



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #113
Wednesday, July 25, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Peter Busby
Claude Cormier

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto Board
of Directors

WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda, which included reviews of:

1. Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges – Schematic Design
 2. West Don Lands Block 8 – Issues Identification
 3. George Brown College: The Arbour – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the June 20, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared that Urban Strategies has a conflict for the West Don Lands Block 8 project and recused himself for that review.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that the second Port Lands Flood Protection Public Consultation was held on July 18, 2018 with over 250 attendees. The team sought public input on the detailed design of the river and natural green spaces, roads and bridges.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on projects that were presented at the June meeting, including West Don Lands Block 12 which is scheduled to start construction in October 2018 and is seeking Site Plan Approval in December 2018. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Quayside project will be signing the PDA at the end of July and the project will return to DRP in September with more details.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Bridges – Schematic Design

Project Type: Structure

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Entuitive with Grimshaw and Schlaich Bergermann Partner

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: three

Presenter(s): Michael Meschino, Entuitive; David Dennis, Grimshaw; Michael Stein, Schlaich Bergermann Partner

Delegation: Simon Karam, Waterfront Toronto

ID#: 1096

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the project's third time presenting to the Panel and they will be presenting Schematic Design. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the Port Lands Flood Protection project consists of four buckets of work, including earthworks and flood protection, parks, bridges and structures, and roads and municipal infrastructure. Ms. Mallozzi provided a recap on feedback received from the last meeting, including focus on bringing rigour to the patterning, views, and experience of the landscape and river, concern over the bridges feeling more closed than open, bring colour options to the next review, consider how the catenary infrastructure will affect the appearance of the bridges, and think about incorporating asymmetry into the design. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the team is seeking feedback on the patterning and views, the relationship of the user on the bridge to the surrounding landscape, the attempt to create openness, the treatment of catenary infrastructure, and the initial thinking on the lighting strategy. Ms. Mallozzi then introduced Michael Meschino with Entuitive, David Dennis with Grimshaw and Michael Stein with Schlaich Bergermann Partner, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Dennis began by noting that the team focused on refining the main bridge shell to more structurally efficient, making the bridge structure as transparent as possible, opening up the views and further enhancing the connections between the river, the park and the bridges, and studying how to best integrate the bridge furniture and utilities such as lighting and crash barriers into the overall design.

Mr. Stein explained that they wanted to keep the intriguing shell structure but removed the shell wherever possible. The team reduced the overall shell area by 30% which necessitated strengthening the edges. Mr Stein explained that the plates are now folded inside to introduce some stiffness into the structure.

Mr. Dennis walked the Panel through the three bridges starting with Cherry north. Mr. Dennis noted that this bridge has two independent single span bridges, one for vehicular traffic and one for the future LRT. Mr. Dennis noted that Cherry south is three spans with only two lanes of traffic. The Martin Goodman Trail is located on the inside of the main structure with separation from the road. The two bridges are slightly offset in plan creating an interesting asymmetry. The Commissioners bridge has a uni-directional bike path that sits on the outside of the structure. The circular support piers sit within the landscape. The lighting strategy consists of up lighting the shell and running a continuous light along the edge.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether the splay on the Commissioners bridge has to do with the hydro infrastructure. Mr. Glaisek replied yes. The Panel member also noted that the positioning of the bike paths moves around on all of the bridges and asked for a rationale for this. Ms. Mallozzi replied that the Cherry Street bridge has the bi-directional bike lanes and Commissioners Street bridge has uni-directional bike lanes and they are all based on where the bike paths are located. The Panel member asked whether the turning lane in the middle of Cherry street is a continuous turning lane. Mr. Dennis replied that it is a median with occasional cuts. The Panel member also asked about the three alternative designs for the balustrades and what form of protection the third option provides. Mr. Dennis replied that there would be very fine horizontal cables.

Another Panel member noted that when the roads team presented their design in April, the team was encouraged to look at where bikes are likely to travel. Ms Mallozzi replied that extensive work has been done in order to plan for bikes.

One Panel member asked how to get from the level of the roadway and bridge down to the water. Mr. Dennis replied that there are locations where the bike lanes go down to the water and there are also pedestrian paths. Mr. Dennis added that there is flexibility in how these locations are treated in terms of pedestrians and cyclists.

Another Panel member asked if any more thought has been put into what colour the bridges will be. Mr. Dennis replied that there are many opinions amongst the design team and no consensus yet. Mr. Dennis noted that they would like the accentuate the

definition on the folds in the bridge using paint. The Panel member asked if all three bridges would be differentiated through paint colours. Mr. Dennis replied that they see all three bridges being relatively neutral. The Panel member asked if there is an opportunity to shape the piers under the bridge. Mr. Stein replied that the piers are driven by conveyance of water flow and minimizing the size of the structure is necessary which is why the columns are cylindrical.

