



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #75
Wednesday, September 17th, 2014**

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
Paul Bedford, Acting Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Gerry Faubert
Pat Hanson
Betsy Williamson
Jane Wolff

Regrets:

Brigitte Shim
Don Schmitt

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Halija Mazlomyar

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
Harold Madi

WELCOME

Bruce Kuwabara opened the meeting by welcoming everyone back from the summer break. Mr. Kuwabara provided an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair and asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the July 2014 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare. Claude Cormier stated that he was on the Daniels team presenting today. Mr. Kuwabara also declared a conflict of interest, noting that his firm is working on other projects with Daniels adding that he is also an ambassador for Artscape. Mr. Kuwabara invited Mr. Bedford to act as Chair during the proponent presentations.

The Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President of Planning and Design, to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

Villiers Island Precinct Plan

- The precinct plan is progressing with features that include a “green ribbon” that follows the river, a proposed catalytic use site, and the preservation of historic structures.
- The next phase is work on the building massing and heights.
- Will come back to the public and the panel.

Ontario Place Revitalization

- On July 31, 2014 the Government of Ontario announced their long-term vision to revitalize Ontario Place into a vibrant waterfront destination.
- The plan does not include residential, which from a Waterfront Toronto perspective is positive.
- Waterfront Toronto continues to work with the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport and Infrastructure Ontario to deliver the Park and Trail project which will be coming back to Design Review on October 8th, 2014.

Queens’ Quay Revitalization

- The installation of Silva Cells and granite paving is progressing well.
- The road should re-open in a month, with the street car coming back October 12th.
- The project will be substantially complete for Pan Am.

The Acting Chair then moved to the project reviews.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 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: Daniels Corp

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

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: one

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

Delegation: Tom Dutton, Daniels; Neil Pattison, Daniels

1.1 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 stated that the current design solution has been arrived at as a result of an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Settlement process, adding that it has involved give and take

on everyone's part - including the City, WT and the owners. Mr. Glaisek noted that this agreement has been negotiated without having to go to the OMB and provides a known outcome. Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto is asking the Panel to comment within the parameters of what has been agreed to through the settlement process.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ken Greenberg, Principal, Greenberg Consultants Inc., introduced the project within the context of the East Bayfront Precinct Plan stating that the East Bayfront Precinct Plan has been exceeded by the diversity of users and tenants that have moved here. Mr. Greenberg outlined the major site moves including the extension of Canada's Sugar Beach across Queens' Quay, and the extension of the public space into the internal "Yard". Claude Cormier, Principal, Claude Cormier + Associés, then presented the public realm, including public art locations. Pina Petricone, Principal, Giannone Petricone Associates then presented the North Block, noting the four faces the building in response to its context including the expressway and the local neighbourhood. Roland Rom Colthoff, Principal, RAW Design then presented the South Block noting its various tenants and users, and the unique expressions on the façade of those tenants. Mr. Colthoff added that they are targeting LEED Gold for the office component of the building.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there were any wind or shadow studies complete at this time. Mr. Greenberg stated that they are currently being developed, adding that as those come in, any adjustments to the design needed will be made. Mr. Cormier noted that micro climate and physical comfort are important, adding that they are trying to reduce the impact of the scale of the buildings on the public space.

Another Panel member asked for more description of the skin on the residential towers. Ms. Petricone explained that the frit pattern is on the outer shells of the towers, noting that one pattern does not interfere with the reading of the other and there is no frit on the inside face.

Another Panel member asked if the massing had been developed in conjunction with the architects or if the settlement massing come first. Ms. Petricone stated that the process by which the massing was developed involved iterative tests between the City, Developer, Architect and Waterfront Toronto, noting that the starting point were the East Bayfront Urban Design Guidelines.

Another Panel member asked who the sustainability consultants were. Ms. Petricone stated that it was Smith and Andersen with Novus Environmental for wind, noise and air quality. Ms. Petricone added that they are submitting their applications under the City of Toronto Tier 1 for the North Block and Tier 2 for the South Block.

