



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #129
Wednesday, Nov. 20th, 2019**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

-

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda, which included the review of:

1. 3C PL1 – Schematic Design
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the November 20th, 2019 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Claude Cormier declared conflicts for **3C PL1** and recused himself from the review.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on NEXT PLACE joint review time and location. Ms. Day confirmed that the scope of the study will focus on Exhibition Place and encouraged the Panel members to attend.

The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that the DRP consensus comments from October's Issues Identification review have been delivered to the **Outer Harbour Rowing Facility** team. VJAA is working to address comments with a revised site plan and is consulting with TRCA on objectives for the site to augment the landscape proposal. Mr. Glaisek noted the proponent is expected to return for Schematic Design review after their Site Plan Application submission. The date is not yet determined. In responding to the Panel's comments last month, Mr. Glaisek provided recent photos of the **Hanlan Boat Club** and noted the new boat house completed construction in July 2019. Mr. Glaisek noted a waterfront tour next year can be organized to see all the completed DRP projects.

Mr. Glaisek noted DRP consensus comments from last month have been circulated to the **East Bayfront Boardwalk and In-water Pipe** team, and the project is expected to return to present responses to Panel comments, including updates on boardwalk material and bench design. Tentatively, the next DRP is scheduled for December 2019.

Mr. Glaisek noted a **Quayside** public briefing was held on Nov. 19th, 2019 by Waterfront Toronto to provide an update on the proposal realignment and explain how the threshold issues have been addressed. Mr. Glaisek noted the team received ongoing concerns with privacy issues but also many positive feedback on Waterfront Toronto's resolution of the threshold issues. Mr. Glaisek noted **Quayside: Buildings, Mobility, Sustainability**, is expected to return to the DRP in January, 2020.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **Aitken Place Park**: the park construction has been completed, the team is progressing with deficiencies, and the public art piece "Light Keeper" has been installed. Mr. Glaisek provided newly installed photos of the art piece, noting it was designed by Studio North from Calgary with a budget of \$300,000, and utilizes frenal lens typically used in lighthouses. Chloe Catan, Public Art Manager with Waterfront Toronto, noted residents are excited with the art piece and can be seen interacting with the light patterns on the ground.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the **West Don Lands Stormwater Facility** and noted the quality of the concrete finish is a concern. One Panel member noted the qualification of the contractor is important.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the construction of **Bonnycastle Public Realm** in East Bayfront, noted that removal of materials is in progress and construction is starting on the east side with curbs and sidewalks.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **Waterfront Reconnect**: the Rees Street portion, including painting of the Gardiner bents and adding graphical texts, has been completed. The project is sponsored by Waterfront BIA, City BIA Office, City Transportation, and additional intersection improvements are anticipated to be completed in 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the construction progress and mock-ups of the Port Lands Flood Protection bridges. Waterfront Toronto examined the steel color, finish, handrail detail, and lighting mock-up. Mr. Glaisek noted the steel is bent in Amsterdam, assembled in Halifax, then barged to Toronto via the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Furthermore, Mr. Glaisek noted the first series of PLFP construction photo documentation has been made online for the public via Waterfront Toronto's Port Lands website. The photos capture moments in the workday of crew members and Waterfront Toronto will be showcasing a "photo of the week" every Friday to further publish the documentation on social media. One Panel member noted the photos are valuable assets to the City.

Mr. Glaisek provided the upcoming draft DRP agenda for December 2019.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the public session.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 3C PL1 – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1108
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Keating Channel Precinct
<i>Proponent:</i>	3C Lakeshore Inc.
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Adamson Associates Architects, PMA Landscape Architects, Footprint
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Greg Dunn, Adamson Associates Architects; Leslie Morton, PMA Landscape Architects; Lyle Scott, Principal, Footprint
<i>Delegation:</i>	Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Jasmine Frolick, 3C Lakeshore Inc.; Domenic Crignano, 3C Lakeshore Inc. Alfredo Romano, 3C Lakeshore Inc.; David Koren, Adamson Associates Architects; Lyle Scott, Principal, Footprint; Andrew Ferancik, Principal, WND Planning; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, began by noting the existing site context, policy context of the Keating Channel Precinct Plan, the project background and history. Mr. Hilburt noted the team submitted their first Site Plan Application in October 2019 and Waterfront Toronto is in the process of review. Mr. Hilburt noted the project came for Issues Identification DRP review in July 2019 and is returning today for Schematic Design review. The project is anticipated to start construction in late 2020 while the construction of the new Cherry Street through the larger 3C site is ongoing.

