



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #57  
Wednesday, April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

---

**Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
George Baird  
Paul Bedford  
Claude Cormier  
Don Schmitt  
Jane Wolf

**Regrets:**

Betsy Williamson  
Brigitte Shim  
Peter Busby

**Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

**WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Panel and provided an overview of the agenda, before moving to General Business.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from March 2012. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

There being no other comments, the Chair then invited Mr. Glaisek to give 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. Mr. Glaisek noted that at the last meeting, the Panel requested an update on the Portlands. Mr. Glaisek then presented the Development Planning and Phasing presentation from the March 31, 2012 public meeting, noting that this presentation can be found on the Portlands Consultation website ([www.portlandsconsultation.ca](http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca)).

Mr. Glaisek reminded the Panel of the scale of the project and provided an overview of market demand and phasing of the development, adding that this was an "optimised" version of the previous plan. Mr. Glaisek noted that the total infrastructure costs for the Portlands (north of the ship channel) were estimated to be \$2.155 Billion dollars. Mr. Glaisek concluded by noting that the sentiment from the public was disappointment that the green space and river area had been reduced from the award winning Lower Don Lands plan.

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

One Panel member asked how wide the river was planned to be. Mr. Glaisek stated that it was planned to be 150 metres from top of bank to top of bank.

Another Panel member asked what the next steps were. Mr. Glaisek stated that the project update would be going to Executive Committee in June, followed by City Council in July. Mr. Glaisek noted that despite cost reductions, it is still a \$2 Billion-Dollar project overall, though \$150 million has been saved primarily by reducing some of the public amenities, though 90-percent of the public amenity associated with the original plan has been cut. One Panel member was surprised to hear that it was in fact a \$2 Billion-dollar project instead of the 900-\$600 Million-million previously discussed. Mr. Glaisek clarified that the 900-\$600 Million was just for the Lower Don Lands area and did not include transit, adding that the \$2 Billion-billion covers the entire Portlands north of the ship channel – a much larger area.

One Panel member felt that the original Lower Don Lands plan was a stroke of genius that overlaid engineering and naturalization onto the publically owned lands. The Panel member stated that the original jury selected the Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Landscape Architects (MVVA) scheme in part because of “Promontory Park”, noting that the park was created using fill from the river naturalization. The Panel member then asked what MVVA’s thoughts were on the latest “optimised” plan. Mr. Glaisek replied that he did not know MVVA has not been asked to comment formally, but did help produce the optimized version.

Another Panel member asked what Waterfront Toronto’s position on the “Optimised” plan was. Mr. Glaisek stated that prior to the public meeting, WT felt that it was a good compromise with the City’s Plan, adding that WT was encouraged to hear open to suggestions from the public that some of the public amenities need to be put back.

Another Panel member felt that the balance has shifted more toward development in the latest plan, noting that it looks and feels different than the previous award-winning scheme. Another Panel member stated that they had one reservations with the original plan because they felt that the development blocks appeared to be in the park space, noting that in the “optimised” plan, the development blocks are clearer and more clearer, more consistent, and separated from the open space.

One Panel member felt that reducing the naturalized area could have quantifiable implications to the water quality entering Lake Ontario, adding that less meandering of the river means faster water speeds, and the less time for the water to be filtered.

Another Panel member stated that Toronto needed a great park that serves the City, noting that if this is ultimately a 100 year plan, then that is one more reason to provide a park at a civic and monumental scale.

One Panel member requested that this topic be discussed at the May Design Review Panel in order to gather take a formal position comments on the “optimised” plan. The Chair agreed and moved to the Project Reviews.

---

## PROJECT REVIEWS

## **1.0 West Don Lands Development Proposal: River Square Neighbourhood Phase II**

*ID#: 1042*

*Project Type: Building/Structures*

*Location: Area bounded by King Street, River Street, Eastern Avenue and Don River Park*

*Proponent: Urban Capital Property Group*

*Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architectes with ZAS Architects*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): André Perrotte, Saucier + Perrotte Architectes; David Leinster, The Planning Partnership*

*Delegation: Paul Stevens, ZAS Architects; David Wex, Urban Capital Property Group; Jeff Geldart; Urban Capital Property Group*

### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Renee Gomes, Director of Development for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project reminding the Panel that the concept for River City (all phases) was presented and approved by the Panel in July 2008. Ms. Gomes added that the Schematic Design for River City Phase 2 was presented and approved in September 2011. Ms. Gomes noted that Phases 1 & 2 are part of a single site plan application, adding that Phase 1 is now well under construction and that the Sales Centre for Phase 2 opened in Fall 2011. Ms. Gomes concluded by stating that Waterfront Toronto is seeking Panel feedback on the overall design development of the scheme, and approval to proceed to construction.

