



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #56
Wednesday, March 7th, 2012**

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
George Baird
Paul Bedford
Peter Busby
Brigitte Shim
Don Schmitt
Betsy Williamson
Jane Wolfe

Designees and Guests:

John Campbell
Christopher Glaisek

Regrets:

Claude Cormier
Robert Freedman

Recording Secretary:

Margaret Goodfellow

WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the Panel, and reviewed the agenda. The Chair then noted that both presentations were Private Development Applications that had been referred by City Planning to the Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel as they are located within the purview area of the Designated Waterfront.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair moved to adopt the minutes from February 2012. The motion was seconded and the Minutes were adopted by the Panel.

The Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Brigitte Shim, as a member of the Board of Directors at Build Toronto, declared a conflict with the 10 York Street Proposal. Ms. Shim then stated that she would recuse herself from reviewing the project. Peter Busby also declared a conflict with the 10 York proposal, stating that both he, and a member of the development team at Tridel were Shareholders in the Windmill Development Group. The Chair thanked Mr. Busby for his declaration, stating that in his and Waterfront Toronto's opinion, though a Conflict of Interest may exist in principle, it is not of such a nature as might be likely to have, or fairly be perceived to have, any material effect on the execution of Mr. Busby's duties as a Panel member. Therefore, the Chair stated, Mr. Busby could review the presentation.

The Chair then invited Mr. Campbell to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE CEO

John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto's President and CEO, began by summarizing progress since his last report.

Mr. Campbell stated that Waterfront Toronto is continuing to work with the City and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to study how acceleration of the development of the Portlands can happen. A roadmap must be developed to outline how development can happen in phases so that upfront government funding can be reduced. This roadmap must adhere to the principals, or Terms of Reference (TOR), of the Environmental Assessment including Flood Protection, Naturalization, and City Building. Mr. Campbell noted that WT will not support any solution that does not adhere to the TOR. Mr. Campbell added that departing from the TOR is not consistent with saving time. Mr. Campbell then stated that a Market Sounding has been completed to gauge the market and estimate the absorption rates of development in the Portlands. This study and optimised version of the Environmental Assessment will be presented to the public on March 31st, April 3rd and 4th, at which time the public will have the opportunity to provide feedback.

Mr. Campbell then stated that Waterfront Toronto and the TTC have been working to find a solution to provide permanent transit to the East Bayfront. The Environmental Assessment originally proposed a longer tunnel and the reconstructed underground loop at Union Station. Mr. Campbell stated that unfortunately, the cost estimates have come back much higher than the 90 million in Waterfront Toronto's budget. The TTC is currently planning on increasing bus service to the area, but WT is hoping that there is a better interim solution to get rail to the East Bayfront.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments, there being none, he then invited Mr. 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.

Waterfront Toronto Design Review District

- The two projects being presented today are actually Private Development Applications that have been referred to the Waterfront Toronto Design Review Panel (WTDRP) by City Planning. Private development applications (Site Plan Applications or Re-Zonings) that are located within the WTDRP purview area (a slightly modified version of the Designated Waterfront Area) will now be presented to the WTDRP, and introduced by City Planning Staff. Like the City's Design Review Panel, the WTDRP will act in an advisory capacity to City Planning, with the minutes being appended to an official letter from Waterfront Toronto as part of the Development Approval Process.

Queens Quay Revitalization

- As Toronto Hydro did not receive authority from the Province to increase their rates, they have suspended many of their capital projects. Toronto Hydro's work directly impacts the work with the TTC and Toronto Water, and will have implications to both the costs and the start of construction for the Queens Quay Revitalization. Waterfront Toronto is working with the TTC, Toronto Hydro and Toronto Water on a solution. Waterfront

Toronto is also working with the Waterfront BIA to minimize disruption during the busy summer months. The additional design work, elaborate staging plans, and Hydro impacts will add additional funding requirements.

- Waterfront Toronto hopes that these issues will be resolved in time to commence early construction works in June.

Underpass Park

- Dramatic lighting has been installed underneath the Richmond/Adelaide ramps at Underpass Park, (Blocks 19 and 20). The final block of the park (Block 18) is now under construction.

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

One Panel member asked if the challenges facing the Queens Quay Revitalization will have any impact on the trees. Mr. Glaisek responded that there will be no impact to the trees.