Mr. Hilburt noted the project site engages the Trinity Street section of the Lake Shore Public Realm work which has anticipated implementation for post 2025. Mr. Hilburt provided a recap of July 2019's Consensus Comments and introduced Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Design with City of Toronto to continue the introduction. Ms. Mighton provided a recap of the site's LPAT settlement, the Keating Channel Precinct West Zoning By-law 1174-2010, and the As-of-Right Zoning post ZBA settlement. Ms. Mighton provided the preliminary city planning issues including alignment with the Draft Plan of Subdivision, flood protection considerations, interface with public streets, impacts to animation zones, impacts of massing on pedestrian comfort, and the management of commercial-residential interface of future phases. Mr. Hilburt noted Waterfront Toronto's areas for Panel consideration: the project as a stand-alone development on day one, tone of the future urban fabric, alignment with future master plan, the existing and future public realm and landscapes, and the proposed sustainability features and strategies. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Greg Dunn, Partner with Adamson Associates, to present the design.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Dunn began the presentation by providing a summary of consensus comments from the last review and the team's responses. Mr. Dunn noted the phased site plan analysis has been coordinated with the masterplan, the ground floor passageway has been realigned, parking and loading is designed with a future underground connection in mind, and the precast exterior cladding has been replaced with an alternative strategy.

Building

Mr. Dunn explained the building parti combines nature and a "machined" aesthetic to create a strong dialogue with the site context. Mr. Dunn noted the massing is a form that spirals up, maximizing zoning envelope with setbacks, articulating the exterior with a linked terrace spiral that carves into the various facades while animating the roof. Mr. Dunn noted 5 Broadgate in London by Make Architects and the LCT One building by Hermann Kaufmann ZT GmbH as precedents for the project.

Mr. Dunn noted the ground floor layout will activate the complete master plan with retail on all four corners. On day one, the more limited site will be activated with a temporary landscape. Mr. Dunn noted the project context has been updated with the new Gardiner profile. Mr. Dunn explained that the roof will be a big amenity space with

full size elevator access, providing views back to the city. The articulated massing provides a range of floor plate sizes for the market with multiple floors having access to the terraces. Mr. Dunn noted that wrapping the terrace parapets around the building create different conditions, from fully opened terraces to outdoor meeting rooms. Mr. Dunn noted the vehicular car portal is located off Trinity Street, sharing an entrance with the loading services.

Mr. Dunn noted the façade treatment has been further developed: more solidity has been provided in the facade to improve overall design performance, and the anodized aluminum supports the “machine” aesthetic. Mr. Dunn provided 3D views of the building from various perspectives and noted the terraces are positioned to ensure interaction with future plaza. Mr. Dunn then introduced Leslie Morton, Principal with PMA Landscape Architects to present the landscape design.

Landscape

Ms. Morton began by noting that the public space principles remain the same: quality ecologies, spatial comfort, resilience, and dynamic spaces. The landscape concept takes into consideration of the range of scales of the site context, from under the Gardiner to the open expanse. Ms. Morton noted four types of landscape concepts: pioneer landscape, process landscape, heritage landscape, and future landscape.

Ms. Morton provided an update on the temporary and permanent landscape extents, materiality, streetscape approach on the north and at Trinity Street, sustainability features, and the planting species. Ms. Morton noted the proposed landscape programming, including food truck parking in the cul-de-sac, public art, flexible outdoor events, and a limestone screened movable pavilion. Ms. Morton noted the green roof coverage helps to mitigate stormwater and the plant species are shade and salt tolerant, alluding to the Port Lands palette. Ms. Morton then introduced Lyle Scott, Principal with Footprint to present the sustainability strategy.

Sustainability

Mr. Scott noted that the site is an existing brownfield and is underutilized. The project is targeting TGS Tier 1 while exceeding on many categories, notably with the 60% green roof coverage and LEED Gold standard. Ms. Scott noted the project has good walkability and access to public transportation, targeting over 35% indoor potable water use reduction, a significant decrease of GHG emissions and overall energy use. Mr. Scott noted the building has a great TEDI due to the high performing building envelope with low glazing ratio. Compared to a typical office building envelope with 80% glazing, Mr. Scott noted the proposed design shows great energy performance improvements. Mr. Scott noted the design targets the WELL Building Standard encouraging the users to spend time outdoors and walk through the building.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for more clarification on the connectivity between office floors. Mr. Dunn explained four of the larger floors are interconnected with the more modestly sized outdoor terraces, the top three floors are interconnected from the south to the north, and interior stairs are designed to accommodate flexible market conditions. The Panel member asked for the location of the parking and loading entrance for the eastern block. Mr. Dunn explained the team looked at that early on, the concept is to introduce an entrance from Lake Shore Blvd. in the ultimate case where the Martin Goodman Trail is moved- the details have not yet been determined.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the intention of the ground floor passageway and the Queens Quay corner. Mr. Dunn explained the south portal connects Queens Quay to the future plaza, the portal then frames the plaza as a bounding element. Mr. Dunn noted the sloping terraces, as seen from street level, frame the plaza.

