



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #94
Wednesday, November 23, 2016**

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
Paul Bedford, Vice Chair
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Chris Reed
Don Schmitt
Brigitte Shim
Betsy Williamson
Jane Wolff

Designees and Guests:

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto

Regrets:

George Baird

Recording Secretary:

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

WELCOME

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

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Vice Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the October meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Vice Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Bruce Kuwabara noted that he would be recusing himself as Chair for the first item, as he had a conflict with the Canary District Block 16 project.

The Vice Chair asked James Parakh, Urban Design Program Manager with the City of Toronto, to give an overview of the Chief Planner Round Table held on November 21, 2016. Mr. Parakh noted that it was a very successful session with a number of speakers including; Alka Lukatela, Acting Director of Urban Design with the City of Toronto, Carol Belanger, Architect for the City of Edmonton, Lon LaClaire, Director of Transportation for the City of Vancouver, and Brent Raymond, Partner at DTAH. The discussions ranged from procurement processes to public realm successes and challenges. Mr. Parakh noted

that one of the Mayor's goals is to ensure that 25 years from now, Toronto is still one of the top cities to live in.

The Vice Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report on project progress.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek invited Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to update the Panel on the Port Lands Flood Protection and Enabling Infrastructure Due Diligence Report. Ms. Mallozzi noted that on October 20, 2016, Waterfront Toronto released an extensive Due Diligence Report on the proposed Port Lands Flood Protection Project. The report provides greater certainty on the cost estimate, schedule and risks associated with the proposal to naturalize the mouth of the Don River, provide flood protection to the area, and unlock significant economic development potential. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the project will take seven years to construct with an anticipated start date of 2017.

One of the Panel members asked about mitigation measures regarding compressible peat and flowing sand. Ms. Mallozzi responded that it is still a work in progress, however, the team is looking into dock wall or retaining wall structures as the solution.

PROJECT REVIEWS

Canary District – Block 16

ID#: 1071

Project Type: Building

Location: Canary District

Proponent: Dream Developments

Architect/Designer: KPMB

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Bruno Weber, KPMB Architects

Delegation: Peter Zimmerman, Dream Developments, Marc Baronette, Kilmer Infrastructure Developments, Andrew Dyke, KPMB Architects

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that the previous scheme presented to the Panel in February received lots of enthusiasm for the architecture, however, there were restrictions in the development agreement that made it unrealistic to deliver. The current project approach adheres fully to the approved Precinct Plan.

Mr. Glaisek summarized the Panel comments from the last meeting by, noting that there was a need for three bedroom units and more detail on the sustainability goals for the building. Mr. Glaisek also noted that the project was reviewed by City Planning and Design staff on November 16, 2016. No major issues were reported and it was recommended

the project move forward with a Preliminary Project Review application. No variances are required as the proposed building is compliant with the zoning by-law.

Mr. Glaisek then posed a series of questions for the Panel, including their thoughts on the Toro-Balcony Guard System, whether the changes to the public realm are appropriate, their thoughts on the colour and materiality of the mechanical penthouse, and whether the height of the parapet walls at the amenity space are appropriate.

Mr. Glaisek then introduced Peter Zimmerman, Vice President of Development at Dream.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the team will be making an application for preliminary planning review to ensure they are in full compliance with the by-laws. The team is intending to bring the project to market in 2017 with construction completed in 2019.

Mr. Zimmerman introduced Bruno Weber, Associate at KPMB, to give the project presentation. Mr. Weber began by noting that the Canary District is 100 percent sold out. Retailers have put in effort to create well-designed spaces. Given that the Canary District has only been open for 8 months, there is lots of activity happening in the area. Mr. Weber noted that the team has redesigned the building to comply with the as of right zoning.

Mr. Weber then walked the Panel through the elements of the building starting with the public realm. Mr. Weber noted that the retail is oriented to Front Street while the residential entrance is on the side street with a large scale canopy and bronze coloured window frames. The three iconic elements include the stair, the door, and the reception. On the opposite end of Palace Street, there is a bike storage facility, designed to feel like a store front. Mr. Weber then described the retail level on Front Street which has signage that will be studied moving forward. An art piece above the storefront will be used as a way of incorporating colour into the block. Mr. Weber noted that the top floor will be a green roof, and the mechanical penthouse will be aesthetically pleasing as it is very visible from the adjacent property's amenity space.

