



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #98
Wednesday, February 15, 2016**

Present

Paul Bedford, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Claude Cormier
Betsy Williamson

Regrets

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
Pat Hanson
Chris Reed
Brigitte Shim

Recording Secretaries:

Tristan Simpson
Rei Tasaka

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

WELCOME

The Vice Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Vice Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the January meeting. The minutes were adopted.

Mr. Fleissig provided the Panel with an update on the last Board Meeting held with the new Board members. Mr. Fleissig noted that the meeting went well and felt that the new member's backgrounds will be beneficial to the direction that Waterfront Toronto is moving towards with regards to partnerships and funding models.

Mr. Fleissig informed the Panel that Bruce Kuwabara has announced that his last meeting as a Panel member will be in March, and an event is being planned to celebrate his contributions to the Panel.

Mr. Fleissig also noted that Waterfront Toronto is working with the City of Toronto to better align both DRP processes.

The Vice Chair then invited Chris Glaisek, Senior Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report.

Mr. Glaisek provided an overview of the construction progress happening at Bayside, noting that Aquavista received Notice of Approval Conditions in January. Mr. Glaisek also explained that the Aitken Place Park construction tender will be issued in February.

Mr. Glaisek showed the Panel some images from the Ice Breakers Outdoor Art Installations and noted that the exhibition will be displayed until February 26, 2017. Mr. Glaisek noted that there are five pieces strategically distributed along the waterfront from Yonge Street to Bathurst Street.

Mr. Glaisek informed the Panel that the Design Review Panel Call for New Members has been posted on the Waterfront Toronto website and will be published in the February 17th issue of the *Novae Res Urbis*. The ad will also be promoted on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn.

Mr. Glaisek provided the Panel with updates on projects from the January 25th meeting. Mr. Glaisek noted that City Planning has asked 300 Commissioners Street Storage Facility to return to the Design Review Panel for another review. The Jack Layton Ferry Terminal design team has engaged Carolina Soderholm (Designholmen) and Kristina Ljubanovic (Bespoke) to develop the wayfinding and signage strategy. The Cherry Street Lakefilling design team is looking into the MT35 building, the park and the Trinity Pedestrian Bridge in response to Panel comments.

PROJECT REVIEWS

Carbon Reduction Studies – (For Information Only)

Project Type: Information

Presenter(s): Anna Palamarchuk, Waterfront Toronto

1.1 Project Presentation

Anna Palamarchuk, the Environment and Innovation Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, explained that sustainability has been a key corporate objective from the outset. The sustainability framework was created in 2005 as a roadmap for how to transform sustainable communities. Ms. Palamarchuk noted that this document is currently being updated and will be called the Resilience and Innovation Framework. This document will focus on climate change mitigation, resilience, innovation, and intelligent communities.

Ms. Palamarchuk reviewed the current climate change context which is driving the urgency to figure out how waterfront communities can contribute to carbon reductions. The Paris Agreement, an agreement within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, was adopted by consensus on December 21, 2015, by all nations of the world. Ms. Palamarchuk explained that some of the key commitments include holding the

increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius. The world will have to decrease emissions by 4% a year in order to reach the 2 degree target, and 10 % to reach the 1.5 degree target. Ms. Palamarchuk noted that Waterfront Toronto joined the Climate Positive Development Program which focuses on emissions from buildings, transportation, water, solid waste and wastewater.

Ms. Palamarchuk provided an overview of the proposed Waterfront Toronto Strategies which includes, rooftop solar, transport mode shift, transport electrification, “Passive House”, and heating electrification. Ms. Palamarchuk explained that “Passive House” is maximizing solar gain through building insulation and orientation. This helps to capture and store energy which reduces energy demand and mechanical heating requirements. Ms. Palamarchuk explained that vehicle electrification and mode shift would involve designing streets for transit, cycling and walking, and the potential for future autonomous vehicles. Ms. Palamarchuk described the photovoltaic system being a combination of roof and site photovoltaic coverage of 30%. Ms. Palamarchuk described the next steps which involve updating the Minimum Green Building Requirements with a focus on, reducing energy demand, increasing renewable energy generation, integrating resilience strategies, expanding smart building infrastructure. Ms. Palamarchuk also noted that Waterfront Toronto will be working with ARUP on Sustainability Strategies with the goal of climate positive. Ms. Palamarchuk concluded by saying that the ultimate goal is to embed these strategies into everything we do.

