



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #106
Wednesday, December 20, 2017**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Jeff Ranson
Chris Reed
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

George Baird

Recording Secretaries

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

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

1. York Street Park and Rees Street Park
 2. West Don Lands – Block 12
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the November 15 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

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

The Chair noted that John Livey, Deputy City Manager, has announced his retirement.

The Chair also noted that the legislature has approved reform of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to replace it with a new Local Planning Appeal Tribunal aimed at giving more power for planning back to cities. The Chair added that regulations put forward by the province on how to transition to the new body will mean the applications currently being considered by the City will be eligible for appeal under the old system.

The Chair also noted that on December 15, 2017, the OMB approved the decision to re-divide the City's existing 44 wards into 47 wards. The Chair explained that the review was conducted due to Toronto's significant population growth, with some wards growing above the average ward population.

The Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that Jack Layton Ferry Terminal Phase 1A construction began in November 2017. The western walkway has reopened for public access and the main walkway is now closed. Mr. Glaisek added that concrete removal, excavation and electrical work is now underway. Sub-surface/tree infrastructure work is schedule for January. Mr. Glaisek then invited Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide an update on the Bentway.

Ms. Mallozzi announced that the Skating Trail grand opening has been announced for January 6th at 11:00 am. Substantial Performance of the site has now been achieved, and the Conservancy has begun to build the Skating Village for the winter season. Planting around the trail is complete, and custom moveable furniture will be constructed in time for the opening. Ms. Mallozzi added that the Events Dock is complete and the liquid landscape in front of the Fort is planted.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Rees Street Park and York Street Park

Project Type: Parks and Public Realm

Location: Central Waterfront

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto

Architect/Designer: TBD

Review Stage: Issues Identification

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Netami Stuart, Waterfront Toronto

Delegation:

ID#: 1092

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Netami Stuart, Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Waterfront Toronto and Parks, Forestry and Recreation are co-leading this project. Waterfront Toronto will oversee the delivery of the design competition and procurement process and will manage the design of the parks. Parks, Forestry and

Recreation will manage the construction of Rees Street Park while Waterfront Toronto will manage the construction of York Street Park. Ms. Stuart noted that in terms of the procurement policies, all comments and input provided by the Panel will be publicly available and referenced in the procurement documents. There will be no in-camera DRP discussions about York Street Park or Rees Street Park.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Stuart provided an overview of context for both parks noting the proximity to the Rogers Centre and Union Station. Ms. Stuart noted that the York Street Park site consists of eight columns which are remnants of the Gardiner off-ramp that was recently removed. There are eight Siberian Elms, three Norway Maples, and one Silver Maple that have been preserved through the demolition of the ramp. The park is framed by two office buildings and two residential buildings. York Slip is located directly south of the park and sees lots of pedestrian traffic from taxi boats and party boats.

Ms. Stuart described the Rees Street Park site noting that directly across Queens Quay to the south is HTO park, designed by Janet Rosenberg Studio and Claude Cormier + Associés. The adjacency of both parks will create a unique condition along Queens Quay. Ms. Stuart explained that views of Rees Street Park from Queens Quay are mostly framed by the Gardiner Expressway. Ms. Stuart noted that there is a future Toronto Water Stormwater Storage Shaft planned for the south-east part of the park. The park will need to accommodate a 12-meter diameter stormwater storage shaft and adjacent low building. The eastern frontage of Queens Quay is occupied by two businesses, including a Beer Store. Ms. Stuart noted that the Peter Street Basin is the only location where Lake Ontario extends north of Queens Quay. Peter Street Basin and the public walkway surrounding it are public parkland managed by Parks, Forestry and Recreation. Ms. Stuart raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the role and character of each park within the waterfront, the relationship of York Street Park edge to the office building at 88 Queens Quay, how the design of York Street Park deals with streets on three sides, the relationship of Rees Street Park to HTO Park, Rees Street WaveDeck and John Quay, and how can the design of Rees Street Park address the scale of the Gardiner Expressway, the Rogers Centre and the CN Tower.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

Rees Street Park:

One Panel member asked whether the Peter Street Basin will be part of the design competition. Ms. Stuart responded that it will factor into the site context for the design competition, however it is not within the subject site.

