and signage for animation:
Many Panel members noted the relatively small area of retail that is proposed, “yet the podium is designed as if it’s the mall next door”. The architectural expression was commented on as overly emphasizing retail and signage and should be revised. A Panel member commented that these areas seem a bit broken up with respect to architectural language that can be resolved as the project progresses further.

Use responses to public realm to generate a local response in architecture:
Many Panel members advised that the project could benefit from using the responses to the public realm in the architecture to create distinction as opposed to being residual responses. The massing and articulation could respond more meaningfully to the new street, Bushby Drive, the new park or open space and the midblock connections and pedestrian routes. The architecture has the opportunity to specifically relate to those conditions.

**Overall Massing**

Consider another way to break up facades by differentiating outer perimeter and interior new street:
The massing proposed with 6-7 storeys on top of the tower components and stepping up to Civic Centre was suggested to be revised to consider another way to differentiate massing. A Panel member commented that the architecture of the towers relies on some framed elements that are interesting ways to break up some of the facades, however there could be “another kind of logic”. For example, consider differentiating the outer perimeter of the project from an interior new intimate street-facing massing in the design. The centre of the project could be the new street and the massing and articulation would support that design objective.

Transition massing down from McCowan:
A Panel member advised that the high point of building massing along McCowan, should transition downwards to relate to lower scaled buildings to the east.

Revisit the massing to provide sunlight:
A Panel member advised that the massing should be revised to allow for five hours of daylight on the streets, particularly for new streets,” a 45 degree angular plane determines whether or not we get a north side of street with light...Remarkable new streets should have the benefit of daylight.”
As an example, the proponent was advised to look at higher density to the north and less density to the south, in order to provide more sunlight.

**Improve long corridors with natural light:**
Regarding the internal workings of the building a Panel member advised looking for opportunities for sunlight as the project progresses:
- On amenity levels: It was observed that these are very long corridors and that the design should look at gaining natural lights and borrowed light on the amenity levels.
- On the 7th and 8th floors: The corridors were noted to be very close to exterior – opportunities to bring in natural light for wayfinding and improved environment should be looked at.

**Increase sustainability ambitions:**
Provide higher standards in the architecture and public realm for sustainability: In acknowledgement of the future changing regulatory framework to achieve net zero buildings, several Panel members advised that the project will be required to respond and should be integrated into the early design for high energy performance and carbon efficiency. The envelope ratio of glazed to solid walls at 30%-35% should be accommodated early in the design. The R value of 10 for slab, roof and glazing should be designed for.

The city should define metrics:
A Panel member noted that the absence of clear metrics by the city should be addressed. For example, no clear metrics exist as to how the transportation master plan fits in the city’s carbon goals and the city was urged to better define standards that pertain to carbon, for this site in particular.

**Above Grade Parking**

**Remove above-grade parking:**
“The elephant in the room is parking.”: Panel members identified the major issue of the above grade parking as an impediment to a successful high density proposal. The concept of having “an old school parking garage” across the street from a 30 billion dollar investment in transit was noted to be incongruous and potentially “a source of embarrassment”.

A Panel member commented that the “4 levels of parking above-grade is forlorn and forbidding.” The levels of above-grade parking were noted by several members as an indication of overdevelopment of the site. Another Panel member noted that setting a human scale and high quality public realm are goals for the project, “but having that many levels of parking prevents it from being credible right now.”

The city was urged to undertake a rapid response to this issue due to the danger of setting a precedent for other projects in the Centre.

Panel members advised the following:

1. **Provide below-grade parking instead:**
Several Panel members were not fully convinced, based on past extensive professional experience, that the parking was a technical issue, but rather a financial issue. Familiar with the need for ‘bathtub-ing’ the below-grade structure, they questioned the statement that it was technically impossible. They advised the proponent to relook at this issue.
2. **Reduce parking number requirements:**

   a. **By proposing less density:**
   Many Panel members noted that the parking requirement is related to the density proposed. Proposing less density should be looked at. A Panel member noted, “Building such a large parking deck - it starts to be overdevelopment of the site to carry the density you are looking for.”

   b. **By reducing the parking requirement:**
   Many Panel members also advised reducing the parking requirement. A Panel member commented, “It’s definitely the right place for density but also the right place for significant parking reduction. Wouldn’t it be sad if after building it, there is no longer a demand for parking – [there would be a] large unnecessary podium to the building.”

   - Another Panel member well versed in parking studies noted the estimated 0.8 parking ratio to be conservative and can potentially be reduced by the implementation of a TDM (Travel Data Management) and new mobility options. The site was noted to be in close proximity to the subway, Smart Track, Eglinton East LRT and the local bus network – a lowered ratio should be considered appropriate.

