



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #80
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
Paul Bedford
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Brigitte Shim
Don Schmitt
Jane Wolff
Gerry Faubert
George Baird

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
Harold Madi

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Halija Mazlomyar

WELCOME

Bruce Kuwabara opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, noting the full agenda. Mr. Kuwabara provided an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair stated that there were no minutes to adopt this month, noting that both March and April Minutes will be provided next month.

The Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Mr. Cormier and Ms. Hanson both stated that they had submitted unsuccessful proposals for the Aitken Place project. Mr. Glaisek stated that they did not have a “Material” Conflict of Interest, and could therefore participate in the review. Mr. Cormier also noted that he was proponent for the Daniels project and would not participate in that review.

The Chair then invited John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto’s President and CEO, and Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto’s Vice President of Planning and Design, to provide their reports.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT AND CEO

John Campbell reminded the Panel that “Waterfront 1.0”, the first \$1.5 Billion contribution from the Federal, Provincial and Municipal governments, will be fulfilled by 2023. Mr. Campbell stated that Waterfront Toronto is working with all three levels of government on “Waterfront 2.0”, to secure funding towards the next phase of development which includes flood protection and the Light Rail Transit Program.

Mr. Campbell then stated that he will be continuing in his role as President and CEO until September 2015, noting that there is currently a CEO search underway.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

Queens Quay Revitalization

- Queens Quay is progressing well and will be formally opened on June 19th.

BBTCA Runway & Jets Environmental Assessment (EA)

- The final draft EA Study Design/Scope, developed during Part One of the EA process, will be posted for a 30 day public comment period on April 20th, 2015. It describes the list of effects that will be studied through the EA and the methodologies that will be used to study these effects.
- Waterfront Toronto is part of the “Agency Advisory Committee” that has helped to ensure that impacts on the entire waterfront, including the Portlands are considered in this study.

Gardiner Expressway East EA

- The results of the evaluation of the “Remove” and “Hybrid” alternatives show that both are viable alternatives with respective advantages and disadvantages. The evaluation, and the supporting facts, will provide the foundation for a City Staff Report for Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) on May 13th, 2015 and Council consideration.

Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and Harbour Square Park Design Competition

- The Jury met on March 31st and April 1st, 2015 and selected a winning team.
- The Jury’s recommendation will be publically announced on Friday, April 10th, and will be presented to the Waterfront Toronto Board of Directors on May 4th, 2015.

The Chair then asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Bedford stated that the Waterfront Town Hall event held on April 1st, 2015 at the Toronto Reference Library was very successful, adding that he had never been more proud to be part of this Panel and this organization. He then thanked John Campbell for laying out waterfront revitalization in an easy way to understand. Mr. Madi stated that this was going to be a milestone year for the waterfront.

The Chair then stated that he and other current and past Panel members would be participating in the *Leading With Landscape* conference hosted by The Cultural Landscape Foundation May 21st-24th, 2014, noting that he never imagined that the city would be emerging and developing like this. The Chair added that when you have a major growth spurt, urban design is even more important.

The Chair then moved to the project reviews

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 EBF Development: Bayside R3/R4 (Aquavista)

ID#: 1054

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: East of Merchants Wharf, South of Edgewater Drive

Proponent: Hines/Tridel

Architect/Designer: Arquitectonica

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Sam Luckino, Arquitectonica; Jitka Jarolimek, Provident Energy Management

Delegation: Bruno Giancola, Deltera; Salvatore Cavarretta, Tridel

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design at Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project reminding the Panel that the project had been previously reviewed in March 2014 and July 2014, with a vote of Support. Mr. Glaisek noted that the design has since been tweaked to respond not only to Panel comments, but also the community. Mr. Glaisek stated that the community was now supportive of the design.

1.2 Project Presentation

Sam Luckino, Vice President, and New York Office Director at Arquitectonica introduced the project. Mr. Luckino then described the evolution of the major features of the scheme including the curved façade at grade and the Artscape art wall. Jitka Jarolimek, Project Manager with Provident Energy Management reviewed the Mandatory Green Building Requirements noting that the team is targeting LEED Platinum for the Condominium and LEED Gold for the affordable rental units. Ms. Jarolimek noted that photovoltaic panels will offset 1% of annual energy consumption for Aquavista.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member wondered what some of the concerns from the community were. Mr. Luckino stated that some community members felt it did not look urban enough or was too “Miami” resort in style.