One Panel member asked if the structure itself is sheet steel and whether it is welded and seamless. Mr. Stein replied that it is typically prefabricated and welded.

Another Panel member asked when there will be an opportunity to discuss the landscape treatment. Mr. Dennis replied that the team is starting to focus on that right now. Mr. Dennis added that the treatment of the abutments is important along with public access and how people will move through the space.

One Panel member asked what the design of the underside of the bridge will consist of. Mr. Dennis replied that it is being shown as an expressed structure of the bridge.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the consistency of the family of bridges works well. The Panel member also liked the round piers on the Commissioners Street bridge. The Panel member felt that the balustrades look too conventional and suggested coming up with a solution that maintains transparency. The Panel member also suggested not creating a connection down to the river between the two bridges as it would muddy the image too much.

Another Panel member liked that idea of the folded plate structure being painted to differentiate the inside from the outside. The Panel member felt that the tensile fins needed more resolution. The Panel member felt that the lighting from below was great.

One Panel member felt that the composition of the curve of the main part of the bridge and the vertical element of the fins and the balustrades are not working together – not transparent. The Panel member suggested minimizing the vertical elements to make experience of moving through the bridge feel more temporal and so that the beautiful line of the arch is telegraphed. The Panel member suggested increasing the transparency of the balustrade by using a glass railing. The Panel member recommended avoiding expressing the underside of the bridge as it will likely get dirty.

Another Panel member asked for consideration to be given to the landscape, especially the treatment of the abutments. The Panel member also noted that the up lighting might conflict with the bird-friendly guidelines and suggested minimizing or dimming the light at certain times of the night.

One Panel member liked the idea of the family of bridges noting that it gives the island an identity. The Panel member asked the team to consider tilting the fins to create a better experience of being on the streetcar. The Panel member suggested working with

the columns to create micro habitats. The Panel member also thought it might be interesting for the bridges to be didactic and give the community an opportunity to understand what is happening with the landscape below.

Another Panel member felt that the structure was very elegant. The Panel member felt that developing the lighting strategy and use of colour will result in a very interesting bridge design. The Panel member noted that the way the underside of the bridge meets the columns is awkward and some sort of language to make the transition smoother was recommended.

One Panel member felt that the railing treatment still needs some refinement. The Panel member was concerned about the up lighting with regards to light pollution. The Panel member was also interested in understanding how this bridge will weather overtime.

Another Panel member felt that the role of the fins needs to be modulated as they currently lack dynamism. The Panel member noted that MVVA needs to sort out how pedestrians move through the system and how people will get to the lower level.

One Panel member asked the team to bring a comprehensive list of infrastructure pieces that will go on the bridge and integrate the furniture in the same way that the benches are furniture. The Panel member cautioned the team about upkeep of the colour of the bridge noting that maintenance often falls short.

1.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

- Overall the Panel felt that this project is on the right track
- The design of the balustrades requires further refinement to maximize transparency while maintaining cohesiveness with the rest of the bridge design.
- Ensure that safety concerns are addressed, specifically with kids climbing on the arches.
- The design of the fins requires further thinking. They should be less prominent.
- Ensure that there are adequate ways of getting down to the river from the bridge level.
- Provide further detail on how the landscape relates to the bridges.
- Refine the piers and the treatment of the visible underside of the bridge.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-Support for the project. The Panel voted in Full Support of the project.

2.0 West Don Lands Block 8

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Kilmer, Dream, Tricon

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance, COBE Architects

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Will Lambeth, COBE

Delegation: Tony Medeiros, Dream

ID#: 1101

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Dream, Kilmer and Tricon were the successful proponents of Infrastructure Ontario's RFP for Blocks 8, 20, 3W, 4W and 7W in the West Don Lands. This project is part of the Province's Affordable Housing program as well as the City's Open Doors program. Mr. Loudon noted that Block 8 is proposed as a purpose-built rental building with ancillary retail at-grade with 30% affordable rental housing units. Mr. Loudon noted that this is the team's first time presenting to the Panel for Issues Identification and they are seeking feedback on the approach to the ground floor animation in relation to Tank House Lane, the relationship of development to the Distillery District and Canary District, and the relationship to Cherry Street. Mr. Loudon then introduced Adam Feldmann, Associate with architectsAlliance to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by noting that the team will specifically be focusing on Block 8 for this review. The project consists of 750 units with approximately 225 affordable units. The site was previously used as the bus parking lot for the Pan American Games and is well serviced by transit. Mr. Feldmann then introduced Will Lambeth with COBE Architects to explain the site opportunities.

