



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #112
Wednesday, June 20, 2018**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Claude Cormier
Mazyar Mortazavi, Waterfront Toronto
Jeff Ranson
Chris Reed

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. West Don Lands Block 12 – Detailed Design
 2. Quayside – For Information
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the April 18, 2018 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest. Nina-Marie Lister noted that she had a conflict with the Quayside project and recused herself for that review.

The Chair noted that on June 7, 2018 Community Council voted to allow housing suites in the city's backyard laneways. This item will go before City Council at the end of June for approval. The Chair also noted that 307 Lake Shore Boulevard East opened on June 16th with performances and workshops held throughout the weekend along with food vendors. The Chair noted that 307 will be open to the public every weekend.

The Chair then introduced Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto to provide a report. Mr. Glaisek noted that construction progress continues on the Bentway with final completion anticipated this summer. The final finishes including bent numeral painting, sodding and site furniture construction are underway. Mr. Glaisek noted that the grand opening of Strachan Gate is planned for late August.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 West Don Lands Block 12 – Detailed Design

Project Type: Building

Location: West Don Lands

Proponent: Dundee Kilmer

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance

Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Four

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

Delegation: Edward Yu, architectsAlliance

ID#: 1084

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Scott Loudon, Development Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Block 12 represents the fourth market residential building in the Canary District. The final development blocks of the Canary District are Block 12, Block 13 and Block 16. Mr. Loudon noted that this is the fourth time the project has presented to the DRP and today they will be presenting Detailed Design. Mr. Loudon provided a recap of comments made by the Panel in December 2017, including further detail on the building narrative, more detail is needed on the courtyard space, resolve the grading issues along the townhouse units at grade, consider making the rooftop space usable for residents, and consider doing mock-ups of the cantilevered design systems to ensure they're air-tight. Mr. Loudon then asked the Panel to consider if the team has adequately addressed the previous comments made. Mr. Loudon then introduced Adam Feldmann, Associate at architectsAlliance, to give the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Feldmann began by noting that they have added an additional 11 units to the building, but the unit mix has not changed since the last presentation. Mr. Feldmann introduced Michael Guadagnoli, Director of Building Performance with Ecovert, to present the sustainability portion of the project.

Mr. Guadagnoli explained that in terms of the energy analysis, they are still targeting TGS Tier 2 and are still up at 45% energy savings with an Energy Use Intensity of 138 ekWh/m². Mr. Guadagnoli noted that they are still on track for LEED Gold and one of

the major changes is the addition of the solar wall. The solar wall system will offset 45 tonnes of CO2 every year.

Mr. Feldmann noted that the entrances for the loading bay were narrowed to minimize the interruption of the street condition. Mr. Feldmann explained that the building has been raised one meter to raise the stoops of the townhouses which effectively lines up with Block 11. Mr. Feldmann walked the Panel through a series of shadow studies on the courtyard space. Mr. Feldmann introduced Robert Ng, Principal at NAK Design Strategies, to present the landscape design.

Mr. Ng noted that the team looked at the relationship of the unit entrances and the public realm. Mr. Ng explained that the townhouse units along Tannery Road now step up, not down. Mr. Ng noted that they are looking at partition screens to provide some privacy between the units and the public realm. Mr. Ng explained that they are looking at Corten planters approximately 3 feet high from the sidewalk side. Mr. Ng walked the Panel through the revisions to the courtyard design noting that the trees have been removed altogether and is being reprogrammed with play spaces for children. Mr. Ng noted that the amenity space now consists of some areas for casual seating, a barbeque area, and a row of birch trees.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if they were able to add a storey to the building because everything else got lowered. Mr. Feldmann replied that they realized that they were below the zoning, but the building was raised to respond to the comments about the stoop.

Another Panel member asked why they are not showing the month of December in the shadow studies. Mr. Feldmann replied that the City standard does not require shadow studies to be shown for December.

One Panel member asked what the width of the play area in the courtyard is. Mr. Feldmann replied that it is 15 meters.

Another Panel member asked what the expectation is for the front stoop of the townhouse units. Mr. Feldmann replied that it will be a semi-private seating area for residents.

One Panel member asked if all of the ground floor units are accessible from the street. Mr. Feldmann replied that only some are accessible from the street, but they're all accessible from the inside. The Panel member asked if they have any intentions to signal the entry for the units. Mr. Feldmann replied that this kit of parts is still being worked out.

