



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #134  
Wednesday, May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

---

**Present**

Paul Bedford, Chair  
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Janna Levitt  
Nina-Marie Lister  
Fadi Masoud  
Jeff Ranson  
Brigitte Shim  
Kevin Stelzer  
Eric Turcotte  
Michael Leckman (City of Toronto DRP)  
Heather Rolleston (City of Toronto DRP)  
Carl Blanchaer (City of Toronto DRP)

**Representatives**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto  
James Parakh, City of Toronto  
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

**Regrets**

**Recording Secretary**

Leon Lai

---

**WELCOME**

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

1. 55 Lake Shore Boulevard East Block 4 – Schematic Design

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the March. 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest.

George Baird declared conflicts for **55 Lake Shore Boulevard E. Block 4** and recused himself for the session.

The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting that **3C PL1 Schematic Design 2** received a vote of Full Support last month and has completed the DRP process. For **Port Lands Flood Protection: Parks Detailed Design**, Mr. Glaisek noted April 2020 DRP comments have been circulated to the design team and the project is not anticipated to return given a Full Support vote. If major changes take place in the future, Waterfront Toronto will bring the project back to the Panel. Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **Quayside** with excerpts from a statement made by Waterfront Toronto's Board Chair Steve Diamond on May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

WT Project News:

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on the construction of **Port Lands Flood Protection**, noting that slurry walls along the perimeter of the river valley have been completed, remaining section will be protected by structural cut-off walls. **Cherry St. Stormwater Treatment Facility** construction continues, Mr. Glaisek noted mechanical equipment is being installed, electrical duct bank is underway to be poured, and the team is addressing concrete quality issues with medium sandblasting to correct deficiencies. Mr. Glaisek noted **Lake Shore Boulevard Public Realm** Pilot Project began construction, the site is located at the corner of Lake Shore and Bonnycastle St.. The team will monitor features including resilient bioretention planting, passive storm irrigation, permeable pavers, sub-base, and exposed aggregate concrete.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the temporary public art installation of PLFP as part of the Contact Photography Festival has been cancelled, over the next weeks, Waterfront Toronto will be publishing a series of online photo stories with videos of 130 Commissioners Steet. The work will feature photos by Vid Ingelevics & Ryan Walker. Mr. Glaisek concluded the segment with an update on June's upcoming DRP projects.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair noted 55 Lake Shore Boulevard Block 4 is a joint-review and welcomed the City Panel members today, clarifying that the City Panel member will participate in the Q&A and comments but will not vote at the end of the review. The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

---

## PROJECT REVIEWS

### **1.0 55 Lake Shore Boulevard East Block 4 – Schematic Design**

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1075
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Two
<i>Location:</i>	Lower Yonge
<i>Proponent:</i>	Menkes
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	architectsAlliance, NAK Design Group, GBCA
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Peter Clewes, architectsAlliance; Sibylle Von Knoblock, NAK Design Group; Craig McIntyre, EQ Building
<i>Delegation:</i>	Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Ran Chen, City of Toronto; Nader Kadri, City of Toronto; Carly Bowman, City of Toronto; Blair Robinson, architectsAlliance; Jude Tersigni, Menkes; Jennifer Lane, Menkes; Mark Karam, Menkes; Jared Menkes, Menkes; Peter Menkes, Menkes; Joel Pearlman, Menkes

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

Caroline Kim, Urban Design Manager with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by noting the existing site context, DRP history and development timeline. Ms. Kim noted the site is part of the LCBO lands, the proposed massing is in accordance with the approved settlement in 2018 and full compliance with the site-specific zoning bylaw. Ms. Kim noted there are three residential towers with heights of 79, 87, and 90 storeys, set on top of two mixed-use podiums with various preserved and re-integrated elements from the existing LCBO office and warehouse building. Programmatically, the north podium contains residential lobbies, the south contains day-care and public school pending approval from TDSB and the Ministry. The area between the two podiums will be developed as a shared street and provide a mid-block pedestrian connection.

Ms. Kim recapped the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan including transportation and street network, street types, public realm, mid-block connections, and public art plan. Ms. Kim provided a summary of the Lake Shore Public Realm design and noted the project is here for Schematic Design. Ms. Kim provided a recap of the Consensus Comments from Nov. 2016's review and noted the areas for Panel consideration: a connected and animated public realm, integration of heritage elements on site, landscape design, and sustainability objectives. Ms. Kim then introduced Peter Clewes, Principal with architectsAlliance, to give the design presentation.

#### **1.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Clewes began the presentation by noting that the project was last reviewed four years ago and a series of changes have been made to the master plan subsequent to that review. Mr. Clewes provided an update on the block plan, mid-block connections, connection to the PATH network, land use, and the proposed built-form.

