



**WATERFRONT**Toronto

## **Waterfront Design Review Panel Minutes of Meeting #30 Wednesday, October 8, 2008**

---

### **Present:**

Bruce Kuwabara  
Tania Bortolotto  
Peter Clewes  
Renee Daoust  
Anne McIlroy  
Greg Smallenberg  
Don Schmitt  
Charles Waldheim

### **Regrets:**

George Baird  
Paul Bedford  
Peter Halsall  
Siamak Hariri  
Janet Rosenberg

### **Recording Secretary:**

Margaret Goodfellow

### **Designees and Guests:**

John Campbell  
Christopher Glaisek  
Robert Freedman

---

### **WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Panel and provided an overview of the agenda. He 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 future of the Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO). Mr. Campbell stated that TEDCO will be replaced with a new entity called Build Toronto, whose aim would be to attract business to surplus lands and rehabilitate neighbourhoods and polluted areas. It would be paired with a second corporation called Invest Toronto, set up to promote the city to foreign investors. Mr. Campbell stated that the City and Waterfront Toronto are currently in the process of clarifying who will develop the lands in the Portlands within the Designated Waterfront Area (DWA). Mr. Campbell noted that Waterfront Toronto is currently focused on revitalizing the West Don Lands, East Bayfront and Central Waterfront, with timelines for the Portlands being further out, but cautioned that the removal of the land from Waterfront Toronto's purview will affect the business model and be a cause for concern.

Mr. Campbell then announced that Waterfront Toronto had recently hired David Kusturin as Vice President of Program Management. Mr. Kusturin will implement and oversee controls related to the design and delivery of projects and help to ensure that they are appropriately scoped, staffed and budgeted, with a streamlined delivery process. Mr. Kusturin will be developing Waterfront

Toronto benchmarking standards, key performance indicators and checks and balances for projects and project managers.

One Panel member then asked Mr. Campbell how he sensed the public was responding to the Spadina Wave Deck. Mr. Campbell stated that the overall response to the project has been positive, noting that the Spadina Bridge will be constructed in 2009 and will really give shape to the vision. Mr. Campbell added that the revitalized Queen's Quay will also be a signature piece of the waterfront.

Mr. Campbell added that when Waterfront Toronto was established it was mandated to make a city for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and revitalize with core principals such as Sustainable Development and Design Excellence. Mr. Campbell noted that with LEED Gold now an accepted benchmark there is an opportunity to push the benchmarks even further in the Lower Don Lands, where there is little existing infrastructure to tie into. Mr. Campbell noted that the Panel's support and guidance with this respect will be invaluable.

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

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

### *Reese and Simcoe Wave Decks*

- The Construction Tender has been awarded to Sommerville Construction and work will begin on October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008. Both Wave Decks are expected to be completed and open to the public by this June.

### *Martin Goodman Trail (Ontario Place)*

- The Construction Tender has been awarded to Mopal, Inc. and work is set to begin in October. The new trail and landscape are expected to be open to the public by this June.

### *Queen's Quay Environmental Assessment*

- Mayor Miller personally conducted a site walk of Queens Quay to try to resolve the differences between Waterfront Toronto's vision for Queens Quay and the TTC's goals for Transit City. Joining him on the walk were key members of the West 8 design team as well as TTC Chair Adam Giambrone's transit staff. At the end of the two-hour walk, the Mayor embraced the West 8 vision but requested that it be fine-tuned to ensure that transit is given the highest priority in the corridor, even suggesting some technical solutions that he has seen used elsewhere.

### *Gardiner Expressway Environmental Assessment*

- The joint Steering Committee and the Waterfront Toronto-City Staff Working Group have been meeting regularly. An outline of the Request for Proposals has been put together by Waterfront Toronto, and the City is contemplating hiring a consultant to draft their portion of it that focuses on traffic engineering. Waterfront Toronto staff will write the portion that focuses on urban design.