One Panel member asked for the project timeline and further clarification on site readiness for day one opening. Mr. Dunn explained the project site will have no fence on day one, however he cannot speak for the adjacent sites.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the towers east of site. Ms. Frolick explained they are residential towers with a mixed-use podium, and noted the masterplan indicates a parallel service road that brings access from Lake Shore Blvd. Mr. Dunn added that the current parking entrance is shared with loading services, the team is contemplating basement connectivity to adjacent block but unsure if the loading services can be shared- the block to the east will require its own loading bay. The Panel member asked if the plaza is public. Mr. Dunn noted it is a POP space maintained by the owners of the site.

One Panel member asked if the pavilion is opened or insulated. Ms. Morton explained it is modular, operable, and outdoor year-round, the intention is to extend the shoulder seasons with a flexible space. Ms. Morton added the screen is a limestone panel and the ground is sod.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the area with red sticks shown in the rendering and the condition of landscape outside of the permanent zone. Ms. Morton explained the red sticks area is a placeholder for a small, tall installation, that frames a gateway into the public plaza. Ms. Morton answered that the planters outside of the red line will be transplanted and relocated, other elements can also be moved and used elsewhere.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the sequence of construction in the public realm and if a pre-planting sequence is required. Ms. Frolick explained the construction order will start from north, west, to south side of the landscape.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the interface between project streetscape and the Queens Quay status quo design. Ms. Morton explained the area within the “permanent” zone is permanently installed concrete that extends to Queens

Quay. The Panel member noted to consider future conditions and potentially remove concrete pavers for Waterfront Toronto's granite pavers.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the mechanical system for heating. Mr. Scott explained the team is currently envisioning the use of a magnetic bearing chiller.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt the vertical terrace as public space is interesting. With the green ambition of the project, consider a stronger dialogue between landscape and architecture - the landscape concept should flow through the design. Currently, the Panel member felt there is a disconnect between landscape and architecture, the ground plane does not have the same rigor as the architectural proposal. The Panel member noted to provide planting species for the terraces. The Panel member appreciated the porosity that the corner glass retail space brings to the ground floor, it is important to ensure the retail is global and continue to develop the massing and fenestration details thoughtfully.

Another Panel member thanked the team for the thorough presentation, noted concerns with the office pavilion proposal in terms of maintenance of the screen slats, public safety, and blocking important views down the promenade. The Panel member does not recommend the strategy of movable furniture or planters in the public realm, consider an alternative interim strategy.

One Panel member appreciated the coherent presentation. The Panel member recommended the team to refer to other projects along the waterfront, such as West 8's public realm work, for vegetation species in the laneway that can thrive in low light and high pollution. The Panel member recommended to further develop the landscape on the roof, including a more rigorous architectural screen for the mechanical volume as vines will not work in this climate- leverage this as a starting point to consider the terrace landscape thoroughly. The Panel member commented to extend the color landscape from the laneway to the end of the cul-de-sac, cautioned against mixing native seed species, and consider vegetation that will provide strong structure. The Panel member noted that the landscape installation requires further prescriptions and a rigorous location in the landscape plan.

Another Panel member commended the team for a massing that is highly contextual. The Panel member noted the temporary fence is an opportune venue to showcase designs, art, and help activate the ground plane. Utilize fast growing trees of low value in the promenade to create shade and visual axis. The pavilion could be created with more temporary planting or other organic matter that can be composted. The Panel member asked the team to look at the Terrence Donnelly health Sciences Complex at the University of Toronto as a design precedent, it is a highly reflective massing that generates attraction in its own way.

One Panel member commended the team for a skilful proposal, consider carrying the upper volume design language and rhythm down to the building base. The Panel member recommended adding a light touch of color, consider the lighting impact in grey winters, and provide more details to understand the function of the glass retail volume. The Panel member asked the team to provide more details on the temporary public space programming for further comments at the next review.

Another Panel member recommended the team to align the sidewalk design with Waterfront Toronto to avoid redoing any work when the ultimate Queens Quay streetscape is realized.

