



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #44  
Wednesday, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

---

**Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford  
Peter Clewes  
Claude Cormier  
Renee Daoust  
Anne McIlroy  
Greg Smallenberg

**Regrets:**

George Baird  
Siamak Hariri  
Janet Rosenberg  
Brigitte Shim  
Betsy Williamson

**Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

**Designees and Guests:**

John Campbell  
Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

**WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Panel and provided an overview of the agenda. The Chair then 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 design team is currently studying how the "stacked option" can be designed and configured. The project will be presented at a public meeting on July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The project will also be presented to the Design Review Panel before going to Council.

*Sugar Beach*

- The pink umbrellas are currently being installed and the "candy striping" being applied to the granite rock outcrops. The park will be open to the public on June 30<sup>th</sup>, with the official ribbon scheduled for August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

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

One Panel member asked when the occupants were moving into the Corus building. Mr. Glaisek stated that they have already begun to move in, noting that 300 Corus employees are currently working there.

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair stated that at the conclusion of this meeting, an in camera session would be held to discuss prospective Panel members, noting that the terms of four Panel members would be concluding in July 2010.

The Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. No conflicts were declared.

The Chair then moved to adopt the minutes from both March 2010 and May 2010. The minutes were adopted.

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

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Central Waterfront Development: York Quay Revitalization Phase II**

*ID#: 1032*

*Project Type: Building/Structure*

*Location: York Quay, located between Simcoe Street and York Street, south of Queens Quay*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre*

*Architect/Designer: Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Landscape Architects (MVVA) with designer/artist James Carpenter Design Associates (JCDA), Beyer Blinder Belle Architects (BBB), Young & Wright Architects, GHK International and ARUP.*

*Review Stage: Conceptual Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Michael Van Valkenburgh, MVVA; James Carpenter, JCDA.*

*Delegation: Gullivar Shepard, MVVA; Bill Boyle, Harbourfront Centre; Helder Melo, Harbourfront Centre.*

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

Margaret Goodfellow, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that this is the second time it has come before the Panel. Ms. Goodfellow reminded the Panel that the 3.5-acre site is currently used as a 212 car surface parking lot that generates \$1.2 million dollars in annual revenue for Harbourfront Centre. Ms. Goodfellow stated that the Phase II scope includes the design of a 300 stall underground parking garage, Canada Square, Urban Plaza, and the planning work necessary to permit the future retail and cultural development, or "Cultural Village". Ms. Goodfellow then reviewed the feedback given by the Panel at the January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting including;

- A concept for the landscape is needed now

- The design of the public space should drive the project, not the garage design
- The aperture is far too large given the scale of the urban plaza
- The built form needs a normative relationship to Queens Quay
- Clarify the locations of the “fronts” and “backs” of the proposed buildings
- The ramp needs to be concealed at the very beginning
- The Queens Quay Terminal’s laneway should be considered more than a service alley
- Circulation needs to be rethought and improved
- Show the final Queens Quay condition more clearly on all the drawings.

### 1.2 Project Presentation

Michael Van Valkenburgh, Principal with MVVA, provided an overview of the project noting that they had appreciated and hopefully addressed the Panel feedback from January. Mr. Van Valkenburgh then presented the concepts for Canada Square, the Urban Plaza and the Interim landscape. James Carpenter, Principal with JCDA, then presented the design of the underground parking garage and the public art integration.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member wondered what is the materiality of the garage ramp enclosure was. Mr. Shepard replied that they were currently envisioning extending the language of the metal louvers that disguise the mechanical exhaust, adding that it was very early in the design.

Another Panel member asked if the pine trees along Queens Quay were being kept. Mr. Shepard replied that the trees are not of a high enough quality to transplant elsewhere.

Another Panel member asked how much of the Interim Landscape will be maintained once the “Cultural Village” has been built. Mr. Shepard answered that the area denoted by the Interim Landscape will be completely devoted to the Cultural Village. Another Panel member asked what the timing of the Cultural Village was. Mr. Glaisek answered that it will be a Harbourfront Centre project, and will be dependant on selecting a development partner and market forces.

One Panel member wondered where bicycle storage was being accommodated. Mr. Van Valkenburgh replied that they would be located in the areas around the trees, both in the Urban Plaza and the Interim Landscape.

Another Panel member asked what the scale of the proposed unit pavers were. Mr. Shepard answered that they were currently looking at a 10”x10” unit paver.

Another Panel member enquired about how the bollards work with the school bus loading and drop off. Mr. Shepard stated that the school buses will occupy the site twice a day for 45 minutes, at which time the bollards will be removed to accommodate this and restored afterward. Mr. Shepard added that service vehicles would also have access the site beyond the bollards, adding that this would be managed by Harbourfront Centre. Another Panel member asked if the tour buses would be accommodated on the site. Mr. Glaisek stated that they will not be accommodated on this particular site, but that a strategy is being developed with the Queens Quay team.

One Panel member asked how someone travelling by taxi would arrive at the Enwave Theatre or The Power Plant. Mr. Boyle answered that most people would likely be dropped off at the street and walk down.

Another Panel member wondered how the neighbours were embracing this project. Mr. Boyle replied that the neighbourhood residents and businesses enthusiastically supported the project at the last Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting, adding that it had also been well received at the Public meeting held in March.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members commended the team, feeling that the scheme had evolved tremendously. One Panel member stated that they were happy to see a re-emphasis put on the design of the public space. One Panel member felt that the scheme was poetic and beautiful. Another Panel was impressed with what the team had managed to do within such a tight budget.

Another Panel member felt that the scheme was solid but could be more coherent, feeling that it could undergo a process of editing and strengthening of certain elements such as utilizing more Fastigate Oaks to frame the Urban Plaza. Another Panel member noted that the Urban Plaza is now very attached to the Enbridge Theatre, feeling that the theatre now needed to address the Urban Plaza properly.

Several Panel members felt that the bosk of trees proposed on top of the garage entry ramp was great. Another Panel member felt that more attention should be paid to the north and south facades of the garage entry ramp, wondering if there was a more iconic treatment that could be given to them. Another Panel member felt that the ramp could be rendered less heavy in its materiality to appear as if it is “peeling up” from the surface of the Urban Plaza. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that it should reference the material language of the elevator entrance. Another Panel member wondered if it could be clad in the same stainless steel mesh used in the garage. Another Panel member felt that the team should study the materiality even on the inside of the garage entry ramp.

One Panel member felt that the team had transformed the utilitarian experience of parking in an underground parking garage into a sublime experience. Another Panel member felt that the bottom of the void in the garage could be an interesting location for an art piece.

Another Panel member felt that the scale of the elevator core should be further studied, feeling that the scale of it above grade should relate to the scale of it below grade.

Another Panel member noted that the Interim Landscape could provide a great programming opportunity to reach out to young artists or designers. Another Panel member felt that the trees planted for the Interim Landscape could be used elsewhere or accommodated when the Cultural Village buildings come online.

One Panel member felt that the selection of the Metasequoia tree for Canada Square was a great choice. Another Panel member felt that the way in which Canada Square had been rendered made it seem like it was not addressing the Queens Quay Terminal building.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Enliven the north and south facades of the garage entry ramp
- 2) Consider the use of retractable bollards
- 3) Consider potential uses for the interim landscape including linkages to programming for the Power Plant, or an opportunity for young emerging designers.

### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Van Valkenburgh, Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Shepard thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in support of the project.

The Chair then moved to convene the in camera portion of the meeting.

---

### **CLOSING**

At the conclusion of the in camera session and with no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting.