



BOUSFIELDS INC.

MEMORANDUM

To: File

Project No.: 1734

From: Mike Dror

Date: June 24, 2021

Re: City Working Group 3 Meeting Notes

Participants:

Councillor Mike Layton (ML)	Andrea Fresolone (AFr)
Barry Brooks, Community Planning (BB)	Angela Cole, 13 Annex Lane (ACo)
Robert Ursini (RU)	Corinna Li, HSRO (CL)
Daniel de Moissac (DdM)	Danae Engle, HSRO (DE)
Anne Fisher (AFi)	Edward Leman (EL)
Kevin Lee (KL)	Henry Wiercinski (HWie)
James Parakh (JP)	James Jennings, 23 Annex Lane (JJ)
Daniel Reynolds (DR)	Ron Soskolne (RS)
Gino D'Ambrosio (GD)	Sue Dexter, HVRA (SD)
Jay Brown (JB)	Elizabeth Sisam (ES)
Kareem Sethi (KS)	Zoe Newman (ZN)
Peter Venetas (PV)	Jennifer Franks (JF)
Mansoor Kazerouni (MK)	David Sisam (DS)
Aamer Shirazie (AS)	
Amanda Chih (ACh)	
Claudia Sanchez (CS)	
Alun Lloyd (AL)	
David Leinster (DL)	
Samantha Irvine, ERA (SI)	

AGENDA:

6-7pm

1) Follow up from previous working group meetings (massing and form, streetscape and public realm, (cultural) heritage, benefits), including changes presented by developer at June Design Review Panel

7-8pm

- 2) Movement
- 3) Timing
- 4) Outstanding items

DRP

- JP: Presented a staff summary of some of the DRP's comments:
 - The Formal DRP Minutes were not available at the time of this working group meeting. It's important to note that only those minutes will form the formal recording of the panel comments once approved by Panel members.
 - Appreciate that the applicant took this to the DRP
 - On the Urban Living Room (ULR):
 - Natural light into the concourse is appreciated.
 - Appreciated idea of programming the space.
 - Integrate flexibility and make it feel less "corporate".
 - Introduce more greenery.
 - Some panel members appreciated how the podium was eroding to the tower whereas others suggested maybe it was better to have a clean break between lower and upper portions.
 - Some panelists suggested exploring removing the indoor portion with potential replacement of open space along Spadina Road.
 - Other suggested shortening it at the front – setting it back a bit more from Bloor.
 - Also suggestions that it could be set back further at the north end
 - Direct access to the TTC subway was very much appreciated with the natural light coming down.
 - Heritage:
 - Reviewed in and of itself and the merits of the building.
 - Widening sidewalk is not justification for removing the building.
 - Laneway:
 - More greening as screening for townhouses but also creating green buffer.
 - Terracing can have additional greenery and screening.
 - Balconies:
 - Looks bulkier than floor plate really is.
 - Simplification of the design recommended for tower design and the top.
 - Examples: Tower Hill, St. Clair; The Colonnade, Toronto
 - One Panel member suggested potentially making the entire top white, playing with light and shadow to create drama on the top, and integrating balconies on some faces
 - Appreciated height was not visible above silhouette of Knox College.

HERITAGE

- DdM:
 - Presented about heritage merits of the building.
 - Contributes to important character of intersection and history of Spadina Road.
 - Not designated or listed, but HPS still considers the 334 Bloor building to be a significant heritage resource located in area of growth.

- Applicant noted it had only nominal value, lost much of its context, therefore may have less value.
- City disagrees – in their opinion this makes it even more valuable, anchors intersection, represents of classical style, notable architects, unusual for having retail at grade, retains most of its integrity except for the storefront, including windows, art deco details, etc.
- Site has unique constraints including TTC entrance, heritage, but heritage integration in heritage with transit can be accomplished like 85 Spadina – Norman Gash House – but notes that it does not see as much traffic but can look at Hudson's Bay building on Queen which does.
- Another objective is to increase publicly accessible space but built heritage has value to public realm as well.
- Want to see that alternatives were explored.

BUILT FORM

- MK:
 - Recollected principles established in the beginning of this process (slides from Workshop 1).
 - Met as group/community at start of project and what community was looking for.
 - Reminded of the discussion because it was heard at DRP and tonight.
 - Seems to be this notion that what we are trying to do with heritage building is widen the sidewalks. Beg to differ, we are trying to achieve more objectives that cannot be achieved with that building there.
 - Noted other feedback from DRP.
 - "Celebrates transit", "Responds to By-laws", "Complicity with lane to the north", "Complicity with the neighbourhood". Need to do more to fulfill the narrative.
 - "Much to admire", "Pushes at the edge of typology and tower", "Creates communal space".
 - Lots of recognition for celebrating transit, great public realm, pushing at the edge of the typology of podium and tower.
 - Talk of simplifying tower, and balconies adding to bulk:
 - Tried to get away from traditional tabletop typology of podium that ends and goes up a tower and go with a different approach.
 - Trying to do transitional form that blends into a tower.
 - Continued with erosion by nibbling away at corners in the middle and sculpting at the top.
 - Wanted to carry that idea consistently across the base, the middle, and the top of the building.
 - Comment was made that we eliminate the colour. Open to exploring colour and materials.
 - Noted that projecting balconies are not proposed to wrap around the entire building, only on north and south.
 - If you add wrap around balconies to a typical 750 m2 tower, you get an equivalent of a 930 m2 floorplate.
 - This one is not bulkier than most buildings.
 - By sculpting the form, you have broken down the bulkiness.

