



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel**

### **Minutes of Meeting #148**

Wednesday, Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021

Meeting held Virtually

---

#### **Present**

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

#### **Regrets**

---

#### **Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Emilia Floro, City of Toronto

---

#### **Recording Secretary**

Leon Lai

---

## **WELCOME**

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

1. 545 Lake Shore Boulevard West – Schematic Design
- 

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Oct. 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts of interest were declared.

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 **Queens Quay East Area 2B+2C** completed 30% design and the package has been circulated to TTC and the City for review. Consensus Comments have also been circulated to the Proponent team. Mr. Glaisek noted that the project will require more funding to proceed with the rest of the design and it will return to DRP in due time. Mr. Glaisek noted **West Don Lands Block 20** received a vote of Full Support at the last review and the project has completed the DRP process.

Waterfront Toronto Construction Update:

Mr. Glaisek provided a construction update on **York Street Park (Love Park)**, noting that excavation and construction of caissons for the mechanical building have started. Mr. Glaisek noted the excavation of the pond perimeter wall has also been initiated. Mr. Glaisek noted Waterfront Toronto released a new aerial overview footage of the **Port Lands Flood Protection** construction progress, recapping the process throughout 2021, and showed the video for Panel members.

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, noted the tentative Jan. 2022 WDRP agenda.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

---

**PROJECT REVIEWS**

**1.0 545 Lake Shore Boulevard West - Schematic Design**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1097
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Waterfront Toronto
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Sweeny&Co Architects, FORREC Landscape Architects, Hunter & Associates, Ecovert
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Craig Hunter, President, Hunter & Associates LTD Dermot Sweeny, Principal, Sweeny&Co Architects Scott Torrance, Senior Director, FORREC Landscape Architects Miguel Lopez, Building Performance Specialist, Ecovert
<i>Delegation:</i>	Fei-Ling Tseng, Sweeny&Co Max Mazri, Sweeny&Co

Danielle Moffatt, Canderel  
Dana Roebuck, Canderel  
Jonathan Hong, FORREC Landscape Architect  
James Parakh, City of Toronto  
Susan Mcalpine, City of Toronto  
Juliana Azem, City of Toronto  
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto  
Kristal Tanunagara, Waterfront Toronto  
Corey Bialek, Waterfront Toronto  
Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto  
Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto

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

Josh Hilburt, Development Planner with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the site context, previous development proposal, and the project description. Mr. Hilburt noted the revised application proposes two development blocks: office uses on the north and residential on the south, with courtyard, POPS on the northeast corner, and pedestrian connections. Mr. Hilburt noted the project timeline and introduced Susan Mcalpine, Senior Development Planner, City of Toronto to further present the planning context. Ms. Mcalpine noted the Office Plan, Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan, and the Zoning By-law context for the site. Mr. Hilburt noted the project is here for Schematic Design review and recapped the March 2018 Issues Identification Consensus Comments. Mr. Hilburt noted the areas for Panel consideration, including the architectural expression of the residential building in response to the context, heritage building, street frontages, ground floor animation and servicing requirements in relation to the public realm, overall landscape strategy, and connectivity of the public realm. Mr. Hilburt then introduced Craig Hunter, President of Hunter & Associates, to continue the presentation.

### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr Hunter began by noting the 2018 design and the updated development proposal. Mr. Hunter provided a summary of the site history, site photos, adjacent development and uses, the neighbourhood and community context. Mr. Hunter noted the recent nearby developments and their respective heights. Mr. Hunter introduced Dermot Sweeney, Principal of Sweeny&Co Architects to continue the presentation.

Mr. Sweeny provided a summary of the project massing, section, building plans, and overall programmatic statistics. Mr. Sweeny noted the building elevations, renderings, and the public realm context. Mr. Sweeny then introduced Scott Torrance, Senior Director with FORREC, continued the presentation on public realm and landscape design. Mr. Torrance noted the ground floor landscape plan, tree planting strategy, POPS at Queens Quay & Bathurst, Lake Shore and Bathurst, midblock connection, and the courtyard design. Mr. Torrance noted the courtyard inspiration, precedents, the lighting and planting strategy.

