

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 24 – JANUARY 30, 2014

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of October 31, 2013 and November 28, 2013 Meetings
- 9:05 am Carrville District Centre, Part of Block 18 lands
Nine-Ten West Limited
19T-13V010, OP.13.015 & Z.13.043**
Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of
Subdivision / 1st Review
Presentations:
Maira Wilson and Mark Antoine, Development Planning
The Planning Partnership, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:30 am Design Review Panel Pilot Project Evaluation**
Review City of Vaughan Design Review Panel Terms of Reference and Protocol
- 11:30 pm Adjournment and Lunch**

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL



Planning Department

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 25 – FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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

- 9:00 am Breakfast Meeting**
- 9:30 am Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of January 30, 2014 Meeting
- 9:35 am 2900 Regional Road 7 – Phase 2
EXPO Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**
High-rise Mixed Use Development
Royal 7 Developments Ltd.
1st Review
Presentations:
Farhad Jalilli and Stephen Lue, Development Planning
AJ Tregebov Architect
- 10:45 am Break**
- 11:00 am 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue**
Mid-rise Mixed Use Development
Cityzen Development Group
1st Review
Presentations:
Farhad Jalilli and Eugene Fera, Development Planning
Mark Zwicker, Architecture Unfolded
- 12:10 pm Adjournment and Lunch**



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 43 – March 31, 2016

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:15 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of February 25, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. 77 Woodstream Inc.
77 Woodstream Boulevard, Woodbridge
Mixed Use Commercial / Residential Development**

Presentations:
KFA Architects + Planners Inc.

10:40 a.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 27 – APRIL 24, 2014

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

9:00 am Breakfast Meeting

9:30 am Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of March 27, 2014 Meeting

**9:35 am 1176 Rutherford Road, Northeast corner of Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road
High-rise Mixed Use Development (Carrville District Centre)
Cedarbrook Residential Inc.
1st Review**

Presentations:

Sandra Cappuccitti and Mark Antoine, Planning Department
Turner Fleischer Architects Inc., Bousfields Inc.

10:45 am Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 28 – June 26, 2014

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

- 9:00 am** **Breakfast Meeting**
- 9:30 am** **Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of March 27, 2014 and April 24, 2014 Meetings
- 9:35 am** Draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape and Open Space Plan
2nd Review
Presentation:
EDA Collaborative Inc.
- 10:45 am** **Break**
- 11:00 am** 10398-10402 Islington Avenue (Kentview Estates), Village of Kleinburg
Mid-Rise Residential
Royalpark Homes
1st Review
Presentations:
Farhad Jalilli and Eugene Fera, Planning Department
The MBTW Group
- 12:10 pm** **Adjournment and Lunch**



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 29 – August 28, 2014

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

- 9:00 am** **Breakfast Meeting**
- 9:30 am** **Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of June 26, 2014 Meeting
- 9:35 am** Kipling Courtyards (8204 Kipling Avenue)
Mid-Rise Residential
LCT Investment Group Ltd.
1st Review
Presentations:
Cecilia Nin-Hernandez, Eugene Fera and Audrey Farias, Planning Department
Kohn Architects Inc.
- 10:45 am** **Break**
- 11:00 am** Market Lane Holdings Development (Woodbridge Avenue)
Mid-Rise Residential Development
Site Development Application OP & Zoning
Market Lane Holdings Inc.
2nd Review
Presentations:
Farhad Jalilli and Eugene Fera, Planning Department
Nino Rico Architect Ltd.
- 12:10 pm** **Adjournment and Lunch**



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 30 – September 25, 2014

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 244, Second Level

9:00 am Breakfast Meeting

9:30 am Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of August 28, 2014 Meeting

9:35 am 27 North Kleinburg Estates (89 & 99 Nashville Road and 10515 Highway 27)
Mid-Rise Residential
Stateview Homes
1st Review

Presentations:

Farhad Jalilli, Judy Jeffers and Daniel Rende, Planning Department
A. Baldassara Architect Inc.
EMC Group Limited

10:45 am Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 31 – October 30, 2014

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 244, Second Level

9:00 am Breakfast Meeting

9:30 am Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of September 25, 2014 Meeting

9:35 am Woodbridge Park Limited (Steeles Avenue West)
Mixed Use Development
1st Review

Presentations:

Farhad Jalilli and Daniel Woolfson, Planning Department
Weston Consulting
Kirkor Architects & Planners

10:45 am Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 32 – November 27, 2014

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Committee Room 244, Second Level

9:00 am Breakfast Meeting

9:30 am Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of October 30, 2014 Meeting

9:35 am Royalpark, 9881 Islington Avenue West
Mid-Rise Residential Development
1st Review

Presentations:

Farhad Jalilli and Clement Messere, Planning Department
Kirkor Architects & Planners

10:45 am Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 24 – January 30, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 30, 2014, in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice Chair)

Absent

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Mark Antoine, Development Planning Department
Maira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Sandra Cappuccitti, Development Planning Department
Amy Roots, Development Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Michael Rietta declared a conflict of interest with reviewing the Carrville District Centre application.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, October 31, 2014 and Thursday, November 28, 2014 be adopted as circulated.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for a Draft Plan of Subdivision Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Carrville District Centre, Part of Block 18 lands

Applicant: Nine-Ten West Limited (19T-13V010,OP.13.015, Z.13.043)

Architect: The Planning Partnership
Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Location: North West corner of Rutherford Road and Dufferin Street

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. Does the development concept meet the vision and principles of the Carrville District Centre as a pedestrian-friendly local urban centre? Consider scale, connectivity, and character of place, including:
 - Layout and sizes of blocks, streets and parks
 - Built form massing
 - Building setbacks
2. Do you have any design recommendations to improve the organization of the public realm, in particular the integration of Main Street and the Urban Square into the urban fabric, as successful spaces for everyday life?

Staff Presentation:

Mark Antoine and Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department

Overview:

- The high quality submission package enabled panel members to provide a concerted evaluation of the project. It is an interesting and thoughtful plan. The attendance of both the design team and developer was noted and appreciated.
- The positive commitment to creating a mixed-use local urban centre with a strong public realm was recognized. However, the main challenge to the success of the plan is a “hidden Main Street” and how to make the retail and associated public realm successful.
- Improvements were recommended to better integrate the local urban centre into its larger context, including consideration of how people get there, how it connects to natural open spaces, the interface with regional roads, and the connection to other quadrants of the Carrville District Centre to make it a larger and more viable community destination.
- The street and block pattern of the proposed development is discontinuous. Considerations should be given to more of a grid pattern that enhances direct connections and visibility to and through the planned area.

