



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #21 Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Present:

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair
Tania Bortolotto
Peter Clewes
Renee Daoust
Anne McIlroy
Charles Waldheim

Regrets:

George Baird
Peter Halsall
Siamak Hariri
Bruce Kuwabara
Janet Rosenberg
Don Schmitt
Greg Smalenberg

Designees and Guests:

Robert Freedman
John Campbell
Christopher Glaisek

Recording Secretary:

Margaret Goodfellow

WELCOME

Paul Bedford welcomed the Panel, noting that Mr. Kuwabara and Mr. Glaisek had asked him to serve as Acting Chair this month. He provided an overview of the agenda and then, noting the full agenda, invited Mr. Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to provide a summary of project progress over the past month.

REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN

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

Spadina Head of Slip

- With the contracts having been signed, the ground-breaking will be taking place on November 30th, 2007, with an anticipated completion date of June 2008.

Jarvis Slip Public Space

- An Invited Competition will be kicked off on November 22nd, 2007 for the design of the public space on Jarvis slip, adjacent to the Corus project. The four shortlisted teams include: West8/dTAH, Janet Rosenberg and Associates, Daoust Lestage Inc., and Claude Cormier Paysagists.
- The winning team will be announced on January 28th, 2008

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if they had any questions or comments, there being none, the Acting Chair then moved to General Business.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Acting Chair emphasized the importance of the Re-Visioning Session on Tuesday, December 11th, noting that Panel members' participation is vital to the success of the session. The Acting Chair then requested that Waterfront Toronto circulate an agenda to Panel members to gain their input.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions or comments on the last month's meeting minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Central Waterfront Masterplan

ID#: 1007

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

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: Eight

Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8

Delegation: John Hillier, DTAH, Adam Nicklin, DTAH, and Mark Ryan, West 8

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, provided an overview of various projects which make up the overall Central Waterfront Masterplan and their related schedules, including a status report on the Queens Quay EA process, the heads of slip, the bridges and the finger piers. Ms. Mallozzi stated that this presentation will be a dense overview of all of the work being completed for the Central Waterfront public realm from furniture and lighting design options to timber structural systems. Ms. Mallozzi noted that though the East Bayfront Public Realm is a component of the overall Central Waterfront Masterplan, it will be presented separately, and will get into greater detail.

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

- The overall progress in achieving the original vision
- Which elements of the Masterplan the Panel would like to review in further detail

1.2 Project Presentation

Adriaan Geuze, Principal with West 8, began the presentation by stating the original challenge of the project – to give the Toronto waterfront an identity. Mr. Geuze then described the concept of the “green foot” for Toronto, citing imagery from the Group of Seven, and cottage country. Mr. Geuze then presented the Masterplan as a series of 12 Design Protocols: Tools to guide and influence the design of future initiatives on the Central Waterfront. Mr. Geuze then described

further some of the elements such as the promenade, linkages and bridges, inventory of existing street furniture, low energy consumption illumination, pontoon design, Queens Quay, and other strategic projects.

1.3 Panel Questions and Comments

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

One Panel member asked if the “maple leaf island” was still in the plan. Mr. Geuze stated that there is every intention to try to keep it, and that currently it is being studied as an element of the water treatment facility in the East Bayfront.

Another Panel member asked if the design protocols were intended to be separate documents, or one. Mr. Nicklin stated that they would be different chapters or segments of one document. The Panel member agreed that that is the best approach, noting the importance of knitting all the protocols together.

One Panel member enquired as to the implementation plan of the project. Mr. Geuze stated that construction will soon begin on the Spadina Head of Slip, with the Spadina Bridge beginning next year. This will be followed by the remaining heads of slip and bridges.

One Panel member asked Mr. Geuze what he felt the greatest challenge was on this project. Mr. Geuze stated that he was not sure if the project will ever be fully realized and shared with the city at large, noting the importance to have “buy-in” from the public and the politicians in order to fully realize the project. The Panel member agreed that it is too early for the complete “buy-in” from the public, but stated that it could come with time. One Panel member cautioned that in Toronto, masterplans never seem to get fully implemented. Another Panel member stated that there was currently a lot of ignorance about the project in the city and that it needs to be better publicized.

Another Panel member enquired as to who would oversee the implementation and use of the design protocols. Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto would, but that the City of Toronto would have to be supportive of them. The Panel member emphasised that it is really important for the project to address this question, and ensure the proper strategies for implementation.

One Panel member asked what the Toronto Port Authority thought of the floating piers. Mr. Campbell stated that the Port Authority has been very supportive of the work that had been done along the waterfront to date.

