



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #84
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Present:

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair
Pat Hanson
Claude Cormier
George Baird
Don Schmitt
Brigitte Shim
Betsy Williamson
Peter Busby

Meg Graham
Joe Lobko
Jim Melvin
Adam Nicklin
Brian Hollingworth

Regrets:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
Jane Wolff

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
Harold Madi
Calvin Brook

Recording Secretaries:

Tristan Simpson
Halija Mazlomyar

WELCOME

Paul Bedford opened the meeting noting that he would be acting as Chair in the absence of Bruce Kuwabara. The Acting Chair then provided an overview of the agenda before moving to the General Business portion of the meeting.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Acting Chair noted that minutes from the June and July meeting needed to be adopted. He requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from June and the notes from July. The minutes were adopted.

The Acting Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. No conflicts were declared.

The Acting Chair then provided the Panel with an update on the Gardiner Expressway Environmental Assessment noting that plenty of work has been underway since the last City Council meeting in June 2015. He noted that the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting will be taking place on September 22nd where three options will be put forward. One of

the options is a vast improvement from the original Hybrid option, freeing up land along the Keating Channel.

The Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design with Waterfront Toronto, to provide a report on project progress.

REPORT FROM THE V.P. OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek welcomed the six guest Panel members from the City of Toronto's Design Review Panel. Mr. Glaisek explained that the One Yonge proposal could be one of the tallest buildings in the city and for that reason, the guest Panel members were welcomed to provide input on the first two projects, the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan and The One Yonge Street Development.

Mr. Glaisek then provided a summary of project progress.

Gardiner Expressway

- The City Staff Report is now public outlining the three concepts put forward;
 - Option 1:
 - Similar to the Council Reviewed Hybrid with tighter Cherry Street on and off ramps.
 - Option 2:
 - New hybrid with a more northern alignment between Cherry Street and the Don Valley Parkway.
 - Provides some improvements to the Keating Channel.
 - Option 3:
 - Similar to what was shown by First Gulf
 - 50km/h posted speed

Public Art, West Don Lands

- Professional photos of the new public art installations were shown followed by a video giving a virtual tour of artwork in the West Don Lands.

East Bayfront

- Bayside's Water's Edge Promenade has been completed.

One of the Panel Members asked about the status of the Billy Bishop Airport Environmental Assessment. Mr. Glaisek replied that the first phase of work has been completed and Waterfront Toronto has undertaken a peer review. It was noted that a more thorough update will be provided at the following Design Review meeting.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Lower Yonge Precinct Plan

ID#: 1063

Project Type: Precinct Plan

Location: Bounded by the Gardiner Expressway, Lower Jarvis St., Queens Quay and Yonge St.

Proponent: City of Toronto/Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: N/A

Review Stage: One

Review Round: Concept Design

Presenter(s): Willie Macrae, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Amanda Santo, the Director of Development Approvals with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project stating that Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto collaborated on the Lower Yonge Urban Design Report which formed the foundation of the precinct plan. The Urban Design Report was endorsed by Council in Summer 2014, along with the Lower Yonge Transportation Master Plan (phase 1 and 2) completed in Spring 2015. Ms. Santo explained that the Urban Design Report articulates the overall urban design vision for the precinct while the Transportation Master Plan established the street network.

1.2 Project Presentation

Ms. Santo then welcomed Willie Macrae, Senior Planner with the City of Toronto to give the presentation. Mr. Macrae started off the presentation by giving some background and context around the project indicating that the site is currently composed of three main property owners including: LCBO, Pinnacle and Choice Reit (Loblaws). It was noted that the vision for the precinct is to develop a complete community with a strong connection to the waterfront while providing sustainable development. Mr. Macrae stated that there has been public consultation meetings, and web dialogue throughout the process.

Mr. Macrae explained that the precinct will be divided into 8 blocks comprising 40 percent mixed commercial uses and 60 percent residential. The precinct will include a public art component, with mixed uses encouraging daytime activation of the site. The heights and setbacks are conducive to its surroundings allowing the site to read as a mid-rise precinct perforated by towers. Redpath Sugar Factory will continue its current use, however less sensitive uses will be introduced into the precinct to buffer the industrial use and the more sensitive residential uses.

