



WATERFRONTToronto

Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #28 Wednesday, July 9, 2008

Present:

Bruce Kuwabara, Chair
George Baird
Paul Bedford
Tania Bortolotto
Renee Daoust
Peter Halsall
Anne McIlroy
Janet Rosenberg
Don Schmitt
Greg Smallenberg
Charles Waldheim

Designees and Guests:

John Campbell
Robert Freedman
Christopher Glaisek

Regrets:

Peter Clewes
Siamak Hariri

Recording Secretary:

Margaret Goodfellow

WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the Panel, noting that this was a momentous day as eight projects including three buildings, are being presented this month. He provided an overview of the agenda and then invited John Campbell to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE CEO

John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto's President and CEO, began with an update on the Gardiner Expressway. He reminded the Panel that from 2004-2006, Waterfront Toronto, working with City officials, undertook a technical study of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard Corridor, and recommended dismantling the Gardiner from Spadina Avenue to the Don Valley Parkway. Mr. Campbell then announced that on June 12th, 2008, the Board of Waterfront Toronto moved to recommend to City Council the initiation of an Environmental Assessment to consider the partial takedown of the Gardiner Expressway from Jarvis Street to the Don Valley Parkway and to replace the structure with a "great street". Mr. Campbell noted that the approach is consistent with Waterfront Toronto's vision to reconnect the city to its waterfront, develop better north/south pedestrian connections and improve the quality of place in the new communities under development in East Bayfront and the West Don Lands.

Mr. Campbell then announced that 25 submissions were received for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the Bayside and Parkside development parcels in the East Bayfront. Mr. Campbell stated that on June 19th, 2008, Waterfront Toronto announced the 5 short-listed

development teams for each development parcel who will be asked to submit as part of the Request for Proposals (RFP) to be issued this summer, adding that they hope to make the final selection by the end of 2008. Mr. Campbell added that the caliber of these submissions bodes well for the coming transformation of the waterfront.

Mr. Campbell then stated that Waterfront Toronto has recently undergone an exercise to prioritize which projects will be built with the \$1.5 billion seed money given by the Municipal, Provincial and Federal funding partners. Mr. Campbell added that Waterfront Toronto hopes to have a firm plan by the end of the summer.

Mr. Campbell stated that on July 8th, 2008, Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty, Ontario Minister of Energy and Infrastructure George Smitherman, and Toronto Mayor David Miller, joined Waterfront Toronto and George Brown College officials in announcing that George Brown College will join Waterfront Toronto's revitalization efforts and its new campus will be a cornerstone of the East Bayfront community. Mr. Campbell added that the new campus, slated to open in 2011, will house the college's Centre for Health Sciences, its first student residences and a recreational complex. The waterfront campus will be located on a 0.83 hectare (two-acre) parcel of land located on the south side of Queens Quay Boulevard between Lower Jarvis and Lower Sherbourne Streets, with the master plan designed by Daoust Lestage Architectes from Montreal.

Mr. Campbell then announced that Waterfront Toronto has increased the communications team and welcomes Michelle Noble, Director of Communications and Marketing, Ed Chalupka, Government Relations Manager, and Debra Conlon, Project Communications Manager, adding that Waterfront Toronto will be getting the message out of what we are doing to not only the rest of the City, but the Province and the Nation.

Mr. Campbell also welcomed Waterfront Toronto's new Director of Portlands Development, Raffi Bedrozean, adding that Waterfront Toronto will be working towards a consolidated plan for the Portlands that is in line with our overall mandate.

The Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek to provide his report.

REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, provided a summary of project progress.

Spadina Head of Slip

- The construction of the slip is progressing well with most of the decking and benches in place. The design team is currently fine tuning the lighting strategy and anti-slip measures. It is now anticipated that the slip will open in August, 2008.

Queens Quay Environmental Assessment

- The Environmental Assessment team is working through the design options for the streetcar alignment and whether it will run along the south side or the centre of Queens Quay. A major challenge continues to be balancing high speed transit with the desire for pedestrian crossing opportunities.

East Bayfront

- A solution to the type and location of a storm water management facility in the East Bayfront has been achieved which will result in a partially open storm water treatment tank, tucked under the boardwalk and the Parliament Head of Slip.

Don River Park

- Through Waterfront Toronto's Cost Estimation Validation Process (CEVP), the "perch" art piece proposed for Don River Park has been removed. A new public art piece will replace it at Mill Street under the West Don Lands Public Art Strategy.

Martin Goodman Trail

- A new intersection on Lake Shore Boulevard West has been approved at Ontario Place that will unlock approximately three acres of land which can now be dedicated to the Martin Goodman Trail. The tender for construction of the trail will be issued in Fall 2008.

Lake Ontario Park

- A public meeting will be held on July 10, 2008 for the presentation of the Final Draft of the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan.

Lower Don Lands

- Waterfront Toronto and Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates received an Urban Design Special Jury Award for Sustainable Development from The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada in recognition of the Lower Don Lands Design Competition and winning proposal.

