



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #47 Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

---

**Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Brigitte Shim  
Betsy Williamson

**Regrets:**

George Baird  
Peter Clewes  
Bruce Kuwabara  
Greg Smallenberg  
Jane Wolff

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

**Recording Secretary:**

Melissa Horwood

---

**WELCOME**

Paul Bedford welcomed the Panel, noting that Bruce Kuwabara has asked him to act as Chair this month.

The Acting Chair then provided an overview of the agenda and invited Christopher Glaisek to provide his report.

---

**REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, provided a summary of project progress.

*Sherbourne Park*

- The pavilion is complete and the skating rink opened last week. The public art pieces are nearing completion as well as the channel.

*Don River Park*

- The pavilion is currently under construction.

*Underpass Park*

- Construction will commence construction soon.

*York Quay Revitalization, Phase II*

- Parking garage will commence construction soon.

*Pan Am Update* – provided by Meg Davis, Waterfront Toronto’s Vice President for Development

- The RFQ process is complete and 3 firms have been short listed and 2 firms are in reserve for the short list. The PSOS has been given out to bidders and Waterfront Toronto is working through the project agreement with Infrastructure Ontario. The bidders will have an agreement with both IO and WT. There will be 4 full day sessions with each bidder on their designs and a follow up session 3 or 4 weeks later. RFP bids will be in by early May 2011 with a final presentation at the end. Commercial and financial close is scheduled for early September 2011. The Design Review Panel will meet the preferred proponent once they are selected.

The Acting Chair asked the Panel if there were any questions or comments.

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair addressed the Panel and spoke about issues that could arise from the implementation of the 2010 Pan AM Games in Toronto. The Acting Chair stated that currently, there are no provisions for streetcar, LRT or any other form of transit to service the area. The Acting Chair stated that it may be helpful for John Campbell, CEO of Waterfront Toronto, to speak with Bruce McCuaig, CEO of Metrolinx regarding this issue.

Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto’s plans have always included transit, particularly in West Don Lands and East Bayfront, extending the streetcar line down Cherry Street and across Queens Quay to the east. Because of the tunneling challenges of the Queens Quay streetcar, the cost estimates have exceeded provisions that were originally put aside. There is currently no solution at the moment for getting transit to these areas. It is assumed that surface busses will service the area in the interim. Waterfront Toronto is in talks with TTC to come up with a solution that is more affordable, perhaps dedicated bus route. The Cherry Street streetcar extension is still in the budget but the issue is whether it can be built in time for Pan Am in 2015.

The Acting Chair stated that it would be useful to explore, with Metrolinx, the possibility of some kind of GO Station in the West Don Lands, as in the west at Exhibition Station.

The Acting Chair moved to adopt the minutes from December 2010. The minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Acting Chair noted that the Panel did not have Quorum for the meeting.

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

There being no other comments, the Acting Chair moved to the Project Review portion of the meeting.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 West Don Lands Development Proposal: TCHC Blocks 21 & 23**

*ID#: 1019*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Proponent: TCHC*

*Architect/Designer: CORE and Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc.*

*Location: Area bounded by King Street, River Street, Eastern Avenue and St. Lawrence Street*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Four*

*Presenter(s): Babak Eslahjou, CORE; Scott Torrance of Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc.*

#### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Derek Goring, Director of Development for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project noting that due to cost issues with the previous design, the design team has changed but the same basic objectives still stand. Mr. Goring stated that Waterfront Toronto was involved in the selection for the new team. Mr. Goring reminded the panel that the previous concerns from the Design Review Panel were the relationships between grade related units and the public realm, the interface between the two buildings across the woonerf and the management of noise from the overpass.

#### 1.2 Project Presentation

Babak Eslahjou of CORE provided an overview of the project reminding the Panel of the program, design objectives and the overall context. Scott Torrance of Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc. provided an overview of the landscape elements including courtyard plans, plantings and materiality.

#### 1.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification only.

One Panel member asked for clarification regarding the parking entrance. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the garage access will come from the new street.

One Panel member asked where one would emerge from the underground parking. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the elevators go directly into the building.

Another Panel member asked how deep the canopies are in relation to the porches. Mr. Eslahjou stated that they would be between 1.5 m and 1.8 m and that the porches facing St. Lawrence Street are 2.6 m.