Comments:

- The key challenge with the phased plan will be how to animate the destination with enough density and pedestrian traffic to support retail from the beginning. The success of this destination will depend not only on achieving density within the urban centre, but also the ability to draw from multiple neighbourhoods.
- The proposed placement of the larger floor plate building (“big box”) will sterilize a large portion of Main Street and as a result, Main Street will not have the desired animation. Panel recommends placing the larger floor plate retail in a different location, such as at the ends of the street. Otherwise for the foreseeable future, the big box store creates a depression in the centre both in terms of density and animation.
- The two storey buildings fronting Main Street are a lost opportunity to create density, to animate the destination. To build upon lessons learned at Shops of Don Mills, early phasing should include synergy with commercial spaces, such as professional offices, on top of the two storey retail.
- Need to improve the relationship between the urban square and westerly neighbourhood park. There is an opportunity to create some dialogue between the neighbourhood park to the west and the urban square by strengthening the pedestrian connection and opening up east-west views between them. Panel imagined a linear green feature starting from the west at the neighbourhood park connecting to the urban square. The building that sits in between these two spaces should be a 360 degree building that sits within a broader public space.
- View Terminus – The plan contains some awkward relationships between the block structure and building footprints, with more consideration needed for the experience of the person walking and what views they will encounter.

Many buildings are leaning into a view but not frankly addressing the street views as either a terminus or an opening.

- The street pattern and pedestrian circulation should be modified to improve direct access and views to the central urban square. The configuration of the curved street compromises the experience of the square and program opportunities within it. Panel members recommended an intersection with a 90 degree turn. Alternately, would be better to flip the curve of the street to a mirror image. A retail edge could follow the curve of the street on the north side to connect built form to the public square.
- Carrville District Centre as a whole faces the challenge of a broader Secondary Plan Area intersected by Regional Roads. The presented plan needs more effort to integrate and connect with adjacent communities so that people can arrive on foot, with better consideration given to the location of pedestrian crossings at signalized intersections, materiality, and streetscape design. .
- Consider how to create better built form presence along Dufferin Street. By creating a mixed-use frontage condition along Dufferin Street. By including parking lots/ structures, and service areas the plan creates a rear-lotting suburban condition. Frontage on arterials is challenging, but they should not be ignored. In particular, the proposed parking structure facing the natural open space on the east side of Dufferin is the biggest missed frontage opportunity. Consideration could be given to adding residential to overlook the woodlot, either in the form of a tower or a veneer of residential around the parking structure.
- The neighbourhood park at the west end is a successful interface with the adjacent low density residential that should be better connected to the inner parts of the plan.
- The pedestrian mews that breaks down the size of the block between Main Street and Dufferin Street is a positive development.
- With respect to Grand Trunk and park on the west side, the way the townhouses relate to the street edges needs to be reconsidered. Pay attention to what the frontages of residential units become at street level (i.e. not 3 steps up to the front door), which can be a key differentiator between creating an urban versus suburban place.
- Review what street conditions will be created by the townhouses and at the mews. Need to pay as much attention to those streets as to Main Street to make sure the plan will all come together. The town house garages facing the east-west should be reconsidered to engage the street.
- The second internal ring road oscillates between being a front and a back.
- Need to incorporate sustainability from vision to detail. It was noted that sustainable features were lacking in the built form principles, and throughout the narrative.
- Encourage the inclusion of more native species and fewer cultivars in the tree planting mix.

5. OTHER ITEMS

a. **Design Review Panel Pilot Project Evaluation**

Review City of Vaughan Design Review Panel Terms of Reference and Protocol

Introduction:

Staff provided a summary of revisions to the *City of Vaughan Design Review Panel Terms of Reference and Protocol*. Refinements to panel administration and procedures were discussed and recommended to staff.

Appointment of Panel Chair and Vice Chair:

All present member of the panel unanimously elected Antonio Gomez-Palacio as the Chair and Richard Witt as the Vice Chair.

Summary of Discussion:

- This panel meeting was recognized as the first meeting of a two year tenure.
- For an even-keeled transition, staff recommended a staggered rotation of panel members. Staff requested that panel members self-organize their tenures through the Chair and provide staff with their recommendations at the next meeting in February 2014.
- Staff clarified that terms for panel members may be requested to extend past the two year tenure order to support a smooth panel rotation. Panel recommended a maximum of three consecutive two year terms for a panel member.
- Panel members raised an issue that the new condensed five minute staff presentation time for Design Review Panel does not allow sufficient time for staff to provide panel with the detailed background information helpful for an informed review of a project. It was agreed that a closed administrative “Pre-meeting Briefing” will be held from 9:00 to 9:30 AM, prior to Design Review Panel. The purpose of the pre-meeting briefing will be for staff to provide panel members with more detailed background information for the projects being presented in Design Review Panel, and to provide panel members with the opportunity to ask staff questions. Design Review Panel will start at 9:30 AM.
- Panel members requested a one page circulation of staff comments for each project being presented at Design Review Panel.
- To improve and uphold architectural standards, panel members recommended that urban design questions speak to the quality of architecture. Panel members highlighted that Design Review Panel in the City of Vaughan must necessarily first address the fundamental issues of urban design given the developing suburban to urban context (versus infill in an established urban context). Applicants should provide the architectural narrative for the First Review (Schematic Design stage), and detailed architecture drawings for the Second Review (Site Plan Application Stage) in order for panel members to address issues of architectural quality.
- Staff will revise applicant submission requirements to separate the requirements for First and Second Reviews.

- It was clarified that a conflict of interest does not constitute an absence.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 am

End of Minutes



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 25 – February 27, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, February 27, 2014 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc. (Acting Chair for Agenda Item #1)
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Absent

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design
Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Amy Roots, Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Eugene Fera, Planning Department
Farhad Jalili, Planning Department
Moirá Wilson, Planning Department
Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Services Department
Stephan Lue, Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Richard Witt declared a conflict of interest with reviewing 2900 Regional Road 7, EXPO City– Phase 1, Building 2, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for January 30, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Site Plan Application

Applicant: Mario Cortellucci

Architect: AJ Tregebov Architect

Location: 2900 Regional Road 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the second tower of the proposed development complement the existing high-rise tower and enhance the urban environment along Regional Road 7 within the VMC?
2. To what extent does the overall architectural quality of the proposed development meet the City's expectation for the area as envisioned through the VMC Secondary Plan?

