



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #71  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

---

**Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Betsy Williamson

**Regrets:**

Jane Wolff  
Gerry Faubert  
George Baird  
Brigitte Shim  
Don Schmitt

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
James Parakh

**Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow  
Tracy Watt

---

**WELCOME**

Bruce Kuwabara opened the meeting by wishing everyone a happy new year.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair provided an overview of the agenda and asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the November 2013 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Chair then asked if there were any conflicts to declare. No conflicts were declared.

The Chair then noted that the City was currently studying the proposed expansion of the Billy Bishop Airport. Mr. Campbell noted that that City Staff believe it is essential to understand the airport's existing and planned size, volume of passengers, number of flights, and its role within the Southern Ontario regional system of airports, in order to complete this evaluation, and have recommended deferring the decision to a later date. Mr. Campbell then noted that the Waterfront Toronto Board agreed and wrote a letter to members of the Executive Committee stating that as the stewards of the waterfront, and the custodian of \$1.5 billion in public investment, it was their responsibility to speak out for that investment. Mr. Campbell added that this really was a generational decision, and not one that should be rushed.

The Chair then asked the Panel if they should weigh in as a group and publish a position statement. The Chair then requested that a think tank session be booked to review issues such as the Island Airport, transit and the future of the Gardiner Expressway, and consider what has been learned and what could have been done better.

The Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to introduce the first proponent.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 LOP Private Development Proposal: Hanlan Boat Club**

*ID#: 1051*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: 6 Regatta Road*

*Proponent: Hanlan Boat Club*

*Architect/Designer: Tristan Armesto*

*Review Stage: Concept/Schematic Design*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Tristan Armesto*

*Delegation: Nick Matthews, Kelly Brigley*

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

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project, noting that the Hanlan Boat Club approached Waterfront Toronto and proactively asked to present their concept to the Design Review Panel. Mr. Glaisek stated that the proponent had recently secured a lease with the City of Toronto but has taken considerable steps to provide a flexible solution for the current site in addition to presenting how the club could be relocate as described in the LOP Master Plan. Mr. Glaisek added that this is a Private Development Application, and is not subject to WT's Mandatory Green Building Requirements, but will be subject to the Toronto Green Standards.

#### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Tristan Armesto provided an overview of the context of the boat club within the wider waterfront and Lake Ontario Park Master Plan. Mr. Armesto noted that the boathouse massing concept was derived from an analysis of the action of rowing and the connection to the lake. Mr. Armesto reviewed the program, plans and views incorporating the current and proposed site.

#### **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel members if they had any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether the proposal for the current site or relocated site was preferred. Mr. Armesto stated that the current site would be more affordable, noting that a lease is in place to 2025, but noted that the site as suggested in the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan is better for rowing as it provides better sheltered water.

Another Panel member asked what the plan was for mechanical systems. Mr. Armesto stated that the building will aim to reduce the environmental impact as much as possible following LEED standards, but it will be adapted to the requirements on each site and the availability of city services on that site.

Another Panel member asked if this site was in a flood plain. Mr. Armesto stated that it was not. There being no other questions, the Chair opened the meeting to the Panel comments.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members commended the project team on a great start. One Panel member stated that it's a great program on a great site, feeling that there is a project here that could be very elegant.

One Panel member felt that conceptually, the proposal on the relocated site was stronger. Another Panel member preferred the site on the shore, noting that the forms are anchored on the land site. Another Panel member felt that the forms were more anchored on the land site, feeling that on the lake site, the building was more of an object. One Panel member noted that changes in orientation between the two sites would affect heat gain and the materials selected. Another Panel member felt that it was hard to show two sites, noting that you can't flip the site without really changing the building.

Several Panel members felt that the entry to the building should be focussed on.

One Panel member stated that they were not sure if it felt like a boathouse. Another Panel member felt that the concept felt like a lot of trailers stacked together. One Panel member cited the new boathouse in Chicago by Studio Gang and a very interesting precedent.

Another Panel member felt that the structure could be flexed to express the movement of rowing more, noting that the structure seemed rigid.

One Panel member felt that the model was very successful, adding that this could be a problem as the design evolves if form is privileged over detail. Another Panel member noted that the clean edges shown in the model did not translate to the drawings as the show overlaps in the skin and structure. Another Panel member urged the team not to try to shoehorn the diagram and accept that it will have to change as the project develops.

Another Panel member stated that the details could make the difference between a good or a bad project. Another Panel member agreed feeling that the beauty of the project will be in the detailing. Another Panel member felt that the designer should gather the engineers together to figure out the structural wood detailing before the design progresses further.

One Panel member noted that the channel glass does not want to be punctured formally or materially, noting that the system will have to change in order to puncture the "wrapper". One Panel member noted that the designer will have to source garage doors that open on a curve. Another Panel member felt that the roof systems and flashing will be challenging to work out.