1.2 Panel Questions and Comments

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

One Panel member asked whether ARUP has recommended the combined heat and power. Ms. Palamarchuk replied yes. The Panel member questioned this recommendation given that this still requires combustion. The Panel member noted that Sweden, the most sustainable country in the world, is using biomass fuelled combining heat and power.

Another Panel member asked how “clean” the Toronto grid is. Ms. Palamarchuk replied that our grid is 8% fossil fuels based, and the rest is hydro or other.

One of the Panel members was concerned about using soft language and explained that once these goals become a requirement, developers will comply. The Panel member felt that this was an aspirational report but wanted to know how this is going to be implemented. Mr. Glaisek noted that Quayside will be exploring all of these new approaches as a pilot project.

Another Panel member asked if “Passive House” will work on Villiers Island. Mr. Glaisek responded that they are working with the City of Toronto towards “Passive House” as a component of the Villiers Island Precinct Plan.

2.0 Tommy Thompson Park Infrastructure

ID#: 1079

Project Type: Pavilion and Park

Location: Tommy Thompson Park

Proponent: TRCA

Architect/Designer: DTAH

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Megan Torza (DTAH), James Roche (DTAH)

Delegation: Andrea Chreston (TRCA),

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by noting that a previous version of this project designed by Montgomery Sisam Architects (MSA) was reviewed by the Panel previously. Mr. Glaisek walked the Panel through the last MSA presentation as a reminder of what was previously presented. Mr. Glaisek noted that only three of the four pavilions were built due to budget constraints, and now the fourth is being delivered by a different agency with a different designer. Mr. Glaisek raised a number of issues for the Panel to consider, including the continuity with existing buildings designed by MSA, the relationship of the proposed pavilion to circulation, arrival, and event space, and the edge condition where the granular and natural area interface.

2.2 Project Presentation

Megan Torza, Associate with DTAH, began by informing the Panel that the project is halfway through Schematic Design, and a number meetings have been held with Stakeholders, including Friends of the Spit and other outdoor recreation groups who are interested in the outcome of this project. Ms. Torza noted that the team is working on the basis of information provided by Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and the previous work done by MSA with the hopes of building on this work. Ms. Torza noted that the intention is to avoid overbuilding the site and ensure that it's not too urban or refined. Ms. Torza explained the existing conditions which includes a gravel parking lot that has expanded due to the increased pedestrian traffic visiting the park, a small information shelter, and a bus turnaround accommodated by a multi-use trail bulb out.

Ms. Torza then introduced James Roche, Associate with DTAH, to present the landscape portion of the project. Mr. Roche described the existing forest conditions as fresh-moist poplar deciduous. The fill is high is clay, so there is lots of perched wetlands. Mr. Roche noted that the stormwater strategy involves raising the grade which creates high points on the parking lot allowing for the stormwater to drain into the swales. Mr. Roche noted that there is currently lots of ponding which the bioswales would help alleviate. Mr. Roche also noted the possibility of making a thicket using dogwood which creates a visual marker for the site. Mr. Roche described the proposed landscape palette which includes, porous pavement, dogwood for screening, gabion walls, and planted swales.

Ms. Torza walked the Panel through the pavilion design which will be located at the threshold between the parking lot and the park. The architecture is intended to be integrated with the surrounding landscape. Ms. Torza explained the material palette proposed for the pavilion will consist of weathering steel soffit, a gabion wall, board-form concrete, and steel columns. The lighting strategy consists of night sky friendly lighting that will be located along the perimeter of the building under the canopy. Ms. Torza walked the Panel through the timeline of the project noting that they are hoping to go to tender and receive City Approvals this summer, with the intention of starting construction in October, 2017.

