



WATERFRONTToronto

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

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
George Baird
Gerry Faubert
Pat Hanson
Brigitte Shim
Jane Wolff
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Paul Bedford
Claude Cormier
Don Schmitt

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Halija Mazlomyar

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
Harold Madi

WELCOME

Bruce Kuwabara opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, reminding the Panel that there will be no meeting held in August. Mr. Kuwabara then reviewed the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The 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 Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare. Pat Hanson declared a conflict with the project being presented (R3/R4), noting that her firm had been shortlisted to design the park adjacent to this project. Mr. Kuwabara also noted that Claude Cormier had recused himself, adding that his firm was also on the shortlist to potentially design the adjacent park. No other conflicts were declared.

The Chair then stated that there had been a lot of scrutiny and media surrounding the costs of certain park elements. Mr. Glaisek noted that there was a lot of discussion about cost, but not about actual value.

Mr. Glaisek stated that the origin of this scrutiny came from a request for a change in Waterfront Toronto's governance structure to allow the corporation to debt finance and seek additional funding for flood protection and transit. Mr. Glaisek felt that the pink umbrellas seemed to be the wrong thing to pick on, adding that it all about identity and place making – the wedge which has attracted attention and investment on the waterfront as a whole.

Mr. Madi, felt that the message does not seem to be getting out there that there is a payback to this investment, including an incremental uplift in property taxes.

The Chair then asked for an update on the progress on Queens Quay Boulevard. Mr. Glaisek stated that he had an update in his report, adding that it will be substantially complete for the Pan/Para Pan Am Games in July 2015.

The 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.

Pan Am Athlete's Village

- Construction is progressing quite quickly, including work on the streetscape, YMCA/George Brown College Residence, affordable housing and market housing developments.

Woonerfs

- Silva Cells are being installed in the Woonerfs beside River City.
- Woonerfs will be complete by December 2014.

Lower Yonge Precinct Plan

- *The Urban Design Report: Principals and Recommendations, part of a greater precinct plan, has been completed and will be presented to Toronto City Council on Tuesday, August, 12th, 2014.*

Queens Quay

- *Work is progressing on the Site Services, TTC Rebuild, Road Construction and Public Realm.*
- *All northside sidewalks will be complete by the end of 2014 and the Promenade will be complete for June 2015.*

Jack Layton Ferry Terminal design competition

- *Waterfront Toronto, with the City of Toronto Parks Forestry and Recreation will be launching an innovative design competition for the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal and Harbour Square Park. The goal will be to hire a successful design team to reimagine this space, develop a master plan and implement a first phase of that master plan.*

One Panel member noted that there had been a lot of discussion lately surrounding the prevalence of the colour grey in the Athletes' Village. Mr. Glaisek stated that the original colours were not

grey, but that grey seemed to be the compromise in the end for the various owners as there were conflicts with branding or cultural interpretations of colour.

The Chair then moved to the first project review.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 EBF Development: Bayside R3/R4 (Aquavista)

ID#: 1054

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location:

Proponent: Hines/Tridel

Architect/Designer: Arquitectonica

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Sam Luckino, Arquitectonica; Jitka Jarolimek, Provident Energy Management

Delegation: Bruno Giancola, Deltera; Salvatore Cavarretta, Tridel

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design at Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project reminding the Panel that on March 12, 2014, the project received a vote of “Support” for the Conceptual Design. Mr. Glaisek stated that since the last presentation, the proponents, the City and Waterfront Toronto have been in discussions regarding the “Dog leg”, adding that it had now been removed. Mr. Glaisek stated that the GFA has been recaptured, adding that Waterfront Toronto feels that the removal of the dog leg warrants the extra height.

1.2 Project Presentation

Sam Luckino, Vice President, and New York Office Director at Arquitectonica introduced the project noting that when the project was presented in March 2014, the building was at 45m in the 38m zone. Mr. Luckino noted that after discussions with the city and with the removal of the “Dog Leg” and the redistribution of the GFA, the net result is that the building is now 41m. Mr. Luckino added that Artscape has been selected as the provider of the affordable rental units. Mr. Luckino then described the updated elevations, materiality and options for the service doors. Jitka Jarolimek, Project Manager with Provident Energy Management reviewed the Mandatory Green Building Requirements noting that the team is targeting LEED Platinum for the Condominium and LEED Gold for the Affordable rental units.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if they would be provided with a copy of the energy report. Ms. Jarolimek answered that yes, it would be.

One Panel member asked why the developers are targeting LEED Platinum for the condominium, and LEED Gold for the affordable rental. Mr. Luckino stated that there is a huge cost premium to bring it to platinum, adding that they are studying the cost the differential.

Another Panel member asked what type of glass will be used. Mr. Luckino stated that they have specified SNR 54.

Another Panel member asked if the affordable housing units were fully metered. Ms. Jarolimek stated yes, they were metered for electrical, hot and cold water with the same waste diversion strategy as the Condominium units.

Another Panel member asked if the land under the former “dog leg” was privately owned, or will it be part of the park. Mr. Glaisek stated that the intention is that it will be part of the park, noting that the legalities have to be worked out.

One Panel member asked if the design team was still exploring distinguishing the retail condition. Mr. Luckino answered that with the removal of the “dog leg”, the team was trying to bring the language of the rest of the building down to grade.

Another Panel member asked if the demising walls in the affordable rental units are concrete. Mr. Luckino stated that they were. One Panel member wondered if there a way to structure the building so that it could be something different in the future. Mr. Giancola stated that they are obligated by the City to keep the units as affordable rental housing in perpetuity.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Panel members all stated their support for the removal of the “dog leg”.

One Panel member noted that there is an extra cost to having two heating and cooling plants, feeling that there was a greater cost overall because of the strata title between the condominium and affordable rental units. Mr. Giancola, replied that to put this all in perspective there is actually a huge cost savings overall by housing the affordable rental units inside this condominium building as opposed to building a stand alone building.

Another Panel member noted that the east side of the building, where the “dog leg” was, will still be a great place for a café or some other use that would have a direct relationship with the park. Another Panel member noted that there were interesting precedents of grocery stores where all the garage doors open and really connects it to the outdoors.

Another Panel member felt that the railings above the retail space should be better integrated visually, wondering if the railing could be brick. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that it would obscure views from the pool deck. One Panel member felt that by slipping down the cornice, you could get safety plus view. Another Panel member felt that the design of the infinity pool lives up to the thrill of being on the waterfront.

One person felt that the four facades had such different characters, adding that the programming and detailing should be detailed to those different conditions.

1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- Support for removal of the “dog leg”,
- The treatment of the canopies of the affordable rental and condominium units should be the same,
- The next review should focus on the ground floor, street level elements, landscape and the retail component.

- The treatment of the garage doors will be a key element, there will need to be an innovative way and set a precedent.
- Please provide a copy of the energy report at the next meeting.

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Luckino and Ms. Jarolimek thanked the Panel for their comments.

1.7 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 Support of the Schematic Design of the project.

CLOSING

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