Presentation:

Farhad Jalili and Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Overview:

- The acting Chair characterized the nature of the comments received from the Panel as “a missed opportunity, a disconnect and a disappointment”
- Several members of the Panel expressed frustration that comments from the previous Design Review (dated October 27, 2011) were not responded to or reflected in the design

- The Panel felt that the proposed building design was not enhancing the urban environment, was not promoting a pedestrian oriented development and was setting a precedent for development that lacked a pedestrian scale
- The Panel felt that great improvements needed to be made to the massing, materiality and relationship to context (Highway 7 and Black Creek), and the Applicant was encouraged to set the bar higher with respect to the overall design quality
- The Panel's disappointment in the proposed design was acknowledged as a bigger issue than the development and site itself, as the extraordinary amount of planning and investment that has been made in the VMC brings with it extraordinary expectation
- The Panel members agreed that the site presented a huge opportunity as one of the first projects in the VMC to set the standard as a legacy project and to promote high quality urban design
- The Applicant was requested to bring the design back to the Design Review Panel again with a greater level of detail and consideration of the following comments before moving forward with site plan approval

Comments:

Drawing Package / Presentation

- There was consensus among the Panel that there was a real disconnect between the stage of the project and the level of detail provided
- The presentation package was very low quality and left a lot of unanswered questions due to a lack of provision of basic diagrams and drawings

Design Approach

- The relationship to the future subway and VMC station is key to understanding the intensity of development proposed, yet there was no mention of this as a gateway site in the presentation, and there was a perceived lack of relationship to context articulated in the design response
- The Panel reiterated the importance of understanding the context in order to get the design right and make the development a success
- There was no mention of sustainable principles, or whether the project was striving to meet any LEED standard of development

Massing

- The Panel was concerned with the lack of pedestrian scale and the 'flat facing condition' of the +160m long block, commenting that it created an "un-pedestrian compelling" environment

- The Panel felt that there was a tremendous disconnect between the tower and podium design, and that the tower orientation exacerbated the disconnection further
- The Panel felt that there was a lack of cohesiveness in the language between the building masses, and felt that the podium condition weakened as it turned the corner to become 1 storey in height
- The Panel questioned whether the Applicant understood the implication of the unresolved podium condition on the legacy of the project, and were concerned that the condition would repeat in future phases of the project
- The Panel encouraged the design of a much more robust podium condition along the north side of the site, with at-grade access to units providing animation, greater potential value and ROI

Galleria

- There was consensus among the Panel that they didn't understand the need for the enclosed galleria, as there are many other ways to connect the buildings and enable access to common amenity spaces
- The Panel felt that the galleria space would be far more successful as a completely open air break and grand public realm gesture
- While the canopy helps to signify an entrance, the Panel felt that the galleria had no real presence on the street, and that pedestrians would not understand it to be a public space or accessible mid-block connection
- The Panel appreciated that the Applicant tried to mitigate the Highway 7 condition, but recommended that the galleria be designed with much more prominence from the street as a taller feature, with more visibility
- The Panel was concerned with the colonnade design, and questioned the 5 x 5 m proportions which they felt would compromise the viability of the retail. The Panel suggested that the more successful examples of colonnades are those that are as tall and as shallow as possible
- The Panel felt that the loggia condition was problematic, and that the design needed more relief, innovation, stronger corners, and pronounced entrances

Materials

- The Panel was concerned with the materiality of the towers
- The Panel felt that the proposed design included design changes that were too subtle and that there needed to be more distinction between phases 1 and 2
- The Panel questioned the choice of the curtain wall in this location, stating that the kind of transparency and overall view that would warrant its use did not correlate to the context

Landscape

- The Panel were disappointed with the low quality drawings and inconsistency of the landscape information provided in the package
- The Panel felt strongly that there was a need to better connect to the Black Creek spine (the 'Central Park of the VMC') by emphasizing the east-west linkage as a primary green finger and incredible amenity that would add value and function as a main pedestrian connector
- The Panel questioned the design of the centralized amenity space as an arrival court that prioritizes vehicles and proposed that a broader, wider promenade with a double row of trees and designed as a grand gesture was warranted given the scale of development
- The Panel felt that the landscape treatment along Highway 7 could be improved to emphasize entry points and break up the mass along the block
- The Panel referenced the Lakeshore Towers project as a good precedent in integrating and addressing landscape connections at grade

b. Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment

Applicant:	Cityzen Development Group
Architect:	Architecture Unfolded Inc.
Location:	177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

1. To what extent does the proposed development achieve a meaningful and respectful relationship with the existing heritage buildings?
2. How well does the proposed development fit within the existing urban context of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan, specifically along Woodbridge Avenue and Wallace Street?
3. How well do the proposed site layout, massing, built form and scale address the surrounding context and transition to the neighbouring community?

Presentation:

Farhad Jalili and Eugene Fera, Development Planning and Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Services Division

Overview:

- Panel supported intensification on this location and embraced the provided contemporary design expression. However, within a heritage conservation district, capturing an incremental development expression is crucial to the success of the project. The design should be based on the realization of evolving condition from the exiting heritage setting to today's urban environment.
- Panel commended the applicant for bringing the project forward in the early design stage and with the development and design team attendance.
- The proposed design faces three main factors, development objectives, heritage values and urban design requirements. The design challenge is to create a balance between the factors.
- Due to an unusual topographical condition of the site, Panel requested the design team to provide a number of cross-sections through the site for the next review, showing the relationship between the proposed development with the site and its context.

Comments:

Site Plan Layout

- Panel found it unacceptable to force people with disabilities to go around site in order to enter the building. The building's main entrance should be universally accessible.
- The proposed traffic circulation for site is not properly designed. It is not clear how drop-off, load, and access the underground parking function.
- The site is too shallow to contain a double-loaded corridor floor plate building type. A single-loaded corridor floor plate typology requires less site depth and allows for better transition to the context and wider separation from the existing heritage buildings.

Building Elevation, Massing and Transition

- Panel found the proposed building massing to have an overwhelming impact on the surrounding community and streetscape. To reduce the bulkiness of the proposed structure, alternative design solutions should be explored.
- The proposed building appears to aggressively elbow its way out to achieve maximum density rather than to sensitively negotiate between the development objectives and the context to create a positive relationship with its surroundings.