Another Panel member asked what the relationship was of vision glass to solid walls was. Ms. Jarolimek stated that it was approximately 40% vision to 60% solid.

Another Panel member wondered what the ground floor height was where the pool was located above. Mr. Luckino stated that where the pool is the ceiling height is 5m, adding that it is higher (6.4m) for the rest of the ground floor.

Another Panel member asked if anyone had brought up the idea of continuous weather protection to the team. Mr. Luckino stated that it had not yet come up.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members stated that there was a greater clarity with the massing now that the “Dog Leg” was gone.

One Panel member stated that they liked the views provided by the balconies and their sculptural qualities. Another Panel member felt that Toronto needed a little more “Miami”, adding that this building speaks to this place but brings something else and has a unique identity that is needed on the waterfront.

Another Panel member stated that the transition between the podium and the tower seemed stark. Another Panel member felt that the exuberance of the building needed to come right down to the ground floor, adding that currently it felt a bit timid.

One Panel member felt that the retail entrances seemed a bit flat, adding that perhaps a protected element would help. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the edge of the façade at the ground floor could be brought in and the canopy more exaggerated. Another Panel member felt that bringing the curved glass down to the ground floor was a huge improvement adding that weather protection should feel more part of the building.

Another Panel member stated their appreciation of the study of the signage and window wall, noting that the design of the south facade is a difficult design challenge.

One Panel member stated that the Endicot brick is used everywhere in the City, feeling that this choice will date this building as part of the last 10 years of development in the city. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the City is in the “black brick” age.

Another Panel member felt that having a true infinity pool would make this project fantastic, feeling that the view should be unobstructed and fuse the pool and the lake.

One Panel member felt that the Artscape artwall was very innovative, stating that money should be spent on low-iron, structural glass. The Panel member added that they were not sure if anyone would want to hang an artwork behind a mullion and money should be spent to ensure that this is a great space for displaying art.

1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Push the design of the south façade of the podium further
- Ensure that the Artscape “Artwall” is a great space for displaying art

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Luckino and Ms. Jarolimek thanked the Panel for their comments.

1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Support of the project.

2.0 Aitken Place Park

ID#: 1060

Project Type: Park/Public Realm

Location: East of Aquavista between Edgewater Drive and Merchants Wharf

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Tom Balsley

Review Stage: One

Review Round: Concept Design

Presenter(s): Scott Torrence; Scott Torrence Landscape Architect, Tom Balsley

Delegation:

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Andrew Tenyenhuis, Planning and Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project and design team. Mr. Tenyenhuis stated that Aitken Place Park is the next step in the creation of public realm project in the East Bayfront Precinct, adding that it is envisioned to be a neighbourhood park; a place to encourage social interaction. Mr. Tenyenhuis added that the park will mainly serve the residents and businesses of the precinct, but will also be something waterfront visitors discover while walking the Water's Edge Promenade. Mr. Tenyenhuis stated that they are targeting a Spring 2016 construction start.

2.2 Project Presentation

Scott Torrance, Principal with Scott Torrance Landscape Architects, introduced the team and provided an overview of the site context, circulation patterns and climatic studies. Tom Balsley, Principal with Thomas Balsley Associates then presented scale comparisons and an overview of preliminary programming, program precedents and the resulting concept plan.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked how the size of the dog run was determined. Mr. Balsey stated that the dog run is not just a place for dogs to do their business, but also a place for people to make connections, noting that the more compressed a dog run is, the more chances there are for social interaction and accountability for keeping the space clean.

Another Panel member asked if the wind studies assumed full build out of the surrounding buildings. Mr. Balsley stated that yes, the results did assume the buildings were there, adding that the primary winds come from the West and North-West.

