



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #45  
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

---

**Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Clewes  
Claude Cormier  
Renee Daoust  
Siamak Hariri  
Anne McIlroy  
Brigitte Shim  
Greg Smallenberg  
Betsy Williamson

**Regrets:**

Bruce Kuwabara  
Janet Rosenberg

**Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

**Designees and Guests:**

John Campbell  
Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

**WELCOME**

Paul Bedford welcomed the Panel, noting that Bruce Kuwabara has asked him to act as Chair this month. 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, provided a summary of project progress.

*Port Lands Sports Complex*

- The Architecture of the Port Lands Sports Complex in the Lower Don Lands has been evolving well. The project will come before council in August.

*Sugar Beach*

- Sugar Beach is now open to the public with the formal ribbon cutting taking place on Monday, August 9th. It has received great reviews in the media to date.

### *Queens Quay Revitalization*

- The design team has been working to refine the “Horizontal Alignment”.

### *York Quay Revitalization, Phase II*

- The parking lot has now been closed, and perimeter fencing installed to allow the construction manager, Ellis Don, to begin site mobilization and preparation. Hoarding will be erected in August along with the release of the shoring and excavation tender.

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

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair noted that this meeting will be the final meeting for four of the Panel members, adding that every year, four panel members are rotated from the Panel and four new Panel members join. The Acting Chair then thanked the departing Panel members including Anne McIlroy, Janet Rosenberg, Siamak Hariri, and Renee Daoust, for their unique contributions to the Panel and Waterfront Toronto over the past five years. In particular, he acknowledged Anne’s attention to city-building issues, Janet’s critiques on the public realm, Siamak’s focus on the “big idea” behind each project, and Renee’s attention to beauty, sophistication and good urban design.

On behalf of Waterfront Toronto, Christopher Glaisek joined the Acting Chair in thanking the Panel members for their time and efforts on this volunteer panel. Mr. Glaisek then welcomed Peter Busby, Managing Director of Busby Perkins+Will, as the Panel’s newest member who’s particular role will be that of Sustainability Advisor.

The Acting Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Greg Smallenberg declared a conflict with the Foundry Building presentation as his firm is designing the Foundry Mews, adjacent to the property. Renee Daoust declared a conflict with the George Brown College project as her firm was involved in the original feasibility study.

The Acting Chair moved to adopt the minutes from June 2010. The minutes were unanimously adopted.

There being no other comments, the Acting Chair moved to the Project Review portion of the meeting.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 East Bayfront Development: George Brown College Health Sciences Campus**

*ID#: 1023*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Proponent: George Brown College (GBC)*

*Architect/Designer: Stantec/Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects in Joint Venture (Stantec/KPMB)*

*Location: South of Queens Quay, West of Lower Sherbourne Street*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Michael Moxam, Stantec/KPMB; Bruce Kuwabara, Stantec/KPMB.*

*Delegation: Ann Sado, GBC; Eugene Harrigan, GBC; Terry Comeau, GBC; Nerys Rau, GBC*

### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Margaret Goodfellow, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that it is the third time it has come before the Panel and is currently in the Design Development Stage. Ms. Goodfellow reminded the Panel that the City, as landowner, is entering into a ground lease with George Brown College on Block 5, with an option to develop Block 3. Ms. Goodfellow stated that the lease with the City extends to Sherbourne Park, with a Public Easement to allow access to the water's edge – which is the same situation with the laneway on the East, owned by TEDCO. Ms. Goodfellow then stated that WT is continuing to work with George Brown College, Stantec/KPMB and Philips Farevaag Smallemberg to respond to some of the specific design concepts envisioned by GBC for the laneway.