## Building

Mr. Clewes detailed the tower heights, step-backs, and separation distances as laid out in the settlement. Mr. Clewes noted the parking, loading, and ground floor animation strategies, then provided a recap of the design of Block 1 and 2. Mr. Clewes noted the programmatic distribution on each podium floor and summarized the project statistics. Mr. Clewes provided a series of sectional perspectives describing the heritage mews and exterior views depicting the proposed façade treatments and public realm design. Mr. Clewes noted the entire face of the Harbour St. façade is glazed to provide a different character for retail and school programs, while providing a continuous canopy for weather protection. At the heritage facades, Mr. Clewes noted the team is interested in carving into the elevations, like a colonnade, to create functional and visual porosity. Mr. Clewes then introduced Sibylle Von Knoblock, Partner with NAK Design Group, to continue the landscape design presentation.

## Landscape

Ms. Von Knoblock noted the boulevard designs in plan, including integration of the Lower Yonge Streetscape design, waterfront standard pavers, pedestrian clearways, and rows of trees. Ms. Von Knoblock noted the planting and tree species, movable furniture, and paving patterns. At the school entrance area, Ms. Von Knoblock noted the team interested in creating a striped paving pattern with five types of pavers. At the heritage mews, Ms. Von Knoblock provided information on the custom outdoor furniture, light pole, planters, and pavement patterns. Ms. Von Knoblock provided a summary of the street tree and planting palette.

## Sustainability

Mr. Clewes provided a summary of the project's sustainability targets, inspired by Waterfront Toronto's MGBR standards, including electric vehicle infrastructure, cycling infrastructure, connectivity, green roofs, high-efficiency appliances, etc. No decision has been made yet on an Enwave district energy connection. Mr. Clewes noted the units are designed for long term flexibility and concluded that glazing is maximized to enhance liability of the units.

### **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the project has been analysed with regards to the Toronto Green Standards and if the presented sustainability targets are the appropriate focus. Mr. McIntyre responded the project has been submitted for TGS v3, the energy performance falls a little short when compared to the new requirements, but this project is not required to meet those targets. TEDI is 65, which is better than the minimum requirement because there is a focus on the envelop design to meet the new requirement.

Another Panel member asked if the development application approval includes the review of the tower designs, and if the tower locations changed since 2016. Mr. Parakh noted the review scope today includes aspects of the design laid out by City Urban Design as areas of focus. The Panel member asked for clarification on the vehicular use of the mews and access to parking. Mr. Clewes answered the access is for four levels of underground parking and it is not designated for trucks.

One Panel member asked for more information on the day-care drop off and pickup, the number of openings in the heritage façade, tower representation in the renderings, and the status of the park. Mr. Robinson noted there is at grade and P1 drop-off for the day-care. Mr. Clewes noted each street is afforded two openings and the rendering shows all three towers with one being behind the two in the north. Mr. Kadri noted that the latest target date of the park is 2028, the procurement process of the park has not started and the team is working with TDSB to come up with some potential shared solutions to see how the park can evolve over time.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the width of the heritage mews. Mr. Clewes noted the existing heritage building frontages determine the width of the mews. City Heritage suggested to maintain the existing east, west, and north facades in-situ retaining the structure- the flexibility is provided at the south façade where future Harbour Street comes through.

One Panel member asked for the mid-block connection relationship between 1-7 Yonge and 55 Lake Shore, and clarification on the retail space program. Mr. Clewes noted the 1-7 Yonge mid-block connection is at grade, north of the heritage mews, and there is an elevator at the mews to bring one up to the path connection. Mr. Tersigni noted the retail landscape is changing, Menkes is exploring different opportunities while trying to maintain maximum flexibility. However, it will not likely be a food store since Block 1 is already targeting that type of tenant.

Another Panel member asked for the sidewalk width on Freeland St. and the anticipated number of students at the school. Ms. Von Knoblock noted the sidewalk clearway is 3.7m. Mr. Clewes answered the elementary school is designed for approximately four hundred students and the LCBO has stipulated, on the basis of marketing, that the only place for the school is at the south façade.

Another Panel member asked for the pick-up and drop-off area for the south tower, the rationale behind the small amount of ground floor animation along Cooperage Street, and if most retail spaces are dedicated for the PATH. Mr. Clewes answered the south tower drop-off is off Harbour Street, and the retail configurations can be shifted. The Panel member asked for the location of the school entrance and if a shadow study has been completed for the mews. Mr. Clewes noted the entrance to the school is through the colonnade at the southwest corner of the podium and that the shadow situation is difficult, but a study can be provided.

