



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #29 Wednesday, September 10, 2008**

---

### **Present:**

Paul Bedford, Acting Chair  
George Baird  
Tania Bortolotto  
Renee Daoust  
Peter Halsall  
Siamak Hariri  
Anne McIlroy  
Greg Smallenberg

### **Regrets:**

Peter Clewes  
Bruce Kuwabara  
Janet Rosenberg  
Don Schmitt  
Charles Waldheim

### **Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

### **Designees and Guests:**

Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

## **WELCOME**

Paul Bedford welcomed the Panel, noting that Mr. Kuwabara and Mr. Glaisek had asked him to serve as Acting Chair this month. He provided an overview of the agenda and then invited Mr. Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto's Vice President for Planning and Design, to provide a summary of project progress over the past month.

---

## **REPORT FROM THE VP PLANNING AND DESIGN**

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

### *Long Term Business Plan*

- Mr. Glaisek presented Waterfront Toronto's Long Term Plan that was adopted by the Board on September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008, noting that they had managed to prioritize \$3.6 billion in projects into the \$2.1 billion budget without losing any major projects, and adding the entire Central Waterfront plan.

### *Spadina Wave Deck (Head of Slip)*

- The Spadina Wave Deck will be formally opened on September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008, at the head of slip at the foot of Spadina Avenue. This is the first piece of public recreational infrastructure including the wave decks, bridges and promenades to be built along the Central Waterfront.

#### *Reese and Simcoe Wave Decks*

- The design team has completed 100% Construction Documents and tendered the Rees and Simcoe Wave Decks. Construction is anticipated to begin in October 2008.

#### *Canada Square*

- The consultant team has identified a compromise proposal that reduces the amount of below-grade parking and provides sufficient revenue-generating potential to finance construction of the garage and the new park with only a small remaining funding gap, which Harbourfront Centre is looking into raising itself. A draft report is being prepared and the public will be consulted.

#### *East Bayfront*

- The Developer Request For Proposals (RFP) for the Parkside development in the East Bayfront are due back on September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008. This will be followed by the release of the Bayside development lands RFP slated for early October 2008.

#### *Gardiner Expressway Environmental Assessment*

- The Terms of Reference for the RFP are being drafted together with the City of Toronto to hire a consultant to complete an Environmental Assessment for the partial dismantling of the Gardiner Expressway from Jarvis Street eastward.

#### *Lake Ontario Park*

- The Master Plan is now completed and will be brought to City Council for adoption in a manner similar to the East Bayfront and West Don Lands precinct plans. There is currently a budget allotted for Phase One of the plan to proceed at this time, and will likely include a wetland restoration and sewage treatment at the Ash Bridges Bay Treatment Plant and Coatsworth Cut area, working with Toronto Water.

#### *Don River Park*

- 100% Construction Documents are completed and the tender will be issued in late Fall 2008 with construction slated for early Summer 2009, once the first segment of the Flood Protection Landform (FPL) is complete.

#### *Sugar Beach*

- The Board raised no further objections to the design of the Jarvis Slip Public Space after the results of the Design Review Panel meeting where presented on September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

#### *Martin Goodman Trail*

- The Ontario Place section of the Martin Goodman Trail was tendered on Friday, August 29<sup>th</sup>, with construction expected to start in October, 2008.

#### *Regional Sports Complex (RSC)*

- The hand-over of the RSC is now complete, and the City has been given the full package of materials that had been developed by Waterfront Toronto over the course of the feasibility study. Waterfront Toronto also delivered to the City a potential business plan for construction of the Regional Sports Complex within the Hearn by a third-party operator who is interested in the facility.

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

One Panel member asked what was happening with the Queens Quay Environmental Assessment. Mr. Glaisek asked the Acting Chair if this topic could be covered in an in-camera session. The Acting Chair agreed to hold an in camera session after the Project Reviews.

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Acting Chair thanked Mr. Glaisek for his report.

The Acting Chair noted that there was a minimum quorum this month and urged Panel members to make more of an effort to attend regularly.

The Acting Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Mr. Halsall declared that he was conflicted for both Sugar Beach and the West Don Lands Public Realm projects. Mr. Smallenberg declared that he was conflicted on Sherbourne Park and the West Don Lands Public Realm projects.

