



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #99
Wednesday, March 8, 2017**

Present

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

Regrets

Peter Busby

Recording Secretaries:

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto Board of
Directors and Panel Liason

WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the February 15th meeting. One of the Panel members pointed out an incomplete sentence in section 1.2 and asked for a revision. The minutes were then adopted as revised.

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

The Chair introduced Mazyar Mortazavi who will be the new Liaison to the Waterfront Toronto Board of Directors, a position which involves reporting back to Board members on Panel meetings.

The Chair noted this this will be his last meeting on the Panel and thanked everyone for the extraordinary experience. All of the work on the waterfront and the leadership of Waterfront Toronto with the support of the City of Toronto has opened up new opportunities. The Chair suggested hosting a tour of the waterfront as an orientation to the new Panel members in the spring.

Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design, thanked the Chair for the time he has dedicated to the Panel over the past twelve years. He then gave the Chair a photo montage of Design Review Panel projects as a token of appreciation and noted that there will be an event on April 19th to celebrate the Chair's accomplishments.

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

Mr. Glaisek explained the possibility of transitioning the briefing material from printed binders to an online secure portal where Panel members could access all Design Review Panel material electronically. This would be a more sustainable process with the reduction of paper usage and staff time. Mr. Glaisek asked whether the Panel would be interested in using this portal instead of printed binders at every meeting. The Panel members agreed that this would be good idea. Mr. Glaisek noted that a training session would be scheduled for Panel members to be introduced to the new process once it is ready.

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on Villiers Island noting that the sustainability review by Sustainability Solutions Group is complete and the project team is in the process of making the report accessible to the public. The project team, in conjunction with the City of Toronto, is in the process of incorporating some of the sustainability audit recommendations into the Precinct Plan, including revisiting tower placement.

Mr. Glaisek invited Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi explained that construction mobilization on the Bentway began in early March, and removals and grading for civil construction will begin in April. Ms. Mallozzi noted that an important milestone for the project is the closing of the Skating Trail/Refrigeration tender package in March. Kearns Mancini/Patkau have now issued drawings for a building permit for the Fort York Visitor's Centre Extension. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the Conservancy has now hired a CEO who will be starting March 27th, and who will work closely with the team on programming and activation for the Bentway.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the Tommy Thompson Park Entrance Development Project, which was reviewed at the last meeting will be returning to Design Review Panel for Design Development when it is ready.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1.0 TO Core Study

Project Type: Information

Presenter(s): Andrew Farncombe (City of Toronto), Corinne Fox (City of Toronto)

1.1 Project Presentation

Andrew Farncombe, Project Manager with the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that TOcore is a 25-year plan for Toronto's Downtown Core. Mr. Farncombe noted that the project's deliverables include a new Downtown Secondary Plan and new Infrastructure Strategies. The plan is based on 5 guiding principles, including liveability, connectivity, prosperity, resiliency, and responsibility. Mr. Farncombe explained that there are 128 proposed policies. One of these policies involves balancing residential and non-residential growth by protecting the critical economic areas. Another policy involves shaping a diverse downtown by proposing three categories of mixed-use designations with supporting land use policies, including Tall Building Communities, Transition Areas, and Mainstreet areas that contain heritage buildings and midrise buildings. Another policy is Building for Liveability which involves defining transition typologies, shadow impact considerations, amenity spaces for non-residential developments, and defining appropriate heights. Another policy is rebalancing streets.

Mr. Farncombe introduced Corrine Fox, Program Standards and Development Officer with the City of Toronto, to provide an overview of the Parks and Public Realm Plan. Ms. Fox explained that under TOcore a Parks and Public Realm Plan is being developed which will create a blueprint for a connected, expanded and diverse parks and public realm system in the downtown that maintains liveability in the face of continued population and employment growth. Ms. Fox noted that land values are high in the downtown core so there needs to be a focus not only on expansion of parks and public realm, but also on the connectivity and the quality of public spaces. Some ways of achieving this involve creating Toronto's "Core Circle" by linking the green space system that rings the downtown, identifying 10 Great Streets for a thriving grid, and encouraging connections that stitch along the Gardiner/Rail corridor.

1.2 Panel Questions and Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions or comments.

One Panel member asked how TOcore affects the waterfront. Mr. Farncombe replied that the public realm created in the waterfront is part of the overall public realm. The Panel member asked how we can use the harbour. Mr. Farncombe replied that these are all emerging ideas including the Toronto Islands becoming part of the "Core Circle".

Another Panel member asked about the policy regarding shaping a diverse downtown and asked why there wasn't more mixed use included on the map. Mr. Farncombe replied that this map represents the existing context to a certain degree. Mr. Farncombe noted that this feedback will be taken into account.

One Panel member raised the issue of the controversy over the heritage designation from Wellesley to Bloor Street along Yonge Street. Mr. Farncombe replied that there was a study undertaken in this area and as the OMB settlement proceeds, the plan will be modified to reflect this.

Another Panel member asked why the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan (CWSP) is still not in effect. Mr. Glaisek replied that the CWSP was appealed in its entirety, but

portions have been brought into effect through settlements. Mr. Glaisek noted that this document is still used as a guiding tool and centre of discussions for all Waterfront Toronto projects.

