



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #63  
Wednesday, November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

---

**Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Don Schmitt  
Betsy Williamson  
Jane Wolf

**Regrets:**

George Baird  
Gerry Faubert  
Brigitte Shim

**Recording Secretary:**

JD Reeves

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

**WELCOME**

The Chair provided an overview of the agenda before moving to General Business.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from September 2012. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and they were unanimously adopted.

The Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare and none were declared. Claude Cormier noted that he is working on the 3C site but, because there is no approved development plan and the site is not immediately adjacent to the promenade, there should be no conflict with the East Bayfront presentations.

There being no other comments, the Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek to give his report.

---

**REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, provided an update on the Queens Quay Revitalization stating that the ground breaking was scheduled for later in the week, November 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Glaisek continued that a soft start had already occurred

limited to some demolition of the TTC tracks to ensure that schedule completion of the project by Spring 2015 could be maintained.

Mr. Glaisek then invited James Parakh, City of Toronto Urban Design Manager, to provide an update on the 90 Harbour Street and 10 York Street developments. Mr. Parakh started by thanking the panel for their reviews which had made a great difference in improving the design quality of both projects. He explained that both projects have received zoning approval by Council. Since the last Panel presentation, planning staff made recommendations to lower the heights of both projects to achieve some transition from the Financial District heights to the waterfront. Changes to the floor plate to 10 York were also requested so that floor plates did not increase towards the top of the building.

Mr. Parakh continued that part of the 90 Harbour approval contained a section 37 financial contribution towards the take down of the York-Bay-Yonge Gardiner off-ramp and revitalization of the park.

The Chair asked if the council presentation included an update of the building facades. Mr. Parakh responded that there was no update to the facades however council directed the designs to come back to the Panel for further review, particularly of the office building and ground floor components.

There being no further questions or comments, the Chair moved to the first project review.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 East Bayfront Public Realm: Bayside Waters Edge Promenade**

*ID#: 1041*

*Project Type: Public Realm*

*Location: Bayside Local Street B along the water's edge, between Sherbourne Common and Parliament Slip and south of Queens Quay*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: West 8 + DTAH*

*Review Stage: 2<sup>nd</sup> Engineering*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8*

#### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Mr. Glaisek provided a brief introduction and summarized the previous DRP comments from September 2011, specifically:

- 1) Re-evaluate on-street parking and two-way movement on the waterfront street
- 2) Blur the paving treatments
- 3) Use shallow curbs
- 4) Fill in the gap at Aiken Square
- 5) Maintain a continuity of retail

## 1.2 Project Presentation

Adriaan Geuze, with West 8 + DTAH, presented plans, elevations, and renderings to explain how the project evolved since the last presentation, including Bayside Street B (along the water's edge) and Street A (the extension of Bonnycastle south of Queens Quay into Bayside).

## 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel Member asked if all the streets in Bayside are public. Mr. Gueze stated that the areas presented today were all public spaces with some important improvements to the standard City details and materials such as granite curbs. Mr. Gueze continued there is a private street but it has not been designed or included in the scope of the presentation today. The Panel Member then asked if there are any entrances to underground parking on Streets A and B. Mr. Gueze stated that parking entrances would be on Streets A, C, and the private street. The Panel Member then asked if there is a street along Aiken Place Park. Mr. Gueze responded that it is not currently a street but it is to be further developed in the next phase of the Bayside development. The Panel Member then asked if the proposed bollards at either end of Street B are mechanically or manually operated. Mr. Gueze stated that this is an important design question but it has not been resolved. Mr. Gueze continued that it requires input from the city and businesses and some understanding of when and who would be responsible for managing the system. Mr. Gueze then stated that he would recommend a low-tech solution without a computer system where all the relevant parties and emergency vehicles would have the appropriate access.

Another Panel Member asked why the Street B north sidewalk trees stop when adjacent to Aiken Place Park. Mr. Geuze stated that this appeared to be an error and suggested that they come back with a response on this issue when they know more about the park design. The Panel Member then asked if West 8 was designing the park. Mr. Geuze stated that it hasn't been decided yet.

## 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel Member pointed out the Ash Borer is killing all the Green Ash in the city, and because of this they have a concern about the proposed *Gleditsia triacanthos*, Honey Locust, monoculture along the streets. Mr. Geuze agreed that this should be reviewed.

