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INTRODUCTION

The jury for the St. Lawrence Market North Building Competition deliberated over two days on May 18 and 19, 2010 at the Ontario Heritage Centre in Toronto. After extensive detailed examination, the jury unanimously selected as the winning submission the Red Submission.

The Red Submission was submitted by Adamson Associates Architects and Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners.

Professional Advisor

- Peter Berton, Professional Advisor, +VG Architects, Toronto, chaired the deliberations
- Natasha Ervin, Coordinator, also of +VG Architects

Competition Jury Members

- Christine Couvelier, Culinary Concierge, Victoria, British Columbia
- Dr. Ron Dembo, zerofootprint, Toronto, Ontario
- William Greer, Toronto, Ontario
- Andrea Leers, Leers Weinzapfel Associates Architects, Boston, Massachusetts
- Peter Ortved, CS&P Architects Inc., Toronto, Ontario
- Russell Smith, Toronto, Ontario
- Claire Weisz, WXY Architecture, New York, New York

General comments

- The jury was given detailed analysis and comments from the Technical Advisory Committee to which they could refer during deliberations, along with all background material provided by the City of Toronto and the competitors. The Technical Advisory Committee consisted of staff from the following City divisions:
  - Toronto Court Services
  - Toronto Parking Authority
  - Real Estate Services, including staff from Development & Portfolio Planning and St. Lawrence Market.
- City Planning, including staff from Urban Design and Heritage Preservation Services
- Facilities Management, including staff from the Energy Efficiency Office; Design, Construction and Asset Preservation; and Facilities Operations
- Transportation Services
- Parks, Forestry and Recreation

An independent cost consultant and an independent building program consultant also sat on the Technical Advisory Committee.

- It was noted that each of the submissions had components that did not meet aspects of the program requirements and the extent of this was identified to the jury for each submission. The jury made an effort to determine if the compromises made by the competitors were justified by other benefits achieved by those moves. The Development Parameters have specific recommendations for height, angular planes, entrances, materiality and urban edges. Four of the designs do not appear to meet the requirements of a setback above the 16 meter height, or the 44° of angular planes. The Development Parameters recommend a base which has an historical character similar to other buildings in the area, which implies masonry, but each competitor interpreted the importance of this recommendation differently.

- Selected City staff were consulted at the request of the jury for clarifications on certain design and programming aspects as required.

- The jury was well aware of the design problem; that is the difficulty in identifying the building type and expressing it in the architecture and interior design. The differences between the courts and the market, and the conflict between a farmers market and a conference or event facility require resolution in order to create an architecture that expressed the purpose of the building. The jury referred regularly to the struggle between the concepts of “Civic Building” and “Farmer's Market” and eventually became comfortable with what the image of the building could be. It was clear that the North Market Hall would need to take on some special identity to set it apart from all of the other local event venues, perhaps in a similar way to some of the historic or industrial venues in the City, versus local hotels and convention centres. The jury felt that there was an opportunity for the Market Hall space to have a distinctive and memorable quality, like many of the famous market venues in other cities.
• All of the submissions would require further development in terms of Court access, security screening and queuing areas, as well as various design revisions to meet the programmatic requirements, but this report does not detail those except for the winning submission.

General Jury Recommendations

• The jury concluded that the North Market Building would be improved if opportunity for market uses were increased during the week to further animate the precinct. Suggestions included a flower market, independent vendor carts that could easily be moved, or another day of the Farmer’s Market. This would not preclude the Saturday Farmer’s Market which would continue in its present form. The unique opportunity to build on the public identity of the St. Lawrence Market location as the centre of Toronto’s food, tastes, fresh quality and healthy living should not be lost. The winning scheme provides an opportunity to create not only a great Market space but also a unique venue and event space.

• The programming of all three buildings should be integrated through a larger plan. The programming of St. Lawrence Hall should be considered as well, perhaps as court uses such as administration spaces and conference or special event space that can complement the North market Hall as a venue space. The winning design gave the jury the inspiration to propose something that would be a lively place every day, with local food, ‘Taste of Toronto’, vital cities and sustainability as its main themes. The new daytime population from the courts program will help to support this active program. The indoor street should have food stalls near the café for a variety of options. More seating should be provided for places of respite to attract people, and marketing opportunities should be identified for the types of events and shows that would require this type of space.

• The City should consider undertaking retail analysis and marketing studies to follow the vision toward something that is truly a unique destination within the City not only for people coming from the central business district for a market lunch, but also those coming from further afield.

• Careful consideration should be given to the restaurant. What kind of restaurant is it to be? Cafeteria–style? Destination? Expert advice is required here. Appropriate services should be provided – coffee, food, washrooms and so on for the day to day visitor, but what else could happen here?