One Panel member asked which trees will be in earth and which ones will be on slab. Mr. Eslahjou stated that all of the trees will be on slab. The Panel member then asked for a clearer description of the interface between the private and the public space. Mr. Torrance stated that they are all more or less at the same grade as the whole common spaces but they tried to separate the semiprivate area from the common spaces. Mr. Torrance stated that the intention was to create a fence between the soft surface area and the private terraces on either side and that plantings would be on the east side.

One Panel member inquired about how the 1 meter grade change within the site works. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the original design is a full meter higher than the current design. Diagonally, across the site from the northeast corner to the southwest corner is a 2 meter difference. Mr. Eslahjou also stated that there will be stairs at the south woonerf to get from the woonerf to the common space.

One Panel member asked Mr. Eslahjou to describe what is happening on the roof and specifically, what the size of the penthouse is on the taller building. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the roof of the townhouses is an inaccessible yet extensive green roof and that the penthouse is purely mechanical and will have all of the equipment for all three buildings housed within it. He also clarified that the mechanical load has yet to be calculated and that once it has been done, the penthouse will likely be smaller than the renderings have shown.

Another Panel member asked what the treatment for the paving material would be. Mr. Torrance stated that they would like to introduce a different kind of paving material and try to repeat that in the public space and in the woonerf area. He also stated that the children's water play area would likely be concrete.

One Panel member asked what the nature of the multi purpose rooms in the family buildings were. Mr. Eslahjou stated that they would be used as meeting rooms that tenants could book.

One Panel member asked what determined the size of the windows of the ground floor family units, stating that, in Vancouver, there are always stairs coming up 1.0 m-1.5 m to create a stoop. Mr. Eslahjou stated that they have room to increase the window size but the ground floor is a balance of how much light to allow in and yet maintain privacy. He also stated that there is a grade change, so it is different on the east and west sides.

One Panel member asked if the colour scheme has been finalized and if so, how did you arrive at that scheme. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the issue was debated at length because there are a lot of black brick buildings coming up in the area. Further more, he stated that they would probably create a scheme of a darker brick with lighter Hardy board on the townhouses.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the designed seemed peculiar with the garage entrance to the south of the buildings. They stated that the parking entrance is clearly an issue on this site, and that in this configuration; it cuts the building off from Underpass Park. The Panel member stated that the remaining connection to Underpass Park is less than generous. Another Panel member stated that they like this garage design better than the previous one.

One Panel member stated that the building amenities appeared to not relate to each other and that the elements are not necessarily working together. The Panel member stated that any features that are not fully integrated into the design will likely be removed due to budget or at the time of value engineering.

Many Panel members enjoyed the idea of a splash pad for children. One Panel member thought they are great for kids but stated that, realistically, they will be wet and messy and loud all of the

time. The Panel member also stated that the splash pad acts as a barrier between the seniors building and Underpass Park.

One Panel member thought that the canopies were not integrated well with the building.

One Panel member stated that the penthouse of the seniors is overpowering to the design of the building. Another Panel member stated that, as the top of the building can be seen from the Don Valley Parkway, special considerations have to go to the mechanical on the roof. Also, the green roof will be visible, so thought must go into the design of that as well.

Many Panel members stated that the windows are not as random as one would like and that they should either be less random or more random.

One Panel member stated that the area that requires the most work is the semi-private realm. A few Panel members stated that it was difficult to see where members of the public are allowed to go. Another Panel member stated that the connections for common space should be maximized. One Panel member stated that there needs to be a better understanding of the public realm. One Panel member stated that the paving needs to be better understood. Another Panel member stated that there were not enough places to sit outdoors. One Panel member stated that it was very important that this must be a place that families and seniors want to be.

One Panel member stated that the canopy on the south façade of the seniors building needs to be lower and provide actual shade as this area is likely to get a lot of use by the seniors.

Another Panel member stated that the paving material should be more consistent and that allowing one space to flow into another space will add to the coherence.

One Panel member stated that planting more trees would likely be beneficial and that the area needs to develop a stronger language. One Panel member thought that the trees selected should reinforce the urban character and that the design should try to integrate the warehouse signature. The Panel member also questioned the ability to get 30 cubic meters of soil for each tree and that simplifying the program may help the design.

