

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 51 – JANUARY 26, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of November 24, 2016 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Rutherford GO Station Design - Metrolinx (1st Review)**

Presentations:

Moira Wilson, Urban Design

Grazyna Krezel, R.V. Anderson Associates Limited

John P. Does, R.V. Anderson Associates Limited

10:40 am

## **Adjournment**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 51 – January 26, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 26, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio Landscape Architecture and Urban Design

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Musa Deo, Development Engineering & Infrastructure Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Sheldon Levitt in the Chair.

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

A Conflict of Interest was declared by Megan Torza, DTAH for Item #1.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for November 24, 2016 were approved

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Metrolinx Rutherford GO Station Design**

Architect: R.V. Anderson Associates Limited  
Location: At Rutherford Road and Westburne Drive  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the 15% design submission for the station redevelopment in the context of completion of this project as a 30% illustrative design.

1. The City requests that Panel Members provide design guidance at this preliminary stage of New Station Development for Rutherford GO Station with a focus on how the project can be used as an opportunity for community-building and urban form.
2. As phase 1 of the new station development, how successful is the site organization and the architecture of the station building and parking garage in expression, function and to capture existing and future public realm opportunities?

**Overview:**

- Panel commended the leadership of Metrolinx for their attendance and bringing the station redevelopment forward to Vaughan Design Review Panel.
- GO is important public infrastructure and a station is a natural community hub.
- The site represents an excellent location for mixed use.
- The design as presented does not acknowledge this opportunity or set the stage for future mixed-use/intensification opportunities.

- It is not apparent how the design could be adaptable to potentially huge changes in car travel (driverless cars, etc.).
- The key recommendation of Panel is to establish an urban framework for the site starting with an internal street and block pattern to inform both Phase 1 and the subsequent infill of parcels.
- Also consider incorporating a greater mix of uses in Phase 1 rather than a singular use as a storage facility for cars, with the site primarily designed for the ease of drivers.
- The design of this project should celebrate the experience of being on a train and draw from the grand tradition of public infrastructure for trains.
- The design team should be expanded to include urban design and landscape architecture to inform the project.

**Comments:**

Site Plan, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design

- Panel recognized that complex problems have been solved with regard to access and parking for a large number of cars at peak hours. However, the Phase 1 proposal should set the stage for future development with a greater mix of uses that could make it a more vibrant place seven days a week.
- Panel questioned if the bus loop is located in the right place and, with the track alignment, where Phase 2 buildings could be placed.
- Reconsider the kiss 'n ride configuration and how to better integrate it with the station including more generous crosswalk and walkways to directly and safely connect people to the station entrance.
- The surrounding residential community may be biking and walking to this site, and it will hopefully become a node of activity. The current design does not present opportunities for quality pedestrian (or cycling) experiences. Recommend more consideration of the experience of people travelling throughout the site, not just between the station and platform. The east-west pedestrian connection on the north side of the parking structure needs to be part of a bigger continuous pedestrian system that brings people from the sidewalk to the platform.
- The landscape needs a better narrative and to be more defined in terms of programming - where users come from and what they do. The proposed internal public spaces seem like residual spaces - Need to define internal public spaces programmatically to be more meaningful.
- The proposed plaza is on the north side of the building and therefore will not be a comfortable microclimate.

- Phase 1 public space(s) should be informed by the full vision for the site and reinforced by potential future uses.
- Project specifications should underline the importance of the natural system that continues through the site, and the stream that runs around the site to properly integrate them into site planning.
- The Phase 1 Landscape Plan should also include how to incorporate Low Impact Development best practices in the surface parking areas.
- The submission should show Site Plan alternates considered in order to comment on the proposed final solution.

### Architecture

- Panel complimented the cultural and ecological analysis that informed the design of the associated Rutherford Road underpass and bridge design and suggested the Rutherford GO station design take cues from this project for a cohesive sense of place and strong identity.
- It was felt that the architecture should establish a higher standard for the GO brand. How will the train passengers know they are “arriving” at this particular station in Vaughan? Recommend taking the opportunity to express each station differently within the transit system. The identity of the GO station design could include a reference to movement, celebrating the experience of the passengers on the train as they approach the station.
- The design should respect and center upon the human experience, starting with the architecture and planning of the train station where passengers move and wait, rather than the parking garage.
- When passengers wait for the train, they need to look out the window to see the train. Recommend disengaging the station from the parking garage and relating the station to the train platform.
- Given the project is a station redevelopment, suggest bringing the building closer to the street to signal that Metrolinx is there to be part of the community. To this end, it was suggested to move the station entrance out of the parking garage to the public street frontage.
- A meaningful frontage on Westburne Drive with ground floor retail and public spaces could also be explored to free more land for Phase 2.
- The buildings’ massing and façade articulation needs to better respond to its immediate context while ensuring the building reads as an entity. Suggest that the garage footprint should be reconsidered within the context of the opportunity to fix drop off sizes, passenger loading and kiss ‘n ride.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 52 – FEBRUARY 23, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:30 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Election of Vice Chair

Confirmation of Minutes of January 26, 2017 Meeting

9:45 am

## **Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments**

### **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

### **High-Rise Development, 1st Review**

Presentations:

Amy Roots, VMC Project Manager

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Claude Cormier, Claude Cormier + Associés

11:05 am

## **Break**

11:15 am

## **Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines**

Presentation:

Calvin Brook, Brook McIlroy

12:15 pm

## **Adjournment**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 52 – February 23, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 26, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD  
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.  
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.  
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio  
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.  
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group  
Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects  
John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited  
Megan Torza, DTAH

##### **Absent**

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects  
Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management  
Tim Simmonds, Chief Corporate and Intergovernmental Relations  
Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Moirra Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Amy Roots, Urban Design  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Musa Deo, Development Engineering & Infrastructure Planning

**The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair.**

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

A Conflict of Interest was declared by Margaret Briegmann, BA Group for Item #1.

**3. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR**

Megan Torza was nominated as Vice-Chair and the nomination was unanimously received.

**4. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for January 26, 2017 were approved.

**5. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments**

Architect: Diamond Schmitt Architects  
Claude Cormier + Associés  
Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC)  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the ground floor layout and streetwall design in activating all four sides of the development and in responding to the context of the development block?
2. How successful is the architectural expression of the towers and treatment of the parking structure in relation to the surrounding buildings?

**Overview:**

- Panel expressed excitement for how the scheme has progressed, highlighting that the residential towers have brought energy and animation to the development, but noted that

improvements in the design did not do enough to mitigate the significant presence of the parking garage. Panel commented that more effort can be made to screen the parking structure and address circulation concerns.

- Refinement of the east elevation was encouraged to provide greater differentiation between uses, integrate intuitive wayfinding opportunities and better animate the pedestrian alley. Opportunities for more formal and informal programming of the pedestrian alley were encouraged, as was future proofing the design of the ground level in terms of floor height for potential land use conversions over time. Concern was raised with the design of the green wall, and ongoing operations and maintenance considerations.
- Panel felt that adequate amenity space was lacking in the development, given the number of residents, and cited the rooftop as providing a huge opportunity for programming as a “fifth façade for at least half the units”.
- While the twin tower expression is striking in minimalist purity, the pattern seems “a little relentless”. Consider varying the heights between towers and in towers between slips, provide greater interest by articulating larger south facing units. Explore opportunities to introduce interference or accent to counter balance the strong pattern.
- Panel felt that some architectural differentiation could be added to the podium and parking facade, including the addition of colour to provide warmth and compatibility with the approach to the adjacent projects within the same development block.
- The townhouse uses were recognized as a positive addition to the project. Panel noted the need for a finer grain and more sensitive residential scale around the different architectural and landscape interfaces along this edge.
- Refinements to the Portage Parkway condition are required to address the corner condition at future Buttermill Avenue to be more pleasant for pedestrians, including wind mitigation and prevention of this edge being treated as a back.
- Panel encouraged the Applicant to review the “Growing Up: Planning for Children in New Vertical Communities” study that examines how new multi-unit housing in high-density communities can better accommodate the needs of households with children and youth, and consider how intentional design considerations related to unit design, amenities, program and rooftop condition could make the development friendlier to families and children.
- Microclimatic conditions need further consideration. Wind mitigation needs to be addressed for streetwall, rooftop and Portage Parkway conditions with real regard for solar design of the towers.
- Winter design should be considered to create a better year round pedestrian experience. Winter renderings should be shown.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design

- Panel was impressed with the simple and elegant landscape scheme which resolves site circulation by providing porosity towards the Mobility Hub for pedestrian access.

- Panel felt that the ‘book end’ of active uses was not enough to animate the central spine. Explore further opportunities within the pedestrian alley and circulation areas for passive use and programming, including temporary uses such as vendors and installations where retail does not yet make sense. The south east corner of the building was cited as a prime location for activation.
- While the “jewel box” was seen as a great addition to the development, greater visual cues are required to draw visitors within the site, better define the entry to the pedestrian alley and establish a stronger north-south axis. Reconsider the width of the pedestrian alley at the north of the site near Portage Parkway to ensure adequate pedestrian space and ensure the promenade is set up with a strong view corridor into the site.
- Wind conditions should be carefully considered along Portage Parkway and Buttermill Avenue. While the preliminary wind study indicates that the pedestrian alley is comfortable for walking in spring and winter, the design should address comfortable conditions for sitting.
- The minimal amount of amenity space proposed in the plan is unrealistic for the amount of residents proposed, despite the other amenities in the area. Convenient access to private amenity spaces is important for the lifestyle of residents, especially families with children, in addition to trips outside to nearby parks. Protected architectural elements on the rooftop may need to be introduced to extend amenity space, address microclimatic concerns and ensure seasonal use. A connection between towers at level 7 should be explored.
- Concern was raised with respect to performance of the proposed green wall in terms of solar access, irrigation requirements and operations and maintenance considerations.
- Concern was raised with respect to potential conflict along the east-west driveway between pedestrians and vehicles. Is there a way to eliminate the southern entrance in the ultimate condition by providing access from the west along future Buttermill Avenue?
- Provide greater detail on the relationship of this development proposal to the vision for the proposed context. Concern that Portage Parkway will become a condition of backs to the buildings. Better transition to adjacent land uses required.

### Massing and Architecture

- Architectural expression of the podium is too corporate in appearance (*‘another grey building’*). Panel recommended that the qualities of warmth and colour (wood, gold) infused into the adjacent buildings and landscape, characterizing the VMC, should be extended into this site.
- The elevations of the parking garage require further development. While the fins are conceptually interesting, they take up a lot of area in elevation. Explore more cover, colour and patterning to respond to the context. The walls where loading is located need some introduction of texture.
- Panel raised concern with the length of the inactivated east elevation fronting the pedestrian alley, and questioned whether parking was the right use along level 1. This façade could be improved by articulating it in a more playful way and consideration may be given to designing the landscape interface as a small parkette for residents.