- Dividing the proposed building into different segments and providing an alternative elevation for each increment could be a solution. This approach creates an evolving impression of the development to reduce the building's overwhelming visual and physical impact. The massing and its segments should follow the existing land parcel layout.
- Rather than simply creating a backdrop for the existing heritage building, alternative context sensitive and transitional design approaches should be explored.
- The proposed design consideration of using a podium to break down the building presence on the southeast corner is appropriate. The same podium design method could be used to transition to the neighbouring community.

Heritage Preservation

- The existing heritage preservation policies have been developed to preserve the integrity of the urban environment and the quality of heritage artifacts within the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District. Any deviation from existing policies requires a thorough study and strong justification.
- Panel encouraged the design team to retain the prominence of the existing heritage buildings and cherish them through the design process.
- The resolution of how the new development connects the existing heritage buildings has not been resolved. The value of the heritage buildings should be captured and their anatomy should be preserved.
- Panel found it inappropriate to reduce the character and functionality of the heritage buildings to the new building's lobby and amenity area.
- The spacing between the heritage building and the new building has a crucial role in preserving the autonomy and character of the heritage sites. This has not been successfully achieved by the proposed design.
- The provided vertical elements on the proposed elevations conflict with the heritage building facades.

Site Context and Public Realm

- The proposed new building has been moved to the Wallace Street frontage, compromising the pedestrian and traffic safety on the street.
- The placement of columns along Wallace Street to support the proposed building's overhanging segment is not appropriate. The building should be moved back from the street line to allow for a comfortable sidewalk, similar to the existing sidewalk on the south side of the street.

- The existing streetscape, which includes the heritage houses and landscaping, is highly attractive and deserves to be protected. In order to develop the subject sites, an extraordinary and highly sensitive design approach is needed.
- To achieve a context sensitive development within the existing fine grain urban heritage fabric, a multi-building design approach should be adopted.
- A meaningful and respectful relationship between the proposed development and the surrounding community and streets is lacking. The proposed design should consider a proper transition to the neighbouring community.
- The proposed development's aggressive interface with Wallace Street's sidewalk and the drop off area on the west create a mean public realm space, insensitive to the pedestrian experience and the surrounding urban heritage context.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 26 – March 27, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 27, 2014 in Committee Room 242, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario.

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects (Acting Chair for Agenda Item #1)

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair for Agenda Item #2)

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Harold Madi, City of Toronto

Absent

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Planning Department

Amy Roots, Planning Department

Sandra Cappuccitti, Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Clement Messere, Planning Department

Melissa Rossi, Planning Department

Brianne Clace, Budgeting & Financial Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m., with Sony Rai in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Antonio Gómez-Palacio declared a conflict of interest with reviewing Tesmar Holding Corporation application at the northeast corner of Jane Street and Riverrock Gate.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for February 27, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

Applicant: Park Avenue Place
Tesmar Holding Corporation
Architect: Graziani & Corazza Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect: Terraplan Landscape Architects
Location: Northeast corner of Jane Street and Riverrock Gate
Review: First Review
Application Number: OP.05.020 and Z.07.029

Introduction:

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

1. How successful is the design of the central open space as a vibrant public amenity that is well connected within the planned urban fabric and that defines strong pedestrian connections?
2. How successful are the design features in creating a well-planned transition between mixed use residential and surrounding employment uses?
3. How well does the architectural design and podium features contribute to the creation of a high quality pedestrian oriented and animated urban environment?

Presentation:

Clement Messere and Amy Roots, Development Planning Department

Overview:

- The site is in a mediation process with the Ontario Municipal Board. Therefore, certain elements of this application have already been defined and are not up for discussion.

- It was agreed between panel members that there were many missed opportunities on site, which should be considered moving forward. The proposal seems to be based on restrictions.
- The large nature, symmetry, and repetition of the towers becomes visually monotonous and lacks interest. Consider materiality, articulation, and massing to further define the proposal.
- Consider distributing commercial development throughout the podium. Differentiate interior uses with materiality and articulation of the podium façade.
- The panel questioned the viability of the open space as a functional, well designed amenity space. Consider connectivity and programming.
- The buildings do very little to physically animate the public space and streetscape along Jane Street.

Comments:

Drawing Package / Presentation

- The panel members found it challenging to understand the package, as there are several disconnects within the proposal.
- The applicant is encouraged to focus on the overall urban design issues and principles that drove the design, rather than focusing on the smaller details and elements determined by Ontario Municipal Board negotiations.

Building Façade and Elevations:

- Articulate a distinction between the three towers. The symmetry and repetition of the building's design and mass is not a positive element in the proposal. Enhance the differentiation with the colour scheme, materiality, articulation, and massing.
- Explore an asymmetrical arrangement of towers, altering the layout of the site as a whole to allow for a better landscape condition.
- Offset the location of the towers to better address Jane Street and animate the skyline.
- The materiality of the building is not fitting for the development. Explore contemporary design.
- There is a lack of articulation expressed by architecture for both the podium and towers, creating an overwhelmingly monotonous condition at street level.
- The eastern blank wall, while required to mitigate the impact of noise, could be improved architecturally.
- The roof is severely oversized and should be reconsidered.

Articulation and Distribution of Land Use:

- There is a strong imbalance between the placement of commercial and residential uses in the proposed north and south podiums. Create a balance in the distribution of interior uses in each building by shifting the location of retail and creating a transition between the two buildings.
- The architecture of the building is the same throughout regardless of functionality. Work to highlight the difference in commercial and residential uses through the architecture of the building. Define commercial and residential podium elements with different materials and architecture.
- Re-examine the relationship between the proposed uses and open space. Commercial development should always address public space. There is the potential for the amenity space to address the park to the rear.

Landscape and Open Space:

- The relationship between the ground floor and the landscape proposal needs to be explored further. Consider a transition between private and public space.
- The pedestrian realm is very harsh in this area. Consider the connectivity of the park to Jane Street. The current pedestrian connection through the block can potentially be incorporated into an urban parkette.
- Work to better link program elements of the proposal and landscape elements to create a highly quality pedestrian realm.
- At the northeastern corner of the site, create a connection to the existing open space system with both the building and landscape proposal. Specifically, explore the northern edge condition as a whole and consider incorporating amenity space, making a seamless landscape transition beyond the site.
- The current proposal was not designed for people to use the site; rather it was designed as an area for movement. Consider the number of people that will be using the site when programmed.
- Think beyond the property line and consider the relationship to existing development, landscape and streetscapes.

