



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #104
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Chris Reed
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto Board Liaison

WELCOME

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

1. Transit Reset Phase 2 (for information)
 2. 215 Lake Shore Blvd. East (FedEx Site)
 3. Bathurst Quay Streetscape and Public Realm Improvement Plan
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the July 26 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Eric Turcotte declared a conflict for both 215 Lake Shore and the Bathurst Quay Streetscape and Public Realm Improvement Plan and recused himself for both items.

The Chair asked the Panel to share their thoughts on the waterfront tour held on September 19th. Some highlights of the tour included the potential of the Keating

Channel, the need to rethink sustainability (buildings being all glass), innovation, the need to challenge ourselves, the transformation of the public realm in the Port Lands area, thinking about dimensionality and potential of the waterfront, and using the landscape as a connector.

The Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek showed a series of construction progress photos of Aqualina and Aquavista and Monde. Mr. Glaisek noted that Aqualina is scheduled for occupancy September 25, 2017, Aquavista is scheduled for occupancy June 2019 and Monde is scheduled for occupancy in November/December 2018.

Mr. Glaisek then introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the skating building extension at the Fort York Visitor's Centre is progressing, with the walls and roof now poured. Ms. Mallozzi explained that the Events Dock/Fort frontage hardscape will be completed this fall, as well as some softscape, including the Liquid Landscape. The skating trail is targeted for a soft opening in December. Ms. Mallozzi noted that it will be poured in a monolithic pour in late September, and will cure for 28 days following.

Mr. Glaisek then provided an update on last month's projects noting that West Don Lands Block 12 is planning to launch the project at the end of September and they will be returning to DRP in October. West Don Lands Block 16 is slated to start construction in October and the project is sold out. Bayside A1/A2 is planning to launch in November 2017. West Don Lands River City Phase 4 is planning to start construction in October 2017 and the project is over 70% sold. George Brown College Block 3 is planning to start construction in 2021 and will be coming back to DRP for subsequent phases.

One Panel member asked for an update on the Innovation Centre, to which Mr. Glaisek replied that once a tenant is secured, the building's design will be tailored to the tenant's needs and brought back for Panel review.

FOR INFORMATION

1.0 Transit Reset Phase 2

Project Type: Master Plan

Location: Waterfront from Etobicoke to the Port Lands

Proponent: City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, TTC

Architect/Designer: Steer Davies Gleave

Review Stage: For Information

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Nigel Tahair (City of Toronto), Chris Glaisek (Waterfront Toronto)

Delegation:

ID#: 1089

1.1 Project Presentation

Nigel Tahair with Transportation Planning at the City of Toronto, introduced the project by noting that it is a comprehensive study area that extends from Etobicoke to the east and the Port Lands to the west. The waterfront has a high number of special events, which generates significant network trips in both peak and off-peak periods, making it somewhat unique. Mr. Tahair noted that the major emerging priorities include, the Union Waterfront Link, the Dufferin Loop to Exhibition Loop, Park Lawn Easterly dedicated transit right-of-way, Bathurst/Fleet/Lake Shore/Queens Quay Intersection, and the Humber Bay Link. Mr. Tahair and Mr. Glaisek explained that the three options for the Union to Queens Quay segment include, expanding LRT infrastructure (Option A), repurpose the tunnel to a walkway/moving sidewalk (Option B), and repurposing the tunnel to alternative transit technology (Option C). The LRT option expands the capacity at the Union Station streetcar loop to allow future east bound and westbound service along Queens Quay to run through Union Station. The walkway/moving sidewalk option replaces the streetcar service between Union Station and Queens Quay with a moving sidewalk and walkway, within the existing tunnel. The alternative transit technology option replaces the single-line streetcar service between Union Station and Queens Quay with a high-speed, high capacity, dual line cable pulled system in the existing tunnel.

1.2 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked about the pros and cons of the tunnel option. Mr. Tahair replied that with the below grade connections, there will be fewer people crossing at the surface.

Another Panel member asked if Option C1 conflicts with any work happening at the Jack Layton Ferry Terminal. Mr. Tahair explained that there would be little impact as the improvements are to the east and the portal is considered as a narrowing area.

One Panel member asked about the moving sidewalk at Spadina Station as a comparison. Mr. Tahair replied that it was shorter than the proposed Option C and noted that there were some reliability issues and maintenance difficulties with the Spadina moving sidewalk.