- The scale of the townhouse units and relationship of the building at the corner of Portage Parkway and future Buttermill Avenue needs to be refined. A perspective view at this corner is requested.
- Could the west elevation be a hybrid of townhouse units at grade and single loaded two storey units above to increase their scale and proportion within the streetwall?
- Refinement of the materiality and scale between the townhouse units and residential lobby is required. The corner of Buttermill Avenue and Portage Parkway should be refined. Is the townhouse condition the best option?
- The introduction of natural light into the corridors was appreciated as an important humanizing gesture for residents.
- The parking is not fully designed, as there is no indication of ramps in the plans. Refinement of the parking layout can generate design opportunities on the façade.
- Concern for pedestrian comfort along Portage Parkway and at the rooftop. Design refinements and mitigation required.
- Encourage the Applicant to review the City of Toronto's "Growing Up" study to explore greater opportunities to accommodate families and children in the design.

## 2. Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines

Architect: Brook McIlroy  
 Location: All Wards  
 Review: Second Review

### Introduction:

Calvin Brook, a partner with Brook McIlroy, presented the proposed general approach and structure of the Urban Design Guidelines document, including the design framework, priorities, and idea of a "Green Datum". The presentation was followed by an informal roundtable discussion with panel members.

### Overview:

#### The Green Datum

- Panel members unanimously supported the Green Datum as a design approach to improve the nature of arterial roads. *"Interesting because it sets up a longer legacy for Vaughan's [arterial road] streetscapes."*
- Overall, it was felt that a greater separation between public and private space along arterial road conditions would be attractive to [residential] developers.
- Panel advised that more detail on its implementation will be required for the success of the Green Datum, including fine grain programming of the space and the design of the surface threshold between public and private spaces.
- Panel members expressed interest to see precedents/case studies. A pilot project would help people understand the idea and to refine the design guidelines.

- The idea that the Green Datum connects with sustainability as an ecological corridor was of interest. Panel advised that landscape performance goals should be outlined in the document.

**Comments:**

The Green Datum

- The narrative for the Green Datum should be more robust in the explanation of how it contributes to the bigger picture of city-building, including both sustainability and placemaking objectives.

Sustainability:

- What is the contribution to the overall open space framework, urban tree canopy targets, ecological corridors and their connectivity?
- Could innovative storm water management methods of passive irrigation for these large planting strips be proposed in the Regional ROW as well?

Placemaking:

- The green corridor and character of mid-rise buildings set up a distinctive, signature character for the city.
  - At the finer grain scale, outline the purpose of the spaces within the Green Datum with respect to potential ground level programming to create meaningful spaces.
- The Green Datum idea responds to what many developers are already asking for in the GTA: a greater setback for a better transition between the public and private realms.
  - Panel advised further exploration of non-residential conditions along arterial roads to understand the associated opportunities and challenges with the application of the Green Datum.

Implementation

- The transition and interface of the public ROW to the private frontage should be carefully considered and illustrated in a more intentional way in the diagrams and guidelines. Consider how public and private spaces will connect and work together in different development scenarios.
- Panel raised a concern about the standards of maintenance for Green Datum landscapes, which is key to the success of a planting and landscape-based water strategy. Consider how streetscape level of service along Regional Roads integrates with the private setback maintenance.
- Provide greater detail on how the Green Datum responds to various built-form conditions, such as, for example, the treatment fronting a portion of blank wall along the ground floor of a multi-use building. Further study the interface of landscape program with buildings and how the landscape functions from a typological use perspective.
- The transition of the Green Datum landscape across properties needs to be considered, especially with areas that have smaller frontages and incremental development. Panel

advised that proportional guidelines (i.e. permeable %) would be helpful.

- Mid-block connections and side yard treatments are important transition zones to consider. These may be more flexible in terms of their design.
- Consider the 40 year renewals of strata landscapes built over parking structures, when the built landscape/ trees are removed and rebuilt/ replanted.
- Soil volume requirements for tree planting should be provided, including planting depths over strata landscapes.

#### Regional Considerations

- Consider how the Region's design, operations and maintenance of the ROW will influence the Green Datum. Cross reference with various Regional guidelines that might support or conflict with the proposal.

#### Document Structure

- The document will inform the sense of design priorities and provide clarity of intent. Flexibility is important. The stated rationale for a performance measure allows a designer the option to show how they meet the same stated objective a different way.
- Develop a development application checklist as part of document for the purpose of consistency.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 53 – MARCH 30, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of February 23, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Islington Steeles Ventures Inc.**

**7082 Islington Avenue**

**Mixed Use Development**

**1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Carmela Marrelli, Development Planning

Rob Nicolucci, RN Design

Paul Diproffio, Nak Design

10:40 am

## **Break**

10:55 am

## **York Major Holdings Incorporated**

**Indigo Condominiums in Maple (Phase 2)**

**100 & 110 Eagle Rock Way**

**Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Review**

Presentation:

Shahrazad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Les Klien, Quadrangle Architects Limited

Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners INC.

12:05 pm

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 53 – March 30, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 30, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Megan Torza, DTAH (Acting Chair)  
Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD  
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.  
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio  
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.  
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG  
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.  
Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects  
Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

##### **STAFF**

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design  
Carmela Marrelli, Development Planning  
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning  
Natalie Wong, Development Planning

**The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Megan Torza in the Chair.**

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for February 23, 2017 were approved

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Islington Steeles Ventures Inc.**

Architect:	RN Design
Landscape Architect:	NAK Design Strategies
Location:	7082 Islington Avenue
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How well do the built form types and massing respond and transition to the surrounding context?
2. Does the proposed design concept for the community, in its organization and structure, encourage social activity, active transportation, vibrant and connected public spaces, and a respectful relationship with the surrounding open space system?

**Overview:**

- The street and mews system needs to be reconsidered to create a legible and functional street network. A street hierarchy should be established. Front entrances should face the street to encourage neighbourliness and a more pedestrian-oriented environment. Public (amenity) spaces should be anchored to the streets. Streets and mews should participate in the extension of the open space into the development. More consideration of how spaces connect and how they will be occupied should inform the design.
- A greater mix of units and building types, including potentially mid-rise to unite townhouse and tower forms, should be pursued to take advantage of topography and access to the open space system.

- The relationship to the surrounding community and open space network should be improved with increased connectivity, defined edges, and attention to views and vistas from the public circulation network. A conversation with the TRCA is needed about a vision for the open space lands in terms of a possible trail connection to the south.
- A stronger built form relationship to Islington Avenue should be established to capitalize upon its potential for more pedestrian movement and street life. Towers and podium should address the street with active uses. Orientation of the towers to the street is important, rather than a 45 degree orientation.
- The relationship to the neighbouring church is too tight. It should be integrated into the design concept for a friendlier transition and spatial relationship.
- Panel noted that drawings are missing and lacking in clarity. Drawings should communicate grade relationships, a hierarchy of site circulation, servicing, parking and vistas. Additional information, including ground floor plans, an underground parking plan and a typical floor plan of a townhouse unit is also required.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan Organization, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design

- Lack of permeability, lack of accessibility and lack of engagement are key issues. Connectivity within and through the site needs a more clear direction.
- The existing church needs much more space. A tower is proposed next to it, which creates a very odd situation.
- The configuration of stacked townhouses creates a car-oriented street experience. Consider front doors to units facing streets with rear laneways that connect the garages.
- The site arrangement leaves quite a few opportunities on the table to create connections between townhouses, the open space system and amenities. There are not enough interesting views. Some of the nature corridors could be more interesting as landscape opportunities if reoriented toward the open space. This reorientation would in turn help address the issue of front and back / mews and street.
- Panel commended that the townhouses are aligned perpendicular rather than parallel to the open space so that the open space interface does not become privatized. However, the layout of streets, blocks and built form should take better advantage of the site for a connection with the topography and adjacent Humber River landscape.
- Moving the building massing to the north would allow for more space for retail parking to the south. This would also create an interesting opportunity to connect Islington Avenue to the open space system through the sliver at the south of the site.
- Suspicious about the commercial – whether it will work or not, whether it will be inviting.
- Arrival (to the lobby) does not need to share space with the loading and garbage given the amount of site area.

### Street Network Hierarchy

- The key concern is the mews and street relationship. Advise to flip the scheme to create a more normal relationship between units and street so that people will understand how to get to the front door. The driveways between the townhouses will feel like a sterile place as an ocean of garages and cars.
- The internal street system needs to have a hierarchy for it to be legible. Recommend creating a main street spine with public spaces anchored to it.
- Emergency access may be an issue with the narrow roadways proposed. A minimum 8.5m wide roadway is needed to allow for parallel (visitor) parking on one side.
- The dead ends of the roads were flagged as it is not clear how garbage will be picked up for the townhouses.
- Mews need to be wider; Need to have a sense of how people will interact in this space to make it believable.

### Open Space and Pedestrian Connections

- A beautiful site and a missed opportunity. The opportunity is for more residents to experience the Humber River by allowing people to walk to and along the edge.
- The boardwalk and nature walk are great opportunities, but where they end (at a garbage area) and how they connect is a concern. Recommend to connect the boardwalk and nature walk through the amenity spaces.
- The presentation's narrative proposes integration but the Plan shows segregation – it looks like a gated community: A singular very well defined entrance with a gatehouse with a beautiful landscape and the balance of that edge is a two storey parking garage with some retail.
- Connection to Islington Avenue for pedestrians is important.
- Drawings should clearly communicate grade relationships to review pedestrian connectivity and accessibility. There are a lot of stairs and walls. It is unclear how sidewalks in the internal streets connect.
- The idea of the mews is starting to get lost, not only due to elevation differences, but also due to the presence of a lot of paving.

### Parking and Loading

- An unfriendly edge along Islington Avenue. There are probably technical issues to having parking as proposed. Retail parking should be internal to the site.
- A better distribution of visitor parking throughout the site is needed. Remove surface parking areas.
- Loading areas should be removed from the surface and relocated either underground or in a podium.