Tall buildings have been a focus of the precinct including, ensuring that setbacks are generous to allow for optimal sunlight penetration. The city requirement for tower separation is 25 meters whereas the Lower Yonge Plan is recommending a 30 meter tower separation. The location of the park has been a topic of debate throughout the process. Mr. Macrae stated that the team has landed on a centralized park which is consolidated and unencumbered. Mr. Macrae concluded the presentation by providing the Panel with a series of questions and areas of focus including the connection to the surrounding fabric, built form and massing, and the public realm. Should include the questions here

1.3 Panel Questions

One of the Panel Members asked whether Harbour Street, from York to Yonge will remain a 2-way street and if Lake Shore will remain one-way west bound. Mr. Macrae replied yes.

The Panel Member then asked what would be programmed on floors 2-6. The proponent replied that a community centre is one of the most essential services along with other institutions and offices. The Panel member stated that programming all of those floors with commercial and retail services would be challenging.

Another Panel Member asked about Infrastructure Ontario being in the final stage of selling the land owned by LCBO. The proponent replied that the last three bidders have submitted their bids. Since the proposed park includes and abuts the properties, the Section 42 (parkland) contributions from all three properties would go towards the park, known as both on-site and off-site dedication.

One of the Panel Members asked about the rationale behind the 30 meter tower separation as opposed to the City guidelines indicating 25 meters. The proponent replied that the Tall Building Guidelines were not looking at buildings taller than 50 storeys. Super tall buildings should have more obligations and requirements set than what is recommended in the Tall Building Guidelines.

Regarding separated bike lanes, one of the Panel members asked if Sherbourne was the only separated north-south bike path. Mr. Macrae replied that there is an intention for Lower Simcoe to become a separated bike path in the future.

Many Panel members asked for clarification regarding the corner piece of land to the north of the One Yonge proposed development. The proponent replied that the land was owned by the City and not Pinnacle. He also stated that it's not a developable area and that the space would be used for a potential plaza or park. Another Panel Member asked why the City can't force Pinnacle into buying the piece of land. The proponent replied that the City has no mechanism to require an applicant to buy the piece of land if the site is developable without it.

One of the Panel members asked why the podium heights were so high. Mr. Macrae replied that the City and Waterfront Toronto have set a street wall height to street width ratio of 1:1.

Another Panel member asked what is being done from the City's perspective in terms of north-south connections. Mr. Macrae replied that the proposed Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Phases 3 & 4) will continue to study the potential connection between Church and Cooper St.

A Panel member was also having a hard time understanding the placement of parks and how they're linked. The proponent stated that the Lower Yonge Urban Design Guidelines had set out strategies for park connections and the distance between parks, which was reflected in the proposed precinct plan.

One of the Panel Members asked what transit plans were in place for the precinct plan given that there is no money to fund an LRT. Mr. Macrae stated that although speculative, it may be possible that a financial component of the sales of the LCBO lands could go towards funding the LRT. The Panel Member suggested that a condition of the feasibility of this precinct plan should be securing funding for transit.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

One of the Panel members expressed concerns regarding the parcel of land at the north-west corner of the precinct, noting that it should be incorporated into the One Yonge development. The Panel Member believes that this corner is vital to the development. In terms of the park location, the Panel Member felt that relocating it should be looked into and recommends looking into placing it in front of Redpath Sugar Factory. This would allow a potential synergy with Sugar Beach and allow more north-south pedestrian flow. In the East Bayfront Precinct, the north south streets are primarily shopping whereas the east-west streets are service streets. The Panel member feels that this works well in East Bayfront and should be mirrored in the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan.

Another Panel member commended the proponent for providing a comprehensive presentation however, they were struck by the scale and concentrated density. In terms of transit, the Panel member felt that there needs to be an adequate transit facility in place in order for this plan to

happen. A concentration of 28,000 people with only one day care is not sufficient, there needs to be more community support services available. The City needs to demand adequate funding for community services.

One Panel Member expressed concerns regarding the permeability and connectivity of the site. The neighbourhood needs to be seen as a unit not fragmented pieces of a neighbourhood. The park needs to be seen in a catalytic relationship and be read as a system. Connectivity is fundamental to the success of the neighbourhood.

One of the guest panel members stated that in the interest of longer term view, Redpath Sugar Factory has to be considered as a potential development, however he understands that it can't be treated as a development site now. In terms of the density, the panel member feels that the park area is not big enough given the density.

Another Panel member had similar views regarding the density. His concerns lie in the plan having the same population as the West Don Lands but on one quarter of the land. The panel member also had concerns with compromising too much in order to avoid an OMB hearing. Trying to meet them halfway is not how we should be tackling the issue. They also raised questions regarding the lack of zoning in Toronto, stating that we are in danger of losing heritage buildings in place of new development because we will no longer be able to economically justify heritage buildings.

