



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #109
Wednesday, March 21, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

George Baird
Claude Cormier
Chris Reed
Nina-Marie Lister
Mazyar Mortazavi

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Bayside: Aquabella – Construction Documents
 2. 545 Lake Shore Boulevard West – Issues Identification
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the January 24, 2018 and February 21, 2018 meetings. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts were declared

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that on February 28, 2018, Waterfront Toronto, in partnership with the City of Toronto Parks, Forestry and Recreation, launched the request for qualifications (RFQ) calling on international design professionals to develop a “bold vision” for York Street Park and Rees Street

Park. The design competition will follow a two-stage process which begins with this RFQ followed by Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto pre-qualifying and shortlisting one group of four to five teams for each of the two parks. Mr. Glaisek added that in parallel to this competition, Waterfront Toronto will be running a separate pre-qualification process that invites artists to join the winning design teams and collaboratively develop a public art component in the park design.

Mr. Glaisek also noted that on February 22, 2018, over 250 people joined Waterfront Toronto for a consultation on the future designs for parks and green spaces in the Port Lands. Mr. Glaisek explained that some of the feedback themes included the integration of the natural and the urban, access to water, connection to surrounding neighbourhood and the broader waterfront park system, and accessibility by transit and multiple modes.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Bayside: Aquabella – Construction Documents

Project Type: Building

Location: Bayside

Proponent: Hines and Tridel

Architect/Designer: 3XN Architects

Review Stage: Construction Documents

Review Round: Four

Presenter(s): Audun Opdal, 3XN, Scott Torrence, Forrec Ltd, Craig McIntyre, EG Building Performance

Delegation: Salvatore Cavarretta, Tridel, Carlos Antunes, Kirkor Architects

ID#: 1074

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Aquabella is the third mixed-use residential building to be developed in Bayside. The building program will be primarily residential with retail at-grade and a child care centre at-grade and on the mezzanine level. Ms. Li explained that this is the project's fourth time presenting to the Panel and today they are presenting Construction Documents. Ms. Li noted that shoring and excavation commenced in February 2018. Ms. Li raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the resolution of the building details, the appropriateness of the revised plant species selection on the balconies, and the thermal break strategy. Ms. Li then introduced Audun Opdal, Partner with 3XN, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Opdal began by reviewing the concept of the stacked units terracing down to the water's edge. Mr. Opdal walked through the material palette noting that the interior of the balcony frame will be a pure white porcelain panel and the exterior of the frame will be coloured slats using three warm earth tones. The balcony railing will be clear glass

and the window wall will be grey aluminium and clear glass. Mr. Opdal then introduced Scott Torrance, Practice Leader with Forrec, to present the landscape portion of the presentation.

Mr. Torrance began by noting that the design of the terraces consists of a glass guard on the outside to protect the planters from wind. The planter depth is 450 mm and a seasonal planter is provided for each terrace unit to allow owners to plant their own species. Mr. Torrance noted that there are three planting strategies that create a mosaic across the terraces. In terms of the maintenance strategy, Mr. Torrance explained that the condominium corporation will be responsible. Mr. Torrance noted that regular maintenance during the growing season will occur at a minimum four times per year and there will be an annual review by a horticulturalist. Mr. Torrance then introduced Craig McIntyre, President of EQ Building Performance, to present the sustainability portion of the presentation.

Mr. McIntyre began by noting that the team is meeting the MGBR V1, TGS Tier 2 and LEED Platinum requirements. Mr. McIntyre explained that the Energy Use Intensity target for the building is 183 ekWh/m³. Mr. McIntyre noted that the total amount of thermal breaks is 53% and the remaining 47% is solid concrete.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if the team has ever done thermal break detailing on a building. Mr. Antunes replied that they have tried the thermal break approach on the balconies in a couple of units in Aqualina and Aquavista. This approach was also used on the Marilyn Monroe Towers in Mississauga and it is working well. The Panel member asked if there is any measurement of results. Mr. Antunes replied that they don't have access to the Marilyn Monroe building data, but they are hoping to undertake testing on the Bayside units.

Another Panel member asked if there is possibility of improving the 50% thermal breaks. Mr. Antunes replied that there are other products out there such as the Schöck System which gives you 100% thermally broken balconies. One of the problems with using this system is that the balconies on Aquabella are larger than average, which can result in the possibility of water infiltrating into the joints, and the team was obviously not comfortable going in this direction.