### 1.2 Project Presentation

Michael Moxam, Senior Principal at Stantec Architecture Ltd. provided an overview of the project reminding the Panel of the program, design objectives and the overall context. Mitchell Hall, Senior Associate with Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects, provided an overview of the design since it was last reviewed in December 2009, including the elevations, materiality, and detailing. Greg Smallemberg, Partner with Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg, then presented the landscape elements noting that all of the storm water is being treated and filtered on site. Chris Piche, Associate with Stantec, concluded by providing an overview of the sustainability measures, noting that they are on track to achieve LEED Gold Certification.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked how the team was dealing with heat gain on the south façade of their building. Mr. Hall answered that their strategy was to use a combination of fritting, a double-skinned facade on the West block and a crenellated façade on the library. The Panel member asked what the percentage of “fritting” was on the glass. Mr. Hall answered that it was 50%. Another Panel member asked what the overall percentage of glazing was on the building. Mr. Piche answered that the percentage of glazing was 60%, adding that to deal with the heat gain the perimeter is segregated from the remainder of interior spaces. Another Panel member asked if there was a heat recovery system, and if so, what the heat recovery was. Mr. Piche answered that it was 70%, adding that in shoulder seasons the solar wall will be used to pre-heat the outdoor air.

Another Panel member asked how weather protection was being provided on the terraces. Mr. Smallemberg answered that although open to the air, glass parapets on the L4 and L7 terraces will help to mitigate the wind.

Another Panel member asked what the method of procurement was for the construction of the project. Mr. Hall stated that there is a Construction Manager on board, Ellis Don.

One Panel member asked what the purpose of the sunken court was at the south end of the building. Mr. Hall answered that it was part of the “ Learning Landscape” and intended to bring light and air into the concourse level of the building. Another Panel member asked if the sunken court was weather protected. Mr. Hall answered that it was exterior space. Another Panel

member asked what the dimensions of the sunken court were. Mr. Hall stated that it was 6.5m x 10m.

One Panel member asked what the width of the south sidewalk was adjacent to the building along Dockside Drive. Mr. Hall answered that the sidewalk is approximately 2m wide, though widens at the bookstore and between vestibules.

Another Panel member enquired about the materiality of the outdoor reading rooms. Mr. Hall stated that they are currently intended to be wood, stone and metal.

Another Panel member asked what the underside of the soffits were clad in. Mr. Hall stated that they will likely be metal for the most part with wood soffits at grade.

Another Panel member asked what stage of approvals the project was. Mr. Hall answered that GBC has received their Notice of Approval Conditions (NOAC) on their Site Plan Application.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the scheme was developing appropriately, and would be a fabulous public building. Other Panel members felt that the overall project was great and much more refined since the last presentation in December 2009. Another panel member appreciated the development, noting that it is difficult when there is no “back” of the building.

One Panel member was not convinced by the merits of the sunken court, feeling that its cost could be better devoted elsewhere in the building as the court will not be an inviting space for much of the year. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the south facade of the building would be better served by a direct connection to the public realm instead of the sunken court. Other Panel members agreed, feeling that there were great seasonal challenges that the sunken court needed to overcome. One Panel member felt that the sunken court was fine, feeling that it is part of the vertical landscape of the building.

Several Panel members felt that there were too many different conditions and too many materials, feeling that the project could undergo a process of further editing. Other Panel members agreed, feeling that there are moves that could be strengthened and others that are edited. One Panel member felt that the design team should reflect on their original concept of expressing the sectional qualities of the building on the outside, while undergoing the process of editing. Another Panel member agreed, wondering if there was an opportunity for the voids to penetrate vertically through the building more. Another Panel member stated that the project needed to find the right balance between solidity and transparency.

Another Panel member felt that three trees along the East Laneway were not enough, noting that it seemed residual. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the East Laneway design should incorporate shading devices for the summer. Another Panel member felt that the wind mitigation elements were not successful. Another panel member stated that the porch-like quality of the south-east corner that was seen in earlier versions of the scheme should not be lost.

One Panel member felt that alternatives such as glazed doors should be looked at for the service doors along the West Side of the building.

One Panel member felt that the extent of glazing on the east and south facades are too extensive and irresponsible, adding that a more attention should be paid to responding to solar conditions and materials.

Another Panel member felt that the 7<sup>th</sup> floor terrace would be better served with some shading devices.

One Panel member felt that certain details such as the soffits and the underside of the stairs and library should all be part of the conception of the building.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Clarify, strengthen and refine the materials and details used in the project – refer back to the “expression of the section” to drive the editing process,
- 2) Study the need and benefit that the sunken court brings to the project,
- 3) Pay greater attention to shading devices and opportunities for shade in the outdoor spaces,
- 4) Re-consider the amount of glazing on the south and east facades of the building.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Moxam, Mr. Hall, Mr. Piche and Mr. Smallenberg 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, wondering if the comments were of a nature that would require the design team to come back before the Panel.