There being no further questions, the Chair thanked Mr. Campbell and Mr. Glaisek for their reports and proceeded to the Project Review portion of the meeting.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Green Building Requirements Review Process

1.1 Project Presentation

Lisa A. Prime, Director of Sustainability for Waterfront Toronto, provided an overview of the Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR) new reporting process, adding that the overall intention is to streamline the submission process for Developers and the review process for Waterfront Toronto Staff and the WTDRP. Ms. Prime reminded the Panel that the MGBR were first established in 2005 with the intention of setting the bar to transform the market for higher performing buildings, adding that they were updated in 2010 to better reflect current market conditions and changes to the regulatory environment. Ms. Prime noted that a tracking system is used to monitor progress and ensure each project is on course to achieve MGBR and LEED Gold, adding that implementation of the new process will commence immediately and incorporate Panel feedback.

1.2 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there was currently a requirement to report on the Energy Model for the building at Schematic Design phase. Ms. Prime stated that currently there was not mandated at that early phase, but could be.

1.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that an Integrated Design Team with experience should be required.

Another Panel member felt that a key aspect to this process should be the institution of signed declarations from the Architect and Mechanical Engineer for energy modeling. The Panel member added that the Mechanical Engineer should be present at the DRP presentations to validate that the project meets LEED, adding that often the projects fall short. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the Energy Model should be done as early as possible, and presented at the Schematic Design Phase. Another Panel member agreed, adding that accountability at the front end will help to ensure the desired end result.

One Panel member then moved a motion that would;

“Require proponents at the Schematic Design submission and subsequent presentations to provide their explicit LEED Scorecard information and EUI (Energy Use Intensity) in kWh/m². This should be supported by an energy model from the mechanical engineer on the team.”

The Panel member added that the EUI is a bottom line number that predicts how much energy the building will consume. The motion was seconded and passed by the Panel.

Another Panel member added that they would also like to see a report on the energy performance of the building one year after completion. Ms. Prime stated that that currently was part of the reporting system and was encouraged to see it supported.

1.4 Proponents Response

Ms. Prime thanked the Panel for their feedback, noting that the changes would be made and presented at the next Panel meeting.

2.0 Private Development Proposal: 10 York Street

ID#: 1048

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: 10 York Street

Proponent: Tridel/Build Toronto

Architect/Designer: Wallman Architects

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Rudy Wallman

Delegation: Steve Daniels, Tridel

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parakh, Urban Designer with the City of Toronto, introduced the project, noting the context of the building within the York Street corridor. Mr. Parakh noted that the City of Toronto Official Plan states that Tall Buildings should be designed to consist of three parts, carefully integrated into a single whole, requesting that the Panel please comment on the various component parts of the tower including:

- a) Base: How well does the buildings base integrate with the surrounding public realm. Consider grade relationships, set backs on York Street, relationship to the Gardiner as well as the exterior expression of the podium and it's effectiveness in concealing above grade parking.

- b) Middle (shaft): Please comment on the design of the middle (shaft) of the tower, including the relevant components (projecting window bays and vertical coloured glass striations) which make up the shaft.
- c) Top: Please comment on the design of the top of the tower and its role in contributing to the skyline character and integrating roof top mechanical systems into the design

1.2 Project Presentation

Rudy Wallman, Principal with Wallman Architects inc. introduced the project team, site context and site statistics, noting the amount of development and towers in the immediate vicinity of the project. Mr. Wallman then presented the plans, conceptual landscape features, relationship of the podium to the street and shadow studies.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked where the application currently was in the City's review's process. Mr. Wallman answered that the team has applied for a Zoning Bylaw Amendment (Re-Zoning) as the proposal does not confirm with the current zoning in the area.

Another Panel member wondered what the status of the Landscape plan was, beyond the property line in the public realm. Mr. Wallman answered that they are currently coordinating the planters and trees to minimize the impact with below-grade services.

Another Panel member asked if there had been any coordination of the set-backs with other developments along York Street. Another Panel member asked what the degree of consistency was the trees, planting and sidewalk widths were as well.

One Panel member enquired about the conceptual idea behind the design of the tower. Mr. Wallman stated that they were aiming for a contemporary expression that balanced the glazing ratio of 60 percent solid to 40 percent glazed, adding that the colours and pattern were inspired by the Northern lights.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members felt that the project should be seen and presented in relation to the Ice Towers to the North, Maple Leaf Square, Telus, and the development to the South in order to establish a cohesive urban design framework and continuity for York Street. Several Panel members expressed concern that the building face fell further into the perceived public realm than the buildings to the South. Several Panel members felt that the podium should be pulled back to align with the buildings to the south. One Panel member felt that the face of the tower should come all the way down to meet York Street.

One Panel member felt that the relationship between the base and the tower was incongruous. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the tower did not pick up on the subtle elegance of the base. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that there were architectural opportunities to shape the buildings that could be pushed with a triangular site. One Panel member felt that the "clipped" corner of the tower was creating an awkward condition.

