



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting #66  
Wednesday, June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

---

**Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
George Baird  
Pat Hanson  
Brigitte Shim  
Don Schmitt  
Betsy Williamson  
Gerry Faubert  
Jane Wolff

**Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek

**Regrets:**

Bruce Kuwabara  
Claude Cormier  
Robert Freedman

**Recording Secretary:**

JD Reeves  
Tracy Watt

---

**WELCOME**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and explaining that Bruce Kuwabara was unable to attend and asked him to chair the meeting.

---

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair provided an overview of the agenda and asked if any Panel member would like to move to adopt the minutes from the May 2013 meeting. One Panel member moved to adopt the minutes, and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if they had any conflicts of interest to declare and none were declared.

The Acting Chair then invited Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to provide their reports.

---

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

Mr Glaisek provided a summary of project progress.

- *Gardiner Environmental Assessment (EA)*: The EA process has resumed and the first public meeting is scheduled for June 13<sup>th</sup> at the Metro Convention Centre to initiate an open dialog with the public. The competition entries will be presented as initial ideas providing a framework for exploring alternatives. The options being presented are from Jarvis Street east to Carlaw Avenue. A recommended alternative is scheduled to go to City Council in March 2014.

One Panel Member asked if the York-Bay-Yonge Ramp take down would be considered within the EA study. Mr. Glaisek stated that this portion of the Gardiner was included in a separate study, which will allow this piece to move forward sooner, rather than have to wait for the full Gardiner EA.

- *CWF Queens Quay Construction*: This is progressing well, and the first instillation of the granite sidewalk, in front of the Westin Hotel, should start in the next few weeks.

The Chair asked when Corktown Common Park would be opened. Mr. Glaisek stated that Waterfront Toronto is planning to open the park on June 27<sup>th</sup> and that it would be open the entire summer.

The Acting Chair then moved to the first project review.

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **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*: Design Development

*Review Round*: Four

*Presenter(s)*: John Curtis, Arquitectonica; Bryce Miranda, DTAH; Jelle Therry, West 8

#### 1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project, noting that it was last presented to the Panel in September 2012 and received conditional approval pending final review of a couple of components.

Mr. Glaisek then summarized the issues:

- The height, space and width of this area of the Via Velo has been finalized, but we are looking for feedback on the interior and the connections to the exterior.
- Flexibility in being able to join some of the two bedroom units into larger family sized ones.
- Environmental model of the final façade is still pending.

Mr. Glaisek invited the design team to present their project update.

## 1.2 Project Presentation

John Curtis, a principal at Arquitectonica, provided an overview of the project, describing architectural changes that have occurred since their previous presentation. The presentation includes the floor plans, elevations, details, and rendered perspectives. Mr. Curtis explained that, further to previous panel recommendations, the design now includes a combination of sheer walls and columns to allow for future unit expansion. Mr. Curtis stated that since the last presentation the client has requested that the project target LEED platinum. The façade is 40:60 vision glass to spandrel glass. The aim is to create an open and accessible public space.

Bryce Miranda, a principal at DTAH, provided an overview of the “Via Velo”, including the scale of the space, access points, and enclosure system. To bring life to the space Mr. Miranda explained that there were three animation strategies: animated floor, animated ceiling, and animated store fronts, as well as planting and furnishings.

## 1.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked the panel members if they had any questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked how many larger 2 and 3 bedroom units would be available. The ratios for the units are 50% for 1 bedroom, and 20% for larger 2 and 3 bedrooms. They have made changes to their layout to accommodate larger units.

Another Panel asked if the Via Velo would either be for public bookings, or if it would solely be available to the residents and retailers? Mr. Miranda stated that it is envisioned as a public space for anyone but it will be the client’s ultimate decision as to how it is programmed.

Another Panel member asked about lighting of the Via Velo. Mr. Miranda responded that they have conducted a day light study and half the space is in shadow and half is in light therefore artificial lighting will be needed to keep the interior bright.

Another panel member asked if the Via Velo was envisioned as a four season space that would be heated. Mr. Miranda said it can be heated, but for energy reasons, it is not planned to be heavily heated. The retail walls will be treated as exterior walls and will thus be fully insulated. The panel members then asked what type glass is being used. Mr. Miranda told the panel that IGU glass would be used.

Another panel member asked if the temperature inside the Via Velo would be compatible with the tree species being proposed, which are warm climate plants. Mr. Miranda said the species has not yet been finalized and agreed that the heating requirements will be partly driven by tree species requirements.

Another panel member asked if the doors to the Vila Velo would operate on either the calendar year or the temperature. A decision has not been made at this time.

The Acting Chair asked why no balconies were proposed on the Queens Quay façade. Mr. Curtis said they wanted to differentiate this façade from the others. The desire was also to create a strong architectural edge on the street. The panel members asked if there is a retail entrance on Queens Quay. Mr. Curtis said no, the retail entrances are on Street A because drop off/TTC stop locations will lead most pedestrians there.

