



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #96  
Wednesday, December 21, 2016**

---

**Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair  
Paul Bedford, Vice Chair  
George Baird  
Peter Busby  
Claude Cormier  
Pat Hanson  
Chris Reed  
Don Schmitt  
Betsy Williamson

**Designees and Guests:**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto  
Lorna Day, City of Toronto

**Regrets:**

Brigitte Shim  
Jane Wolff

**Recording Secretary:**

Tristan Simpson  
Rei Tasaka

---

**WELCOME**

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

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Chair requested the Panel members to adopt the minutes from the November meeting. The minutes were adopted pending approval of the 55 Lake Shore and 100 Queens Quay consensus comments.

The Chair then asked if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Bruce Kuwabara noted that he would be recusing himself as Chair during the Canary District Block 16 review, as he had a conflict.

The Chair introduced Lorna Day as the new Director of Urban Design with the City of Toronto. The Chair also noted that this was Don Schmitt's last meeting as a Panel member and thanked him for his contribution and time dedicated to the Panel. Jane Wolff, whose time on the Panel is also ending but was unable to attend, was also thanked for her contribution as a Panel member.

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

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

Mr. Glaisek noted that at the Design Review Panel Visioning Session, the Panel requested updates on a number of projects and Waterfront Toronto-related initiatives including the Innovation Centre, the Bentway, and new Board Members.

Mr. Glaisek reviewed the list of Board Members and noted three new members including Janet Rieksts-Alderman, Sevaun Palvetzian, and Mazyar Mortazavi. Mr. Glaisek also noted that Mark Wilson's term as Chair has ended after 14 years of serving on the Board and his successor, Helen Burstyn, will assume the role of Chair in January 2017.

Mr. Glaisek introduced Pina Mallozzi, Director of Design with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on the Bentway. Ms. Mallozzi noted that the design team met the 90 percent Construction Documents milestone in early November, 2016. Kearns Mancini Architects and Patkau Architects have now been formally engaged to prepare construction drawings for the Fort York Visitor's Centre Extension. Ms. Mallozzi also noted that in November, Waterfront Toronto finalized the Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Toronto and the Matthews Foundation, reflecting the governance and funding approach approved by Toronto City Council. Ms. Mallozzi explained that work will continue on the programming and activation for the Bentway and a Construction Manager has been hired, with construction tenders expected to be released in January.

Mr. Glaisek introduced Meg Davis, Chief Development Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on the Innovation Centre. Ms. Davis noted that there is a Pre-development Agreement in place and they have been testing the market which has demonstrated interest in the site. Ms. Davis noted that the building will be redesigned with the previous Panel comments in mind, but not until they have a tenant. Menkes will be working with the tenant to design a building that reflects their needs. Ms. Davis noted that they are hoping to get Council approval in March.

The Panel then went in-camera to discuss internal management issues.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **Canary District – Block I 6**

*ID#: 1071*

*Project Type: Building*

*Location: Canary District*

*Proponent: Dream Developments*

*Architect/Designer: KPMB*

*Review Stage: Schematic Design*

*Review Round: Three*

*Presenter(s): Bruno Weber, KPMB Architects*

*Delegation: Peter Zimmerman, Dream Developments, Marc Baronette, Kilmer Infrastructure Developments, Andrew Dyke, KPMB Architects*

#### **I.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project by reviewing the comments made by the Panel at the last meeting. The comments included:

- The balcony details, including the vertical privacy panels and the Toro Balcony Guard system, need to be executed with care and attention to detail because of the impact they will have on the overall building aesthetic
- There is a disconnect between the ground floor portion of the building and the upper portion of the building that needs to be addressed through materiality or form
- There should be flexibility to convert and combine units over time
- The opportunity to add outdoor amenity space on the roof should be explored
- Thermal breaks should be applied to all balconies, not just the upper floor

Mr. Glaisek introduced Bruno Weber, Associate with KPMB, to give the presentation.

#### **I.2 Project Presentation**

Mr. Weber began by addressing the public realm comments regarding the entrance area looking a bit barren due to a lack of trees. Mr. Weber explained that they are able to add one tree, however the amount of trees cannot be densified beyond that due to the existing soil volumes. Mr. Weber then explained the improvements to the corner condition, which involved adding a window to increase the viewing capacity. Mr. Weber also showed the new rendering which incorporates the fully designed window wall system and illustrates all doors and windows. Mr. Weber noted that the mechanical penthouse has been modified to reflect the coloured panel on the lower part of the building. In terms of the balcony details, Mr. Weber explained that the heights of the balcony rails have been increased along with the modifications to the doors and privacy rails. In response to the Panel comments regarding the convertible unit request, Mr. Weber explained that every unit was reviewed individually, and as existing, there is a large portion of units that can be joined. Mr. Weber noted that the occupiable roof is contingent on approvals from Infrastructure Ontario, however, if approved, there would be a series of varying grass heights to allow for key views to the south. The corridor from the elevator would be

extended with a covered canopy. Mr. Weber then explained modifications to the Toro Balcony Guard system which involved removing the overall incorporating frame and developing a vertical post against the building itself which eliminates the bulky appearance. Mr. Weber also explained that the preliminary material palette which consists of beige brick with darker greys to join the material palettes of the adjacent buildings. The retail façade pattern will be undertaken through a curated art process.

