Introduction and Project Description

St Thomas Developments is developing 88 Queen Street East, a three phase, multi-use development project located in Ward 27 (Toronto Centre-Rosedale) in downtown Toronto. The project is being designed by Page+Steele/IBI Group Architects.

The project site is bordered by Shuter St to the north, Dalhousie St to the west, Mutual St to the east, and Queen St East to the south. The subject site for this public art plan is noted as “Parcel A”, and funds from this development block will be applicable for the funding of this project.

The subject site is located at the north end of the development site. A 28 storey residential tower with a seven storey podium will front onto the south side of Shuter St and will span Mutual St to Dalhousie St with at-grade retail uses located here. The tower will sit at the east end of the site with the podium continuing to the western property line. At the west end of the site, immediately south of the podium, will be a public park space designed by Claude Cormier + Associates that will front onto Dalhousie St.

To the south of the residential tower, at the east side of the development and fronting onto Mutual St, will be the vehicular parking and service entrance for the site as well as a separated mid-block access point which will provide access to the park space for pedestrians from the east. A future north-south, mid-block pedestrian mews is planned to connect the park space to the south end of the site to Queen St East and will be designed and completed in subsequent development blocks. The overall development site will eventually be composed of a mix of residential, commercial, hotel, retail, and park space and is anticipated to be completed within the next ten years, with the subject site scheduled to be completed by 2019.

Neighbourhood and Site Background

The project is located in Ward 27 in the heart of downtown Toronto, an area bustling with activity and rich in history. Corktown, the Garden District, and parts of Cabbagetown are in the vicinity and contribute the historic character of parts of the neighbourhood. The development is in close proximity to a number of historic buildings such as St Michael’s Cathedral Basilica, the Metropolitan United Church, the Cathedral Church of St James, and the Moss Park Armoury. The area has undergone numerous changes over the decades and was once the heart of the industrial area of Toronto before undergoing massive gentrification in the 1960’s and the construction of the Moss Park public housing projects.

The site is a short walk to the Eaton’s Centre, St James’ Park, Moss Park, the John Innes Community Recreation Centre, Yonge + Dundas Square, St. Michael’s Hospital, and numerous shops, restaurants, bars, and other community amenities. The area is a mix of historic Old Toronto brick and stone buildings and glass, concrete and steel high rises from the mid-century to more recent developments.

The area is significantly built-up and this site is possibly the last area to be developed in the neighbourhood. The creation of a pedestrian mews with shops, cafes, and retail uses will add a significant economic benefit to the neighbourhood while the public park space within the development site will provide a welcome respite from the surrounding urban landscape.
Inspiration for the park space comes from Paley Park in New York City, designed by Zion Breen Richardson Associates and completed in 1967. The intention is to create a pocket park with a combination of hardscaping, planting, and seating and the public art creating a backdrop to this space.

Project Team

Client: St Thomas Developments
Architect: Page + Steele/IBI Group
Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associates
Public Art Consultant: Ben + Karen Mills, Public Art Management

Public Art Objectives:

• Animate and highlight the park space through a contemporary expression of public art that is sensitive to the urban context and that will engage the community and visitors

• Use appropriate scale, materials, and execution to provide public art to the neighbourhood that is site-specific, engaging, and represents the art of our time

• Define a landmark for the neighbourhood that is a “must experience”

• To the greatest extent possible, stand the test of time as a unique work of art

• Low/manageable maintenance requirements over the long term to ensure the art is always accessible to the public
Site In Context

(Subject site noted as Parcel A)
Art Location Description:

**Park Art Wall:**

The art location for this project will be the expansive west-facing wall noted on the site plan above and indicated in red. The area is approximately 19m long and 6m tall fronting onto the park facing west. A south facing return wall extends approximately 2m and will provide a visual terminus for the future north-south pedestrian mews stretching connecting to Queen St East at the south.

A concrete wall will serve as buffer between the park space and the parking entrance and loading docks which service the building. The budget for the concrete wall is not part of the art budget. The artists will be asked to enhance this wall through an artistic intervention which provides a visual backdrop to the park and acts as a cue to passersby while also animating an otherwise featureless concrete wall which provides visual and sound protection from the services of the building.

The art location will sit within the private property of the building and will have a 2.1m setback from the public park space, which will be owned, maintained and operated by the City of
Toronto. The public art will not extend into the City lands. The maintenance of the public art will be funded and managed by the building owner/condominium corporation.