Another Panel member asked if the Design Protocols will be implemented into the Jarvis Slip Public Space or the Pier 27 Development. Mr. Glaisek stated that these protocols are still in draft form, but saw no reason why they could not be sent to the design teams.

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that the Great Lakes in Toronto were really more about sand and marsh, than granite from the Canadian Shield. One Panel member added how clever the project is, noting that it references the place where Torontonians escape to on the weekends, and where they really want to be. Mr. Gueze agreed, noting that the landscape proposed is romantic, an illusion, but that it is really a Canadian cliché, and that the anchor of that cliché is easily

transformed into functional space. Another Panel member felt that this plan gives Toronto its own identity and a reason not compare itself to other cities.

Another Panel member stated that Waterfront Toronto should clearly define the phases of work, what those phases are, as well as the schedules and budgets for those phases, noting that publicising this would give the public something tangible to begin to penetrate the hearts and minds.

One Panel member stated that the trees would really have the biggest impact along the waterfront, noting the importance that this be done as soon as possible, and help with the “buy-in” from the public.

One Panel member stated their support for the evolution of the bench designs, but cautioned that their span be studied to ensure there are breaks in appropriate locations.

One Panel member stated that they would like to see how signage will be addressed.

Another Panel member stated that Waterfront Toronto should convene some sessions with the City of Toronto to review these protocols and ensure work is not being duplicated, noting that work being done on tree pit details could be incorporated into the new City Tree Pit Manuals. One Panel member stated that Waterfront Toronto should look into where the new Astral Media Street Furniture will stop.

1.4 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Support for the vision of the project, right direction, the Canadian vision is strong.
- ii. A Communication strategy is important to keep the project in the hearts and minds of Torontonians, with the phases and timing of development and important component of the strategy.
- iii. Ensure that Waterfront Toronto enforces the protocols with future projects.
- iv. Communicate with the City of Toronto and the Port Authority to ensure their cooperation and buy-in of the project.
- v. Plant the trees early to gain support from the public.
- vi. Study the furnishings and lighting further, including opportunities for chairs along the waterfront
- vii. Study signage as an important component of the strategy

1.5 Proponent’s Response

Mr. Geuze thanked the Panel for their feedback.

2.0 East Bayfront: Public Realm

ID#: 1021

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

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: One

Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8

Delegation: John Hillier, DTAH, Adam Nicklin, DTAH, and Mark Ryan, West 8

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, noting that this is the first presentation of the East Bayfront public realm to the Panel, and goes into more detail on the concepts and ideas proposed in the Masterplan.

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

- Feedback on the cross section of promenade
- Feedback on the street sections
- Feedback on planting options and tree pit details

2.2 Project Presentation

Adriaan Geuze, Principal with West 8, began the presentation by outlining the pieces that make up the public realm including the floating elements, streets and promenade, trees, and public spaces. Mr. Geuze then described in detail the nature of the boardwalk. Mr. Hillier, Partner with DTAH, continued by describing the tree pit details and the implications of planting on one side of the street versus both. Mr. Hillier then further described the street sections including parking options with Mr. Geuze providing an overview of street furniture and materials. Mr. Geuze concluded the presentation by outlining potential stormwater management solutions and the implications on navigation, and stressed the importance of a continuously treed waterfront.

2.3 Panel Questions and Comments

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

One Panel member asked if the continuous double row of trees proposed as part of the water's edge promenade, was intended to carry up the sides of the slips, specifically, the eastern side of Jarvis Slip. Mr. Geuze replied that, in this case that was the intention and the trees would help define the public space better.

Another Panel member enquired as to why no trees were proposed for the north-south street between Project Symphony and the proposed Institutional tenant to the east. Mr. Hillier responded that as a utility corridor, finding the space for appropriate soil volumes for the trees has been a challenge, combined with the fact that loading and servicing will be taking place on this street, makes planting viable trees very difficult. Mr. Hillier noted that this street will also have a different character from those that run along the park edge, but would investigate further if trees could be possible.

One Panel member enquired about the strategy to deal with the City of Toronto's policy against planting monocultures, noting that the power of this scheme is in the consistent language of trees along the water's edge. Mr. Hillier replied that as an option, two or three similar tree species that have a similar character could be used. One Panel member suggested that the species of trees be planted in blocks to gain consistency over the course of a block. Another panel member cited the Bloor Street revitalization and Bayview Avenue in the West Don Lands as precedents where one consistent species of tree were being used. Mr. Geuze added that it is desirable to have one species of tree to have the greatest impact, noting that if trees are grown from seed, they have a greater bio-diversity and more inherent genetic resistance than trees that are cloned. One Panel member asked if a tree nursery had already been selected to begin to grow the trees for the waterfront. Mr. Geuze replied that that had not happened yet, but agreed that it should be done

soon, citing the fact that trees were purchased twenty years before the planting of the Champs Elysees in Paris.