Another Panel Member raised similar concerns regarding the density. The panel member stated that in Vancouver, the park standard is 2.2 acres/1,000 people. A population of 28,000 people requires at least two elementary schools and a high school. As proposed, Lower Yonge would be creating a very unlivable space. There are neighbourhoods that exists with 18:1 density ratios however, they have proper transit services in place to support those densities. In terms of the sustainability component, the Panel Member is worried that developers have been getting away with passing buildings off as LEED certified without actually achieving a sustainable building.

1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

- What is the city getting back and what's it going to look like 10-50 years from now?
- In terms of principles, density will be fine provided that transit infrastructure is there to support it and that community services are in place. It is absolutely critical for these to be in place.
- Connections to the surrounding fabric: north-south connections to the waterfront are powerful and the public realm needs to support the density (wide sidewalks).
- Public realm itself, in particular the park – there's an argument for both sides, the adequacy of a park that size to support the density. There needs to be a network for people to be able to move north-south.
- The connection between Cooper and Church should be pursued early, not later.
- Concerns about floor to ceiling glass towers and energy performance
- Willing to help City Staff in the face of an OMB challenge
- Convene a joint panel to discuss the city-wide building issues

1.6 Proponent Response

Mr. Macrae thanked the Panel for their comments.

2.0 1-7 Yonge

ID#: 1064

Project Type: Buildings

Location: Entire block bounded by Yonge Street, Queens Quay East, Freeland Street and Lakeshore Boulevard East

Proponent: Pinnacle

Architect/Designer: Hariri Pontarini Architects

Review Stage: One

Review Round: Concept Design

Presenter(s): David Pontarini

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mrs. Santo introduced the One Yonge project indicating that Pinnacle submitted a rezoning application in 2013 and subsequently appealed to the OMB. Since that time, Pinnacle and their team has had extensive negotiations with the City and more recently WT to bring their application more in line with the Lower Yonge Urban Design Report and emerging Precinct Plan. This presentation is based on the results of these negotiations and community feedback. WT/City has not completed their review of the application and look forward to hearing comments from the panel to help guide future negotiations. Mrs. Santo then welcomed David Pontarini with Hariri Pontarini Architects to give the presentation.

2.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Pontarini handed out an executive summary of what was given in the binders to all Panel members. Mr. Pontarini stated that they have been working on this project since 2012 even though the application was submitted in 2013. The south core has been very successful in bringing commercial and residential development to the area. He explained that the application submitted in 2013 was a reflection of the densities in the area. Since then, the project has gone through a very public process with a 33 percent drop in density. The renderings are trying to capture what the park and public realm could look like however, they are still a work in progress. The proposal includes 60 percent residential and 40 percent non-residential (office/retail). The ultimate idea of the development is to create a complete community.

Mr. Pontarini stated that the original number of towers was reduced while the podium heights were raised. The tower area ratio is 33 percent on the north block and 66 percent on the south block, due to the lower heights and wider floorplates. A detailed shadow analysis has been undertaken along with testing how the development fits within the existing Toronto skyline.

Mr. Pontarini explained that the location of the park in the center of the Lower Yonge Precinct was something that they embraced. Locating the community center adjacent to the park was an important feature encouraging a public activated corner. The sidewalk widths vary between 4-14 meters allowing for a pedestrian oriented space.

2.3 Panel Questions

One of the Panel Members had a question of clarification regarding the end vote and whether the City was also voting. Mr. Bedford replied that their comments are welcome but the actual vote will be recorded from members of the Waterfront Panel.

One of the Panel Members asked if the corner parcel of land was part of the development, and whether the south building could be moved north. The proponent replied no due to the 30 meter tower separation.

Another Panel Member asked about the tower floor plate and why it couldn't be more slender than what's proposed. In New York City they have super tall buildings and super slender buildings. The proponent replied that those units sell for \$7,000/square foot. Typically the New York towers are catering to a different market which can afford a large premium for space.

One of the Panel members asked the proponent to speak to the extent to which the environmental conditions have been studied. The proponent replied that as a part of their revised application, a new wind study has been undertaken. The Panel member also asked if the city has an environmental performance standard. A member of the City replied that they are looking to convert some of the existing Toronto Green Standard guidelines into policy.

Another Panel Member asked how the proponent arrived at the current number of storeys. Mr. Pontarini replied that along Yonge Street there is a pattern of marking our transit nodes with a tall tower. The downtown core used to be associated with commercial uses, but the nature of the core is changing and residential is becoming just as important as commercial. If Toronto is targeting height at the transit nodes, this site can support 95 storeys.