Another Panel member asked if they consider the moving sidewalk tunnel at Billy Bishop Airport as successful. Mr. Tahair noted that the addition of the tunnel helped spread out the peaks of people arriving at once. The Panel member also asked about costs for the options. Mr. Tahair noted that they don't have cost estimates yet, however they will hopefully be included in the October Staff Report to Council.

One Panel member asked whether the Option C1 has an escalator or a ramp exit. Mr. Tahair replied that at the moment there are exit stairs and an elevator only.

Another Panel member asked if any studies were undertaken on adding a mid-station stop for Option C to which Mr. Tahair replied no. The Panel member also asked if a fare would be charged. Mr. Tahair replied no.

1.3 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member felt that Option C was clearly the best option and the expanded LRT infrastructure would be the second best option. The Panel member felt that the moving sidewalk option should not even be considered.

Another Panel member commended the team on a great presentation. The Panel member felt that quality of life and physical impact on users needs to be a consideration. The Panel member also asked the team to consider the rate of growth in the city.

One Panel member agreed that the funicular is the better option, however felt that further study is needed. The Panel member felt that the method of exit, space, and location is fundamental to making this option work.

Another Panel member felt that the system needs to be a complete solution that is elegantly accessible and seamless.

One Panel member felt that the moving sidewalk was the best option in terms of options to get on and off mid-way, and the funicular would be the best option if a stop at the Air Canada Centre was possible. The Panel member also noted that the tunnel where the streetcar emerges onto Queens Quay could be an option for pedestrians to enter and exit.

One Panel member felt that in the long-term, the seamless streetcar connection would be the best option. The Panel member also felt that the Fleet Street/Bathurst options need to integrate pedestrians and cyclists into the study.

Another Panel member noted that transit on the waterfront is such a critical issue especially with the development that is happening to the east. Connecting people from the east to Union Station is a priority.

1.4 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall commended the team for a comprehensive presentation
- The powerful public realm experience needs to be maintained
- Pedestrians and cyclists need to be integrated into the study
- Accessibility that can handle the crowds is important, especially given the increase in Bay corridor travel patterns
- There are reservations regarding the pedestrian walkway/sidewalk given the existing precedents in the city.
- Seamless connections are the most desired

PROJECT REVIEWS

2.0 215 Lake Shore Boulevard East (FedEx Site)

Project Type: Building

Location: East Bayfront

Proponent: Greenland Group

Architect/Designer: Hariri Pontarini Architects

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): David Pontarini (Hariri Pontarini Architects)

Delegation: Daisy Wang (Greenland Group), Pino Di Mascio (Urban Strategies)

ID#: 1088

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that 215 Lake Shore is a proposed 49 storey (150 meter) mixed-use development containing 1148 units with a combined GFA of 84,665 square meters with at-grade retail. The project submitted for Site Plan Approval on September 6, 2017. Mr. Glaisek raised a number of topics for Panel consideration, such as the building massing in the context of East Bayfront, the program and adjacencies with surrounding buildings and open space, and public art. Mr. Glaisek then introduced David Pontarini, Founding Partner at Hariri Pontarini Architects to give the project presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Pontarini began by providing an overview of context, noting the Daniels City of the Art building to the east, Sherbourne Common and Monde Condominiums to the west and Corus Entertainment, George Brown College and Sugar Beach to the south. The site consists of three mixed use residential and retail buildings that are 49 storeys, 39 storeys and 14 storeys. Mr. Pontarini noted that the design attempts to activate the courtyard as much as possible with retail space. Mr. Pontarini noted that they will be following Waterfront Toronto materials for the planting and paving strategy. Mr. Pontarini noted that there is minimal lobby space to provide more space dedicated to retail. Mr. Pontarini explained that a glass canopy is proposed over the courtyard to shield the space from harsh weather conditions, allowing people to use the space through all the seasons. Mr. Pontarini noted that in terms of sustainability, they are required to meet Tier 1 targets, however, they are looking to target Tier 2 as the plan develops.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel asked for clarification on the Ontario Municipal Board settlement. Pino Di Mascio with Urban Strategies, replied that the site falls within the East Bayfront Precinct Plan prepared by Waterfront Toronto in 2005. The amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law that implemented it was adopted in 2008 for all publicly owned lands. Mr. Di Mascio noted that all private land owners appealed the by-law. The original owners of the site, Castlepoint Numa, arrived at a settlement on the design

with Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto, but the zoning still needs to go to the Ontario Municipal Board in November.