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

One Panel member felt that a sub-committee should be struck to stay on Queens Quay and ensure that the public realm concept is preserved. Another Panel member agreed adding that if St. Clair Avenue West is the best urban condition that the City can create, then that poses a problem for Queens Quay. The Chair then nominated Mr. Bedford and Ms. McIlroy to sit on the sub-committee. Another Panel member suggested a half-day workshop with the entire Panel.

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair thanked Mr. Campbell and Mr. Glaisek for their reports.

The Chair then asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Mr. Halsall stated that he was conflicted on Sugar Beach, the Martin Goodman Trail, and Central Waterfront. Mr. Schmitt stated that he was conflicted on the Central Waterfront. Ms. Bortolotto stated that she was conflicted on the West Don Lands District Energy Centre. Mr. Baird stated the he was conflicted on the TCHC Development. Mr. Waldheim then stated that he could be seen to be conflicted on the TCHC Development as Mr. Baird is his employer at the University of Toronto's School of Architecture Landscape and Design. Mr. Kuwabara and Mr. Glaisek felt that this did not constitute a conflict of interest, and agree to review academic relationships in the Conflict of Interest guidelines.

The Chair asked the Panel if there were any questions or comments on the previous month's meeting minutes. There being none, the Chair moved to adopt May's minutes. The minutes were then adopted.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 Sugar Beach

ID#: 1026

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Lower Jarvis Street, between Queens Quay and the Water's Edge, on the East side of Jarvis

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Claude Cormier Architects Paysagistes Inc.

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Marc Halle, Claude Cormier Architects Paysagistes Inc.

Delegation: Andrew Jones

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Roche, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project noting this is the first time that the winning scheme for the Jarvis Slip Public Space Design Competition has been presented to the Panel. Mr. Roche provided the project background and context and reviewed the Jury's recommendations.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Response to jury recommendations
- Functionality and seasonality of the proposed sand beach
- Spatial organization/relationship to adjacent projects
- Site furnishings/park elements/detailing

1.2 Project Presentation

Marc Halle, Project Manager with Claude Cormier Architects Paysagistes Inc. provided an overview of the winning scheme's variation of the theme "urban beach", and the particular responses to the site at Lower Jarvis. Mr. Halle provided precedents of successful urban beaches around the world, inspirations from Georges Seurat, followed by the urban design and detailed design elements of the site.

1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked how the beach would be used in the winter. Mr. Halle responded that there was a passive recreation approach taken to this site as Sherbourne Park was intended for the more active recreation, adding that elements such as the under-glow from the coloured umbrellas on the snow in the winter would help provide an interesting vista and engaging environment.

Another Panel member asked if there was an opportunity to make the water feature a winter element. Mr. Halle stated that was not currently envisioned but that they would look at it.

Another Panel member wondered how the coloured striping was achieved in the rocks. Mr. Halle replied that they are currently looking at methods of baking the colour into pre-cut grooves in the surface allowing for a flush, enamel-like finish.

Another Panel member wondered what type of programming was envisioned for the park. Mr. Halle stated that they were hoping there would be an opportunity for a food outlet and public washrooms in the development block at the north end of the park, as well as general animation provided by Corus and George Brown College.

One Panel member questioned the use of the beach concept at this location as it is in a much harsher, more industrial environment than HTO Park. Mr. Halle agreed that the site was more industrial, but felt that sugar refinement activities were not necessarily harsh, adding that the intention was to introduce landscaping elements that will soften the hard character of that site.

1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members agreed that the revised scheme responded well to the Jury's comments and recommendations. One Panel member felt that the notion of the urban beach was really compelling and gains strength as an idea as it is repeated across the waterfront.

Another Panel member stated that the site should be the recipient of one of the new washrooms from the City's street furniture program.

One Panel member expressed concern about the development viability of Block I, given its relatively small footprint. Mr. Glaisek stated that for the right occupant it will work.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to make sure the park design appropriately responds to the design of the Corus concert space, specifically providing viewing areas centered on the stage.

One Panel member stated that the intersection of the promenade and the slip head area was awkward and needed resolution. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the scheme needed an anchor point in this area.

Another Panel member urged the design team to review the inflection of the path's trajectory and its relationship to the boulder.

Another Panel member felt that the Sugar Boat had a tremendous spatial impact on the site and urged the team to account for it in all plans and views of the site.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to consider creating a step down from the promenade to the beach to mitigate the effects of sand blowing onto the pathway.

Another Panel member stated that the views depicted in the renderings depended on a certain growth and tree canopy height. One Panel member questioned the use of spruce conifers, feeling that they tend not to flourish in public spaces. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that conifers take quite a long time to grow unless they are in large pits and well tended to.

One Panel member stated that there needed to be an explicit strategy about occupying the space in colder months.

Another Panel member stated their concern with the paving pattern in the Promenade, feeling that the contrast in colours could be a problem for visually impaired people.

