



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #115
Wednesday, September 26, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. Bayside: Aqualuna – Detailed Design
 2. West Don Lands Block 8 – Schematic Design
 3. Port Lands Flood Protection: Parks and River – Detailed Design
 4. Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads – Detailed Design
 5. Quayside – Issues Identification
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared that Urban Strategies has a conflict for the West Don Lands Block 8 project and for the Quayside project and recused himself for both reviews. Claude Cormier declared a conflict on the West Don Lands Block 8 project as his firm is the landscape architect and recused himself for that review.

The Chair then introduced Meg Davis, Chief Development Officer with Waterfront Toronto to provide an overview of the signed Plan Development Agreement (PDA). Ms. Davis noted that the agreement defines and governs the relationship between the two organizations as they jointly create a Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP)

focused on Quayside. The agreement defines goals, roles and responsibilities and was signed July 31st.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Chief of Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Quayside Roundtable meeting was held over two consecutive nights, August 14 and 15. The content of the meeting was presented by team members from Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs, and brought forward specific ideas around public realm, buildings, and streets. Mr. Glaisek noted that on August 25th, the Bentway Block Party was held to celebrate the completion of Phase 1 with the opening of Strachan Gate. Mr. Glaisek noted that on September 20th the Waterfront Innovation Centre had its groundbreaking. WPP will be the anchor tenant and MaRS recently announced plans to lease 24,000 square feet of office space inside the Innovation Centre.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on projects that were presented at the July meeting, including Port Lands Flood Protection Bridges which is currently working through comments from the last review with a focus on the balustrades, the lighting and the colour and finish. The team will be returning to DRP for Detailed Design October 24th. Mr. Glaisek noted that George Brown College's The Arbour is also considering Panel comments on the wood exterior cladding and revisiting the daycare based on Panel feedback.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Bayside Aqualuna – Base Building and Community Centre

Project Type: Building

Location: Bayside

Proponent: Hines/Tridel

Architect/Designer: 3Xn Architects (base building) Perkins + Will (community centre)

Review Stage: Detailed Design (base building), Issues Identification (community centre)

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Audun Opdal, 3XN; Duff Balmer, Perkins + Will

Delegation: Salvatore Cavarretta, Tridel

ID#: 1085

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Angela Li, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Hines and Tridel are co-developers of Bayside's market residential buildings. Aqualuna is the fourth building to be developed in Bayside, and the last market residential building. The building program will be primarily residential with animation uses at-grade including retail and a community recreation centre. Ms. Li noted that this is the project's third time presenting to the Panel. Ms. Li explained that Perkins + Will, the fit-out architect for the community centre, will be presenting Issues Identification for that portion of the building today. Ms. Li provided a recap on comments made at the last meeting in October 2017, including the height of the south tower should be lowered given the current 9-meter difference between this tower and

Aqualina's, committing to thermal breaks is a precedent-setting move for the city, the Queens Quay elevation is an important interface, elevation drawings should be brought to the next review, the community centre is a pivotal piece of the building, the design of the mid-block connection is critical, and further analysis is needed on the sun/shadow conditions and wind studies. Ms. Li asked the Panel to consider the materiality of the building, the details of the balconies and the relationship of the community centre space to the breezeway. Ms. Li then introduced James Parakh, Urban Design Program Manager with the City of Toronto, to speak to the building's cladding. Mr. Parakh walked the Panel through a series of precedent images that demonstrate how visible cladding can be with a vertical picket balcony design and asked for the Panel's feedback on the cladding system. Ms. Li then introduced Audun Opdal, Principal with 3XN Architects, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Opdal began by noting that the building strives to maximize views to the water but also to the streets and public realm with the aim of creating a good urban environment. The materiality is a simple palette given that the building is playful with a lot of movement. The aluminium panels are textured with either a perforation or embossment. Mr. Opdal noted that the breezeway is flanked by retail with good synergy between the spaces. Mr. Opdal then introduced Mayan Hershkovitz, Sustainability Project Manager with EQ Building Performance Inc. to present the sustainability portion of the presentation.

Ms. Hershkovitz explained that with much consideration the team has decided to pursue LEED V4 Homes Multifamily Midrise. Some of the key sustainability features of the project include 50% indoor and outdoor water use reduction, local materials used for drywall, insulation and roofing, low VOC finishes, and high-performance envelope with low-E glazing, warm-edge spaces, and casement windows. Ms. Hershkovitz then introduced Duff Balmer, Design Principal with Perkins + Will, to present Issues Identification for the community centre piece.