Another Panel member asked what is the percentage of glass behind the fritted piece. Mr. Pontarini replied that the ratio is approximately 40-50%, but they are still exploring this feature. The Panel member also asked if the balconies are part of the square footage of the units. Mr. Pontarini replied no. The Panel member also asked about the percentage of three-bedroom units. Mr. Pontarini replied that it is approximately 10%.

One Panel member asked about affordable housing and whether it is part of this proposal. Mr. Pontarini explained that this will be happening in phase 2. The Panel member also asked about the timing between the east and west block. Mr. Pontarini replied that it will be sequentially phased, working their way to the west. The Panel member also asked if the parking was continuous between the two phases and whether the first half would be built followed by the second half. Mr. Pontarini replied yes, that the parking would be built in phases. The Panel member asked whether the red ribbon would continue into the second phase, to which Mr. Pontarini replied yes.

Another Panel member asked what the rationale was for placing the higher tower to the north. Mr. Di Mascio replied that the tower location resulted from the 10-year settlement process.

One Panel member asked where the canopy is supported from. Mr. Pontarini replied that this detail has not been defined yet.

Another Panel member asked about the sustainability targets for the project. Mr. Pontarini noted that the settlement requires Tier 1 but they will be targeting Tier 2.

One Panel member asked how the open space will function with the vehicular movements. Mr. Pontarini explained that this area will be seen as a minimally used traffic zone where vehicles and pedestrians will cohabitate.

Another Panel member asked if the City's Complete Streets Guidelines apply. Mr. Pontarini noted that they will be working alongside the City and Waterfront Toronto regarding this matter.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member was unconvinced by the sculpting of the massing and felt it was unrigorous. The Panel member also felt that consolidating servicing on the woonerf is going to have a negative impact on the character of the woonerf space.

Another Panel member felt that the character of the plaza feels too hardscaped and suggested adding some softscape elements.

One Panel member felt that the OMB settlement has compromised the project significantly. The urban design issues shaped by the OMB decisions have undermined

the public realm. The Panel member noted that the only place residents will experience sun for more than 30 minutes is the vehicular drop off zone. The Panel member also felt that the third building feels out of place in comparison to the other two towers. The Panel member encouraged the need to think more about the sustainability goals.

Another Panel member was disappointed that the legislative framework is driving the public realm. The Panel member encouraged the team to explore softening the landscape, adding clusters of trees, seating, a play space, and making connections to Sherbourne Common. The Panel member also encouraged the team to think about water accumulation on site and the need to somehow proactively channel it.

One Panel member noted that there are big changes happening with local energy requirements. The Panel member noted that New York City's benchmarking law mandates annual energy and water use reporting.

Another Panel member felt that that the question of how to create continuity for public space and connecting it to Sherbourne Common needed more thought. The Panel member also felt that the drop off area will become a prestige place for vehicles and take away from the public realm space. The Panel member also noted that the north elevation along Lake Shore Boulevard feels like the back of the project, rather than a frontage.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- More work should be done on the positioning of the towers to improve the public realm experience
- The public realm should create a stronger edge along Sherbourne Common
- The location of access points for vehicles, woonerf vs courtyard, should not dominate those spaces
- The architectural character of all three building feels inconsistent
- Incorporate softer landscape elements into the courtyard space
- The sustainability targets should exceed what is required

2.6 Vote of Support/Non Support

No vote was taken, as project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.

3.0 Bathurst Quay Streetscape and Public Realm Improvement Plan

Project Type: Public Realm

Location: Bathurst Quay

Proponent: City of Toronto

Architect/Designer: Urban Strategies Inc.

