



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #69
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
George Baird
Pat Hanson
Brigitte Shim
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Paul Bedford
Claude Cormier
Gerry Faubert
Don Schmitt
Jane Wolff
James Parakh

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
John Campbell

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Tracy Watt

WELCOME

Bruce Kuwabara opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, and provided an overview of the agenda.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair then asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the September 11th, 2013 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Chair then asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. No conflicts were declared.

The Chair then invited John Campbell to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT AND CEO

John Campbell provided an update on the Gardiner East Environmental Assessment (EA), reminding the Panel that Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto are working to determine the future of the easternmost section of the Gardiner Expressway. Mr. Campbell added that this is the section of the elevated highway that runs from Jarvis Street to east of the Don Valley

Parkway, running next to, or through the new waterfront communities that are under construction or being planned.

Mr. Campbell stated that this is a multi-year comprehensive environmental assessment (EA) and integrated urban design study which is examining the feasibility, impacts and costs of potential options for the elevated roadway including; Remove, Replace, Improve, or Maintain. Mr. Campbell noted that 10 years ago, this was a discussion, but now it is clear that something has to be done because of the current state of repair of the Gardiner. Mr. Campbell announced that the next public meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 15th, 2013.

Mr. Campbell then stated that Waterfront Toronto will be engaging in the discussion of expansion of the Island Airport, adding that a recommendation will be provided to the Board of Directors. Mr. Campbell stated that the question is not the use of jets, but the broader impact on waterfront revitalization.

One Panel member asked if jets would be discharging fuel. Mr. Campbell answered that he was not aware of this being standard practice, but would ask that this be considered as part of the study.

Another Panel member stated that they felt uncomfortable with the fact that Porter Airlines has been framing the discussion in terms of noise, adding that the issues are in fact much more broad. Mr. Campbell noted that noise is just one of the aspects that the City is reviewing, adding that they will likely meet the noise requirements. Mr. Campbell stated that the conversation isn't even about the current operator, Porter, adding that they could be sold to any airline tomorrow.

Another Panel member commented that time had changed the conversation on the future of the Gardiner. Mr. Campbell noted that the two sections that are in the worst shape are the Western and Eastern sections, adding that the City decided to rehabilitate the Western Section to allow time to study the future of the Eastern section. Mr. Glaisek added that currently the Remove option seems to be in the same order of magnitude as the Maintain option in terms of cost. Mr. Campbell added that this will allow the team to weigh the more qualitative aspects of the options.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Private Development Application: 10 York Street (120 Harbour)

ID#: 1048

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: 10 York Street

Proponent: Tridel/Build Toronto

Architect/Designer: Wallman Architects

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Five

Presenter(s): Rudy Wallman, Wallman Architects

Delegation: Steve Daniels, Tridel; Jitka Jarolimek, Provident Energy Management

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Sarah Henstock, Senior Planner with Community Planning introduced the project, providing an overview on the heights, pedestrian weather protection, setbacks, and streetscape, noting that the applicant has been working cooperatively with City Planning throughout the process.

1.2 Project Presentation

Rudy Wallman, Principal with Wallman Architects, provided an overview of the project, describing how the design had evolved to address Panel comments and concerns. Mr. Wallman presented a section of York Street showing how the designs of 10 and 1 York framed the street. Mr. Wallman stated that the graphic motif had been eliminated, and the corner had been resolved to provide continuous weather protection. Jitka Jarolimek, Sustainability Project Manager with Provident Energy Management, followed by stating that the project is on track to achieve LEED Gold, noting that the project is currently looking at being 41% more efficient than the Model National Energy Code. Ms. Jarolimek stated that there will be sub metering, .4 parking stalls per unit, and 1 bicycle parking space per unit.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked what the approach was to mitigating thermal bridging on the balconies. Ms. Jarolimek said that the balconies did not incorporate thermal breaks.

Another Panel member asked what was being done to mitigate solar impact on the south or west façades. Ms. Jarolimek replied that the glazing permits low heat gain on all the facades, noting that 50% of the facades are solid and 50% transparent.

Another Panel member asked how the intake and exhausts are integrated into the building façade. Mr. Wallman stated that they will be integrated near the underside of the balcony.

Another Panel member asked if the renderings were indicative of the colour palette. Mr. Wallman answered yes, adding that the precise colour, for example whether the fins are white or silver, are still being explored.

Another Panel member asked how this building's EUI compared with other buildings. Ms. Jarolimek replied that with residential buildings, the "worst case" must be modeled, and comparisons should only be made with other residential buildings.