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel if there were any questions or comments on the previous month's meeting minutes. One Panel member noted that the minutes stated that sub-committees were going to be struck for the Toronto Community Housing Corporation's (TCHC's) housing project, as well Queens Quay. Mr. Glaisek stated that there had been a sub-committee meeting with TCHC and Daniels in which Ms. Rosenberg, Mr. Schmitt and Waterfront Toronto staff had attended. Mr. Glaisek stated that there had been no sub-committee struck for Queens Quay, adding that the Panel would be brought up to speed in the in-camera session. There being no other comments, the Acting Chair moved to adopt September'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: Design Development*

*Review Round: Two*

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

*Delegation: Marc Halle, Claude Cormier Architects Paysagistes Inc.*

#### **1.1 Introduction to the Issues**

Christopher Glaisek introduced the project noting this is the second time the project has come before the Panel and is currently in the Design Development phase of work.

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

- The response to the Panel's Key issues from July 2008
  - The design of the umbrellas

- Extending the use of the park in colder months
- Choice of tree species
- Intersection between the promenade and the North West corner of the slip head

### 1.2 Project Presentation

Claude Cormier, Principal of Claude Cormier Architects Paysagistes Inc. described the evolution of the design since it was last presented in July, 2008. Mr. Cormier then outlined the various components of the site, sectional properties, materiality, and the water's edge promenade configurations.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel Member asked how high the umbrellas were off the ground. Mr. Cormier answered that they are 2.8 metres above the ground.

Another Panel member wondered if there was still a plan to have the white, recycled plastic Muskoka chairs as part of the urban furniture. Mr. Cormier replied that they are still intending to use them and are currently working with the chair's manufacturer to create a version that is more robust and able to withstand a lot of abuse.

One Panel member requested more information about the temporary landscape at the north end of the site. Mr. Glaisek stated that this temporary landscape was intended to fill out the site until such time that development happens on Block I.

Another Panel member wondered if the toe rail was necessary. Mr. Cormier answered that they feel the coping stone is a sufficient cue to the water's edge, adding that the City requested that the toe rail be there for safety reasons.

Another Panel member asked if the site could accommodate large groups gathering to the West of the Corus site. Mr. Cormier replied that they have studied the numbers of people that could gather on this site and there is plenty of room to accommodate large groups, adding that these studies led to a change in materiality of the mounds from grass to the rocks now shown.

Another Panel member wondered how the Panel's concern with the use of the site in winter had been addressed. Mr. Cormier answered that the site and activities there will be naturally subdued in the winter, adding that the beach is pure to its concept and will by nature be more active in the summer.

### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members felt the scheme was very clear.

One Panel member stated that the use of the coniferous trees work and help to give the site a presence and retain its form in the winter.

One Panel member stated that the current design of the umbrellas left them prone to vandalism. Other Panel members felt that the scale of the umbrellas was not quite right and wondered if there should be fewer, larger pieces to compete with the industrial environment. Another Panel member felt that the material resolution of the umbrellas should be studied further, wondering if

instead of painted metal, the team consider more natural materials that age well with a high degree of craft and durability.

One Panel member stated that the lighting strategy should mark this place differently, adding that using the taller poles at Queens Quay would signify its presence there.

Another Panel member felt that the sectional change of the beach to the promenade gives both elements more clarity to both spaces.

Another Panel member urged the team to examine the need for a toe rail, feeling that it took away from the aesthetics of the beach. Another Panel member felt that the toe rail was actually more of a tripping hazard and was less safe than no rail at all.

One Panel member felt that the striping of the rocks was less “fun” and more “bizarre”, and took away from the natural beauty and power of the rocks. Another Panel member felt that the design aesthetic and entire concept was “anti-naturalistic” from the beginning and it is too late to expect the proponents to revisit the concept. Another Panel member felt that the colour differentiates these rocks from the one in Yorkville.

Another Panel member stated that consideration should be given to whether occupants of this park will be able to use washrooms in Corus, or whether there is an opportunity to use one from the City’s Consolidated Street Furniture program.

Another Panel member noted that the design intention of the space adjacent to the Corus site was not as clear as the other spaces in the park, adding that when a concert is not being performed the space loses its sense of purpose. One Panel member felt that the location of the rock in relation to the Corus building was awkward.

Several Panel members expressed frustration with the resolution of the water’s edge promenade (boardwalk) at the Jarvis Slip. One Panel member felt that the beach should be built out to the edge of the boardwalk temporarily until a resolution is found to deal with the boats, allowing the boardwalk to be extended the full length at a later date. Another Panel member felt that the waters edge promenade is at the scale of the city and not an individual site, adding that it should always be consistent and not trumped by an individual scheme for a site.

Another Panel member expressed frustration at not being able to conceive of the project in its entirety and suggested that modeling its nuances at a larger scale could be of benefit.

