



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #101  
Wednesday, May 17, 2016**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Chris Reed  
Brigitte Shim  
Betsy Williamson

**Recording Secretaries:**

Tristan Simpson  
Netami Stewart

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

---

**WELCOME**

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

- Bayside R5 – Aquabella
- River City Phase 4
- Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the April 19 meeting. The Chair noted that section 1.5 required more emphasis on the Regeneration Area Designation. The minutes were then adopted as revised.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. No conflicts were declared.

The Chair nominated the Betsy Williamson become the Vice Chair for the Design Review Panel and asked Panel members to vote. With a unanimous vote, Ms. Williamson was elected Vice Chair.

The Chair updated the Panel on recent news regarding the Ontario Municipal Board reforms. The Chair noted that the legislation will be tabled at the end of June and hopefully adopted in the fall. Some of the key changes include precluding de novo hearings and shifting from a culture of litigation to a culture of mediation. The Board Liaison noted that once the details are released, this should be made a discussion item at a future meeting.

The Chair then invited Mr. Glaisek to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted the construction is continuing to progress on the Bentway, with the site grading and civil utilities currently ahead of schedule. Ms. Mallozzi noted that an agreement has been reached with the City on the 800 Fleet Street site, representing an important collaboration between the City and the Conservancy that will provide enhanced trail connections, and additional green space adjacent to the Bentway. The Conservancy's new CEO Julian Sleath has now hired a Director of Development, David Carey, who has begun work on additional funding strategies for the site.

Mr. Glaisek provided the Panel with an update on projects that were reviewed at the last meeting. Mr. Glaisek noted the Port Lands Framework Plan document is being prepared and finalized with the Official Plan Amendment going to Council for endorsement in principle. The Villiers Island team is updating the plan based on feedback received from the last Design Review Panel meeting and from the Stakeholders Advisory Committee and Landowners Advisory Committee meetings. Mr. Glaisek noted that the plan will be going to City Council in November 2017. Mr. Glaisek explained that the official application to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada has been submitted for the Cherry Street Lakefilling and Design. The current focus of the team is on detailed engineering design integration and construction is targeted for August/September. Mr. Glaisek noted the Lower Yonge Municipal Class Environmental Assessment will be going to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee on June 8, followed by City Council on July 5.

---

## PROJECT REVIEWS

### **1.0 Aquabella – Bayside R5**

*ID#: 1074*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: East Bayfront*

*Proponent: Hines/Tridel*

*Architect/Designer: 3XN*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Audun Opdal (3XN), Scott Torrance (Scott Torrance Landscape Architect), Craig McIntyre (EQ Building Performance Inc.)*

*Delegation: Carlos Antunes (Kirkor Architects), Michael Gross (Hines)*

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

Erik Cunnington, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by providing an overview of context. Mr. Cunnington walked through the previous Bayside phases that have come to the Design Review Panel (DRP) including Aqualina, which is targeted for occupancy for this summer/fall, and Aquavista which is targeted for occupancy in 2018. Mr. Cunnington noted that the area is currently serviced by two buses and will eventually be serviced by the waterfront Light Rail Transit connecting to Union Station. This is the project's third time at the DRP and the team is presenting Detailed Design. Mr. Cunnington raised a number of areas of the project for the Panel to consider, including the southwest corner entrance treatment, modifications to the groundfloor with regards to the addition of the new townhouse, and appropriateness of the sun/shade strategy for the patios. Mr. Cunnington introduced Audun Opdal, Partner with 3XN, to give the presentation.

### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Opdal began by reminding the Panel of the building's original concept which represents stacked cottages. The building is meant to represent a family home arranged together as neighbours, terracing down to the water's edge. Mr. Opdal noted that the development puts people first and focuses on the quality of views, space and lifestyle. An additional townhouse was added in response to Panel comments and creates a stronger presence on the laneway. Mr. Opdal explained that the material palette consists of GFRC for the exterior cladding, glass for the railings, and aluminium handrails. A planter has been added along the balcony of the day care facility which has created a canopy at the ground floor. Mr. Opdal then introduced Scott Torrance with Scott Torrance Landscape Architects, a division of Forrec Ltd, to present the landscape portion of the project.