## Massing and Architecture

- Architecture needs more variety and hierarchy. Not exciting yet with just towers and stacked townhouses. There should be a mid-rise component as a transitional building type to unite the tower and townhouse building types, create edges and spaces for the community, and to reduce the amount of paving on the plan.
- Improve adjacencies between built form and open spaces (streetscapes, amenity spaces, natural system). Loading should not be next to a tot lot, amenity spaces should be along the pool area rather than a garbage area, etc.
- The 45 degree angle orientation of the buildings along Islington is a concern. It creates a funny relationship with Islington Avenue. It would be better to conform to the direction of Islington Avenue to allow an easier relationship between podium and street and inside of the development. The tower and podium should address the street, permeability and arrival. Look to the tower orientation to re-anchor the public space, get a spine going through the site and connecting all the spaces in a stronger more legible way.
- Consider having some terracing to soften the effect of the towers.
- Provide more variation in tower heights.
- Towers need a minimum 25m facing distance.
- It was questioned if the towers are located in the right places on the site.
- Stacked townhouses are a challenging typology given the site's grades. Consider other stacked design options that will allow the resident to get to their unit directly without going out from the parking and then up.
- Cross sections should be provided at right angles to the townhouses to understand the 3.5 storeys. It is important to understand facing distances and heights.
- The Panel requested the Applicant provide a set of typical floor plans for the townhouses to see if the parking can be placed under the mews. It is recommended to consider deck parking between units to allow for pedestrian access on the other side with the front door on the street.

## **2. Indigo Condominiums in Maple (Phase 2)**

Architect:	Quadrangle Architects Limited
Location:	100 & 110 Eagle Rock Way
Review:	First Review

### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the streetscape design in providing for pedestrian permeability and connectivity between the Eagle Rock way and the public park?
2. How successful is the built form interface in animating the park?
3. Please comment on the architectural expression of the built form, its impact on the pedestrian realm, and its design integration with the Eagle Rock way streetscape.

## **Overview:**

- Panel appreciated the quality and the content of the submitted package. Panel applauded the design in creating an active edge for the park by locating the amenity space to the north, and the consideration given to the public realm to create a diverse and interesting space. Panel also commended the applicant on the design of the south building (phase 1) which has managed to achieve sun light on the opposite side walk throughout the year.
- The Panel unanimously agreed that a pedestrian crossing along Eagle Rock Way is imperative to the success of development due to the proximity to the station and possibility of speeding vehicular traffic and urged the city staff to review and accommodate a safe crossing.
- Panel asked the applicant to revisit the architectural expression of the linked breezeway to either emphasize it as an anchor or to highlight it as a break similar to phase1.
- Panel suggested increasing the colour contrast of the proposed material and introducing a sense of playfulness into the architectural expression of the building as well as the public realm.
- Panel emphasized the importance of the animated promenade and recommended design measures to clearly mark the promenade as pedestrian only space.

## Site Layout and Landscape Architecture

- The Panel commended the location of the ramp and suggested the applicant to consolidate the loading of the phase2 and phase3 within the phase3 of the development to provide more relief in the north facade.
- The pedestrian nature of the promenade should be accentuated with bollards or other design consideration to assure the separation of the vehicular traffic from the pedestrian.
- Panel suggested replacing the perpendicular parking spots with lay by parking and/or underground parking to create a better face for the park as well as separating the vehicular traffic from pedestrian.
- Panel proposed table top crossing connection to the park for an integrated design.
- The corner of the Eagle Rock Way and Troon Avenue should be refined and the intake structure should be relocated to a less visible space.
- Panel proposed the planters along the retail to be replaced with at grade landscape and/or tree grate to allow more permeability for the retail.
- Incorporate the grade difference into the design of the planters to reduce high planter walls; planter walls should also be buffered with landscape.
- Propose side walk on the north side of the building along Salterton Circle.

## Massing and Architecture

- Articulation of the loading wall is required to minimize the two storey blank wall facing the residential town houses to the north.

- Since the south west corner of the building will be visible due to the setback of the phase three, consideration should be given to the quality of the corner and reducing its blank walls, book ending the two east and west corners will enhance the look of the building.
- Panel suggested bringing more architectural interest into the design by treating the balconies differently and proposing wrap around balconies on the west side.
- The bridge between the two buildings should either be designed to be the focal point and the anchor for the development with high quality architecture or to convey a sense of lightness and transparency similar to the phase 1 bridge.
- Panel referred to the character of the facade as serious and proposed to create more playfulness into the design. In order to provide some relief and create a sense of fun in the long facade of the building especially at the ground floor the Panel proposed a diversity of character both in the landscape design and the elevation.
- The materiality of the facade needs to have more colour contrast in order to accentuate the different components. Panel encouraged the three vertical planes to be distinguished further by material.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 54 – APRIL 27, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 245,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of March 30, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Hilton Garden Inn**

**3201 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

**Mixed-Use Development, 2<sup>nd</sup> Review**

### **Presentations:**

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Christina Napoli, Development Planning

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page + Steele / IBI Group Architects

John Zipay & Associates / Weston Consulting

10:40 am

## **Break**

10:55 am

## **Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments**

**Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

**High-Rise Development, 2<sup>nd</sup> Review**

### Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Claude Cormier, Claude Cormier + Associés

12:15 pm

## **Break**

12:35 pm

## **Vaughan Fire Hall 7-4**

**835 Nashville Rd, 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

### Presentations:

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage

Vick Vignarajah, Infrastructure Delivery

Chris Kubbinga, Thomas Brown Architects Inc.

Sebastian Lubczynski, Thomas Brown Architects Inc.

1:45 pm

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 54 – April 27, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 27, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

##### **Absent**

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

Mauro Peverini, Director of Development Planning

Tim Simmonds, Chief Corporate Initiatives and Intergovernmental Relations

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design  
Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage  
Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development  
Gregory Seganfreddo, Zoning  
Stephen Lue, Development Planning  
Christina Napoli, Development Planning  
Selma Hubjer, Development Engineering & Infrastructure Planning  
Musa Deo, Development Engineering & Infrastructure Planning

**The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair.**

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for March 30, 2017 were approved

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**3201 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

Architect:	Page+Steele/ IBI Group
Location:	South side of Highway 7, east of Interchange Way– Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC)
Review:	Second Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

- How successful is the revised proposal in addressing the DRP comments to build a stronger relationship with the surrounding context, create a human scale along Highway 7, advocate the planned street network and catalyze an urban environment.

## Overview:

- Panel appreciated the ambitious scheme and noted that relocating the hotel has been a liberating move for the project that has provided simplicity to the site overall organization. Notwithstanding this improvement, Panel felt that there were remnants of the site organization remaining from the original submission that required reconsideration. Panel encouraged the applicant to look at the site with fresh eyes, addressing 4 major issues:
  - “*frontages along the perimeter*”, integrating a mix of different building forms
  - “*1 big open centre*”, creating a true people centre courtyard and amenity space by removing parking at grade
  - “*doors everywhere*”, providing a more fine grained approach to retail and hotel entrances, independent entrances for the residential towers and potential inclusion of at grade units
  - “*abundance of amenities and public art*”, providing greater public realm improvements, services, and places to congregate to reflect the urban nature of the project and create a strong sense of place and identity

## Comments:

### Site Plan Organization

- This is an ambitious scheme, with densities on par with downtown Toronto. With that comes a commitment to deliver a quality ground plane that is commensurate with the ambitions of a truly urban project. The amount of surface parking spaces (increased from 25 to 65 parking spaces) and extent of at grade servicing area is counter to the ambition of an urban project of this scale. The same ambition with respect to proposed density has to be met with the quality of urban treatment at the ground floor. Surface parking should be eliminated.
- The character of the centre court is undefined, and it is unclear whether its primary function is to serve as a public space or service area. Panel commented that this area is “trying to do too many things”. Given that the scale of the development represents the size of a village, greater at-grade amenity space is required and servicing areas should be reconsidered. Panel suggested revising the site plan to create an incredible courtyard for people by relocating all surface parking underground, incorporating public art and structuring a stronger mid-block landscape connection. There should be no delineation between asphalt road and paved landscape.
- Panel questioned the viability of the site circulation and whether it would be feasible to service the proposed densities by one ramp and one access point, as proposed.. Panel suggested the Applicant reorganize the site plan to recognize new planned streets, and consider constructing a portion of the new north-south road as part of the initial development build-out. Panel also suggested that the east residential loading area could be moved to be serviced from the north south connection, that the central access could be relocated and that a direct east-west vehicular connection could be created.
- The loading for the north-east tower presents a conflict with the drop-off area, and the

drop-off for the residential buildings is not clearly visible from the entrance access, requiring a sharp left turn to negotiate movement that is undesirable. Consider relocating loading below grade.

- Panel unanimously agreed that the location of the bus stop should not be a deciding factor in the design of the proposed access. The bus stop should be relocated to accommodate a central access and mid-block connection.
- Resolving parking needs requires greater creativity. Panel speculated whether the 5 levels of underground parking would be sufficient or feasible to service the proposed uses and densities as the details of the design are further refined and as the surface parking is reduced. Should structured parking be required to offset parking requirements, Panel suggested that the Applicant explore integrated parking within a robust podium veneered by townhouses.
- Phasing of the development should be further studied to ensure creation of a proper vehicular network. Provide more context information and demonstrate how the project works in terms of phasing and implementation.

#### Architecture and Massing

- Relocation of the hotel has resulted in a site plan that feels like two separate projects. Create a centralized service and drop-off area, move the vehicular access mid-block, and consider transferring some density to the south-west corner in a different building form to create a full perimeter building that frames a true courtyard. Per the VMC Urban Design Guidelines, explore a more robust podium with at grade units, mid-rise components, townhouses, etc.
- The symmetry of the towers, reminiscent of the previous design, is too pronounced and relentless in terms of access and massing. While the symmetry worked well in the previous scheme, Panel felt that it was less successful in the revised design. Panel suggested revisiting the symmetry of the two residential towers and consider variation in height and differentiation to create balance. Independent entrances to the residential towers should be considered.
- Panel expressed concerns with the size of the tower floor plates, especially in the south mixed use building.
- Panel questioned whether the coloured amenity areas proposed for the building facade could be commissioned as part of the project's public art commitment. A public artist should be included on the design team as early as possible.
- Given the proposed 55 storey tower heights and densities, Panel commented that window systems other than window wall treatment should be explored.

#### Landscape Architecture

- While the proposal has refined the external streetscape design, the internal landscape seems to be treated as an afterthought. More robust pedestrian movement is required with enhanced mid-block connections and special paving treatments. Strengthen the north-south connection, and consider how the blocks will work together over time, particularly with respect to pedestrian movement. Explore reintroduction of decorative

paving and creation of a shared space design. Expand and enhance the design and treatment of the east-west landscape spine to provide a better pedestrian experience and improved views from the towers. Ensure that enough area for required soil volumes is provided to establish and grow mature trees.

- The green roof of the hotel complex should incorporate some amenity for the south tower. Explore opportunities for shared amenities between the residential uses and hotel.

