



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #70
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

Present:

Brigitte Shim, Acting Chair
George Baird
Claude Cormier
Gerry Faubert
Pat Hanson
Don Schmitt
Betsy Williamson

Regrets:

Bruce Kuwabara
Paul Bedford
Jane Wolff

Recording Secretaries:

Margaret Goodfellow
Tracy Watt

Designees and Guests:

Christopher Glaisek
John Campbell
James Parakh

WELCOME

Brigitte Shim opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, noting that Bruce had asked her to act as Chair this month.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Acting Chair then asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the October 9th, 2013 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

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

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel to adopt the 2014 schedule of meetings. The schedule was unanimously adopted.

The Acting Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT OF PLANNING AND DESIGN

Mr. Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

Gardiner East Environmental Study

- Round Two of the Gardiner East EA public consultations were held on October 16, 2013
- During this meeting, plans were shown that illustrated each of the four alternatives being considered.
- The preferred alternative will be presented to the public in Spring 2014.

East Bayfront

- Waterfront Toronto and the City are currently conducting Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) settlement meetings to find common ground with the private developers in the East Bayfront.
- The Settlement materials will likely be presented to the Panel

Urban Park and Waterfront Trail at Ontario Place

- LANDinc and West 8 in joint venture were selected as the successful proponents to design the 7.5 acre park and trail at Ontario Place
- There will be a public meeting on December 4th to unveil the design team and the consultation process
- This work will be done in advance of revitalization work for the remainder of the Ontario Place lands .

The Acting Chair asked if there were any questions or comments.

One Panel member asked how the Keating Channel Precinct was affected by the Gardiner East EA. Mr. Glaisek stated that it is not affected by the EA, adding that the developers are currently appealing the Keating Channel zoning by-law.

The Acting Chair then moved to the first project review.

PROJECT REVIEWS

Lisa A. Prime, Director of Environment and Innovation, presented a “Review of Research on Energy Use Intensity & Thermal Breaks for Balconies”, noting that this is in response to Panel queries. Ms. Prime then introduced Subhi Alsayed, Project Director at Tower Labs. Mr. Alsayed then presented their “Pilot Balcony Thermal Break results and Cost Benefit Analysis”. Mr. Alsayed noted that their research suggests that a high performance building envelope will result in greater energy performance than simply using balcony thermal breaks with a typical building envelope.

One Panel member felt that even though the payback was estimated to be 99 Years of energy savings, that \$1200 still did not seem like a big investment when compared with what a consumer would spend on interior finishes.

Another Panel member felt that it seemed to make more sense to invest that money into improved wall systems.

Another Panel member felt that at some point in the future, the product cost will go down, noting that if the Ontario Building Code (OBC) mandated its use, then there would be no competitive disadvantage – it would level the playing field for everyone. Another Panel member felt that if the rules surrounding building envelope performance were tightened up, then that would result in a better overall system too.

Several Panel members commended the Tower Labs team and their research, and thanked them for their informative presentation.

1.0 East Bayfront Development Proposal: Bayside Phase 1 – R1/R2 (Aqualina)

ID#: 1040

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: North of Queens Quay, east of Sherbourne Common

Proponent: Hines / Tridel

Architect/Designer: Arquitectonica

Review Stage: Construction Documents

Review Round: Five

Presenter(s): John Curtis, Arquitectonica; Bryce Miranda, DTAH; Jitka Jarolimek, Provident Energy Management.

Delegation: Bruno Giancola, Tridel

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek introduced the project, noting that the project received conditional support for the building and non-support for the “Via Velo” at the June 2013 presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Jitka Jarolimek, Project Manager with Provident Energy Management, began the presentation by noting that the project team is targeting LEED Platinum. Ms Jarolimek stated that the team is taking a holistic approach to energy savings, adding that energy loss is being reduced in every way. Ms Jarolimek stated that occupants can plant their own vegetables on the roof, irrigation for plants uses non potable water and suite metering will meter heating, cooling and hot and cold water consumption. John Curtis, Vice President at Arquitectonica, then provided a general overview of the building’s evolution noting that 60% of the units are convertible through the use of column and shear wall construction. Bryce Miranda, Partner with DTAH, then presented the Via Velo, responding to Panel comments that were raised at the last meeting.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there were any concerns about wind on the roof deck. Mr Curtis stated that wind studies had been completed and no “hot spots” had been identified.

Another Panel member asked about the times which the Via Velo will be accessible to the public. Mr. Miranda replied that the intention behind the design was to make it as flexible and as public feeling as possible. Another Panel member asked if Waterfront Toronto had any control over who will be leasing the commercial space adjacent to the Via Velo, noting that the right operator will be critical to the success of the space. Mr. Glaisek answered that it remained to be worked through at a corporate level.

