



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #24 Wednesday, February 13, 2008**

---

### **Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford (via telephone)  
George Baird  
Tania Bortolotto  
Peter Clewes  
Renee Daoust  
Siamak Hariri  
Janet Rosenberg  
Greg Smallenberg

### **Designees and Guests:**

John Campbell  
Robert Freedman  
Christopher Glaisek

### **Regrets:**

Anne McIlroy  
Charles Waldheim  
Peter Halsall  
Don Schmitt

### **Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

---

### **WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Panel and reviewed the agenda, noting that there would be an in-camera session at the end of the project reviews.

The Chair then invited John Campbell to provide his report.

---

### **REPORT FROM THE CEO**

Mr. Campbell, Waterfront Toronto's President and CEO, began by explaining that Waterfront Toronto is currently conducting a Cost Estimation Validation Process (CEVP) for all its major programs including the Central Waterfront, East Bayfront and West Don Lands in an effort to more accurately budget for the projects and aid in setting priorities.

Mr. Campbell noted that Waterfront Toronto has been pursuing the feasibility of implementing a district-wide vacuum waste system and is awaiting a report from the City of Toronto regarding its adoption in the West Don Lands and East Bayfront.

Mr. Campbell stated that a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is currently being developed with the Port Authority to help determine responsibilities for operation and maintenance of the water's edge public realm.

Mr. Campbell announced that the Cherry Street Transit Environmental Assessment (EA) for the new streetcar line has been completed, noting that it was a combined effort between the community, TTC and Waterfront Toronto. The preferred alternative that came out of the EA

provides for a street car right-of-way running along the East side of Cherry Street rather than down the centre – a first in the City of Toronto.

Mr. Campbell concluded by announcing that the Request for Qualifications for the public lands in the East Bayfront, east of Sherbourne Park will be launched at the MIPIM conference in March to an international audience. Mr. Campbell stated that Waterfront Toronto was sensitive to the community's concerns regarding a potential increase in commercial uses relative to residential as well as its possible impact on the built form in the original Kotter Kim designed precinct plan, adding that there is a commitment to finding the right mix of uses to animate the East Bayfront.

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair thanked Mr. Campbell for his report. Noting that there was a very full agenda, the Chair suggested that the administrative component of the meeting be moved to the end of the meeting along with the in-camera session.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Project Symphony (Corus Entertainment)**

*ID#: 1017*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: South side of Queens Quay on the east side of the Jarvis Street Slip*

*Proponent: Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO) and Corus Entertainment*

*Architect/Designer: Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc. (Exterior) and  
Quadrangle Architects (Interior)*

*Review Round: Seven*

*Presenter(s): Brian Curtner, Quadrangle Architects*

*Delegation: Ted Shore and Caroline Robbie, Quadrangle Architects; Tom Petty, Tracey Ewing and Julie Edwards, Corus Entertainment.*

#### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, introduced the project, noting that this is an information session by Corus Entertainment's architects, Quadrangle, to clarify the design intentions on the inside as they relate to the public realm as requested by the Panel at the November 2007 meeting.

#### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Brian Curtner, Principal with Quadrangle Architects, began the presentation with two promotional video clips from Corus Entertainment to provide a sense of who the company is, followed by why the company is moving to the waterfront. Mr. Curtner then provided an overview of the design intentions of the interior of the building including the new version of the central studio, the "Hub" and the radio broadcast rooms as well as the atrium and other interior spaces.

#### **1.3 Panel Questions**

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

One Panel member asked where the public entrance doors were, and how the public would access this building. Mr. Curtner stated that the building is a twenty-four hour, seven days-a-week, three hundred and sixty-five days-a-year operation and will be secured until such time that there are events open to the public. Mr. Curtner added that they are still working out the operational model. Another Panel member asked how often the large sliding doors on the south side of the atrium would be open. Mr. Curtner stated that that would depend on the programming of the space, noting that currently their facilities in Liberty Village do not allow for such possibilities, but given this new opportunity they intend to program it. Mr. Curtner cited concerts and other spontaneous gatherings that currently happen at “102.1 The Edge” radio station on Yonge Street as an example of the interactive nature of what could happen at the site, noting that Corus is in the business of entertainment.