One Panel member asked how the balconies are draining and whether it's always piped or if it trickles down. Mr. Antunes replied that it is piped to come through the townhouse below. The Panel member was concerned about the pristine quality of the wrapped monolithic look getting dirty quickly, and suggested channelling the water where it's not white.

Another Panel member asked if there is a way for residents to personalize the planters on the balconies. Mr. Torrance replied that a private planter is allowed for the residents on the terrace.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the maintenance strategy and whether the maintenance staff would have permission to enter the resident's unit to reach the terrace. Mr. Torrance replied yes and that this will all be coordinated with the condo corporation.

Another Panel member noted that only three of the plants are evergreen shrubs and asked whether there was a reason for only choosing three winter species. Mr. Torrance replied that they are trying to focus on selecting native plants.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was not convinced about the maintenance in the winter in terms of the planters. The Panel member complimented the effort to provide a variation of planting species.

Another Panel member asked the team to take a closer look at the flashing detail as there are multiple pieces of flashing coming together. The Panel member noted that quality control from 3XN on the construction oversight is essential to the building's success.

One Panel member asked the team to pay close attention to the balconies as they tend to be the achilles heel of a building and are often built by a separate subtrade. The Panel member also felt that 50% thermal breaks is a step in the right direction, however Waterfront Toronto needs to do more in terms of incorporating thermal breaks into the sustainability framework.

Another Panel member noted that this building is great from a sustainability perspective. The Panel member did have concerns over the summertime glare due to the all-white building and suggested adding shading devices. Mr. Opdal replied that there is a standardized umbrella for the terraces.

One Panel member felt that the painted undersides of the balconies are going to be a problem. The Panel member noted that the renderings indicate that it will be a smooth surface, but there is no indication in the detail drawing that it will be smooth.

Another Panel member asked whether the kitchen, bathroom and mechanical vents will be organized below a linear diffuser. Mr. Antunes replied that this will be the case for the townhouse units. The Panel member congratulated the team on the hard work that has gone into this design.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Ensure that the winter plantings and maintenance regime is well executed. Consider adding more plant species that have winter qualities.
- Successful execution of the balcony details is critical to the success of the building

- Getting 50% thermal breaks is a good start, but more work needs to be done on the Waterfront Toronto side with setting standards

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.

2.0 545 Lake Shore Blvd. West – Issues Identification

Project Type: Building

Location: Central Waterfront

Proponent: Canderel

Architect/Designer: Sweeny&Co,

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Dermot Sweeny, Sweeny&Co

Delegation: Craig Hunter, Hunter Associates, James Deitcher, Canderel, Joanna Kimmont, City of Toronto

ID#: 1097

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that Lake Shore Boulevard West is a proposed mixed-use residential development located on a 1.8-acre site, occupying the south-east corner of Bathurst and Lake Shore. The building is listed as a heritage property by the City's Heritage Preservation Services. Mr. Glaisek noted that this is the project's first time presenting to the DRP for Issues Identification. Mr. Glaisek raised a number of areas for the Panel to consider, including the ground floor animation, the site organization, the role of the site in relation to Queens Quay, the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood and Billy Bishop Airport, and the integration of the heritage building with the new development. Mr. Glaisek noted that City Staff have reviewed the project and are not comfortable with the proposed density. Mr. Glaisek added that the site is still subject to review by Ports Toronto for compatibility with Billy Bishop Airport. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Dermot Sweeny, Principal at Sweeny&Co, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeny began by noting that the subject site is located along the windmill line which was the limit of how far the piers could extend into the harbour. The site is both a terminus for Queens Quay and a gateway site for Billy Bishop Airport. Mr. Sweeny noted that the team is looking to introduce a market hall on the ground floor to activate the space and bring more needed retail to the area. Mr. Sweeny explained that the heritage building has an interesting hexagonal pavilion entrance with other fascinating detailing around the building. Mr. Sweeny noted that the existing building geometry has informed the concept design. Mr. Sweeny explained that concept one consists of 2 taller towers with 25-meter separation. Concept two consists of two shorter towers the same density as concept one. Mr. Sweeny noted that this concept has more sculpted massing that tapers down to the water, similar to other building typologies along

Queens Quay. Mr. Sweeny explained that concept three consists of a taller tower on the Lake Shore side of the site and a shorter tower on the Queens Quay side.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked whether this project has been cleared by Transport Canada regarding its proximity to Billy Bishop Island Airport. Mr. Sweeny replied that they will bring the results of the aviation analysis to the next review. The Panel member also asked what the building massing is. Mr. Sweeney replied that it's approximately 50,000 – 60,000 square meters and all three scenarios are roughly the same.