Mr. Weber proceeded to describe the sustainability goals for the building which includes achieving LEED v4 and meeting all of the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto sustainability requirements. Mr. Weber noted that they will be using this building as a test case for thermal breaks on one level of the building. Mr. Weber also introduced the Toro Balcony Guard System which is a perforated aluminum balcony system. Mr. Weber explained that they are trying to add the illusion of a third dimension using different perforation sizes.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members asked if the curated art piece on the mezzanine level of the building could be replicated on the mechanical penthouse to bring colour and vibrancy to the top. Mr. Weber stated that they would look into this possibility.

Another Panel member asked if there would be partitions between the balconies. Mr. Weber replied that they would be a perforated vertical screen between each units' terraces.

One of the Panel members asked about the height of the parapet walls. Mr. Weber responded that it's set at bar height which means you can see over the wall when standing but not while sitting. The Panel member also asked whether white masonry was being used on the façade. Mr. Weber clarified that it's a brick containing the charcoal colour of Block 4 and the grey from the Wigwaman building. The Panel member also asked how the balcony system achieves the "facet" effect. The proponent replied that the faceting will come from an optical illusion provided by varying the perforation sizes.

Another Panel member asked if there was any outdoor amenity space. Mr. Weber replied that there is a second floor terrace, but the roof is not accessible.

One of the Panel members asked if it be possible to combine two units if someone bought them together. Mr. Weber said this would be possible only in some locations where the structure permits. The Panel member then asked why they are only proposing the thermal break on the top floor. Mr. Webber replied that this would be a feasibility test for the developer for cost and construction viability in Toronto.

Another Panel member asked if all the landscaping outside of the property line is built. Mr. Weber replied that this was the case and they are proposing to extend the existing pavers to the building face. The Panel member then asked what material would be used for the outdoor amenity space. The proponent replied that the material would be similar to the public realm.

One of the Panel members asked how all the retail space was divided. Mr. Weber replied that there are two large spaces and one small space, and typically the smaller spaces (1,200 square feet) work well for newer operators, whereas the larger spaces (2,500 square feet) are well suited for restaurants. The Panel member then asked what the average size of the smaller residential units was. The Proponent replied that the average small unit is approximately 450 square feet and the larger units are approximately 1,160 square feet.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One of the Panel members felt that every space in the building is being used well and therefore the roof should be converted to an outdoor amenity space as it would add a lot of value to the building.

Another Panel member felt that there is a disconnect between the character of the upper floors and the lower floors of the building. They suggested finding ways to achieve formal continuity or material continuity.

One Panel member raised concerns that the appearance of the building, as shown in the current rendering, will be different once the privacy screen partitions and sliding doors on the balcony are factored in.

Another Panel member stated that the team needs to ensure that the balcony system is flawless and well executed. They noted that the colourful retail facia is a great move and there should be some reciprocity with what happens on the mechanical penthouse. The Panel member noted their support for the outdoor amenity space, but cautioned that this could change the building envelope. The Panel member noted that many buyers are looking for the ability to purchase multiple units with the intention of combining the units into one, and recommended providing that flexibility.

One Panel member suggested relocating the vent panel at the corner of the building where the bike storage is located to add a window into the space. The Panel member also asked if it would be possible to add more trees to the public realm. Mr. Weber responded that more trees could be added to certain areas, however, there is already a rhythm to the existing trees.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

1. The opportunity to add outdoor amenity space on the roof should be explored
2. Balcony details, including the vertical privacy panels and the Toro Balcony Guard system, need to be executed with care and attention detail because of the impact they will have on the overall building aesthetic
3. There is a disconnect between the ground floor portion of the building and the upper portion of the building that needs to be addressed through materiality or form
4. Thermal breaks should be applied to all balconies, not just the upper floor
5. There should be flexibility to convert and combine units over time

1.6 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 providing all items listed above are addressed.

