



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #48 Wednesday, March 9th, 2011**

---

### **Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford  
Peter Busby  
Peter Clewes  
Claude Cormier  
Betsy Williamson  
Jane Wolf

### **Regrets:**

George Baird  
Brigitte Shim  
Greg Smalenberg  
Robert Freedman

### **Recording Secretary:**

Melissa Horwood

### **Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek

---

## **WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Panel and provided an overview of the agenda. The Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek to provide his report.

---

## **REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, provided a summary of project progress.

### *Don River Park*

- The pavilion chimney is complete and construction had commenced on the skin. The pavilion is scheduled to be complete by summer 2011. The landform is roughly in place and the top soil is scheduled to be sculpted in 1-2 months.

### *Lower Don Lands*

- The Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Environmental Assessment has been submitted to the Ministry of the Environment. The Lower Don Lands OPA and Zoning By Laws were approved by Council and only received 14 letters of appeal. Waterfront Toronto is trying to allocate more funding for the project.

### *Pan Am Athletes Village*

- The design process is currently underway with the selected teams and will be complete by May 27, 2011. The preferred proponent will be selected by summer 2011.

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

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Both Bruce Kuwabara and Peter Clewes declared a conflict of interest with the Bayside Development presentation as both of their firms were involved in submitting a bid for the RFQ. Paul Bedford was appointed Acting Chair for that review.

A few Panel members urged this matter to be discussed with John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto. They felt that both Mr. Kuwabara and Mr. Clewes would be able to objectively evaluate the design of the winning bid.

One Panel member asked if the mayor of Toronto, Mr. Rob Ford, would be sitting on the Board of Directors for Waterfront Toronto. Mr. Glaisek stated that Mr. Ford has stated that he will attend, but has yet to do so.

The Chair then moved to adopt the minutes from February 2011. The minutes were adopted.

There being no other comments, the Chair moved to the Project Review portion of the meeting.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 East Bayfront Development Proposal: Parkside**

*ID#: 1037*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: North of Queens Quay, east of Sherbourne Common*

*Proponent: Great Gulf (Downtown Properties) Limited*

*Architect/Designer: SafdieArchitects*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Moshe Safdie, SafdieArchitects*

*Delegation: Alan Vihant, Great Gulf*

#### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design, introduced the project noting that it is the second time this project has come before the Design Review Panel and is currently at the Schematic Design phase. Mr. Glaisek stated that there are proposed changes to the zoning envelope that would have to be approved by the City and are outside the main areas of concern for today's review.

## 1.2 Project Presentation

Moshe Safdie, Principal with Safdie Architects, provided an overview of the design of the project since it was last reviewed in December 2010, including a reconfigured canopy, ground level daycare, underground parking for the daycare and a smaller atrium.

## 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One panel member asked what was planned for providing outdoor space for the daycare. Mr. Gray stated that the daycare is being built on behalf of the City of Toronto and that Waterfront Toronto has funds to finish a space with the City, but it has yet to be discussed.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the north façade. Mr. Safdie stated that they are considering putting glass block along the north façade and that the arcade along the west façade connects to the sidewalk along the north. Mr. Safdie also stated that the north façade is not intended to be an animated, active façade.

The Panel member then asked how the arcade differs from the previous presentation of the design. Mr. Safdie stated that they opened it up, allowing the area to be drenched in daylight, but still protected from the elements. He also stated that light studies were conducted on the design.

One Panel member asked if the east-west passageway between the building was public. Mr. Safdie stated yes, the passageway is public. The Panel member then asked how large the retail space was. Mr. Vihant stated that it was approximately 10,000 square feet.

One Panel member asked why the office space was eliminated. Mr. Vihant stated that they were looking to use the space for their own company use but other locations were better suited. He also stated that the space would be competing with the Hines development of Bayside.

Another Panel member asked what percentage of insulated glass is on the tower. Mr. Safdie estimated that it was 25% insulated glass. The Panel member then asked if an energy model has been done of the building. Mr. Safdie stated that an energy model was currently underway.