Miguel Lopez, Building Performance Specialist with Ecovert, provided an update on the energy modelling results, energy conservation measures, and Toronto Green Standards strategies.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the heritage addition façade. Mr. Sweeny responded the heritage building has a limestone color, the team is mimicking the color with either metal or porcelain panel and provide a lot of insulation. The Panel member asked if it is a single office or broken up to multiple tenants. Mr. Sweeny noted it has been split up, the structure is in good shape and the renovation will introduce a new vertical core on the south side for multi-tenancy.

Another Panel member asked if the second floor has a mechanical space. Mr. Sweeny confirmed that it is existing mechanical and raising the height of the building allows the penthouse to be embedded and recoup some of the square footage from the mechanical. The Panel member asked if there is information on the courtyard sunlight condition. Mr. Torrance noted it will mostly be in shade, shade tolerant plants will be specified, and a lot of deciduous trees to meet the City's objectives. The team is also working with a great supplier to provide supplementary lighting to the courtyard.

One Panel member asked if the project balconies are thermally broken and clarification on the design of the structural support on the southwest corner being very different from the rest of the design. Mr. Sweeny noted the team is studying thermally broken systems. The southwest corner POPS was generated very late because of support from the City and the community, the team has not studied the column sufficiently and is interested in providing a more direct diagonal cutaway through the plaza by pulling the column back and cantilevering the building outward.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the parking access from Lake Shore and Queens Quay going westbound, and underground parking distribution. Mr. Sweeny noted Lake Shore is not a safe condition to come out, one of the reasons for the thorough block is to allow people to drive multi-directionally without making left turns. The first level of parking will provide spaces for residents, visitors, and office, the lane provides space as the primary waiting area for pick-up and loading. Mr. Torrance noted City Transportation did not support right turn into the lane from Lake Shore.

One Panel member asked if the entrance along Bathurst into the courtyard considers sightlines in inviting the public or if it is an area mainly for the condo and office. Mr. Sweeny responded that the courtyard is an amenity, not intended as a park, but access will be given to people on the sidewalk. The Panel member asked for clarification on the glass frit circles. Mr. Sweeny noted the frit is still being developed. Mr. Torrance noted the entrance to the courtyard from Bathurst frontage is 4m wide and the team would like to make the alternate experience of programming special.

Another Panel member appreciated the clustering of trees and asked if the tree planting configuration is derived from below grade infrastructure. Mr. Torrance noted they are existing honey locust trees that the team is interested in preserving.

One Panel member asked if the courtyard is fully accessible from the office and who will provide maintenance of the courtyard. Mr. Sweeny noted the courtyard will mostly be owned by the residential, there will be an agreement on maintenance between the two buildings, and there will be access from both buildings. Mr. Sweeny noted the building interior will remain open until the team sees the demands of the tenant, the building is designed with the flexibility in accommodating multi-tenancy.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the community's thinking on the corner public space. Mr. Sweeny noted the community wanted to open the corner for movement such as carrying luggage to and from the airport. The Panel member asked if there is a sun study on the courtyard. Mr. Hunter noted yes there is, and the courtyard is mostly shaded.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the cladding on the south elevation of the heritage building and if there is access from the office directly to the courtyard. Mr. Sweeny noted there are fragments on the south elevation that are newly added and will be mostly glass panels; the loading bay will be clad in masonry.

Another Panel member asked if planters can be provided along Queens Quay to ensure tree success. Mr. Torrance noted the team is biasing space for movement along Queens Quay to maintain area for movement. To get the number of trees based on soil volume, the trees must be lined up in this configuration.