Another Panel member noted that at the last review they asked the team to look into more modulation with the balconies and more breaks along the façade and asked the team if they have given this comment any further consideration. Mr. Feldmann replied

that they did look into this and felt that the linearity was important to contrast the verticality of the townhouses.

One Panel member asked if there was further resolution on getting a grocery tenant on the ground floor. Mr. Feldmann replied that they are still hoping this will happen but there is nothing to report yet.

Another Panel member asked where the solar wall will be located. Mr. Guadagnoli replied that it will be located on the south side of the mechanical penthouse wall.

One Panel member asked for details on the species selection. Mr. Ng replied that they are looking at birch trees for the planters. The informal area of the amenity space will emulate what the Highline has done with the grasses and perennials. Mr. Ng noted that the private terraces have room to plant tomatoes etc.

Another Panel member asked what the window to wall ratio is. Mr. Guadagnoli replied that the ratio is 58% window to 42% wall.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member liked the building design noting that it is handsome and simple. The Panel member also felt that the improvement to the stoop situation is good but felt that raising the planter higher to provide more privacy would be beneficial. The Panel member was concerned about the additional height on the south tower further limiting the amount of sunlight on the courtyard space. The Panel member also suggested using alternative material to Corten for the planters.

Another Panel member was appreciative of the refinements to the landscape design. The Panel member felt that the shadow study was helpful, however, noted that one quarter of the year the courtyard space will be in shade. The Panel member suggested moving the children's play space in the courtyard to the area that gets the most sun. The Panel member felt that the use of reflective materials should be maximized in the courtyard space. Lastly, the Panel member suggested incorporating native pollinator species and all season play in the courtyard space.

One Panel member suggested incorporating an interactive lighting strategy to the courtyard space and making the end wall a feature of the space.

Another Panel member felt that more consideration should be given to the outdoor amenity space noting that areas with more active programming should be placed furthest away from the units. The Panel member also asked the team to consider stepping back the south tower given the added height.

One Panel member noted that the amenity space is very large and felt that more shade should be provided.

Another Panel member noted that tall planting material needs to be accommodated in the planters along the townhouses for owners to personalize. The Panel member was also excited to see the courtyard space used as a winter amenity space.

1.5 Consensus Comments

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

- Further refinement is needed on the courtyard space. Ensure that the children's play area receives as much sun as possible. Respond to winter conditions using lighting and colour and consider creating a feature wall.
- Ensure that ample privacy is provided on the stoops of the townhouse units but allow flexibility for more privacy to be added.
- Consider organizing the outdoor amenity space uses based on the proximity to units
- Consider stepping back the south tower to allow more light into the courtyard space
- Explore alternative materials to Corten for the planters

1.6 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 Full Support of the project.

2.0 Quayside – For Information

Project Type: Building

Location: East Bayfront

Proponent: Sidewalk Toronto

Architect/Designer: Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto

Review Stage: For Information

Review Round: N/A

Presenter(s): Aaron Barter, Waterfront Toronto; Steven Turrell, Sidewalk Labs; Lauren Reid, Sidewalk Labs

Delegation: Carol Webb, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto

ID#: 1100

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Aaron Barter, Innovation and Sustainability Manager with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project by noting that Quayside is an I-shaped site located on 12 acres of land owned by Waterfront Toronto. The site is located between the East Bayfront and Keating Channel precincts. Mr. Barter noted that the vision for Quayside has been to try something new and transformational with the hopes of this being a global demonstration project for innovation. Mr. Barter noted that Waterfront Toronto recognized that they should bring on a partner to formulate a plan that would start earlier than we normally would in the planning process. The four transformational goals that Waterfront Toronto had in mind for the project included sustainability, resilience and urban innovation, complete communities, economic development and prosperity, and partnership and investment. Waterfront Toronto selected Sidewalk Labs to be its partner because their response to the RFQ not only reflected what Waterfront Toronto was looking for but went above and beyond. Mr. Barter then introduced Steven Turrell,

Associate Director of Development with Sidewalk Labs, to give an overview of Sidewalk Labs.