### **Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt**

Architect: Diamond Schmitt Architects  
Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associés  
Location: South side of Portage Parkway, west of Millway Avenue,  
and on the east side of the future Buttermill Road,  
Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC)  
Review: Second Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the revised proposal in addressing the DRP comments to mitigate the presence of the parking garage, better animate the pedestrian alley to the east, provide adequate amenity space on the roof, create a balance in the expression of the twin towers, refine the portage parkway frontage and bring warmth into the design.

#### **Overview:**

- Improving the graphic and visual quality of the roofscape is important, but the landscape areas need to be programmed to function as a great space. Winter conditions need to be considered.
- Explore whether the different languages of the building components can be brought together more sympathetically.
- More attention needs to be paid to the upper floors of the podium to provide the same level of opening and thoughtful detailing as is shown at the ground level.
- Public art should be carefully considered as an important element whose integration has the possibility of providing identity and character for the development.
- Incorporate TDM measures to help animate the ground floor.
- The mews should be emphasized as a key pedestrian connection with enhanced lighting and greater number of entrances and openings.
- Develop an interior lighting, circulation, signage and wayfinding strategy for the parking structure.

#### **Comments:**

### Site Plan Organization

- Given the complexity of the program, Panel appreciated the simplicity of the site organization and straight forward way to get in and out of the building.
- As the context develops, the east-west mews will become an important pedestrian spine that will likely carry a strong flow of pedestrian traffic. As such, the south east corner of the building at the terminus of the mews will be a critical activity point in the future that needs to be addressed. Study the interim and ultimate potential of the corner for conversion. Future proofing might require rotation of the circulation stairwell.

### Architecture and Massing

- Panel were supportive of the ability to covert ground floor parking spaces and felt that the few parking spaces along the east elevation could be employed for a better immediate solution. A second 2 storey restaurant facing the bus terminal was suggested.
- The east elevation should be studied to demonstrate interim and ultimate façade design potential. Vertical animation of the façade was encouraged.
- While the individual urban design moves of the project are understood, Panel were not sure the elements of the project were successfully coming together to create a meaningful experience within the context to contribute to the urban story of the development. “Are all the pieces better together, right as each one is individually?”
- Building faces are looking at a mirror of each other. Either the towers should be different from another, or differentiation within the building performance of each tower should be explored.
- The proportion of parking structure is more shocking in this iteration of the project.
- Given the strong graphic identity of the towers, Panel questioned whether the louvers were the right solution. To build on the graphic quality of the towers, Panel encouraged the Applicant to engage an artist to provide a design for the parking screen to bring a distinct identity for the place, and allow the public art budget for the development block to be integrated on the face of the building. The art piece could be kinetic in nature, and take the whole 4 storey height.
- If the louvers are maintained, consider playfulness with the angles to produce a pattern and respond to north and south facing conditions.
- The quality of materials used will be key to the success of the parking structure over the long term as elements are exposed to salt. Encourage Applicant to explore an anodized metal with tinted colour and warmth, rather than powder coated.
- Coordinate a proper lighting and wayfinding strategy for interior of the parking structure.
- Suggest the screen behind the louvers be separated from the car bumper.
- Given the number of entrances and permeable configuration, the design of the parking structure should be treated as a public space and should benefit from same detail given to the landscape in terms of lighting, paving, wayfinding, etc.
- The townhouse elevation is fighting the overall aesthetic of the podium design, materially and in terms of scale, made more apparent by the twin tower expression of the towers.

The townhouse units look like an 'add on' and do not read as part of the entire complex, particularly given their more traditional look.

- The increase in townhouse scale from 2 to 3 storeys hasn't achieved what Panel recommended since the parking structure height has also been increased since the last DRP package. What would it take to do a single loaded building or stacked units instead? Have rooftop terraces been explored? If this component of the project could extend above the roof level, it would add more definition to the rooftop open space. Visual presence of the parking garage should be mitigated.
- The interface of Buttermill Road and Portage Parkway "doesn't seem to hang together". Does the edge along Portage Parkway have to be different? While Panel appreciated the plaza design, the corner is not working as well as it could.
- Given the reduced parking ratios and transit oriented nature of the project, TDM measures should be pushed further. Bike parking ratios seem underwhelming. Increase the amount of bike parking and explore inclusion of showers, auto share spaces, etc. to push TDM opportunities for residents and be a leader in VMC without much expense relative to the ground floor.
- Panel questioned the energy performance of the tower's building envelope, the rationale for the similar treatment of the different solar orientation, and stating that 70% of the envelope is covered with cantilevered balcony slabs that will act as thermal bridges resulting in energy waste.

#### Landscape Architecture

- Panel members were not convinced that the green wall treatment is enough to activate the east elevation.
- The revised landscape design of the pedestrian alley has provided for good animation and seating opportunities, and could develop as a linear plaza. The design of the southeast corner and mews could be developed further.
- While the inclusion of rooftop amenity areas is a positive development for the project, the design of the space needs to be more playful in nature.
- Programming of the roof amenity needs further development. Consider inclusion of a fitness track. With the positive development of family size units, play space and shaded areas should be considered.
- Amenity areas on the roof should be connected.
- Panel questioned whether the size of amenity areas had been reduced in the revised proposal.
- The dog strategy was appreciated.

## **Vaughan Fire Station #7-4**

Architect: Thomas Brown Architects  
Location: 835 Nashville Road, Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District  
Review: First Review

### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Will the new fire station architecture contribute a positive visual impact and community presence in the Heritage Conservation District?
2. Are there any opportunities to improve the fire station architecture, with special consideration given to the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District Plan?

### **Overview:**

- Today fire stations are widely recognized as civic buildings. Panel invited the City to really own the expression of the architecture as a fire station, celebrating its place in the community.
- Panel identified that the key challenge with the building elevations is that two very different buildings have been combined into one building. Functions should inform the architecture to achieve a very clear expression.
- Need to more clearly delineate the public places and routes within the building and site. Design the space for the community to be engaged in with the station as part of the community, both outdoor and indoor spaces.
- The heritage expression of the landscape should be explored as part of a Heritage Conservation District, especially along the street frontage. The side and back yard landscapes should respond to the natural heritage.
- The Applicant was commended for a very thorough presentation. The Panel recognized that the project needs to balance tight functional requirements with a historic and community aspect.

### **Comments:**

#### Architecture

- The expression of building architecture seems subdued and should be more relevant to the program. The architecture should express and celebrate the function(s) of the fire station. A uniform exterior treatment is not appropriate given the two different units of the program: crew and apparatus. The crew building could be more residential in character and the apparatus unit more industrial.
- The industrial heritage vernacular of barns, sheds, stations are more functionally appropriate to the apparatus program of the fire station and would be compatible with

the Heritage Conservation District.

- The architectural expression of the residential component is very different. The applicant is encouraged to look at examples that fit in the heritage district such as orchard or farm like buildings that will inform the architectural expression.
- Panel appreciated the big, glazed doors of the apparatus bay. Could extend this statement over for one or two more bays across the front elevation to make it start to look more like beautiful historic fire station architecture.
- Common rooms and private spaces, such as gyms, rest areas, the kitchen and outdoor patio space, could be moved to the upper floors to separate them from the public space. Alternately, keep the activities related to operation to one side of the building. This separation will give more privacy to the fire crew and at the same time, expand the community aspect of the station on the main floor to accommodate school visits, gatherings, gift areas etc.
- The internal circulation spaces could be softer and better integrated with the landscape.
- The expression of the fire station's place in the community could be more cheerful, allegorical and playful to celebrate its role.
- Edwardian and Victorian fire halls are fine examples of architecture that contribute to the architectural fabric of a city.
- The vertical silo/ tower was received as a positive design element that creates a landmark in the Heritage Conservation District. Could continue to play with its expression, perhaps thinner and taller, perhaps tapered, so that the vertical does not feel threatening.
- The main entrance and forecourt needs to be more significant and legible.
- The proposed materials are high quality and beautiful. Consider having a different type of masonry for the residential side of the building.
- Could incorporate a frieze of masonry in the front elevation for the fire station's signage.

#### Site Plan and Landscape Architecture

- The Applicant was advised that a landscape plan and details are essential for the project.
- The Landscape Plan could reference iconic agricultural typologies, such as the hedgerow, and incorporate low maintenance meadow-type planting for the ground plane.
- Add some priority around public and private spaces, both indoors and outdoors, to help clarify the function of the building in the community.
- The entrance of the station is public space that should be clearly delineated.
- The rear and side yard spaces should have greater integration with the natural heritage. Valley land management might influence planting and storm water management.

- For visitors, the main entrance and forecourt should be more significant and legible. The forecourt should be a more prominent area that meets the street. Visitor parking could be designed to be part of the forecourt using enhanced paving and flush curbs.
- All paved areas do not need to be asphalt to integrate better with the cultural heritage landscape.
- Less fencing and more landscape is recommended to integrate the site with the natural and cultural heritage landscape. Where fencing is required, use a different type of fence to work with the heritage character of the District, building and silo.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 55 – MAY 25, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of April 27, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Edgeley Pond and Park**

### **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Review**

#### **Presentations:**

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, Development Engineering & Infrastructure  
Planning

James Roche & Yvonne Battista, DTAH

Abe Khademi, WSP

11:00 am

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 55 – May 25, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, May 25, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will (Acting Chair)  
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.  
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.  
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio  
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

##### **Absent**

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects  
Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects  
Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG  
Megan Torza, DTAH  
Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD  
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management  
Andrew Pearce, Director of Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning  
Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning  
Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development  
Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Moirra Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Amy Roots, Urban Design

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Paul Kulig in the Chair.

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2017 were deferred

4. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Edgeley Pond and Park**

Landscape Architect:	DTAH
Engineer:	WSP/MMM
Location:	Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC)
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successfully does the proposed park design integrate with adjacent development thresholds?
2. How successful is the Jane Street frontage in creating an iconic and porous gateway into the park?
3. How successful is the proposed stormwater design in capturing the story of the Black Creek?

**Overview:**

- Panel commended the City on the ambition of the project, and the positive inversion of turning a stormwater management facility into public space.
- The narrative of the project could be more clearly expressed through refined programming, incorporation of public art into the land and water-scape, and a didactic landscape that celebrates the water story.
- Simplify programming aspirations so that it can evolve with the broader community including other parks proposed for the VMC.
- Coordination of edge conditions requires further refinement, particularly at the north and south ends of the site, to find a gracious balance between structuring privacy and creating

openness (through lighting, CPTED principles, grade changes and buffering).