One Panel member asked if a whole building connectivity analysis was completed for the enclosure. Mr. Lopez noted there are some assumptions made using conservative details from thermal bridging guide. The Panel member noted R7 seems high for insulation and spandrel at R18, and asked for clarification on thermal breaking technologies at the slabs and window to wall transitions. Mr. Lopez noted there are some thermal breaks, the preliminary details are assumed, a curtain wall system. The Panel member asked if there are decentralized ERVs in the units, if the model shows a 2 or 4-pipe system, and the heating can be shared. Mr. Lopez noted the doors are sealed; the system is 4-pipe. Mr. Sweeny noted there is the possibility but will depend on the tenant and if a substantial mechanical change will be required.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

One Panel member thanked the team for the redesign and asked to consider something to advance the landscape so there is green closer to the intersection and not just hardscape right up to the front of the building. The Panel member suggested coupling material with form, such as bringing the rectilinear portion of the building more in tune with the heritage building and extend some of the plant material up. The Panel member noted there is already a Loblaw's across the street and encouraged the team to break up the storefront into smaller pieces which will make the area feel more like a neighbourhood.

Another Panel member commented that there are too many formal motifs: the rectilinear base, the wave, plus the columns, and asked the team to consider editing, such as reduction in the overall formal moves. The Panel member suggested to do more with the brick than the amount shown which might reduce the number of other

motifs employed. As for the column, it is early days and noted it angles too far back, consider something less attention-seeking, calmer, and let people walk around it. The Panel member is concerned with the service loading bay design at the east end of the heritage building and noted it would be better if the design is pulled back, so it does not go all the way to the corner or pulled forward, so it interlocks with the corner – more design development is needed. The Panel member suggested modifying the south face of the loading bay by incorporating a ramp from the courtyard to the office which will give more formal play and plasticity to the elevation, otherwise it is a banal façade.

One Panel member appreciated the use of local tree supplier and supported maximizing trees in the landscape design. The Panel member suggested to creatively further increase ground coverage in the public realm and use materials that are significant to the local community. The Panel member noted wind and microclimate are important in creating a successful public realm.

Another Panel member is concerned that the cladding and punched window expression do not work well with the heritage building. The Panel member felt the columns are random and suggested a single column instead. The Panel member felt the number of total parking spots seem low and agreed that there are too many formal motives happening on the building elevations. The Panel member noted it is time to commit to thermal separation, especially at the balcony slabs. The Panel member encouraged the team to seriously consider carbon level of the design both in emissions and embodied.

One Panel member noted the entire neighbourhood is changing and the current site feels a little hostile, it is important to straighten the Bathurst pedestrian path to ensure improved safety. The Panel member felt the link to Queens Quay is insufficient, consider the design of the entire elevation. The Panel member noted the heritage expansion needs great sensitivity to succeed and thermal separation is a common suggestion at the WDRP – it should be a standard feature. The Panel member appreciated the presentation.

Another Panel member appreciated the intact preservation of the heritage building because it is not facadism. The Panel member appreciated the shade respite offered by the courtyard at the site and noted success will hinge on whether it is publicly accessible. The Panel member encouraged more integration of grey water reuse, rainwater retention alone is not enough because flooding might still occur – consider using the planters as performative landscapes. Success of the building will depend on the quality of the cladding, spandrel, and curtain wall. The Panel member supported the editing of the formal moves and felt circles, diagonals, waves, frames, are too much.

One Panel member felt there is not enough information on how the massing fits within the site context and asked the team to provide more views along Queens Quay and Bathurst so the relationship between building and context can be better understood. The Panel member felt the podium along Bathurst feels like a shear wall, with the change in materiality on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor it is important to express the base better, such as creating a gap between the top and the base. The POPS felt like an after-thought and

the Panel member encouraged the team to look at the space holistically with landscape and the building.

Another Panel member noted the site currently feels hostile and encouraged the team to make it better. The Panel member felt the courtyard needs more sense of place, calibrated to be less circulatory and connect with the office. The Panel member asked if the residential lobby can be designed so it is opened to Queens Quay, which will complete itself as a midblock connection. The Panel support the tweaks to the building to better counterbalance the heritage building on the site. The Panel member suggested a more intimate, pedestrian friendly design for the corner POPS.