Mid-block Connection:

- Explore the pedestrian through connection further to create a more interesting condition that will be better utilized. Incorporate elements that attract interaction within the space, such as spill out commercial and an urban parkette.

Streetscape Interface and Podium:

- The landscape proposal along all right-of-ways needs to better enhance the pedestrian experience and animate the streetscape. Create an attractive environment and develop a proper interaction between the podium, landscape, and right of ways. The panel is very eager to explore this relationship and landscape details of this relationship in the second review of this development.
- The distance between the development and the curb line is very large, creating a suburban condition. Consider investing beyond the property line and define the pedestrian realm with a demonstration streetscape project.
- Address the harsh Jane Street environment and consider ways to attract people and soften the landscape. Consider an interim condition of the streetscape, as well as future build out.

Layout and Site Organization:

- The proposal locates the service and loading area at the corner of the north and south buildings, creating a relationship with the open space. Relocate the service and loading, moving it further into the site and developing a more appropriate use at the corner.
- The panel questioned the necessity of parking at grade and felt that the proposed spots were misplaced and awkward in relationship to the site.

Context:

- The site is located within the Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan and must comply with the principles set forward by this plan.
- Consider how this application fits into the overall vision for the City of Vaughan. In the end, it is the developers and their proposal that make these visions a reality.

5. PRESENTATION

a. City-Wide Streetscape Manual

Location: City-Wide Urban Intensification Areas and Heritage Conservation Districts

Landscape Architect: EDA Collaborative Inc.

Review: First Review

Introduction:

City staff provided a presentation summarizing the draft City-Wide Streetscape Manual, and invited comments from Design Review Panel Members.

Panel's Comments:

Street furnishing and paving programme

- The City should have a coordinated street furniture program and paving palette, either as part of this Study or as a next step.

L.I.D. Measures

- Low Impact Development measures (Green Infrastructure) should play a strong role in the Streetscape Manual. Costing is available for L.I.D. measures and should ideally be incorporated into the financial tool and strategy. The long term operations & maintenance (O&M) savings from implementing L.I.D. measures (irrigation, servicing pipes) should be considered.
- It was noted that several L.I.D. measures exist that do not have the higher O&M costs of rain gardens/ infiltration trenches, such as infiltration galleries that run parallel in the continuity strip through permeable paving.

Cycling Facilities and Crosswalks

- It was noted that cycling facilities and roadway crossings are described in the manual but not included in the costing, creating a blurry line that might cause problems for implementation. It was noted by the City and Panel Members that the design of Complete Streets must consider the entire roadway.

Complete Streets and Performance Standards

- It was highlighted that the City of Toronto is undertaking the development of a Complete Streets Manual that includes integration of utilities and roadway.
- Panel expressed concern that it will be difficult to apply generic standards & guidelines without focusing on performance standards for the streetscape. Without performance standards, the danger becomes that streetscapes, especially when design is viewed as separate from the roadway, are exposed to become trivialized, as decorative treatments only, rather than as critical part of the street and city infrastructure.

Design Guidelines

- The manual should set standards & guidelines for the treatment of the public/private frontage zone. The private setback area is often the most problematic area in development applications but also affords the most opportunity for creativity and space-making. The current level of treatment is poor because of an absence of City standards for the private frontage zone.
- Encroachments can be of mutual benefit to the developer and to the public realm.
- Include guidelines for the interface of streetscapes with public spaces and what techniques are acceptable to the City.

Streetscape Typologies

- Need to understand the variations (within a typology) from street to street and what elements are important to keep, and what can be cut.
- Need to anticipate anomalies in the streetscape, not just typical, such as at bus stops, left and right turning lanes and lay-by parking pockets that reduce the R.O.W., and turning radii at intersections, in order to provide standards and guidelines for development in these instances.

Level of Service

- It was noted that the project is starting from a position of paucity and defensiveness (to defend public investment in streetscapes) because there seems to be a lack of buy-in on the benefits of streetscape investment. Panel members noted that a Return on Investment Study would allow this project to start from a position of informed investment.
- The typical designs for the proposed Levels of Service and corresponding design elements reflect the City's hesitancy to invest in streetscapes.
- Recommend that at least the Premium Level of Service should be raised to a higher standard in terms of quality, especially given the small percentage of streets that are anticipated to be Premium Level of Service. Consider including non-standard furnishings and other amenities for Premium to reinforce the distinctiveness of streets.
- Structural soil cells are a solution when you have a paved boulevard in tight urban areas. They might also be a solution when the R.O.W. is narrowed at an intersection with the addition of a right turn lane. Therefore soil cells need to be included in all urban levels of service, not just Premium, to account for variability in urban conditions in paved areas.

Plan Views

- The Manual should include Plan view studies to provide direction in specific situations where the R.O.W. changes, such as at intersections and lay-by parking. The generic cross sections provided in the Manual do not address these conditions.

Street Lighting

- The location of pedestrian lighting in the typical cross section was questioned. It was also noted that often pedestrian poles located on the side of a sidewalk next to the building frontage, end up being too close to the building, and they also become redundant to lighting on the building façade.

Implementation

- The success of the Streetscape Manual will be contingent upon: i) securing the funds to implement it, and, ii) enforcing it with developers. Both are contingent upon complete Council buy-in to the public realm as a mechanism to building the kind City they want.
- The trick of providing a flexible streetscape framework is enforcement. Designers need the flexibility to implement a context-responsive design; however, what is the mechanism for enforcement? Successful enforcement of streetscape standards and guidelines requires multi-disciplinary buy-in from all departments including support of Complete Streets by Engineering.
- Recommend to monitor and measure the impacts of streetscape investment on a pilot street, such as the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District, as an established mixed-use main street. Illustrating early measurable success will be critical to achieving buy-in.
- Recommend a City of Vaughan Master Plan to coordinate all proposed street construction with utilities and repair work (roads budget).



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 27 – April 24, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday April 24, 2014 in Committee Room 242, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario.

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

STAFF

Present

Grant Uyeyama, Interim Director of Planning, Director of Development Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Maira Wilson, Planning Department
Amy Roots, Planning Department
Sandra Cappuccitti, Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Mark Antoine, Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Adoption of March 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes was deferred to the next panel meeting, May 29, 2014.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Application

Applicant: Cedarbrook Residential Inc.