One Panel member commented that the design of the soffit for the ground floor passageway is important in tying together Queens Quay and the future plaza. For the next review, the Panel member noted to include the roof landscape as part of landscape strategy, materials and studies for the cladding detail, and a strong strategy in addressing the rooftop mechanical space. The Panel member noted the service road parallel to Martin Goodman Trail is problematic, recommended to work with the City to minimize openings and consider alternative strategies- it is important to address the future problem now. The Panel member noted since the POPS plaza is a clearly defined area, consider delivering that as part of Phase 1 with inexpensive materials that can help create a great public gesture for the development on day one.

Another Panel member is unconvinced with the temporary landscape strategy, consider shifting the line of the parking structure above the temporary landscape to allow for more permanent landscape area to be completed on day one. The Panel member noted that the exterior cladding panelling is not consistent, provide a rationale for the façade divisions at the next review. The Panel member recommended to leverage the massing volume to capture the Queens Quay vista and create a “Flatiron” moment at the view terminus, consider defining the corner with an articulated mass that rises beyond the ground floor. The Panel member noted it is important for the team to commit to the trees as rendered on the terraces and not replace them in the final build-out with smaller bushes.

One Panel member asked the team to provide more details and metrics on the water conservation targets and consider elevating the sustainability targets to TGS Tier 2 to qualify for the DC rebates. The Panel member is concerned with the large amount of ground floor space allocated for loading services, the stranded northwest corner retail, and asked the team to consider alternative strategies. The Panel member appreciated the variety of intimate, human scale spaces that occur throughout the building.

Another Panel member noted the discrepancy in fenestration division lines is a concern as the change in pattern is too abrupt and severe. The Panel member noted concerns with the triangular shaped retail volume on the ground floor, specifically the acute glass corner details and furnishing challenges, continue to develop the retail strategy and provide more details at the next review. The Panel member commented that the terrace landscape is very challenging and require careful development, the streetscape design should be coordinated with Waterfront Toronto, and the temporary landscape is

too cumbersome with complicated uses and movable apparatuses, consider an alternative singular strategy that can accommodate the variety of programs and functions.

1.5 Consensus Comments

The chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

General

- Appreciated the team for responding to the challenging constraints of the site
- It is important to consider the greater site, including both Phase 1 and Phase 2, at this stage of design to maximize development, loading/parking, and public realm potential.
- Not supportive of a future service road from Lake Shore Boulevard into Phase 2, leverage the Phase 1 design to consider alternative solutions

Building

- Provide more details on ground floor retail space design, including programming strategy, layout and access.
- Consider leveraging the ground floor passageway to create more than a pass-through and capture terminus views, ie. further articulate building parti and massing to address and create interest at the Queens Quay view terminus.
- Loading and parking program on the ground floor continues to be a concern, consider further reducing and replacing with programs that contribute to the activation of the ground floor.
- Supported the overall façade design strategy, consider further refinement on resolving the exterior details, ie. pattern and continuity of solid volumes.
- Provide more information on fenestration details at next review
- Consider stainless-steel as an alternative material to anodized aluminium for the exterior cladding and the potential introduction of color.
- Provide detailed ground floor elevations, specifically at the north elevation, at the next review.

Landscape

- Consider delivering the plaza POP space as part of the Phase 1 development to provide additional outdoor amenity for tenants on day one.
- The temporary landscape design feels cluttered, consider a stronger landscape design that leverages a more focused, single strategy to create high impact program opportunities.
- Not supportive of the multitude of movable apparatuses, consider limiting movability to only seating.
- Think ahead and consider how the temporary Phase 1 landscape will connect with future Phase 2 development.
- Provide more information on the building landscape design, such as materiality, vegetation, integration and interaction with building elements, on the terraces and the roof.

- Consider winter performance and opportunities for the building landscape design.
- As a “pioneering site”, public realm is critical for day one success, consider maximizing the ground floor landscape opportunities.
- Incorporate the final streetscape of Queens Quay and Lake Shore Boulevard into the landscape design to anticipate future connection.

Sustainability

- As certain sustainability targets exceed Tier 1 requirements, it is strongly encouraged to push the project to meet TGS Tier 2.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Mr. Dunn thanked the Panel for their comments. Mr. Dunn noted the team will address the green roof concerns, conceive the ground floor retail unit more integrally as part of the base building, and coordinate both day one and ultimate conditions. Mr. Romano appreciated the Panel’s comments and criticisms. He explained dealing with the Gardiner is a challenge but the retail unit at the northwest corner as an important part of the ground floor and is meant to address the future public realm.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted in Conditional Support (Unanimous) for the project.

CLOSING

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.