THE CITY OF TORONTO

City Clerk's Office

Minutes of the Joint Administration Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee

Meeting 1

Monday, November 7, 2005

The Administration Committee and the Planning and Committee met jointly on November 7, 2005, in Committee Room 1, City Hall, Toronto, commencing at 2:35 p.m.

Administration Committee	
Councillor *	2:35p.m.
Councillor Sylvia Watson, Chair	Х
Councillor Janet Davis, Vice-Chair	Х
Councillor Frank Di Giorgio	Х
Councillor Rob Ford	-
Councillor Doug Holyday	Х
Councillor Peter Li Preti	Х
Councillor Frances Nunziata	Х
Councillor Bill Saundercook	Х
Planning and Transportation Committee	
Councillor John Filion, Chair	X
Councillor Karen Stintz, Vice-Chair	Х
Councillor Cliff Jenkins	Х
Councillor Peter Milczyn	Х
Councillor Denzil Minnan-Wong	Х
Councillor Howard Moscoe	Х
Councillor Case Ootes	Х
Councillor Michael Thompson	Х

* Members were present for all or part of the meeting.

Councillor Watson in the Chair.

Declarations of Interest Pursuant to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

None declared.

1.1 Framework for Nathan Phillips Square Design Competition and Capital Funding Forecast for Project Implementation

The Administration Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee considered a report (October 26, 2005) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer outlining relevant issues for the design competition to revitalize Nathan Phillips Square (NPS), providing capital funding forecast to implement the Square's revitalization and seeking approval of the design competition framework.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) City Council endorse the guiding principles for the Nathan Phillips Square design competition outlined in Appendix B of this report;
- (2) the heritage context and site issues and opportunities discussed in Appendices E and F of this report be approved as the framework for the Nathan Phillips Square design competition;
- (3) City Council endorse a two-stage competition process for the Nathan Phillips Square design competition as outlined in Appendix I of this report;
- (4) this report be forwarded to the Budget Advisory Committee for consideration as a part of the 2006-2010 Corporate Capital Budget;
- (5) the Chief Corporate Officer, in consultation with other relevant City divisions, report back to City Council for its consideration of the winning design and design team to be selected by the design competition jury;
- (6) the Chief Corporate Officer, in consultation with other relevant City divisions, report back to City Council in the fall 2006 on management and financial structures to govern the ongoing management and funding of Nathan Phillips Square in a coordinated manner; and
- (7) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

The Committees also considered the following:

(i) communication (November 2, 2005) from the Chair, Roundtable on a Beautiful City advising that the Roundtable on a Beautiful City on November 1, 2005, requested the Chair to forward the following recommendations to the Joint Meeting of the Planning and Transportation

Committee and the Administration Committee for consideration on Monday, November 7, 2005:

- (1) that, subject to the balance of the recommendations listed below, that City Council support the renewal of Nathan Phillips Square in general accordance with the principles for restoration and enhancement outlined in the report (October 26, 2005) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer, and allocate an appropriate budget to ensure the effective implementation of the adopted plan and design for the renewal;
- (2) that a Management Board or Committee of Stewards be established immediately, chaired by a Member of City Council, and in advance of efforts to renew Nathan Phillips Square, to review and provide advice on the ongoing maintenance and activities on Nathan Phillips Square, with a view to restoring its dignity, and providing ongoing stewardship. Such a Management Board would represent a broad range of community interest, including individuals with a strong sense of the history of the Square, its design origins, as well as its future potential.

This Management Board would also act as a resource for reviewing the Terms of Reference for the renewal of the Square, to provide a forum in which interested parties can keep abreast of developments related to the renewal of the Square, for providing support to the jury established for selection of the winning design, and for ensuring that the selected design is effectively implemented;

(3) that the Terms of Reference for the renewal be developed further to expand upon those elements of the Square that are to be 'restored or renewed', rather than 'transformed', so that it is clear to all competitors what the limits of change are, and so that the competitors are aware of the expanded activities envisaged by the City through renewal. In general terms, the area with the elevated walkways is to be restored and renewed, while the area outside of the elevated walkways may be subject to a more significant transformation and that this territory include the roof podium, the zone along Bay Street, Queen Street, the entire west side of the Square, as well as the rear section of City Hall, along Hagerman Street. The existing elevated walkways would generally form the transition between the areas of restoration and renewal and transformation;