Another Panel member asked if the water element was intended to be operated all year round. Mr. Torrance answered that it would not be.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member stated their appreciation of the approach to designing the park to serve the residents that surround it, adding that the dog run was the most critical element. Another Panel member felt that this park would be a "sweet spot" on the waterfront, and was looking forward to seeing how the project evolved over time.

Another Panel member commended the team for their micro climate analysis, noting the importance of this in their design response. Another Panel member felt that standing at the waterfront is not very comfortable many times of the year, feeling that the micro climate elements should be tweaked to provide as much protection as possible in the cold months.

Another Panel member felt that the formal move of the sloped trail and water feature was successful. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the big move of the slope provides shelter from the North West. Other Panel members agreed that the slope was a strong move.

One Panel member noted that one can view the water from any location in the park, adding that you would not want to place the pavilion at the south end of the park to block the views. The Panel member felt that having a “front porch” was better at the south end of the park. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that there could be a real density of trees in the seating area in the south instead of a pavilion. Another Panel member felt that the money budgeted for the park pavilion should be reallocated towards investing in the topography and planting, adding that the money could be spent on providing shelter from wind instead of shelter from sun. One Panel member wondered if the Pavilion could be seasonal or temporary. Another Panel member felt that without something vertical like a pavilion, it doesn’t show the slope or create a focal point in the park.

Another Panel member felt that the language of the park could be edited to emphasize the “soul” of the park, challenging the proponents to consider what the “big idea” was behind the park. One Panel member felt the proposal seemed to be more of a collage of precedent program. The Panel member stated that they were not sure what the character, identity or personality of the park currently was. One Panel member felt that the topography was the “big idea”. Another Panel member cited the wall in Tear Drop Park in New York City as an example of a feature that really elevates or created a “soul” in a park.

Another Panel member felt that this park did not have to be a regional draw, noting that this waterfront park is a much needed amenity on the waterfront.

One Panel member wondered if there was a role for public art here, noting the art piece “The Vessel” in Taddle Creek Park that is both art and a water play structure. The Panel member cited Sugar Beach and the Village of Yorkville Park, where the Pink umbrellas and big rock make the identities.

Another Panel member felt that this park should appeal to park users of all ages.

Another Panel member stated their concern with all of the retaining walls around the planting, feeling that it gave it a very “engineered” quality, and wondered if it could somehow be “deconstructed”.

2.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Maximize the comfort level in the cooler seasons
- Study the use or quantity of engineered concrete retaining walls
- What is the “Big Idea” of the park?

2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Torrance and Mr. Balsley thanked the Panel for their comments.

2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Support of the project.

3.0 Private Development Proposal: 143 Queens Quay and 130-132 Lakeshore

ID#: 1055

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: East of Jarvis to Bonnycastle from Lake Shore Boulevard to Queens' Quay

Proponent: The Daniels Corporation

Architect/Designer: Greenberg Associates; Giannone Petricone Associates, RAW Design and; Claude Cormier Associes

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: two

Presenter(s): Ken Greenberg, Claude Cormier, Pina Petricone, Roland Rom Colthoff

Delegation: Tom Dutton, Daniels; Neil Pattison, Daniels

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design at Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, noting that this is a mixed-use development proposal for privately owned lands within the East Bayfront. Mr. Glaisek reminded the Panel that the current massing has been arrived at as a result of an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Settlement process. Mr. Glaisek noted that as private landowner, the development is not subject to Waterfront Toronto's Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR), but will be subject to the Toronto Green Standards (TGS).

3.2 Project Presentation

Ken Greenberg, Principal with Greenberg Consultants Inc., introduced the team and the context of the project. Mr. Greenberg then reviewed the Panel comments from September 2014, noting that they had distilled these into four key elements; Sugar Beach North, pedestrian comfort, Continuity of public realm and diversity in architecture, and sustainability strategy and energy performance. Cormier, Principal with Claude Cormier + Associés, then presented the public realm, including Sugar Beach north and "the yard". Pina Petricone, Principal with Giannone Petricone Associates then presented the North Block, noting the canopy that has evolved and become an important architectural element. Roland Rom Colthoff, Principal with RAW Design then presented the South Block noting its various tenants and users, and the unique expressions on the façade of those tenants.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there was a difference in cost per square foot between the north and south buildings. Neil Pattison, Director of Development at The Daniels Corporation responded that the base building costs are similar between north and south buildings.