Architect: Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Landscape Architect: NAK Design Strategies

Planning Consultant: Bousfields Inc.

Location: 1176 Rutherford Road

Northeast corner of Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. To what extent does the site organization, layout, and massing of the proposal create a functional development? How successful is the proposed vehicular and pedestrian circulation system in servicing the needs of the mixed-use development?
2. Does the proposed design concept encourage pedestrian movement and presence, create vibrant public realm and amenity space, and develop connections to the surrounding open space system?
3. What kind of pedestrian experience is created along the Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road streetscape interfaces?

Presentation:

Sandra Cappuccitti and Mark Antoine, Planning Department

Overview:

- It was suggested that the proposal had three separate disconnected spaces on site: the streetscape and public realm condition, the drop-off and loading area, and the natural vegetated area..
- Create an integrated landscape and architectural design approach that will link the site, connecting the urban built form and natural open space.
- The Panel recommended that the applicant explore alternative forms of massing for the building to better respond to existing site conditions, including the protected woodlot, Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road streetscapes, and existing topographic conditions.
- The Panel outlined concerns relating to the streetscape proposal. Create an urban plaza at the intersection of Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road and enhance the pedestrian public realm along the streetscape through social programming and architectural elements.
- The Panel encouraged the design team to create an accessible and safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation system on site.

Comments:

Drawing Package / Presentation

- The Panel commended the applicant for bringing the project forward in the early design stages with a comprehensive presentation package and a positive civic minded attitude.
- The Panel agreed that the location of the site provides an exciting opportunity for the applicant and understood the challenges of the site relating to grading and access.

Streetscape Master Plan and Gateway:

- Review the development in accordance with the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study. Enhance the proposal to act as a gateway into the Carrville District Centre.

Site Circulation and Access:

- The Panel questioned the functionality of the circulation system on the ground floor level, specifically relating to the proposed surface parking and drop-off area.
- Access on site is constrained by existing conditions which adds stress to the proposed circulation network. The Panel suggested moving the two access points closer to the intersection to develop an alternative circulation system with an internalized courtyard.

- The Panel encouraged the applicant to consider accessibility and universal design as a primary concern due to the constraint provided by the existing topographic conditions. Consider the impact that grading has on the development and how the impacts can be mitigated.
- Consider visibility to amenity spaces and permeability through the site as a whole.

Layout, Massing, and Architecture:

- The Panel encouraged the design team to revisit the proposed massing, addressing the street wall condition created along Rutherford Road.
- Explore the relationship created between the podium and tower condition and the architectural expression between the two structures.
- The Panel questioned the location of the density along the streetscape. Explore alternative ways of distributing the density and massing. Consider relocating the massing to the corner to better define the gateway.
- While many Panel Members suggested that the design team continue to use the high-rise towers and mid-rise typology, others questioned if a more uniform condition would be appropriate for the site.
- It was suggested that density be re-distributed to create two more slender towers and a consistent 6 to 8-storey mid-rise condition that is consistent over the podium.
- Explore ways of internalizing the density to create a more functional circulation network that respects the building frontages onto the streetscape, amenity space, and woodlot.
- Explore the convergence of the building, grade issues, and vegetation at the south eastern corner of the site. The architecture should respond to the existing grading.
- The proposal of the mechanical penthouse should be considered further, working to incorporate the penthouse into the architecture.

Pedestrian Connections and Streetscape:

- Create an appropriate public/private interface between the residential units and the Rutherford Road streetscape. Consider developing private urban spaces to respond to the residential units.
- Consider incorporating retail units along the southern portion of the building, internalizing the residential units, understanding that it is challenging to define retail space without knowing the commercial tenant.
- Review the treatment of the streetscape at the corner of Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road. There is no interface between the life of the building

and the life of the site. Create public plaza space by inverting the corner and proising retail to create social conditions.

- Develop a comprehensive landscape proposal to engage the streetscape and public realm. Consider appropriate space for pedestrians, architectural features such as canopies, and social programing to develop a relatable pedestrian scale.
- Develop appropriate setbacks, while considering connectivity to the entire site through universal and accessible design standards.

Woodlot and Amenity Space:

- Develop a site strategy as an integrated approached, working together to link the natural and urban built form.
- Work to connect the three open space systems existing on site: the retail streetscape, the vehicular drop-off area, and the woodlot.
- Consider the most appropriate interaction of the massing that takes advantage of the natural space and urbanity. Define the TRCA buffer line and consider how the amenity space proposal interacts with the woodlot.
- Develop connections to the woodlot and reinforce connection to the surrounding Block 11 lands.
- The site acts as gateway to both the woodlot and the Carrville District Centre. Defining a clear overall open space master plan for the woodlot and an overall vision for the natural area.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

End of Minutes



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 28 – June 26, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 26, 2014 in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario.

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects (Acting Chair)
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Alfredo Landeata, B+H Architects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Amy Roots, Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Audrey Farias, Planning Department
Eugene Fera, Planning Department
Farhad Jalilli, Planning Department
Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Services
Daniel Rende, Cultural Services

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m., with Drew Sinclair in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Brad Golden declared a conflict of interest with reviewing the draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape and Open Space Plan as he is a sub-consultant on the project.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for April 24, 2014 were approved.

4. PRESENTATION

a. Draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape and Open Space Plan

Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Landscape Architect: EDA Collaborative Inc.

Review: Second Review

Introduction:

EDA Collaborative provided a presentation summarizing the draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape and Open Space Plan, and invited comments from Design Review Panel Members.

Panel's Comments:

Overall

- The Panel was unanimous in their congratulations for producing an inspiring and thoughtful document with a strong and compelling vision.
- The Panel complimented the sincerity in the plan, and felt that the vision was very specific to the VMC.
- The Panel recommended further work on the implementation strategy to address the conflicts and reality of existing uses. The City should anticipate what buildings may stay and develop transitional plans for the public realm.
- Marketing is needed to communicate long term vision and ensure trust building in the community.

Implementation

- Need to clarify the purpose of the document in terms of intended use, application and audience.
- The map of conflict (ownership overlay on vision) will require work to resolve issues for implementation of the public realm. Panel recommended more

detailed mapping of key conflict areas and the development of strategies to resolve them. Provide a clear idea of what is happening now, and expand on strategies to reconcile areas of highest conflict with the vision.