One Panel member stated that they thought the design may be stronger if it moved towards a warehouse/industrial signature. The Panel member thought that the current design was too generic and that there should be less materials as all three perspectives have different characters. Another Panel member stated that there needs to be a better understanding of the language of the space.

Another Panel member stated that the south elevation of the project is very important and that the permeability of the public realm has to be shown. This elevation needs to be shown in the future.

One Panel member stated that there is an opportunity to reinforce stronger connection to the surrounding context through character, colour, and window dimension. The Panel member also stated that if you are living in that building, you do not want to stand out, and that the design of the building will help with that.

Another Panel member stated that the umbrellas in the semi-private courtyard area will not hold up and that a canopy is required to provide a larger area of protection.

One Panel member stated that if they cannot have balconies then maybe Juliet balconies can be provided to get air circulation on the units.

#### 1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Reinforce a stronger connection to the surrounding context.
- 2) Clarify the language of the landscape and define areas that are open to the public.
- 3) Incorporate landscape elements within the design that are integral to the project.
- 4) Concerned about what will be end result in terms of the landscape treatment – what will get cut from budget.
- 5) Evaluate the size of the penthouse and the condition of the green roof.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Eslahjou and Mr. Torrance thanked the Panel for their feedback.

#### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked that Panel for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in non-support of the project and asked the project come back to the panel and incorporate some of the suggestions.

---

## **2.0 West Don Lands: Storm Water Quality Facility**

*ID#: 1036*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: gh3*

*Location: North of Lake Shore Boulevard, East of Cherry Street*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Pat Hanson, gh3*

### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Brenda Webster, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that it is currently at the schematic design phase. Ms. Webster explained that, although the project is housed in the Lower Don Lands-Keating Channel Precinct, it will service all of the West Don Lands. Ms. Webster stated that they are anticipating the project to be tender ready in July 2011.

### 2.2 Project Presentation

Pat Hanson, Principal with gh3, provided an update of the project since it was last at the Design Review Panel in December 2010. The project consists of a deep shaft, or "well" covered by stone with a glass "pump house" used to pump out sediment from the bottom of the shaft, and a

building with UV treatment. Ms. Hanson presented the site, its constraints and the infrastructure the building will contain.

### 2.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification only.

One Panel member asked what could be seen in the circular building. Ms. Hanson replied that will be a removable grate, the visibility of which has yet to be determined. Ms. Hanson also stated that there will be a hoist beam with some mechanical components that will likely have a chrome finish.

One Panel member asked if the project was on budget. Ms. Hanson stated that yes, they are on budget. Another Panel member asked what portion of the budget is for the building. Ms. Hanson stated that the budget for the building is \$1 000 000 and the infrastructure is \$20 000 000.

Another Panel member asked if there was heat in the building and if it was an option to install windows for ventilation? Ms. Hanson stated that there will be minimal heat in the building. The Panel member stated that if there is any HVAC in the building it is possible to apply for LEED accreditation.

One Panel member wondered why the presence of the shaft is not visible on the site. Ms. Hanson stated that there was some discussion to make it possible to look into the shaft but found that it was problematic. Ms. Hanson stated that the other option was to raise the shaft 0.6 m – 1.0 m and the expression of the cylindrical nature of the shaft would add another form to the site. Ms. Hanson concluded that the final design intent was to keep the pump house as invisible and light as possible.

Mr. Freedman asked if they have consulted with Toronto Water about the height of the exhaust. Ms. Hanson stated that they have been informed by Toronto Water that 4 meters is required.

Another Panel member asked what happens to the roof during a snow fall. Ms. Hanson stated that the theory is that the pitch is steep enough that snow will fall off.

One Panel member inquired about the lighting solution for the design. Ms. Hanson replied that on the evening there will be some lighting for safety, but it will be kept at a low level.

One Panel member stated that people will be curious about what the building does and wondered if there was any consideration for signage. Ms. Hanson stated that there has been a discussion about adding an interpretive element to the project.

### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the skewed traditional shape of the building is becoming a well-known idiom and that often shape is closely tied to formative issues. The Panel member stated that the building has a very interesting story and that this is a very elegant proposal. The Panel member also stated that the shape is good but it is void of the story of the building and it is not as invested with the story of the functional infrastructure quality as it could be.