Another Panel member asked whether the market hall idea is solidified or if this just an aspiration. Mr. Sweeny replied that they still need to develop the idea further and find tenants for the space, but having retail in the area is critical.

One Panel member asked if a retail study has been done to inform the viability of the market hall. Mr. Sweeny replied that they are planning to engage a retail consultant. Mr. Sweeney added that there is close to 30,000 residents in the area and this number is growing substantially, and residents have voiced the need for more retail. The Panel member also asked what other community amenities the building will offer. Mr. Sweeny replied that it is still early in the process, but they have thought about flex space, office space or partially retail. The Panel member also asked if ERA was aware that they plan to lower the floor on the inside, as it will change the perception of the site from the outside. Mr. Sweeny replied that they are aware of this change and making this adjustment to the building will make it more accessible.

Another Panel member asked what the motivation is for preserving 30% public space. Mr. Sweeny replied that the connection to the east is just a service lane and the intersection at Bathurst and Queens Quay is tough and they wanted to pull the space back to allow more room for pedestrians. The Panel member also asked if a servicing woonerf for a building this large is realistic. Mr. Sweeny replied that with scheduled deliveries, this should be manageable.

One Panel member asked what existing urban plans there are for this area. Joanna Kimont, Planner with the City of Toronto, replied that this site falls within the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood which is still an emerging plan.

Another Panel member asked what the distance is between the towers for option three. Mr. Sweeny replied that the distance is 18 meters for option three. Mr. Sweeny added the 25 meters is the requirement, but this is still under appeal.

One Panel member asked if there have been any discussions with the property to the east regarding the possibility of a shared driveway. Mr. Sweeny replied that they have talked about this possibility, however there is a return on the heritage façade, so they don't want to build anything that overlaps this façade.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that they weren't opposed to the two-tower scheme, however they were sceptical about the amount of density shown. The Panel member felt that a simpler scheme for the towers integrates better with the heritage building. The Panel member also felt that the open space calculation is invalid as it's just the leftover space and eliminates the ability to have more of an urban scheme.

Another Panel member felt that more attention should be paid to the public realm and civic identity of the project. The Panel member also felt that prioritization of the entrances and their relationship to the public realm is important. The Panel member added that the public realm gets smaller in options two and three and if that's the case, it should become a civic corridor instead.

One Panel member felt that how the building responds to the street is very important. In terms of height, the Panel member noted that the Queens Quay elevation has an iterating datum line that is important to continue. The Panel member also noted that the public realm is important as there is a lot of circulation at the corner of Bathurst and Queens Quay and there is potential for civic relief at this corner.

Another Panel member felt that the southwest corner is very important, and they like the idea of having retail. The Panel member felt that the 20-meter right-of-way undermines the public realm. The Panel member also felt that a lot of ground floor area on the street level is wasted. The Panel member suggested doubling up with the adjacent condo or taking it right up to the property line.

One Panel member thought it was great that there's real mixed-use and the combination of uses is positive and important. The Panel member noted that the intersection at Bathurst and Lake Shore is scary for pedestrians and the public realm is a critical factor to the building's success. The Panel member felt that there should be a study from Lake Shore Boulevard down to Billy Bishop Airport to determine what the public realm vision is.

Another Panel member was appreciative of the research and work that has gone into this presentation. The Panel member felt that the piece of heritage façade on the north-east side of the building should be internalized. The Panel member also felt that concept one contrasts the heritage base and noted that concept two has a nice sculpted lower volume, making a strong backdrop to the heritage building.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Consider how this project fits into the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan
- Get this building "right" as it is the last empty site on Queens Quay
- The heritage hexagon piece of the building at the north-east corner of the site should be the entrance to the complex
- Respect the 25-meter tower separation and the building datum along Queens Quay

- The façade along Queens Quay should be powerful. This is an opportunity to bring life to the Queens Quay frontage.
- It is important to design good street edges. Consider reprioritising all the entrances
- Investigate the public market further to determine the viability of the proposed size, and how many people will cross Lake Shore to get there.
- Bring the aviation analysis to the next review

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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