Another Panel member asked if the public consultation process will be similar to the Bentway process. Ms. Stuart replied that they plan on having 3-4 focus group discussions about activities and recreation, gardens and trees, and food and markets. Ms. Stuart noted it is anticipated that the stakeholder meeting will convene in January

2018, and they hope engagement with the local community will coalesce into a good understanding of the programming for each park.

One Panel member asked about the public art process and how this will be integrated into the design of the parks. Ms. Stuart explained that Waterfront Toronto has a Public Art Program Manager who is looking into how to integrate future public art. Ms. Stuart added that apart from taking 1% from the capital budget, there is currently not a significant budget identified for this.

Another Panel member asked to clarify the ownership of Peter Street Basin and what's public and what's private. Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Designer with the City of Toronto, explained that it is all city-owned up to the doors. Ms. Mighton added that so far there is no agreement in place with the landowner.

One Panel member asked for clarification on the stormwater storage shaft. Ms. Stuart explained that this facility is part of a far greater system. The facility will need to be 12 meters in diameter and 60 meters deep, however, it is not detailed at this time.

Another Panel member asked what the timing of the stormwater storage shaft is. Ms. Stuart noted that it 10-15 years away, but they will attempt to get clarification on the parameters as soon as possible.

York Street Park:

One Panel member asked about the irregular property line. Ms. Stuart explained that the south-west corner is privately owned by the condo to the south.

Another Panel member asked about the health of the remaining trees on the site. Ms. Stuart noted that all the trees on site were in good to fair health based on an arborist report completed before the ramp was taken down. Ms. Stuart added that the species in the park can live to 100 years under ideal conditions.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that at the last Design Review Panel meeting, the TOcore presentation received comments that recommended looking towards open space data. The Panel member suggested adding this idea into the RFP. The Panel member also recommended making parks to the north of Queens Quay more local in scale rather than a regional destination. The Panel member felt that York Street Park can really set the tone for Harbour Street. Mr. Glaisek added that Rees Street Park feels like a neighbourhood park, but York Street Park is surrounded by commercial buildings and has a more civic context.

Another Panel member noted that York Street Park is a very high traffic area in a central location with new office buildings. The Panel member felt that the one thing

that is missing in this area is a publicly available quiet space that is open and accessible, but sheltered from the traffic.

One Panel member cautioned being too prescriptive in program at the risk of hindering the designers' creativity and ideas for the site. The Panel member suggested that Rees Street be built as an interim park with a bold idea that will be there for 10-15 years until the stormwater storage shaft gets built.

Another Panel member noted that there is an opportunity to write a brief for a 15-year plan which allows for ephemerality. The Panel member noted that there is an opportunity to look into how to integrate functional infrastructure and what this will look like.

One Panel member recommended avoiding taking the traditional path of designing a park. The Panel member felt that partnerships should be investigated if we are looking into having interim versus long-term uses. The Panel member also raised whether it is possible to put out both parks as a joint design competition. The Panel member felt that one design vision for both parks could be advantageous and should include the Peter Street Basin too.

Another Panel member noted that there should be a thoughtful jury who are forward thinkers and will consider things such as 21st century sustainable design. Another Panel member added that it is important to note that it is necessary to exceed these expectations and existing sustainability standards.

One Panel member felt that there is an opportunity to build a deeply natural space as opposed to hardscape. This is an opportunity to create a space that provides refuge and speaks to microclimate.

Another Panel member felt that Rees Street Park has the potential to be a heavily programmed space that would have amenities such as a public pool.

One Panel member noted that the West Don Lands has a very strong public art program and felt that this should be reflected in this area. The Panel member felt that the edges of the parks and how they interface with private development are key.