One Panel member asked if there had been any discussions had on sharing the energy day and night between the users. Tom Dutton, Senior Vice President at The Daniels Corporation answered that it was not their intention to share residential and commercial mechanical, citing issues with metering in previous projects. Mr. Dutton added that the south side offices will be combined as much as possible.

One Panel member asked if the team had considered different responses to the Gardiner Expressway, asking if it were to be taken down, would the response still be the same. Ms.

Petricone stated that they had studied the elevation with and without the Gardiner, noting that the north elevation would still be facing an expressway of sorts and their response would still be the same – less filigree and more robust scale. Another Panel member asked where the large bicycle ramp leads to. Ms. Petricone answered that it leads to a large bicycle storage area.

Another Panel asked if affordable housing was part of the residential development. Ms. Petricone stated that it was not at the present time. Neil Pattison, Development Manager with Daniels, stated that as part of the settlement process, there are explorations including the provision of funds to be paid to provide affordable rental housing elsewhere.

One Panel member asked for a description of the institutional tenant. Mr. Colthoff stated that the nature of the institution would be creative arts, digital media, and arts accelerator. Another Panel member asked how the students access the space. Mr. Colthoff stated that access would be through “the yard”, adding that there are two banks of elevators as well as ceremonial stairs.

Another Panel asked what the plans were to keep “the yard” animated in the winter. Mr. Greenberg stated that the aperture to the yard had been narrowed, combined with the lighting and the retail activities should make it a more comfortable space.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members commended the team on the overall calibre of the project and the complexity of the programs. One Panel member stated that this will be a huge contribution to the city. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that “shoehorning” this much program onto this site is quite a challenge.

One Panel member stated their support for the extension of the diagonal line from Canada’s Sugar Beach, noting that pedestrians crossing Queens’ Quay will actually be using the crossing at Jarvis. Another Panel member wondered if the planting that follows the extension of that alignment could be shifted over to define Jarvis Street. Another Panel member felt that the corner of Jarvis and Queens Quay will be defined with the public art.

Several Panel members felt the use of colour was appropriate. Another Panel member wondered why colours were always used to denote creative or artistic uses, feeling that the existing material palette could be pushed further without the use of the colours.

Several Panel members stated that it was important that microclimatic studies come back at the next presentation. One Panel member stated that they would like to see the overall sustainability strategy at the next meeting including further information on the envelope and energy performance.

Several Panel members stated that the project needs to come together as a strong building during the next phase of design, feeling that every elevation is eclectic, and the materials seems to have the same weight. Another Panel member was not convinced that everything needs to be a different colour to give it expression.

Another Panel member felt that the materials needed to be edited and the material qualities maximized. One Panel member felt that the frit pattern was quite ethereal, but felt that overall the cladding could be more rigorous with such a radical project and program. Another Panel member felt that the delineation of the slab should be removed as a design motif, adding that the

“digital ripple” was compelling. Another Panel member felt that the corner of the south block was articulated nicely including the bending of the slab, feeling that the North Block was harder to read.

One Panel member warned the proponents that providing a large amount of west facing glazing in a studio environment will result in the artists providing their own light control.

Another Panel member stated that the carving of the open space on the ground plane was good, feeling that the inflection of the yard, and tightening at the ends gives it a sense of place. Another Panel member felt that further study of the ground floor glazing could help in making “the yard” as comfortable and as dynamic as possible. Another Panel member felt that three steps might not be enough to invite people to sit and congregate.

One Panel member stated that unit break downs should be presented at the next meeting.

Another Panel member urged the team to consider the flexibility of the uses overtime, potentially allowing tenants to grow or expand in the space.

1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Study and provide more detail on Sugar Beach “north”.
- Study that the microclimate of “the yard” and ground plane treatment ensure pedestrian comfort.
- Refine the material palette through “Radical rigour”
- Study how such an eclectic program can be expressed in one building or family of architecture without being monolithic
- Present the overall sustainability strategy at the next meeting including further information on the envelope and energy performance

1.6 Proponents Response

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

1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting 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.
