



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #65
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

Present:

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair
George Baird
Pat Hanson
Brigitte Shim
Don Schmitt
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Bruce Kuwabara
Claude Cormier
Gerry Faubert
Jane Wolff
Robert Freedman

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek

Recording Secretary:

JD Reeves

WELCOME

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair in Bruce Kuwabara's absence, opened the meeting by explaining that Bruce was unable to attend.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Acting Chair provided an overview of the agenda and asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the December 2012 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare and none were declared.

The Acting Chair observed that many of the current debates happening at the city, including the island airport and transit, have implications for the waterfront. The Acting Chair also congratulated the Corporation on positive press coverage related to the *Waterfront Toronto Economic Impact Analysis (April 2001 – March 2013) Report*.

The Acting Chair then invited John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto's President and CEO, and Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to provide their reports.

REPORT FROM THE CEO

Mr. Campbell thanked the Chair and stated that Economic Impact Report was undertaken to quantify and explain the value of the Corporation's investments in the waterfront. Mr. Campbell stated that Waterfront Toronto is in the process of defining what investments are required over the next ten years to complete the waterfront revitalization mandate, which is being called *Waterfront 2.0*. Mr. Campbell explained that they're looking into various funding options for priority projects including transit and development.

Regarding the recent island airport debate, Mr. Campbell explained that Waterfront Toronto has historically tried to stay neutral because of the three-levels of government reporting structure but stated that Waterfront Toronto is encouraging the city to collect all the facts so the implications are well understood before reaching a judgement.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel Member congratulated Waterfront Toronto for their success in spurring investment in the waterfront. Mr. Campbell stated the Panel played an important part in that success.

The Acting Chair then encouraged Waterfront Toronto to continue to publicize its successes because many people are unaware of the achievements.

The Chair then asked whether the ability to borrow would be part of Waterfront 2.0 funding strategies. Mr. Campbell stated that the ability to borrow had been raised in recent discussions with Minister Murray but that it is important to balance the right to borrow with a sense of accountability.

The Acting Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek to give his report.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

- *CWF Queens Quay Construction*: Construction is progressing well with the TTC corridor demo complete and the mock-up approved; Bell and Enbridge completed upgrades; Hydro's upgrade is well underway; sanitary construction (York-Simcoe) is nearly complete; advanced materials purchased and delivered (inc. granite, silva cells, tree tagging); and the early surface works (e.g. York bus layby) near completion.
- *Jarvis Dockwall*: The dockwall underground reinforcement work is complete and the surface works, including a granite mosaic, is now underway.
- *Portland Water's Edge Promenade*: The granite mosaic has been installed and the contractor is installing site furnishings and planting trees.

- *Queens Quay MGT Connection:* The contractor is progressing through various punch list items, including replacing the sidewalk in several areas where installed improperly. Once complete, road painting and signage will be installed. Completion is scheduled for early summer.
- *West Don Lands /Pan Am Athlete's Village:* Construction of the woonerfs, Don River Park, and Pan Am Athlete's Village are well underway and on schedule.

The Acting Chair then moved to the first project review.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 East Bayfront Development Proposal: Parkside

ID#: 1037

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: North of Queens Quay, east of Sherbourne Common

Proponent: Great Gulf (Downtown Properties) Limited

Architect/Designer: Safdie Architects

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Isaac Franco, Safdie Architects

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project, noting that it was last presented to the Panel in November 2011 and received conditional approval, since then, to respond to market challenges, the project has undergone a modest redesign. Mr. Glaisek stated that the podium has been reduced by two storeys and six storeys have been added to tower with a net change of 4-storeys and no change the GFA. Mr. Glaisek indicated Waterfront Toronto supports the redesign and believes the building looks better but asked the project team to come back to get the Panel's opinion of the redesign.

Mr. Glaisek then summarized the Panel's recommendations from the November 2011 presentation:

- Reevaluate the need for canopies along Queens Quay
- Consider an alternative treatment of the former atrium facade
- Reconsider the location of the outdoor day care space
- Develop energy model and sun studies

Mr. Glaisek then stated that the day care location may be changing and therefore asked the panel to focus on the other design issues.

1.2 Project Presentation

Isaac Franco, a principal at Safdie Architects, provided an overview of the project, stating changes are a win-win by both improving the commercial viability of the project and improving the building's overall proportions, producing a more elegant design. Mr. Franco presented the new

design including a sun-shade study which showed that reducing the podium by two storeys had an added benefit of casting less shade on the adjacent park.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel Member asked if the podium is symmetrical on the east and west sides. Mr. Franco stated that the podium is not symmetrical at the tower, but that the Queens Quay façade is symmetrical. The Panel Member then asked if the opening in the south façade provides light into public corridors. Mr. Franco confirmed that it did and stated that there is a small resting area by the windows to enjoy the view.

Another Panel Member asked if the tower floor plate had increased in square footage. Mr. Franco stated that it is the same size as before and that the redesign simply added additional floors.

Another Panel Member stated that the podium's south façade looks like an office building and asked if there was a way to wrap the language of the east and west façade around. Mr. Franco stated that he believes the added windows in the south façade make it look more residential while providing light into the interior.

The Acting Chair then asked if the day care would be part of the development. Mr. Franco stated that it is currently being discussed and that they are not sure at the moment.

There being no other questions, the Acting Chair opened the meeting to the Panel comments.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel Member stated that the ziggurat form of the south façade, despite the additional windows, looks office-like. The Panel Member observed that the additional planting on the north façade helped and suggested that a similar solution on the south façade could help. The Panel Member stated that they recommend that the south façade be revised before the project moves forward but strongly supports the reduction in the podium height and hopes it works well with neighbouring buildings.

Another Panel Member stated that they support the reduction in the podium and the added tower floors. The panel member further commented that they especially appreciated the improved sun exposure on the adjacent park. The Panel Member continued that the connection between the tower and podium has been greatly improved. The Panel member agreed with the others that the south façade needs further development, but was reluctant to prescribe a solution.

Another Panel Member observed that these sites are difficult in that the buildings have no "back" but, stated that one of the most positive aspects of the project is the mid-block connection. The Panel Member agreed with the other panel members, stating that the south façade on Queens Quay is the final piece of the project the needs re-working. The Panel Member continued that the south façade has a sense of monumentality but it sets up a false expectation in that it is not a major entrance into the building and it is just an entrance into the ground-floor retail.

Another Panel Member stated that it is unclear how the reduced podium works within the wider context, but there is no question that the proportions of the building are much better. The Panel Member stated that the connection between podium and tower is much improved, but it is

somewhat lost because of the material changes between the tower/podium. The Panel Member encouraged the design team to pay more attention to the tower and podium materials. The Panel Member agreed with others that the ziggurat form is a large gesture that sets up a false expectation about the interior space and would encourage the design team to reduce the massiveness of the south façade.

Another Panel Member stated that Waterfront Toronto should consider the impact precinct-wide that this precedent sets for other Queens Quay developments on the north-side.

The Acting Chair appreciated the reduced shadow impact on the adjacent park and supported the podium/tower height changes and agreed with other Panel Members that the south façade requires additional work.

1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) While there are four fronts to the project, the south façade should act as the primary façade and create a real "address" on Queens Quay, which requires more work be done on the façade.

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Franco thanked the Panel for their feedback

1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project. The Panel unanimously voted for conditional support pending resolution of the key issue above.

CLOSING

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