Mr. Turrell explained that Sidewalk Labs formed in 2015 seeing the opportunity for digital revolution to change the quality of cities. Mr Turrell noted that the team was built specifically to bridge the divide between urbanists and technologies. The team has studied and learned from prior smart cities attempts and concluded that the best way to bring urban design and digital technology to effect a step by step change in city life was through district scale innovation in an unbuilt environment.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Barter explained that the Sidewalk Toronto partnership formed in September 2017. Starting in late 2017, the Sidewalk Toronto team began the planning and public consultation on the Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP), outlining what they think this place could be.

Mr. Turrell explained that based on community feedback, the team was organized into working groups to represent the themes that matter most to the community. These working groups include sustainability, public realm, community and city services, housing affordability, mobility, buildings, digital platform and privacy and data governance. Mr. Turrell then introduced Lauren Reid, Director of Privacy and Data Governance, to provide an overview of privacy and data governance.

Ms. Reid explained to the Panel that data collection is not new, and the team intends to set a new standard for transparent, accountable, and responsible data use. Ms. Reid noted that the Responsible Data Use Policy Framework is a part of the Master Innovation and Development Plan and will govern the collection and use of data.

2.3 Panel Questions/Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions and comments.

One Panel member asked how the team plans to sort out the beta testing in a way that's meaningful relative to working at a city scale where things have to be permanent. Mr Turrell replied that they the ability to take more risks than a typical real estate developer could. Determining the right way to beta test is something constantly being considering. Ms. Mallozzi explained that some of the early actions, including the mobility pillar, is looking into innovations such as a dynamic curb. The team is working with the City to find a way to deploy this which will involve a digital signage pilot happening on Bay Street between Harbour Street and Queens Quay.

Another Panel member noted that developers try to maximize profit by reducing the cost of construction adding that there is vast research being done to make building costs cheaper. The Panel member noted that the team has stated that they are aiming to reduce the cost of living by 14%, since the price of the land is competitive, and reducing the cost of construction dramatically is unlikely, the Panel member asked if they are proposing to reduce their profit. Mr. Turrell replied that one of the things that will be part of the plan is a very specific affordability plan. Mr. Turrell clarified that the

14% is not about a 14% reduction in rent, its about a wholistic reduction in cost of living, including things like the use of private automobile, and whether someone can live just as conveniently in an urban setting without those extra costs. Mr. Turrell stated that they will be committing to an affordable housing number that is greater than the current 20% on the waterfront. The Panel member asked for clarification on specific sustainability targets. Mr. Barter clarified that the project will define key targets for Quayside including sustainability targets. Mr. Barter explained that the standards for Quayside will align with TGS V3 and Tier 4 and Passive House inspired design.

One Panel member asked to elaborate on the regulatory direction that the team is headed. Mr. Turrell explained that the outcome they are trying to get to working with Waterfront Toronto, is determining the right way to amend existing building codes and zoning issues.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on what Sidewalk Labs core business offering is given that their core business is digital output. Mr. Turrell clarified that Sidewalk Labs and Google are both owned by Alphabet but are two very different companies. Google makes a profit from search and data and Sidewalk Labs does not. Mr. Turrell explained that Sidewalk Labs business model falls into three buckets, including traditional real estate development opportunities, physical Infrastructure perspectives that they can help finance, and digital products. Mr. Glaisek added that an example of this would be garbage removal which consists of connecting tunnels that have small robots for garbage removal. The goal being to get garbage trucks off the street using digital tools. Mr. Glaisek noted that its about blending the urban goal with technology as a solution to this goal.

One Panel member also asked about mobility noting there is no waterfront transit to speak of and asked how they plan on servicing the waterfront. Ms. Mallozzi explained that within the mobility pillar, there are five tools used to achieve the larger objective, which is to reduce the reliance on private automobile. Ms. Mallozzi added that there is a strong commitment for the plan that already exists for the extension of the waterfront transit. Ms. Mallozzi noted that conversations around how to accelerate the delivery of waterfront transit will be happening over the course of the summer and fall.

Another Panel member noted that the lessons learned from this can have a bigger impact on future development and felt that this could be a great tool to make other places better. The Panel member felt that the lack of examples made it difficult to fully understand the project's overall intentions.

One Panel member asked what piece is rising to the top that could be the most exciting or innovative. Mr. Turrell replied that one example they are excited about is modular paving. Plywood mock-ups have been created and currently tested at 307 Lake Shore with embedded LED lights. Mr. Turrell also mentioned tall timber design as another example that they are excited to prototype at Quayside.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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