One Panel member asked how many LEED credits the building is estimated to receive. Mr. Vihant stated that there is a requirement to achieve, at a minimum, LEED Gold certification and that they will meet that.

One Panel member asked if the entire facade of the arcade was full masonry. Mr. Safdie stated that the material is architectural precast concrete for the columns and architectural precast concrete that is limestone coloured and acid-etched on the façade, to feel like stone. The Panel member then asked if there was any real stone on the base of the building. Mr. Safdie stated no, referencing Ottawa City Hall and a project in Springfield, Massachusetts as a few examples where this product was used successfully. Another Panel member asked if the columns were poured concrete. Mr. Safdie stated that the columns were poured concrete clad in architectural precast concrete.

One Panel member asked if the public space would be masonry. Mr. Safdie stated that currently there was not a mock-up, but that the intention is to have two or three different stones, likely granite. Mr. Safdie stated that, in the future, they will present the stone options to the Panel.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member had concerns regarding the relationship to ground plane public space and the daycare. Another Panel member stated that they had issues with the daycare in that it seemed odd to have an outdoor space in an extremely public space that is delineated only by a fence. The Panel member stated that the articulation of the edge needs to be clearer.

Another Panel member stated that the daycare location is good and that, as there is a large park beside it, the location is one of privilege. The Panel member stated that negotiations should occur with the City of Toronto to allow Sherbourne Common to be the outdoor space for the daycare. Another Panel Member stated that it is very difficult to negotiate the terms of outdoor daycare space. Another Panel member stated that, at a minimum, the size of the exterior space given to the daycare needs to be smaller. One Panel member suggested that wall panels that open up may resolve the problem.

Many Panel members stated they felt the outdoor daycare space takes over the public space of the area and that it weakens the image of the building. One Panel member suggested moving the daycare off of the main floor and using a rooftop terrace for the open space. Another Panel member agreed that the power of the arcade along the west façade was interrupted by the outdoor daycare space.

One Panel member stated that, along the north and south elevations, there is a dialogue between the composition of the base and tower, but there is not one along east and west façades. The Panel member stated that the west façade will be the big public façade of the building and that the integration of the actual base and actual tower must be stronger. Many Panel members agreed, stating that a greater language needs to be developed between the tower and the base. One Panel member stated that the relative gesture of the east and west facade is not a material thing but potentially an adjustment to the massing.

One Panel member stated that the glazing along the south façade seems to be residual language of the office space.

One Panel member stated that there needs to be more work done along the north and east ground floor treatments. One Panel member stated that having a blank façade along Lake Shore Boulevard registers a lack of confidence in that street. One Panel member stated that there may be another way to animate the façade along Bonnycastle so it looks more like a street and less like a loading dock. Many other Panel members agreed. One Panel member had concerns about the size of the loading dock, stating that it seems unnecessarily large.

One Panel member stated that they would like to see samples of the cladding materials, as the design is dependent on the quality of the material.

One Panel member had concerns about the size of the balconies, stating that at 1.8 metres, one could do little more than just stand out on it.

One Panel member stated that there is not a clear set of rules about the articulation of public and semipublic spaces in relation to the passageway.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Re-evaluate the daycare location, its relationship to the arcade, and the way it is articulated.
- 2) Look into the size of the balconies to provide more accommodation of uses.
- 3) The façade of the loading dock requires more development and articulation.
- 4) Submit a material palette during the next review, including the glazing on the ground floor and the detail of the precast concrete.
- 5) Provide an energy model and percentage of building that is glazing.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Safdie thanked the Panel for their feedback.

#### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked that Panel for a vote of support, conditional support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in Support of the project moving on to the next phase.