- Management and operations of the park requires further consideration as the project advances through design development to carefully consider how recovery of flooding will occur, and how programming of the park relates to fluctuating water levels.
- A stewardship program for the surrounding community to build a sense of ownership should be considered moving forward.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan Elements

- Further refinement is required to unearth the underlying engineering and ecological stories of the project. The stormwater process should be evident to all visitors.
- Develop an animation or graphic simulation to illustrate different storm events, with their associated park impact and recovery measures.
- Identify conflicts and generate illustrated strategies for management of water, crowds, parking, cyclists and dogs, etc. as part of the project's narrative, plan development and graphic communication.
- The east-west bridge is an important iconic element and connection that should be delivered early in the project's implementation plan and potentially prioritized over other elements, currently shown.
- Public art opportunities should be carefully explored to take advantage of the dynamic nature of the site. Integration of public art in the floodplain is strongly encouraged.
- Provide more detail on how the design of park components (pathways, slopes, planting etc.) anticipate response to fluctuating water levels.
- Need to better communicate the heights and widths of pathways related to water levels.
- Ensure retail is integrated into adjacencies to activate the urban plazas.
- Material choice should consider comfort for four season use.
- Consider whether there is an opportunity to create a more interesting relationship between the strata park and open space lawn areas in relation to elevation.
- Further refinement of the lighting strategy is required to ensure iconic elements are highlighted, and to study nighttime conditions.

#### Streetscape Design and Edge Conditions

- Revisit the Jane Street frontage to better address the future urban condition.
- The orchard treatment for the Maplecrete edge was supported.
- Greater permeability along the northern edge was encouraged.
- Integration of park design with adjacent development and private open space, including potential POPS, should be further refined and modelled. Park plans should include more

detailed landscape plans for adjacent projects.

- Panel encouraged City Staff to protect the park from future shadowing impacts, including from west of Jane Street.
- The urban plazas at the southwest and southeast corners of the project are key locations for connectivity that need careful attention. Potential conflicts with loading and servicing for private developments need to be resolved.
- Integration of the 'blue streets' concept from the VMC Streetscape and Open Space Plan with the park should be explored.

### Programming

- As a unique and exciting destination, this park could easily attract regional visitors from outside of the VMC and from outside of Vaughan. The park's design and maintenance and operations should anticipate high volume of use.
- Panel felt that while the park will be a "phenomenal addition to Vaughan", it is over programmed. Edit programming aspirations to protect and enhance the character and function of this park / ecology which is different than other urban parks in the VMC. Recommended to establish a hierarchy of events and activities. Uses should evolve over time and flexibility should be built into the design to enable this evolution once the neighbourhood begins to be populated.
- Design conflicts need refinement to ensure that design of potential event spaces are not sloped and that the amphitheatre is not located in areas proposed with meadow planting.
- Ensure sizing of programming elements for appropriate scale.
- Programmed areas should be reconsidered in relation to sun/shadow studies.
- What happens when park areas are closed for flooding?

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 56 – JUNE 29, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:30 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of April 27, 2017 and May 25, 2017 Meetings

9:40 am

## **Metrolinx**

### **Maple GO Station Improvements and Parking Structure**

#### **1st Review**

#### **Presentations:**

Moira Wilson – Urban Design, City of Vaughan

Laurence Cudip – AECOM – Architecture

Shalini Ullal – AECOM – Landscape Architecture / Urban Design

10:50am

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 56 – June 29, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 29, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Megan Torza, DTAH (Acting Chair)  
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc  
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects  
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will  
John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects  
Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG  
Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD  
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.  
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Moiria Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage  
Amy Roots, Urban Design  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning  
Winnie Lai, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Megan Torza in the Chair.

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2017 and May 25, 2017 were approved.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW**

1. **Metrolinx Maple GO Station Improvements and Parking Structure**

Landscape Architecture/ Urban Design:	Shalini Ullal, AECOM
Architecture:	Laurence Cudip, AECOM
Location:	Maple Heritage Conservation District
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. With a focus on community-building and leveraging public realm opportunities, how well does the proposed infrastructure integrate with its transforming urban context including consideration of the Maple GO Secondary Plan, new development along Eagle Rock Way and the Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan?
2. How can the architecture of the parking structure and other architectural components of the station be improved in the context of urban transformation, its relationship to the heritage station building and the Maple Heritage Conservation District?

**Overview:**

- The project specifications and design exemplar must establish a strong vision for the Maple GO Station – this vision is currently missing.
- To establish the vision, station improvements need to consider the site holistically with further study given to urban design. Acknowledge, consider and propose how this site could function and positively connect to the urban community centered upon Eagle Rock Way as a Main Street. More attention is needed to successfully respond to heritage.
- Need to reduce dominance of the car on the site which is driving the design. Assign, allocate and define open spaces anticipating a changing modal split within

25 years. The vision must give more importance to the experience of pedestrians, to alternate modes of transportation other than vehicles, and to the different types of users.

- To prescribe a best practice approach, the project specifications and exemplar must dictate what is that is in terms of implementation – i.e. Articulate the design priorities, be strong about the overall vision, and then illustrate it with the exemplar design.

## **Comments:**

### Drawings

- Limits need to be clearly demarcated on the drawings. The station improvements are a massive opportunity that should be carefully considered within its context. Limits should include the bus loop.
- Drawings should provide more context to communicate how these station improvements respond to surrounding conditions and to acknowledge and convey the history of the area.
- Drawings should communicate a more inclusionary, pedestrian experience of the station, rather than the vehicle-oriented approach. Drawings are needed to describe the pedestrian spaces, such as the plaza, and how they will work in connection to the architecture and circulation system.
- Drawings need to be clearer about what are the priority experiences that need to be designed – such as the procession along Eagle Rock Way, the pedestrian approach from the south to the station, the plaza.
  - Strengthen tree lined routes to the main station if this is an important thing.
  - Can the switchback / huge ramp break down the scale of the huge retaining wall (between the heritage station and Eagle Rock)?
  - Site limits will dictate where you can start to bring the site down. If you can bring down the grade of Eagle Rock Way by a foot, it reduces the length of your pedestrian ramp.
  - If a plaza around station is important, then design the plaza with configuration and details to understand it is a special moment.
- Show the urban transformation in the drawings. The parking garage is a huge facility and is being approached by vehicles from all directions. There is a convergence of many different activities and modes – how will this work in 10 years? What happens when there are more buses, more taxis? There is conflict between modes of transportation particularly to reach the north lot. How can you modify congestion in year 10? Additionally, the higher density development along Eagle Rock will influence the functioning of the station.

- Develop more cross section and contextual drawings to show relationships to the edges – intermediate scale drawing(s) are needed to show how all modes of transport and people will eventually work here comfortably.
- Need drawings to show the platform area – north, south, west and east sides - and how it integrates with the site improvements.
- Requested that the renderings show the correct buildings as designed by Quadrangle in the background rather than the contextual built form massing as shown.

#### Vision and Scope of Work

- Panel expressed disappointment that Metrolinx is not scoping this exercise as something more than a parking garage. There is very important urban design component. Project specifications need to stem from a long-term approach and vision for the Maple GO Station.
- Strive high for best practises and then apply and test them in the design. “The design exercise is to create a diagram that works functionally and then to translate that diagram into a design that sings”.

#### Site Plan / Architecture / Landscape Architecture

- The lands to east were designated to be big box but something amazing happened here. The Maple GO Secondary Plan area - a tight, dense urban community with a main street along Eagle Rock Way, was planned. Much effort and investment has been put into the development of this community. The drawings ignore this connection with a design that is in isolation of, and that will negatively impact all this urban transformation.
- The view terminus at the end of Eagle Rock Way is an important idea for the Maple GO community that should be stronger in the station design.
- More space or “breathing room” within the site should be created for the experience of the heritage station building, the public spaces within the station, and to set up more positive spatial and built form relationships with its surroundings.
- The heritage station, though modest in size is a very proud building. The surrounding landscape space should be equally proud, rich, and pedestrian-friendly as this building.
- The heritage station building is very small in size but a big urban design idea: The idea that something so small connects to something big - miles and miles of rail.
- The heritage station has a symmetry, and a front door – there should be an aligned pedestrian experience, tree lined, that takes pedestrians to the front door.

- Pay careful attention to architectural elements in the parking structure that can work with the heritage building, such as the stairwells, pavilions at grade. Any opportunity must be maximized so that heritage station is not so alone. Also consider the heritage landscape around the station – garden, picket fence and two pine trees – and pay homage to the cultural landscape context.
- The pedestrian experience needs inspiration. Provide more space for the pedestrian focus areas within the GO station.
- Need to establish a hierarchy of circulation to reduce conflicts. Clearly the car, dimensions of the car and their circulation is guiding the design. All the spaces including the plaza are strangely shaped, left over spaces and will be uninviting for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Increase bike parking capacity within the parking structure.
- The parking structure building does not relate in a positive way to the new development along Eagle Rock Way, to the townhouses to the east, the cemetery and/or the heritage station building. The footprint and corners of the parking structure need to be more carefully considered with respect to its relationship to the surrounding community. , the building corners creates pinch points. Consider ways to improve this relationship including reducing the building envelope, chamfered corners, architectural treatments at corners and/or rotating the building parallel to the rail line.
- Further consider how the design directs people moving in and out of the site. Recommend eliminating the vehicular connection along the north side of the parking garage. Consider providing electronic display to minimize the amount of traffic circling around the site.
- In the current configuration, the southwest corner of the site is the largest open space. Rotating the building parallel to the rail line may provide opportunities to expand the open space in the northeast and southeast corners and improve the relationship to Eagle Rock Way, the townhouses to the east and the cemetery.
- Connection between the upper and lower levels of site should be more carefully considered. Should improve the pedestrian crossing from the bus loop to the station building. Could consider a bridge connection between the bus loop and the garage to connect to the parking elevators and future ticket office (eliminating the need for the elevator in the bus loop).
- There is an opportunity to use the corner of the garage as an enhanced station feature with a better relationship to Eagle Rock Way and the existing station building (i.e. this corner of the garage should feel like it is part of the station proper). Review opportunities to relocate the ramp in the northwest corner further east (grades permitting) or the southwest corner.
- It is a tremendous responsibility to design that first view of Maple that all train passengers arriving to the station will experience and this must be taken on whole

heartedly. The west façade of the parking structure is the front door and the first view of visitors and therefore the elevation should be significantly improved.

- Consider the near term and long-term plan for the north parking lot to protect/enhance the at-grade pedestrian crossing at the station building. This may include exploring access opportunities to/from McNaughton Road.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 57 – JULY 27 , 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of June 29, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments**

### **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

### **Transit City Tower 3, 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Claude Cormier, Claude Cormier + Associés

10:45am

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 57 – July 27, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, July 27, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

##### **Absent**

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Mauro Peverini, Development Planning

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning

Dorthoy Kowpak, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning  
Niaz Mohammed, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning

**The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair.**

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for June 29, 2017 were approved.