- Regarding “corporate feel” to the ULR, will take into account as revise design further.
- Lots of comments received back (at DRP) on ULR related to old images.
- Along Bloor, lots of appreciation that natural light can get down to concourse level through ULR.
- Scale of ULR is quite large – a 7 metre tall, 24-metre-wide space when including the 6 m space from ULR to sidewalk. The portion of the ULR along Spadina has a 15.8 metre height.
- ULR is about 7,000 square feet.
- The corner POPS is currently 12.8 by 12.5 m, so almost 2,000 sf. What is the right size for the corner?
- Cannot look at any one element in isolation because they are collectively adding up to what we’re trying to create.

HERITAGE

- SI
 - At DRP, heard positive things about widening the sidewalk.
 - Not a rationale to remove heritage, but about balancing of objectives.
 - There was talk on dismantling and relocating facades was opposed (like was done at One Bedford). Heritage expert at DRP starkly opposed that approach.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

- JJ:
 - Comment that this is not just about widening a sidewalk.
 - Annex Lane residents’ concerns have not been addressed.
 - Are seeing improvements on original presentation.
 - Appreciate that the townhouses are shown correctly. They are starting to be understood but concerns have not been addresses.
 - Does not feel that the improved green space between site and Annex Lane is sufficient.
 - Would like a line-of-sight drawing from ramps coming up to their bedrooms.
- MK:
 - Was relaying that the DRP noted concerns were addressed with the lane to the north.
 - Started to respond to Annex Lane concerns.
 - Hopefully the willingness of the design team is seen that shows they will go as far as we can to make the condition as great as possible.
 - Will look at additional greenery on the terraces.
 - Have prepared line of sight drawings and ready to present to them.
- DS:
 - Said that the DRP generally thought the tower erosion regardless of colour was not really helping.
 - ULR is the wrong term – not sure what it is.
 - Recommends looking at Victor Prus’ Bonaventure Station in Montreal (like an outside world inside).
- EL:

- Surprised that discussion of ULR and corner POPS is being dumbed down to widening of sidewalks which is not doing justice to it at all.
 - This is one of four major corners in the area.
 - Huge opportunity here to do something.
 - Not convinced it is there yet but happy to have offline discussions about it.
- DE:
 - Any thought to adding a fourth meeting?
 - Have we meaningfully engaged with unrepresented communities?
- BB:
 - Yes, maybe mid-late September.
 - Provide opportunity for the applicant to make further changes and come back to the Working Group to present.
- ML:
 - As long as we see an evolution of change, there is merit to meeting further.
 - To DE's point, did meet with Larry Frost (Native Canadian Centre) and invite Angus from WigWamen.
- ZN
 - Met with Jennifer Franks from Indigenous Affairs Office at City
 - Talked about opportunities for WigWamen Terrace and Native Canadian Centre to participate.
 - To participate meaningfully would require more thought than just being invited to a fourth meeting.
 - This is an opportunity to get the process right (Truth and Reconciliation Report Point 92) calling on corporate consultation with Indigenous groups before economic development processes.
- SD:
 - Support engagement with Indigenous people.
 - Need to consider ULR and opportunities.
 - Would require a little extra talk and sit down to figure this out.
- PV
 - As part of pre-engagement process, we did reach out to the Indigenous communities on Spadina and met with a professor at UofT as well.
 - Did take cues early on in advance of submitting an application to set up a dialogue, in particular with Larry.
 - Happy to continue that dialogue.
 - Were trying to go down that path at the beginning and part of it right now is reconvening on that path and ensuring that dialogue continues.
- ML:
 - Larry Frost comments to ML were about focusing ULR on Indigenous focus and telling stories of the community in that area.
 - His thoughts would integrate well into this spaces particularly with the entrance to the subway with foot traffic and people.