- Thought and creativity around the transition and incorporation of existing uses will be an important component to the success of the Plan. A flexible strategy to incorporate existing buildings will be integral to the Plan, especially along Black Creek.
- Panel acknowledged the complexity of phasing considerations and market forces facing the implementation of the public realm, and recommended tackling the challenge of a targeted phasing approach more directly. The phasing strategy may not be quadrant based, or radial around the mobility hub as expected. Early projects may be more varied in location depending on the development market, and therefore implementation tactics need to be more strategic. The mapping and sequencing of planning exercises should be addressed comprehensively.
- The City needs to develop a strategy about where first public investments will be directed. The City can learn a great deal from the Waterfront Toronto lessons about implementation. Waterfront Toronto's first approach was about investment in catalyst projects, but their experience was that a different approach was necessary. Subsequently, they created three implementation plans and looked at creating a sequence of strategic investments that plugged into active development projects.
- Programming of open spaces will be an important implementation consideration. Try to describe projects / early installations using great imagery that will build trust in the community.
- In terms of scale of implementation, Panel recommended identifying an opportunity in early phases to test the vision at a finer grain through a small scale demonstration project.
- Community awareness will be an important aspect of the project to build excitement and support. The Panel recommended exploring methods to expand community awareness.
- Connectivity is key. People need to see a connection between activities in the VMC and the larger vision, including the examples shown in the presentation of what is possible for early placemaking. A comprehensive marketing strategy will be critical moving forward.
- Need to create more visualization to incentivize landowners to participate in the process.

5. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. 10398-10402 Islington Avenue (Kentview Estates), Village of Kleinburg

Applicant: Royalpark Homes
Architect: The Ventin Group (+VG)
Planner: The MBTW Group
Location: 10398-10402 Islington Avenue
Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. To what extent do the proposed site organization, built form and architecture relate and positively react to its context and the historic Village of Kleinburg's urban environment?
2. How well does the proposed site plan create a high-quality pedestrian environment within the site and along Islington Avenue?

Presentation:

Farhad Jalilli and Eugene Fera, Planning Department

Overview:

- The Panel acknowledged that this was a pre-application concept, and thanked the potential applicant for coming in so early in the process to engage in an initial design dialogue.
- The Panel felt that this was an exciting site, with an interesting context. The Panel encouraged the design team to study the site plan again to create a more structured response to the village context with more sensitivity to the surrounding natural areas to create a stronger relationship to the landscape.
- The Panel discussed the introduction of a new condo building typology within the context of the neighbourhood. They challenged the design team to examine the integration and resolution of this new built form typology within the surrounding context in a sensitive manner.
- There was a sense that the scheme was trying to hide the development. The Panel encouraged the design team to make the project more visible, interesting and important to the streetscape and context.
- Find a more authentic resolution to architectural style. The approach to recognizing the Prairie style should be more about responsiveness to site, relationship between interior and exterior spaces, materiality and craftsmanship, rather than adopting architectural elements.

- The Panel encouraged the design team to engage in early conversations with the TRCA to understand the consideration for the valley lands and buffers along the top of bank.

Comments:

Site

- Legacy of Kleinberg Village and potential relationship to the future Pierre Burton Discovery Centre is an important consideration
- Insert the site plan into the context map to understand the granularity of the Village context and the relationship of the project to the core.
- Consider the entirety of the site from the south end and develop a much richer design statement along the street.
- Examine how the development could better relate to Islington in terms of relationship of built form to use.
- The design approach might consider the residential nature of a large estate frontage which structures a well-crafted presence from the street using a statement garden wall, rather than the proposed under-scaled gate posts, to present a much richer experience.
- Setback from the southern edge is problematic with the building on the south edge being too close to the property line. Given that these will be large high end units with terraces, privacy and space will be a premium.
- Review the location of the access road. Should the road remain as shown or be flipped to the opposite property line and used as a buffer?

Massing

- Without commenting on any proposed building heights, the Panel felt that a careful height transition strategy was important to ensure compatibility with the surrounding context.
- The massing in the 6 storey building is bulky and the façade is too continuous. Suggest breaking up the mass, and inserting view corridors to allow for perception of the valley lands and tree canopy behind. View corridors will be an important feature to ensure that the memory of valley is not lost from the street.
- Great opportunity exists in mirroring the western building massing to frame the courtyard and create an urban edge to the adjacent church instead of pushing the massing to the top of bank.
- The bar building could be a townhouse or rowhouse block that sets itself off with a different architectural approach from the condo building.
- Incorporate great street architecture with breaks in the building.

- Create a “face” to Kleinburg Village, and perhaps a different, lighter face to the valley lands.
- In perspective, the south façade is prominent and will be very perceptible from the street. As the design evolves, this face needs to be carefully considered.
- The large scale of the roof is contrary to the design intent to screen buildings to reduce visual impact. Removing the hipped roof will provide less impact immediately. The screening of mechanical equipment will be a challenge.
- The high level of investment and flexibility with respect to the internal building circulation strategy (through units) is an amazing design opportunity which should be capitalized on.
- Limit underground parking to the line of the build form.

Architectural Character and Materiality

- Find a more authentic resolve to architecture style by removing the term “style” altogether, whether Prairie or Usonian. Instead, suggest taking inspiration from the scale, craftsmanship, detail, materiality, method of construction and relationship to site related to the referenced styles - don’t just satisfy guidelines.
- Incorporate historicism in terms of materiality and detail but use a contemporary building form.
- High quality materials should be used to reflect the high end market target.

Landscape

- The internal courtyard needs work and design development. There is concern about the pedestrian quality of the space. The proposed concept is car driven, and should be instead designed for pedestrian priority as a prominent amenity space. A landscape strategy is needed.
- The planted buffer along the courtyard could have more planting depth to improve its scale and impact as a feature.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 29 – August 28, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, August 28, 2014 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario.

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, ALA

Harold Madi, City of Toronto

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Absent

Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Amy Roots, Planning Department

Eugene Fera, Planning Department

Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Planning Department

Daniel Rende, Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for June 26, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Kipling Courtyards (8204 Kipling Avenue),

Applicant: LCT Investment Group Ltd.
Architect: Kohn Architects Inc.
Location: 8204 Kipling Avenue
Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. Does the overall site organization effectively address the site context and is the central amenity space adequate for community interactions?
2. Does the proposed successfully interpret, relate to and incorporate the defining characteristics of the original contributing context of the Kipling Avenue Character area located within the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District?