2.4 Panel Questions and Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel to provide comments and ask any questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members felt that this proposal is plausible. The Panel member also stated that the architectural approach is an interesting contribution to the built form. He cautioned the proponent not to make the buildings too complicated.

Another Panel member mentioned that the massing on the south block does not have the same clarity as the north block, stating that the 30 storeys should be brought down to 20 storeys. He recommends that they have similar slenderness to allow for more sunlight. The Panel member also mentioned the sculpture shown in the renderings stating that it does not relate well to the park, or the ground floor.

One Panel member felt that the diagonal walkway on the north block is a mistake. The Yonge Street corridor should be strengthened by streetwall buildings not diverted

Another Panel member felt that the proponent didn't do a good enough job rationalizing why the proposed height is suitable at this location. The Panel Member doesn't feel that enough study is being done on the types of neighbourhood being created. The proponent needs to figure out a way to make this block work in an integrated fashion. He feels that the north block should have two not three towers.

One of the guest Panel members felt that the way this proposal is rendered does not feel like a waterfront building, it feels like a shopping mall. The guest Panel member stated that the south block feels heavy and the internal space in the Toronto Star tower looks uninviting and should be more open if it's going to contribute to the public realm.

Another guest Panel member was also having a hard time understanding the justification behind the 95 storeys stating that it feels post-rationalized. Lake Ontario is the landmark not a 95 storey tower. The ground floor plane of the development needs to be more designed at a human scale. Another Panel member agreed with 95 storeys being too much. We have to think about the living conditions of people living 95 storeys in the air.

One Panel member felt that having one block dedicated for residential uses and the other being commercial does not create a community environment and doesn't feel appropriate given the degree of density. They also stated that the parking requirements for the building seem high. Residents who chose to live in this area are not going to be car dependent. The identity of the neighbourhood is not going to come from the fact that it has a tall tower, it will come from the public realm.

Another Panel member discussed a number of issues including the ground floor animation. They stated that the galleria is redundant in terms of creating good retail space and public realm. The way the office space sits above the galleria won't allow for any light penetration. They also suggest putting loading below grade.

2.5 Summary of Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the Panel's recommendations

- South block is unresolved, buildings feel boxed in and too big
- There is a case for height given that it's Yonge Street, provided the infrastructure is there to make it work.
- Feels suburban at grade and needs better integration with the public realm
- Servicing should be underground.
- Parking standards are excessive, the people that choose to live here are going to walk
- In terms of the architecture, it feels like a collection of ideas from here and there and the Toronto Star building is not integrated into the whole
- Public realm should come first
- The sustainability needs to be far more robust especially given a project of this magnitude.

2.6 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 voted in non-support of the project stating that there were many unresolved issues.

3.0 York Bay Yonge Ramp Reconfiguration Design (Harbour Street)

ID#: 106

Project Type: Street Park/Public Realm

Location:

Proponent: City of Toronto

Architect/Designer: DTAH

Review Stage: One

Review Round: Schematic Design/Preliminary Draft Plan

Presenter(s): Brent Raymond, DTAH

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Design Director with Waterfront Toronto introduced the project by informing the Panel that with the removal of the Harbour Street Ramp (Part of York Bay Yonge Ramp) the City of Toronto is undertaking a design for Harbour Street between Simcoe Street and Bay Street. This project is being undertaken by Engineering and Construction Services at the City of Toronto who has retained MMM and DTAH to undertake the design. The scope includes transforming Harbour

Street from one-way to two-way operations and includes off-street bicycle infrastructure. Mrs. Mallozzi then introduced Brent Raymond with DTAH to give the presentation

3.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Raymond began the presentation by giving an outline of the planning context. In 2010 the Environmental Assessment was prepared for what to do with the current ramp. The result was to remove the York Bay Yonge ramp and place it back at Simcoe Street. Some of the key opportunities that open up by pulling the ramp back include, more light penetration and space to allow for a pedestrian sidewalk.

Mr. Raymond explained that two options for separated bike lanes were explored. In terms of the street trees, open planters were preferred by Urban Forestry. The objective of the open planter is to allocate 30 m³ of soil per tree. The team is looking to achieve this goal while being cost effective, given the limited funding, and also delivering a good street. The proponent compared the open planter to the trench Silva cells and explained that silva cells would only deliver 16 m³ of soil per tree versus 30 m³. In terms of paving, the team is looking at a paver that is used along Waterpark Place in order to provide continuity throughout the site. Mr. Raymond raised a question on whether the lighting should be the standard City of Toronto light fixtures or if this space deserves its own signature light fixtures.