Another Panel member wondered if the North elevation of the North building would change if the Gardiner Expressway were to come down. Ms. Petricone answered that the moves and materials were designed as if the Gardiner Expressway were not there, so it would not change.

Another Panel member wondered if the canopy was intended to be transparent. Ms. Petricone answered that the canopy was transparent, adding that is sloped and structured.

One Panel member wondered if the large canopy overlapped the canopy running along the South building. Ms. Petricone answered that the two canopies do overlap, noting that the larger canopy

works at the urban scale and is at a 7m datum that includes the lights in the yard. Ms. Petricone added that the secondary canopy works more at the pedestrian scale, and is at a 5m datum.

Another Panel member wondered if the large canopy was structurally independent from the South building. Ms. Petricone replied that it is connected to the North building, but not attached to the South building.

Another Panel member wondered what the canopy was mitigating. Ms. Petricone answered that it was designed to mitigate wind washing down the South-West corner of the North block, adding that the canopy, combined with the large post will solve the wind issues so that you can sit comfortably.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members commended the team for the great work shown and response to Panel comments. One Panel member felt that this will be a fantastic piece of the City, adding that the day/night time use is incredible.

Another Panel member stated that there is a design team and developer that could make this an exceptional project.

One Panel member loved the idea of “the Yard”, urging the team to ensure that it was a comfortable space all year round.

One Panel member stated their support for the “frame” and use of materials.

Another Panel member felt that the Richardson elevation was less successful, feeling that there could be a more visible, stronger identity.

One Panel member felt that the moiré pattern frit on the glazing of the North Building was great, adding that it was important that the glazing on the balconies overlap the edges of concrete balcony.

Another Panel member felt that the canopy had helped the project as a unifying element. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the project needed the canopy to get face time on Jarvis and Queens Quay. Several Panel members were concerned about the size of the column holding up the large canopy. One Panel member cited the canopies of Goldman Sachs or the Lincoln Center in New York City as examples of great canopy precedents.

One Panel member felt that the proportions of the lower podium of the North building was not quite right.

Several Panel members felt that the brick on the North building felt like a foreign element, noting that it looked like brick spandrel panel.

Another Panel member felt that the bike ramp was successful.

One Panel member felt that the strongest part of the North building were the towers, feeling that the faceted sections facing “the yard” were great.

One Panel member felt that the South building was barely a brick building, noting that it was almost a glass building with brick. The Panel member felt that the solidity needed to be pushed further.

Another Panel member did not feel that the fibre cement cladding proposed on the South building was fitting, feeling that the screwed-on material was out of place on an otherwise solid building.

Another Panel member stated that they would like to see more about the “storefront” when or if the project comes back.

Another Panel member felt that the Artscape piece was reading as neither brick nor void, wondering if it was the meat in the sandwich or the void that separates the brick warehouse volume. The Panel member felt that the Artscape piece could be more interesting than it is. Another Panel member felt that the floor-to-floor height should not be that of standard office space.

One Panel member wondered what happens when the umbrellas meet pavers, noting that it is a different condition than the sand. Another Panel member wondered if the umbrellas could turn into something that has program. Another Panel member wondered if there was an alternative to the pink umbrellas that could still maintain a connection to Sugar Beach south.

Another Panel member felt that beach chairs might not be the right element here, feeling that they might be more inclined to sit on the steps than the chairs.

3.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Refine the main entrance canopy and the possibility of removing the large column
- Review the Lakeshore elevations including the use of masonry
- Create a clear and distinct identity for Artscape
- Review the figuration and design of the canopies and diagonal gestural elements of the South building podium
- Review of alternatives to the pink umbrellas in the new public space while still using the colour pink to create continuity with Sugar Beach.

3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Greenberg, Mr. Cormier, Ms. Petricone and Mr. Colthoff thanked the Panel for their comments.

3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.

CLOSING

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