One Panel member felt that the proposed umbrellas had developed nicely, but were still too formal. Another Panel member agreed, stating that there is perhaps another level of consideration that should be made, perhaps a further level of abstraction. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the furnishings were very static and that consideration should be given to having cabanas or canvas chairs that people could move around to shelter themselves from the wind in the shoulder seasons. Another Panel member felt that the recycled plastic Muskoka chair was appropriate but wondered whether it would withstand vandalism such as flame.

Another Panel member stated that there should be a system of managing the umbrellas and chairs over the season, potentially having removable umbrellas. Another Panel member felt that storage of these elements could become a problem and required a maintenance program.

The Chair then asked the Panel to vote on whether to support fixed or removable umbrellas. Eight of nine Panel members voted to keep the fixed umbrellas.

1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the scheme and the urban beach theme in particular
- ii. Further refine the design of the umbrellas
- iii. Consider how to extend the use of the park in colder months
- iv. Reconsider the choice of conifers in the scheme
- v. Study how the intersection between the promenade and the North West corner of the slip head is working.

1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Halle thanked the Panel for their feedback.

1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in support of the project to proceed to the Design Development Phase.

2.0 WDL Development Proposal: River City Blocks 19, 20, 22 and 24

ID#: 1028

Project Type: Building/Structure

Proponent: Urban Capital Property Group

Location: Area bounded by King Street, River Street, Eastern Avenue and Don River Park.

Architect/Designer: Saucier + Perrotte Architectes with ZAS Architects Inc.

Review Stage: Preliminary Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): David Wex, Urban Capital Property Group; Gilles Saucier, Saucier + Perrotte Architectes

Delegation: Andre Perrotte, Saucier + Perrotte Architectes; Paul Stevens, ZAS Architects Inc.

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek introduced the West Don Lands Developer Team, comprised of Urban Capital Property Group, Redquartz Developments, Saucier + Perrotte Architectes and ZAS Architects Inc. The team was the winning proponent for the first Developer RFP issued by Waterfront Toronto, and will be developing blocks 19, 20, 22 and 24 across from the TCHC development site.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Appropriateness of the design as a gateway structure to West Don Lands
- Acceptability of minor variances to the Precinct Plan for proposed massing
- Bridge across the woonerf
- Relationship of at-grade residential units to public realm
- Relationship of entire development to Don River Park

2.2 Project Presentation

David Wex, Partner with Urban Capital Property Group, introduced the project team including Andre Perrotte and Paul Stevens from ZAS Architects. Gilles Saucier, Principal with Saucier + Perrotte Architects then described the design intentions and site strategies of the building, emphasizing the importance of maintaining continuity of the street wall while creating a sense of enclosure and place.

2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member wondered if there was a strategy to mitigate possible noise issues in the courtyard caused by its proximity to the Richmond-Adelaide ramps. Mr. Saucier stated that there are design features such as a landscaped berm indented to help buffer the noise.

Another Panel member enquired as to where the entrance to the parking was. Mr. Saucier answered that the parking was accessed from the “woonerf” at the southern edge of the site.

Another Panel member asked if the courtyard space was intended to be public or private. Mr. Saucier answered that it was intended for the residents and visitors, but could be accessed by the public.

Another Panel member asked for more clarification on the nature of the cladding materials. Mr. Saucier stated that the “mini-towers” would be white glass curtain wall, with the surrounding buildings being clad in a light aluminum screen in a darker finish, accentuated by punched openings.

One Panel member asked if the buildings respected the setbacks laid out in the Block Plan. Mr. Saucier stated that the heights were respected and that the setbacks were achieved with an angular plane instead of a stepped profile, with minor intrusions into the setback in a few places.

Another panel member requested clarification of the landscaping treatment of the King Street elevation. Mr. Wex replied that they were aware of the fact that this elevation is a gateway to Don River Park and were going to treat it as such in the landscape design.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel generally felt that the overall massing and response to the site was strong and engaging. One Panel member noted that there was currently nothing else like it in Toronto and felt that the market was ready for it. One Panel member stated that the building framed a fantastic gateway to Don River Park.

One Panel member commented that the parking strategy was well conceived, but encouraged the designers to open up the facades of the parking more instead of walling them off. Another Panel

member felt that there was an opportunity to open up the south façade and the parking entrance to the public realm more.

Another Panel member felt that there was an ambiguous nature to the central courtyard and it should be made more private for the residents. Other Panel members agreed. One Panel member stated that there needed to be a more deliberate strategy to deal with noise from the ramps in the courtyard.

One Panel member stated that the character of the project was strong and appropriate to the industrial context. Another Panel member agreed, adding that the project was a great contribution to the West Don Lands neighbourhood. Another Panel member wondered how the buildings would ultimately fit in after the eventual build out of the other parts of the neighbourhood.