One Panel member asked for the heritage façade restrictions. Mr. Clewes answered that anything beyond maintaining the facades with no intervention is a negotiation.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the ventilation and mechanical strategy. Mr. Robinson answered there will be ERVs for the suits providing makeup air to each floor, air in corridors will be minimized with fresh air coming in from units. The fan coil system is distributing hot and chilled water and Menkes is exploring an Enwave connection.

One Panel member noted the sustainability models as stated in the indicative report closely approached the TGS Tier 1 requirement and asked for more information on the green house emission of the project.

#### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member appreciated the project focus and the public realm development. The Panel member noted the mews is a troublesome area in the planning, the massive columns impede on the experience, and felt more like a road with sidewalks than a mews – consider improving the design for the mews to read more pedestrian, such as providing more space for sidewalks, to allow walking around columns and more space in front of the large retail spaces. The Panel member noted to consider improvement the co-use by limiting to the width for one car only at the road entrances. It is important to treat the columns and ensure they support a sense of welcome for the ground floor programs. With COVID, the city has developed a new sensibility towards public space, the Panel member noted it is important to visualize the public realm with more people using them. The Panel member encouraged the team to find ways to lower the EUI to under 50 and commented that the elevated bridges are not supported.

Another Panel member noted the only equivalent scale of project to this one is at Bloor St. and Yonge St and commended the powerful representation of the development, particularly the gothic proportions and heights. On the other hand, the Panel member felt the landscape is too domestic and should be made more urban. The Panel member asked the team to consider opportunities to go beyond the current payback periods and improve the sustainability goals, such as using different types of glazing responding to the various programs and thus improve EUI.

One Panel member commended the strategy for ground floor animation, heritage retention, integration of the new south façade, framing of the future park, and was excited for the project ambition. The Panel member appreciated both affordable and market units sharing the residential lobbies. There is no question on the heroic architectural gestures in raising the buildings, but the Panel member is concerned that these volumes, such as the columns and the elevator cores, are diminishing the quality of the mews. The Panel member took exception that the towers are not being reviewed, noted the architectural design of the buildings here have to be exceptional, the joint-DRP has a responsibility to review those aspect.

Another Panel member appreciated the clarity of the presentation, the programmatic organization, and felt the heritage facades are too opaque – more openings should be considered. The Panel member supported the gothic proportions of the raised towers and asked the team to be more playful with treating the column and tower volumes that are carried to grade, i.e. public art integration.

One Panel suggested to prioritize pedestrian use on the public realm and noted bridges are not supported as they do not promote an animated public realm. The Panel member appreciated the thoughtfulness in the building design and noted the same level of leadership should be demonstrated for the landscape and public realm. It is

important to maximize public realm opportunities wherever possible and create spaces for pedestrians to gather at grade.

Another Panel member supported the overall heritage strategy but was concerned with the public realm design. The Panel member noted more space should be provided for the mews to accommodate the population in the buildings and people moving through. The Panel member asked for shadow studies, more information on below grade infrastructure, and noted the current public realm allocation is minimum. Consider conceiving the plan in the context of the greater precinct.

One Panel member noted it is an incredibly complex project and the vertical shading elements on the south glazed façade should be made horizontal to better respond to the sun. The Panel member is concerned with the small amount of sunlight that will penetrate to the mews and the health of landscape under those circumstances. The Panel member noted sidewalk width is a concern for the size of the development and encouraged the design team to embrace thermal bridging to improve energy performance and reduce carbon consumption. Furthermore, the Panel member noted that the argument for thermal bridging is related to human comfort and that the cost argument is invalid- it is time to take on a progressive approach to the design of high-rise balconies.

Another Panel member noted the east-west mid-block connection is an important part of an emerging public realm that will connect the various blocks at 55 LSBE, consider aligning the mid-block connection with adjacent projects. The Panel member noted that the Path connection appears to avoid the mews altogether, consider alternative configurations to improve access. The Panel member encouraged more creative ways of designing the massive columns, such as a reflective surface, to better engage the public realm. The Panel member noted the park is very important and should not lag in its development, consider coordinating the timing of the delivery of the park with the residential portions.

Given the prominence of the site and impacts of COVID-19, one Panel member called for leadership from the City to consider the right-of-ways, sidewalks, so the public realm can be more flexible and have opportunities to innovate. The Panel member supported that the park should be delivered first, which will help define the value of the public realm. The Panel member asked to consider Freeland St. as a woonerf to discourage cars, provide additional space for children to play, and overall a more imaginative perimeter to stimulate ground floor animation.

Another Panel member asked the team to consider further consolidate the pick-up and drop-off areas at the mews. The Panel member noted the character, presence, and identity of the mews is unclear when the heritage bridges are visually interrupted by the tower vertical elements in front – consider moving the bridge to the other side of the columns. The Panel member recommended to enlarge the openings along Freeland Street to improve porosity on the edges of the site.

