



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #73
Wednesday, April 9th, 2014**

Present:

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair
George Baird
Gerry Faubert
Pat Hanson
Don Schmitt
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Claude Cormier
Bruce Kuwabara
Brigitte Shim
Jane Wolff
Harold Madi

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
James Parakh

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Tracy Watt

WELCOME

Paul Bedford opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, noting that Bruce Kuwabara was unable to attend and asked him to chair the meeting.

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 March 2014 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. No conflicts were declared.

The Acting Chair then stated that on March 25th, 2014, the Executive Committee voted to let City Council vote on the proposed expansion of the Billy Bishop Airport. The Acting Chair added that on April 1st, City Council voted in favour of a Staff report recommending further study, noting that the studies would include design and construction details of runway and taxiway extensions, a completed environmental assessment and a full understanding of the marine exclusion zone and requirements from Transport Canada. The Acting Chair felt that the vote to study the proposal further was the best outcome under the circumstances.

One Panel member wondered if it would actually be possible for Porter or the Toronto Port Authority to meet all of the Transport Canada requirements. Another Panel member felt that there would have to be a very good reason for Transport Canada to grant any exemptions.

The Acting Chair then stated that he had accompanied David Quarmby, Consultant and former *Transport for London* Board Member on a ride around Toronto and the GTA. The Acting Chair noted that Mr. Quarmby had a lot to share regarding lessons learned from the London experience, adding that he gave a speech to the Board of Trade earlier this morning. The Acting Chair added that the timing was good for this as Premier Wynne is speaking at the Toronto Region Board of Trade on Monday, April 14th and will speak about dedicated transit funding.

The Acting Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President of Planning and Design, to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

Gardiner East Environmental Study

- Waterfront Toronto and the City are working further to look at the questions raised by Council. Mr. Glaisek added that this extra time will allow for more modelling to be done on the options.

Queens Quay Revitalization

- It's been a pretty hard winter, but a lot of granite has been laid.
- The TTC streetcar tracks are currently being installed from Simcoe to Rees.

Port Lands, Cousins Key Precinct

- A public meeting will be held on May 15th to present options for the precinct, now called Villiers Island.

The Acting Chair then asked if there were any questions from the Panel.

One Panel member noted that at a recent lecture given by Adriaan Geuze from West 8, there were a lot of questions surrounding the viability of London Plane trees for Queens Quay, noting that on Bloor Street 20% were lost on the north side and 40% were lost on the south side. Mr. Glaisek stated that he was aware of the issue noting that on Bloor Street, shading from tall buildings was a major factor that Queens Quay does not have. Mr. Glaisek added that many of the trees on Bloor Street were planted late in the season, and combined with over salting, led to a higher loss rate. Mr. Glaisek concluded by stating that the team would continue to study the issue to insure the survival of the trees along Queens Quay.

The Acting Chair then moved to the first project review.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 WDL Development: River City Phase III

ID#: 1051

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: WDL Development: River City Phase III

Proponent: Saucier + Perrotte Architects

Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architects

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: three

Presenter(s): Andre Perrotte, Saucier + Perrotte Architects, Michael Pires, MMM Group

Delegation:

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design at Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, reminding the Panel that this is being presented at the Design Development phase of review. Mr. Glaisek stated that the City and Waterfront Toronto have been working with the proponents on the heights of the podium and tower. Mr. Glaisek noted that although a departure from the block plan, the proponent team is striving to match the podium with the height of the buildings along Bayview Avenue. Mr. Glaisek stated that the tower has also evolved, adding that the team will be seeking a Minor Variance from the Zoning By-Law for an extra three stories from what was contemplated in the block plan.

1.2 Project Presentation

Andre Perrotte, Principal with Saucier and Perrotte Architectes, presented the project reminding the Panel of the context within the neighbourhood and River City development and proximity to River Square, Corktown Common and the Richmond/Adelaide overpass. Mr. Perrotte presented an update on the plans and sections, followed by detailed, rendered views. Michael Pires, Engineer with MMM Group, then presented the Mandatory Green Building Requirements (MGBR).

1.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the exterior of the building was clad in. Mr. Perrotte answered that the exterior materials at grade included board formed concrete, opaque glass and louvers. Mr. Perrotte stated that above, wherever it is white, the materials include white aluminum composite panels and ceramic frit treatment where it fades from solid to transparent glazing. Mr. Perrotte added that where the building is black, the materials include black aluminum composite panels and the smoky areas are two-tones of opaque glass.

Another Panel member asked what the insulation strategy was for the soffit/balcony. Mr. Pires answered that the underside of the projecting balconies are insulated. The Panel member asked if insulating the balconies affected the thickness. Mr. Pires answered that the slab is stepped to accommodate the thickness. The Panel member asked if thermal breaks were being used. Mr. Pires answered that they were not.

Another Panel member asked what the glazing type was. Mr. Pires answered that the frames are stainless steel with warm edge spacers, adding that the project is currently achieving 44% improvement over the Model National Energy Code (MNEC).