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Bryan Bowen, City of Toronto

Delegation: Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

ID #: 1087

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stuart, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that the City of Toronto conducted a series of consultations to create a neighbourhood plan for Bathurst Quay. In July 2017, City Council endorsed the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan (BQNP) Interim Report after consultations that began in 2014. Ms. Stuart explained that the BQNP describes a new long-term vision for the silo site as a community and cultural hub on the waterfront, and potential future location of an aquatic centre. Ms. Stuart noted that today's presentation will outline issues in the design of near-term improvements to two focus areas within the BQNP study area, including Eireann Quay streetscape improvements (east side), and the Canada Malting site improvements. Ms. Stuart raised a number of topics for Panel considerations such as, integrating parking with the pedestrian circulation, stormwater management and planting within high volume parking lots, activation/program for the south building, integrating safety/security perimeter barrier surrounding the Silos into the design. Ms. Stuart then introduced Bryan Bowen, Project Manager with the City of Toronto, to give the project presentation.

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Bowen began by noting the BQNP Streetscape and Public Realm Improvement Plan Focus Areas, which is the phased revitalization of the Canada Malting Complex (silo site), and rationalizing and improving the Eireann Quay streetscape. Mr. Bowen described the silo site as approximately 1.5 hectares with the silo structures dating from 1929 to 1944. The administration building was built in 1953 and was an active industrial site until the 1980's. The site was transferred to the City of Toronto in 2002 by the Harbourfront Corporation for "public purposes". Mr. Bowen described the silo site today which is partially licenced to Toronto District School Board (TDSB) for outdoor play space, and partially leased short-term to Ports Toronto to support Billy Bishop Airport operations. There are parking spaces for the community centre and for the TDSB, and the site is also home to Ireland Park. Mr. Bowen described Eireann Quay, which is the public right of way to Billy Bishop Airport, and provides access to the ferry queue, serving private and commercial vehicles to/from the airport and Toronto Islands. Mr. Bowen noted that the recent addition of the pedestrian tunnel has reduced vehicle queuing. Mr. Bowen explained some challenges of the current site configuration, including driveway access to long stay airport parking bisects the silo site, prohibiting through access for pedestrians, poor quality and legibility of Eireann Quay streetscape, visibility, access and profile of Ireland Park are compromised, multiple licensing and short-term lease arrangements result in confusion and uncertainty. Mr. Bowen noted that the objectives for the silo site and Eireann Quay, include making the site and street look and feel like part of the neighbourhood, maximize flexibility of new open space for both programmed and passive uses, create an environment for transformation of the Administration Building as a community and central hub, improve sight lines and access to Ireland Park, achieve compact and clearly articulated Billy Bishop Airport footprint, and normalize traffic operations on Eireann Quay. Mr. Bowen explained that the next steps include public consultations planned for the fall and construction start in 2018.

3.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked about the future of the parking. Mr. Bowen replied that the long-term vision is to look at moving all parking, including the parking on Stadium Road, underground.

Another Panel member asked if there has been any discussion about bringing the streetcar line into this area. Mr. Bowen replied that this has been part of the strategy and is being discussed.

One Panel member asked about the fencing along the silos. Mr. Bowen replied that the perimeter fence will stay in the near term but will come down in the long term.

Another Panel member asked about the parking spaces. Mr. Bowen replied that they were grandfathered when the site was transferred.

One Panel member asked whether the silos will be used for adaptive reuse or simply fixing the façade. Mr. Bowen replied that this has not been decided yet, but will be tackled in the long-term.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member felt that this project could use broader thinking. The Panel member also felt that the proposed focal point in the centre of the Canada Malting site is not the right place and recommended channeling the pedestrian flow along the water's edge promenade instead. The Panel member also recommended consolidating the parking to one location.

Another Panel member felt that the connectivity with transit would be very beneficial and works to eliminate the impact of the automobile. The Panel member also felt that the long-term plan should have a bolder long-term future.

One Panel member also agreed with aiming higher with the long-term plan. The Panel member also suggested to reconsider the space as not just a park but a high-performance landscape.

Another Panel member suggested integrated an interesting amphitheatre of stormwater ponds. The Panel member also noted that smog is a concern in this area, so incorporating strategies to help improve air quality would be an interesting pilot project to prototype ideas, such as smog absorbing artwork.

One Panel member wanted to see the cycling network overlaid on this plan. The Panel member also noted that the potential reuse of the administration building is exciting and was curious about potential future tenants.

3.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The long-term vision needs to be clearly set out at the next meeting
- Extending the streetcar service to the airport should be a consideration

- Consider piloting small projects that help improve air quality
- Reconsider the focal point of the site from the centre of the site to the water's edge promenade

3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

No vote was taken, as project was reviewed at the Issues Identification stage.