One Panel member recommended wrapping the ground floor with retail and felt that the colored pavement is not a proxy for strong public space that will support animation - other alternatives should be considered. The Panel member suggested to take more

liberty in improving the school frontage, elevate the sense of welcome and accessibility for parents with strollers. The Panel member recommended to rework the Freeland St. frontage to appropriately address crowds and access to school and day-care.

Another Panel member recognized that while energy economics are important and they do not typically lend themselves well to residential development, the team is still encouraged to consider the carbon impact when it comes to metrics of window-to-wall ratio and EUIs. The Panel member noted a significant carbon contribution for this project will come from its construction. Even at the completion of the project, there will already be a large carbon deficit that should be made up. The Panel member asked the team to consider reducing embodied carbon and energy use, such as improving the mean radiant temperature by having a higher performance envelope, to further improve comfort and usability. Another aspect is to allow flexibility in the systems in anticipation for modifications that will have to be done to meet the carbon neutral goal by 2050.

One Panel member noted the energy model figures submitted for EUI closely approaches the TGS Tier 1 standard and encouraged further improvement. The Panel member noted the TEDI number has exceeded Tier 1 while greenhouse gas emission is still over. While an argument for balcony was made with the justification of providing passive shading to the units, the Panel member noted the primary energy load for all buildings is still heating - it is important for the design team to recognize this in improving the overall energy use. Lastly, the Panel member noted a connection with Enwave district energy should be strongly considered to lower carbon intensity.

## **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

### General

- Strong support for the overall design strategy on a huge project with a great magnitude of complexity.
- Appreciated the organization of the program and integration of diverse uses in a positive and progressive manner.
- Given the immense scale, city-wide visual impact, and landmark status of the project, it is important to have an opportunity to provide comments on the materiality, colors, and architectural expressions of the towers.
- The Panel commended the block-wide servicing strategy which helps minimize at-grade use for loading and service access that would otherwise interrupt the public realm experience.

### Public Realm

- Conceive the ground plane as a continuous network of porous public spaces, not only throughout the project, but also linking with the adjacent blocks.
- Given the high number of residents, users, and the post-COVID demand for public space, consider a more generous public realm at grade.
- The public realm can be further improved to have more robust use, consider maximizing opportunities for gatherings in numerous locations.

- Explore ways to maximize exposure to sunlight and leverage those moments for great public use.
- Exploring opportunities for widening the sidewalks, particularly along Lake Shore Boulevard, in conjunction with Waterfront Toronto and the City.
- At Freeland St., explore the opportunity of a more woonerf style design to better accommodate the large volume of children accessing the day-care and school, in conjunction with Waterfront Toronto and the City.
- Consider strategies to minimize vehicular conflict and provide a wider sidewalk to increase the public realm and improve safety.

#### Heritage Mews

- The heritage mews is a unique opportunity for this site and it is important to maximize its potential. Consider the cultural ambition and architectural character of the Brookfield Place Atrium designed by Santiago Calatrava, another mid-block connection, as an aspirational example for the mews.
- Explore the possibility of widening the mews to increase overall public realm, in conjunction with Waterfront Toronto and the City.
- Consider emphasizing pedestrian use by widening the sidewalks, especially on the south side to provide more space for retail access, while recognizing a minimized vehicular use with pinched entrances on either ends of the road.
- The proposed exterior treatment of the elevator cores and columns in the heritage mews diminish the quality of the public realm and heritage facades, consider all sides of the built-form, including soffits, as character defining opportunities, i.e. public art on facades.
- Provide shadow and sun studies for the space.

#### Landscape

- The Panel appreciated the removal of the retail component of the park, and encourages designing the park earlier than later to ensure the design and delivery are well integrated with the buildings.
- Provide details on the soil volumes, landscaping, and relationship to the site infrastructure to ensure the conditions are fully designed and coordinated.

#### Building

- Further maximize daylight penetration at the day-care and school through modifications to the building.
- Appreciated the strong retail presence along Harbour St., consider further refining the façade to bring a finer-grain expression and sense of welcome.

#### Sustainability

- Appreciated the flexible and innovative unit designs that accommodate the potential for future conversions.
- Consider further improvements to the sustainability strategies to improve the EUI.
- Thermal bridging at the balconies remains a sustainability and occupant comfort concern.
- Given the timeline of the project, it is important to go beyond the current energy performance and carbon emission objectives, and consider a higher standard.

- Continue to explore the potential of an Enwave connection.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Mr. Clewes noted the commentary provided today is helpful, the challenge in assessing the impact of the projects at this metropolitan scale that appears to lack the granularity of Toronto. Mr. Clewes appreciated the commentary sincerely and will take the suggestions to heart.

#### **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 Conditional Support (Unanimous) for the project.

#### **CLOSING**

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.