



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #55 Wednesday, January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

---

**Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Donald Schmitt  
Betsy Williamson  
Jane Wolff

**Regrets:**

Bruce Kuwabara  
Brigitte Shim

**Recording Secretary:**

Melissa Horwood

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

**WELCOME**

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

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

---

**REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, presented the Panel with aerial maps and plans of the overall waterfront area, including images of the proposed and completed projects. Mr Glaisek requested feedback from the Panel on the clarity of the information. One Panel member suggested that two maps be created; one of the overall waterfront vision and another of projects completed to date. Another Panel member suggested that the view be a regular plan view, as opposed to an axonometric view. Another Panel member suggested larger images and another Panel member suggested the map contain only items that are approved, unless there is a proposal to change it.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. There were no conflicts of interest declared.

One Panel member asked about the status of transit along Queens Quay East and Cherry Street, noting that the areas are into the development phase. Mr. Glaisek stated that Cherry Street is funded as part of the Pan Am 2015 project being led by Infrastructure Ontario. The Panel member

asked if a public letter of concern would help, and Mr. Glaisek recommended waiting to see what comes out of the Transit City debate at Council.

Another Panel member stated that George Brown College stated they would not have selected the waterfront site if they knew transit would not be available. Mr. Glaisek stated that the East Bayfront LRT is meant to come from Union Station, underground along Bay Street, and then up to grade all the way to Parliament Street. Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto had initially allocated \$150M for the project, but the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) estimates are that it will cost at least \$260M. Mr. Glaisek stated that the area currently needs an interim solution as opposed to full service all the way to the Portlands for the next 10-15 years. One Panel member suggested that the transit study of the area come to the Design Review Panel once it is complete. Mr. Glaisek stated that this request is possible.

One Panel member stated that City of Toronto council is meeting soon to discuss cuts to existing transit and that there is a possibility that a small amount of Provincial money could be re-allocated from the Eglinton Crosstown LRT to other projects in the City noting that, if City council approves this, it could be a possibility for a source of funding for transit in the East Bayfront.

The Acting Chair then moved to adopt the minutes from December 2011. The minutes were adopted.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Bayside Urban Design Guidelines**

*ID#: 1046*

*Project Type: Guidelines*

*Location: South of Queens Quay, between Sherbourne Common and Parliament Slip*

*Proponent: Hines*

*Architect/Designer: Bousfields, du Toit Allsopp Hillier*

*Review Stage: Concept Design*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Robert Glover, Bousfields Inc. and Adam Nicklin, du Toit Allsopp Hillier*

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

Christopher Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design, introduced the project to the Design Review Panel. Mr. Glaisek introduced many of the City of Toronto staff members that were present at the meeting, including Andrea Old, Angus Cranston and Susan McAlpine. Mr. Glaisek stated that the Bayside Urban Design Guideline is an update from the original draft East Bayfront document, and was a collaborative effort between Hines, Bousfields Inc. and du Toit Allsopp Hillier. Mr. Glaisek informed the Panel that the guidelines are being revised as part of the Plan of Subdivision process.

#### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Robert Glover, Partner with Bousfields Inc., presented the project to the Design Review Panel, noting that the guidelines are consistent with those already developed for the Central Waterfront, to ensure that the overall cohesiveness of the waterfront remains. Mr. Glover stated that they worked closely with du Toit Allsopp Hillier, the designers of the public realm, to develop the guidelines. Mr. Glover stated that they are looking for feedback regarding the role of the guidelines within the larger process of development for the area. Adam Nicklin, Partner with du Toit Allsopp Hillier, presented the urban design approach to the area.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if guidelines had been developed regarding vehicular entrances. Mr. Glover stated that they have suggested areas and locations in the guidelines.

One Panel member asked if there will be a change in materiality between the public and private street. Mr. Glover stated that all of the streets will appear to be public space. Another Panel member asked why they were having both public and private roads, if they were all going to look the same. Mr. Glover stated that the City of Toronto wants wider streets if they are public and that underground parking is prohibited below public streets. Another Panel member asked what the implications were in terms of maintenance of privately owned roads. Mr. Glover stated that the private roads will be maintained by the condominium entity. One Panel member asked if the accountability for this maintenance will be transferred, if Hines decides to sell. Mark Potter, Construction Manager with Hines, stated accountability would be transferred.