**4. DESIGN REVIEW**

**1. VMC Residences III GP Inc. as a General Partner and on behalf of VMC Residences III Limited Partnership (Transit City Tower 3)**

Architecture:	Diamond Schmitt Architects
Landscape Architecture:	Claude Cormier + associés
Location:	Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the ground floor layout and site design in responding to the context of the development block, activation of edges and accommodation of different modes of transportation?
2. How successful is the architectural expression of the tower and treatment of the parking structure in relation to the surrounding buildings?

**Overview:**

Panel raised serious concerns with the proposal and feared that introducing a second large parking structure that dominates the vast majority of the site is "*opening up a Pandora's box of issues that the VMC will have to deal with moving forward*". Panel felt that this phase of the project had lost track of very important conversations, including the approach to parking and density, tower configuration, expression and scale, and allocation of residential within a broader mix of uses.

1. Approach to Parking and Density:

- Panel noted that they reluctantly supported the first parking structure, but do not want this to become a precedent for others. Not everything should default to above grade. In an economy where density is being pushed so far above planning permissions, investment in underground parking should be implemented despite geotechnical challenges.
- Panel raised the notion of rethinking where and how the future of the parking is considered. If the 3 towers had been prepared as a comprehensive master plan, there would have been a very different approach to parking for the site.

2. Tower Configuration, Architectural Expression and Scale:

- Proposed tower floor plates, podium size and scale of the development were challenged. With height and density thresholds more than doubling what is permitted under the current Secondary Plan policies, Panel feared the ripple effect of issues into the VMC.
- Panel questioned whether the VMC might be better served by a 6-storey mid-rise building in this location.
- Panel questioned the parking structure cladding as the major expression of the podium. The volume of massing speaks to the context argument: applying the same expression as the phase 1 parking podium makes the Panel's concern with the scale of massing and relationship to context even more noticeable.

3. Mix of Uses:

- Panel felt that the robust earlier discussions about a mixed use approach to the block – vertically and horizontally – have been weakened by the extent of the 3 residential towers proposed. Despite some minor retail along Portage Parkway, Panel felt that the conversation about a 24-hour mixed use environment has been lost and that the balance of uses had been tipped off.
- Panel raised concern with the use of parking dominating the podium as a predominate feature with little function and strongly encouraged greater integration of retail to provide a better ground level pedestrian experience. Given that there are very few parking spaces proposed on the second floor, Panel encouraged the extension of the retail to a double storey configuration with windows to vary the expression.
- Panel felt that the colonnade on the south and east facades would not create a welcoming environment and would be a detriment to the pedestrian realm.

**Comments:**

Site Organization

- As the first complete development block of the VMC, and given the mix of uses and proximity to the transit hub, this should be the most vibrant, interesting experience in the downtown. Panel continue to be concerned with the approach

to ground floor use and do not feel that the site is generating the animation it should. Too much pressure is being placed on the landscape to create animation. The landscape design is heroic and carries a strong narrative, but it “can’t solve the edge condition”.

- This site requires a strong commitment to the ground floor. Resolving parking, servicing and access is overriding the future proofing of uses in the long run. More work should be done to free up the ground floor on the north and south frontage for additional uses and activation.
- Explore the opportunity for a shared opening to accommodate loading and servicing with parking entrance and exit / egress.
- The pedestrian connection to the south is too narrow to be meaningful, and is not creating a welcoming environment. The south frontage should be reconsidered.

#### Massing, Urban Design and Architecture

- The project is suffering from a struggle between unity and anonymity. The architectural language and approach to design is too uniform.
- While the project proposes an urban scale, it suffers from a suburban mentality in terms of how cities work as complex, fine grained environments. While there are a wide mix of uses in the block, the project is not achieving the fine-grained scale of an excellent urban environment. Everything is huge and architecturally out of scale. The scale of retail is insignificant in relation to the residential proposed. While the entrance carpet is a strong gesture, it can’t make up for the lack of scale of entrance at the corner.
- Further attention to the skyline needs to be considered to create transition. Panel understood the iconic twin tower concept presented in the first submission, but question the third 55 storey tower proposal in relation to the skyline strategy. A variety of building heights and types are required.
- Panel were concerned with the size of the tower floor plate and requested the applicant and City to stick to the tall buildings footprint control.
- The design of the covered vehicular drive needs to be reconsidered in terms of the vertical plane and soffit. Explore the opportunity to create something unique under the emergency egress. This space could become an enhanced pedestrian walkway skinned with public art and illuminated.
- Investigate the use of a two bay split level configuration of the parking with shorter ramps to allow for future conversion of the upper floors of the parking structure.

#### Landscape Architecture

- Panel are concerned with the performance potential of the landscape. The building has maximized its envelope to the point that it is forcing the landscape to work underneath it.

- The widened promenade was appreciated.
- The throat from the bus turnaround should be incorporated into a broader paving strategy to connect the walkway to the surrounding bus terminal and give a visual sense of right-of-way for pedestrians.
- Panel urged the Applicant to provide full access for the roof garden amenity as there is a premium for occupiable space given the scale of units proposed.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 58 – SEPTEMBER 28, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of July 27, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Edgeley Pond and Park**

### **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

#### **2nd Review**

#### **Presentations:**

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, Development Engineering & Infrastructure  
Planning

James Roche & Yvonne Battista, DTAH

Abe Khademi, WSP

10:40 am

## **Break**

10:55 am

## **Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, 3<sup>rd</sup> Review**

#### **Presentation:**

Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy

12:05 pm

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 58 – September 28, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 28, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Megan Torza, DTAH

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Paul Kulig in the Chair.

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

John Tassiopoulos declared a conflict with the first item.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for July 27, 2017 were approved.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW**

1. **Edgeley Pond and Park**

Landscape Architecture:	DTAH
Engineer:	WSP
Location:	Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Review:	Second Review

**Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the proposal in its continued efforts to combine a stormwater management facility with public space?
2. How well has the proposal captured the narrative of the Black Creek?

**Overview:**

The design of the park is progressing very well and will be an exemplary, pioneer project in fundamentally reimagining the relationship between city and river systems.

Further refinements should be considered in the following areas:

- Refine the edges to avoid uncoordinated conditions (ie - retaining walls, fences, design and servicing problems). Cross sections and other 3D drawings should be prepared to communicate these relationships.
- The Jane Street edge needs to be further developed to ensure that it acts as open and welcoming edge into the Park. While the design of the berming serves a storm water function, the street edge should still be designed as a place in and of itself. Consider the sequence of experiences from the urban plaza and along Jane

Street to Apple Mill Road, which will function as the ultimate destination to the subway.

- Programming of the park still needs further refinement. Explore areas where unprogrammed space should go to enable the park to evolve over time.
- Strata park is overprogrammed; consider scaling down park program or spreading out park facilities to the north.
- Refinements to the scale and design of the amphitheatre area should be explored. Consider including additional design elements to enable this area to also function as a central lookout point.
- Signage and strategies related to public safety are needed to communicate how the storm water management facility functions during different storm events and everyday situations.
- The iconic pedestrian bridge should be implemented as soon as possible, and future proofing of infrastructure for easier implementation should be considered.

#### **Comments:**

##### Edge Conditions

- The weakest part of the design are the edge conditions and the treatment of the interface with adjacent development projects. Continue to coordinate design elements with adjacent properties to strengthen the park interfaces. If possible, include the landscape designs for adjacent development projects into the concept plan so that the overall development block reads as one seamless, well integrated space.
- There are still some missed opportunities in the design of the Jane Street edge to future proof for greater density and use, and to strengthen views into the park.
  - While the move to bring the park edge to the street is understandable, Jane Street should be more occupiable as a space with seating and gathering areas.
  - Consider whether all of the mounds are required to serve a stormwater function, or whether any of the berms could be removed or softened along the park edge. The transition to Jane Street could be less of a hard edge to ensure more welcoming areas are included.
  - Reconsider the way that views are structured along Jane Street in relation to the berms. The berms are creating some barriers. View corridors could be refined to reinforce views, but still provide some sense of enclosure. North and south views could be repositioned to culminate at the Apple Mill Road intersection.
  - How does the layby parking work in terms of functionality and the behaviour of people? Are cars expected to loop in?

- There are missed opportunities in the design of the south edge and interface with the urban plaza, pedestrian pathway and private driveway. The integration of these spaces and parallel systems is not well resolved. This path will serve as a major desire line and connection between the urban plaza and strata park. Consider a more formal treatment and improved wayfinding function.
- The urban plaza is not urban enough. While the gradient of urban to natural is understood, this area will serve as a main gateway to the park and needs to be reconsidered in terms of flow of people to accommodate gathering and movement.
- Cross sections should be extended to show edge conditions.
- Ensure enough shaded areas are provided.

### Scale and Programming

- In light of this project servicing as a storm water management facility, what are the implications in terms of design and programming? What happens in future phases when Black Creek gets naturalized? How does the design evolve over time?
- The project seems overly programmed for its typology. This will not be an urban park.
- The scale of the strata park should be reconsidered in terms of its program. The space seems too confined by its considerable program. Is there an opportunity to move the pavilion north towards the community garden area to free up space to make the skating loop larger?
- Consider scale and programming of the amphitheatre. With the sloped terracing condition, the stage on a pathway system does not work well. Think of the scale of desired events. Consider including a viewing platform, floating stage or extension of a wooden dock pavilion that also functions as an overview/overlook point towards the island.

### Phasing

- Staging of elements needs further refinement. If the strata park is to be built in the first phase, the reality of the programming needs should be resolved (washrooms, shaded areas, etc).
- The pedestrian bridge should be advanced earlier, as it is a functional necessity. Future proof the design now to construction necessary footings and infrastructure to avoid uprooting elements later.
- Is there an opportunity to share parking with the future school to the east?

## **2. Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines**

Architect: Brook McIlroy  
Location: City-Wide  
Review: Third Review

### **Introduction:**

Anne McIlroy, a Principal with Brook McIlroy, presented the revised 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines document, developed to address earlier input from meetings with landowners, members of the development and design community, and working sessions with the Vaughan Design Review Panel in October 2016 and February 2017. The presentation was followed by an informal roundtable discussion with panel members, based on the following questions:

### **Document Contents**

1. Are there any topics that should be further explored in the City-Wide Intensification Guidelines?

### **Document Usability**

2. Does this document read well as a tool and resource to shape development?
3. Are there any comments regarding the demonstration plans that would help designers interpret the document?