### 1.2 Project Presentation

Andre Perrotte, Principal with Saucier + Perrotte Architectes, provided an update on the Design Development of the project, noting that they had integrated Panel comments from the September 2011 review. David Leinster, Principal with The Planning Partnership, then provided an update on the landscape and public realm integration.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if all the units had balconies. Mr. Perrotte stated that some of the studio units did not have balconies.

Another Panel member asked what the widths of the passageways were. Mr. Perrotte stated that the widths vary from 4 metres to 5 metres.

Another Panel member asked for more information on the cladding. Mr. Perrotte stated that it varied from a high gloss metal panel to fritted glass.

### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members stated that they were very comfortable with the development of the project. One Panel member stated that they appreciated the development of the detailing of the units and the relationship to the public realm. Another Panel member felt that the team had more than satisfied the bold and complex expression that the Panel was looking for at the last meeting. Another Panel member felt that the ~~Architecture-architecture~~ was magnificent and were comfortable with the detailing, especially the treatment of the slab edges. Another Panel member

felt that the project broke the mould of typical condominium development in the City. Another Panel member felt that the presentation was great, adding that they hope the building looks as good as the renderings are making it look.

Another Panel Member wondered if the window to the secondary bedroom or den could be pulled out to have a view to the park instead of only the corridor.

One Panel member felt that the bold colours of the landscape elements complimented the palette of the building, adding that there was potentially a missed opportunity in the pool area with the plantings selected, to acknowledge that the site is right next to the river.

Another Panel member stated that they would like to see the material samples. Another Panel member expressed concern that the cladding materials could be prone to vandalism or dirt.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) The Panel would like the opportunity to see the material samples for information purposes only. They do not necessarily have to be presented by the team.

### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Perrotte and Mr. Leinster thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support, non-support or conditional support for the project.

The Panel voted unanimously in ~~Support~~ support of the project.

---

## 2.0 Green Building Requirements Review Process

### 2.1 Project Presentation

Lisa A. Prime, Director of Sustainability for Waterfront Toronto, provided an overview of the Minimum Green Building Requirements (MGBR) new reporting process, noting the modifications that were made based on the Panel's comments at the March 2012 presentation.

Ms. Prime stated that the modifications included: reinstating the Integrated Design Process (IDP) ~~back to~~ in the new version of the MGBR; Update reports are to be submitted at each milestone, including target credits for achieving LEED Gold; Signed declarations are now required, and; An IDP expert is now required to attend DRP presentations. Ms. Prime added that Submission requirements for Energy Efficiency now include the Energy Use Intensity in ekWh/m<sup>2</sup> (supported by an energy model).

### 2.2 Panel Questions

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

No questions of clarification asked.

### 2.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Chair suggested that as Mr. Busby was not able to be present for this presentation, that he and Ms. Prime follow up with each other to make sure Mr. Busby's questions or concerns were addressed.

2.4 Proponents Response  
Ms. Prime thanked the Panel.

---

### **3.0 10 York Street**

*ID#: 1048*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: 10 York Street*

*Proponent: Tridel/Build Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Wallman Architects*

*Review Stage: Conceptual Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Rudy Wallman, Wallman Architects*

*Delegation: Steve Daniels, Tridel*

#### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parakh, Urban Designer with the City of Toronto, introduced the project, reminding the Panel of the concerns raised at the last meeting in March 2012 including coordination of the setbacks along York Street, concerns with the ground plane and street wall, the tower form and floorplate and the overall image of the building.

#### 3.2 Project Presentation

Rudy Wallman, Principal with Wallman Architects, presented the project's evolution since the last presentation in March 2012. Mr. Wallman noted that the Panel's feedback was taken seriously and the team had worked hard to address their concerns.

#### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked how much deeper the parking had to go below grade to remove the parking from above grade. Mr. Wallman stated that two additional levels of parking were added, making it seven stories of below-grade parking.

Another Panel member asked how the Idea of the building had changed or evolved. Mr. Wallman stated that conceptually, the idea of the northern lights is not as important, adding that the team is working with the verticality of the building and the projecting glass pieces that appear to extend beyond the top.

Another Panel member asked how the team was proposing to mitigate wind and noise on the outdoor amenity space adjacent to the Gardiner Expressway. Mr. Wallman answered that they are conscious of the issue, noting that they are proposing a glass wall and canopies to protect from down drafts which is a problem with towers.

One Panel member asked what the dark panels were comprised of on the elevation. Mr. Wallman stated that the dark panels were intended to be metal, with the projecting elements being a combination of white metal and fritted glass.