One Panel member asked if there have been any discussions with the City of Toronto for them to take ownership of the private roads. Mr. Glover stated that there is a long history of private roads and that it is his understanding that there is no desire by the City of Toronto to take over these roads. Mr. Nicklin stated that they worked with the City of Toronto to accept a narrower public street, noting that the private road is 3.5 metres narrower.

One Panel member asked how the entrances into the area would be managed when the public streets are closed. Mr. Glover stated that the roads in Bayside are flexible enough to accommodate some closures.

Another Panel member asked why the private drive makes a 90 degree jog. Mr. Glover stated that if the street did not make that turn it would constrict the development parcel to the north. Mr. Glover also stated that it gives the precinct a more neighbourhood feel.

One Panel member asked if the pedestrian connection to Sherbourne Common is now in line with the private drive. Mr. Glover confirmed that it has been aligned with the private drive.

One Panel member asked how they would ensure that Phase I does not just feel like a phase. Mr. Glover stated that they understand that this could be an issue so they are currently working on addressing it. Mr. Nicklin stated that the phases will be cohesive, making it still feel like a neighbourhood.

### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

A few Panel members felt that the third point under Principle 5, regarding Old Town Toronto materiality, should be removed.

One Panel member supported the idea that the guidelines be only mildly prescriptive. Many Panel members felt comfortable with the guidelines.

One Panel member felt that more consideration needs to be given to the capacity of the private street to act as a connector when the public street is closed. Other Panel members did not have

concerns with the private road becoming primary at times. Another Panel member supported the jog in the private road, noting that it created different vistas. One Panel member felt that Street B should rarely be closed, given its proximity to public space.

One Panel member felt that guidelines for vehicular entrances should be further developed and come back to the Panel.

One Panel member felt that the buildings along the waterfront are continuously getting taller, first with Corus Quay and then with George Brown College. The Panel member was concerned that the urban design intent is being eroded.

One Panel member felt that it was hard to distinguish green roofs from parks in the renderings.

One Panel member felt that there should be a visual connection from Aiken Place Park through to Parliament Street slip.

Another Panel member felt that the private street was executed well. A few Panel members felt that there will be enough capacity for the road as it currently is. One Panel member stated concern over future issues surrounding the private ownership of some roads.

Many Panel members supported the plan. One Panel member felt that the hierarchy of highly private to public space is working very well.

One Panel member suggested extending the Queens Quay streetscape beyond Street C. Another Panel member suggested the private connection towards Parliament Slip be moved south to line up with the private drive.

One Panel member felt that the guidelines provide the right amount of detail, given that there is a Design Review Panel in place, or similar mechanism, to ensure quality going forward. Another Panel member felt that the guidelines should include a landscape maintenance section.

Many Panel members felt that parking should not be placed under Aiken Place Park for fear that it would impact the plantings above. One Panel member felt that the use of Silva Cells should be mandated in the plan.

One Panel member felt that dimensions needed to be provided for all blocks, noting that different architects will be using the guidelines.

Another Panel member felt that it needs to be made explicit that the private owners do not have the authority to close the street and that all obligations of the current owners need to be passed to future owners in perpetuity.

One Panel member emphasized that it is important that the private and public areas do not look drastically different.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Over all support for the nature of the guidelines.
- 2) More detail about width and location of vehicular entrances.
- 3) Some concern regarding the capacity of the private street.

- 4) Clarity of land tenure and maintenance obligations over time.
- 5) Fine tune the alignments of pedestrian connections through to Parliament Slip.
- 6) Eliminate the reference to Old Town Toronto.
- 7) Make specific reference to zoning and heights.
- 8) Complete the extension of Queens Quay beyond Street C.
- 9) Phase 1 needs to feel complete on its own.
- 10) Prescription of soil depth above parking structures to make sure that quality trees will be able to grow.
- 11) Make sure that there are more specific dimensions on the drawings.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Glover and Mr. Nicklin thanked the Panel for their feedback.

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

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

---

#### **CLOSING**

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