### *East Bayfront*

- The Parkside "Request for Proposal" has closed and has been reviewed by the Steering community is evaluating-should be able to announce the team
- This month Bayside is going out-4 prequalified developer teams-financing and the market place of concern.

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

One Panel member wondered how the Panel comments were distributed and disseminated to proponents. The Chair stated that the comments are recorded and distributed to the Project Managers. Mr. Glaisek then stated a “lessons learned” session may be helpful to review if the intention of a project materialized in the built form.

The Chair thanked Mr. Glaisek for his report.

---

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The noted that Toronto will be hosting “The Future of Urban Waterfronts” on November 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>, 2008, adding that John Campbell will be speaking at the conference.

The Chair asked the Panel if there were any conflicts of interest to declare. Ms. McIlroy stated that she had a potential conflict on the Tommy Thompson Park Pavilion Project and would not participate in the review.

There being no other comments, the Chair moved to adopt September’s minutes. The minutes were then adopted.

---

## **PROJECT REVIEWS**

### **I.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/Concept Design*

*Review Round: Two*

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

*Delegation: Nancy Gaffney, TRCA*

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

James Roche, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting this is the second time the project has come before the Panel in the Concept Design phase of work, as it did not receive support from the Panel in July 2008 to proceed to Schematic Design. Mr. Roche reminded the Panel that the TRCA is an “Eligible Recipient” of Waterfront Toronto and is implementing a long-standing master plan for the park.

Mr. Roche then summarized the Panel’s key issues from the July 2008 meeting which were:

1) clearly identify whether the buildings are part of the landscape, or objects situated within a landscape, 2) study the materiality of the buildings, 3) find a more appropriate and context-sensitive balance between hard and soft landscape areas, and 4) consider ways to provide winter amenity to park users.

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

Ralph Toninger, TRCA Project Manager, provided a brief overview the project including the local and regional context, master plan goals, noting that currently the site was not equipped to sustain

the amount of people coming to the park every year. Mr. Toningner added that the Tommy Thompson Park Advisory Committee and Friends of the Spit community groups supported the designs. Robert Davies, Partner with Montgomery Sisam Architects, introduced the scheme noting that the structures are not just events along the path, but are an integral part of the paths themselves. Santiago Kunzle, Partner with Montgomery Sisam Architects, then presented the revised schemes and design intents including the reuse of materials, landforms, and green strategy.

### 1.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member enquired as to the level of coordination between the Field Operations' Lake Ontario Park (LOP) Master Plan and this project. Mr. Toningner stated that TRCA was involved in the design of the LOP Master Plan and that the design intentions were incorporated, adding that the Gateway structure is that point at which the two master plans come together. Mr. Toningner added that the Tommy Thompson Park Master Plan is embedded in the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan. Mr. Roche added that there was also always the intention to have outposts throughout the master plan.

Another Panel member asked if there was a maintenance program intended for the wood cladding. Mr. Kunzle stated that the intention was that the wood would weather and become even more a part of the landscape over time. Another Panel member asked what type of wood was going to be used. Mr. Kunzle stated that that would depend of what type of wood could be re-used, noting that TRCA manages forests within the watersheds and the type of wood would depend on what is available to them at the time.

Another Panel member wondered to what degree vehicles were to be used within the park. Mr. Toningner stated the site is essentially a car-free wilderness area, noting that there are currently shuttle busses and possibly water taxis after the site is developed.

One Panel member asked what happens to the site at night. Mr. Toningner stated that the park is open from dawn to dusk, but is closed at night.

Another Panel member asked how winter consideration had been incorporated into the design. Mr. Kunzle stated that the pavilions are sited to protect from the prevailing winds in the winter and maximize solar penetration into areas like the staff booth/interpretive area for added comfort.