- (4) that particular attention be paid to the history of "The Ward", i.e. the precinct in and around City Hall, and elements be incorporated into the project to illustrate and reflect the history of The Ward and its environs;
- (5) that the two stage design competition process outlined in the report (October 26, 2005) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer, be supported based on the following comments and possible adjustments:
 - that while this project will combine both areas of renewal (a) and transformation, and includes significant technical challenges, that it is in the public interest to support a limited design competition process rather than a conventional RFP process. That while we would expect that design solutions within the area of the elevated walkways would be similar amongst all of the competitors (based on preliminary Terms of Reference and Heritage Report), that the programmatic renewal of the elevated walkways, the potential re-positioning of the Peace Garden, the placement and design of the proposed stage, the enhancement of the PATH system, the transformation of the substantial areas of existing soft landscape and the relationship of the Square to all adjacent streetscapes and Osgoode Hall, provides sufficient programmatic scope as to warrant the range of design consideration which is the intended outcome of a design competition;
 - (b) that the first stage proponents include both an architect and a landscape architect on each team. That while design teams should be encouraged to include a broad multi-disciplinary approach in the first stage, this will be subject to the realities of the number of available specialist consultants, in areas such as heritage and transportation. Therefore, team composition could be subject to jury review and adjustment prior to confirmation of second stage team selection;
 - (c) that requirements for the first stage submission be limited in nature, but sufficient to allow the competition jury (and not a committee comprised of City staff), in consultation with

the Management Board, to select from 3 to 5 teams to proceed to the second stage;

- (d) that the jury be of the highest calibre and include strong local representation;
- (e) that second stage proponents be required to attend a briefing session at the beginning of this stage, organized by the professional advisor and City staff, intended to provide competitors with a detailed review of program requirements, existing site conditions and constraints (including approaches to the first parking level), a presentation by the City's Heritage Consultant, and other matters critical and relevant to the renewal of the Square;
- (f) that an exhibition of the second stage finalists be organized and that all second stage competitors be asked to present their work in a public forum, prior to the final jury selection;
- (g) that the design competition potentially include consideration of additional building programs (e.g. meeting space, childcare) on the third floor of City Hall, as well as the possible re-opening of the rooftop observatory;
- (h) that competitors be directed to consider the staging and phasing possibilities of the work with regard to the practicalities of implementation and capital costs required; and
- (i) that the project demonstrate best practices with regard to sustainable design;
- (ii) communication (November 3, 2005) from Michael P. Nevin;
- (iii) communication (November 4, 2005) from Sybil Wa, Diamond and Schmitt Architects Incorporated;
- (iv) communication (November 7, 2005) from Catherine Nasmith, Vice President, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario;
- (v) briefing note, headed "Questions and Answers", (October 20, 2005), submitted by Facilities and Real Estate Division.

The Director, Business and Strategic Innovation, Facilities and Real Estate Division, gave a PowerPoint presentation.

The following persons addressed the joint meeting:

- Joe Lobko, Joe Lobko Architect Inc.;
- Christopher James Hope, Hiroshima Day Coalition, and submitted a written brief;
- Michael P. Nevin, Member, Hiroshima Day Coalition;
- John Phillips, and submitted a written brief; and
- Michael Rosenberg.

Councillor Kyle Rae was also present during consideration of this matter.

On motion by Councillor Li Preti, the Administration Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to the Budget Advisory Committee and Policy and Finance Committee that:

- (1) City Council adopt the staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the report (October 26, 2005) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer as amended to provide that \$16 million be recommended for the state of good repair for Nathan Phillips Square, and any additional expenditures for enhancements be conditional on other sources of funding from private/public partnerships or other levels of government;
- (2) on motion by Councillor Saundercook, the architect Viljo Revell be appropriately recognized in Nathan Phillips Square;
- (3) on motion by Councillor Moscoe, the recommendations in the recommendations section of the communication (November 2, 2005) from the Roundtable on a Beautiful City be referred to the Deputy City Manager and Chief

Financial Officer for report directly to City Council when this matter is considered; and

(4) on motion by Councillor Moscoe, under no circumstances should the name "Nathan Phillips Square" be changed.

Motion (1) above carried on the following division of votes:

- Yeas: Councillors Holyday, Di Giorgio, Saundercook, Thompson, Ootes, Watson, Stintz, Minnan-Wong, Milczyn, Nunziata and Li Preti.
- Nays: Councillors Moscoe, Davis, Jenkins and Filion.

The following motion by Councillor Holyday was voted on and lost on the following division of votes:

That the recommendations contained in the report (October 26, 2005) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer be amended to provide that:

"the \$16 million 'state of good repair' for Nathan Phillips Square be approved and the \$23 million request for enhancements to the Square be referred to the Deputy City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer for consideration and report to the Administration Committee, such report to include, but not be limited to, private and commercial donations for enhancements to the Square."

- Yeas: Councillors Holyday, Di Giorgio, Saundercook, Moscoe, Davis, Milczyn and Filion.
- Nays: Councillors Thompson, Ootes, Stintz, Minnan-Wong, Jenkins, Nunziata, Li Preti and Watson.

(Budget Advisory Committee; c.: Interested Persons and Committee Secretary, Roundtable on a Beautiful City – November 8, 2005)

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Chair