One Panel member felt that there should be a better response to the sustainability aspects of the building such as solar incidence and energy consumption. The Panel member added that the energy modeling for a glass-clad building is extremely difficult to reconcile, as well as the heat gain from the dark cladding, and their proper orientation will be critical. Another Panel member agreed that the environment will have a strong impact on the choice of skin. Another Panel member felt that these issues were easily resolvable, citing examples where a subtle shift in the angle of the glazing units dramatically increased the efficiency of the glass.

Another Panel member urged the proponent to provide more sections at the next presentation in order to help the Panel gain a greater understanding of the complexities of the site grading.

Another Panel member felt that the relationship between the at-grade residential units and the woonerf as well as River Street should be strengthened further. Other Panel members agreed, adding that there should be opportunities for families to live here and give life to the street, adding that the life of the street will ultimately depend on that.

One Panel member felt that the design of block 24 was under-considered and not as developed as the other blocks, and lacked the folding and syncopation of the other facades. Another Panel member agreed, noting that the “origami” effect of the folding plates was very strong and should not be lost.

Another Panel member stated that the idea of the prairie from Don River Park should be taken advantage of in the landscaping of the site. Another Panel member agreed, adding that with Stoss Landscape Architects on the team, there is a real opportunity to integrate and push the ideas and planting possibilities of prairie landscape.

2.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Improve the interface between the parking and the public realm
- ii. Don’t design private open space to draw in the public
- iii. Address the sustainability of the building and how it is achieving LEED Gold
- iv. Further consider the impact of noise on the courtyard and strategies to mitigate that
- v. Consider the relationship of the at-grade units to the street including family units.

2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Saucier and Mr. Wex thanked the Panel for their feedback.

2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support:

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in support of the project to proceed to the Schematic Design Phase.

3.0 West Don Lands District Energy Centre

ID#: 1024

Project Type: Building/Structure

Location: East of Cherry Street, North of the railway corridor

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Steven Holl Architects Inc. with Bortolotto Design Architect Inc.

Review Stage: Schematic Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Chris McVoy, Steven Holl Architects Inc.

Delegation: Tania Bortolotto, Bortolotto Design Architect Inc.

3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Carla Guerrero, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project noting that this project is currently in Schematic Design and is the first time that it has come before the Panel. Ms. Guerrero then provided an overview of the site context, project challenges and budget.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Overall project concept
- Building form and response to the site
- Types of uses for the programmable community space within building
- Configuration of the buildings to the north of the District Energy Centre on Block 8

3.2 Project Presentation

Chris McVoy, Partner with Steven Holl Architects Inc., described the project as sustainable urbanism that takes infrastructure and turns it into green space, noting that this project is conceived of as a landscape more than a building. Mr. McVoy then presented their reconfiguration of Block 8 to create more public space, the transit pergola and reflecting pool, sustainable technologies and planting strategies.

3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked what the width of the public space North of the building was. Mr. McVoy answered that it is currently five metres wide.

Another Panel member asked what the design intentions were for the north façade of the building. Mr. McVoy answered that it would be the side of the ramps going up to the roof garden, adding that they are still designing the actual elevations, whether concrete or planted etc.

Another Panel member wondered what the increment was for the levels. Mr. McVoy answered that the difference in height is 400mm so that no guard rail would be necessary, adding that there would be additional steps in between to navigate these levels.

Another Panel member wondered what the elevation of the train tracks were and if they were higher or lower than the roof garden. Mr. McVoy pointed out that the level of the roof garden was actually higher than the tracks.

One Panel member wondered what the size of the open space on the roof garden was. Mr. McVoy answered that it was 2,900m² envisaged as open and free space. Another Panel member asked if the intention was to have active or passive recreation on the roof. Mr. McVoy stated that is was currently not programmed. Another Panel member asked if there was an internal way of getting to the roof. Mr. McVoy stated that there was currently not, adding that it was something they could consider.

Another Panel member asked what the budget would actually cover. Mr. McVoy stated that it would cover the building shell and a portion of the public space, adding that the district energy equipment is covered under a separate budget.

One Panel member asked if the team was working with a landscape architect. Mr. McVoy answered that although not formalized yet, they are intending on bringing Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates onto the team.

3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members stated that both the intention and direction of the project were incredibly strong. One Panel member felt that the integration of the district energy plant with the constructed landscape was remarkable.

Another Panel member felt it was interesting that the building is leading with landscape. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the proposal camouflages what is building and what is landscape. Another Panel member stated that they were looking forward to MVVA joining the project as the roof will have articulation details that need to be resolved.

One Panel member felt that the urban design concept was an improvement over the precinct plan. Another Panel member stated their appreciation for the attention paid to creating a public space in the transit loop, a normally overlooked space, and urged the design team to push that as far as possible. Another Panel member agreed, adding that it was also important to create quality public spaces out of these areas.

Another Panel member felt that the 5.0 metre dimension of the “Distillery Walk” North of the building was too tight. Another Panel member added that the resolution of the grades in the public space will also be important to the quality of the space.