---

## **2.0 West Don Lands: Storm Water Quality Facility**

*ID#: 1036*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: gh3*

*Location: North of Lake Shore Boulevard, East of Cherry Street*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Pat Hanson, gh3*

*Delegation: Grazyna Krezel, R.V. Anderson*

#### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Brenda Webster, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that it is currently at design development. Ms. Webster stated that the facility will serve storm water for all of the West Don Lands. Ms. Webster stated that a pre-requisite for LEED NC certification is a 20% reduction in energy consumption and that the design is currently at a 13% reduction. Ms. Webster stated that the team feels as though they have exhausted every avenue in terms of making the building LEED NC certified. Ms. Webster stated that the project is a sustainable one, but LEED NC is not geared towards storm water quality facilities.

#### 2.2 Project Presentation

Pat Hanson, Principal with gh3, provided an update of the project since it was last at the Design Review Panel in February 2011. Ms. Hanson focused on the materiality of the building, the landscape design, and the channelling of water on the site.

### 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked for further clarification regarding the shape of the pump house, noting that it was circular before and it is now triangular. Ms. Hanson stated that there are two structural beams running diagonally through shaft that are potentially holding up concrete slab above, giving protection to workers. The shape is a result of having a curve where the beams can sit on one of the quarters of that circle. The Panel member also asked what was planned to be in the pump house. Ms. Hanson stated that there would be a hoist beam, access panels and a heating unit.

Another Panel member asked how involved Ms. Hanson would be in the construction of the project past design development. Ms. Hanson stated that they will be reviewing the detail of the working drawings but there is no agreement in place to be involved for site review.

One Panel member asked Ms. Hanson to explain the journey of the water. Ms. Hanson stated that the rain water from the site is being managed by the design of the site

Another Panel member asked what the schedule was for the project and what the size of the building was. Ms. Webster stated that there is currently a tender out for the tunnel with construction scheduled to commence in July 2011. Ms. Webster also stated that the building will be just less than 300 square meters.

Another Panel member asked if the building would be designed with an open rain screen. Ms. Hanson stated that they are currently discussing that with Pico Engineering. Ms. Hanson stated that Pico Engineering would prefer to caulk the joints but they would like to see mock-ups of the detail first.

One panel member asked what the biggest challenge is with the building. Grazyna Krezel from R.V. Anderson stated that waterproofing the stone cladding building would be the biggest challenge as they must make sure they can drain water off of the building very efficiently and cannot have any space where water can get below grade, where it can freeze and pop up stone. Thinking of double system, one is caulked.

Another Panel member asked if the project has been priced. Ms. Hanson stated that it has, and that it is within budget.

### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that they enjoy the fantastic development of the channelling of water. The Panel member stated that it is a very important building that is very tuned and that the architects should stay on the project through construction. Many Panel members agreed, stating that if they do not do the construction document, they must be able to revise them and that they should be on site during construction.

Another Panel member stated that the project is pure sculpture, and the nicest thing ever presented to the Design Review Panel in the last five years. Another Panel member stated that

they love the simplicity of the design. Another Panel member stated that the story the water tells is fantastic.

One Panel member suggested that there should be a provision for the building to be included in Doors Open Toronto.

One Panel member stated that the details of this project are everything, whether it is caulked or not. The Panel member also suggested that a rain screen modified with a larger air space may work for the project.

One Panel member cautioned the use of the St. Marc limestone as a paver, as it may be difficult to install.

Several Panel members expressed deep concern about gh3 not being involved in construction document and contract administration and felt it was critically important for them to continue their involvement throughout.

## 2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Create strong details for construction
- 2) The architect should be involved throughout the rest of the project

## 2.6 Proponents Response

Ms. Hanson thanked the Panel for their feedback.