• Building Access, security checks, queuing spaces, and Market programming need to be coordinated, carefully developed and considered in order to deal with potential conflicts.
• Extending the parking garage under Market Lane Park to reduce the garage design by one level of parking should be considered from a cost benefit perspective.

The jury comments on each submission are on the following pages. Following the winning submission, the other submissions are presented in the order of the colour spectrum.
1.0 RED SUBMISSION -Winning Entry

Description
The key design feature of this team's approach was to create a galleria space which splits the building into two elements creating an axial relationship to the site and an attempt to make a visual connection to the St. Lawrence Hall, including a view of the cupola through the glass roof of the galleria. The ground floor is virtually transparent from the Jarvis Street façade to the Market Lane Park. From the Market Hall a major stair connects the Market to the mezzanine level and on to the St. Lawrence Hall.

The building is five storeys high plus the mezzanine and including mechanical systems.

The upper level of courtrooms is capped by a peaked, sloping glazed roof on top of which there is a green roof.

Jury Comments
- Of all the schemes, the jury identified this scheme being the most successful at solving the struggles between “Civic Architecture” and “Market Architecture” and identified this building as a Market Building that engages the street with a Courthouse above it.
- The structure of the building modulates a large space and encourages visitors to the building to travel through the length of the building to the north end to connect to the St. Lawrence Hall. It also creates flexible spaces on both the main level and the mezzanine level for use as a performance space or for smaller gatherings. The market floor is also divisible using the column grid and screening systems.
- This scheme had the clearest and most effective urban design solutions successfully linking all three buildings. The plan opens the market to the streets and public spaces on three sides which was an important element for the users of the building. This effectively creates an indoor street through a Market. One juror said “When I am showing visitors the City I’d like to bring them to this building to experience the street life and hang out.”
- The façade is broken into manageable proportions and has a simple structural grid. The scale, texture and context is in keeping with the Architecture of the district, including the historical precedents. The original market building on this site had similar proportions to this building making this scheme better suited to the area and to a market building.
- The jury felt that the perspective looking toward the cupola of St. Lawrence Hall used some license to show the effect. In actual fact the sightlines would make only the top of the cupola visible from the entrance, and not throughout the ground floor as illustrated.

- The exterior of the building is busy and cluttered with louvre systems that will be complicated to maintain and clean. The jury felt that the east and west façades could be improved by simplifying the exterior elements and developing the design of the louvre system.

- The jury felt that even though this scheme does not meet the design parameters for angular planes, the concept of splitting the mass into two forms around a central galleria would not be possible if the development parameters were followed to the letter. Therefore, the jury felt that the architects should work with the City to look at ways to reduce the scale along Jarvis Street.
Recommendations for Developing the Winning Design

- The winning competitor indicated in their written material that they would welcome the opportunity to meet with various City departments to modify and develop the design to deal with some of the City’s design concerns, so the following are some of the major issues that the jury felt could use revision or improvement.
- The new market building should engage the south façade of St. Lawrence Hall and bring it into the building.
- A much larger arrival space will be required on the ground floor for the courts and perhaps a public stair. Court entry on the Market Lane Park side would allow for queuing.
- Courtroom planning should be revised to avoid side entry to the courtrooms.
- Roof structure is overly complicated, and the green roof is inaccessible and should be simplified to integrate the green roof for serviceability and accessibility, but the high sloped ceilings and access to natural light in the courtrooms was seen to be a very positive aspect and should be maintained.
- Private Corridor access for the Justice of Peace requires further development.
- The corner staircase acts as a gateway to the city, and requires more space.
- The materials of the building should be reconsidered to be a little less polished in this urban fabric
- Security screening systems, circulation and queuing areas need to be carefully developed, and likely enlarged. The architects will need to work closely with City staff to improve all of the functionality
- The louvre system should be re thought and developed to overcome the maintenance and service aspects, as well as the opportunity for bird roosting.
- The scale of the building appeared to be somewhat monumental. The jury felt that (after a site visit), the height in itself was not so much the issue because the design inherently requires a higher façade, but perhaps the large overhangs at the upper level added unnecessarily to the height.
- The loading for the building needs to be revised to meet the Zoning by-law and the technical requirements of Transportation Services.
2.0 ORANGE SUBMISSION

Description
This scheme references the South Market form and then opens it up in an attempt to reveal the building within. The building is clad in copper which is patinated in a graduated way from the green near St. Lawrence Hall to the brown of the surrounding masonry buildings on the South façade. The fenestration on the bracketed walls is pixilated, creating a hyper-animated façade. The curving walls are readable on the interior public corridors leading to the court rooms, and provide daylight to the upper levels. In the reverse, an interior skylit courtyard on the upper levels provides access to the adjacent office floors and offers a potential view of the cupola on St. Lawrence Hall. The market hall relates well to both Jarvis Street and the Market Lane Park.