The Panel voted in Support of the project, feeling that the design team would take the comments into consideration and did not need to come back before the panel.

---

## **2.0 West Don Lands District Energy: Foundry Building**

*ID#: 1033*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: 153 Eastern Avenue*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Kongats Architects*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Alar Kongats, Kongats Architects*

*Delegation: Danielle Lam-Kulczak, Kongats Architects*

### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Brenda Webster, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that this is the second presentation to the Design Review Panel and is currently in the Design Development Phase. Ms. Webster reminded the Panel that the Foundry District Energy Centre will provide heating and cooling for the first phase of the West Don Lands development, noting that Waterfront Toronto has engaged Kongats Architects and Andy Patton as the Public

Artist to develop this project in collaboration with FVB, the engineers for the District Energy System.

## 2.2 Project Presentation

Alar Kongats, Principal with Kongats Architects, provided an overview of the project including how the design has evolved to address the Panel comments from the May 12, 2010 presentation. Andy Patton, Artist, presented the concept of “colouring architecture”, noting that the intention is that colour will shift according to the daily mean temperature and act as a communication tool to the community.

## 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked how wide the vertical slot was on the side of the west side of the building. Mr. Kongats answered that it is 8 inches to create an intense condition of light, adding that it is scaled to the size of a person peeking in.

Another Panel member wondered if the roof was still being planted. Mr. Kongats stated that there is no longer a green roof.

Another Panel member asked how the building was intended to be read during the day. Mr. Kongats answered that it was meant to be read as a simple, modest historic building.

One Panel member asked if louvers were intended for the south side of the building. Mr. Kongats stated that there were louvers, added that they are needed for the air intake.

## 2.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that the building as cipher or barometer of weather was a fascinating concept. Another Panel member appreciated the simplicity of the project, noting that it is a box that produces energy and is very clear in that intention. Another Panel member felt that it would be a beautiful project as a simple adaptive re-use and restoration of a heritage building on its own. Another Panel member felt that the project had evolved since the last time it came before the Panel.

One Panel member stated that they appreciated the light integration and the connection to the temperature, adding that it is critical that it actually works the way it is intended. Another Panel member wondered if the colours were actually getting in the way of the building. Another Panel member felt that instead of temperature, the colours should reflect the energy consumption of the neighbourhood.

Another Panel member supported the removal of the green roof.

One Panel member felt that the slot could be slightly larger to have a real presence on the West facade.

Another Panel member found that the site plan as rendered made it difficult to understand the true context of the project including the existing and future public realm. Another Panel member

agreed, feeling that the context was neither presented nor addressed. One Panel member felt that the design team treated all the elevations equally, noting that the south elevation will become the primary public interface with its location adjacent to the park. Several Panel members agreed, feeling that there was a missed opportunity on the south facade and should have a direct relationship with the Foundry Mews. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the Foundry Mews should become a development site. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Foundry Mews Park is part of the precinct plan. Another Panel member felt that the Foundry Mews was an integral part of the precinct that created an alternate network and sequence through the precinct, adding that it should be celebrated more. One Panel member noted that the comments on the Foundry Mews should be directed to Waterfront Toronto and not the designers of the District Energy building. Another Panel member stated that there does not have to be a design for the park to know that there should not be louvers on the primary south facade. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that it was important for there to be a design for this public space sooner rather than later.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) The colour rendering concept is interesting, could it be tied to energy consumption instead of temperature?
- 2) Show how the building links to the existing and proposed streetscape.
- 3) The south facade is an important facade, do not ignore it.
- 4) The connection between Underpass Park south through the Foundry Mews should be strengthened.
- 5) Expose the mechanical workings; don't mask what the project is.