## 2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

---

## **3.0 East Bayfront Development Proposal: Bayside**

*ID#: 1039*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: South of Queens Quay, between Lower Sherbourne Street and Parliament Street*

*Proponent: Hines*

*Architect/Designer: Ehrenkrantz Eckstut& Kuhn Architects*

*Presenter(s): Stan Eckstut, Ehrenkrantz Eckstut& Kuhn Architects*

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Andrew Gray, Vice President of Development for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, stating that the Panel will see this project many times over coming years. Mr. Gray stated that the presentation was meant for information purposes, to give the Panel context of what Bayside is going to be. Mr. Gray stated that Waterfront Toronto developed two RFP's simultaneously, Parkside and Bayside with the intention that Bayside would be a mixed-use community with a strong focus on ground floor retail. Mr. Gray stated that corporate goals were set for the design including year round animation, cohesive design and high quality architecture. Mr. Gray

introduced Hines as Waterfront Toronto's "partner on the waterfront", noting that the private company has been in business for over 50 years.

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Stan Eckstut, a founding Principal at Ehrenkrantz Eckstut & Kuhn Architects provided an introduction to the project, highlighting the site, the new parks in the area, the pedestrian focused streets, a proposed new waterfront "woonerf", and the mixed-use neighbourhood.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked what the yellow on the plans represented. Mr. Eckstut stated the yellow was the building lobbies.

One Panel member asked if the bicycle path was on the north side of the development. Mr. Eckstut stated that is the current plan but they are assuming that bicycles will come through on the east and west edges as well.

Another Panel member stated that there does not seem to be a retail floor plate large enough to accommodate a grocery store and that it will likely be necessary for the area. Mr. Eckstut stated that they are currently looking into that and don't want to preclude large grocery stores. He stated that they may have to look at putting such a use on the second floor.

One Panel member requested further clarification on the development of Bonnycastle Road, stating that the gap on the west side of the road looks quite large. The Panel member stated that north of Queens Quay, Bonnycastle Road is for servicing Parkside. Mr. Eckstut stated that they are sensitive to the fact that there is a problem with the drawing and that in the end there will likely be more conventional retail opportunities along Queens Quay.

Another Panel member asked for clarification of the below ground parking. Mr. Eckstut stated that each area has parking below with tentative curb cuts. He stated that they do not want to make the entrances too obvious but they also do not want the design to work "too well" for cars either. Mr. Eckstut stated that the location of the garage entrances does need to go through more testing. The Panel member then asked if the views may be negotiated in a way that seems more graceful and clear. Mr. Eckstut stated that the limited entrance to Bonnycastle Road is their way of trying to be graceful. He also stated that it was mostly for parking of people who are living and/or working, not necessarily visitors to the area.

One Panel member asked if the area will become a destination for people on the weekend and if the area was mainly housing. Mr. Eckstut stated that, if they can lease Bonnycastle Road to restaurants, then it would become a waterfront retail street, mainly for the residents of the neighbourhood. He also stated that the area is really designed for pedestrians but by the time everything is done, the parking garage operators will make sure that parking is easy to find.

Another Panel member asked why the Winter Garden is designed on an angle. Mr. Eckstut stated that the design is a practical one in that they are trying to provide an easy way to get in and out of the area.

One Panel member asked what their initial thoughts were on employment activity for the area. Mr. Eckstut stated that he suspected that businesses that are thinking of leaving the downtown core for the suburbs may rethink if they can relocate here.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that, when they first looked at the plans they were highly in support of the waterfront street with buildings pulled back and the ends anchored by two squares. The Panel member also stated that, if they were to go to the waterfront, they would want to be on the waterfront. For example, why would one want to eat along Bonnycastle Road when they can eat along the waterfront? The Panel member also urged the creation of a strong solid street edge on the waterfront edge and that, by putting two squares at the end, it gives it the opportunity to anchor it with retail and active social uses. Another Panel member agreed with making the waterfront the primary location for social interaction.

One Panel member stated that the sense of scale is very nice and that by emphasizing a grander street, the scale difference is made stronger.

Another Panel member suggested that the design be pushed even further. The Panel member also emphasized the importance of Bonneycastle Road as a main street and that the gaps along it must be eliminated or removed.