Mr. Torrance explained to the Panel that the green roofs are extensive with 450 mm of growing medium. The plantings are protected by glass given the wind exposure and location of the building. Mr. Torrance explained that in response to Panel comments from the last meeting regarding shade devices on the balconies, an option for one umbrella and two anchor points will be available for each unit. These umbrellas are wind resistant and will provide consistency throughout the building. Mr. Torrance explained that a planter has been added on the day care facility balcony but will be protected by glass on the inside. Mr. Torrance introduced Craig McIntyre, President at EQ Building Performance Inc., to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Mr. McIntyre explained that the project's overall targets are MGBR Version 1.0, Toronto Green Standards Version 2, Tier 2, and LEED Platinum with 84 points. Mr. McIntyre noted that an open studio model, which is a software engine that models the buildings energy use, was used. The Energy Use Intensity results established that the building's design achieves 45% savings. Mr. McIntyre noted that some of the building's sustainability features include Energy Star appliances, recapturing stormwater for irrigation needs, and bird friendly glass treatment.

### **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the shade devices for the terraces. Mr. Torrance explained that the unit comes with one umbrella and two anchor points to allow for flexibility in the placement of the umbrella, but once the umbrella is installed, its location is fixed.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the planter drainage system. Mr. Torrance replied that the planters are not pre-cast planters, they are cast in place planters. Mr. Torrance noted that it's a linear drainage system to catch both surface water and water that percolates through.

The Panel member also asked if the shading canopies are available in more than one colour. Mr. Opdal replied that they would like to limit the shading devices to one consistent colour on all balconies.

One Panel member asked what provision there is to reduce thermal bridging from the interior units to the balcony. Carlos Antunes, Partner with Kirkor Architects replied that there is no separation of the concrete from the outside of the balcony to the inside of the unit, which is within the code allowances. Mr. Antunes explained that it is essentially a sill with a window system on top, and there is no thermal break.

One Panel member asked which of the sustainability features mentioned is the most effective. Mr. McIntyre replied that the low 40-50% window to wall ratio is the most effective.

Another Panel member asked if it would be possible to get more texture from the GFRC material. Mr. Opdal replied that it is possible, however, this was the preferred grain size. The Panel member asked how the joints between the GFRC panels are being treated. Mr. Opdal explained that there is 12mm tolerance and they will be open with a concealed mounting method, not caulked. The Panel member also asked what would be the next most effective sustainability feature from an emissions savings point of view. Mr. McIntyre replied that triple glazed windows would be a good choice. This would come with a premium, however, the lifecycle costing over 10 years has a greater energy benefit than thermal breaks.

One Panel member asked the Proponent to walk through the detail of the planter. Mr. Torrance explained that there is two inches of rigid Styrofoam with growing medium and mulch on top. The Panel member asked if the planters are on top of units from below. Mr. Torrance replied yes and that there is good insulation. Mr. Antunes added that each terrace is designed as an assembly.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the seasonality of the plantings at the Day Care should be taken into consideration given our harsh winters.

Another Panel member had concerns with the representation of the glass balconies as completely see-through and ephemeral. The Panel member noted that these will likely be more reflective so this needs to be scrutinized to ensure that the desired effect is achieved. The Panel member also cautioned that the plant material on the outside glass wall of the day care facility may spill over onto the white GFRC and stain it.

Another Panel member noted that Aquavista, which was previously reviewed by the Panel in November 2015, did a very good job of walking through the entire ground floor in detail, and noted that attention to the ground floor is very important. The Panel member cautioned the team that balconies are often the Achilles heel of buildings and that they are fundamental to the building design. The Panel member asked to see a sample of the glass on the balcony at the next review. The Panel member asked why the glass was placed on the inside of the planter at the day care facility. Mr. Torrance noted that this was for safety reasons to prevent kids from climbing.

One Panel member noted that they support the tree location along the laneway. The Panel member was also appreciative of the layering of the trees and porches to create separation from the Laneway.

Another Panel member noted that in the rendering showed on slide 33, the underside of the slab of the white canopy should be painted.

One Panel member noted that this project is a very beautiful piece of architecture. The Panel member noted that Vancouver just passed a by-law that all new buildings have to meet Passive House standards. The Panel member noted that concrete slabs are effectively a radiator. Adding a thermal break that would cost approximately \$1000 per unit on a million dollar unit seems reasonable.

Another Panel member felt that this was a very elegant building and acknowledged the architect for beautiful design. The Panel member cautioned the team that building maintenance can sometimes fall short. The Panel member also suggested adding a few more plant species to the planters to ensure higher chances of success. The Panel member also suggested adding shade devices on the outdoor amenity space to.