Mr. Balmer noted that the design objectives for the project include supporting and enhancing the liveability of the East Bayfront precinct through the injection of community function, contribute to the vitality of the public realm and water's edge, and to assert a distinct public identity while blending with the larger development context. Mr. Balmer noted that the community centre will establish an important gateway to the precinct and will be central to the evolving neighbourhood. Mr. Balmer noted that they will be exploring the operability of the building with the potential of spill-out space. The community centre is part of the larger building which has a signature language. Mr. Balmer added that the intent is to tie the design of the community centre into the design of the building to ensure it is harmonious and seen as a community centre and not a private club.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the material of the underside of the soffit will be. Mr. Opdal replied that the balconies will be a white painted concrete and the breezeway will be a porcelain tile option. The Panel member also asked the team to describe their approach to thermal breaks on the balconies. Carlos Antunes, Partner with Kirkor Architects, explained that they are exploring two options; a continuous mechanical system of breaking the balcony and a stop start method. Mr. Antunes noted that they are still working out the details of this.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the alignment of Queens Quay. Mr. Glaisek replied that the alignment is still in flux but doesn't affect this building.

One Panel member asked if there is a signage strategy in place for the retail store fronts. Mr. Opdal replied that there are two options that they are working with which consists of using part of the signage band and sometimes not.

Another Panel member asked if there is a retail tenant strategy. Mr. Opdal replied that conversations have started, and they have some potential tenants in mind, but nothing has been solidified.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member liked the look of the aluminium cladding material but cautioned the team about the possibility of vandalism on such a smooth surface. The Panel member noted that replacement, repair and protection need to be considered. The Panel member suggested coming up with a scheme where the plants outside are controlled and maintained by the condominium corporation rather than the tenants.

Another Panel member commended the team on such a beautiful building. The Panel member was also supportive of the building materiality. The Panel member asked the team to consider extending the community centre to the west side of the breezeway to give it more of a presence.

One Panel member felt that this building is a very good example of design excellence. The Panel member noted that the planting material needs to complement the cladding and also look good in every season.

Another Panel member noted that the building is very sculptural from the top but felt that there is an overcontrol of the base. The Panel member noted that the ground plane of the community centre and the possibility of spill out space needs to be carefully considered.

One Panel member noted that how the concrete surface on the underside of the balconies is painted is a key piece given how prominent the balcony soffits are. The Panel member also wanted to ensure that none of the balcony components get value engineered out as they are the identity of the building. The Panel member also noted that the mid-block connection is a signature feature in this neighbourhood and is essential to the neighbourhood quality.

Another Panel member was supportive of the cladding options. The Panel member was, however, concerned about the transparency of the skin on the ground floor as people may feel exposed with the transparent perimeter. The Panel member suggested considering operability options for the retail tenants on the ground floor such as windows that can open.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel felt that this is a beautiful piece of architecture that pays attention to detail.
- Focus on the retail space including: treatment of signage, adaptability of the space, ground floor façade and operability
- The balconies are the building's identity. Ensure every aspect of them is well executed.
- Planting and landscape need to be carefully managed.
- The east-west pedestrian passageway is essential to the neighbourhood. Ensure that it is a space for people to enjoy.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 West Don Lands Block 8

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Kilmer, Dream, Tricon

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance, COBE Architects

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Mark Hallé, Claude Cormier + Associés; Thomas Krarup, COBE Architects

Delegation: Tony Medeiros, Dream

ID#: 1101

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Dream, Kilmer and Tricon were the successful proponents of Infrastructure Ontario's RFP for Blocks 8, 20, 3W, 4W and 7W in the West Don Lands. This project is part of the Province's Affordable Housing program as well as the City's Open Doors program. Mr. Loudon noted that Block 8 is proposed as a purpose-built rental building with ancillary retail at-grade with 30% affordable rental housing units. Mr. Loudon noted that this is the team's second time presenting to the Panel and today they will be presenting Schematic Design. Mr. Loudon then introduced Adam Feldmann, Associate with architectsAlliance, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by noting that architectsAlliance is working on the design for the 8a building and COBE is working on the design of the 8b and 8c buildings. Mr. Feldmann noted that the building consists of 760 units with 223 units being affordable. The affordable units will be integrated throughout the building. Mr. Feldmann explained that they are working within the as-of-right zoning with a minor variance with height due to some grading issues. Mr. Feldmann then introduced Thomas Krarup, with COBE architects.