One Panel member stated that they support the presentation. They also stated that waterfront roadways work in cities, Vancouver being a prime example. Many Panel members agreed with the introduction of a waterfront roadway. The Panel member also stated Hines has done the right thing, as long as they adhere to the notion that public space is public space.

Many Panel members stated that the active social use will not work, as it is taking up too much space.

One Panel member stated that bringing the street to the edge brought the plan from before alive and that, as a framework, it feels as though it could be a strong neighbourhood or a district.

Many Panel members stated concerns about the location of parking entrances

One Panel member suggested that the south facing units will be the most desired sites and that an emphasis should be placed on south facing waterfront retail.

One Panel member stated that, as a subtext, the notion of the green park in the middle sits neither here nor there and that the intention is not clear. The Panel member stated that the creation of a more linear park would allow more buildings to be open to the water. One Panel member disagreed with the statement, saying the green square creates a separate area for the neighbourhood – a village square.

One Panel member stated that they were unsure about the corner cul-de-sac as it is not in the language of Toronto. Another Panel member disagreed, stating that the cul-de-sac would allow people to be dropped off by cars.

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

This being an information session, the Panel did not provide a summary of issues.

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Eckstut thanked the Panel for their feedback.

---

## 4.0 York Quay Revitalization: Phase II

*ID#: 1032*

*Project Type: Building/Structure*

*Location: York Quay, located between Simcoe Street and York Street, south of Queens Quay*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto and Harbourfront Centre*

*Architect/Designer: Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Landscape Architects (MVVA) with designer/artist James Carpenter Design Associates (JCDA), Beyer Blinder Belle Architects (BBB), Young & Wright Architects, GHK International and ARUP.*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Gullivar Shepard, MVVA*

*Delegation: Helder Melo, Harbourfront Centre*

### 4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek introduced the project, noting that it is increasingly challenging to build the entire project with the \$25 million allocated in federal funding. Mr. Glaisek stated that Harbourfront Centre feels as though building the underground parking is the most important piece of the design and that Harbourfront Centre would prefer to defer the landscape above until further funds have been raised. Mr. Glaisek stated that the presentation would be for a temporary, interim landscape, until Harbourfront Centre can raise funds to build a permanent public space.

### 4.2 Project Presentation

Gullivar Shepard, Senior Associate with Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, provided an overview of the project, which last came to the Panel in June 2010. Mr. Shepard informed the Panel that the project needs to be communicated as temporary but cannot be too temporary; the project should not require extensive annual replanting.

### 4.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member suggested that the mounds are formally similar to the Martha Schwartz park in New York. The Panel member stated that they went back to look at that project and came across an article where someone from Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates stated there is no expression of the plaza as a place. The Panel member asked Mr. Shepard to address the comment about the park relative to the project. Mr. Shepard stated that the team feels the project needs to be a place. Mr. Shepard stated that the statement did not come from him, but if he were to comment on the park design by Martha Schwartz he would state that it is slightly cynical. Mr. Shepard stated that the project presented is much more than a bench and pavement; the mounds create a clearing and edge, the life of the project is in the planting and the design intent is to establish a softer sense of a clearing.

One Panel member asked if other schemes were considered that did not have organic plantings. Mr. Shepard stated that in public meetings that were held, everyone valued the importance of planted landscape, and some trees have already been removed to allow construction. He also stated that there is an element of Harbourfront Centre's program that has an association with little art gardens and that ultimately the design is really fighting cost and the over-reliance on pavement.

One Panel member asked how long the installation would last, how much it would cost to build the temporary landscape and if there was a yearly maintenance budget for it. Mr. Shepard stated that the project could be there for a while. He also stated that Harbourfront Centre will cover the maintenance costs. Mr. Shepard stated that there is no set cost for the design of the temporary landscape, but the design is scalable to adjust with the cost.