2.3 Panel Questions

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

One of the Panel members asked how the 100 parking stall requirement came about. Ms. Chreston noted that the number comes from the latest version of the Masterplan from 1992, which identified the need for 100 spaces based on the numbers of visitors and groups to the park. The current parking lot has 100 spaces and it gets filled during the summer months. Overflow parks along Unwin Avenue and along Leslie Street.

Another Panel member asked whether the team has discussed not using Cor-Ten as it leeches heavy metals into the ground and therefore is not environmentally sensitive. Ms. Torza responded that the original design did not include Cor-Ten, however through stakeholder consultation the material was brought in to relate to the other pavilions. Ms. Torza also noted that the Cor-Ten is used only on the underside of the soffit where there is less exposure to water damage. The Panel member questioned the lighting plan given the dark Cor-Ten material and the up-lighting. Ms. Torza replied that the lighting upward is meant to keep the lighting at a minimum on site but also comply with City's lighting regulations.

Another Panel member asked what the table top around the parking lot and walkway is made of. Mr. Roche responded that the material is concrete. The Panel member asked whether the team has considered planting trees in the parking lot. Mr. Roche responded that it comes down to whether there is enough uncontaminated soil volume underneath. Currently this is not the case and the goal is to minimize excavation on site.

Another Panel member asked to clarify the scale of activity regarding trucks dumping materials currently on site. Ms. Chreston noted that the truck traffic and lake filling activity is fairly small. The multi-use trail is currently a controlled open from Monday to Friday, 7am to 5pm for trucks to access the site, however they do not observe much traffic. Ports Toronto currently operates the lakefilling which has been ceased as of last year. Ports Toronto's lease with Natural Resources expires next year and TRCA does not anticipate renewal. The Panel member then asked whether they expect the land filling activity to fully stop. Ms. Chreston noted that at this point the activity has stopped. However, they anticipate work to stabilize the shoreline and other maintenance related activities. The Panel member asked if bikes are permitted in the park. Mr. Roche noted that they are permitted along the multi-use trails.

One Panel member asked about the design for the gate and whether there was a proposal. Ms. Torza replied that there isn't a design yet. The gate shown in the renderings is what the City has recommended as the preferred gate. The Panel member asked if there was any thought in incorporating rubble into the concrete. Mr. Roche replied that this was considered, however, due to cost, concrete was chosen as the best option. Mr. Roche noted that they will be looking into breaking up the monotony of the concrete.

Another Panel member asked how many events are held in this space per year. Ms. Chreston replied that there is generally one to two events per year, but they are looking to hold more events given that the park will now be open frequently.

One Panel member asked where the closest TTC stop is. Mr. Roche noted that the closest stop is on Commissioners Street. Mr. Roche noted that a stop at the corner of Leslie and Unwin Street would be ideal.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Vice Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One Panel member noted that a lot of time was spent with MSA talking about material choice and deployment. The Panel member noted that is not just about mimicking the material palette. The Panel member felt that the materials proposed on the pavilion are decorative and nothing more. The Panel member also felt that the columns are minute and non-conceptual and urged the design team to up the weight and toughness of the pavilion.

One Panel member noted that Poplars and Cottonwoods grow very fast and recommended discarding the multi-stem and using Poplars instead. The Panel member also felt that adding trees to the parking lot swales would be beneficial to the space and help anchor the project and naturalize the pavilion. The Panel member also proposed adding a green roof on the pavilion.

Another Panel member noted that the intersection at Unwin and Leslie Street should be regularized. The existing multi-use trail is needing to be torqued in an awkward way due to the irregular intersection.

2.5 Consensus Comments

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

- The gate at the entrance needs to be more than just an ordinary gate
- Incorporate Poplar trees at the entrance to create a buffer between the parking lot and the street
- Consider using an alternative material other than CorTen steel on the soffit of the pavilion
- The materials choice for the pavilion should serve more than a decorative purpose
- The lighting needs to be effective and sensitive

Items not in the project scope:

- The TTC bus stop should be moved from Commissioners Street to the Unwin and Leslie Street intersection. A covered bus shelter should also be considered.
- The “clumsily circumstantial intersection” should be re-designed to regularize it.
-

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project. The Panel voted in Conditional Support of the project.