Another Panel member asked what the area of the typical floorplate was. Mr. Wallman answered that it is 890 square metres. One Panel member asked if there was anything in the City of Toronto's Tall Building Guidelines regarding floorplates for towers of this size. Robert Freedman, Director of Urban Design at the City of Toronto answered that for typical towers, 750 square metres is the maximum floorplate allowed, noting that for a tower of this size-height there is no set guideline, but it is often negotiated. Another Panel member wondered if there was a set tower slenderness ratio. Mr. Freedman stated that currently there is not, but that it should be considered.

One Panel member asked if the proponents felt that this was the best design for the site. Mr. Wallman answered that they felt that it was the right shape of tower for the site.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members offered the team their congratulations for addressing many of the concerns raised at the last meeting, most notably, the relationship to York Street.

One Panel member urged the team to make sure that the canopies would be designed to accommodate for the downdraft. Another Panel member felt that the how the canopy at the podium meets the façade should be developed, noting that perhaps more substantial vertical mullions could help give structure to this. Another Panel member agreed that the canopies were currently unresolved.

Another Panel member felt that the reveal between the podium and the tower on the East side should be eliminated. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the reveal should extend around all four sides of the building.

Another Panel member felt that more of the retail/café program on the ground floor should wrap around to York Street. Another Panel member noted that the corners of the podium were being rendered as solid, feeling that they should read as open and transparent, so as not to block views or add to the clutter of columns made by the Gardiner Expressway.

Another Panel member felt that the expression of the tower was still a bit confused. Another Panel member felt that the reading of the structure should be suppressed so that the projections read more. Another Panel member was not convinced that the metal cladding proposed would be durable at grade.

Another Panel member felt that a tower of this height and magnitude should play a landmark role on the skyline. Another Panel member agreed, feeling the site was iconic, but the building was not yet. Another One Panel member disagreed, feeling that the site was perhaps not any more iconic than the surrounding ing sites, adding that it is also not that much taller than the other buildings proposed for the area.

Another Panel member stated that there was still no design for the "top" of the building, feeling that this was a lost opportunity to help create the landmark status something special. Another

Panel member agreed, noting that the top seemed unresolved and even less ephemeral than when it was presented in March.

Several Panel members felt that the building and tower geometry and form needed to be simplified. One Panel member noted that a possible solution could be to simplify the geometry by straightening out the notch in the West façade. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the façade should be faceted even more than currently proposed.

One Panel member requested a greater understanding of the issues and constraints on the site in order to gain a greater insight and be convinced of the design solution. Another Panel member felt that the building seemed like a series of compromises, adding that it was trying to do too many things and needed to be bolder in its expression. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the decisions on the Site-site Plan-plan were driven purely by the functional diagram in terms of drop off and loading.

One Panel member urged the design team to study the at-grade relationships that the development on the North side of the Gardiner/Lakeshore Boulevard was proposing, noting that the base was open and transparent. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the development to the North was not a great comparison. One Panel member felt that the North East corner of the site should be more monumental as it is a stepping stone to the waterfront, adding that it should create a sense of arrival, not simply mimic the street wall condition to the south.

One Panel member felt that the view looking north and south toward the site along York Street was missing from the presentation, noting that just meeting the setbacks of the adjacent buildings was not enough. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that there needed to be a drawing with more context for a fair comparison. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the building needed to be described at three scales – at the metropolitan scale, at the scale of downtown, and at the Pedestrian-pedestrian scale. Another Panel member requested that all four elevations should be shown, in context.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Support for the changes to parking and setback from York Street.
- 2) Create a sense of “arrival” to the waterfront within the public realm.
- 3) Simplify the elevations.
- 4) Provide views of all four elevations and perspectives from York Street at the next presentation.
- 5) Podium
  - a. Consider the transparency at the corners.
  - b. Study the durability of the metal panels at grade.
- 6) Tower
  - a. The form and proportions still need to be studied.
- 7) Top
  - a. Still needs development.

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Wallman thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a note of support, non-support or conditional support for the project.

One Panel member stated that they would vote for Support with conditions (conditional support), noting that they felt the project was moving in the right direction.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the implications of voting in Support with conditions, verses non-support. Mr. Glaisek stated that generally, if there are fundamental issues that the Panel was concerned with and wanted to see back before the Panel than it should be non-support, noting that it would prevent the proponent from going too far down a direction the Panel may not be happy with.

One Panel member moved a motion of non-support. 5 of 6 Panel members voted in non-support of the project, asking that it come back at the Schematic Design phase.

---

**CLOSING**

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