Mr. Krarup explained that the team was infatuated by the rich diversity of the area. It's situated at a junction between two neighbourhoods and the team wants to include these elements in the architectural palette. Mr. Krarup explained that the amenity spaces throughout the 3 buildings will be shared and are located in well-lit areas. Mr. Krarup also explained that the courtyard space will draw people to the area. Mr. Krarup then introduced Mark Hallé with Claude Cormier et Associés to present the landscape portion of the presentation.

Mr. Hallé began by noting that there is a water feature located in the centre of the courtyard to be designed for kids to play and as a focal point. Mr. Hallé explained that there are four-meter circular planters along the courtyard space with dynamic theatrical catenary lighting throughout the space.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the retail strategy is. Mr. Feldmann noted that the retail strategy is about looking at a small amount of service-oriented retail for the community. Mr. Feldmann added that the bulk of the project is focused on residential, not retail.

Another Panel member asked why the Metrolinx building was relocated to the east. Deanne Mighton, Design Project Manager with the City of Toronto, replied that this was decided based on the Union Station Rail Corridor Environmental Assessment in order to accommodate the LRT bridge widening at Cherry Street.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the below grade parking. Mr. Feldmann replied that all of the blocks will be connected through the underground parking. Mr. Feldmann noted that they will bring a plan drawing of this to the next review.

Another Panel member asked about the raised planters and whether this was to provide more soil volume. Mr. Hallé replied that the planters are raised to provide more soil volume for the trees because of the parking garage below.

One Panel member asked if there is a predetermined use for Block 20. Mr. Feldmann replied that it is now zoned for a commercial use.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt strongly that having substantial retail along Tank House Lane is the wrong approach and could create a pedestrian safety issue crossing Cherry Street. The Panel member was also sceptical about having a water feature given the issues of maintenance and seasonal use.

Another Panel member suggested playing with the orientation of the paving pattern to help direct the flow of pedestrian movement. The Panel member liked the fenestration of the towers and the depth and massiveness of the podium but wondered if the smaller tower could also play with depths more. The Panel member noted that the TTC stop is going to be the main reason that people cross Cherry Street regardless of retail.

One Panel member liked that the loading and service area was consolidated in a single entrance. The Panel member also liked the retail and suggested that the retail along Tank House Lane is flexible with opportunities for people to experiment with the space. The Panel member also noted that Cherry Street is currently not a busy street and, in the future when the area becomes more populated, if it becomes a problem, a pedestrian crossing signal could be installed then. The Panel member also suggested that the team investigate stormwater retention on the roofs. The Panel member was also concerned about the three different layers of the building looking disjointed and advised the team to ensure that the materiality of the three layers jives with one another.

Another Panel member noted that the challenge with the site is that it's in between the Distillery District and the West Don Lands which both have very different characteristics. The Panel member noted that this is a challenge to bridge the two characters into the design. The Panel member also felt that there wasn't enough continuity between the three buildings.

One Panel member liked the brick base on the 8c building but wasn't convinced about the porcelain cladding. The Panel member also felt that an EUI target of 170 is too high and wanted to see more rigour with the building's sustainability.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Integration of market and affordable units is very positive.
- Minimizing loading access to one location is supported.
- Continuity of the public realm network is strong.
- The usability and accessibility of the podium amenities is successful.
- Water feature may not be worth pursuing given the maintenance required.
- Do not extend the retail spine from Tank House Lane along the laneway but focus it on Front Street. A small amount of retail related to the streetcar loop should be explored.
- The use of materials in the public realm requires further refinement.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-Support for the project. Four Panel members voted Conditional Support and one Panel member voted Non-Support.

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: River Valley – Detailed Design

Project Type: Parks

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: MVVA

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: three

Presenter(s): Herb Sweeney, MVVA; Neil Budzinski, MVVA

Delegation: Michael Van Valkenburgh, MVVA (conference call)

ID#: 1090

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Shannon Baker, Director of Parks and Public Realm with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that two items will be presented today, including the River Valley and the Roads and Municipal Infrastructure. Ms. Baker provided a recap on comments from the April meeting for parks and river valley, including the multi-use recreation trail's location in the park space, the balance between the constructed nature of the park and integrating the industrial heritage, feeling this piece has been lost too much. Ms. Baker provided a recap on comments about the roads, including thinking about the opportunity to economize with the streets by minimizing some of the plantings, ensure that the plan is forward thinking in terms of where the traffic will naturally go and where car parking will be accommodated during the transition phases, and ensure pedestrians are brought forward with as much thought as vehicles and cyclists.