One Panel member asked if the outdoor tables adjacent to the “Hub” were private or public and if there was an intention to block off this eating area to the public. Mr. Curtner stated that it is the intention that if the tables were part of the public realm they would not be blocked off, adding that the outdoor space is technically outside of their leased area and any uses would require approval from TEDCO as the landlord. Another Panel member asked if the Hub would serve alcohol, thus needing a fenced area. Mr. Curtner replied that this was not the intention, noting that only special events would likely do so and would receive a special alcohol license when needed.

Another Panel member asked how security would work at the exterior entrance doors to the Hub when the atrium was open to the public. Mr. Curtner stated that those issues would have to be resolved, possibly utilizing a photo-id badge or other security measures.

Another Panel member asked if there was going to be food service for the public in the Hub area. Mr. Curtner stated that there could be the possibility in one portion of the Hub, but that it would still have to be worked out. Another Panel member cited the example of the City Hall cafeteria that serves both employees and the general public.

One Panel member asked for more detail on the nature of the broadcast studios at the north-west corner. Mr. Curtner said that there would be four radio DJ's similar to the “Q107” model and that these each would require two support staff in separate rooms. The Panel member then asked if there would be any audio speakers on the outside or if the signage had been designed yet. Mr. Curtner stated that there would most likely be audio speakers and that the signage package is something they have been asked for and are working on. The Panel member then asked if there were any thoughts on providing seating or other public amenities in the zone that skirts the building immediately adjacent to the studios. Mr. Curtner replied that it was his hope that Quadrangle could be involved in the design of that area.

One Panel member asked if there was bicycle storage outside of the building or if there had been consideration of extending the season outdoors by incorporating radiant heaters. Mr. Curtner stated that their focus was on how the public space would be animated by the performance studio.

Another Panel member asked if there were going to be any lighting or projection elements. Mr. Curtner stated that they are considering different options including possibly utilizing a curtain containing LEDs that could display different images when the performance space is not in use.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then thanked Mr. Curtner for participating in the information session, noting that it would have been very helpful to the Panel to have had this presentation much earlier and added that as this was an information session there would be no Panel discussion.

#### 1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues: N/A

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Curtner thanked the Panel for the opportunity to present the interior plans for the Corus Building.

#### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non Support: N/A

### **2.0 Sherbourne Park**

*ID#: 1020*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design*

*Location: Area bounded by Sherbourne Street to the west, future development to the east, and from Lake Shore Boulevard south to the water's edge.*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg (PFS)*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Greg Smallenberg, PFS; Jill Anholt, Jill Anholt Design*

*Delegation: Jennifer Nagai, PFS; David Leinster, The Planning Partnership*

#### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Roche, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, noting that the last time this project was reviewed by the Panel, concern was raised about the overall unifying idea of the park resulting in a panel request that the project come back for a second review of the Schematic Design before proceeding to Design Development.

#### 2.2 Project Presentation

Greg Smallenberg, Partner with PFS, began by thanking the Panel for their constructive feedback at the last presentation, adding that after a period of initial disappointment at being asked to re-conceptualize the design, the result has been positive. Mr. Smallenberg then described the new design including the creation of three primary urban rooms consisting of "the Woods", "the Water" and "the Green".

Jill Anholt, Principal of Jill Anholt Design, then described the revised art pieces and their relationship to water purification and the storm water management system.

#### 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked for more information on the nature of the scrim in the art piece. Ms. Anholt stated that once the water passes through the UV filtration system, it will exit at the top of the piece and run along a scrim and into a channel, at which point the water will be 97% pure. Another Panel member asked what will happen to the art piece in the winter. Ms. Anholt replied that the water would freeze to the scrim, adding another dimension to the art piece. Another Panel member asked what the materiality of the piece will be. Ms. Anholt stated that the main structure is comprised of textured concrete, with the scrim being made of stainless steel. Ms.

Anholt added that they are also investigating the possibility of using a phosphorescent concrete that would capture light energy during the day and glow at night.

