

Toronto Community Housing Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, August 13, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Wednesday, August 13, 2018 at
180 Sackville Road, Ground Floor Amenity Space 3:00pm

Present:	Regrets:
Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy (Chair)* Antoine Belaieff, Metrolinx (Vice Chair) Graeme Stewart, ERA Architects Andre D'Elia, Superkul Labib Chowdhury, Alexandra Park Resident William Shane, Alexandra Park Resident Sybil Wa, Diamond Schmitt Architects Shirley Blumberg, KPMB Architects Paul Bailey, REVIVE	Rubesha Zia, Regent Park Resident Berhane Abraha, Lawrence Heights Resident David Leinster, The Planning Partnership David Anselmi, Canada Lands Company Roland Rom Colthoff, RAW Design Samuel Abebe, Lawrence Heights Resident Ali Elchanti, Regent Park Resident Gunta Mackars, Metrolinx
Sat out: Yiwen Zhu, Urban Strategies	
TCHC Staff	City of Toronto Staff:
Vincent Tong Andrew Goodyear Elvira Vigo Frozan Shaikhamiri Joyce Ho Adam Shaw Derek Brunelle	Leo Desorcy
Recording Secretary: Joanna Kolakowska	

Project Reviews

The following projects were reviewed by the TCHC Design Review Panel on August 13, 2018:

- **Allenbury Gardens – Building E**

Project type: Site Plan Approval

Design Review: Second Review

Design Team: Core Architects &
Baker Turner Inc.

Presenters: Joyce Ho (TCHC)
Babak Eslahjou
(Core Architects)
Tim Turner
(Baker Turner Inc.)

Conflict of
Interest: N/A

Vote: Redesign - 0
Refine - 0
Fully Support – All



1.1 Project Information

Joyce Ho from TCHC introduced the Allenbury Building E project with an overview of the built context, a description of the neighbourhood and adjacent communities and an outline of the development history to date.

The revised design was presented by Babak Eslahjou and Tim Turner who highlighted the key changes from the previous scheme that was last seen by the DRP. Key architectural revisions centered around changes to the lobby, reconfiguration of the ground floor to allow for more visibility from east to west, the removal of wrap around balconies and redesign of the facades, and changes to the loading bays. Additionally, the landscape

design responded to previous DRP comments by creating an evergreen buffer along the east property line and by removing the hardscape pedestrian path in that same area.

Following the presentation, Leo Desorcy elaborated on the comments provided by the City to let the panel know that there is a concern about removing the path from the east side of the property as they would like to maintain pedestrian circulation along the eastern edge.

1.2 Panel Commentary

The panel commended the team on a clear and well organized presentation. Panel members were pleased to see many thoughtful changes implemented based on their previous comments including lowering the lobby to grade and revisions to the façade to account for the different acoustic and view issues. Overall, the panel felt that the team had presented an elegant scheme. The following is a list of recommendations to further refine the design:

East Landscape

The panel praised the team on creating a dense evergreen buffer along the eastern edge of the property but expressed concern over the removal of the pedestrian path in that area. They acknowledged that there was a previous comment regarding this path being reconsidered, but felt that changes such as a shift from hardscape to a more permeable medium and a reduction in width would have been sufficient. Panel members felt that the re-introduction of a less formal pathway with appropriate lighting could work quite well to create a silent space that would be inviting for the community and maintain better pedestrian circulation.

Panel members also appreciated the reconfiguration of the loading and ground floor program to allow for visual transparency from east to west of the building. Given this change, panel members thought that the landscape in front of the glass could be further refined to create a special moment. Additionally, the relocation of the transformer from its' previous location was noted as an improvement but there was concern over it being in front of the window, even if lowered. There was a recommendation to

consider a location at the north east corner of the building, near the pet relief area if feasible.

South Façade Design & Cladding Materiality

The panel felt that the design team had made great changes to the treatment of the east/west and north façade; however, they suggested that the team consider creating a recess in the west façade to better respond to its' proximity to the adjacent building.

Panel members advised that the south façade should be developed further as the south west view will be a key view from the highway and will act as the anchor to the development. Specifically, they felt that the team should look to break up the façade and create more verticality. They suggested that perhaps the reveal developed on the east/west facades could wrap around the corner and slim out the building. Additionally, they suggested the team consider making the podium on the south side more opaque to visually create a more contrasting break from the tower; this would also help screen materials being stored on balconies.

Although the cladding material choices have not been finalized, panel members cautioned against the use of aluminum panels as they felt it would not weather well in time. Given the proximity of the building to the DVP, they felt that once the panels acquired a patina the building would have an industrial feel to it. There was a suggestion to look at masonry as an alternative to align better with the residential use.

The panel restated their concern over the use of spandrel panel emphasizing that they are concerned that it will not weather well. In general, they felt that the use of glass as a solid material appears inauthentic. However, the panel appreciated the spandrel and slab detail provided and suggested that some breaks in the slab be added to reduce thermal bridging.

Finally, there was a suggestion from the panel to TCHC for future projects to present elevation studies showing the conformity with new Toronto Green Standard, 40/60 solid to window ratio requirements.

Bike Parking

The panel appreciated the overall shift of some of the bike parking to the underground to open up the ground floor plan; however, there was a concern that not enough resident spots were left on the ground floor. Additionally, there was concern over the location of the visitor parking. The members felt that the current placement is not an intuitive location from the perspective of someone who may be coming to the building for the first time. Finally, the panel felt that a ramp or stair access from the underground bike locations would be preferable but acknowledged that elevator access to the bikes on P1 would be sufficient provided that the elevator is large enough.

Sound Wall

Members of the panel recommended that the design team re-consider the addition of a sound wall along the eastern boundary as they felt that a chain link fence will not be sufficient intervention to make the space pleasant. They acknowledged that financial limitations may make this impractical, in which case they recommended that at a minimum structural provisions would be put in place in order to make any future installation of such a sound wall easier.

*****NOTE:** The above comments were made by the panel based on a condition without a sound wall. However, a sound wall is in fact being provided and the landscape architects have been asked to consider this in the design.

Sustainability

Panel acknowledged that there are improvements in sustainability performance of Building E over the remainder of the development but expressed some disappointment that the building was only meeting the base requirements of the new Toronto Green Standards, especially if being encouraged by the City to make this an exemplary project. They encouraged TCHC to raise the bar in terms of sustainability on all future projects, including the market buildings.

1.3 Chair's Summary

At the conclusion of the panel discussion, Anne McIlroy restated that the panel felt this was an elegant building with a strong grade relationship and identified the following key recommendations:

1. Reintroduce the east pathway in a less formal way.
2. Further examine the use of both glass spandrel and aluminum as cladding and consider if these are the best materials for this use.
3. Refine the accessibility to the visitor bike parking at ground level.
4. Further develop the south façade including introduction of architectural reveals and potentially creating a more solid feel to the podium.
5. Reconsider the location of the transformer.
6. Consider providing a solid sound wall or at least a structural provision for later addition.

Additionally, she requested that TCHC provide a clarification of their sustainability standard at a future DRP meeting.