Another Panel member asked who decided that parking was more important than landscape and if the decision is mandatory. Mr. Kuwabara stated that the decision was a revenue strategy made by Harbourfront Centre. He also stated that Harbourfront Centre did not want to lose their parking revenue and that the parking garage will increase their revenue. The Panel member asked if the garage is currently under construction. Mr. Shepard confirmed that the garage was under construction.

One Panel member asked how seasonality was being dealt with on this project. Mr. Shepard stated that there will be glimmers of winterberries within the plantings. Mr. Shepard also stated that over planting is a strategy that will be used, and that the point is to not put a precious monoculture over the entire project.

#### 4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that the project should stop now and not go any further; it compromises what Waterfront Toronto stands for- high quality investment in the public realm. The Panel member also stated that the design is "too nice" for temporary purposes and it will never be replaced. Furthermore, the Panel member stated that doing nothing, forcing the area to just be paved, may be the best alternative to a temporary landscape that will never be replaced.

One Panel member suggested something along the lines of Claude Cormier's Blue Sticks, as it is not trying to be landscape, but a temporary condition. The Panel member stated that the design is great, but that it looks too permanent as opposed to something that is more temporary.

Another Panel member stated that MVVA has an incredible sensitivity to plant material and that the shagginess of the plantings is what makes it great. The Panel member suggested that the project should emphasize the ephemeral quality of the planting.

One Panel member stated that they do not like some of the work of Martha Schwartz as it can be sarcastic and does not hold up well over time. They also stated that they are not a big believer in clever landscape. The Panel member also stated that there is a real concern about doing too much and they question if they should actually be doing it. The Panel member suggested something that is more theatrical and temporary that says "a beautiful square is coming" and does not invite the temporary landscape to become a permanent missed opportunity.

One Panel member stated that the “future park” could be an at grade parking lot that creates revenue for the future landscape. Another Panel member suggested placing a sign at the surface parking that would read “your money for parking is going towards a future park”. Mr. Glaisek stated that there is no desire by Harbourfront Centre to continue to have surface parking.

One Panel member stated that if this project came to us as a permanent installation, the Panel would not allow it and that, as far as they are concerned, it is permanent as they have no idea how long it will be there.

One Panel member pointed out that the public complained about the temporary light poles in Sugar Beach for a year, and this is a much bigger and possibly longer temporary condition.

One Panel member stated that the Canada Pavilion that is at Harbourfront Centre was supposed to be temporary but it looked so good that it stayed.

One Panel member stated that the design team should come back with a design that is clearly temporary, that suggests change is coming in the future.

One Panel member stated that there is an issue with the language of the project. The Panel member stated that MVVA is great with working with plantings and suggest they try using a different medium. One Panel member suggested making a ritual of the death and replanting of a temporary garden.

One Panel member suggested putting up a rendering on a billboard of what they really want. Another Panel member suggested that it would need something really punchy and simple.

One Panel member stated that they did not think the work was too good and that the landscape seems serviceable and seems temporary. Another Panel member disagreed, arguing that no one will know it is temporary.

One Panel member asked if the Panel would like something that is a bold move, like a painted sign. The Panel member was reminded of the giant hill on the backside of Sugar Beach by the Corus building. The Panel member stated that the hill has a Waterfront Toronto sign stuck on either side that essentially says “don’t get used to the hill; there will be a building here someday”.

Another Panel member felt the project was good, and maybe even shy. The Panel member suggested either going all the way knowing that the project could stay for 25 years, or doing as little as possible to make sure that they will be able to generate money. The Panel member liked the idea of stating “Future Park” where the park will be. The Panel member stated that this project will stay for 10 years because it is too good.

One Panel member stated that a lot of money will be spent and we will end up with something that we don’t really want and that it may be better to draw the line somewhere. The Panel member stated that they think it will do damage to Waterfront Toronto and the public will not be impressed by the design which they will perceive as permanent.