Mr. Lambeth walked the Panel through some of their initial observations and reflections. Mr. Lambeth pointed out some of the iconic landmarks in the Corktown neighbourhood and the Distillery District noting that they will be taking inspiration from the old and new. Mr. Lambeth noted that its important to create a new urban space that complements what's already there. The program distribution will consist of residential along Mill Street and retail along the south side.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there are streets planned to come through the site. Mr. Feldmann replied that both streets will be private adding that there are no public streets running through the site. Mr. Feldmann noted that they are trying to centralize the loading on the east side of the site to free up space on the other two private roads.

Another Panel member asked what is planned for the site to the south. Mr. Feldmann replied that the site is zoned for commercial use and parking. The Panel member asked what the protocol is for walking across the streetcar tracks on Cherry Street from Tank House Lane. Mr. Feldmann replied that there is no restriction and people just walk across.

One Panel member noted that amenities such as a grocery store are lacking from the area and asked whether they are considering this type of retail. Mr. Feldmann replied that supermarket chains don't feel that there is enough demand in the area to justify a grocery store.

Another Panel member asked what "other" referred to in the legend in terms of program distribution. Mr. Feldmann replied that they are trying to find ways to animate the ground floor and they are looking at the possibility of amenity space and live work space.

One Panel member asked whether they have a retail consultant on the team. Mr. Feldmann replied yes, however they have not had any involvement in the project yet.

Another Panel member asked whether there is a provision for day care. Mr. Feldmann replied that they weren't aware of any.

One Panel member asked whether the unit mix is fixed. Mr. Feldmann replied yes.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that retail is a huge challenge in this area adding that the Distillery District is more of a themed shopping district, not neighbourhood retail. Trying to extend the spine of Tank House Lane to the east would be a mistake. The Panel member felt that beyond Front Street, the only conceivable retail location would be on Cherry Street near the loop or having no retail at all.

Another Panel member felt that getting rid of the retail could create an intimate scale.

One Panel member felt that there is an opportunity to develop an innovative residential typology that harnesses the spirit and intimacy of the Distillery District. The Panel member suggested using the POPS area for secondary live-work, courtyards, and gardens.

Another Panel member felt that the fine-grained reflection of Mill Street should be for principally active living. The Panel member noted that while this is a south facing space, it's still an internally facing block and felt that the space has to be courtyards, garden spaces.

One Panel member asked whether the Cherry Street loop is going to disappear in the future. Mr. Glaisek replied that once Cherry Street is realigned the streetcar will extend into the Port Lands, but the loop will likely remain. The Panel member was appreciative of the study that was undertaken especially regarding the idiosyncratic spaces. The Panel member was hoping to hear more about how this translates into something meaningful for the site.

Another Panel member noted that the formula for retail is simple – intimate and narrower spaces. The Panel member liked the idea of concentrating the loading to one area. The Panel member noted that the private streets are wide and felt that this was too much of a separation. The Panel member suggested encroaching on the streets to make it feel more intimate. The Panel member added that creating smaller spaces that retailers can actually afford will add to the intimacy of the space. The Panel member felt that that the targeted 60% window to wall ratio is fine. The Panel member asked the team to bring more thinking around how the utility structures are broken down and who's paying the bills, for heating, electricity. The Panel member asked the team to provide more detail on the lifecycle cost of operating these buildings from an energy perspective. The Panel member also suggested pursuing Passive House design.

One Panel member felt that the street south of Tank House Lane along the rail tracks would be a more relevant precedent. The Panel member noted that Cherry Street is a bit of a mess these days and asked the team to consider how their project will contribute to improving Cherry Street. The Panel member felt that Cherry Street should be seen as an important linkage piece. The Panel member felt that different combinations of program creates a whole new set of conditions. The Panel member noted that if retail were to be placed anywhere, it should be located on the east side of the transit loop.

Another Panel member noted that Block 20 is very close to Block 8 and there will be a lack of sunlight along the street. The Panel member noted that the frontage along the streetcar loop will have the most access to sunlight.

2.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

- The retail strategy requires further development. Consider integrating finer grained retail along the TTC loop
- Consider integrating radical mixed use
- Focus on the north-south linkages instead of the east-west
- Provide further detail on the lifecycle cost of the building over the next 50 years
- Consider how this project will contribute to improving the condition of Cherry Street
- Provide further detail on Block 20's future use and form

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.

3.0 George Brown College: The Arbour – Schematic Design

Project Type: Building

Location: Dockside

Proponent: George Brown College

Architect/Designer: Moriyama Teshima Architects and Acton Ostry Architects

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Carol Phillips, Moriyama Teshima; Krista Palen, Transsolar Inc.