Another Panel member asked what the feedback has been like on River City Phases I and II. Mr. Perrotte answered that the projects have been very successful, adding that there are a lot of investors, and the majority of the comments are in praise of the amenities. Another Panel member asked if there were any families. Mr. Perrotte answered that he did not think there were many.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members felt that the built form and overall proportion of the podium to tower was very successful and much improved. One Panel member stated that the design team has undertaken a very skilful study and carving of the project from the clunky “as of right” zoning. Another Panel member agreed, adding that the inclusion of the townhouse units at grade was very impressive.

Another Panel member stated that they found the response to the Panel’s previous issues generally persuasive, adding that they were intrigued that more and more mid-rise buildings are coming on the market. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that enthusiasm for mid-rise buildings is growing within the community, adding that changes to the Ontario Building Code will also allow 6 story “stick” buildings (wood construction).

One Panel member felt that there were great elements in terms of energy and sustainability, noting the 2/3 glass and 1/3 solid proportions of the exterior cladding, urging the team to push the thermal resistance of the solid areas.

One Panel member stated their appreciation for the subtlety of the use of the exterior cladding. Another Panel member felt that the top of the building seemed heavy, adding that the “dissolving quality” was not as successful. Another Panel member agreed, adding that they were uncomfortable with the looseness of the edges of those facades and felt it needed more attention. One panel member asked the team not to give up too much black.

Another Panel member felt that staining could be an issue on the white areas of this building in 5-10 years, urging the team to ensure the detailing of the envelope will prevent unsightly dripping.

Several Panel members urged the design team to study the quality of the space near the loading bay more, specifically the amount of board-formed concrete.

Several Panel members expressed discomfort with the yellow balconies, adding that the materiality and transparency of those balconies will be important. One panel member felt that gold was preferable to yellow, adding that it could be something that catches the light and allows light to go through.

One Panel member added that the architectural quality and relationship to the overpass needed to be maintained with the projecting boxes, specifically with the respect to the glazing.

Another Panel member stated that the outdoor amenity space was well designed, noting that the sectional quality of the space will help to mitigate noise concerns.

One Panel member felt that the green space adjacent to the building - set aside for an easement with the City of Toronto - should be landscaped.

1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Study the materiality and quality of space of the loading, garage entrance adjacent to the overpass, specifically the amount of concrete at grade.
- The open space should be landscaped.
- Maximize the energy performance of the 1/3 solid wall areas
- Be conscious of how the light materials will weather.
- Come back with material and colour samples.

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Perrotte thanked the Panel for their comments.

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 voted unanimously in Support of the Detailed Design of the project.

2.0 EBF Development: Parkside, (Monde)

ID#: 1037

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: EBF Development Proposal: Parkside (Monde)

Proponent: Safdie Architects

Architect/Designer: Safdie Architects

Review Stage: Construction Documents

Review Round: Seven

Presenter(s): David Orens, Safdie Architects

Delegation: Rose Tam, Great Gulf

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design, introduced that project, noting that this presentation represents the "Construction Documents", or 4th Phase of Review. Mr. Glaisek added that most of the previous issues raised by the Panel have centred on the resolution of the South Façade, which finally received support in July 2013. Mr. Glaisek concluded by stating that Great Gulf will be applying for their building permit in May, and are looking to break ground in late 2014/early 2015.

2.2 Project Presentation

David Orens, Associate Principal with Safdie Architects introduced Michael Pires, Engineer with MMM Group, who presented the sustainability strategy and Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR). Mr. Orens then then presented the façade materials, technical details, and the landscape and green roof design.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked where the door to the retail was located off of Queens Quay. Mr. Orens replied that the intention was that retail would be accessed off of Sherbourne Park, adding that they have allowed for a door on Queens Quay, but will ultimately be driven by the tenant.

Another Panel member asked how the soffits were being treated. Mr. Orens stated that it was an exposed soffit, painted white.

Another Panel member asked how the architectural concrete was achieved? Mr. Orens stated that they utilize smooth forms, poured in a single pour, adding that he will personally be supervising the pour and mock up.

Another Panel member asked why precast concrete could not be used more. Mr. Orens stated that due to the structural loads, a 30% increase in the size of the column would be necessary, so the team decided to use cast-in-place concrete.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member urged the design team to consider sandblasting the finish, noting that when cast-in place is chipped, the aggregate is exposed. Another Panel member felt that the sandblasted concrete would have more longevity. Another Panel member felt a light sandblast would allow the materials to accept light in the same way, and look more similar.

Another Panel member felt that the landscaping of the balconies was important to softening the appearance of the building, adding that it will be important to maintain those plantings.

Several Panel members stated that it was important to have access to Queens Quay from the retail, noting that it will have an effect on street life. One Panel member stated that doors on the Queens Quay façade should not be an option, no matter who the retail tenant is.

2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Provide access to retail from Queens Quay
- Continue to study ways to ensure longevity of the concrete and matching the precast and cast-in place as best as possible.
- Ensure the success of the plantings, particularly at the balconies.

2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Orens and Mr. Pires thanked the Panel for their comments.

2.7 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 voted in Support of the project.

CLOSING

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