One Panel member requested clarification on the details in the forest, noting that in their experience birch trees do not tend to have a lifecycle of 50 years. Mr. Smallenberg stated that the selection of the species will be critical to achieving the life span, noting that they are studying which species will work and in general are looking to select an iconic tree that will provide a light canopy and allow for the close spacing of trees to achieve a dappled light effect. The Panel member then asked what Mr. Smallenberg's thoughts were on creating monocultures. Mr. Smallenberg replied that he was a proponent of monocultures within the context of a larger diversity of trees, noting that the species of trees along the water's edge promenade and Queen's Quay will be different. The Panel member then asked what the nature of the under-story was. Mr. Smallenberg replied that they were considering gravel or an aggregate of sorts with stone paving to define pathways.

One Panel member asked if there was a strategy for creating the desired forest effects before the trees reach maturity, noting that the strength of the design is dependant on the contrast between the forest and the meadow. Mr. Smallenberg answered that they will pre-purchase and individually select the trees to assure a reasonable canopy at the outset. Mr. Smallenberg added that strategies such as initially planting with a tighter tree spacing could also help achieve the effects that they are looking for. Another Panel member asked if there was a succession plan as the plants mature. Mr. Smallenberg answered that that will be part of the discussion around selection of the tree species.

Another Panel member asked what the reflecting pond was made of. Mr. Smallenberg replied that they saw the reflecting pool containing about an inch of water, just a film to blur the edges where the pond ends. Mr. Smallenberg added that materially they are looking at a stainless steel that has been chemically bathed to achieve an array of colours, adding that whatever the final material is, this "wrapper" will be something spectacular.

One Panel member then asked if there was a strategy for maintaining the grass in the meadow given the expected volumes of people. Mr. Smallenberg replied that the answer is partially a construction detail and partially an operations and management issue, but emphasized that if there is a good base and it is well constructed and irrigated then the meadow will be far less difficult and expensive to maintain. Another Panel member asked if grass was the best choice. Mr. Smallenberg answered that a balance had to be struck between the sustainability and the programmatic desires for the park, noting there are sustainable ways to create and maintain lawns.

One Panel member asked if the park as designed meets the budget. Mr. Smallenberg replied that some of the costs are shared with infrastructure including the storm water management facility as well as public art. Mr. Smallenberg added that 75 percent of the park is trees, grass and gravel and if cuts had to be made it would be in the hard surface materials.

#### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel commended the design team for their hard work and impressive response to the criticisms at the last meeting. The Panel generally agreed that the proposal was dramatically more powerful and one Panel member felt the revised design was inspiring. Another Panel member liked the contrast between the intimate spaces and the wide open spaces. Another Panel member

felt the power of the scheme was its simplicity. Another Panel member felt that the seasonal aspects of the scheme were very compelling. Another Panel member felt that this park could be a true destination in its own right, adding that currently there is nothing else like it in the city. Another Panel member felt that the scheme acted as a strong link between the city and the waterfront, adding that the project had the potential to be an international icon. One panel member stated that they liked the design and shape of the pond and the “harp-like” water features in the public art.

One Panel member felt that the cadence of the trees needed to be studied further south of Queen’s Quay, adding that the geometric pattern could become more fluid and picturesque towards the south.

Some Panel members felt that the double row of trees along the water’s edge should not run through the park, adding that the paving pattern was the important element to maintain, and that the trees seemed like a barrier to the waterfront. Other Panel members felt that the trees are an important part of the consistency of the linear promenade system and should remain adding that there should be no exceptions if a sense of continuity is to be achieved and that the trees act as foreground to the water, not an obstruction. Another Panel member stated that whatever the system is, it should be maintained, noting that if the system has interruptions for the open spaces then that should be the rule across the waterfront or if the system does not break for open spaces then that should be the rule everywhere.

One Panel member stated that the ideas of water and sustainability are much clearer and stronger in this scheme and urged the team to push sustainability even further and make future design decisions generated through sustainability.

One Panel member felt that there may be too many art pieces. Another Panel member agreed that they are very powerful pieces and that three would be enough. Another Panel member urged the team to study the materiality further, perhaps using more noble materials than concrete.

Another Panel member was concerned about the use of granular material in the forest feeling that with the volume of foot traffic it would be difficult to maintain. Another panel member cautioned that where the path meets the grass there will likely be maintenance challenges.