Another Panel member asked if soil cells were being used for the trees along the water's edge. Mr. Hillier replied that they would be using them. The Panel member then asked how the trees were to be watered, noting that drip irrigation lines tend to get cut during road work and repair. Mr. Hillier replied that alternative methods of watering trees such as bio swales have issues such as street salt contaminating the water, and suggested that if the trees had enough soil volume, the trees would do well. Mr. Gueze added that they are committed to delivering healthy trees and believe that this will happen.

Another Panel member wondered what the parking strategy was in general for the East Bayfront. Mr. Hillier replied that there will be negotiations with each building owner to incorporate underground parking, noting that street parking is planned for short term parking and couriers. Mr. Gueze added they have proposed a mild regime for parking, noting that streets dominated by parked cars are not friendly, but that streets with no parking can be uncomfortable at night. One Panel member cited the parking condition near the Radisson Hotel where a similar parking strategy exists.

One Panel member enquired as to the timeline of the Environmental Assessment for the central waterfront. Ms. Mallozzi replied that currently there are two separate EA's that overlap, a transit EA lead by the TTC, and the Queens Quay EA lead by Waterfront Toronto. Ms. Mallozzi added that the transit EA should be complete in four to six weeks, and the Queens Quay EA will be entering the Design Alternatives phase of the process in January.

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

A few Panel members noted that they did not agree with Waterfront Toronto's decision to place the loading and servicing along the north-south street and would have preferred to see this take place along the east-west streets.

Several Panel members agreed that having larger tree pits situated on one side of the road was preferable to having smaller tree pits running along both sides of the street.

The Panel generally agreed that the granite paving proposed will help to demarcate the East Bayfront as a precinct. One Panel member added that there is also a strong sustainability component with granite as it is reusable, durable, and facilitates road repairs by allowing crews to remove pavers as needed. One Panel member cautioned that the City of Toronto Works department should be brought into this discussion early, noting that stockpiling and maintenance issues will likely be of concern to them. Mr. Hillier added that Ottawa uses granite paving extensively. Another Panel member added that it would be interesting to analyze the sustainability of concrete versus granite pavers.

2.4 Summary of Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Support for the larger tree pit to ensure the trees will thrive.
- ii. The proposed monoculture of trees gives the waterfront a strong identity.
- iii. Support for the use of granite pavers, but coordinate with the City of Toronto works department.
- iv. The absence of vegetation on the pedestrian north-south streets is a concern.

- v. Support for street parking as much as possible on one side.

2.5 Proponent's Response

Mr. Gueze thanked the Panel for their comments.

3.0 Project Symphony – (Now First Waterfront Place)

ID#: 1017

Project Type: Building Design

Location: Jarvis Street south of Queens Quay on the south-east side of the Jarvis Slip

Proponent: TEDCO

Architect/Designer: Diamond and Schmitt Architects

Review Round: Five

Presenter(s): David Dow, Diamond and Schmitt Architects

Delegation: Carlo Bonanni, TEDCO

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Andrew Gray, Vice President for Development of East Bayfront with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project and outlined the project's context within the Plan of Subdivision being proposed for Phase I of the East Bayfront, noting that the middle north-south street may become pedestrian, pending city review of the traffic analysis.

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

- The overall evolution of the project since the last presentation to the Design Review Panel on June 13th, 2007.

3.2 Project Presentation

David Dow, Partner with Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc., began the presentation by providing an update on the status of the project, noting that the Site Plan Application had just been submitted to the City of Toronto. Mr. Dow stated that in order to expedite the schedule, the project is being sequentially tendered, noting work had already progressed onsite including demolition of the former Marine Terminal warehouse, driving of caissons, and preparation excavation of the underground parking. Mr. Dow then presented the project's evolution since the June 13th Panel meeting, noting the ongoing dialogue with the West 8+DTAH team on treatment of the open space adjacent to the building. Mr. Dow concluded the presentation by stating that an RFP will be going out for the restaurant component of the program, and that Karen Mills had been brought on to the team as the public art consultant.

3.3 Panel Questions and Comments

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

One Panel member asked for a further description of the interface between the building and the adjacent public open space. Mr. Dow described the programmatic elements beginning at the north-west corner of the building, including radio studios and television studios, with the intention that at times the television studio would open up on to the adjacent public space. At the south-west corner, would be a "Hub", described as a flexible tenant area where employees could come together for informal gatherings or meetings, and that on special occasions, the space could be open to the public for lectures, announcements, receptions or screenings.