Another Panel member stated that they would like to see the water moving off the building, perhaps by way of a hidden pipe inside, to tell the story of the building.

Another Panel member stated that they are happy that the surface water is being collected but it feels as though there needs to be a bio swale, or something along those lines, to continue the story. They also said that the public needs to understand that the stormwater process and how it is captured and treated.

Another Panel member stated that the first image was really helpful and that it was easy to understand the significance of the project within the entire neighbourhood. The Panel member also stated that the drawings need to extend to show the extent of the infrastructure that comes to the shaft and then ends up in the Keating Channel.

One Panel member stated that the role of the project is the presence of infrastructure in Waterfront Toronto and that, collectively, over time you will end up with these pieces of infrastructure at the edge of this new neighbourhood and there needs to be clarity of what they do and why there are doing it. The public needs to see the buildings as a contribution to the neighbourhood.

One Panel member thought that a sign would destroy the entire abstract approach of the building. They also stated that the abstractness of the form is hard to resolve and that more time needs to be spent on expanding on that minimalist quality.

Another Panel member stated that although they enjoy minimalist architecture they feel as though it sometimes becomes automatic and that this building could have a bit of that presence.

Another Panel member stated that they are concerned about the budget.

Another Panel member stated that it would help to see the drawings in a 3D model to see what the relationship is with its context.

Another Panel member stated that they feel as though the bike trail is intended to bring something that is the opposite of what it is. Another Panel member stated that the in plan are equally spaced is shown differently in the rendering

One Panel member stated that the main issue is to tell the story on what is going on and why the building is there in the first place. The Panel member also stated that the guts should not be hidden but exposed for what they are.

## 2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

1. Explain the "story" of the building and infrastructure
2. Refine the details of the design - placement of doors and windows, possibility of trees being added
3. Find out if the building is capable of being LEED certified

## 2.6 Proponents Response

Ms. Hanson thanked the Panel for their feedback.

## 2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for a note of support, non-support or conditional support for the project. The Panel voted in Support of the project to move onto the Design Development stage.

---

## **3.0 Central Waterfront Public Realm: Portland Slip Water's Edge**

*ID#: 1038*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design*

*Location: West side of the Portland Slip; South of Queens Quay just west of Bathurst Street*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: du Toit Allsopp Hillier (DTAH)*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Adam Nicklin, DTAH*

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, noting that currently there is no connection to Ireland Park at the foot of Bathurst Street. Ms. Mallozzi informed the Panel that the City of Toronto is currently rebuilding the dockwall and that Waterfront Toronto has been asked to make the landscape improvements to compliment the new dockwall. Ms. Mallozzi stated that the project consists of 130 m of Water's Edge Promenade along the Malting Silos.

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Adam Nicklin, Partner at du Toit Allsopp Hillier, provided an overview of the various components of the project including; the dockwall, lighting and furniture elements and relationship to the East Bayfront Water's Edge Promenade.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification only.

One Panel member asked if there are there any current plans for the malting silos. Robert Freedman, Director of Urban Planning at the City of Toronto, stated that he has seen some images but part of the issue with them is they are in very bad shape.

Another Panel member asked if there would be a connection, perhaps a walkway, with the school? Mr. Nicklin stated that there is a functional walkway already in place at the school.

The same Panel member asked how many cubic meters of soils there was for the trees and if Mr. Nicklin could describe the cross-section of the dockwall. Mr. Nicklin stated that there is 30 cubic meters of soil for each tree. He also stated that in the first phase of work, sheet pile is driven 5 meters out from the dockwall and it is anchored with steel tiebacks and that granular is spread on top and then Silva cells set in place and granite laid on top.

One Panel member asked if they would be incorporating fish habitat design into the project. Mr. Nicklin stated that the City of Toronto is taking care of that aspect.

One Panel member asked if there was anything that could be improved upon for future phases now that construction at the Water's Edge in East Bayfront has started. Mr. Nicklin stated that the design evolved a lot and many improvements have already happened during the design phase for East Bayfront.

Another Panel member asked where all of the cleats are. Mr. Nicklin stated that they have preserved them and would like to use them.

Another Panel member asked if there is any need to accommodate Porter. Ms. Mallozzi stated that the only design requirements by Porter for the slip is that it be able to act as a secondary mooring for the airport ferry.