One Panel member thanked the team for being so responsive to the Panel's last round of comments. The Panel member asked whether Waterfront Toronto has new performance standards regarding sustainability. Mr. Glaisek noted that Waterfront Toronto is working on revising and updating its mandatory green building requirements and noted that the Panel member's comment regarding thermal breaks and triple glazing will be taken into consideration in that process.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The Panel felt that overall this is a beautiful piece of architecture and a great addition to the waterfront.

- The details of the building are fundamental to the project's success. This includes the purity of the white building material over time, the importance of the retail strategy, and the detailing of the balconies.
- Ensure that seasonal change is considered when choosing species for the planters, consider adding a few more plant species to ensure success of the planters, and the maintenance strategy is critical.
- Explore the use of thermal breaks on the balconies.

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

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.

### **2.0 River City Phase 4 – Harris Square**

*ID#: 1067*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: West Don Lands*

*Proponent: Urban Capital*

*Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architects*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Andre Perrotte (Saucier + Perrotte Architects)*

*Delegation: Paul Stevens (ZAS Architects)*

### **2.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that this is the fourth building out of a series of River City developments in the West Don Lands. Mr. Loudon noted that Urban Capital recently had their minor variance approved at the Committee of Adjustment. The variance included an increase in height from 36 meters to 44.7 meters, which is required to support the structural design in providing open space at grade, as well as a few other minor variances such as minor step back relief above 27 meters, minor setback relief from the rear lot line, and an increased mechanical penthouse roof area and size. Mr. Loudon noted that the variance approval is conditional on removal of an existing bus ramp easement running along the north portion of the property. Mr. Loudon also noted that TTC is currently reviewing the proximity of the Downtown Relief Line proposed alignment along Eastern Avenue, in relation to the below grade structure of the building. Mr. Loudon provided issues for the Panel to consider including, consideration for extending the granite paving beyond the property line to the curb line, the number, location and size of the columns, the change in materiality of the soffit, and the appropriateness of the proposed screen between the service laneway and Underpass Park. Mr. Loudon then introduced Andre Perrotte, Owner of Saucier + Perrotte Architectes, to give the presentation.

### **2.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Perrotte explained that this site is much smaller than the previous phases and much more of an awkward shape. Mr. Perrotte noted that they are asking for 13

storeys instead of the approved 10 storeys in order to elevate the lower floors to provide views from the units over the expressway. Mr. Perrotte noted that the team is asking for a variance for a larger mechanical space, to integrate it as part of the volumes of the building. Mr. Perrotte explained that most of the residential units are positioned to face the nicer views south. Mr. Perrotte noted that the amenity space has been developed as a more substantial space to accommodate a party room with indoor and outdoor areas. Mr. Perrotte introduced Mr. Torrance to present the landscape portion of the project.

Mr. Torrance explained that the site is at the confluence of Underpass Park and Lawren Harris Square and there is a complexity of geometries and materials to contend with. Mr. Torrance noted that Lawren Harris Square has crushed black granite, and they are looking to use a dark grey granite paver for the ground floor of the building. Mr. Torrance explained that Hackberry trees will be planted along the perimeter of the property and a double row of trees will be added along the east side of the building. Mr. Torrance explained that custom linear planters have been developed. Mr. Torrance then introduced Anna Kazmierska, Sustainability Manager with MMM, to present the sustainability portion of the presentation.

Ms. Kazmierska explained that the team is pursuing LEED Gold, targeting 65 points. Ms. Kazmierska noted that there will be a reduction to the window-to-wall ratio, enhanced thermal break in the window system, higher soffit insulation, and higher insulation levels for glazing and spandrel. Ms. Kazmierska explained that the roof at the upper level will be designed to accommodate a superimposed dead load of an intensive green roof.

### **2.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked where the enclosed space of the amenity space is located. Mr. Perrotte referred to the mechanical penthouse floor plan and the subsequent rendering to explain the extents of the enclosed space. Mr. Perrotte explained that they decided to provide amenities only accessible to residents rather than trying to program a semi-public space on the second level of the building. The amenity space on the top floor is meant to be more of a social space.

Another Panel member asked about the surface material at the ground floor. Mr. Torrance replied that the material is granite pavers and concrete slab. The Panel member also asked about the nature of the first floor retail space. Mr. Perrotte replied that they their hope would be to create a café that would help animate the space. The Panel member also asked if the paving pattern of the ground floor is consistent with Lauren Harris Square. Mr. Torrance replied that the cuts and angles are consistent with Lauren Harris Square.