For the parks and river valley piece, Ms. Baker asked the Panel to consider the balance between programmed space and designed nature, clear articulation of the path network within the parks, and integration of the industrial heritage into the park. For the roads piece Ms. Baker asked the Panel to consider the appropriate use of space within the 40-meter right-of-way to address all needs of modes, creation of appropriate street character through public realm and adequate consideration of the interim condition of the streets. Mr. Glaisek added that the catalytic use is an important issue to highlight. Mr. Glaisek asked the Panel to consider whether the proposed catalytic site based on the Villiers Island Precinct Plan should to be moved to accommodate a destination playground. Ms. Baker then introduced Herb Sweeney, Associate Principal with MVVA, and Neil Budzinski, Senior Associate with MVVA, to give the presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Sweeney began by explaining that this review will be focused on the river valley area which consists of the ice management area, the Don Greenway, the river valley park, the Keating Channel and canoe cove. Mr. Sweeney noted that some outdoor recreation opportunities include nature trails, kayak launches, fishing, gravel beaches

and cross-country skiing. In terms of water access, Mr. Sweeney explained that there will be different water access typologies, including canoe and kayak launches, fishing nodes, stepping stones and portages. Mr. Sweeney noted that the canoe cove configuration has changed in complexity since the last review.

Mr. Budzinski talked about the flood control and river stabilization noting that the channel is armoured using a variety of bioengineered and armouring techniques. Mr. Budzinski explained that the water fluctuations drive the planting and habitat species selection.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked what the status of the Marine Terminal 35 building is. Mr. Sweeney replied that over the course of the last six months, the team has been working with ERA Architects and they established that keeping the building is not possible given the damage from the fire. Mr. Sweeney noted that they are exploring ways to commemorate the site.

Another Panel member asked if the team could bring drawings to the next review that show what the 100-year flood condition would make the space look like. The Panel member asked if the catalogue bridge shown is what the bridge will actually look like. Mr. Sweeney noted that as the design has progressed there have been some budgetary issues, and they have not had the opportunity to detail the bridge to a greater extent than a modified catalogue version.

One Panel member asked what will happen if there is no maintenance in the park. Mr. Sweeney replied that there many unknowns related to the future operations of the park, but they have been identifying a trajectory of where they want the system to go.

Another Panel member asked if maintenance is more of an issue top of bank than below. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the team recognizes that the parkland maintenance above top of bank relies on working collaboratively with the City of Toronto, the future long-term owners of the site. Ms. Mallozzi added that the team has kickstarted a process with the Parks Forestry and Recreation department to start cataloguing the entire site and the amount of operations and maintenance required. The Panel member asked if the design team has ever worked on a project of this scale with this level of complexity. Mr. Sweeney replied that in totality they've experienced similar complexities with other projects but not collectively with one project.

One Panel member asked if the industrial heritage will be located primarily along the Keating Channel. Mr. Sweeney replied yes.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that the industrial heritage has been lost. The Panel member also felt that spill over space and a support structure for park users to seek shelter is necessary.

Another Panel member wanted the dynamism of the high water after a flood event to be better understood and asked the team to bring drawings of these extreme conditions. The Panel member noted that so much effort has been put into the road bridges and some more effort should be put into the pedestrian bridges.

One Panel member congratulated the team on the tremendous project. The Panel member felt that each street intersection should have a connection to the park entrance. The Panel member noted that water access is so important, and the beaches and kayak launches are great. The Panel member felt that the multi-use/pedestrian bridges should be more daring and should feel related to the road bridges. Lastly, the Panel member was still skeptical of the maintenance piece and noted that this is something that should continue to evolve.

Another Panel member was supportive of the destination playground being located where it is and suggested moving the cultural institution into one of the development sites.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Consider retaining more of the industrial heritage features in the revised design.
- Demonstrate the dynamism of the river by showing what it will look like in a 100-year flood event and after.
- The pedestrian bridges require more design consideration in relation to the road bridges.
- Consider making pedestrian connections into the river valley at the termination of each north-south street
- Accommodate both a destination playground and a significant cultural institution in the plan