3. **Above-grade parking should be mitigated if permitted to proceed:**
If above-grade parking is permitted to proceed, its adverse impacts should be mitigated:
   a. **Line it with active uses:**
   Several Panel members advised lining the exterior of the parking garage with animated uses to make the above-grade density more valuable to the project, “In a centre like this, density should be useful. It would be much better if the parking garage is in the middle and wrapped by things that are useful to the livability of the community - residential components, jobs.”

   The proponent was advised to look at providing more employment uses which is also a target for provincial and municipal policies, “the more jobs you can put here the better.”

   b. **Mitigate with architectural treatment:**
   These areas need more architectural treatment and screening in addition to consideration for animated uses. A Panel member advised that the provision of midblock connections open to the sky and open space at-grade, will also help to articulate and reduce the impact of parking.
**Introduction**

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework, and the consultant provided design rationale. Questions of clarification were addressed by staff and the consultant. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following:

1. **Heritage and Views:** Does the proposed bridge design address heritage values and context; and views to and from Rosedale Valley?

2. **Other considerations:** Are there additional considerations that could enhance the relationship between the proposed bridge and the existing context (North and South Approaches)?

3. **Tunnel:** What design features could be utilized for the tunnel and its approaches to create a sense of space and a sense of place in relation to the bridge and surrounding area?

**Panel Comments**

**General**

Panel members were appreciative of this type of project which is of great importance to the city, and commended the calibre of the proposal and work to date, with a Panel member also noting the firm's excellent body of work on bridges.

Panel members were enthusiastic for the opportunities in the project to celebrate and amplify the value of green space in the city. A Panel member commented, "What a great project – The ravine is the official topographic feature of Toronto. [There is] an inversion of geography so that we have a place where that is evident."

The delicate palette, thoughtful detailing and "light and elegant" proposal were noted by several Panel members.

**EA Scope Additions**

Include the possibility of access down to Rosedale Valley and Don Valley Parks in the EA:

A Panel member advised including the concept of access down to the Rosedale Valley level in the EA (Environmental Assessment), which would also provide important access to the subway station.
from the lower level valley. Noting problems with getting down in to the valley generally in the city, "this is the one place you would be allowed to intercept the valley to do that."

While the EA may not preclude this access, based on forty years’ experience working on EAs, the Panel member advised that if the element is not included, the subsequent response later on is that the EA did not contemplate the element and therefore it can't be done, "rather than saying we didn't preclude it – can we at least say talked about it."

**Include the possibility for universal accessibility in the EA:**
Several Panel members recommended the provision for universal accessibility in the project. While acknowledging the challenges of implementing this within the project parameters, a Panel member advised studying and identifying the difficulties with cost and process, but to recognize it formally as a possibility in the EA in order to allow for this to be implemented in the future.

**Extent of public realm boundary:**
A Panel member advised that the project concept should extend to Howard St to the end of Glen Road. Due to this portion of Glen Road being underutilized there is opportunity to also look at a more pedestrian-priority design in this location.

The higher density projects previously brought to the Panel in the area also give more rationale to extend the concept of the bridge and tunnel improvements southward in support of those projects and areas south of Bloor St.

**Heritage and Views**
Many Panel members noted the "refreshing" and sensitive respect for heritage preservation and views evident in the project. They made the following recommendations:

**Continue approach to views:**
A Panel member noted that shifting the bridge and the attention to sight lines from Glen Road is positive and encouraged the team to continue studying views from the north and south approaches as the project progresses.

As noted in the public art comments below, several Panel members advised moving the plaque and planter out of the way from the access and view to the bridge.

**Consider a slimmer bridge structure as per the existing bridge:**
Some Panel members noted that the existing bridge is already quite elegant and beautiful, but the proposed seems a little thicker and heavier, “it somehow seems bigger”, than the existing structure from the renderings. For further design development, they encouraged the proponent to continue looking at ways to make the bridge as slender as the existing. A Panel member noted, “gothic architects had great ways of taking a thick piece of structure and thinning it to make you think that it was thin”. They made the following suggestions to consider:

1. **Colour:**
   From the rendering a panel member suggested reviewing the coloration of the bridge materials which may have something to do with a thicker impression of the structure.

2. **Refine Railing Curbs:**
   Several Panel members noted that these could be refined or thinned out so that "a very fine line represents the delicacy of the bridge".
c. **Use railings to thin out the deck profile:**
   A Panel member suggested looking at railing picket structure so that it overlaps on top of half of the thicker deck profile, in order to visually reduce the thickness of the deck as it spans across the valley.

d. **Consider a more narrow bridge if possible:**
   While acknowledging that the bridge is wider than the existing for multi-use and accessibility considerations, several Panel members advised further consideration, if possible, for a more narrow structure than the proposed bridge, for the following reasons:

   - Visual heaviness: A Panel member suggested that the widening of the bridge may have something to do with the bigger appearance of the proposed.

