



WATERFRONTToronto

Consensus Comments

Waterfront Design Review Panel #127

Wednesday, Sept. 25, 2019

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Pat Hanson

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto

Consensus Comments reflect the general position of the Panel on a project and are based on the summary provided by the Waterfront Design Review Panel Chair during the meeting. The Meeting Minutes will be published following adoption by the Panel at the next meeting and will include the consensus comments as well as reflect individual Panel comments or discussions during the review sessions.

1.0 West Don Lands Blocks 3,4,7 – Schematic Design

Project ID #: 1106
Project Type: Building
Review Stage: Schematic Design
Review Round: Two
Location: West Don Lands
Proponent: Dream, Kilmer, Tricon
Architect/ Designer: COBE, architectsAlliance
Presenter(s): Thomas Krarup, Project Director, COBE; Adam Feldmann, architectsAlliance; Lauren Abrahams, PUBLIC WORK
Delegation: Michelle Ackerman, Kilmer; Tony Medeiros, Dream; Josh Hilbert, Waterfront Toronto; Henry Tang, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Vote:

Conditional Support - 5; Non-support - 2

General

- The Panel commended the team for the constant evolution of the design and appreciated the helpful presentation.
- Many private versus public relationships in the project are unclear, including transition zones, thresholds, and townhouses that front onto the POP space, townhouses facing the east-west service street, townhouses on Mill St., and units that look onto the third-floor roof amenity terrace.
- The current townhouse and courtyard relationship creates a very private POP space while introducing privacy concerns for the townhouse residents, consider alternatives and rethink the placement of units. ie. A larger Front St. facing public space that does not connect to the east-west street if a through-block connection is not necessary.

Building

- The Panel appreciated the site context studies
- Recommended the team to fully represent contextual information and key neighbouring sites in the presentation, including the Soulpepper Theatre and other buildings on Mill Street.
- Appreciated the 3D rendering of the project in the winter and on a cloudy day.
- Supported the massing concept of brick base with lighter colored volumes on top.
- For Block 7, given the site context to the south, rethink the appropriateness of townhouse units at grade.
- Consider shifting more of the bicycle parking underground and free up more ground floor activation space.
- The project corners are underdeveloped, consider further developing Blocks 3 and 4 building massing to create great public corner spaces.
- The Panel was concerned with the relationship between Block 7, Block 4, and the Cherry St. curve, provide more site context to the east.
- Based on the shadow studies provided, the Panel is concerned that the courtyard POP space will have little sunlight even during noon hours in the fall and spring, rethink the POP space strategy and/or building massing.

Landscape

- Although the biodiversity “round planter” concept in the POP space is appreciated, consider a more robust ecological landscape strategy that can contribute to improving the sustainability performance of the project.
- Consider a stronger landscape strategy in the public realm to improve connectivity, such as at the corners of the site.

Sustainability

- The sustainability targets are too low for the project, it is important for the team to consider more ambitious objectives.

- The Panel members that voted Non-support expressed sustainability objectives as a key concern.

2.0 350 Queens Quay West – Schematic Design

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1073
<i>Project Type:</i>	Building
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Schematic Design
<i>Review Round:</i>	Three
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	Pacific Reach Properties Development
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	Quadrangle
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Les Klein, Principal, Quadrangle; Brad Keeler, Forrec
<i>Delegation:</i>	Ken Brooke, Quadrangle; Shehzad Somji, Pacific Reach Properties Development; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Katherine Bailey (not present for review), City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
<i>Vote:</i>	Full Support - 7 ; Non-support - 1

General

- Public realm is the focus on this review, along with updates to building design shown previously.
- Strong support for the overall project design.

Building

- Appreciated the revisions to the north-south passageway design and consider if doors are necessary for its functionality.
- The east-west connection to future Rees Park is critical, encouraged the team to consider fully in the design now, not wait until future.
- Suggestions to improve the ground floor and second floor building frontage along Lakeshore to create opportunities for more transparency and public realm animation.
- Encouraged the design team to create depth in the building elevation, consider further articulating fenestration.
- The Panel felt the north wall addition to the western-most tower would be very positive in completing the development and encouraged the City and proponent to pursue it in the future when the parking garage becomes subject for development.

Landscape

- Overall support for the landscape design.
- The Panel encouraged Waterfront Toronto and PF&R to take advantage of this opportunity to advance the public realm surrounding Peter Street Basin.
- Proposed bollards look flimsy, consider alternatives.

- Consider the consistent use of public realm details to create cohesiveness in the design. ie the railing detail.
- It is important to provide shade in the public realm around the basin, consider the incorporation of awnings and other shading devices on the retail facades.

Sustainability

- n/a

3.0 Port Lands Flood Protection Roads – Detailed Design

Project ID #: 1095
Project Type: Master Plan
Review Stage: Detailed Design
Review Round: Fifth
Location: Port Lands
Proponent: Waterfront Toronto
Architect/ Designer: DTAH, WSP
Presenter(s): See-Yin Lim, DTAH; James Roche, DTAH; Aaron Small, WSP
Delegation: Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design, WT; Shannon Baker, Director, Parks and Public Realm, WT
Vote: **Full Support - Unanimous**

General

- Overall support for the project.
- The Panel encouraged the team to identify and strengthen elements that will make the project more powerful and exciting, ie. emphasize the extraordinariness of the streets such as spatial allocation, etc.

Landscape

- The character of the streets could be strengthened by considering long-term and seasonal impact in developing a unique Toronto character.
- Articulate and celebrate elements of the project that stand out from the status quo.
- Climate change will have an impact on the project, consider an approach for design and planting diversity.
- At the crossings and refuge areas, consider the materiality and space allocation to ensure accommodation of the aging population.
- Consider both the interim and future site conditions in the design approach, ie. the cycling path design before and after the moving of the Gardiner structure

Sustainability

- n/a

4.0 162 Queens Quay East – Detailed Design

Project ID #: 1104
Project Type: Building
Review Stage: Detailed Design

Review Round: Three
Location: East Bayfront
Proponent: 162 Queens Quay GP Inc.
Architect/ Designer: Kirkor Architects, Alexander Budrevics + Associates
Presenter(s): David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects; Shannon Gallant, Alexander Budrevics + Associates Landscape Architects; Carleigh Oude-Reimerink, Armstrong Planning & Project Management
Delegation: Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Paul Mule, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto
Vote: **Conditional-support - Unanimous**

General

- Appreciated the serious and detailed responses to previous Panel comments.
- Commended the video animations in illustrating how all the pieces come together.
- Congratulated the team for the continued evolution of the project.

Building

- Consider further refinement to the building corners, specifically the canopy details and interface with corner columns.
- Clarify the final intent of the ground floor facades, specifically the north elevation in relation to the new east-west street, consider enhanced treatment of the loading and service frontages and doors.
- Consider bird control measures for the mirror-finish metal panels.

Landscape

- The roof terrace is an important amenity for residents, consider enhancing the landscape species, provide more accurate representation in drawings of seasonality.

Sustainability

- The project is barely meeting the EUI requirement, consider maximizing insulation throughout the building envelope and other strategies.