### 2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Kongats and Mr. Patton thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

---

## **3.0 West Don Lands Public Realm**

*ID#: 1018*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design*

*Location: Area bounded by Parliament Street, Eastern Avenue, the Don River and the CN Rail corridor.*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: The Planning Partnership with Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg and &Co.*

*Review Round: Five*

*Presenter(s): David Leinster, The Planning Partnership, and Greg Smallenberg, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg.*

*Delegation: Mike Tocher, The Planning Partnership*

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Roche, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President Planning for and Design, introduced the project, noting that Infrastructure Ontario (IO) is leading the development of the Athletes' Village in partnership with Waterfront Toronto (WT) and Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC). Mr. Roche

stated that IO has been assigned the role of Project Manager by the Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure (MEI) for the Pan Am Games, adding that WT is leading the public realm design. Mr. Roche noted that together, the team is developing a schedule for implementation that will include completion of the design of the public realm and streets by beginning of 2011.

### 3.2 Project Presentation

David Leinster, Principal with The Planning Partnership, and Greg Smallenberg, Partner with Philips Farevaag Smallenberg, provided an overview of the various components of the public realm including; Mill Street, Cherry Street, Underpass Park, the Woonerfs, local streets, and Eastern Avenue. Mr. Smallenberg then presented the Front Street Streetscape and Park in detail, noting that this will be the heart of the Athlete's Village.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there had been consideration to alternate cross walk delineations besides "zebra striping". Mr. Smallenberg answered that they are using dark and light unit pavers, noting that the City had originally requested asphalt crosswalks with 3m tape. Another Panel member asked how future utility repairs had been considered in the design, noting that new roads are often scarred with patches shortly after they are complete. Mr. Leinster stated that unlike most retrofit conditions, these roads have been designed with lots of extra capacity to preempt the situation, adding that if crews need to access utilities the pavers can be removed and placed back after the work is complete.

Another Panel member wondered how parking was being handled in the area. Meg Davis, Waterfront Toronto's VP of Development for the West Don Lands, stated that parking will be accommodated with underground parking within the commercial development blocks.

One Panel member asked whether there were large gathering spaces envisioned. Mr. Smallenberg stated that the entire street is designed as a gathering space.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members commended the team for the impressive work presented. One Panel member added that that the team has really pushed of the limits of this "pilot project" within the City. Another Panel member felt that the project should be approved and implemented as soon as possible.

Another Panel member felt that there could be an opportunity for electric charging stations within the lay-by parking areas, adding that the infrastructure will already be there to accommodate the lighting. Another Panel member cautioned the design team to think about the bollards, urging them to make sure they are not afterthoughts and perhaps incorporate them as part of the overall lighting strategy. Another Panel member felt that the intensity of the detailing could be reduced without compromising the integrity of the design, adding that it would help strengthen the hierarchy of the elements.

One Panel member felt that the retail will be drawn to Cherry Street or Mill Street, not necessarily Front Street as currently presented. Another Panel member felt that even if Front Street was not

entirely commercial from day one that the intersections at least would be great locations for cafes, adding that commercial development would evolve over time. One Panel member felt that a segment of Front Street should be left purposely under-programmed to allow it to be accommodating to different types of events and large gatherings.

One Panel member wondered if the tree pits should be bigger. Another Panel member wondered if 7m tree spacing was the right direct dimension.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Study the bollards, don't allow them to be an afterthought
- 2) Consider installing charging stations
- 3) Ensure the tree spacing is right

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Leinster and Mr. Smallenberg thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

---

## **4.0 Lower Don Lands Development: Port Lands Sports Centre**

*ID#: 1035*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: South East corner of the Commissioners and the Don Roadway*

*Proponent: City of Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: RDH Architects with 3LHD Architects*

*Review Stage: Conceptual Design*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Bob Goyeche, RDH Architects; Sasa Begovic, 3LHD Architects; Marko Dabrovic, 3LHD Architects.*

### 4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek introduced the project noting that it is a City-run project that is being partially funded by Waterfront Toronto, reminding the Panel of the facility's context and potential impacts on the Lower Don Lands framework plan. Mr. Glaisek stated that the City and the design team had come a long way in addressing the concerns expressed by the Panel in their open letter back in May.

### 4.2 Project Presentation

Bob Goyeche, Principal with RDH Architects, provided an overview of the project noting that the team will be presenting both a stacked and at-grade version of the scheme. Mr. Goyeche presented the site, its constraints and various studies to show how they arrived at Option A – at-grade scheme, and Option B – the stacked scheme. Sasa Begovic and Marko Dabrovic, Partners with 3LHD Architects then presented the designs and sustainability features of each, noting that they were confident that the project would obtain LEED Gold certification.