One Panel member felt that the rectangular form of the tower was not in keeping with the image of the “Northern Lights” as stated. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the extensions above the tower were not strengthening the design of the tower. Another Panel member felt that the idea of the tower dematerializing into the sky could be pushed further, adding that there was a lost opportunity to shape the top of the building. Another Panel member felt that the top of the tower might be able to have a more volumetric relationship with the form of the tower as a whole. Another Panel member agreed, noting that locating special Penthouses on top could help with the shaping.

Another Panel member felt that there could be residential units in the Podium. Another Panel member felt that there could be more openings in the podium. Another Panel member agreed, noting that the revenue from the residential units could potentially support the costs of mechanized parking. One Panel member felt that the team should look at the work of architecture firm Herzog and De Meuron’s parking garage in Miami, Florida as an interesting precedent. One Panel member felt that the perimeter of the building should be animated more, adding that the four metre fence along Harbour Street would be redundant if the ground plane is treated well.

Another Panel member questioned the location of the café on the North side of the building, feeling that there was a lost opportunity to face the future park or even the off ramp, instead of Lake Shore Boulevard. Another Panel member agreed that the retail should be prejudiced to the South, noting that if the off-ramp ended at Simcoe Street, then Harbour Street will become a more desirable street.

Several Panel members stated that they had no issue with the proposed height of the building. One Panel member added that the height had to be “earned” however, feeling that the higher the building, the more spectacular the architecture should be.

One Panel member felt that the patterning of the elevations seemed cluttered, adding that the proponent should consider four different elevational treatments to respond to the sun. Another Panel member stated that they endorsed the basic principal of the strategy of the elevation, but added that it seemed too busy at the moment to have any real power. One Panel member urged the team to look at the work of artist James Turrell and his work with colour and the ephemeral nature of light. Another Panel member felt that the north façade should be designed to consider a future where the Gardiner Expressway does not exist.

1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Public Realm of York Street Corridor.
 - a) Setbacks should be coordinated with Telus, Ice, 10, 8 York Street, and open up views along York Street towards the water.
- 2) Ground Plan.
 - a) Take the podium to the ground.
 - b) Re-examine the parking.
 - c) Vehicle turning area should be treated like a hotel port coucher. Nice paving, lighting etc...
 - d) Canopy can be used to mitigate the wind.

- 3) Harbour Street.
 - a) Study what is happening under the podium. The streetwall is not continuous.
- 4) Tower form.
 - a) Fully integrate the top of the tower into the design. If the tower is to be that high, then it should be incredible. More robust expression.
- 5) Tower floor plate.
 - a) Take the opportunity to express the unique site.
- 6) Podium.
 - a) Solid Void relationship in podium should be studied.
- 7) Overall Image
 - a) Northern lights – what is the conception of the tower in relation to this?

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Wallman thanked the Panel for their feedback.

1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Non-Support of the project.

3.0 Private Development Proposal: 1 York Street

ID#: 1047

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: 1 York Street

Proponent: Menkes Developments Ltd.

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance (aA) with Sweeny Sterling Finlayson & Co. Architects Inc. (&Co)

Review Stage: Conceptual/Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Peter Clewes, architectsAlliance

Delegation: Mark Sterling, &Co.; Adam Feldman, aA; David Copeland, &Co.; Jude Tersigni, Menkes

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parakh, Urban Designer with the City of Toronto introduced the project noting that the proposed development will occupy an entire city block in close proximity to the waterfront. Mr. Parakh added that the development will contain an exciting mix of uses which are distinct yet complimentary to each other. Mr. Parakh then asked the Panel to please comment on the following:

- a) Grade Relationship: How well does the buildings ground floor plan integrate the various programmatic uses with each other and with the surrounding public realm. Consider set backs on York Street, relationship to the Gardiner and vehicular access throughout the site.
- b) Base: Please comment on the design of the base (podium) of the towers, and its ability to form an articulated yet unifying street wall. Please comment on the animation of the street wall, and in particular it's relationship with the future improved city park to the south.

- c) Top: Please comment on the design of the towers and their role in contributing to the skyline character of the downtown. Should there be any variation to the heights of the residential tower?

3.2 Project Presentation

Peter Clewes, Principal with architects Alliance, introduced the project noting that this presentation was intended to cover both the Conceptual and Schematic design reviews. Mr. Clewes then presented the development program and proposed schedule, noting that they are hoping to start construction in October 2012. Mr. Clewes then presented the design including floor plans, elevations and views, concluding with the sustainability framework.

3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked what the facing distance was between the two residential towers. Mr. Clewes answered that though the Tall Buildings Guidelines stipulate a 25m minimum, they are proposing 17m, feeling that a case could be made for a reduced distance because the towers are offset.