Another Panel member stated that the massing proposed for the residential buildings facing Mill Street was an improvement over the block plan. Another Panel felt that the developer call for the blocks should go out with an option for the Steven Holl Architects massing. Another Panel member disagreed, feeling that the buildings could be reminiscent the Huang and Dansky condominiums that have been strongly criticized.

Another Panel member encouraged as much integration of the community centre, school and daycare users as possible. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that there was an opportunity to link together all of these spaces. Another Panel member recommended that Steven Holl be hired to design the school to fully integrate the projects and fill in the connection to Don River Park.

Another Panel member encouraged the team to consider strategies for the North façade of the building as there will be guardrails and concrete walls holding up the ramps. Another Panel member felt that there was an opportunity to put some glazing into the north façade to address people's curiosity for what goes on inside. Another Panel member encouraged the team to look at how the streets terminate at the building, citing an opportunity to signify a connection to the roof.

One Panel member commended the team for incorporating solar panels on the pergola, but wondered if there was an opportunity to incorporate solar collectors onto the south façade as it is currently all glazing.

Another Panel member stated that it was important for people to really be able to access the roof, noting that people may not go up there unless there is a good reason to do so. Another Panel member urged the team to resolve any accessibility issues, while another Panel member felt that the project was too focused on the roof and not how the building meets the ground.

3.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the project
- ii. Consider the North Elevation and how it is seen from the streets that terminate at it
- iii. Resolve potential accessibility issues

3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. McVoy thanked the Panel for their feedback.

3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in support of the project to proceed to the Design Development Phase.

4.0 West Don Lands Development Proposal: TCHC Blocks 21 & 23

ID#: 1019

Project Type: Building/Structure

Location: Area bounded by King Street, River Street, Eastern Avenue and St. Lawrence Street

Proponent: Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC)

Architect/Designer: Baird Sampson Neuert Architects Inc.

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Jon Neuert, Baird Sampson Neuert Architects Inc.

Delegation: Mark Guslits, TCHC; Ian Douglas, Baird Sampson Neuert Architects

4.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, introduced the project, noting that this is the second time the project has come before the Panel and is currently in Design Development. Mr. Glaisek added that the proponents are looking to submit their Site Plan Application by September and would like the Panel's support for doing so even though they are still early in the Design Development phase.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- The relationship to surrounding neighbourhood context
- The relationship of at-grade residential units to public realm
- The location and configuration of the garage entrance

- Viability of open space below ramps

4.2 Project Presentation

Jon Neuert, Partner with Baird Sampson Neuert Architects outlined the project's previous configuration when presented to the Panel in April 2007, noting the evolution of the parking strategy, grade-related units, elevations, and strategies to achieve LEED Gold certification.

4.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if the sound attenuation issues had been resolved, noting that this issue came up at the last presentation to the Panel. Mr. Neuert replied that a sound study has been completed and is consistent with Ministry of the Environment (MOE) acceptable levels.

Another Panel member asked what the unit typology was on River and St. Lawrence Streets. Mr. Neuert answered that there are back to back grade-related on the ground floor with a double-loaded corridor condition on the units above.

Another Panel member asked how much private outdoor space was given to the grade-related units. Mr. Neuert answered that they have 3.0 metres on the St. Lawrence Street side, and 2.2 metres on the River Street side.

Another Panel member wondered if there was a way to control how the private space would be appropriated, citing barbecues and furniture as elements that would be adjacent to the public realm. Mr. Neuert answered that that was likely the role of the building management.

One Panel member asked what the glass to solid ratio of the building was. Mr. Neuert stated they were currently at a 50-50 ratio.

4.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel was generally supportive of the direction of the project. One Panel member appreciated how the various site issues and building constraints were handled, citing the "notch" on the North building as a great way to make the mews feel more public. Another Panel member added that the design language of the buildings was strong.

One Panel member noted that there is a lot of shared space in the courtyard, and very little private space for the grade related units, adding that dimensionally it should be the other way around. Another Panel member agreed and added that 2.0m may not be enough of a setback especially when there are bedroom units so close to the sidewalk. Another Panel member felt that there should be an opportunity for "through units", to allow for a bigger unit and relieve the pressure on the street elevation.

Two Panel members stated that they supported pushing the sidewalk out to the curbside to combine the private space with the public realm. Another Panel member disagreed, stating that this pushes the trees too close to the building face. Another Panel member agreed, adding that putting the trees outboard was originally a Design Review Panel recommendation and should not be reversed.

Another Panel member felt that the ground floor elevations were currently too opaque. Another Panel member felt that there could be an opportunity to use more glazing, noting that frosted glass would still provide privacy. Some Panel members felt that the front entrances of the grade-related units were not identified clearly enough to create a good street character.

Another Panel member felt that the TCHC and River City teams should review their River Street façades together to see what the future nature of River Street will be.