Another Panel member asked to consider thinking about an integrated systems approach and leave the interpretation to green infrastructure open.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Lead with landscape
- Keep the program as open as possible and ensure the themes are bold.
- A thoughtful and forward-thinking jury for the design competition is necessary.
- Integration of public art into the design competition is critical.
- Consider issuing Rees Street Park, York Street Park and Peter Street Basin as one proposal.

- Consider Rees Street Park taking on a local identity and York Street Park taking on a civic identity.

1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

2.0 West Don Lands – Block 12

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: three

Presenter(s): Adam Feldmann (architectsAlliance), Robert Ng (NAK Design Strategies), Michael Guadagnoli (Ecovert)

Delegation: Marc Baronette (Dundee Kilmer)

ID#: 1084

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that Block 12 represents the fourth market residential building in the Canary District. This is the project's third time presenting to the Design Review Panel and the team will be presenting Detailed Design. Mr. Glaisek provided a recap on the comments made by the Panel at the October meeting, including more detail is required on the public realm and the experience from a pedestrian scale, the courtyard space still feels unresolved and multiple options should be brought forward to the next review, ensure that there is a signature treatment to the mechanical penthouse, integrate some colour into the design, and the relationship of the front to the sides of the building need more resolution, including materiality and treatment of the horizontal and vertical elements. Mr. Glaisek raised a number of topics for the Panel to consider, including the relationship of the end wall to the frontage, the introduction of colour, the resolution of the courtyard space, and the treatment of the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Glaisek then introduced Adam Feldmann, Associate at architectsAlliance, to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by noting that the building statistics have not changed since the last review and they are still pursuing a grocer tenant on the ground floor. Mr. Feldmann noted that the mechanical penthouse design has been revised in response to the Panel's comments. In terms of colour and materiality, Mr. Feldmann explained that the base of the building is clad in a terracotta panel, the window mullion is dark grey, the end of the volume cut-ins is a brushed aluminium, seen on the facia of the frame and the edges of the south bump out building, and the soffits are red to give a pop of colour. Mr. Feldmann noted that the south building has been redesigned to not follow the logic of the north building, which is about stacking of the boxes with an offset. Mr. Feldmann explained that a small niche was created for the gas meter to make sure that its off the street frontage. The bicycle parking also shifted south to a

more centralized location between the towers. Mr. Feldmann then introduced Robert Ng, Principal at NAK Design Strategies, to present the landscape piece of the presentation.

Mr. Ng began by walking through the existing site plan, which consists of seven new trees. The precast pavers have a light tone and are high albedo. Mr. Ng noted that the townhouse units on both sides of the building have Corten steel planters. There is an opportunity on the south side of the building to integrate a play element for kids. In terms of the courtyard space, Mr. Ng explained that they plan to choose trees that are light in foliage for the space to allow for enough lighting on the vegetation. Mr. Ng noted that they have added a row of trees to the east side of the outdoor amenity space in response to the Panel comments. The north side of the amenity space will be more of a defined barbeque space. Mr. Ng then introduced Michael Guadagnoli, Director of Building Performance with Ecovert, to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Mr. Guadagnoli noted that they are targeting TGS Tier 2 with an energy use intensity of 121.9 ekWh/m². Mr. Guadagnoli explained some of the sustainability highlights for the project, which include LED low-intensity lighting design with automatic lighting controls, low-flow plumbing fixtures to reduce water consumption, and a greenroof.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions.

One Panel member asked if the material on the edging is brushed stainless steel with a joint. Mr. Feldmann replied that the sample is brushed aluminium, not stainless steel. The plate will be 3mm and hung from the rear with concealed fasteners and the aluminium edge will have a drip edge.

Another Panel member asked if the private yards have wood decking. Mr. Ng replied that the material will be pavers. The Panel member also asked if it's possible to grow certain plants such as tomatoes. Mr. Ng replied no because it is on top of a concrete slab above the parking garage.

One Panel member asked how they are accommodating soil depth. Mr. Ng replied that they are dropping the middle of the slab, but the soil depth will still be shallow. Mr. Ng added that there will be more soil volume where the trees will be located.