2.0 55 Lake Shore/100 Queens Quay (LCBO)

ID#: 1075

Project Type: Building

Location: Lower Yonge Precinct

Proponent: Menkes

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance, B+H

Review Stage: Design Concept

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Peter Clewes, architectsAlliance, Patrick Fejer, B+H Architects

Delegation: Jude Tersigni, Menkes, Joel Pearlman, Menkes

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Amanda Santo, Director of Development Approvals with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by giving an overview of the location and ownership of the site. Ms. Santo also gave an overview of the transportation master plan which includes extending and converting Harbour Street into a two way street. Ms. Santo proceeded to discuss the land use which is 75 percent residential and 25 percent commercial. The commercial land is strategically located to the south to aid as a buffer between Redpath Sugar Factory. Ms. Santo noted that the population projections for the area are approximately 30,000 people living and working in the precinct. Ms. Santo pointed out the two heritage buildings on site and the proposed promenade streets that will provide for generous pedestrian movement. Ms. Santo also noted that the Precinct Plan calls for a 30 meter tower separation distance to avoid a wall of condos along the waterfront. Ms. Santo circulated a document describing the heritage buildings and their designation criteria. Ms. Santo showed the baseline impact of the LCBO warehouse given that the extension of Harbour Street will result in the demolition of the rear portion of the building.

Mr. Glaisek then posed a number of questions for the Panel to consider, including whether it is appropriate to be creating a second-level pedestrian system at the waterfront and will this compete with our goals for vibrant, active street life, does the proposed storefront design and access plan create a strong enough presence on Queens Quay and reinforce its role as the main waterfront street, is it appropriate to design this building in advance of the park design and should it be conceived of as Harbour Street retail or a park pavilion, should there be a building at all in this location or should the entire block be a park, does the spacing and distribution of towers promote adequate access to light and air and view corridors, does the at-grade permeability meet the intent of the precinct plan, does the proposed massing and structural system contribute positively to the character of the mews and is enough of the existing heritage being preserved, and can the treatment of the service entrances be improved.

Mr. Glaisek introduced Peter Clewes, Principal at architectsAlliance, to give the project presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Clewes began by giving an overview of the site followed by the objectives and guiding principles for the project. Mr. Clewes noted that their project site is divided into four blocks. Mr. Clewes noted that the Harbour Street alignment continues shift which has made solidifying aspects of the project difficult. Mr. Clewes described the street hierarchy pointing out the local and neighbourhood streets. Mr. Clewes noted that the Harbour Street alignment has resulted in a park block which exceeds the parkland dedication requirements of the City on the south block. Mr. Clewes noted that the team is proposing the PATH system to connect to the school on the third level of the building. As controversial as an above grade school is, Mr. Clewes noted that there is a connection between the school and the daycare facility. The retail building on the “excess” portion of the park is imagined as a pavilion that connects to the adjacent building. Mr. Clewes mentioned that the heritage mews will be used as a vehicle drop off, with principal loading

located underground. The City of Toronto Heritage department has expressed the need to retain the overhead bridge connecting the two heritage buildings

Mr. Clewes then introduced Patrick Fejer, Principal at B+H Architects, to present the commercial building proposed on site. Mr. Fejer noted that the office lobby is the prominent front door entrance to the building. Mr. Fejer noted that there are significant concerns with the industrial uses to the south of the precinct, which is why the building is oriented to provide an acoustical barrier. Mr. Fejer noted that the building is targeting LEED Platinum status and Toronto Green Standard Tier I. The cladding concept inspired by the pattern of lake reflections on the building.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members asked who would be responsible for overseeing the design of the park. Mr. Clewes replied that this has not been determined, however, it would likely be the City of Toronto or Waterfront Toronto as the design team has no responsibility to the park.

Another Panel member asked for clarification of the park size. Mr. Clewes replied that each development is required to contribute a certain amount either in cash or land, and in this case, the park is larger than what is required through the City's process of securing parkland. The Panel member also asked about building underneath the park. Mr. Clewes responded that the City does not allow anything to be built beneath parkland.

One of the Panel members asked about the density targets. Ms. Santo replied that the precinct plan allows 16 times coverage.