### 1.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

Several Panel members felt that the idea of reusing found materials within the site was very compelling. One Panel member felt that using shipping containers here was very powerful but that cladding them and disguising them took away that power, adding that if anything they should be clad on the interior instead of the exterior. One Panel member agreed, adding that there was a disconnect here with the intention, noting that even the re-used jersey barrier bench was clad, and that the wood in general is finely milled. Another Panel felt that the industrial artifacts should be used more directly. One Panel member felt that the clarity of the minimalist project was being lost, feeling that the shipping containers needed to be freed. Another Panel member felt uncomfortable with the durability of the materials, noting that wood is a problematic material to use in public buildings and is not durable in the long term.

Several Panel members felt that the orienting the buildings to the movement system within the park and topography was very strong. One Panel member wondered what the motivation was for the landforms, feeling that it needed to relate to the larger scale of the park and the LOP master plan.

Several Panel members felt that the buildings needed to undergo some editing, and that it seemed there were too many ideas trying to be integrated into the buildings. One Panel member felt that the designs needed to be bolder and less finicky. Another Panel member agreed, feeling that the composition of the elements needed to be strengthened. Another Panel member felt that all the little elements scattered around the pavilion were diluting the elegance of the project. Another Panel member felt that even the benches needed to be bigger and bolder to better relate to the scale of the “big wild” of Tommy Thompson Park.

One Panel member felt that there was an opportunity to integrate the bird habitat into the landscape instead of the building cladding.

Another Panel member felt that the pavilions could relate to each other not only in orientation, but also in marking the landscape across vast amounts of space.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Support for the idea of found and re-used objects, but in a more straight forward way.
- ii. Clarify and strengthen the design concept.

#### 1.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Toninger, Mr. Davies and Mr. Kunzle 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 moving ahead to schematic design. The Panel voted in non-support of the project, and asked that the project be brought back again at the Concept Design Phase, once the Panel’s concerns are addressed.

## **2.0 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*

*Architect/Designer: Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg (PFS), The Planning Partnership (TPP), Sterling Sweeny Finlayson & Co. (&Co), Jill Anholt Design.*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Greg Smallenberg, PFS; David Leinster, TPP*

*Delegation: Mike Tocher, TPP*

### 2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Carla Guerra, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that the project had gained Conditional Approval in September 2008, and was being reviewed at the Design Development phase. Ms. Guerrero then outlined the issues that were raised at the last meeting including, 1) Continue to pursue large healthy trees with the tightest spacing possible, 2) Keep challenging the basic assumptions and standards, 3) Create stronger

East-West connections and linkages, especially between the Distillery District and the TTC loop, and 4) Support for the public art concepts, both the linear story and the underpass.

Ms. Guerrera then stated that the proposal being presented was the outcome of negotiations with various City departments, the TTC, and the community, adding that the design represents some key strides in moving beyond traditional standards.

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

- The evolution of the design and response to the Panel's concerns from September 2008

## 2.2 Project Presentation

Greg Smallenberg, Partner with Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg, introduced the project team and outlined the design intentions for the street including the use of broad curbs, noble paving, lighting strategies and their aspirations for great trees. Mr. Leinster, Partner with the Planning Partnership, then described specific design features, sectional qualities, sidewalk widths, tree spacing and views of the public space at the Cherry Street TTC loop. Mr. Leinster noted that in response to the Design Review Panel concerns, the sidewalk width at King and Cherry had been increased by reducing the turning radius, the connection between the Distillery District and the TTC transit plaza had been reinforced through the use of brick pavers across Cherry, and that special lighting elements were introduced between the sidewalk and the TTC right of way.

## 2.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member wondered if it was reasonable to expect the Fire Department to accept a 6.0m fire lane. Mr. Leinster stated it is only 6.0m for a limited length. Another Panel member wondered if it was still possible to have a planted median. Mr. Leinster stated that the bike lane helps with the dimension.

Another Panel member asked if the Mega Pavers were used elsewhere in a similar climate to Toronto. Mr. Smallenberg stated that they are used extensively in Ottawa as well as throughout the University of Ontario in Oshawa.

Another Panel member wondered if granite curbs had been considered, adding that they are re-useable unlike concrete. Mr. Leinster stated budget was of concern with this project but they could look into what the specific cost implications were.