### **Implementation**

4. What recommendations should be added to the document to ensure successful implementation?

### **Overview:**

- Ease of navigation is paramount to the success of the document, which needs further work. The navigational diagram(s) should clearly direct users to the appropriate sections for their development.
- There should be a hierarchy within the performance standards; first, the policies as a 'must', with critical guidelines clearly outlined, followed by aspiration measures that are more flexible. The document should be clear in the use of the terms: 'shall', 'should', 'may', 'generally'.
- The document must be explicit about the vision for arterial roads and the intent to design for the pedestrian experience.
- The Panel challenged the consultant to review the document and reduce content by 50 pages. They further suggested that some elements could be relocated for inclusion as part of the comprehensive zoning by-law update.
- The demonstration plans are the strongest part of document and should be expanded to capture more specific conditions unique to Vaughan.

## **Comments:**

### Introduction

- It is important that the document be easy to navigate. The “How-to” section should help users to identify their development type and site location and refer them to the related sections.
- The Panel requested that a diagram be included in the document to illustrate where the green approach related to built form will be applied along intensification corridors.

### Vision and Design Principles

- The Panel suggested that the design principles be more explicit in communicating that the guidelines are intended to support the pedestrian level experience.
- The document should have a clear vision for arterial roads in terms of form and use, and the successful design of retail along these corridors.

### Development Adjacencies

- The Panel indicated the need for further development of guidelines related to the edges of and interfaces with Heritage Districts; what constitutes complementary edges in terms of scale and materiality?
- The Panel requested more information be provided on site organization with respect to how trails should traverse through sites and connect with adjacent TRCA trails.

### Building Performance

- The Panel suggested that the document consider flexibility with respect to tower footprints adjacent to the 400 series highways.
- The conventional townhouse typology with a front loading garage condition is missing from the document.
- The Panel requested that a maximum length be specified for a townhouse block, in addition to a maximum number of units.
- The Panel requested that guidelines be added for utilities and how to minimize their impact.

### Parking Guidelines

- Parking design guidelines should be different in residential, employment and industrial development contexts. Achievement of soil volumes in employment and industrial sites could benefit from corridor planting rather than traditional planting islands.

### Landscape Typologies

- The Panel suggested the development of greater implementation strategies related to privately-owned publicly accessible spaces (POPS).
- The Panel cautioned recommending low impact development (LID) measures in locations where required infrastructure does not exist to support such measures.
- A few performance measures are missing in the landscape section, including design guidelines for landscape areas adjacent to trails, for employment lands and large industrial spaces and for integrating natural heritage into sites.

### Demonstration Plans

- The document requires more demonstration plans illustrating conditions unique to Vaughan, including tough corners, drastic grade changes, and odd lot sizes.
- The demonstration plans are a powerful tool that should be moved up earlier in the document to express clear design intent.
- Demonstration plan notes should reference the design priorities, guidelines and performance measures contained in the document.

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 59 – NOVEMBER 30, 2017

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 243,  
Second Level

9:00 am

## **Pre-Meeting**

Committee Members

9:15 am

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of September 28, 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

## **Indigo Phase III, Condominiums in Maple, 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Shahzad Strike, Urban Design

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Les Klein, Quadrangle Architects

Ryan Mino, KLM Planning Partners

10:40 am

## **Break**

10:55 am

## **Expo City Tower 5, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects

James Roche, DTAH

12:05 pm

## **Break**

12:25 pm

## **Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, Transit City Tower 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects

1:35 pm

## **Break**

1:45 am

## **Liberty Highway 7 + Maplecrete Mixed Use Development, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:

Shahzad Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Simon Ko, Dialog

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design

2:55 pm

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 59 – November 30, 2017**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 30, 2017 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

**The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair.**

## **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

## **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Sheldon Levitt declared a conflict with items one and two.

Megan Torza declared a conflict with item two.

Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict with the third and fourth items.

Antonio Gomez-Palacio declared a conflict with the fourth item.

## **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for September 28, 2017 were approved.

## **4. DESIGN REVIEW**

### **1. Indigo Phase III, Condominiums in Maple**

Architecture:            Quadrangle Architects  
Planner:                 KLM Planning Partners  
Location:                Maple  
Review:                 First Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the massing and scale of the development within the context of the maple GO station and Indigo Phase 1& 2 along Eagle Rock Way?
2. How successful is the building in responding to the grade, and the adjacent transit facilities?

#### **Overview:**

- Panel recognized that the site is a gateway site but stated that is not treated as such, it is not designed as a place of arrival or departure. The original concept of the master plan has a strong vision in creating a transit hub and a landmark with entrances and access on Eagle Rock Way, and grade related uses to animate the street; panel requested that the proposal respects the vision of the master plan.
- Acknowledge that there is an important relationship to GO station, there seems to be a lack of coordination between the project team and Metrolinx, the panel suggested the applicant to work closely with Metrolinx and the City to bring cohesion and unity to the master plan creating a truly transit oriented development.

- Review and revise the first two levels, most of the functions within these levels are servicing and loading, understand that they are not creating positive relations with the public realm.

## **Comments**

### General

- Engage Metrolinx for meaningful design of the cul-de-sac, it is shown with an abundance of landscape but ultimately it is going to be a dead space, consider beyond the boundary property line to design a space with urban quality creating a destination opportunity with more active uses along the edge.
- The second submission should include all the grade elevations and a master ground floor of the broader context. It is important to understand the limits of GO Station boundary and the site property line and the relationship of the retaining wall with the proposal's underground parking and all the exciting opportunities that can be created through a comprehensive approach.
- Provide multiple cross sections through the site for a better understanding of the unique grade relations between the site and adjacent properties.
- Start to rethink the project as a much bigger endeavour, revisit original assumptions around the retail, proposing meaningful amount of bike storage immediately triggers foot traffic increase that can help support retail.

### Site Organization

- The project should not repeat the same functional orientation of the mid-rise developments, because it has introduced a tower component, the project needs to take on a more civic and placemaking frame of mind establishing a moment at the end of the road.
- There is opportunity to turn the north south walkway into an activated edge, currently bedroom windows are facing the walkway, reconsider the location and the design of the lobby and pick-up, drop-off on Salterton Circle, explore a through lobby with entrance and a public terrace on Eagle Rock way. Another option is to locate the amenity space along the walkway.
- The Pedestrian, Vehicular and bicycle circulations has not been fully resolved, there seem to be conflicts between the bus passengers and cyclists trying to access bicycle storage. The 4 lay-by parking spaces at the intersection also create a conflict with traffic movement of the intersection and should be eliminated.

### Architecture

- The idea of the base building stepping down towards the station makes sense but be mindful of the tower separation distance and ensure there is sufficient distance between this building and the Indigo phase II.

- The architectural expression has a curvilinear language while the other buildings are linear buildings with rectilinear language. Consistency of language may bring more cohesion into the context.
- Flip the location of Lobby and the townhouses to create a more urban edge along both the walkway and Eagle Rock Way, relocate private residential uses to the residential street.
- The tower's proportion need to be revisited, the tower is casting shadows onto the park, reduce the foot print of the tower to reduce its shadow impact.
- The size of the loading area on Salterton Circle should be reduced, it is very wide and those driving down the residential street will only see a blank wall and loading space.

### Landscape

- By creating elevated terraces, pedestrians on Eagle Rock Way are facing blank walls, the front of the building should be part of the public realm, try to incorporate the grade by lowering the building to meet the ground.
- If some terracing is required, break the stairs to two sets to make the rise more gradual and inviting.
- The design consists of a podium on top of an exposed parking garage, where bicycles are buried, behind dark, impenetrable spandrel glass. As a TOD development, the project should celebrate the bicycles with a grand gesture as a catalyst to the parking structure across the street.
- Panel questioned how much of the proposed bike parking is offset for the GO station's requirement and how much belongs to the project, they ask the applicant to also distinguish between storage lockers, bike parking, public bike storage as each has a different requirement and impact on the design.
- The cul-de-sac has the opportunity to be more than a drop-off area, it should be treated as a destination, propose enhanced paving for the cul-de-sac to emphasize its importance within the broader context.
- Garde related landscape should be carried on both sides as there is no true back of house, explore dropping the height of P1 level along the road to get enough soil volume to have at-grade landscape.

## 2. Expo City Tower 5

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects  
Landscape Architect: DTAH  
Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Review: First Review

### Introduction:

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How well resolved is the integration of the landscape and streetscape design with site circulation and servicing?
2. How successful are the proposed uses at grade within the context of the Expo development?

### Overview:

Panel commended the positive aspects of the proposal, including:

- A refreshing approach to architectural expression and materiality
- Clear aspiration for great ground related uses and activation of the site, including the notion of a gallery space which was well received
- Excitement around the notion of bringing Edgeley Park into the site and onto the second level terrace
- Compliments on a high-quality package and communication of a thoughtful design process and narrative

Panel felt the following challenges of the proposal require further study and resolution, including:

- Vehicular circulation wrapping a majority of the site
- More focus on the northern frontage and pedestrian connections to Edgeley Pond and Park
- Resolution of the podium design, setbacks and public realm interface

### Comments:

#### Site Organization

- The strongest design moves in the scheme are the notion of creating a significant connection to Edgeley Park to help integrate the projects functionally and spatially, and pushing the tower back from Highway 7 to create variation along the street frontage and act as a gateway to funnel people to the park. While the big moves

are good, the connection to Edgeley Park needs to be much more developed and should reinforce the significant art components of the project.

- The project benefits from its location next to the park, and needs more work to resolve the ground level relationship. Would the pedestrian connection to the park work better from the eastern edge?
- Overall site circulation is a concern, particularly where the highest traffic use will be funnelled through the heavily traversed pedestrian spine. Greater study of the mews is required. Even if access to loading is relocated, vehicular conflicts with the pedestrian spine and proposed adjacent retail uses needs to be resolved.
- Panel felt that it was unfortunate that the driveway was required to extend all the way to Maplecrete Road. There is too much driveway on site, and the access points are not being used to their full potential. Reduce the amount of driveway, if possible, to create a better interface with the park. As well, the drop-off areas towards the north edge needs refinement.
- Explore other options for locating loading and parking, particularly along the north-east frontage where Panel cautioned not to be too *“over protective of that part of the building at expense of all other parts of the building”*. All four façades are being treated as ‘good’ façades – need to pick a less important façade. If the ramp were to be relocated to the north façade, it would free up the entire public mews for connectivity to the park and allow for greater sculpting of the building base.
- An integrated drawing needs to be provided to demonstrate how all projects in context work together.
- Entrances to the art gallery and residential lobby need to be further resolved. Should they function and operate independently from one another?
- The retail and gallery details are critical to the success of the project, and need more resolution in the next stage of design. The character of the retail needs further exploration.