One Panel member asked for clarification of the material on the underside of the balconies. Mr. Perrotte responded that the glass guardrail is smoked glass and the soffit material is high gloss black metal panel.

## **2.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the possibility of combining units would be nice noting that some of the units appear to be very narrow. Changing the sheer wall design would allow greater flexibility.

One Panel member was supportive of the architectural expression of the building, trees and the lighting, however, they were concerned about screening the building in a sea of poured concrete. The type of retail will determine the activation of the space.

Another Panel member commended the team for the keeping the architectural relationship between all four phases. The Panel member felt that the EUI for this building is astonishingly high, and given growing concerns about climate change, this seems irresponsible.

One Panel member praised the team for such a fantastic series of buildings. The Panel member noted that the mechanical treatment is key given that this will be different from the other three buildings. The idea of the public and private zone is a great solution to a very complicated site, the multi-faceted approach is necessary to make this work. The cladding of the public stair should be a piece of public art. The Panel member noted that at the moment, the stairs are an obstacle but could be turned into something positive if conceptualized in an appropriate way. The Panel member felt the treatment of the back urban wall was unclear, there is a need to better understand this space. The Panel member felt that the material used for the soffit and the balconies and their detailing is critical to making the building work.

Another Panel member felt that the undersides of the balconies needs to be painted as the soffits will be very visible from the pedestrian level.

## **2.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The type of retail, seating and other program elements on the ground floor will be critical to the activation of the public realm space.
- Explore the possibility of flexibility in combining units.
- The cladding of the public stairwell needs to be explored in further detail to ensure that it becomes something positive, such as public art.
- The treatment to the underside of the soffit is an important detail as it will be visible from the pedestrian level.
- The relationship and transition between the soffits and the balconies is critical.
- The EUI for this building seems high, consider integrating additional sustainability measures.

## **2.6 Vote of Support/Non Support**

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.

## **3.0 Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project**

*ID#: 1080*

*Project Type: Parks and Public Realm*

*Location: Tommy Thompson Park*

*Proponent: City of Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: DTAH*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): James Roche (DTAH), Megan Torza (DTAH)*

*Delegation: Andrea Chreston (TRCA)*

### **3.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project and summarized comments from the previous meeting including, the entrance gate needs to be more than just an ordinary gate, incorporate Poplar trees in the park area and at the entrance to create a buffer between the parking lot and the street, consider using an alternative material than CorTen steel on the soffit of the pavilion, the material choice for the pavilion should serve more than a decorative purpose, and ensure that the lighting is effective and sensitive. Mr. Glaisek noted a few areas for the Panel to consider including, the appropriateness of the materials used on the pavilion and in the landscape, integration with the existing architectural language, integration between the pavilion and the landscape, and the use of the tabletop configuration on the driveway and the use and location of the proposed gates. Mr. Glaisek introduced James Roche, Partner with DTAH, and Megan Torza, Partner with DTAH to give the presentation.

### **3.2 Project Presentation**

Ms. Torza began by explaining to the Panel that the client is the City of Toronto, not Toronto Region Conservation Authority. Ms. Torza noted that the scope of work for this project includes, a serviced park entrance, parking, accommodation for bus (tour/school) turnaround, and a serviced pavilion and outdoor interpretive area. Ms. Torza clarified that the Martin Goodman Trail and the intersection of Unwin Avenue and Leslie Street are not in the scope of work for this project.

Mr. Roche provided an overview of the site context by pointing out that the existing site is surrounded by a stand of trees. The premise of the project was to reshape the existing parking lot, where a planted space could be created. Mr. Roche noted that the site experiences lots of ponding issues which is why the parking lot will remain granular. The parking lot will be regraded to drain excess surface flow into the landscaped swales that turn overflow into adjacent wetland landscapes. Mr. Roche explained that in response to the comments made at the last meeting, the new landscape material palette consists of raised landforms with groundcover/planting, porous granular pavement, Cottonwood and Dogwood, and planted swales. Mr. Roche walked the Panel through the details of the swale noting that where it's feasible to get deeper trenches, they will.

Ms. Torza explained that there will be two enclosed spaces in the pavilion to accommodate washroom facilities and a staff booth. Ms. Torza noted that the architectural material has been revised since the last meeting and now includes very

durable material such as board-form concrete, solid phenolic panel soffit, aluminium-framed glazing, and steel cruciform columns. The thin roof profile is achieved through a steel frame, not concrete. Ms. Torza explained that on the north and south wall of the pavilion, there is a low profile mounting scheme for wayfinding, signage and interpretive panels.