Another Panel member enquired if there was a current section of the building through the site. Mr. Dow stated that they were currently working with the West 8+DTAH team to coordinate

this and negotiate the 600mm difference across the site. Mr. Dow stated that the ground floor elevation was set at 77.7, and that the site could either slope or include steps, depending on the decision of the public realm team.

One Panel member asked if there were any benches as part of the design. Mr. Dow stated that there was a bench at the north-west corner of the site, which acted to conceal the air intake for the parking garage below.

Another panel member asked if the external, ground floor columns were clad in black granite. Mr. Dow responded that for cost reasons, they would be black tinted concrete instead.

One Panel member asked if the wood soffit extended outside the building. Mr. Dow stated that the soffit did extend outside, as well as the granite flooring in an effort to blur the lines between inside and outside.

Another Panel member asked how the project was reaching its sustainability requirements. Mr. Dow stated that they are confident of achieving LEED Gold Certification of the building, and will be using a green roof, a living wall inside the building, as well as many other features to achieve this.

One Panel member noted a discrepancy between the various drawings as to the precise location of the western edge of the building. Mr. Dow noted that it has now been fixed, and the Plan of Subdivision reflects its final location, with the west face of the building in line with those of the buildings to the north.

Another Panel member enquired as to why the retail component on the ground floor had shrunk. Mr. Dow responded that the tenant required more space in order to make the program for the Hub work. One Panel member asked if there was an opportunity for the retail space to play a dual role, possibly providing coffee to both tenants and the public. Mr. Dow stated that security issues made that scenario difficult, and that it also did not make sense from an economic point of view.

One Panel member asked if signage had been considered yet. Mr. Dow stated it was still unresolved.

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel generally agreed that by siting the restaurant on the south-east corner of the building, there were lost opportunities for interaction with the Jarvis Slip public space as well as views of the Redpath Sugar boats coming in and out. Mr. Dow stated that placing the restaurant on the west side of the building created difficulties in plan with servicing the restaurant, as well as accessing the Hub space, and did not work.

One Panel member felt strongly that the resonance of the previous version of the project was its combination of simplicity, punctuated by elements of exuberance, but that all the exuberance had been value engineered out. One Panel member stated their fear of the green wall being value engineered out next. Another Panel member felt concerned that this was a steady process of regression, and mused that in the next iteration, the “green wall” would probably be value engineered out too.

Several Panel members felt that the loss of the 8th floor resulted in a mundane, flat and boxy form, and worried that it would set a most undesirable precedent not consistent with the precinct

plan. The Panel noted that this was a substantial change from the plans presented at the June 13th meeting.

Several Panel members raised objection to the continued presence of multiple service bays facing the street. There was general agreement that internal service courts are common in Toronto, and this project should be a good neighbour and follow suit. It was emphasized that this change was requested by the panel at each of the previous meetings, yet has still not been addressed.

Another Panel member stated their disappointment that the public space had been minimized on the ground floor, and felt that they had been lead to believe that it would be a lot more open to the public than now appears. Several Panel members agreed feeling that the “City TV”-like quality had been squeezed down. There was also a feeling that the role of the central atrium was diminished, as the “Hub” appears to be a conference/meeting room for staff, with little or not opportunity for public access.

One Panel member expressed great disappointment at the loss of the sculptural, “egg shaped” conference space, noting it was the main element that made the building distinctive from the water side, and that it helped to differentiate the two sides of the building better.

Another Panel member felt that the detailing of the glass walls, which are now virtually the only design element remaining, will be critical to the look of the building. Several Panel members asked to see material samples and typical connection details at the next presentation.

Other Panel members felt the building now looks like it belongs on highway 401, that the design standards were pedestrian, and that it has lost its potential to be a great waterfront building.

3.4 Summary of Panel’s Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Restore the exuberance to the building that value engineering has removed by making a much more powerful design with a more publicly focused ground floor.
- ii. Maximize the south-west corner of the site, enhancing the interface between the private and public realms.
- iii. Reinstate the 8th floor to help differentiate the mundane glass box appearance.
- iv. Consolidate servicing elements to a single aperture on the east façade.

3.5 Proponent’s Response

Mr. Dow thanked the Panel for their comments, noting his disagreement with some of the comments. Mr. Dow stated that opportunities for big design changes are now limited as they are filing for a building permit imminently.

The Acting Chair then moved to convene the *in camera* portion of the meeting and asked the members of the public to leave.

CLOSING

At the conclusion of the *in camera* review, and with no further business, the Acting Chair adjourned the meeting.

--