MOVEMENT

- CS:

- Provided comprehensive presentation.
- Existing site today:
 - Bloor street bike lanes are important.
 - There is currently an external loading area.
 - Site is above Spadina station, Line 2 and Line 1 with TTC buses.
 - Area is similar to Yonge/Eglinton, Yonge/Bloor, Yonge/Sheppard where you have multiple subway lines coming together.
 - Looked at pedestrian context. It is very walkable and different land uses.
 - Looked at Bloor St Corridor and pedestrian crossings. How can the pedestrian experience be improved?
- Proposed site overview:
 - Ramp is on the left side of the site and provides access to vehicle parking underground, some bicycle parking underground and there is a mezzanine area for visitors to the site and there are bike stairs at the side with an easier tread which makes it much more welcoming to cyclists.
- Looked at travel demand and how many trips will be made for proposed residential, retail and office space.
- Looked at existing traffic volumes in Sept 2018 (pre-COVID). Although Green P parking lot can be accessed from Walmer, traffic counts indicated minimal routing between site and Walmer Rd access.
- Looked at other area development changes.
- Net new site traffic of 60 in the AM and 90 in the PM – small incremental change.
- Bike repair station on site; secure shower and change room for office and retail employees.
- Proposed laneway – use of bollards and treatments to provide delineation between driveable area and walkable area, along with landscaping and lighting to emphasize it is a shared space.
- Discussion of laneway area and how its width will provide for good separation, along with proposed landscaping to provide screening.
- Provided diagram showing headlights from parking ramp and noted that impact will actually be less most of the time because the garage door will be closed until cars get further up the ramp than is shown on the diagram.
- Headlights from parking ramp – headlights are very standardized in how much they can flare upwards and outwards. Overheard door softens headlight beams.
- BB:
 - There was a question about how many garage doors are proposed.
 - Noise of these doors going up and down? Will that be an issue in terms of design that you have dealt with in the past?
- CS/AL:
 - One door at parking ramp and for loading area, one door at each bay (3 of them).
 - Hear more about concern and consideration around truck noise; cars and small vans tend to be quieter. Trucks idling and beeping.

- Loading facilities – City of TO has a noise by-law and concern is that these truck noises will be happening 24/7. Focused that all loading activity happens behind the doors.
 - Looked at anticipated loading activity and did a survey of proxy sites. Saw that majority of loading activity was happening with smaller vehicles (smaller vans, cube vans).
 - There will be activity, but one of the onuses is to internalize these activities. That is what is proposed here.
- CL
 - How will development impact left turn lanes queuing at the intersection and how that may cause problems re: traffic flow.
- AL
 - Haven't looked at it yet given the low level of added traffic.
 - Recognize where the proposed intersection is (as far away as we can get from Bloor), and there will be some times where there are conflicts.
 - More people make right turns than left turns but will make left turns when they can.
- JJ
 - How soon can we get the slides and do more detailed engagement?
- PV
 - Happy to continue the dialogue. Don't want to lose momentum with the engagement process and the application. Need to calibrate aspects of resubmission as well.
 - This presentation along with the meeting minutes will be made available on the project website (<https://www.350bloorstreetwest.com>).
 - Can continue to engage, either informally or formally but want to make sure this is moving forward. We can meet in the next couple of weeks and figure out the best method to do it.
 - All material made in the submission is publicly assessable as well.
- EL
 - How do you handle the potential backup of trucks coming onto the site? Particularly grocery deliveries and retail.
- AL
 - Have space for trucks to sit and wait, but most vehicles will be small cube trucks, and very few larger trucks.
- CS
 - Goal of design is that trucks will only be reversing into the loading area so they will always be coming out of the loading area in a forward motion.
- PV
 - This project when completed will have full time property management staff on-site to schedule and coordinate loading, including likely a dock manager.
- ES
 - Lots of bike spaces, are there any for non-residents? How are those accessed?
- CS

- Yes, there is short-term bike parking. Majority will be on the mezzanine level and accessed via bike-friendly stairs with a shorter tread. Also accessible via an elevator.
- ES
 - Would be helpful in the site plan to highlight all the convenience bike parking better.
- CS
 - They are more visible on the original submission.
- HWie
 - Is the laneway sized appropriately for larger vehicle to move in and out appropriately?
 - Parking is at a premium in the area. Is there enough?
 - Will parking accommodate EV charging?
 - At NE corner of ULR, is there an issue with sightlines?
 - Where is the exhaust of the parking garage?
- AL
 - Yes, laneway is sized for the truck maneuvers.
 - Building is pulled back from the existing property lines. This level of detail we will get into further.
 - Will get back to you on rest of the questions.

CLOSING REMARKS

- AF (filling in for ML):
 - Suggestion from ML to narrow Spadina and increase sidewalk width.
- AL
 - We are happy to look at it.
- CS
 - Looked at lane widths on Spadina for initial Working Group meeting.
 - North of intersection did do road diet where they narrowed them in order to provide left turn lane and there isn't much there and only alternative would be whether or not a lane would be removed.
- BB:
 - Thank you to everyone for coming tonight.
 - Retiring as of June 30th.
 - RU will have carriage of the file for now until a new Senior Planner is brought on.
 - In the summer we anticipate a resubmission.
 - Suggested a 4th working group session in September.