### **3.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if there was electric radiant heating in the concrete slab. Ms. Torza replied yes, to ensure that the building does not freeze in the winter months.

Another Panel member asked about the different heights of the landforms. Mr. Roche replied that on the south side of the site they are approximately 1.5 – 2 feet and on the right side they are 1 meter tall.

One Panel member asked if there was consideration to daylighting the washroom facilities. Ms. Torza replied that due to functional, maintenance and aesthetic purposes it was decided against. The Panel member suggested adding row of shallow solar domes on the roof.

Another Panel member asked if trucks are still using Leslie Street as a service route for infill. Ms. Torza replied that the lakefilling is really complete and it is gradually being phased out.

One Panel member asked where the recycling and garbage receptacles will be located. Ms. Torza replied that they will be located on the south side and it would be screened out. The Panel member also asked for clarification on the interpretive panel location. Ms. Torza replied that the interpretive panels would be located on the main exterior wall and there may be additional panels on the north and south side of the pavilion. The Panel member asked about the mounting system. Ms. Torza replied that it will be a low profile mounting system.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale behind the location of the pavilion. Ms. Torza replied that the location was in response to pedestrian flow coming from the parking lot and from the Martin Goodman Trail. Ms. Torza explained that they wanted to ensure that the building doesn't create a barrier between the pedestrian flows. The Panel member asked about the importance of having a thin roof. Ms Torza replied that the thin roof was designed for aesthetic purposes and in response to the last pavilion designed by Montgomery Sisam that had a very heavy roof.

One Panel member asked if there is an opportunity to add a window to the north wall as it is currently blank and will be the first impression when people arrive at the pavilion. Ms. Torza replied that the material used on the wall is interesting and there will be staff windows. The Panel member also asked for the rationale behind the placement of the gabion wall outside the washroom. Ms. Torza replied that it is a privacy screen for the washroom facilities.

Another Panel member asked about concerns over vandalism. Ms. Torza replied that the site is often plagued with heavy vandalism. There will be graffiti sealant on all concrete.

One Panel member asked about the possibility of adding a small green roof to the pavilion. Ms. Torza replied that this would be a good idea, however, the City of Toronto will not maintain it. The Panel member also asked about the entrance gates. Mr. Roche replied that the gates are City standard gates. The Panel member asked if car charging stations in the parking lot were considered. Mr. Roche replied that the plan right now is to create a very simple gravel lot that could be improved over time.

### **3.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member felt that the site plan works well. The Panel member recognized that the team is having to design a building knowing that vandalism is a huge problem and is understanding of this. The Panel member felt that the addition of trees in the parking lot is excellent. The Panel member suggested replacing the Ipe wood with Black Locust which is beautiful and would reinforce the pattern of aggregate concrete. The Panel member felt that the pavilion design is missing something.

Another Panel member suggested using shallow solar domes on the roof of the pavilion. The Panel member also suggested adding solar panels to the roof.

One Panel member felt that the design of the pavilion was too normative and doesn't have a "moment" to it. There needs to be more understanding behind the conceptual thinking that is driving the project. The Panel member recommended simplifying the material palette.

One Panel member was appreciative of what the landscape is trying to achieve with both rough and lush elements. The Panel member noted some inconsistencies with the drawings regarding the berm locations and heights, and suggested providing a grading plan. The Panel member also felt that the area for classroom seating on the south side of the pavilion requires more seating. The Panel member felt that the pavilion looks too delicate and suggested making it look tougher to complement the rugged landscape of the park.

The Board Liaison suggested adding a car charging station to the parking lot. The Board Liaison member also felt that there should be more benches near the swales. The Board Liaison noted that the execution of the details is what will allow the building material to sing, however, there was concern as to whether the execution of the level of detail is feasible given the tight City budget.

One Panel member felt that the parking lot looks too suburban. The Panel member noted that the building feels like an interim solution and asked the Proponent to think about how to do the least amount to create the biggest impact.

### **3.5 Consensus Comments**

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

- The landscape design of lush and rough details works well on the site.
- The parking lot design needs to be revisited as it still feels suburban.
- The design of the pavilion still feels unresolved and inconsistent with the nature of the site. Consider reconceptualising the pavilion design.
- Consider using solar domes and solar panels on the roof and adding car charging stations to the parking lot.

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

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.