Another Panel member felt that the glazing on the King Street elevation should not be angled towards the downtown views, but angled directly north to minimize heat gain. The Panel member cautioned the proponents to note the true orientation of the building, as the solar shading measures implemented on the “south” side of the building do not face true south, adding that solar studies should be a mandatory component of the presentation.

Another Panel member noted that there may be planting strategies other than grass to landscape the site.

4.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Refine how the public realm and grade-related units work together
- ii. Refine the ground floor elevations and their perceived opacity and presence on the street
- iii. Review how the design works with the River City scheme and what the nature of River Street will be
- iv. Address the outstanding sustainability issues

4.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Neuert thanked the Panel for their feedback.

4.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted to conditionally support the project, citing the resolution of the grade-related units relationship to the public realm as an outstanding issue to be addressed. The Chair then suggested that a sub-committee be formed to work with the team in August so that they may be able to maintain their submission deadline in September.

5.0 Martin Goodman Trail: Ontario Place

ID#: 1003

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Linear trail running south of Lake Shore Boulevard from Exhibition Place to Coronation Park.

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: Janet Rosenberg Associates Landscape Architects (JRALA) with Office for Urbanism and BA Group.

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Two

Presenter(s): Antonio Gomez-Palacio, Office for Urbanism; Janet Rosenberg, JRALA

Delegation: Wayne Swanton, JRALA

5.1 Introduction to the Issues

Antonio Medeiros, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, providing an overview of the entire trail from Marilyn Bell Park in the West to Leslie and Commissioners Street in the East. Mr. Medeiros then reviewed the project milestones and budgets and introduced the project team.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- Planting plan and species selection
- Graphic design of the trail markers for use as a template across the system including the Central Waterfront
- Interface at intersections between vehicles and the users of the Trail

5.2 Project Presentation

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, Principal with Office for Urbanism, provided an overview of the project objectives and history of the site from the mid-1800's to today. Janet Rosenberg, Principal with Janet Rosenberg Associates Landscape Architects then presented the updated scheme including the treatment of the intersections, planting materials and the pavement marker strategy, noting that the overall intention is to heal the connection to the rest of the Central Waterfront.

5.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there was still a two-phased strategy intended that would ultimately include a waters' edge promenade through Ontario Place. Ms. Rosenberg stated that that would be ideal, but was not currently included in their scope of work or budget.

Another Panel member wondered if the trail widths of 4.5 to 6.0 metres were wide enough. Ms. Rosenberg stated that users of the trail they spoke with preferred more plantings over a wider path, and that the standard width long the trail's length is 4.0 to 4.5 metres.

Another Panel member wondered if tall grasses were going to be incorporated into the planting strategy to minimize maintenance. Ms. Rosenberg replied that they are still working on selecting the appropriate plantings and the maintenance implications of those selections, but that tall grasses would be limited to avoid making users or the trail visually isolated.

Another Panel member asked if there was a plan by Ontario Place to enhance the parking lots. Mr. Medeiros answered that they are currently getting funding to resurface the parking, add some lighting, and plant some new trees.

5.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members felt that the marker idea was very strong. One Panel member wondered if there could be an opportunity for a smaller or more localized marker within the system. Another Panel member felt that it could be incorporated into a larger graphic identity throughout the length of the trail and weave its way into a global signage program.

Another Panel member felt that given the decision not to provide direct lighting on the trail, there might be an opportunity for reflective elements to be embedded into the surface of the trail.

5.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the project direction
- ii. Proceed into construction

5.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Gomez-Palacio and Ms. Rosenberg thanked the Panel for their feedback.

5.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted unanimously in support of the project to proceed to the Construction Document Phase, and go to tender as soon as it is ready.

6.0 Tommy Thompson Park Pavilion Projects

ID#: 1027

Project Type: Buildings/Structures

Location: Leslie Street south of Unwin Avenue

Proponent: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)

Architect/Designer: Montgomery Sisam Architects (MSA)

Review Stage: Preliminary Design

Review Round: One

Presenter(s): Ralph Toninger, TRCA; Santiago Kunzle, MSA

Delegation: Nancy Gaffney, TRCA

6.1 Introduction to the Issues

James Roche, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, gave an overview of the working relationship between Waterfront Toronto and TRCA on this project, noting that the TRCA is an “Eligible Recipient” of Waterfront Toronto and is implementing a long-standing master plan for the park.

6.2 Project Presentation

Ralph Toninger, TRCA Project Manager, provided an overview the project including the local and regional context, master plan goals, special features, budget and timelines. Santiago Kunzle, Partner with Montgomery Sisam Architects, then presented the project concept and designs for the entrance gate, staff booth/interpretive area, environmental shelter, and ecological research station.

6.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member wondered how the Tommy Thompson Park Master Plan fit with the design for Lake Ontario Park. Mr. Toninger replied that the Tommy Thompson Park Master Plan was incorporated into the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan design.