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

4.0 Port Lands Flood Protection: Roads – Detailed Design

Project Type: Roads and Municipal Infrastructure

Location: Port Lands

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: WSP with DTAH

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: three

Presenter(s): James Roche, DTAH; Brent Raymond, DTAH

Delegation: Aaron Small, WSP; See-Yin Lim, DTAH

ID#: 1095

4.1 Project Presentation

Ms. Baker introduced James Roche, Partner at DTAH, and Brent Raymond, Partner at DTAH to give the presentation. Mr. Raymond explained that the 40-meter right-of-way was set in the environmental assessment and the team is working within those confines. Mr. Roche explained that the three streets are being defined by the river. The design will be inspired by the rough industrial heritage through the use of simple materials. Mr. Roche explained that Commissioners Street has a unique relationship to the park, blurring the park edge. Mr. Roche added that 74% of the right-of-way would be for non-auto use. The Don Roadway is seen as a riparian landscape blurring the social and ecological edges of the street. New Cherry Street will have the same condition on either side and is seen as a series of outdoor rooms. Mr. Roche explained that this allows for the space to evolve and adapt over time to the adjacent development. Mr. Raymond explained that the innovative approach to the street has been for the most part about the technology. Not a lot of these elements are landscape driven. Mr. Raymond explained that its about being adaptable and understanding where the below-grade infrastructure will go for a seamless transition to future uses. In summary, Mr. Raymond explained that the Port Lands streets are inspired by the landscape driven transformation of the Lower Don River and the Port Lands.

4.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if any of the planting area has been lost. Mr. Roche replied no. The Panel member asked whether the TTC is on board with the street configuration. Mr. Roche replied that it's based on the approved environmental assessment.

Another Panel member asked where the north south crossings are on Commissioners Street. Mr. Roche replied that the crossings are only at the signalized intersections.

One Panel member asked what the posted speed limit will be along Commissioners Street. Aaron Small with WSP replied that the posted speed limit will be 40 km/hr with a design speed of 50 km/hr.

Another Panel member asked whether the City has committed to extending Commissioners Street across the Don Roadway. Ms. Mallozzi replied that this will happen in future phases.

One Panel member noted that based on lessons learned from Queens Quay regarding salt, sidewalks and drainage, how will those lessons be applied to this project. Mr. Roche explained that they are proposing raised planters to reduce the amount of salt that will percolate into the soil. Mr. Raymond added that they are mindful of all the factors that contribute to poor tree health and are working to avoid these issues.

Another Panel member asked for clarification of the energy consumption for the heated sidewalks. Mr. Roche explained that they are looking at a heat recapture strategy which uses the waste heat through the sanitary sewer, making use of what you have.

4.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member asked the team to bring a drawing to show the water management and where it goes. The Panel member asked the team to focus more on the design aspect of the street's identity. The Panel member suggested using a unique tree typology on the streets.

Another Panel member noted that people crossing Commissioners Street mid-block is going to be a problem and asked the team to consider ways to break up the street.

One Panel member noted that a lot of road space is taken up by the left-hand turn lane and asked whether this is necessary and whether the road could be narrowed further. The Panel member was nervous about design items getting value engineered out and advised the team to ensure that the texture and quality of the materials are resilient to ensure that they remain part of the design.

Another Panel member liked that the project started out with this idea of industrial heritage but felt that it is now missing and needs to be brought back into the design. The Panel member asked the team to consider what design pieces have to stay in order to make the street work and what can be value engineered out. The Panel member also added that if the streetcar tracks were planted, there would be no issues with vehicles driving on it.

One Panel member noted that if the left turn lane is going to be a central strip, it might as well be a longer left turn lane than painted stripes. The Panel member added that the more straightforward the configuration, the better.

4.4 Consensus Comments

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

- The streets require a stronger identity, whether it be through planting or materials.
- Recapture the industrial heritage of the site back into the revised road design
- Ensure that the pedestrian and bicycle lanes have adequate separation
- Consider making pedestrian connections into the river valley at the termination of each north-south street
- The left hand turning lane requires further thinking. Ensure that the configuration is straightforward.

4.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

5.0 Quayside – Issues Identification

Project Type: Master Plan

Location: Quayside

Proponent: Sidewalk Labs

Architect/Designer: Public Work

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Jesse Shapins, Sidewalk Labs; Willa Ng, Sidewalk Labs

Delegation: Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto

ID#: 1100

5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that the Quayside objectives from the RFP included, sustainability, resiliency, urban innovation, complete communities, economic development, prosperity, partnership and investment. The plan that is being developed is based on these goals and objectives. Mr. Glaisek noted that the area is zoned for approximately 3 million square feet of development. The policy context is three-fold, consisting of the East Bayfront Precinct Plan, the Keating Channel Precinct Plan and the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan. Elements of these plans are being considered by the team in keeping with the spirit of the precinct plans. Mr. Glaisek explained that the team will be presenting the public realm and mobility and the buildings piece will be presented at the October meeting. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Jesse Shapins, Director of Public Realm with Sidewalk Labs, and Willa Ng, Director of Mobility with Sidewalk Labs to give the presentation.