Another Panel Member liked the continuity along the Water's Edge Promenade and agreed that the trees in front of the park should be coordinated with the park design.

Another Panel Member was very supportive of the proposals and was appreciative of the rigor and discipline necessary to maintain the continuity of the design while coordinating with the various city agencies and utility operators. The Panel member stated that it was a very strong proposal and was glad to see the project continue.

Another Panel member suggested that the project was about 25% of the way through City negotiations and that a lot more work will be needed to maintain the design through to the end. The Panel Member then stated that it is unclear how the quality of the public realm will be continued in the private streets and stated that this needs to be expanded upon in the next

update. The Panel Member then stated that the granite curbs are a very important move and it is critical to the success of the project.

Another Panel Member then suggested the granite mosaic in the promenade be extended north to the southern curb on Street B and then to the building facade along Parliament Slip. Mr. Geuze then responded that this is an interesting suggestion but it would not be consistent with the Dockside Water's Edge Promenade which has Paleo Tech.

Robert Freedman, Director of Urban Design at the City, then stated that this is an important project that will get a lot of public attention. Mr. Freedman continued that if executed well, the project has the possibility of galvanizing support for these types of improvements in future waterfront projects. Mr. Freedman also pointed out that there is a new head of Transportation at the City and that it would be interesting to see how the project is received.

The Chair stated that he was glad to see the evolution of the waterfront and found it interesting to see Baldwin Street as a precedent for the Water's Edge Promenade. The Chair continued that they have only seen one building adjacent to this public realm project (R1/R2 or Bayside Block 8) and it raises interesting questions about how this project will inform the development of future blocks.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Encourage consistency and continuity with the previous Water's Edge Promenade designs.
- 2) Find an appropriate solution to managing and operating the bollards at either end of Street B.
- 3) Review the street tree selection and endeavour to provide more diversity.
- 4) The design team should follow through and coordinate the interaction between future building facades and the public realm.

The Chair thanked the Proponent for the presentation.

#### 1.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support, non-support or conditional support for the project.

The Panel voted for unanimously to support the project.

---

## **2.0 East Bayfront Public Realm: Queens Quay Revitalization (Bay- Parliament)**

*ID#: 1050*

*Project Type: Public Realm*

*Location: Queens Quay from Bay St to Parliament St*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: West 8 + DTAH*

*Review Stage: 2<sup>nd</sup> Engineering*

*Review Round: One*

*Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8*

## 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek provided a brief introduction to the project and explained that the preferred transit alternative for the Queens Quay Revitalization project from Bay to Parliament is not fully funded and therefore the project will be phased starting with the south-side promenade between Jarvis and Parliament.

## 2.2 Project Presentation

Adriaan Geuze, with West 8 + DTAH, presented the project with plans, elevations, and renderings to explain the ideas behind the design. Mr. Geuze reminded the panel of the final details for the Central Waterfront Queens Quay Revitalization project (Bay to YoYo Ma) and then explained how they were applied to the East Bayfront Queens Quay project.

## 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel Member asked about the street furniture (TTC shelters, light poles, etc.) and the thinking behind them. Mr. Geuze stated there are two broad categories: the first being standard city elements such as garbage bins, bike racks, and TTC shelters where the design team reviewed the quality and were happy to work with city standards; the second being custom elements such as light poles, tree rings, and benches. Mr. Geuze stated they are still reviewing signage because they have some concerns surrounding the extensive mix associated with the current city standards.

Another Panel Member stated they were aware of the funding shortfall associated with the current East Bayfront transit solution and that Waterfront Toronto is studying alternatives but, then asked how the proposed phasing works with the alternatives. Mr. Glaisek stated that the phase one area, the south-side promenade from Jarvis to Parliament, is south of the existing southern curb which would allow for any future transit system, be it interim or permanent. Mr. Glaisek continued that this allows Waterfront Toronto to build the missing MGT link and southern promenade while the transit debate unfolds. Mr. Geuze stated that he is glad to see the promenade move forward now because, once it is built, it will help build confidence that the asymmetrical right of way design solution is a success.

Another Panel Member observed that in the renderings, the north sidewalk does not appear to go to the facades of the Monde building and those further east. Mr. Geuze stated it was a graphical error because the southern colonnade on the Monde building was missing in the rendering and the paving does go to the edge of the colonnade. Mr. Geuze continued that further east the designs would need to be reconciled with the future Quayside developments but the intent is to extend the granite to the building facades.