Another Panel member urged the team to consider making the entire building off-grid.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) The main entrance to the building needs to be focussed on

- 2) The details of the project will be very important to stay true to the concept
- 3) Bring a structural engineer on board to assist in the design of the wood structure before developing the design further.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Armesto thanked the Panel for their feedback.

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

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

---

## **2.0 Urban Park and Waterfront Trail at Ontario Place**

*ID#: 1052*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm*

*Location: 955 Lake Shore Boulevard West*

*Proponent: Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)*

*Architect/Designer: LANDinc and West 8 in joint venture*

*Review Stage: Concept Design*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Morah Fenning, MTCS; Jamie Maslyn Larson, West 8*

*Delegation: Walter Kehm, LANDinc; Patrick Morello, LANDinc; Myles Mackenzie, LANDinc; Serge Chukseev, Infrastructure Ontario; Ainsley Davidson, Infrastructure Ontario; Sandeep Persaud, MTCS; Alena Grunwald, MTCS*

#### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Glaisek introduced the project by stating that the team was asked to “reconnect residents with both the City and their waterfront” and create a new public space that embodies the Ontario landscape. Mr. Glaisek noted the accelerated schedule of the project with LANDinc and West 8 being selected in November 2013, construction targeted to begin in Spring 2014 and the opening of the park scheduled for July 2015 for the Pan/Parapan American Games. Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto is working with Infrastructure Ontario on behalf of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Ministry of Infrastructure to help deliver this project.

#### 2.2 Project Presentation

Morah Fenning, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, began the presentation by updating the Panel on the work that has been done since closing Ontario Place in 2012. Ms. Fenning then stated that they are moving ahead with the first step to revitalization by developing a park and trail – a new public realm – on the east island of Ontario Place. Jamie Maslyn Larson, Principal with West 8 then presented the site, a 7.5 acre parking lot, the context, constraints, scale comparisons, public participation process, opportunities and inspiration and the concept vision.

#### 2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the panel members if they had any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked where the idea for the cultural/programming element came from. Ms. Maslyn Larson stated that it originated from the design team as a suggested way to activate the park.

Another Panel member asked if there were any ideas on how the rest of Ontario Place would be developed. Ms. Fenning stated that they did not have any answers at this time, noting that the government is working on the themes and structure that will guide the development of the next phase. Ms. Fenning added that green space and public access to the waterfront will be key components of the larger revitalization.

Another Panel member asked who the parking was currently for. Ms. Fenning stated that it is currently used by Ontario Place Corporation staff, noting that alternated parking will be found for their use.

Another Panel member asked whether you could access the site from the Ontario Place Boulevard causeway, and exit a different way. Ms. Maslyn Larson stated that entry and exit to the park would be through the causeway as the rest of the site is under partial closure, noting that as the rest of the site is developed, there will be more connections.

One Panel member wondered what the governance structure of the park would be. Ms. Fenning stated that it is still under consideration.

#### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

The Panel was very supportive of the overall vision for the park and trail. One Panel member noted that it was remarkable considering the amount of time the designers have been on the project. Another Panel member felt that it was a very interesting proposition. One Panel member stated their appreciation for the different experiences on the upper and lower sections of this park. Another Panel member felt that the inspiration of the park was rich and diverse.

One Panel member felt that there was a very hard edge against the service road, cautioning that the design should not turn its back to the rest of the site.

Another Panel member felt that the concession/program area represented a really big move considering the fact that there were so many unknowns about program and operators, wondering if it should be considered more in the spirit of a clearing where operators could “plug in”, or have a “camp-like” quality. One Panel member felt that food will be very important in this park, feeling that it will drive people there.

One Panel member felt that the railing along the top of the programmed space will be an issue, noting that landscape edge railings are tough to resolve.

Another Panel member felt that there was an element of kitsch to the project and urged the team to maintain its authenticity. One Panel member felt that the rocks should not appear artificial.

One Panel member noted that bikes and pedestrians do not mix well and urged the team to consider that in the design of the trails. Another Panel member felt that the pathways could be more rationalized.

Several Panel members urged the team to consider the larger transit connections and transit challenges for the rest of the revitalization. One Panel member felt the connection to the Martin

Goodman Trail is not big enough, feeling that the connection to Coronation Park could also be strengthened.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider ways in which people can touch the water. Another Panel member asked the team to consider all access methods to the park including transit, cycling, and boating.

Another Panel member cautioned the team against trying to accommodate too many activities.

One Panel member wondered what the impacts of the proposed Island Airport will be to this park including the marine exclusion zone and use of jets.

One Panel member stated that Toronto lacks a sense of topography, feeling that the design team should exploit the topography as much as possible.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) There design of the programmed space will be a challenge with so many unknowns – consider a more flexible option.
- 2) The design of the trail should promote the safety of all users
- 3) Study ways to strengthen the connections to the water, the Martin Goodman Trail, and transit.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Ms. Fenning and Ms. Maslyn Larson thanked the Panel for their feedback.

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

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

---

### **CLOSING**

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