One Panel member asked what Phase in the design review panel process the proponent was at. Mr. Glaisek answered that it was at the Design Development phase of review. Another Panel member asked if the Panel would get another opportunity to review the project. Mr. Glaisek answered that the team had met their obligations under the process agreed to by the Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto for private development applications. Steve Daniels, Development Manager with Tridel, stated that the team would be happy to come in again after their Notice of Approval Conditions (NOAC) had been received.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

The Panel commended the team for the thoughtful adjustments to the building since the last meeting, and for their overall response to the Design Review Panel process. Several Panel

members commented on the great model. Another Panel member thanked the team for the section through York Street between 1 and 10 York.

Another Panel member stated that the undercarriage of the loading and entry space had improved.

Another Panel member urged the team to continue to consider what it means to be a residential condominium when you have a commercial height lobby.

One Panel member stated that the highest investment in design and materials should be on the ground Plane.

One Panel member felt that the less window wall utilized the better, noting that curtain wall was superior to window wall.

Another Panel member noted that the energy performance on this building is better than standard, feeling that North America did not currently have a great standard. Another Panel member asked that Waterfront Toronto compile a comparative table for projects both with the Waterfront, Toronto, and International to allow the team to fairly compare to projects presented at the design review panel.

Another Panel member urged the team to focus on the details such as how “dingy exhausts” were being mitigated.

Another Panel member felt that the project had huge support from the Panel, but wanted to keep the pressure on the team to get something really great. The Panel member added that they did not want to hold up the municipal approvals process, but really wanted to be able to review the materiality and details for the project.

1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Great job. Its not easy. Thank you.
- The Panel would love the opportunity to review the details at the ground plane (1:50) and materials at a later date.

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Wallman, Ms. Jarolimek and Mr. Daniels 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 unanimously in Support of the project.

2.0 WDL Development: River City, Phase III

ID#: 1051

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: River City, Phase III

Proponent: Urban Capital

Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architectes

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two (Previously presented on July 9, 2008 as part of larger River City development presentation of all phases)

Presenter(s): Gilles Saucier, Saucier + Perrotte Architectes

Delegation: Peter Duckworth, ZAS Architects

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President of Planning and Design introduced the project. Mr. Glaisek stated that this site was approved for a 24 storey tower site in the West Don Lands Precinct Plan, noting that the proponents are currently proposing to go wider and taller.

2.2 Project Presentation

Gilles Saucier, Principal with Saucier + Perrotte Architectes, presented the project, reminding the Panel of the different phases of the overall development.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if the building as proposed is taller than the block plan. Mr. Saucier replied that the block plan proposed 24 stories and this is currently 30 stories plus penthouse.

Another Panel member asked how 30 stories was determined as the right height to ask for. Mr. Saucier stated that a redistribution of GFA from the podium was put into the height, adding that if they could go higher, they would.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member wondered if "erosion" was the right metaphor for the project, noting that it seems to be applying a formal logic that is out of sorts with how the actual articulation and materiality work together. The Panel member added that the project seemed a bit raw in terms the idea. Another Panel member felt that the conceptual idea was not as important if it is a good building.

Another Panel member felt that the SE corner of the tower seemed "boxy" when compared to the phase 1 building. Another Panel member agreed, feeling like the renderings seemed a bit misleading, making the tower to appear more slender than it is. Another Panel member felt that if the tower was a bit taller, the proportions would be helped.

Another Panel member felt that the podium should be higher. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that a higher podium would render it better volumetrically and have a better relationship to the overpass.

One Panel member felt that how you address "black" in different materials is important, adding that is building is a marker and has enormous visibility. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the minimalism of this project makes the precision of the material palette really crucial. Another Panel member agreed feeling that the articulation of the skin and material presentation of what is white and what is black is very important. Another Panel member stated that it currently seemed like 50% of the building was white and 50% was black, feeling that the design team should choose a bit more of one over the other. One Panel member felt that the "white cube" was an odd scaling devise.

Another Panel member expressed concern over the design of the project at ground level.

Another Panel member felt that wind studies should be completed to analyse the potential effects on the roof deck adjacent to the tower.

Another Panel member requested that context drawings that show the immediate buildings in the area, be shown at the next presentation.

2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Continuity of landscape-present that first, then how the building fits in.
- Ground plane - how that works from an urban design perspective.
- Tower- consider increasing the height for more lightness.
- Podium - needs more presence.
- Materiality-how you address "black" in different materials is important.
- Present Wind Studies and context drawings in the next presentation.

2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Saucier thanked the Panel for their feedback.

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 Conditional Support, allowing the project to progress to design development, but with a request that the proponent address the Panel's concerns.

CLOSING

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