



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #68  
Wednesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

---

**Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
George Baird  
Pat Hanson  
Betsy Williamson  
Gerry Faubert  
Jane Wolff

**Regrets:**

Bruce Kuwabara  
Claude Cormier

**Recording Secretaries:**

Margaret Goodfellow  
Tracy Watt

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
James Parakh

---

**WELCOME**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, noting that Bruce Kuwabara was unable to attend and asked him to chair the meeting.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair provided an overview of the agenda and asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the July 2013 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare. Brigitte Shim declared that she previously sat on the Board of Build Toronto and had not opined on the 10 York Project in prior presentations.

The Acting Chair then welcomed James Parakh, Acting Director of Urban Design to the Panel, noting that he is currently filling the position that Robert Freedman held.

The Acting Chair then stated that he had written an op ed article for the Toronto Star on the Island Airport expansion debate. The Acting added that a final report would be submitted to City Council in December. The Acting Chair then stated that he felt that the issue was not noise, but the impacts on traffic and congestion on the land side. One Panel member asked if there was any

analytical data to support the debate. Mr. Glaisek stated that there are numerous technical reports that are currently underway. The Acting Chair then added that some councilors are in the process of forming a subcommittee as well.

Mr. Glaisek then stated that Waterfront Toronto had not opined publically on the Island Airport debate due to the nature of its Governance Structure and the fact that the airport is outside of the Designated Waterfront Area. Mr. Glaisek added that the Waterfront Toronto Board now feels that they have to take a position and will do so after the technical reports are available.

One Panel member asked if the Panel should take a position. Mr. Glaisek stated that it did not make sense right now, adding that the issue should be revisited once the technical reports are available.

The Acting Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to provide his report.

---

## **REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN**

Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

### *Ontario Place Park and Trail*

- The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) recently announced the first step towards of the revitalization of Ontario Place with plans to construct a new urban park and waterfront trail at the eastern edge of the site. The Ministry of Infrastructure (MOI) has been engaged by MTCS, as the sponsoring Ministry, to be the proponent for the purpose of delivering the project. MOI has directed Infrastructure Ontario (IO) to undertake the project for completion by June 2015. MOI has requested that IO work closely with Waterfront Toronto (WT) in this effort.
- Waterfront Toronto has played an advisory role to date, but it is understood that ultimately, IO and WT will work cooperatively, leveraging WT's expertise in design, public consultation and park construction. The exact protocol is still being finalized.
- Infrastructure Ontario recently released an RFP for a design team for this fast tracked project which will ultimately be coming to the Design Review Panel.

### *Queens Quay Revitalization*

- Mr. Glaisek presented an update on construction activities along Queens Quay, noting that this presentation will also be presented to the Queen Quay Construction Liason Committee (CLC).

The Acting Chair then moved to the first project review.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **1.0 Private Development Application: 10 York Street (120 Harbour)**

*ID#: 1048*

*Project Type:* Buildings/Structures  
*Location:* 10 York Street  
*Proponent:* Tridel/Build Toronto  
*Architect/Designer:* Wallman Architects  
*Review Stage:* Schematic Design  
*Review Round:* Four  
*Presenter(s):* Rudy Wallman, Wallman Architects  
*Delegation:* Steve Daniels, Tridel

### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parakh introduced the project, thanking the Panel and team for working together to improve the project. York Street promenade. Working with the applicants for weather protection, Project has to come back at site plan. Section 37

Mr. Parakh then summarized the issues:

- Weather protection
- tower

### 1.2 Project Presentation

Rudy Wallman, principal at Wallman Architects, presented the project, noting that he was focussing on the treatment of podium and conditions at grade. Mr. Wallman noted that 10 York Street is 10 metres shorter than the ICE development to the north of the Gardiner expressway, in an effort to align with the ideal of stepping down towards the lake.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked where the request for weather protection came from. Mr. Parakh stated that City Staff requested it, largely because it is consistent along York Street. Another Panel member asked if the team had considered the weather protection to be fully part of the façade. Mr. Wallman stated that it was modeled, noting that the team felt it impacted that larger idea of this corner. Mr. Wallman added that they wanted to avoid a conventional projected canopy. Another Panel member asked what the team's design preference was for weather protection. Mr. Wallman answered that they prefer the current solution to a projected canopy, adding that the subtractive quality in combination with the entrance feature makes an interesting juxtaposition.

Another Panel member asked where the off ramp from the Gardiner Expressway meets Harbour Street. Mr. Parakh stated that the ramp comes down to grade further West of the site, at Simcoe street.

Another Panel member asked about the performance of the glass, especially on the West side. Mr. Wallman stated that there will be commercial grade curtain wall, adding that they have few balconies to lose energy on.

One Panel member asked what type of analysis had been done in terms of air quality, being next to the Gardiner. Mr. Wallman stated that air intakes for the building are located on the South side of the building, with exhaust located on the North side.

Another Panel member wondered what the unit breakdown was in terms of percentages. Mr. Wallman answered that there are typically 12 units per floor, mostly one-bedroom plus dens with

two bedroom units located at the corners. Mr. Wallman noted that there are no Studio units. Mr. Daniels added there were also twelve affordable rental units.

There being no other questions, the Acting Chair opened the meeting to the Panel comments.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members commended the project team on the great work that had been done since the last presentation in June 2012.

One Panel member felt that the podium is sculptural and severe, noting that the tower has a slightly different vocabulary. The Panel member added that the cuts and incisions into the podium should be exploited. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the podium is specific, but the tower seems more generic, adding that the tower could benefit from more of the language of the podium.

Several Panel members felt that the top of the building was successfully handled. One Panel member noted that it was more of an elevation than a roof.

Several Panel members felt that the graphic overlay on the podium should be revisited, toned down, or removed all together, feeling that the form of the building was graphic enough. One Panel member felt that the

One Panel member felt that they were not convinced by the resolution of the Lake Shore and York Street corner, feeling that the undercroft zone should extend right through to the corner. Other Panel members agreed, feeling that it impeded the public realm. One Panel member expressed concern over the underside of the canopy, feeling that there was a potential for it to be uncomfortable and windy space. Mr. Glaisek noted that discussions between the project team, WT and the Panel Chair had taken place where the idea of cutting the floor plate back to allow the light at the corner to come all the way through was discussed.

Another Panel member stated that the performance of the glazing on the South and West sides of the building will have to be exemplary, noting that the glass specification is critical. Another Panel member felt that to achieve clear glass that it needs to be low iron.

One Panel member requested that a section through York Street be provided at the next presentation that illustrates how they are shaping York Street.

Another Panel member wondered if there were any opportunities for openings or apertures from inside the mail room, adding that a balance between domesticity and monumentality of the base could be struck.

BW – top is improved. Very good. Hope is stays the same, remarkable cap. Adds to the language. The base and the top are the brackets. Tower got refined. Maybe the graphics and the metal . site gives you so much in terms of form. Corner angled piece gives you something, but not so that it gets fussy. The continuity of the glass may start to collect the grime. Think you are in great shape.

One Panel member urged the team to push the design potential of the parking and loading area through materials and lighting, feeling that it could be a really tough space.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Great progress and response to previous Panel comments.
- 2) The top is well done.
- 3) Reconsider how the corner element is resolved.
- 4) Continuity of the weather protection is important.
- 5) Come back to the Panel prior to finalizing the Site Plan Application. Present a coordinated street section and plan.

### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Wallman thanked the Panel for their feedback. Mr. Daniels and Mr. Wallman stated that they would likely be coming back in October or November.

### 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

---

## **CLOSING**

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