Because the art location is at-grade and easily accessible to pedestrians, careful consideration will be taken to ensure that the future artwork is constructed of high quality, durable materials requiring low maintenance. The public art must be maintainable, durable, and able to withstand graffiti and everyday wear and tear.

The artwork may take on a variety and combination of forms, such as but not limited to: artistic glazing treatments along the wall, metal panels, sculptural enhancements, artist-designed screen wall elements, or others. Budget permitting, supplementary feature lighting may be considered as a component of the public art, but will not make up the artwork itself.

**Section 37 Agreement Reference**

As per Section 3.b) of the Section 37 Agreement between the Owner and the City:

“the owner agrees to provide and maintain works of public art within the lot, or provide cash in lieu thereof, of a value not less than one percent (1%) of the gross construction costs of proposed development on the lot, in compliance with the City’s public art program;”

**Budget:**

The anticipated budget for the program: Approx. $750,000.00

Administration Allowance, including

Competition administration through artist selection**: up to 10% of the budget

Construction Coordination, Site preparation, and Contingency**: up to 10% of the budget

Public Art Design, Supply and Fabrication: 75% of the budget

Maintenance endowment: up to 5% of the budget

** Including: preparation of Public Art Plan, presentation to TPAC, planning and administration of Expression of Interest, assistance in short listing final candidates, preparation of Finalist Brief, management of jury sessions, and assistance in preparation of artist agreement(s), in addition to other activities.

*** Including: Architectural, electrical and structural engineering fees for review of designs and provision of stamped drawings, assistance in preparation and issuance of fabrication tenders for art if requested by artist(s), site preparation including provision of structural supports, electrical supply and other elements required to implement the artwork, and contingency.

**Selection Process:**
A two-stage design competition is being proposed:

Stage 1: Request for Expression of Interest + Interview

This will be prepared and circulated to the long list of artists noted in the Public Art Plan. Artists who respond to the invitation will be required to provide a written Expression of Interest identifying their availability and through an interview process with the public art consultant, the Owner, architect, and landscape architect, discuss their initial thoughts/approach to the site. The Owner team will then review submissions and interview results and identify between three-to-four artists.

Stage 2: Finalist Brief

This will be prepared and sent to short list of artists selected. They will then prepare detailed concepts for which they will be paid an honorarium. Submissions will then be reviewed by Owner team and Jury in order to determine a preferred concept.

The winning artist(s) will be individually contracted by the Owner to develop the public art and to work with the project consulting team (owner, architect, landscape architect, project managers, consulting engineers and public art consultant).

Artist Candidates:

Sue DeBeer, Kent Monkman, Sarah Morris, Vanessa Maltese, Rebecca Baird, Michael Belmore, Jessica Eaton

Jury Composition:

The jury will comprised of three (3) members as follows:

• A representative of the Owner or it’s nominated representative
• Independent art experts of whom one is an artist and one is a resident of the ward

The two independent jury members will be drawn from the following pool:

• Dean Drever, Artist + ward resident
• April Hickox, Artist
• Robin Young, Art patron + ward resident
• Gaetane Verna, Director of the Power Plant Contemporary Art Gallery
• Jennifer Simaitis, Independent curator + Manager of Special Events, Casey House (Art with Heart)

The Owner has the right to veto the jury recommendation as per the terms of the agreement with the City.

Schedule:

TPAC Presentation: May 10, 2017
Community Council: June 13, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Council Approval:</th>
<th>July 5-7, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition Commences:</td>
<td>After approvals are in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion:</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION CRITERIA</td>
<td>SCORE (0 – 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding of the Public Art Opportunity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Concept is site-specific and original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Idea is feasible and within budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Suggests durable materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Maintenance considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Integration with Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Successfully integrates with site and site features and not simply “applied”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Looks like a distinct work of contemporary art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Appropriateness/practicality for area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Contributes to surrounding environment and culture of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Potential Impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Attract an audience and is “must see”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Scale + visibility considered thoughtfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Enhances public realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Distinctive Identity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Original idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Potential to create a unique statement for 88 Queen St East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Should work on a variety of levels, not simply the obvious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Artist availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Artist availability / other commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Single or team endeavour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Flexibility in working with project team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. References/ Recommendations by Past Clients or Curators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>