### Massing and Architecture

- Panel complimented the design team on the materiality of the project and noted that it was refreshing and interesting to see such a departure from the typical tower approach. The building will provide an interesting profile in the skyline and has the potential to be a landmark building in Vaughan. Panel noted that it would be a *“sad day if the brick becomes concrete”*.
- Panel felt the podium design was less resolved than the tower, and needed to be more expressive. Panel commented that the podium did not need to be rotated in alignment with the tower. As well, Panel offered an alternative view that perhaps the building did not need the sizable podium, and the tower could stand on its own as a beautiful brick building within a plaza facing the park.

- The massing of the podium needs to be stepped up proportionality from the street where there is an ability to add another floor or provide double height to the space. As well, the sketch ideas about bringing the park onto the roof terrace need further exploration. The podium should be sculpted to provide a ramp over the current loading area to the second level rooftop amenity which could function as an incredible destination with sunset views facing the park.
- Provide a view from Highway 7 showing the space that has been created between the buildings by pushing the tower back.
- Provide more detail about the casement windows in the next iteration of the tower.
- Review the wind model and provide appropriate mitigation measures, particularly adjacent to the highly programmed park.

#### Landscape Architecture

- Explore introducing a broader forecourt at the base of the building.
- Panel questioned whether the centre median through the private driveway was needed. This road could be tightened to bring pedestrians closer to the park.
- The sculptural green connection is a strong idea. The Seattle sculpture park example was a compelling idea.
- Panel was not convinced that the scale of the landscape precedents was relevant to the scale of the space given the size of the podium.

### **3. Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments, Transit City Tower 3**

Architecture: Diamond Schmitt Architects  
 Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associés  
 Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
 Review: Second Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Which of the options presented best responds to the first round of DRP comments related to:
  - a) Approach to parking and podium design
  - b) Tower configuration, architectural expression and scale
  - c) Mix of uses

## Overview:

Panel reiterated concerns from the first review of the project regarding the approach to parking and podium design, architectural expression and mix of uses. Further;

- Panel expressed concern over the incremental design of the parcels within the block and felt that there was a disconnect between the request to look at the site comprehensively with respect to the density and massing proposed, but then be asked to deal with parking in isolation. As a legacy for the overall VMC neighbourhood, it is advisable to design at the scale of the whole block as “*we shouldn't have this problem in a greenfield environment*”. When the first two towers were reviewed, the magnitude of this third tower was not shown. It is the obligation of projects of this scale to communicate the larger context.
- Panel echoed earlier concerns regarding the dangerous precedent of above grade parking structures being set for the VMC.
- Panel reiterated the need to future proof the parking podium and to continue thinking about convertibility of spaces for the whole master plan and each building as it comes online.
- Panel felt strongly that the project needed to revisit the overall architectural expression to balance out the need for continuity with variance.
- Panel supported the improvement to the landscape interface with the YRT Bus Terminal, but encouraged the Applicant to consider winter maintenance solutions to address impact of salt loading concerns associated with the adjacent transit facility.
- Panel raised concern with the design of the western elevation in relation to the proximity of residential units, commenting that the 11-metre separation was not the ideal scenario.
- Based on the podium options presented, Panel confirmed preference for the residential elevation along Portage Parkway and commented that building heights may have to come down to offset the loss in parking spaces. Resulting parking ratios will have to be dealt with in an innovative manner.

## Comments:

### Site Organization

- Panel expressed frustration from repeated requests to better understand the planned context and master plan for the block, stated throughout previous reviews of earlier proposals in the block – particularly with respect to how densities and massing are proposed and incrementally developed.
- Panel felt this challenging site was the wrong place for this amount of density – not because of height, but because of the amount of and approach to the parking proposed. Panel noted the irony of having such a significant transit facility and

wrapping it with parking, and commented that the design is “*not completing the potential for the block that it has in relation to the transit infrastructure it enjoys*”.

- Panel expressed concern that this first complete and iconic block in the VMC may have the least amount of retail space compared to other blocks and felt that “*if this block cannot sustain a complete retail environment, none will be able to do so*”. Panel felt that the proposal should sustain a greater concentration of retail in the block.
- Continued concern expressed from earlier reviews of the Phase 1 Transit City project regarding mitigation of the visual impact and presence of the above grade parking podium and protection of an animated pedestrian experience were reiterated, particularly at the ground level.
- Panel noted the challenge of developing this particularly demanding site at this point in the VMC’s build out.

#### Podium Design

- The parking screening feels like an applique and needs to be properly veneered. The option to wrap residential uses along the Portage Parkway elevation is preferred to bring life back to the street.
- The LED veneer could be an appropriate treatment facing the YRT Bus Terminal.
- Panel continue to be frustrated by the extent of above grade parking and short-range view of parking. This proposal is not thinking about the long-range view of future parking and the VMC should worry about this. Panel commented that “*you can live with 1 above grade parking deck, you shouldn’t accept 2*”. If there is a technical solution that allows for future uses, that should be implemented.

#### Architecture

- The monotony of the architectural language is not what it should be for a project of this scale, location and significance. More variation in cladding, orientation and sustainability is strongly encouraged to provide greater interest, character and meaning. Explore use of colour and tonality.
- A greater variety of height, interest in detailing along the ground floor plane, depth in profile and expression, and view of the skyline from pedestrian spaces and street level is needed. The proposal is still reading as 3 towers of the same height with the same elevation, with the proposed tower being even larger than the other two. This is a missed opportunity.
- The expression of the tower is problematic in that all renderings are taken from the view of a northbound car driving along Millway Avenue, which is a skewed and isolated angle. If the view was taken from the urban plaza or viewed from the vantage point of a pedestrian moving north from the subway station, a pair of towers would be perceived behind the mixed-use office/rec centre/library hub, with a separate third tower on direct axis with the public open space connecting the

subway station to the bus terminal. Because of this axial view, this third tower should be unique and read strongly as a view terminus.

- The architectural expression and tower pattern could use an element of interference to make it more interesting. Suggestions included integrating the base into the tower more by using the frame vocabulary to integrate the podium and free up the tower, and considering applying the frame on only 1 side to free up the other facades. Explore a difference in tower height and consider a slab shape that offsets the duality of the other two towers.
- The expression of the podium is inappropriate and should read entirely different. Consider drawing on the language of verticality.

#### Landscape Architecture

- The landscape has been wonderfully resolved and is to be commended. The removal of layby parking spaces and continuation of the landscape is a much better solution to this frontage.
- Consider introducing a doorway to the lobby on the south side to help activate the frontage.
- Further investigate the proportion of the promenade and general desire lines.
- The full rooftop terrace should be a habitable amenity.
- Consider roof-top ecologies with regard to northern winds. Black Pine may not survive based on experience with similar project conditions.

#### **4. Liberty Highway 7 + Maplecrete Mixed Use Development**

Architecture: Dialog  
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design  
Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Review: First Review

##### **Introduction:**

City staff sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the site organization in relation to the public street network and public realm?
2. How successful is the architectural expression of the buildings in creating an animated and engaging development?

##### **Overview:**

Panel commented that the proposal represented a very rational plan for the site, but felt that a few missed opportunities needed to be reconsidered to strengthen the overall

design. Moving forward, Panel suggested focussing refinements on the theme of connectivity:

- Greater connectivity to surrounding open space, including extension of Street B's relationship to the Black Creek channel and new connections northward towards Edgeley Pond and Park
- Improvement in transit connectivity, including a strengthened north-south mid-block connection from the southern frontage to Highway 7
- Greater connection between indoor and outdoor amenity areas and reconsideration of compatible adjacent uses
- Reconsideration of the usefulness of the proposed driveway connection to the future local road aligned to the east of the site, and assessment of the lost opportunity for additional open space on site
- Reconsideration of the vehicular connections within the site and potential for providing access along the peripheral roads, minimizing traffic movement within the site
- Clarification on condominium corporation ownership and provision of dedicated open space for the mid-rise building
- Reconsideration of tower locations in relation to desired urban frontages and open space areas

### **Comments:**

#### Site Organization

- Activation of the ground floor level is challenging – *“how do you make as great a place as possible for the people that live there?”* The Highway 7 frontage is challenging, and simply lining it with retail is not the answer. Insertion of amenity uses will also present a challenge given privacy issues. Grade related amenity spaces are better served facing internal spaces. Consider introducing live/work units at grade.
- Site programming needs to be revisited. The retail strategy is weak, and the ramp configuration is creating a remaining space that is too narrow for successful retail. While inclusion of the dog run is a great proposal, its location next to retail is questionable. Consider shifting the dog park to the south-east corner of the site and introducing F+B uses into that space, with potential for spill out patio areas.
- There is an over abundance of circulation in the block, and the proposed green space on the west side is being treated as a left-over piece of land. All parking should be located below grade. Revisit site circulation to remove vehicular movements by reviewing the location of the servicing and ramps. Is it possible to service the site off Maplecrete Road or immediately upon entry into the local

road? Relocation of the ramps would also provide more efficient parking floorplates below grade.

- The strongest element of the plan is the courtyard and woonerf, yet the retail parking is taking up prime “centre ice” space. Take to heart creating a well designed publicly accessible central space that takes advantage of its southern exposure and considers introducing more softscape elements. Consider removing the access lane to the future local road to the east to extend programmable open space.
- The project is not taking advantage of the synergies between the site components and the context. While site porosity is good, inclusion of a stronger north-south mid-block connection is a missed opportunity to create a great public space. Study desire lines and circulation routes to strengthen the east-west connection to the Black Creek channel and consider creating a north-south connection to Edgeley Pond and Park.
- Interior amenity space should open onto public space to create a stronger indoor/outdoor connection. The amenity footprint should be enlarged, and additional space could be introduced on the 8<sup>th</sup> level.
- Provide a context plan that shows the project in the context of existing and planned developments.

#### Urban Design, Massing and Architecture

- Revisit the spirit behind the initial hand sketches, as the elevations that have developed have lost some of the excitement in the concept and are far from the original architectural ideas. *“Be clever about doing things that won’t get valued engineered out”.*
- More layers of architectural expression need to be explored, particularly at the ground floor. Study the potential for the screen / wrapping element to have more layers to its expression, rather than just being one big gesture. If you remove the screen, there is a missing sense of scale and articulation.
- The wrapped balconies and super structure element read as part of the massing of the building. Given that the towers are already large at 850 m<sup>2</sup>, the additional bulk adds weight to the appearance of the building which is counter to the sketch concept.
- Study opportunities created by refining the massing into an L-shaped configuration with larger open space, versus the standalone tower with dynamic pedestrian corridor.

#### Landscape Architecture

- Patterned asphalt is not an appropriate treatment for the central courtyard. The quality of and durability of materials needs to be improved, and enhanced paving should be denoted for pedestrian zones.