Another Panel member acknowledged that this is a difficult space and asked why they chose the Kentucky coffee-tree species. Mr. Ng replied that they are looking to incorporate trees that are more open with less foliage. Mr. Ng added that the ambient light created from the glazing should help with growth.

One Panel member asked why the opening to the garage loading is so wide. Mr. Feldmann replied that this is based on the required turning radii for type A trucks. Mr. Feldmann added that they wanted the exit door space to be recessed from the public realm. The Panel member also asked for clarification of the section drawing showing the landscape condition of the townhouse units to the sidewalk. Mr. Feldmann replied

that there is a four-foot slope along Front Street to Mill Street. In order to deal with this condition, several townhouse units are recessed a bit below grade.

Another Panel member asked if they plan on doing energy sub-metering, to which Mr. Guadagnoli replied yes. The Panel member also asked what their irrigation strategy is for the greenroof. Mr. Ng replied that the greenroof does not need to be irrigated, but there is an emergency hose bib. Mr. Ng added that the outdoor amenity space will be irrigated.

One Panel member asked what the material of the privacy fence will be. Mr. Ng replied that they are still looking into this.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member noted that the building is coming along beautifully. The Panel member felt that there are good intentions for the public realm, but it lacks an overall vision. The Panel member noted that the green roof should be open to the public as the outdoor amenity space will likely get overused.

Another Panel member felt that more design work and conceptual thinking on the private courtyard space is needed. The Panel member noted that the space has a lot of potential and would like to see the possibility for winter activity use.

One Panel member agreed that the courtyard space still feels unresolved. The Panel member was also concerned about the lack of a stoop along the townhouse façade creating privacy issues for the townhouse units.

Another Panel member felt that more cross sections and detailing the condition between the townhouse and the sidewalk, as well as more development of the privacy on the townhouses, are required to better understand what is public and what is private. The Panel member also felt that better sun and shadow studies are required as the current studies only show half the year. The Panel member noted that the courtyard space will not be a sunny space and this needs to be taken into account and designed differently.

One Panel member felt that there is a fundamental programming problem with the courtyard space. The Panel member felt that the glass façade looks off-the-shelf, and while the red colour is sophisticated and helps make the frame more legible, it somehow does not highlight the concept well. The Panel member was also wary about adding trees to the roof near the edge.

Another Panel member felt that the species selection in the courtyard space and the roof is unsuccessful. The Panel member noted that the green fringe of trees is problematic. The Panel member suggested smaller scale vegetation that can deliver a full landscape.

One Panel member felt that the detail of the sunken entry plaza is not desirable and must be revisited. The Panel member also suggested narrowing the entrance to the servicing garage if possible.

Another Panel member felt that there is an opportunity to increase the ventilation and thermal comfort. The Panel member also recommended that the contractors do mock-ups of the thermal break of the cantilevered design systems to ensure they are airtight.

One Panel member was appreciative of the revised mechanical penthouse design and improved clarity of the building design. The Panel member was concerned about the wood privacy fence and felt that this design should be revisited.

Another Panel member suggested playing with the material palette and since the building is primarily glass, this should be given more life.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Overall, the building's architecture has evolved nicely.
- Supportive of the revised mechanical penthouse treatment.
- Further detail should be shown to help explain the building narrative.
- There are fundamental issues with the courtyard space, given that it will be shaded. More work is needed on the choice of vegetation and the programming of the courtyard space. Further detail should be shown through cross sections.
- Consider tightening the entrances of loading/servicing
- The grading issues need to be resolved so that sufficient privacy is provided on the townhouse units at grade. The wood privacy fence needs to be rethought.
- There is an opportunity to make the rooftop space useable for residents.
- The side streets are neighbourhood streets and need to be read differently than Front Street, and cross sections of the entire side streets should be brought to the next review.
- Recommend that the contractors do mock-ups of the cantilevered design systems to ensure they're airtight.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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