One Panel member asked if the length of the TTC platform was necessary. Mr. Leinster stated that the TTC had requested it. The Panel member then asked if planters could be accommodated within the width of the platform. Mr. Leinster stated that operational concerns such as snow clearing and the opening of the street car doors constrained planting opportunities. Mr. Smallenberg then reminded the Panel that the TTC transit shelters and platforms were going to be incorporated into public art pieces.

Another Panel member wondered if there was a potential conflict the overhead TTC wires and the tree canopy. Mr. Smallenberg stated that higher calliper trees will have their canopy above the wires.

Another Panel member asked what the detail intentions were for around the tree pit. Mr. Leinster stated that they will be poured-in-place, but will have a low curb around the pit. Mr. Leinster added that where there is a double row of trees, the surface is contiguous.

Another Panel member if the change in colour of the paving inside the TTC tracks at the Cherry Street loop was for safety reasons. Mr. Leinster stated that the TTC would like delineation of their track bed in this public space.

#### 2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel generally agreed that the design for Cherry Street would make it one of the most beautiful streets in Toronto.

One Panel member felt that the tree spacing was still too great and could be tightened.

Another Panel member felt that the team should investigate granite curbs and invest in quality materials.

Another Panel member stated that sidewalks tend to feel larger when there are no planter boxes, and suggested that they be reconsidered.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the project
- ii. Investigate the feasibility of using noble materials like granite in key places

#### 2.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Smallenberg and Mr. Leinster 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 moving to the Construction Document phase.

### **3.0 Central Waterfront Public Realm: Spadina Bridge**

*ID#: 1007*

*Project Type: Park/Public Realm design*

*Location: Spanning over the Spadina Slip*

*Proponent: Waterfront Toronto*

*Architect/Designer: West 8 + DTAH*

*Review Stage: Design Development*

*Review Round: Two*

*Presenter(s): Adriaan Geuze, West 8*

*Delegation: Mark Ryan, West 8; Adam Nicklin, DTAH*

#### 3.1 Introduction to the Issues

Pina Mallozzi, Planning and Design Project Manager for Waterfront Toronto introduced the project noting that the project is currently mid-way through the Design Development Phase. Ms. Mallozzi then stated that they are looking to tender the project in January and are seeking full approval of the project to do so.

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

- The bridge geometry
- Materiality

- Connection details
- Handrail design and consideration for central rail
- Landing treatment including connection to future boardwalk
- Stair riser/run configuration

### 3.2 Project Presentation

Adriaan Geuze, Principle with West 8 provided an overview of the design of the bridge at the Spadina slip including the Venetian archetype, boldness in detailing, and its combination of slope and steps. Mr. Geuze then outlined the structural configuration, method of construction, materiality, connection details, and phasing plan.

### 3.3 Panel Questions

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

One Panel member asked if there was a barrier free component of the bridge, noting precedents of stair bridges that incorporate ramps with stairs. Mr. Geuze stated that the particular slopes of this bridge would make the incorporation of a ramp difficult. Mr. Ryan noted that the curvature of the bridge allows boats to pass under which is why a stair bridge was utilized, adding that there is a barrier-free route around the slip.

Another Panel member wondered if consideration had been given to having a centre rail. Ms. Mallozzi stated that it is the design team's preference not to have one. Mr. Geuze added that heavy crowds usually warrant central rails, but that is not the intention for this bridge.

One Panel member asked if there was a strategy to deal with pigeons nesting in the structure of the bridge. Mr. Geuze felt that as the structure is over water, the pigeons may not be as attracted to it.

### 3.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then opened the meeting to Panel comments.

The Panel generally agreed that this is a new typology for Toronto, adding that the more that are built, and the sooner they are built, the better.

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

The Chair then summarized the recommendations of the Panel:

- i. Overall support for the project

### 3.6 Proponents Response

Mr. Geuze 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 for the project to be tendered and built.

The Chair then moved to an in camera discussion of review procedures.

---

## CLOSING

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