*Delegation: Luigi Ferrara, George Brown College, Tammy Cook, George Brown College
ID#: 1086*

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Rei Tasaka, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the site was purchased by George Brown College (GBC) in March 2017 and will be the expansion of GBC's waterfront campus in Dockside. This is the project's second time presenting at the DRP, previously for Issues Identification before the Design Competition launched. Ms. Tasaka explained that Moriyama & Teshima Architects and Acton Ostry Architects were selected to design the Arbour. The Arbour will serve as an educational and research hub and will also be home to a new child care facility to serve the growing East Bayfront community. Ms. Tasaka noted that the team is seeking feedback on the program and adjacencies with surrounding buildings, including the ground floor porosity and engagement with the public realm, the relationship of the day care to the service entrances on Knapp Lane, the options for the layby location, and the form of the upper massing / dormer. Ms. Tasaka then introduced Carol Phillips, Partner at Moriyama & Teshima Architects, to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Phillips began by providing some site context. Ms. Phillips noted that the "learning landscape" is the main gathering space within the building. The classrooms are located on the north and south sides of the building with each room bookended by "breathing rooms". The day care is located on the south side of the building with the day care drop off to be located on either Dockside Drive or Knapp Lane. Ms. Phillips explained that every floor is organized in a 3-bar system on a 9-meter grid which could accommodate a 40-person classroom that is not restricted in structure. Ms. Phillips then introduced Krista Palen, with Transsolar Inc., to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Ms. Palen explained that the sustainability strategy is three parts: passive, active and renewable. Ms. Palen noted that they are maximizing the amount of energy that can be drawn from the earth and sun. Ms. Palen explained that they are targeting LEED Gold and TGS Tier 3 and 4.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what timeline the team is working towards. Luigi Ferrara, Dean for the Centre for Arts, Design and Information Technology at George Brown College, replied that construction will begin in 2021 which leads to a 2024 completion. Mr. Ferrara added that this schedule could be accelerated with the Provincial or Federal capital funding.

Another Panel member asked what CLT stands for. Ms. Phillips replied that it is Cross Laminated Timber.

One Panel member asked what type of wood will be used and how it will age. Ms. Phillips replied that it depends on where the wood is sourced from. If it comes from the west coast it will likely be Douglas-fir and if it comes from Ontario, which is the preferred option, it will be Spruce Pine. Ms. Phillips clarified that they are not proposing wood on the exterior of the building.

Another Panel member asked whether there is natural light in the day care space. Ms. Phillips replied that the day care rooms are located on the south side of the building and the outdoor space is located on the south west side of the building so there is access to natural ambient daylight.

One Panel member asked whether the ceiling fans play a critical role. Ms. Palen replied that the fans increase the rate of heat transfer.

Another Panel member asked why the team is targeting LEED given the low-carbon nature of the building. Ms. Phillips replied that LEED is a highly recognizable achievement and is digestible to the public. Ms. Phillips added that the sustainability standards for this building far exceed the LEED standards. The Panel member asked whether the day care facility will be a part of George Brown College. Ms. Phillips replied that the day care facility will be part of George Brown College's teaching environment.

One Panel member asked what material the exterior cladding is. Ms. Phillips replied that they are still working through the details of this, but they are currently looking at a metal cladding system.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member suggested that the grand staircase have a gentle rise to run ratio to make it less daunting and able to accommodate all user groups.

Another Panel member commended the team for such an interesting and great project. The Panel member felt however, that it was misleading that the building reads as a wood building on the outside but doesn't actually have a wood façade.

One Panel member felt that the day care space is deprived of natural light and should be relocated to the east side of the building.

Another Panel member felt that there is an opportunity for this building to have living wood around it. The Panel member noted that they were looking forward to seeing the landscape approach and to consider the opportunity to extend the landscape of Sherbourne Common.

One Panel member felt that there was an opportunity with the learning landscape to engage with Sherbourne Common by having glass doors open up on the east side of the building.

Another Panel member suggested the day care pick-up and drop-off to remain as simple as possible. The Panel member also suggested making the bridge connection an interesting wood structure.

One Panel member suggested making the dormer shorter to give it a less obtrusive appearance, or to lift the sloped portion of the roof so that the flat portion is shorter.

3.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

- Overall the Panel was very supportive of the team on this exciting and ambitious project.
- Where possible, respect aging population and consider staircase design that would allow and encourage elders to use the stairs.
- Consider using wood cladding on the building façade in keeping with the iconic nature of the tall wood building
- Explore daycare locations away from the back-of-house location - perhaps move it to the east side of the building adjacent to Sherbourne Common.
- Layby parking should not impact and sacrifice proposed trees – do not impact sidewalk
- The design of the dormer requires further refinement
- Bring a drawing of the north elevation to the next review

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-Support for the project. The Panel voted in Full Support of the project.