One Panel member felt that there is still a disconnect with the waterfront plans. Mr. Glaisek suggested a meeting with the TOcore project team to discuss aligning visions.

Another Panel member asked why Villiers Island is not included on the plan. Mr. Farncombe replied that the TOcore boundary does not include Villiers Island, and the boundary is defined by Bathurst Street to the west, the waterfront to the south, the Don River to the east, and Dupont Street to the North.

One Panel member emphasized the importance not only of the east west connections but also the north south connections between the waterfront and the downtown core.

2.0 Growing Up Vertical

Project Type: Information

Presenter(s): Andrea Oppedisano (City of Toronto)

Andrea Oppedisano, Planner with the City of Toronto, introduced the study by noting that this is being undertaken to examine how new multi-unit housing in high density communities can better accommodate the needs of households with children and youth. Ms. Oppedisano explained that in 2007 City Council made a request for staff to look into making three bedroom units a requirement. This was examined but never adopted. Ms. Oppedisano noted that even though the City requires 10% three bedroom units, this doesn't mean that quality units are always being built. Ms. Oppedisano explained the first phase of consultations involved a survey to gain insight into the experiences of families with children living in high rise buildings. The survey received 700 responses that included importance of unit number, outdoor greenspace, and proximity to schools and childcare. Ms. Oppedisano noted that they also undertook a "condo hack" which involved interviewing how families have adapted their homes. A study team visited a handful of families living in vertical communities in key growth areas across the city. Discussions included challenges and opportunities experienced, and shared ideas about what would make raising children in tall buildings easier. Ms. Oppedisano noted that park space is very important to families living in high rise buildings. Ms. Oppedisano walked through a number of guidelines such as what the minimum or ideal sizes for different spaces within a unit should be, and unit flexibility. Ms. Oppedisano noted that the next steps involve ongoing consultation, refining the guidelines and unit sizes, and reporting to Planning and Growth Management Committee on the final guidelines and recommended policies in the fall.

2.1 Panel Questions and Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions or comments.

Mr. Mortazavi asked what the low end of a sales price would be. Ms. Oppedisano replied approximately \$450 per square foot. The Board Liaison also noted that there is a need to correlate the reality of the developer's perspective and understanding the

economic modelling that can be tied into the policy. Fundamentally, the affordability piece needs to be considered. The Board Liaison also noted that the people who will be living in these places in 10 years need to be considered. Quality of units needs to be prescribed.

Another Panel member asked how residents felt about the usefulness of balconies. Ms. Oppedisano replied that opinions varied. Ms. Oppedisano noted that they are developing a minimum size requirement for balconies. The Panel member also asked if families preferred living on the lower levels. Ms. Oppedisano replied that based on their findings, the majority of families prefer living on the first 10 floors.

One Panel members felt that the growing needs in high rise developments include bicycle storage and outdoor barbecue areas. The Panel member also felt that lobbies are becoming important social mixing spaces.

PROJECT REVIEWS

3.0 Hanlan Boat Club

ID#: 1079

Project Type: Building

Location: Regatta Road

Proponent: Hanlan Boat Club

Architect/Designer: N/A

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Patrick Okens, Vice President of Development for Hanlan Boat Club

Delegation: John Keen, City of Toronto

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stewart, Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by providing context for the proposed building noting that Hanlan Boat Club is one of several boating clubs that lease parkland south of Regatta Road. All of the lands south of Unwin Avenue are part of one undivided park parcel. Ms. Stewart noted that the lands represented in green in the presentation are subject to Toronto Regional Conservation Authority planning controls and regulations.

Ms. Stewart provided background on the project by noting that the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan proposed realigning Regatta Road, moving Hanlan Boat Club to another location, re-organizing the boat clubs to allow access to the peninsula, and creating a main pedestrian/cycling transect that would run parallel to Regatta Road. Ms. Stewart explained that Hanlan Boat Club first presented a new building to the Panel in January, 2014. This proposal was more ambitious and larger than the current proposal, requiring servicing not available on Regatta Road. Ms. Stewart noted that Hanlan Boat Club was aware and supportive of the idea of moving their club to a new site and included this as a possible option for their original design. The Panel voted in support of the original proposal but requested that the Proponent return when funding for the project was secured. Ms. Stewart proposed a number of issues for the Panel to

consider, including the relationship of the building to Regatta Road, the scale and character of the modular greenhouse structure as a precedent for built form on Regatta Road, the relationship of the building to the fence line, advice on the colour, materiality of cladding and ratio of transparent to opaque, security, doors, access and egress, and rainwater management.