The Chair agreed that it was a good question about how these details get adopted in future private developments on the north side. Mr. Freedman stated that one way to encourage consistency was to add the Queens Quay details to the standard city manual so developers know how to implement the designs.

## 2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel Member stated that, like the Bayside Water's Edge Promenade, it showed a clear vision and the effort taken to make sure that the design is applied consistently. The Panel Member encouraged the design team to avoid what they called "Spadina Avenue clutter"; review the signage system and keep it minimal and clearly placed for vehicles and pedestrians. The Panel Member also stated they are keen to see the Alternate Transportation Study in the coming months.

Another Panel Member stated this project has their full support and that they appreciated the rigor needed to implement the vision. The Panel Member then stated that using the standard TTC shelter is a lost opportunity and that they would like to see a better shelter. Mr. Glaisek stated that the TTC would not accept a custom shelter and therefore not maintain them; likewise with trash cans, the City wouldn't maintain them or pick up the trash if the bins were non-standard.

Another Panel Member applauded the rigor in applying the design and then stated that they have a concern with the signage and that the street will become cluttered with various signs. The Panel member encouraged the design team to work the city to avoid the so-called "wilful chaos".

Another Panel Member stated they are concerned about the construction of the overall project and offered the DRP's support.

Another Panel Member appreciated the thoughtfulness of the scheme and meticulous application of the details. The Panel Member then reiterated their comment on the Bayside WEP project and their concern about tree monocultures.

The Chair then stated that it was an admirable and intelligent application of the design and that they extended his term on the panel because he wanted to help ensure that the Queens Quay Revitalization project gets implemented.

## 2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Encourage consistency and continuity with Central Waterfront Queens Quay designs.
- 2) Would like the design to come back to panel to present an update on the agreed transit solution and how it integrates into the design.
- 3) Encourage more diversity in the street tree mix.
- 4) Review TTC shelter and the signage/wayfinding designs and provide an update at the next presentation.

The Chair thanked the Proponent for the presentation.

## 2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support, non-support or conditional support for the project.

The Panel voted unanimously to support the project.

---

### **3.0 Private Development Project: 21 Lower Jarvis, Go/Metrolinx Operational Building**

*ID#: 1044*

*Project Type: Building Design*

*Location: 21 Lower Jarvis*

*Proponent: Go/Metrolinx*

*Architect/Designer: Reinders + Rieder Ltd.*

*Review Stage: Detailed Design*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Joel Rieder, Reinders + Rieder Ltd.*

*Delegation: Michael Wolczyk, Go/Metrolinx*

#### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Alex Teixeira, Planner from City of Toronto, introduced the project to the Design Review Panel, noting that the project SPA was recently submitted. Mr Teixeira continued that this is the second presentation to the panel, the first was in December 2011, and the project did not receive panel support at the first presentation. Mr Teixeira then summarized the City's site plan comments:

- The building turns its back to Lower Jarvis Street
  - Location of the loading area faces Lower Jarvis Street
  - Negative impact of the building orientation on the public realm
- Need for site improvements along Lower Sherburne Street
- The amount and visibility of surface parking should be reduced
- Screening of the outdoor storage area needs improvement
- Need to improve the overall design of a utilitarian building

Mr. Teixeira then summarized the Panel comments from the first presentation:

- 1) Improve the environmental aspects of the building
- 2) Bring the architecture to a higher level
- 3) Study the building enclosure; develop a more unified design conception
- 4) Develop the landscape of the site

#### 3.2 Project Presentation

Michael Wolczyk, Director, Union Station Infrastructure for Go/Metrolinx, provided background and explained the requirement that the facility be on this site to be close to the rail corridor for maintenance and part storage. Mr. Wolczyk then presented images of the existing site and explained that the site is currently used for materials storage and stated that the proposed project will improve land use.