One Panel member asked what the timeline was for the phases. Mr. Glaisek stated that the project is not funded for the additional phases of the project and is not currently considered a funding priority. Ms. Mallozzi stated that the current phase is set for completion in Spring 2012.

#### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members commended the team for the impressive work presented. One Panel member stated that, although it is a pimple project, it is an important one that will bring life back into the silos. The Panel member also thought that it has the potential to become very iconic for the city. Another panel member praised the project for its bold and continuous design.

One Panel member thought that the project is a very critical part of the Central Waterfront and it will bring people to that piece of the waterfront.

One Panel member stated that being able to learn from the East Bayfront Water's Edge is a great benefit to have as it is a working built-form prototype.

Many Panel members liked the materiality of the project. One Panel member thought the wood was an appropriate choice, as well as the robustness of the marine elements. Another Panel member wondered if others thought the maple leaf pattern in the granite was hokey, but realized that it may not be up for consideration.

Many Panel members stated that they thought the idea of the Malting Silos and the Victory Soy Mills Silos as bookends was well framed. One Panel member thought that the silos allowed for Canada's malting history to be part of our consciousness. One Panel member stated that they thought if people were drawn to the Silos they would discover a new place.

One Panel Member stated that the framing of understanding what has been accomplished and what the missing pieces are was very well done.

A few Panel members thought that the presentation was great. One Panel member stated that of the three projects presented, this presentation was the best and the first presentation was poor and not easy to read.

One Panel member stated that in the future phases, the WaveDeck should turn down, instead of up.

Mr. Glaisek stated that this project is a huge success story for Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto. He went on to state that it would have been a lost opportunity to not take advantage of the existing work being done on the dockwall. Several Panel members echoed Mr. Glaisek's sentiments. One Panel member stated that the project is going to appear as though it was completed on its own, but that is not the reality.

Many Panel members thought that the public should be informed of these types of projects when they are happening.

The Panel congratulated and thanked Ms. Mallozzi for all of her continued hard work on the Central Waterfront.

### 3.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Panel made no recommendations.

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Nicklin thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

---

## **INFORMATION SESSION**

### **4.0 Presentation of Minimum Green Building Requirements**

#### 4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced Dan Stone, Interim Sustainability Director for Waterfront Toronto, to the Panel. Mr. Glaisek made note that the presentation is an information session to gain more specific insight into the objectives of the Minimum Green Building Standards, as part of Waterfront Toronto's ongoing commitment to sustainable design practices.

#### 4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Stone provided an overview of the Minimum Green Building Requirements to the Design Review Panel and highlighted the updates of the report. The Minimum Green Building Requirements is in place to achieve the goals of the Waterfront Toronto Sustainability Framework, to be a national and global model for sustainability, to facilitate market transformations and to be a key component of the Sustainability Framework that relates to development at the block level.

#### 4.3 Panel Questions

One Panel member asked why the new requirement for heating reduction is 65% and cooling reduction is 30%? Mr. Stone said he would need to research this matter and would get back to the Panel.

Another Panel member asked if garbage chutes are necessary, stating that they are not ideal and have maintenance and operations issues. Mr. Stone confirmed that where the building design incorporates a chute system, a tri-sorter system would be mandatory.

One Panel member asked if it is possible to require the developers to design the building with temporary individual boilers which would be replaced when District Energy was provided. Mr. Glaisek stated yes, it is possible.

Another Panel member stated that we should have a requirement of these items at the Design Review Panel and that perhaps there are different requirements for each stage of design.

One Panel member asked if there was a requirement for performance reporting and that, if not, Waterfront Toronto may want to consider being at the forefront of that. Mr. Glaisek stated that it is a discussion to be had with Mr. Campbell.

Another Panel member stated that there needs to be different ways to make it known that these are good intentions and when the requirements are going beyond the City of Toronto's minimum. Mr. Stone stated that the final Minimum Green Building Requirements report includes a chart between the City of Toronto's minimum requirements and Waterfront Toronto's.

Another Panel member stated that the progress tracking chart should be simplified and included as part of the Design Review Process.

Mr. Stone committed to providing the Design Review Panel a consolidated response to the matters discussed and that the background documents would be circulated to the Panel.

---

## **CLOSING**

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