One Panel member suggested to further develop the POPS design by using the column structure and link it with the greater landscape and public realm.

Another Panel member noted carb on emission is a very important issue, the City will be enforcing TransformTO and Canderel will have to decarbonize this project in 20 years. The current TGS Tier 1 requirements are not close to that future objective. The Panel member suggested the team to push for higher objectives, look at some of the material specifications such as low embodied carbon concrete, avoid foam insulation and use mineral wool. The Panel member recognizes that the industry is working towards a moving target that changes quickly, but it is important to improve your design to focus on providing that needed flexibility for the owner.

Another Panel member noted that carbon is hugely important. While buildings are not typically evaluated based on carbon historically, the Panel member suggested the team to think of the residential and commercial components together as a symbiosis and find energy savings, such as any method to turning off the gas boiler to save operational carbon, i.e. share the heat from the commercial with the residential with shared thermal loop, or design the primary heating loop off of a chiller with a heat recovery manifold (which synergistically also lowers the size of the cooling tower), all towards avoiding simultaneous heating and cooling. The Panel member suggested it is important to look at lowering the operational carbon, such as decarbonizing the heat source and providing the owner options to adapt to future carbon costing. The Panel member also suggested the enclosure design to be further improved by cutting heat flow through all the projections and reducing glazing ratio. The Panel member noted while the project meets the current requirements, embodied carbon is a big issue and the team should specify a low carbon concrete.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

### **General**

- Appreciated the major revisions made from its former scheme.
- Appreciated the full retention of the historic building and the reduction in tower heights and density.
- The block is one of the last remaining development sites on Queens Quay West, it is important to maximize its opportunities.

## **Building**

- The design has many different architectural formal motifs, consider simplification.
- Consider the following materiality suggestions:
  - The use of brick on the lower floors of the residential building to marry with the historic building and together create a contextual and unique base for the entire block.
  - The office addition cladding does not appear to fit with the historic building, further development is needed.
- Appreciated the community consultation on the southwest corner and the addition of the POPS. It has a lot of potential, consider the following suggestions:
  - The design and location of the columns require further development to help connect and enhance the pedestrian experience of walking between Bathurst and Queens Quay.
  - Consider seating opportunities.
- Appreciated the retail at grade along Queens Quay, suggestion to break up the large retail space into smaller storefronts to domesticate this frontage and create a stronger neighborhood characteristic.

## **Public Realm**

- Consider extending the soft landscape right up to the corner of Bathurst and Lake Shore to improve the pedestrian experience and minimize the “hostile” feeling of the corner.
- Queens Quay frontage is very important and while the proposed landscaping is appreciated, consider a more performative landscaping strategy
- It is important to maximize the ground plane porosity and access, consider providing access to the courtyard from the office building.
- Provide a performative landscape with shade tolerant species in the courtyard to ensure success.
- Encouraged the City to consider straightening out Bathurst Street to expand the public realm and improve pedestrian experience

## **Sustainability**

- Appreciated that the project meets the current sustainability requirements, consider higher targets to futureproof the building and provide the flexibility for the owner to meet the zero-carbon emissions goal in the future:
  - Provide thermal separation for the building envelope and the balcony slabs.
  - Provide more energy efficient heating and cooling strategies, i.e. take advantage of excess heat from the commercial building for the residential loop to reduce use of boiler.
  - Strong suggestion to provide better energy performance at the next review.

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



Mr. Sweeny agreed with all the comments, noted the columns need work, the motifs are read based on how the building is rendered and felt they will be softened in real life. Mr. Sweeny noted the team will add more solidity to the top and remove some of the vision glass. Mr. Sweeny noted that if the City wants to change the carbon standards, there needs to be more incentives for developers. Mr. Sweeny agreed that a stronger base expression is good but is unsure about carrying brick around the base volume.

#### **1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support**

The Panel voted unanimously Conditional Support 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.