Joel Rieder, architect from Reinders + Rieder Ltd., presented the updated design to the Design Review Panel with plans, elevations and renderings, explaining they had shifted to a more historically referential design and that LEED silver is the minimum standard targeted.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel Member asked why it took a year to come back to the Panel when they had been told that the project was in rush. Mr. Rieder stated that he could not speak for the client but understands that Metrolinx was reviewing whether or not to move forward with this project. Mr. Rieder stated that there was an extensive review of the internal workings of the building and the vehicular circulation on the site. The Panel Member then asked if they had investigated flipping the building so the loading dock was on the east side with the pedestrian entrance on Jarvis. Mr. Rieder confirmed that they had done that study but it was too difficult to get trucks in and out of the loading dock. Mr. Rieder also stated that because there is no public use in the building, a main entrance on Jarvis wasn't seen as critical.

Another Panel Member asked for the width of the driveway, because it appears to create a large interruption in the Jarvis Street sidewalk. Mr. Rieder stated the driveway width was the result of necessary turning radii for trucks entering and exiting the loading area. Mr. Rieder explained that the design is proposing a coloured chip-seal treatment that looks like a red brick walkway to connect the sidewalks on either side.

Another Panel Member asked about the projecting on the south facade and the rationale for its shape. Mr. Rieder stated that it is long narrow building and extra space was needed on the top floor to accommodate the program.

The Chair asked whether there is an elevator in the building. Mr. Rieder stated there is a hydraulic elevator to the area where all the mechanical is located within the building. The Chair then asked if there was an image of the building as previously presented. Mr. Rieder provided a hard copy image to the Chair.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel Member stated that they would like to see the project and the overall building design simplified.

Another Panel member felt that this project downgrades the finishes being proposed elsewhere in the waterfront and appears to exacerbate the condition where the rail corridor and Gardiner separate the city from the waterfront. The Panel member stated that the public realm along Jarvis Street needs much improvement and the building needs to be smarter and simpler.

Another Panel member stated that LEED silver is inadequate, and believed the project could be more sustainable without impacting the overall budget. The Panel member also stated the white transformer needs to be removed to improve the overall Jarvis Street public realm, not just surrounded by vegetation.

Another Panel member agreed with the previous comments and felt there needs to be an overall rethink of the design including the entrance landscape which has a suburban quality. The Panel member suggested that an east-west tree planting along the site would help.

Another Panel member understood the desire for a simple brick building with a beautifying landscape but, encouraged the design team to simplify and enhance the industrial quality of the project and would encourage the proponent to shift the main entrance closer to Jarvis. The Panel member continued that it would be better to focus the budget on the building because it would be difficult to establish a landscape adjacent to the rail line.

Another Panel Member agreed with earlier comments that it would be better to reverse the loading dock and entrance to improve the Jarvis Street interface however, if moving the entrance was not possible, a lot of work would need to be done to improve the Jarvis Street façade and loading dock, including the removal of the white transformer box. The Panel member wished the project could have come back sooner so the panel could have helped direct the design at an earlier stage.

The Chair suggested the proponent review good precedents of industrial projects and masonry work. The Chair suggested projects by Leers Weinzapfel Associates, the Enwave building at Simcoe and Adelaide, Herzog and De Meuron's Signal Box, or David Chipperfield Architects. The Chair continued that the building design itself could be much cleaner and, given the prominence of the location, have a greater emphasis on design. The Chair stated that the project has a sound program and believes the design should strive to achieve a higher standard.

Several Panel members wondered if the project needs to be started fresh with a new design or even a new design team.

Mr. Glaisek asked if there was an alternate approach that did not require starting over but, providing additional direction. The Chair stated they could but, it involves a fundamental reworking of the design rather than a few minor revisions. Mr. Glaisek then requested that the Chair submit some examples of the suggested precedents. The Chair agreed to do so.

Another Panel Member stated that public buildings such as these should try to set the bar for private buildings to follow.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Clarify the massing and the volume (e.g. stair to the roof, loading dock, south facade projection, etc.) with improved order and proportions.
- 2) Revise the Jarvis Street interface and public realm.
- 3) The branding or perception of the building should be considered. This should be an important project for Metrolinx and should strive to be an example of design excellence on the waterfront.
- 4) Level of detail needs to be improved.

Mr. Wolczyk explained that what was presented is a project that started five years ago and it reflects the direction that was given by Metrolinx. Mr. Wolczyk continued that they are happy to go back, review the design and try to raise the bar.

The Chair thanked everyone.

### 3.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support, non-support or conditional support for the project.

The Panel voted unanimously for non-support of the project.

---

### **CLOSING**

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