## 1.5 Summary of the Panel’s Key Issues

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Investigate with the City the possibility of removing the toe rail from the design
- ii. Make a case for using colour in the rocks, or not
- iii. Study the scale, materiality and durability of the umbrellas
- iv. Consider the function and design of the space adjacent to Corus
- v. Study if there are further opportunities to utilize and occupy the park in the shoulder seasons
- vi. Study the resolution of the water’s edge promenade at the edge of Jarvis Slip
- vii. Consider modeling the project at a larger scale to see how all the elements work together more clearly.

## 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Cormier thanked the Panel for their feedback.

## 1.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted to conditionally support of the project, and asked that the project be brought back again at the Design Development Phase.

## **2.0 Sherbourne Park**

*ID#: 1020*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm design*

*Location: Area bounded by Sherbourne Street to the west and future development to the east, from Lake Shore Boulevard south to the water's edge.*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg (PFS)*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Five*

*Presenter(s): Greg Smallenberg, PFS; Jill Anholt, Jill Anholt Design; and Stephen Teeple, Teeple Architects Inc.*

*Delegation: Jennifer Nagai, PFS*

## 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Christopher Glaisek introduced the project noting that the project was being reviewed at the Design Development phase.

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

- The evolution of the design of the pavilion and art pieces

## 2.2 Project Presentation

Greg Smallenberg, Partner with Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, introduced the project team noting that this presentation of Sherbourne Park will focus on the public art component and the pavilion. Jill Anholt, Principle of Jill Anholt Design then presented the "Light Showers" art component comprised of 3 large elements that create a rhythm leading to the pavilion. Ms. Anholt noted that since the last presentation the form had moved away from the monolithic planar nature but still represents the deposition of impurities that dissolve into a vale of light and water, adding that the piece is also responsive to precipitation and seasonal changes. Stephen Teeple, Principle with Teeple Architects Inc. then described the evolution of the pavilion in response to the development of the park and the art. Mr. Teeple noted that the pavilion will now be operating year round, evolving from pavilion into building, adding that they will now be achieving LEED Certification.

## 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked where people were intended to change in and out of their skates. Mr. Teeple answered that there are numerous benches surrounding the rink.

Another Panel member wondered where the Zamboni ice-resurfacer was going to be stored. Mr. Smallenberg stated that the City is intending on using a travelling Zamboni allowing it to be stored off-site.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on how the art pieces, the pavilion and the park design were being tied together materially. Mr. Smallenberg noted that materially, there is the use of stainless steel throughout the detailing, and conceptually there is a lot of interplay in how the pieces all work and flow together.

Another Panel member wondered where the new shape of the art pieces came from. Ms. Anholt answered that the form was expressive of a container or vessel that was a punctuated end to the channel, adding that she felt the form gave it a more human scale.

Another Panel member enquired if light-permeating concrete had been considered. Ms. Anholt replied that she had heard of the material and would take a look at it.

#### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member felt that concept was strong and that the pieces had progressed well. Another Panel member agreed, noting that the pieces were powerful, and that the materiality is a delight to the hand. Another Panel member felt that the conceptualization of the art pieces was not there yet, noting that the vocabulary of the sculptural element does not have the same level of precision as the rest of the art piece.

Several Panel members felt that the design of the pavilion is fantastic. One Panel member regretted that the “sweet spot” of the pavilion held the mechanical unit.

Another Panel member stated that the more opportunities there are to sit and change out of or into your skates, the better. Another Panel member added that changing skates outside was not the end of the world.

One Panel noted that the presentation did not place the pavilion and art pieces in the overall context of the park design to allow the Panel to see how they all work together as one vision.

Another Panel member suggested that the team consider a heat recovery system for the mechanical units in the winter, and consider ways that that the channels could be used for cooling in the summer.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the direction of the project
- ii. Clearly illustrate the entire park and how all the elements tie together for the final presentation

#### 2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Smallenberg, Ms. Anholt and Mr. Teeple thanked the Panel for their feedback.

#### 2.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support:

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted in support of the project moving to the Construction Document phase, and thanked the proponents for addressing their previous concerns.

### **3.0 West Don Lands Public Realm: Cherry Street**

*ID#: 1025*

*Project Type:* Park/Public Realm design

*Location:* Cherry Street, from King Street to the rail corridor

*Proponent:* Waterfront Toronto

*Architect/Designer:* The Planning Partnership, &Co, and Philips Farevaag Smallenberg

*Review Stage:* Schematic Design

*Review Round:* One

*Presenter(s):* David Leinster, The Planning Partnership; Mark Sterling, &Co.