Another Panel member asked if there were any plans for public washroom facilities on the site. Mr. Kunzle replied that there will be public washrooms at the entrance gate and at the environmental shelter.

Another Panel member wondered if there had been consideration to having a pavilion at the very end of “the spit”. Mr. Toninger replied that the Tommy Thompson Park Master Plan talks about decreasing levels of urbanity as one progresses south through the site, adding that at the very tip of the spit, it should be as natural as possible.

One Panel member enquired about the materiality of the staff booth. Mr. Kunzle answered that they were currently looking at pre-cast concrete with embedded texture and colour, noting that since vandalism is a major concern, it is important to find the proper balance between being tough and welcoming.

Another Panel member asked if there was an intention to have heating in any of the buildings. Mr. Kunzle answered that the only space that is intended to be heated is the staff area of the staff booth, and that currently they have not heating at all.

One Panel member noted that winter use of the site is very important and wondered if there was a way to accommodate winter usage better. Mr. Santiago replied that there is also the need to have a light touch on the land, and make these buildings essentially portable.

6.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt the concept of the buildings as part of the landscape is moving in the right direction. Other Panel members disagreed, feeling that the landscape and structures are not fully integrated yet.

Another Panel member stated that they understood the logic and requirements to make the structures vandal proof, but felt that the choice of precast concrete and steel was too tough and austere. The Panel member stated that other materials could be used that would meet the same objectives, but would give a richer, more emotive quality to the project palette. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that steel, concrete and glass are not “natural” building materials, and inherently not part of the landscape.

Another Panel member stated that a stronger position should be taken as to where on the spectrum they were, from fully blending into the landscape to being objects set within a landscape. Another Panel member wondered if there was a way to incorporate “found” or recycled materials from the site into the structures.

Another Panel member felt that the three buildings should relate a bit more to each other in language and materiality. Another Panel member agreed, adding that the common thread, or threads in the designs are currently not clear.

Another Panel member appreciated the simplicity of the structures and that they are modular and portable. Another Panel member felt that the idea of modular or “pre-fab” is driving the design too much, instead of the landscape driving the design, adding that the buildings currently feel too temporary rather than simply light on the landscape.

One Panel member stated that not having to winterize the structures allows the designs to be free of the constraints of a traditional building envelope, and allows the materiality to be pushed even further. Another Panel member felt that not winterizing the buildings is a lost opportunity, and others agreed adding that it’s a shame to shut down the park for half the year.

Another Panel member felt that the precedents shown in the presentation were very strong, but that the designs presented did not achieve the qualities of those precedents.

6.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Clearly identify whether the buildings are part of the landscape, or objects situated within a landscape
- ii. Study the materiality of the buildings, finding the proper balance between hard and soft
- iii. Consider whether to provide winter amenity to park users.

6.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Toningier and Mr. Kunzle thanked the Panel for their feedback.

6.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted to not support the conceptual design at this time and requested it come back.

7.0 Central Waterfront: Rees and Simcoe Heads of Slips

ID#: 1007

Project Type: Park/Public Realm Design

Location: Foot of Rees Street and foot of Simcoe Street at the water's edge

Proponent: Waterfront Toronto

Architect/Designer: West 8 + DTAH

Review Stage: Design Development

Review Round: Ten

Presenter(s): Marc Ryan, West 8

Delegation: Adam Nicklin, DTAH

7.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project noting that they are currently in Design Development for Rees and Simcoe heads of slips, and provided an overview of the context, site related issues and project capital budgets and timelines.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- East side connection to the promenade at Rees Slip
- Skewed configuration of deck area at Simcoe Slip
- Form and composition of the undulating curves and reduced slopes
- Enclosed handrails/guardrails required due to slopes
- Anti-slip and warning devices recommended

7.2 Project Presentation

Marc Ryan, Project Manager for West 8, provided an overview of the construction progress of the Spadina Head of Slip, and presented the structural designs, bench and railing details, anti-slip measures, and provided an updated version of the slopes at the Simcoe head of slip.

7.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked when the bridges were scheduled to be presented to the Panel. Ms. Mallozzi answered that Spadina Bridge is scheduled to be presented in September or October.

7.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that the steeper slopes proposed in the previous version of the Simcoe head of slip design actually signified where one should walk and should not walk more clearly than the new design. Another Panel member felt that the anti-slip dots projected a negative image, adding that there are no dots on docks up north. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the slopes should be signifiers, not the dots. Another Panel member stated that they could live with the dots if it meant keeping the design intent. Another Panel member felt that the surface was more dangerous with the dots than without. Another Panel member felt that people should be able to make their own decisions where and where not to traverse, adding that people should understand immediately if something is safe to climb or not. The rock in Cumberland Park was cited as an example of slopes people know to be careful of despite the lack of “markers”.

Another Panel member stated their preference not to have railings on the slip, citing the rock in Yorkville Park as an example where people use caution where necessary. Another Panel member agreed, adding that railings around the steep areas negate the whole idea of the slip.