#### 4.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member wondered what the number of users would be for this facility. Mr. Goyeche stated that there are three rinks that can accommodate 250 spectators and one rink that can accommodate 100 spectators.

Another Panel member asked how much parking is being accommodated on site. Mr. Goyeche stated that there are 210 parking spots, adding that for major tournaments, off-site parking is being looked at.

Another Panel member wondered where the closest outdoor rink was. Mr. Goyeche stated that the new rink at Sherbourne Commons would likely be the closest rink until the Don River is re-naturalized.

One Panel member asked where the front door was. Mr. Goyeche stated that the main entrance is off Basin Street, with servicing being accommodated off Commissioners Street.

Another Panel member wondered what other program is being accommodated in the facility. Mr. Goyeche stated that there is a Pro-shop, café and multipurpose space.

Another Panel member asked if the design team has had the opportunity to meet with Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, the designers of the Lower Don Lands. Mr. Goyeche stated that they had not met, but plan on doing so after the plan is accepted at Council.

One Panel member wondered what the cost differences were between the “stacked” and the “at-grade” options. Mr. Goyeche stated that there is a premium to the stacked option linked to the increased amount of steel and the need for elevators, adding that from a mechanical and electrical perspective the stacked option is more efficient.

Another Panel member asked if other options such as a two story facility had been considered. Mr. Goyeche stated that many other options had been studied including a two-story option, but did not work functionally.

#### 4.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel generally preferred the “stacked” option to the “at-grade” option. Several Panel members noted that the stacked scheme was more urbane and created higher development potential in the future, adding that it would help ensure that a healthy community would develop around it. Several Panel members felt that the stacked option preserved Basin Street which would also be profoundly important to the emerging neighbourhood. One Panel member felt that the disadvantage of the stacked scheme would be that it could be potentially less accessible to the community, adding it is essentially an office building because you will not see the hockey players beyond the ground floor. The Panel’s comments were mainly focused on providing a critique of the stacked option.

One Panel member felt that the stacked design treated all four facades as equals. Other Panel members agreed, feeling that the building is not expressive enough yet and that “a glass box”

can't be the idea. Another Panel member felt that the geometries of the at-grade option were more appealing. Another Panel member felt that the image of the iceberg was strong although it is only expressed at grade.

Another Panel felt that the plan is a programmatic diagram that does not address its context. Another person agreed, feeling that the scheme should help enhance connectivity to the city and the public realm on a civic scale.

Several Panel members stated that the main entrance should be made more explicit, feeling that the entrance should be off of the street instead of the plaza. Other Panel members agreed, feeling that the entrance should be situated in the best location for public transit. Another Panel member felt that if transit is provided from Commissioners, then the front door should be located there, adding people arriving by car could still have an entrance from the parking lot.

One Panel member wondered if the sight lines from outside the rink could be improved to allow spectators to view the game, or catch a glimpse from the outside.

Another Panel member wondered if the public plaza was appropriate for this location, adding that it seemed redundant when viewed in context to the future lower don lands. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that it could be a green roof or a landscaped surface parking lot. Another Panel member felt that the parking plaza could accommodate programming that does not fit in the building.

One Panel member stated that 100% glazed buildings should not be built, adding that the sun will create warm spots and un-even melting on the rink. One Panel member urged the team to consider utilizing waste ice chips to cool the building in the summer.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) The stacked scheme is preferable,
- 2) The form should be more expressive,
- 3) Clarify the location of the front door,
- 4) Strengthen the connections to the future river and neighbourhood.
- 5) Rethink the location and need of the public plaza - could the space be used for other programming or community opportunities?
- 6) Investigate the feasibility of hooking up to District Energy
- 7) Study the implications of solar heat gain, and potential cooling opportunities with the chipped ice.
- 8) Study the sectional relationship to the street to ensure views down.

#### 4.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Goyeche and Mr. Begovic thanked the Panel for their feedback.

#### 4.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for a note of support, non-support or conditional support for the project. The Panel voted in unanimous Support of the stacked scheme.

---

## CLOSING

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