There being no other questions, the Acting Chair opened the meeting to the Panel comments.

#### 1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel Member raised concern about the Via Velo having too many competing elements between the ceiling and the floor stating it may not be necessary to have a complex treatment on both surfaces and one should be in deference to the other. One panel member suggested this space be thought of as a Passage in Paris. The door system should be adjustable to allow partial closure during the shoulder seasons.

Another panel member stated that the trees are not adding to the space, and as currently conceived in the middle of a bench as though they are shade trees in a park, which isn't necessary. The benches should be considered further, perhaps as moveable with backs.

Another member felt the facades within the Via Velo should have sliding doors that open up the retail spaces directly to the Via Velo.

Another member raised concerns about thermal bridging of the balconies, noting that in a LEED Platinum building it is a let-down and should work together as part of LEED excellence concept.

Another panel member countered that the cost may be prohibitive and better spent on other things.

Another panel member confused as to whether the Via Velo is a public space, condo lobby, or retail space. Dundas Square is an example of a public space which wasn't programmed properly when it was conceived and has an uncertain identity much of the time.

Another panel member stated that they were a little disappointed with the Via Velo given that this project has been to the panel so many times but still seems not to have been fully thought through. Several members agreed that the floor /ceiling combination was too busy and they should choose one or the other. An option is for an artist to be brought in to contribute to one of the animation concepts.

Another panel member felt that the café space should open onto the park side, as well as the Via Velo.

Another panel member agree that the retail connections/windows are an important consideration for animating these spaces. The apparent "window wall" system lining the Via Velo does not feel open and transparent enough, and the heavy millions may be the reason. They also suggested aligning the millions on the big doors with the heights of the regular sized doors.

The Acting Chair felt the balconies should be on the Queens Quay façade to unify the building and give every unit some open space.

#### 1.5 Summary of the Panel's Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) Percentage breakdown of the number of units needs to be clarified including how many could be joined into larger units.
- 2) Thermal bridging for balconies should be analysed and presented to explain their decision.

- 3) Via Velo needs to be further developed. Clarity of the treatments, nature of it as a public or private space, relationship with adjacent retail, use of plant material, and a variety of seating options will need to be addressed.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Curtis 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 unanimously voted for non-support of the Via Velo, and conditional support for the rest of the project pending more information about units and balconies.

---

## **2.0 East Bayfront Development Proposal: Parkside**

*ID#: 1037*

*Project Type: Buildings/Structures*

*Location: North of Queens Quay, east of Sherbourne Common*

*Proponent: Great Gulf (Downtown Properties) Limited*

*Architect/Designer: Safdie Architects*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Four*

*Presenter(s): Isaac Franco, Safdie Architects*

#### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Mr. Glaisek introduced the project, noting that it was last presented to the Panel in May 12, 2013 and received conditional support.

Mr. Glaisek then summarized the Panel's recommendations from the May 12, 2013 presentation:

- Improve the Queens Quay façade and consider its relationship to the adjacent podiums
- Consider strengthening the reading of the colonnade around the other sides of the building.

#### 2.2 Project Presentation

Isaac Franco, a principal at Safdie Architects, provided an overview of the project, stating in their view the building faces the park, not Queens Quay. They presented perspectives, elevations and which also included the relationship to Bayside R1/R2 building. They also proposed lowering the podium by two stories and increasing the tower by four stories.

#### 2.3 Panel Questions

The Acting Chair then asked for questions of clarification.

One Panel Member wanted to know if they had considered filling in the "gap" at the top section. Mr. Franco mentioned that it was one of the options, but felt it looked to top heavy. He proceeded to show some of the study options that were reviewed and rejected.

Another panel member asked if the reading of the facade as “two halves” is important. Mr. Franco answered yes, adding that the stepping detail of the building is an important element and we feed the slot at the top helps reinforce this concept.

The Acting Chair asked if they have file for the required zoning changes. Mr. Franco replied no, but they are in the process of preparing a submission.

There being no other questions, the Acting Chair opened the meeting to Panel comments.

#### 2.4 Panel Comments

One Panel Member felt that the new version didn’t really address the concerns that were raised at the previous Design Review Panel meeting.

Another Panel member felt the stepping podium has a monumental, or commercial character, not a residential building character.

Another panel member stated that this building will set a precedent for Queens Quay and is therefore extremely important.

Another panel member suggested adding more horizontal bands and planted balconies to help the “two halves” into a comprehensive front.

#### 2.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- 1) More changes need to be made the south façade of this building to improve its residential character and relationship to Queens Quay.

#### 2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Franco thanked the Panel for their feedback

#### 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. The Panel unanimously voted for conditional support pending resolution of the key issues above.

---

### **CLOSING**

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