Another Panel member asked if 20m was an appropriate distance between the residential tower and the commercial tower. Mr. Clewes replied that he felt that it was appropriate, given that many City streets are 20m wide. Another Panel member asked if the lights from the office tower at night would affect the residents in the towers adjacent. Mr. Clewes stated that they could design features to mitigate the potential impacts.

Another Panel member wondered why the team was going for a 70 storey tower. Mr. Clewes answered that with over 1 Billion dollars in investment into the transit hub (Union Station), they felt that the location warranted the investment, adding that 70 stories is the maximum that the tower could structurally be.

Another Panel member asked if the building face was set back the same distance as the Maple Leaf Square development to the north. Mr. Clewes stated that the development is set back the same distance (5.0m) from the property line as Maple Leaf square, noting that perhaps the property lines on the development parcels are not aligned, making it appear closer to York Street.

One Panel member asked if the design team had considered aligning the West façade of the building with York Street. Mr. Clewes stated that currently they had not, adding that they can look at it.

Another Panel member wondered why the design team had chosen to locate the "PATH" connection on the North side of the building instead of the South side. Mr. Clewes stated that he could not confidently answer that, noting that it could have been due to the fact that there was retail frontage on the South façade.

Another Panel member asked if thermal breaks for the balconies were intended, adding that they should be factored into the cost of the development. Mr. Clewes stated that he did not believe thermal breaks had been designed or priced, adding that the balconies are intended to provide passive solar shading for the units.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members felt that there should be a consistent public realm treatment and setbacks along York Street.

One Panel member stated that they would like to see more definition in the expression of the building façade. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the complexities of the site were not expressed in the architecture. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that there was no nuance to the towers as they seemed to be following developer norms.

One Panel member noted that the notch out of the North-West corner of the building is what is actually aligned with the Maple Leaf Square development, not the West facade. Another Panel member felt that York Street should open up at this point instead of creating a pinch point.

Another Panel member felt that digitizing the surface of the building could be extraordinary, provided that attention was paid to ensuring the patterning does not get cut off at the corners.

One Panel member stated that in a cold climate regime, the benefits from adding thermal breaks to the balconies far outweighs the shading benefits that the balconies would provide in the summer, adding that the incremental cost of the thermal breaks was relatively small when compared with the price of the units. The Panel member asked that the EUI (Energy Use Intensity) be provided at the next presentation.

Several Panel members felt that there was a lost opportunity in not making the double skin performative in nature. Another Panel member urged to team to consider the Long Term Flexibility of the building, stating that it may not be residential or office 75 years from now.

Another Panel member stated their preference in reading the residential towers as one element instead of two.

One Panel member noted that the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard are now public elevations to address instead of building barriers to.

Another Panel member felt that how the office building and podium address York Street is successful. Some Panel members felt that the West Elevation should be parallel to York Street. One Panel member felt that the Podium should align with York, but that the office tower did not necessarily have to. One Panel member felt that the notch out of the corner of the North West corner of the building was not helping the scheme.

Another Panel member felt that the East elevation should pay more respect to the Harbour Commissioners building. Another Panel member felt that the North Elevation should have a better relationship to Union Square. Another Panel member felt that there should be more differentiation in the building facades, and the way in which the external spaces are expressed.

One Panel member felt that the single loaded PATH connection would give more back to the public realm if it was on the south side instead of being along the Gardiner Expressway as currently proposed. Another Panel member agreed. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that there was not much else to animate the North elevation. Another Panel member felt that the

retail display windows on the South elevation were not successful. Another Panel member agreed, wondering if there was way to reconcile the retail on the South side of the building to become more of a public space with views of the park.

Another Panel member felt that there should be an at-grade crossing at Lake Shore Boulevard, noting that the distance from York Street to Bay Street is quite far. Another Panel member suggested that the City should also consider a public space along the East side of the property.

Several Panel members felt that the proposed spacing between the towers was too close. One Panel member felt that the building should have a great “top”, adding that the extra height should be earned with an architecturally interesting building. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the overall character of the office building was monotonous and perfunctory in nature and should be more expressive.

3.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Show how the building links to the existing and proposed context and streetscape.
- 2) Come back with deliberate analysis of how the building responds to York Street. Do not create a pinch point.
- 3) Stronger consideration of the appropriate distance between the residential towers and the office tower should be given.
- 4) Study the potential East Side connection through the block.
- 5) Study the response and connection from Union Station
- 6) Study the location of the Path
- 7) Top of the building needs development.
- 8) Stronger architectural solution for the towers
- 9) Study the potential to create a more sustainable building, including thermal breaks on the balconies.

3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Clewes thanked the Panel for their feedback.

3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.

CLOSING

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