Mr. Weber addressed comments made regarding the thermal breaks by assuring the Panel that Ecovert has been engaged to undertake energy modelling. The results will determine whether it's technically feasible. Mr. Weber noted that this will be the first LEED v4 building in Toronto.

### **1.3 Panel Questions**

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One of the Panel members asked when the energy modelling results will be complete. Peter Zimmerman, the Vice President of Development with Dream, replied that they will likely have the results by mid-summer.

Another Panel member asked if it would be helpful for Waterfront Toronto to write a letter of recommendation to Infrastructure Ontario vouching for the Proponents and their request for a minor variance. Mr. Glaisek replied that the minutes will capture the request and it will be conveyed.

One of the Panel members asked if the Proponents were worried about the increased balcony height impeding views. Mr. Weber replied that it will be possible to see over it when standing, and it will provide a sense of enclosure when sitting.

Another Panel member asked what part of the roof triggers the minor variance. Mr. Weber replied that having any occupiable space above the top floor of the maximum height limit of 36 meters is what requires a minor variance.

One of the Panel members asked if the Proponent would consider combining some of the units to increase the mix of larger units, given the incremental increase in the desire to combine two units. Mr. Weber replied that they felt that the unit mix, as is, is correct.

### **1.4 Panel Comments**

The Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

A Panel Member noted that while they understand the difficulty with Infrastructure Ontario's pending approval for height exceedance, the project without the outdoor roof would be a missed opportunity. They suggested to simplify the shapes of the various landscape elements to strengthen the language of the rooftop.

Another Panel Member felt that there has been some interesting development in the project, however, the upper volume still feels disconnected from the base. The architectural relationship between the masonry and the perforated balcony guard system

seems disjointed. The Panel member appreciated the extension of the balcony face, noting that the larger faceted façade creates a “real” façade. They suggested that the height of the perforated handrail requires further study to understand what a person sitting down would see out from the balcony. The Panel member stressed that the strong horizontality of the residential component will work more successfully in the base where the orange “stripes” currently read as piers.

One Panel member appreciated the quick turn-around with good progress. They noted that the colour choice for the perforated metal for the balcony is unclear. The Panel member then asked if there is anything that the Panel could do to help improve the likelihood of Infrastructure Ontario supporting the outdoor roof.

Another Panel member noted that the public realm for the project seems adequate as it works with the surrounding context. They appreciated the connection made with curated art to the mechanical penthouse. The Panel member also wondered how this Panel could help the team negotiate approval for the outdoor roof space.

One Panel member noted their concern for the lack of commitment to the thermal breaks by the Proponent. They noted that that thermal modelling can be done quickly and there are details that have been tested. As such, results of the modelling and the decision should be made soon and included in their next presentation to the Panel.

Another Panel member supported the quick turn-around and noted that the presentation was helpful in understanding the design progress. The Panel member appreciated the flexibility studies of the unit conversions, stating that as many as 15% of the buyers of their residential projects seek unit conversions to combine two units both horizontally and vertically. They noted that they would like to see the structural details of the connections of the combined units. The Panel member raised concerns regarding the height of the balcony handrail for those sitting down and trying to see out. They also felt that the thermal break decision should be resolved sooner than later.

The Vice Chair then suggested that the Panel try out a “dialogue” session where the proponent is able to make final remarks if necessary.

Mr. Weber addressed a Panel member’s concern regarding the architectural disconnect between the base massing and the upper residential floors, and noted that it is a difficult issue to address. The intention is to make the back side of the building more a “front” through colour and form and the team is trying to figure this out.

The Panel member noted that the predilection for a more unified architectural language is based on how they would design the building. For the Panel member, the tumbled brick seemed too faceted and struggles to connect with the upper portion of the building. They suggested that perhaps the masonry at the street level could be a warmer tone.

Mr. Weber noted that they had tested other colours for the balcony however it was decided that the white would be more appropriate for the building within the colour palette of the context and the building itself. Mr. Weber also noted that the materials

chosen for the project were intended to marry the two materials of the adjacent buildings which are 100% brick and 100% metal.

The Panel member asked whether it was the materials of only the base portion that was making the connection between the adjacent buildings. They also noted that there is a different micro-climate created by the height of the balcony railings that may appeal to the buyers.

Another Panel member felt that there should be further studies on the railing height.

### **1.5 Consensus Comments**

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

1. There was strong support for providing the Proponent with assistance in gaining approval from Infrastructure Ontario to move forward with the outdoor amenity space on the roof.
2. Resolution regarding the thermal breaks on the balconies should be included when the project returns for the Design Development stage.
3. Structural solutions to enable unit conversion should be explained at the Design Development stage
4. The language of the material palette should be simplified, with less emphasis on reflecting the material palette of the adjacent buildings.
5. The upper residential component continues to feel disjointed from the base. Better integration between the upper and lower portion of the building should be pursued as part of design development process.
6. The balcony detail concealing the hand rail and extending the screen is supported, but the size of the resulting aperture between screens should be reviewed to make sure it does not feel too small for occupants.

### **1.6 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 unanimously in Support of the project.