3.2 Project Presentation

Patrick Okens, the Vice President of Development at Hanlan Boat Club, explained that the boat club was named after Ned Hanlan, a professional rower in the late 1800s and a past resident of the Toronto Islands. Mr. Okens walked the Panel through a day in the life of a Hanlan Boat Club member which consists of usage between early dawn to dusk. The club membership has increased significantly, doubling in the past six years. Mr. Okens showed images of the existing facility which does not give a good presentation of the club. Mr. Okens noted that in April, 2016, members of the club met to discuss whether people wanted to proceed with such an ambitious plan. The general consensus was to stay on the existing site and get something built in the near future. Mr. Okens explained some of the opportunities and constraints of the site which include increasing capacity, improved efficiency and operations, better presentation, and better use of volunteer effort. Some of the constraints are the fixed site boundaries, poor-quality soil, seasonal use, and no water service. Mr. Okens described the proposal as a lightweight greenhouse-type structure with 5 boat bays, and ideal dimensions of 118' x 98'.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked whether rebuilding the docks is part of the scope. Mr. Okens replied that the docks are removed seasonally and will remain in their current state. The Panel member also asked who the neighbours are. Mr. Okens replied that the neighbours include other boat clubs. The Panel member asked about the timeline for this project. Mr. Okens replied that pending approvals, it is achievable for this time next year.

Another Panel member asked how many current club members there are. Mr. Okens replied that there are currently 500 users and growing. The Panel member also asked about the storage capacity of the proposed facility versus the current one. Mr. Okens replied that the proposed building would accommodate all existing boats and room for a 30% increase.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the rectangle shapes represented on the site plan. Mr. Okens replied that these are spaces used to store some boats that remain outside. The Panel member also asked about the trees and whether this building required removing any existing trees. Mr. Okens replied that the current configuration of the proposed building requires no removal of trees.

One Panel member asked if there was a jetty. Mr. Okens replied that there is a dock that gets removed in the winter and a gravel beach to pull up motor boats.

Another Panel member asked if there was a sheltered space for members to wait. Mr. Okens replied that there is currently no designated waiting space.

One Panel member asked if the boat club is quiet during the day. Mr. Okens replied that typically members use the space in the mornings or late afternoon as this is generally when the lake is the calmest.

Another Panel member asked if there is an architect working on the project. Mr. Okens replied that they have not hired an architect yet.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Mr. Mortazavi felt that the project should create a zone for engagement. If the requirements for building construction are not driven by a critical time schedule, there should be consideration for how the building can give back to the community. The project should carefully consider the building design so that it does not become purely a catalogue product that is driven solely by budget. Elements of the proposed design requires tweaking.

One Panel member felt that the image of rowing in the natural setting should be enhanced through the building design. The industrial greenhouse, which alludes to the farming and the country setting is fundamentally good.

Another Panel member felt that importance needs to be placed on how the building interfaces with other future buildings. The Panel member also felt that having a spaces for shade and rain cover were important to the space. The Panel member noted that there needs to be a plan for the public realm including signage, placement of the portable washroom, and strategic placement of trees to provide passive shading. The colour of the paint and finish of the building also should be well thought out.

One Panel member appreciated the look of the modest scale of the greenhouse building which fits well into the fine-grain scale of the area. The Panel member agreed that there needs to be an address on Regatta Road as it will set the precedent for the rest of the properties on Regatta Road. The Panel member also noted that cross-ventilation for the greenhouse structure is critical especially in warmer months. They also felt that the project can incorporate sustainable strategies such as collecting rain water from the roof to be used on site. Overall the Panel member stressed the importance of the public realm and suggested that not only the building but the edge treatment of the site should be carefully considered. These decisions can be properly made with an architect on the project.

Another panel member noted that the form-driven, minimal design as shown in the cover image render works for the site, and the greenhouse concept is a good idea. The Panel member felt that adding a canopy could take away from the simplicity of the design which is its strength and suggested that by putting a large overhead door, the

storage space can become the experience of the site as well a usable space for the rowers such as waiting and staying warm during the cold seasons.

One Panel member stressed the importance of the landscape of the site and suggested that the team work with the existing trees rather than removing them. The edge condition at Regatta Road is unresolved currently with a fence then a building. Having presence at the road frontage is critical.

Another Panel member felt that Regatta Road is an entirely different experience compared to the rest of the area, and this “scruffiness” needs to be captured in the proposal. They felt that the canopy would be useful and suggested that north end of the building should open up to the road. The concept of allowing people to see the boats stored in the building would be powerful. They also felt that saving existing trees is key. The building will be a first precedent within the area therefore the team must set the bar high.

Another Panel member felt that if the garage doors were implemented on the north side it would take care of accessibility and rain protection without having to add a canopy.

A Panel member wondered if there is a possibility of integrating the existing tree in the greenhouse.

Another Panel member noted that this could be an interesting exercise for an engineer, as it could be considered as industrial design. There is simplicity in the design of a boathouse. The 3xN headquarters in Copenhagen was mentioned as a precedent for shed-like pavilions being repurposed.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The simplicity of the “industrial greenhouse” concept is good.
- Explore the possibility of having a weather protected waiting area, whether it be an overhang or garage doors on the north side of the building.
- There needs to be a presence on Regatta Road through signage, windows on the north side, or a “front” door.
- Public realm is key - work around the existing landscape features and think about strategically planting more trees onsite.
- The building design should not be a pure “catalogue” product that is driven solely by budget, but needs some design moves.
- Consider using the building to provide some indoor amenity space.
- Ensure that an architect is retained for subsequent stages of design

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.