   - Greater interaction with the landscape: As part of its special character, the existing narrower bridge was observed to allow for greater engagement with both sides of the landscape beside you when walking on the bridge, versus on one side only.

   - Deterring biking speeds: A Panel member who is also an avid cyclist advised that the widening of the bridge would likely encourage cyclists to speed on the bridge. A narrower bridge may in fact encourage cyclists to dismount and not speed across. This was likened to vehicular collector roads that are wide and result in increased car speeds.

a. **Consider Railing colour:**
   **Study dark pickets:** A Panel member noted that the dark railing will blend into the landscape and be less visible. Several members suggested that the pickets should also be studied in a darker colour that may help to achieve a thin reading of the bridge.

   A Panel member, while supportive of reviewing darker pickets, also noted that the night time rendering shows that the lighter colour of pickets guides you along the bridge at night, and is a convincing image to support the proposed as is.

   **Study view from ravine in summer:** While easier to see in the winter than the summer, a Panel member advised testing it to see whether it blends into the surroundings.

**Character of the bridge terminations and context:**
A Panel member noted that the bridge appears to express the different demographics and economic systems on each side of the bridge, linking Rosedale to St James Town. With one side having “cruise ship” detailing with bronze, ipe handrails and LED lights, the other side is more ‘inner city’ – “a little more concrete and stuff painted on walls”. Several Panel members raised the following to look at as the project is refined:

- The question arises with the inclusion of the tunnel and south side system: “What is the appropriate characteristic? Is it one of consistency throughout or does it change?”
- With regard to the tunnel on the south side, its finishes, lighting, safety, visibility and art: “Where does it sit in relationship to the feel of the entire project?”

Another Panel member noted that there is an “interesting tension” on each side of the bridge and that it would be equally interesting to have different responses to both conditions.
Public visibility and presence
Panel members noted that the bridge is not visible from Bloor St and the project must choose whether to maintain it as a ‘hidden gem’ bridge versus making it more prominent and public. A Panel member summarized, “Do you want people to know it exists or do you want it to be that sleeping elegant bridge?”

While several members did not have a definitive recommendation, several other Panel members advised improving its public presence and made the following comments:

Bridge Presence on Bloor:
A Panel member advised that while appreciative of hidden gems, in this case for this extraordinary structure, “everyone should know about it to experience the wonderful infrastructure that’s there.”

Another Panel member suggested providing details and materials on Bloor St, such as in the railings, in keeping with the vocabulary of the bridge, to announce its presence in a stronger more public way. In reference to the photo of the existing Bloor St chain link fence, it was advised: “The bike tied up on the fence parapet – that should be part of the project.”

Tunnel Presence:
In addition to the bridge, a Panel member noted that having biked in the area for decades and aware of the bridge, the tunnel was previously unknown, “never knew you could cross the road at that location”, and advised caution with a ‘hidden gem’ concept.

The illumination and widening of the tunnel improvements were appreciated by Panel members. Further suggestions were made:

Consider revising the tunnel to be flush with the wall:
For refinement as the design progresses, a Panel member noted that the tunnel is proud of the wall, and advised making the tunnel coplanar with the concrete tube construction and “have it read as a liner rather than something inserted”.

Consider integrating tunnel and bridge lighting and railing:
With regard to the night time rendering, a Panel member suggested that the railing or just the railing lighting be revised to go into the tunnel, to avoid a jarring change in light —“so it looks like a single element and does not end in a blue LED lighting solution.”

Consider softer and indirect lighting in the tunnel ceiling:
A Panel member noted the positive work on shaping the tunnel and suggested that the ceiling could be softer and have more indirect lighting.

Public Art and cultural references
Several Panel members commented on the importance of public art not only in deterring graffiti but also to create ongoing narratives for this important public infrastructure. Suggestions were:
-a Toronto Murmur station which has sound installations – For example, this could have the sound of footsteps that refer to the compelling story on the existing plaque, of Morley Callaghan walking on the bridge with his wife and dog, and then the dog and then him alone. It would be more subtle than a planter and a plaque which should be moved as it blocks the entrance to the bridge.
-rotating artists at the two terminuses and tunnel to provide changing narratives for the project
-the use of illumination in conjunction with art was also suggested that could provide interesting opportunities

A Panel member suggested looking at ways to include cultural references, lettering or motifs in the bridge, such as on the concrete deck or railing curb.
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