Another Panel member felt that the concept could be refined even further and the budget reduced, adding that fewer paths and fewer art pieces would not diminish the design. One Panel member felt that the projection south of the water’s edge promenade seems unnecessary and redundant. One Panel member felt that the design of the main pavilion was strong, but that the secondary pavilion seemed incidental, noting that the original “view-framing” intention of the original pavilion was gone. Another Panel member cautioned that every effort should be made to maintain the skating rink should there be budgetary issues.

## 2.5 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. The Panel supports the project moving to Design Development
- ii. Ensure that the project meets the appropriate budget
- iii. Study the forest planting and succession strategy
- iv. Eliminate the pieces that project into the water
- v. Refine the design to build better, fewer elements

- vi. Study the number of bridges and pathways
- vii. Investigate if the small pavilion is necessary
- viii. Keep the skating rink

## 2.6 Proponent's Response

Mr. Smallenberg and Ms. Anholt thanked the Panel for their comments.

## 2.7 Vote of Support/Non Support

Mr. Glaisek then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non support for the project to move to Design Development. The Panel voted unanimously in favour of the project moving forward.

## **3.0 Central Waterfront Public Realm**

*ID#: 1007*

*Project Type: Master Plan/Precinct Plan*

*Location: Area bounded by Parliament and Bathurst Streets, including Queens Quay and the water's edge promenade.*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: West 8 + DTAH*

*Review Round: Nine*

*Presenter(s): Marc Ryan, West 8*

*Delegation: Adam Nicklin, DTAH*

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto's Planning and Design Project Manager for the Central Waterfront, introduced the project.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Fixtures and equipment
- Materials and finishes
- Design of the key elements

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Marc Ryan, Project Manager for West 8, began by providing an overview of the Central Waterfront Master Plan protocols to date followed by a detailed presentation of the designs of the bridges, heads of slips and lighting elements.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked for questions of clarification only.

One Panel member asked how lighting, signage and other possible sources of visual pollution were being minimized and coordinated. Mr. Ryan responded that this is an ongoing challenge in defining the system, adding that they are looking to reduce the number of traffic and light poles and are currently studying the photometrics of the lighting to be able to reduce the number of poles.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the vision is very strong and stressed that it was imperative that the vision be built. Another Panel member agreed, noting that the history of Toronto's Waterfront is one of unfulfilled promises and false starts. Mr. Campbell stated that the Panel

should take comfort that constructing the Central Waterfront is a priority of Waterfront Toronto. Mr. Glaisek agreed, adding that it is nonetheless important that the Design Review Panel keep Waterfront Toronto accountable for delivering on the key components of the design.

Another Panel member stated that the projects and successes at the waterfront need to be marketed and promoted to the public more, possibly through a year-by-year presentation. Mr. Glaisek agreed, adding that Waterfront Toronto has completed a presentation for the Board that outlines this and would be happy to present it to the Panel at the next meeting.

One Panel member felt that the simplicity of the bridge designs was key and felt that the more articulated versions at Simcoe Street acted as a distraction and even an obstacle to the waterfront. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the bridge could help draw people to the waterfront, adding that if the Simcoe Bridge were built, that in and of itself would be a measure of the success at the waterfront. Another Panel member felt that the railings at Simcoe Slip, necessitated by the dramatic slopes, would take away from the power of the design and wondered if there was a way to use the bridge itself to act as a railing.

Another Panel member felt that the maple leaf motif is becoming very omnipresent and felt concerned about how it would be perceived in 20 years.

Another Panel member felt that the choice of glue-lam over timber structures was wise given the stresses of a marine environment with freeze-thaw cycles.

One Panel member felt that it was important that the Waterfront feel unified. Another Panel member agreed, noting that the West 8+DTAH designs, including the Queens Quay revitalization, bridges and heads of slips collectively do exactly that. Another Panel felt that furniture and lighting elements should also be integrated into the designs of Sherbourne Park and the Jarvis Slip Public Space. Another Panel member disagreed, noting that within the unifying framework there should be room for different architectural expressions.

### 3.5 Summary of Panel's Key Issues

The Chair announced that since several Panel members had left and there was no longer a quorum, this would be an update session only for the Panel and any formal comments or issues could be emailed if necessary.

### 3.6 Proponent's Response

Mr. Ryan thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 3.7 Vote of Support/Non Support: N/A

---

## **CLOSING**

There being no further business, the Chair then closed the public session of the meeting and moved to an in-camera session.