*Delegation:* Mike Tocher, The Planning Partnership

### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Carla Guerrero, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto, introduced the project, noting that it was currently in the Design Development phase of design. Ms. Guerrero noted that the last presentation of Cherry Street in July 2008 focused on the Environmental Assessment and community design charette which determined the alignments, geometries and width of the street and resulted in the new streetcar alignment running along the east side of the street: a first in Toronto. Ms. Guerrero noted that the design team is currently working on the materiality, TTC turn around loop and its relationship to the district energy plant, as well as the public art component that will be integrated with the transit shelters.

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

- The resolution of the Front Street and Cherry Street intersection
- Diversity and selection of tree species
- Legibility and treatment of the Cherry Street sidewalk extending down into the TTC loop
- Approach to transit shelter in TTC loop areas- conceptually linked to Cherry Street or to the District Energy Building

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Greg Smallenberg, Partner with Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, presented the context of Cherry Street as a vital north south connection within the City, adding that this phase of work will cover from King Street to the rail corridor. Mr. Smallenberg then outlined the street sections, materiality and tree planting strategy. Ms. Anholt, Principle with Jill Anholt Design, then presented the public art component in which the transit shelters from the City's Consolidated Street Furniture Program become art pieces themselves enveloped in light and colour, and the underpass area is transformed from dark and foreboding to light and dynamic.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked what the typical tree spacing was. Mr. Smallenberg answered that they were typically 5m-7m apart depending on the tree species.

Another Panel member wondered why the widths of the bike lanes varied from 1.5m to 1.8m. Mr. Smallenberg answered that the lane widths were established during the Environmental Assessment, working with the City and traffic engineers, adding that they will look into the original reason why the lane widths vary.

Another Panel member asked what the team was doing to ensure that the street trees not only survive, but also thrive here. Mr. Smallenberg agreed that street trees in Toronto do not have much of a life span, adding that they are addressing soil volumes with the use of silva cells, and the precise specification of soils. Mr. Leinster added that they also have James Urban on their team who is an expert in urban forestry and that the team has gone to great lengths to coordinate the



locations of the trees in relation to utilities and underground services. Another Panel member stated that the City has been working on changing the standard tree pit detail, adding that new trees are planted in tree trenches to allow for the 20-30m<sup>3</sup> of soil volume per tree needed and the results have been much healthier street trees.

Another Panel member enquired as to the caliper of tree that would be specified. Mr. Leinster stated that they were looking for trees to be between 80-100 caliper, adding that there is a balance between ensuring the tree is young enough to survive being transplanted to their new location, and having a big enough tree to make the street great.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Acting Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

One Panel member stated that the design of the transit shelter at the turn around loop needs to be seen holistically with the rest of the street.

Several Panel members felt that there should be a stronger material link across Cherry Street from the Distillery District to the District Energy Centre. Mr. Smallenberg stated that the City does not want them to formalize this area as a crossing for safety reasons.

Another Panel member stated that a 6.0m tree spacing was used in the International Quarter in Montreal which has been quite successful, and urged the team to look at planting the trees as closely together as possible. Other Panel members agreed. Another Panel member felt that the tree spacing and the lighting needed to be seen as an ensemble.

One Panel member stated that the sidewalk widths seemed minimal and encouraged the team to challenge the widths that they were given. Another Panel member felt that the 1.8m bike land width could be narrowed and given back to the sidewalk. Mr. Smallenberg stated that the dimensionally, they are very restricted in how much play they have with the street dimensions, adding that they are using materiality and wide curbs to enhance the experience and change your relationship between the sidewalk and the street.

Another Panel member felt that creating a network of public art pieces along Cherry is a great idea, noting the piece in the underpass will act as a great marker to this new district. Another Panel member agreed adding that illuminating the underpass will make a big difference to the quality of that space. Another Panel member agreed, but felt that the concepts could be pushed further to have an effect both day and night.

Another Panel member emphasized that the design of Cherry Street is dramatically different already, noting that the streetcar will be running on the East side of the right-of-way.

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

The Acting Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Continue to pursue large healthy trees with the tightest spacing possible
- ii. Keep challenging the basic assumptions and standards
- iii. Create stronger East-West connections and linkages, especially between the Distillery District and the TTC loop
- iv. Support for the public art concepts, both the linear story and the underpass

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Smallenberg, Mr. Leinster and Ms. Anholt thanked the Panel for their feedback.

### 3.7 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Acting Chair then asked the Panel for a vote of support or non-support for the project. The Panel voted to conditionally support the project, and urged the team to push the parameters they were given even further.

The Acting Chair then moved to convene the in camera portion of the meeting and asked the members of the public to leave.

---

### **CLOSING**

At the conclusion of the in camera session, and with no further business, the Acting Chair adjourned the meeting.