Another Panel member asked if the NetZED unit had been sold. Mr. Giancola stated that Tridel was holding onto that unit for the time being. Another Panel member asked how Tridel was able to achieve these sustainable features and still be competitive. Mr. Giancola stated that this is a Marquis project, adding that sustainability is an important part of Tridel's mandate. Mr. Giancola stated that at a practical level, Tridel has instituted a green loan system to finance the incremental costs.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

Several Panel members felt that the design had matured well and become more refined. One Panel member felt that the project respected the site and was a great example of performance and design. Several Panel members commended the proponents on their successful sales. One Panel member commended the team for targeting LEED Platinum, noting how difficult that is to obtain for residential.

One Panel member felt that the scale of the Via Velo felt right when the doors were open, noting that when the doors are closed it seemed to read as more private. Several Panel members felt that the Via Velo had been improved through simplification. One Panel member stated that the simplification was appreciated, but noted that there needs to be an expression that makes it a place. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that simplification does not have to mean banal. Another Panel member stated that they were not convinced about taking the public realm paving through the space, feeling that it could benefit from a brightness and polish. Another Panel member felt that the continuity of the public realm paving was the right move, adding that it could be finished in a different way to make it more refined. Another Panel member felt that the Via Velo lacked the quality and innovation of materials found in the remainder of the building.

Another Panel member urged the proponent to keep the retail small, and keep the Via Velo as open as possible. Another Panel member felt that the tenants will ultimately decide the success of the space.

Several Panel members felt that further refinement needed to happen, adding that they felt the designers were up to the challenge working with Waterfront Toronto. One Panel member felt that the proponents needed to come back to present the Via Velo.

1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- The Project has improved and matured
- The Via Velo needs more study both in design and operations

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr Curtis, Ms Jarolimek and Mr Miranda thanked the Panel for their feedback.

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 voted in support of the project, feeling that the designers and WT should continue to work on the design and operation of the Via Velo but did not need to return to the Panel. One Panel member voted in non-support.

1.0 Private Development Application: 1 York Street (90 Harbour)

ID#: 1047

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: 1 York Street

Proponent: Menkes Developments Ltd.

Architect/Designer: architectsAlliance (aA) with Sweeny Sterling Finlayson & Co. Architects Inc. (&Co)

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Three

Presenter(s): Dermot Sweeny, &Co

Delegation: Adam Feldman, aA; David Copeland, &Co.; Jude Tersigni, Menkes

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Parakh, Toronto's Acting Director of Urban Design, introduced the project, reminding the Panel of its relationship to the 10 York development across the street. Mr. Parakh noted that Section 37 funds have been secured to remove the York St. ramp. Mr. Parakh stated that the proponents had received their rezoning for the site, and is currently in the Site Plan Control process.

2.2 Project Presentation

Dermot Sweeny, Principal with &Co, presented the project noting that it will be a high performance building, targeting LEED Platinum. Mr. Sweeny reminded the Panel that &Co is designing the commercial parts of the building with architects Alliance completing the design of the residential towers.

2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked when the York Street ramps are scheduled to come down. Mr. Parakh replied that it is currently contemplated for 2016, after the Pan Am games. When will the ramps come down? 2016. After the Pan Am games.

Another Panel member asked for clarification of the traffic and parking strategy. Mr. Sweeny answered that there are two curb cuts on Lake Shore Blvd, and two off Harbour Street, adding that one of the exit curb cuts on Lake Shore is an overflow relief.

Another Panel member asked how the building was utilizing Deep Water Cooling. Mr. Sweeny answered that all the cooling for the building will use Deep Water Cooling, noting that Enwave is locating a plant in the basement.

Another Panel member asked what made this building a high performance building. Mr. Sweeny answered that the building will have a high quality curtain wall system, with top quality low e, fritted, floor to ceiling, self-draining glazing. Mr. Sweeny added that daylighting shades are automated and there is an 18" plenum located under the floor.

One Panel member wondered how a person would access the roof garden. Mr. Sweeny stated that there will be signage from both the PATH and York Street.

Another Panel member asked what the decision was behind making the programmatic elements look quite different. Mr. Sweeny stated that it was an intentional move, designed to help break down the massing of this large building.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for their comments.

As presentations had run late, and Panel members had to leave, it was agreed that a subsequent meeting would be convened to discuss this presentation as soon as possible.

2.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

N/A

2.6 Proponents Response

N/A

2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

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

N/A

CLOSING

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