Jury Comments

- The gently curving ceiling of the market hall reflects the curved exterior, and provides an expansive and elegant event space which may not be as well suited to the farmers market. This was a repeated issue in each building design. The building reads as a Civic building and the jury felt that the architecture of this type of building requires a more active market image, perhaps a rougher ambience suited to both market space and special events. Again the ongoing struggle between a market and an event space is clearly apparent.

- Solid clear planning, excellent functional layout, and strong development of upper public spaces—the courtroom gallerias, central atrium and the Front Street balcony. Many beautiful interior spaces.

- Strong resolution of approach to sustainability and many interesting ideas in relation to this goal. Large accessible green roof that is engaged with the building and somewhat protected from the elements.

- While the building has a strong Civic presence, the design of the Market Hall is that of a Civic Hall versus an active Farmer’s Market. The use of the wood finishes helps to resolve this but the overall market space is not that different typologically from what exists today. The structural expression in the Market Hall appears somewhat superficial.

- Maintaining the cornice line of the base of the St. Lawrence Hall limits opportunities for introducing daylight into the Market Hall by extending the “bracket” to that level.

- The pixilated façade is inappropriate to the neighbourhood and limits light. The jury wondered why a more diaphanous façade wasn’t considered in order to create a somewhat quieter building. Even though the windows create shadows the result is a
“A continuous tapestry intended to be monolithic”. The colour of the copper is the only move toward relating to the masonry neighbours.
3.0 YELLOW SUBMISSION

Description

The basic concept of this design was to create a masonry base with a glassy south elevation featuring a cascading feature stair connecting the court levels with grade. The north side of the building attempts to respect the St Lawrence Hall by stepping the mass of the North Market away from it. There is an effort at continuity between the three buildings through landscaping and a direct connection to the St. Lawrnence Hall at grade with an exterior connection.

Jury Comments

- The jury appreciated the amphitheatre-like interior staircase leading to the mezzanine. It creates a variety of spaces and provides opportunities for other activities, like music or readings, but there was some concern as to the availability of headroom over the vehicle ramps below as a result of this.

- The effort to bring natural light into the building through the central light well is laudable, but the jury was concerned that its ability to deliver quality light to the lower level was limited due to size and depth. Extensive rooftop gardens would be accessible and at a human scale.

- This submission respects the design parameter of having a masonry base to the building. The jury was impressed with the renderings showing the view, scale, and materiality from the Market Lane Park as well as the view of the Market interior and the finishes.

- The move of connecting to the St Lawrence Hall inherently requires that the parking access and loading be shifted south, thereby virtually disconnecting the market space with the Jarvis Street edge, and this transparent link to Jarvis was an important element to the occupants of the building. The proximity of the vehicular entrance to the corner is also of concern. The design completely closes off Jarvis Street to the market and goes against a key principle in the design parameters, which is very important to the building occupants. The sidewalk is broken by two curb cuts, as opposed to one, and creates a less pleasant pedestrian environment. To resolve this problem would result in a complete reorganization of the plans.

- From the point of view of the courts uses, the planning is organized to place public waiting areas and courtroom access to animate the south façade and connect visually to the South Market building. This required that courtrooms be split into groups on three levels. This presents complications in terms of security screening and limited elevator access to the upper levels. The court administration areas as
well as judicial chambers are located at the north side of the building, presenting some awkward circulation and exiting situations.

- The concept of stepping the building down to the St. Lawrence hall is an admirable goal; however the jury concluded that the Hall is given too much deference for not enough return. The stepping compromises and fragments the form and does not result in a clear and modern counterpart to the St. Lawrence Hall.

- The Proposal has a strong Heritage Impact Statement, but the design is too full of smaller moves without a strong overriding central idea or parti. "An interesting collection of smaller elements but no strong form or planning idea." The plan is compromised by the effort to achieve a signature stair along the front façade and by placing all of the public spaces along the south façade. The resulting arrangement of placing the courts floors on several levels is difficult to manage from a security and functional standpoint.
4.0 GREEN SUBMISSION

Description
This submission was the only one that generally met the intent of the Development Parameters, particularly with respect to the intent of the angular planes. The arched roof of the building makes an attempt to mirror and respond to the South Market building in form and scale, although it becomes somewhat higher than the south building. The building employs a combination of masonry and glass as its prime materials. The design employs a glass roof into the courts floors and a green roof on the top, which appears to be inaccessible to the public.