One Panel member suggested making a good space for public programming and put the money into something that speaks to what could come when the money is there. Another Panel member

suggested that something that has some public impact, like a billboard or an art piece, that awakens them to an issue.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Scale back the permanent installations and clear the ground plane
- 2) Consider a bold element that is truly temporary and excites people's imaginations for what is to come in the future.

#### 4.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Shepard thanked the Panel for their feedback.

#### 4.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a note of support, non-support or conditional support for the project. The Panel voted in non-support of the project moving onto the next stage.

---

### **5.0 West Don Lands Development Proposal: TCHC Blocks 21 & 23**

*ID#: 1019*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Proponent: TCHC*

*Architect/Designer: CORE and Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc.*

*Location: Area bounded by King Street, River Street, Eastern Avenue and St. Lawrence Street*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Five*

*Presenter(s): Babak Eslahjou, CORE; Scott Torrance of Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc.*

#### 5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Derek Goring, Director of Development for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project noting that the site has already been excavated but the project has had some delays. Mr. Goring stated that the secured funding associated with the project have deadlines and that we must insure that the funding is not lost. Mr. Goring also stated that TCHC does not have control over public realm elements and that, since the project is no longer connected to District Energy, the size of the penthouse will be impacted.

#### 5.2 Project Presentation

Babak Eslahjou of CORE provided an overview of the project reminding the Panel of the program, design objectives and the overall context. Scott Torrance of Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture Inc. provided an overview of changes since the last time the project came before the Panel.

#### 5.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if the balcony was projecting slab. Mr. Eslahjou clarified that yes, it is projecting slab concrete.

One Panel member asked how much the glazing had increased. Mr. Eslahjou stated that the design was at 72% solid and had been reduced to 62% solid. He also stated that 60% was ideal.

#### 5.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the townhouse elevation has dramatically improved but they are still hesitant about “hardy board panels”. The Panel member stated they were appreciative of the increased openings and the building actually feels much more residential. The Panel member stated that the glazing is still random but a line every now and again in the townhouses gives it control and that the main building still needs a bit of that control. The also stated the development of the slippage between the order of the hardy panel and the randomness of the windows behind is an interesting approach.

One Panel member stated that they thought the landscape could use some clarification and that the deployment of the planting and furniture could be strengthened. The Panel member stated that it looked a bit like a collection of pieces.

Another Panel member stated that the project has improved from the last time it was presented at the Design Review Panel. The Panel member also stated that they liked the continuity in the wood material as there used to be three different materials in three different places. The Panel member also stated they should eliminate the walkways to reinforce privacy of each unit facing into the courtyard and would bring green right to the edge of the balconies. The Panel member also stated that this would feel more private where the residents are and then more public where the water feature is.

One Panel member stated that the upper balcony looks “stuck on”, along with the material on the west façade. The Panel member also stated that the penthouse looked very mechanical but also noted that they thought their comments could be addressed in Design Development. Another Panel member agreed, stating that the main issue with the penthouse is its current scale. The Panel member also suggested that perhaps there was a way to break up the penthouse.

One Panel member stated that every outdoor space must be useable for as long as possible.

One Panel member stated the precedents were really strong and that one image in particular, the one with the view down the middle, would be fantastic in this project. The Panel member stated that this could be the project - a great controlled view from the amenities space to the common outdoor area. The Panel member stated they supported the project, but there needs to be a focus on what is really strong in the project.

One Panel member stated that all of the landscaping budget should be spent on trees.

Another Panel member stated that the design can be an alle of trees, filling the centre of the space. The Panel member suggested creating a very clear line; the north-south line is the one that is the strongest.

Another Panel member stated there should be benches for elders to watch their grandchildren.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Adjust the relationship of the amenity spaces to the outdoor spaces.
- 2) Continue to simplify the courtyard design and its relationship to units.

### 5.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Eslahjou and Mr. Torrance thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 5.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a note of support, non-support or conditional support for the project. The Panel voted in Support of the project to move onto the Design Development stage.

---

## **CLOSING**

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