5.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Shapins began by noting that people feel inspired to interact in the public realm when they see the space in use. Mr. Shapins explained that the public realm should be able to adapt as community needs change, have an indoor-outdoor feel, and be comfortable year-round. Mr. Shapins noted that modular paving is one of the ways to enhance the public realm. Some of the benefits of modularity include being able to lift up the pavement to access utilities, being able to easily incorporate lighting into the pavement or being able to test different ways that that things can be plugged in. Mr. Shapins explained that the public realm also needs to be flexible and useable throughout the year. The building “raincoat” made of a translucent material incorporated with a steel structure would allow for a seamless and weather protected space to make you feel like you’re still outside. Mr. Shapins explained the stoa concept is able to adapt and evolve to the community’s needs through the use of a modular kit of parts. Mr. Shapins noted that Parliament Slip will be brought up to Lake Shore Boulevard so that when you cross Lake Shore, you know that you’ve arrived at the waterfront. Mr. Shapins explained that this could become the Parliament Gateway. Mr. Shapins then introduced Willa Ng to present the mobility piece.

Ms. Ng explained that we are building from the ground up for Quayside so there is no need to retrofit any existing street components. Ms. Ng noted that there are four street typologies, including the boulevard which is a main arterial for transit, traditional cars, and AVs; the transitway which is an arterial for transit, AVs; including pick-up and drop-off, the accessway which is designed for cycling and pedestrians with AV access only at bike speeds, and the laneway which is designed for walking speeds.

5.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked about freight and service entrances. Ms. Ng explained that they would prefer these types of uses to stay on the boulevard type street. Ms. Ng added that they are also doing an assessment of emergency vehicles.

Another Panel member asked if they have a scenario for how this site will be developed. Mr. Shapins noted that this would be a question for the people leading the development and buildings piece.

One Panel member asked if they will be creating a specific building code for this area. Mr. Shapins replied that they are interested in less prescriptive solutions and more interested in having a key set of performance outcomes.

Another Panel member asked which street the stoa is located on. Mr. Shapins replied that its being conceived across all buildings.

One Panel member asked whether the rendering shown as a double height two-storey podium with a tower on top is correct. Mr. Shapins replied yes, but the tower would be more of a mid-rise building. Mr. Shapins clarified that the renderings are conceptual and not site specific.

Another Panel member noted that it's clear that the team is using data when it comes to the streets but it remains unclear where else data is coming into the proposal. Ms. Ng replied that the buildings and sustainability piece will present and speak to data use always being beneficial to the people that live there. Mr. Shapins added that the outdoor comfort is based on micro-climate data.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the term "radical mixed use". Ms. Ng replied that for the mobility piece, there will be a heavy reliance on transit but also on pedestrians and cyclists. For this to work, its important to locate the community uses within walking distance. Mr. Shapins added the notion of mixing light manufacturing with residential is something they are interested in.

5.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member wondered how all this innovation was financially viable. The Panel member was sceptical about fire safety issues with mixing uses. The most dangerous use is going to be applied to the entire building, which goes against affordable construction.

Another Panel member noted that the extension of Parliament slip is great, but Queens Quay should extend across the slip. The Panel member asked whether they are designing the space as a unique destination unlike any other place in the world. Ms. Ng replied that they are designing the space for people who live and work there to have a

high quality of life. Ms. Ng added that Quayside is an opportunity to test out some of the unknowns, such as the raincoats. This will be a place where there will be elements that people have never seen before. Mr. Shapins added that inevitably this place will be a destination and it's the team's responsibility to ensure that the space has a true everyday character and not feel like an exhibition centre.

One Panel member noted that the stoa framework allows a huge opportunity to experiment and this is the energy that will attract people. The Panel member added that this will require a new financial model and asked to see innovation in the business model that can deliver on the urban design promise.

Another Panel member was in favour of stratified employment zones as it creates an important juxtaposition.

5.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The Panel liked the idea of extending Parliament Slip up to Lake Shore Boulevard and the opportunities this creates for more access to water. Ensure that Queens Quay runs straight across.
- The Panel was interested in learning further details on the business model for innovation on the site
- Ensure that the area has a true every-day character for everyone

5.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

There was no vote as the project was reviewed at the Issues Identification Stage.

CLOSING

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