Another Panel member asked why the team put the school on the third floor instead of the ground floor facing the park. Mr. Clewes replied that they did look at a scheme where the school was located in the park, however, there is not sufficient space for a combined park and school. The Panel member also asked why the mews does not connect to New Street as a stronger public realm element. Mr. Clewes replied that they are making it a casual loading space with the principal loading underground, but there is a major servicing component that needs to be provided to make this entire project work. Mr. Clewes noted that the mews is not intended to look like a laneway, but they are trying to balance both sides as best they can.

One of the Panel members asked about the orientation of the LCBO building. Mr. Fejer explained that the orientation is meant to act as a buffer to limit the noise impact from the Redpath Sugar Factory.

Another Panel member asked about the projected number of students in the proposed school. Mr. Clewes responded that the school is from junior kindergarten to grade seven with 450 students projected.

One of the Panel members pointed out that transit was not mentioned in the presentation and asked about the status of transit for the area. Ms. Santo replied that

there will eventually be a dedicated streetcar right of way on Queens Quay. As an interim solution, the team is working with TTC to modify existing bus routes to ensure they stop in the area. The Panel member also asked about the heritage approach. Mr. Clewes responded that they don't have a specific approach yet as the team is still at a basic stage in the design.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments and noted that the park and connectivity throughout the precinct are the fundamental issues.

One of the Panel members felt that it was not desirable to have a school located on the third floor of a building. The Panel member felt that a school needs direct access to park space, and sharing a gym with the community was also raised as a concern.

Another Panel member felt that the mews has become a crowded service lane, with loading bays and sidewalk columns destroying the intent.

One Panel member felt that the public realm is being treated as an afterthought. Waterfront Toronto has always led with landscape and that should be the case for this project given the scale. The Panel member also noted that the City should consider allowing for parking below the park.

Another Panel member felt the overhead bridges were unnecessary when there is good public realm, and associated bridges with giving up on the public realm. The Panel member also recommended focusing on the park as a complete piece without being encumbered by retail. The Panel member commented on the orientation of the commercial building noting that while they're aware of the noise, the height of the podium should be studied as a noise barrier rather than the entire tower in order to liberate its orientation.

One of the Panel members commented on the LCBO store, citing the example of the Summerhill LCBO and that this one should be a destination that people want to come to, just like that one.

Another Panel member felt that the commercial building appears set apart from the rest of the plan and doesn't integrate well with the residential neighbourhood

Another Panel member gave direction for the mid-block connections at grade to promote connectivity throughout the site. The mews needs to be rethought as it's currently cluttered with structure and loading. The Panel member felt that it should be cleaned up and made into a more usable public space.

Another Panel member noted that tower separation should comply with the Precinct Plan, which indicates 30 meter separation. The Panel member also suggested rearranging the tower locations to bring the single tower to the back which would resolve the pressure on the mews.

One of the Panel members felt that greater stepping of the height was needed to respect the Precinct Plan.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

1. There should be more mid-block porosity at-grade to provide connections throughout the site, and these should be coordinated throughout the precinct to the extent possible.
2. Second-level bridge connections are not supported, except over Lake Shore Boulevard, because of their visual impact and potential reduction in pedestrian activity at street level.
3. The retail building on the park block is not supported, and any retail pavilion proposed there should be designed as part of the park.
4. The design of the park should happen concurrently with the design of the buildings and be led by Waterfront Toronto or the City.
5. The heritage mews needs to be re-thought and made into a prime public space.
6. The public realm plan in the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan needs to be shown on the drawings, and the relationship between the buildings and the street more strongly conceived.
7. Tower heights should step down as per the Precinct Plan.
8. Tower separation distances should respect the 30 metre minimum as per the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan.
9. The towers on the north-west block should be rearranged to open up view corridors and reduce the infrastructure in the heritage mews.
10. The Queens Quay façade on the south-east block should be conceived as the primary “front door” of the LCBO store, not Cooper Street, the “stepbacks” on the façade should be eliminated in favour of a continuous streetwall, and the roof overhang should be less monumental to fit into the mixed-use residential neighborhood.

2.6 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 Non-support of the project.