Jury Comments
- Carefully thought out building plan that works with a clear entrance to the Market, and an overall volume that is responsive to the Market.
- This scheme creates an open Market Hall which is open to both Jarvis Street and the Market Lane Park. The Entry sequence to the court floor is clear and well defined, and the area of the market hall is rectangular and efficient. The small entrance door at Front Street presented the jury with an enigma—it was not clear why this was such a narrow door.
- The jury commended this design for its efforts to integrate with the neighbourhood and to fit within the design parameters, a comprehensive heritage impact statement and the use of materials.
- The court floors are clearly laid out and provide adequate waiting areas, however, this scheme presents a similar problem to the other five – that is inadequate security screening and queuing areas.
- This design is not extensively detailed as to how it will meet the green standard or provide options for sustainable features compared to the other designs. The green roof seems like an isolated event and could have been more successful if it was recessed into the roof and accessible to the public.
- The use of the glass roof on the upper levels would necessitate extensive shading systems to make it viable, and doesn’t really benefit a number of the office workspaces.
- With respect to the use of materials, “where there is masonry the building is too opaque, and where there is glass the building is too transparent”. The “stone is impenetrable and the glass does not reveal any large public room”.
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The concept of creating a similar form to that of the south market appears to have increased the overall height of the building, and therefore is somewhat discordant with the south market building. The building has captured the form of the market but has great bulk, heavy mass and is somewhat unfriendly and suffers from “packing the form”.

At first glance, the market hall is responsive to the use of a market but on closer inspection the space is similar to what is currently built. There was a sense of the building being somewhat ‘arena like’, and not a significantly improved public space. It does not have the quality of daylight or character required for such a space. The large open space does not easily provide opportunity for smaller gatherings, as in some other schemes, although this is a minor consideration.

The concentrated attention on meeting all of the design parameters provided a solution that would work, but represents a conservative result that creates a market hall that is not markedly improved from the existing.

The Jarvis Street façade is successful in opening up the Market space to the street.

The Jury had a level of respect for this scheme’s attempt at tackling a building form suggested by the constraints of the parameters.
5.0 BLUE SUBMISSION

Description
This scheme presented the concept of a large shed structure with a copper skin creating a canopy over the grade/market level which is relatively open to the street. An open roof garden on the upper level provides amenity, daylight and a building microclimate. The copper skin is pixilated by slanting windows creating a strong horizontal theme.

The main level market floor focuses on the connection to the corner of Market Lane Park and Front Street. There is a strong axial connection to the South Market Building and a physical connection to St. Lawrence Hall. The café on ground level is located at the southeast corner of the building and the main entrance to the courts component is placed on the south side of the parking access at Jarvis Street.

Jury Comments
- The jury commented that this scheme represented a very daring and robust solution within the market precinct, and identified with this concept as a Civic Building. The concept is a ‘Smart Shed’ in an effort to “marry the history of the site” while celebrating Toronto’s evolving cultural complexity.
- The written report was well conceived, clear and a pleasure to read.
- Innovative bold appearance, large interior spaces, strong sustainability component.
- There is a clear, logical layout of floor plans, but quite a leap from the plans to the expression of the exterior elevations.
- A separate court entrance was identifiable in the plan and was seen as positive.
- Judiciary offices are windowless in behind courtrooms.
- The South elevation is the most successful. The large portal to Front Street creates the sense of a building one should move through.
- The jury’s general comment was that while it is reasonable to create a high contrast building, it is not a building that respects the surrounding environment and urban fabric.
- As in all of the schemes, the jury understood the ongoing struggle between a “Civic architecture” and “Market architecture”. While the building is being supported by the courts, the market needs a strong image to be viable as well, the scheme did not create a strong image for the market, but more that of a civic space. The interior
views of the market were not prominently rendered and the clear span structure is reminiscent of the existing building, and hard to imagine as an active market space.

- There is a lazy stair located along the Market Lane Park, minimizing the connection to the park at the north. These moves also had the effect of minimizing the connection to Jarvis Street, which is somewhat counter to the goals of the Farmer’s Market – that is, to engage Jarvis Street with the interior of the market hall.

- The building is not entirely successful at achieving what the narrative says. The building shape seems somewhat out of context in terms of its relationship to the local urban fabric. The random spacing, as well as the slight angle to the fenestration was somewhat baffling to the jury. While the building has a very striking form which is somewhat alien to the area, the jury was concerned that there is strong horizontality referred to as “speedy horizontality” in an area that has vertical expression.