One Panel member wondered if there was an opportunity for the bench at Simcoe Slip to become a height at which one could lean against, transforming it into a piece of urban furniture that might engage people differently than a bench or handrail.

One Panel member felt that one of the reasons the Central Waterfront Design was so successful was that it put in place infrastructure to relieve the pinch points in the sidewalk at the heads of slips, feeling that the pinch-point at Simcoe was not sufficiently improved by the current design as the sloped areas start so close to the existing sidewalk edge. The Panel member added that there should be more flat space, at least one more “band” in the deck, before the sculptural elements. Another Panel member agreed, adding that these slip heads need to stand on their own until Queens Quay is rebuilt.

7.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Widen the flat area at Simcoe slip and normalize its relationship to the sides

7.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Ryan thanked the Panel for their feedback.

7.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then stated that as there was no longer a quorum, no formal vote would be held; adding the final design solution for Simcoe would be distributed to the Panel via email.

8.0 Project Symphony (Corus Entertainment)

ID#: 1017

Project Type: Building/Structure

Location: South side of Queens Quay on the east side of the Jarvis Street Slip

Proponent: Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO)

Architect/Designer: Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc.

Review Round: Eight

Presenter(s): Don Logie, TEDCO; David Dow, Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc.

Delegation:

8.1 Introduction to the Issues

John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto’s President and CEO, introduced the project, noting that although not formally on the agenda, Waterfront Toronto has asked TEDCO to present the

Corus Project to the Panel one final time. Mr. Campbell stated that Waterfront Toronto's original contribution to the TEDCO/Corus project was \$12.5 million, noting that it was split into three contributions; one to achieve LEED Gold Certification, one to achieve the Design Review Panel's design criteria, and the last three million dollars to help achieve an acceptable ground floor animation strategy. Mr. Campbell stated that the first two contributions had been given to TEDCO, but the last sum of money was outstanding due to the Panel's dissatisfaction with the ground floor animation strategy.

The main issues on which the advice of the Panel was sought included:

- The Panel's assessment of the ground floor and public accessibility in the latest iteration of the project.

Mr. Campbell then introduced Don Logie, Vice President of Development for the Toronto Economic Development Corporation, and David Dow, Partner with Diamond and Schmitt Architects Inc.

8.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Logie presented the current configuration of the ground floor plan, noting that there had been some significant changes since it was last presented to the Panel in February, 2008. Mr. Logie stated that they had been working with Councillor Pam McConnell to find a solution that would provide greater public access and connections to the waterfront through the building. Mr. Logie added that management and retail space had been squeezed to allow for a wider public corridor, noting that both a public art strategy and enlarged green wall will be introduced to help enhance the quality of the space.

8.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there was still a restaurant component to the program. Mr. Logie answered that there will be two restaurant facilities, noting that one will be a higher-end restaurant and one is intended to be more of a snack bar; both open to the public.

Another Panel member wondered what the width of the corridor was. Mr. Dow stated that it was 15ft for part of its length, then widens out to 20ft for the remainder.

Another Panel member wondered what the flooring material was in this space. Mr. Dow stated that the black granite had been carried through the space from outside.

Another Panel member asked if there were public washrooms located off this corridor. Mr. Logie stated that there were not.

Another Panel member asked if Councillor McConnell had "signed off" on this project. Mr. Campbell stated that Ms. McConnell had pushed the resolution of the design as far as she could without endangering the deal.

8.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that the corridor did not constitute a quality public space, noting that they would rather walk outside than through this space. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that

the only reason to use this corridor would be to access public washrooms; which are not being provided.

Another Panel member felt that the notion of public accessibility was better when it was through the central atrium and past the central studio space.

One Panel member stated that the corridor felt like a service route that the public can go through and was not good enough. The Panel member added that the corridor had little value as currently shown, but if there was a great piece of public art, its value could increase.

Another Panel member felt the space could be made better, noting that the Stephen Bulger Gallery on Queen Street West was only 15ft wide, and that by removing the bulge in the corridor the 15 foot wide dimension be maintained throughout its length to create a more pristine, gallery-like feel to the space, adding that the ends could be anchored with large pieces of public art. Another Panel member suggested that public furniture could be added to sit on and view the art from, or even be the art.

One Panel member felt that there was an opportunity to get MOCA, George Brown College, or the Power Plant to program the space. Mr. Campbell added that Bill Boyle, CEO of Harbourfront Centre, could be approached as a programming partner.

Another Panel member wondered if these good intentions would be transferred to reality. Mr. Campbell stated that they would be relying on good faith. Mr. Logie stated that they would be interested in working together to make it work.

8.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues: N/A

8.6 Proponent's Response: N/A

8.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support:

The Chair then noted that as there was no longer quorum, that the Panel would not be able to formally vote in support of, or non-support of the project. Mr. Campbell indicated that it sounded like modest acquiescence of the design if the gallery could be curated and exhibitions kept from getting stale.

CLOSING

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