3.3 Panel Questions

One of the Panel members asked whether the City had any statistics on the success rates of silva cells. The proponent replied that the website showed the 4-5 years of planting, tracking the growth rate which exhibited amazing results.

Another Panel member asked what quantity of soil we should be using. The proponent replied that more soil is better which is why 30 m³ is optimal. The Panel member also raised concerns about the City not having money to maintain the open planters.

One of the Panel members asked what percentage of lamps in the City have been switched over to LED. The proponent replied that he was unsure however, he is aware that they are beginning to switch them over.

Another Panel members asked if the City has been in discussion with all of the departments. The proponent replied that they have been involved with cycling, forestry and Toronto Hydro to try to resolve conflicts.

3.4 Panel Comments

One of the Panel member insisted that they should have everyone at the table to draw a system that everyone is happy with, in order to save time and money. He also stated that the open planters tend to look too decorative and not urban.

Another Panel member stated that all of the street lights should be LED.

One of the Panel members recommended that with the limited space, why put trees on both sides of the street when you can make one perfect row of streets on one side.

Mr. Glaisek asked the Panel for a recommendation of which light pole to use. There was strong consensus that the signature waterfront light fixtures for Queens Quay be used to create continuity between the waterfront and Harbour Street.

Another Panel member noted that we need to make the right decision because this street will become the precedent for this area. The question on buried versus not comes down to maintenance, if it can't be figured out, open planters will get filled with garbage. In terms of the pavers it becomes a precedent/template so it must be treated as a template set at a high standard.

3.6 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

- Only use planters where they have a high chance of succeeding.
- Used the Queens Quay light standard.
- Identify and use a consistent paver if possible.

3.7 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 voted in Support of the project.

4.0 Aitken Place Park

ID#: 1060

Project Type: Park/Public Realm

Location: East of Aquavista between Edgewater Drive and Merchants Wharf

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Tom Balsley

Review Stage: Three

Review Round: Design Development/Final Draft Plan

Presenter(s): Scott Torrance; Scott Torrance Landscape Architect, Tom Balsley; Thomas Balsley Associates

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Andrew Tenyenhuis, with Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project and design team. Mr. Tenyenhuis stated that the project was last presented in June 2015, receiving a vote of Support for the Schematic Design of the park. The previous Panel comments included providing alternate routes to the hilltop pavilion, more trees along the edge of the park, modification to the pavilion, and a lighting plan. Mr. Tenyenhuis then introduced Scott Torrance with Scott Torrance Landscape Architecture and Thomas Balsley with Thomas Balsley Associates to give the presentation.

4.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Balsley began the presentation by stating that the materiality throughout the park has been simplified. In terms of addressing comments from the last DRP meeting, more trees have been added to the dog run to provide shade. The pavilion has also been modified by no longer cantilevering over the dog run. The lighting plan consists of the standard Waterfront Toronto light fixtures which allows for continuity throughout the waterfront. The proponent explained that they did not want to litter the site with light poles so instead, the fixtures are hidden in the foliage of trees. In terms of materiality, corten steel has been used throughout the park. Mr. Balsley also explained the request for play features has now been addressed with the introduction of a tube net structure and a suspension line play structure. Fall zones were also taken into consideration when selecting the play structures' location in the park. The proponent stated that the promenade is beginning to get detailed with seating including swivel chairs and an L shaped sectional with a table. Mr. Torrance then described some of the landscape details of the park providing the Panel with an idea of what the foliage will look like year-round.

4.3 Panel Questions

One of the Panel members asked what happens to the stormwater in the paved areas. The proponent replied that there are trench drains which direct stormwater to a cistern for irrigation use. The Panel member also asked about the possibility of trees in the dog run dying from urination. The Proponent assured the Panel that this was not an issue.

4.4 Panel Comments

One of the Panel members commended the team for the lovely design and the natural subtleness of material choice. The Panel member was also fond of the continuous use of pavers throughout the site and the thoughtful planting strategies.

Another Panel member was appreciative of the clarity of the palette and the reduction of material and felt that this project has progressed in a very good way.

Another Panel member noted that the addition of trees to the park has made a huge difference with how the project is read. The Panel member then asked how the trees are trenched. The proponent replied that they are trenched using a paver grate which is dropped down 150 mm with the pavers laid on top.

Another Panel member mentioned that corten steel should never be used in an outdoor setting as it poisons groundwater by leaching into the soil, acknowledging it is late in the design process to change.

4.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair summarized the comments by stating that the project was clear, simple and beautiful.

4.6 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 voted in Support of the project.

CLOSING

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