Presentation:

Audrey Farias, Eugene Fera, and Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Planning Department

Overview:

- The Panel appreciated the applicant's frustration and understood the challenges of the project.
- The Panel strongly felt that that the Heritage Conservation District Guidelines do not encourage creating fake buildings but only speaks to the aspects of proportion and building elements. While the design team was appreciated for their efforts to try to respond to the guidelines, they are encouraged to make the proposal more cohesive by using the existing heritage house.
- It was further stressed that new designs have to be expressions of their own time and should make reference to heritage but does not have to replicate it. The applicant has been advised to carry on the tradition of building contemporary architecture.

- Panel emphasized that it is important that both the applicant and staff are advocates for good livability and relationship to heritage in the 21st century.
- The Panel felt that there are design opportunities to tie in the heritage character in different ways. The design team was challenged to figure how to interpret and create a contemporary design by exploring the heritage aspects with transportation. Stacked townhomes have good pedestrian connections. However, the plan is lacking in pedestrian connections such as sidewalks and walkways.
- The Panel further felt that it was unacceptable to have a design of this scale without an open space or amenity provided.
- The Panel encouraged the design team to invite the applicant to future meetings. They advised that the Panel plays a significant role to advocate in front of the architect and the client. They hold developers to a higher standard of development.
- The Panel stated that the design process was not only about having the client but also having a landscape architect on board.

Comments:

Site Organization and Built Form

- Revisit the site composition such that the external garbage/recycling collection area is not the view terminus.
- Articulate the commercial building from the rest to create a landmark/gateway to the site and to distinguish ways to provide visual cues/entries to the site.
- Examine the presence of the built form along Kipling Avenue, which is currently monotonous, in terms of its design and use. Engage conversation with the city how to increase heights in a point base along the façade to accommodate the density and create a better profile along Kipling Avenue.
- Proposal feels continuous and monolithic. Increase depths and push setbacks to create additional points of interest. Add more height in strategic locations to add variability into the site.
- The driveway against the heritage house seems too close to Meeting House Road. Consider an alternate location for the driveway to provide more space around the heritage house to create an opportunity to showcase the same.
- The applicant needs to demonstrate a better understanding of the site and its context and consider basic elements of walkability. What would it be like to live there? What would it be like for a child to live there?
- Create linear mews from the street into the site.

Heritage Character

- Identify elements in the project that could be more contemporarily expressed. Get rid of the traditional decorative pieces.
- Use varying colours and materials to distinguish the commercial, stacked and freehold townhouses and enhance variations in the building typologies. No two buildings are alike in a heritage district.
- Incorporate more detail in the language of the houses – covered porches over the entrance doors, bay windows and other heritage characters to make it complimentary to the heritage style.

Parking Strategy

- Come up with a more creative strategy for parking. Explore more aggressive parking solutions to clear enough room on the site to create an amenity space.
- Study examples of townhouses that use great examples of space to reduce surface parking such as decked conditions, or sunken garages and have become a boon for developers to create a common open space and make the development unique.

Landscape and Amenity Space

- Work with a landscape architect to add planting at various points.
- The only green space on the site is the berm. Create an amenity space that doesn't have to be big and doesn't necessarily need to be at a greater cost.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 30 – September 25, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 25, 2014 in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Alfredo Landaeta, B+H Architects
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Amy Roots, Development Planning
Moirá Wilson, Parks Development
Audrey Farias, Development Planning
Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Services Department
Judy Jeffers, Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest declared

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for August 28, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Pre-Application Consultation (PAC)

Applicant: 27 North Kleinburg Estates
Architect: A. Baldassarra Architect Inc.
Location: 89 and 99 Nashville Road
Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How appropriate is the proposed incremental design proposal as it fits within the district and conforming to the guidelines?
2. Does the proposal sufficiently respect the existing heritage resources on site?
3. How well does the proposed site layout address the adjacent gateway to Kleinburg and maintain pedestrian comfort within the site?

Presentation:

Farhad Jalili, Judy Jeffers and Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Development Planning

Overview:

- The proposed design approach to the site organization is a major concern. The social factor and the motivation for living in Kleinburg must be realized before proposing any development in the area. Living in the village and integrating to its social life are the main reasons for younger generations to move to this area.
- The integration to the public realm is one of the key design factors in the success of the project. Avoid creating a gated community which segregates the proposed development from its vibrant urban environment and nearby open space.

- The design team should understand the urban character of the area, celebrate and embrace it. Kleinburg's urban setting is extrovert which encourages social interactions. The proposed courtyard setting, however, creates an introverted environment, separating the residents from its surroundings.
- The provided package lacked key information, such as air photo, landscape drawings, shadow study and site topography which made it difficult for panel to fully understand the site condition and the proposed design approach.
- Panel also requires more relevant information to evaluate the proposed design including analyses of site context, natural heritage network and pedestrian pathways.

Comments:

Transportation and Site Circulation:

- The proposed courtyard has been entirely dedicated to traffic circulation and site servicing. The design team should explore other design options by giving priority to the pedestrian condition, movement and comfort.
- Explore the level of adaptability of the proposed site layout if live-work or commercial units are provided along Nashville Road frontage.
- Panel commended the proposed underground parking. However, the location of the access ramp, and its design should be revised to minimize the impact on the proposed development.
- The proposed circular driveway with the ramp in the centre will create a vehicular traffic conflict. The ramp should be moved away from the centre and be internal to the buildings or eliminated by taking advantage of the site's topography.
- Explore the possibility of directly connecting Nashville Road and Regional Road 27 through the site. This new driveway would divide the development into segments and frame the northwest portion which helps to better address the gateway condition. To discourage through traffic, alternative paving options to asphalt should be explored.

Natural Heritage Conservation and Site Topography:

- The proposed design is more appropriate where the land is flat. The topography of the area, however, makes the proposed design incompatible with the subject site. The design team should avoid flattening the land and consider the topography of the site as a determining design factor to develop a context related site layout.
- Disregarding the natural configuration of the land as a major design factor will significantly hinder the future developments on the surrounding sites.

- Consider alternative design solutions to avoid creating retaining walls along the Regional Road 27 frontage. The grading issues can be better resolved if a landscape architect is invited to join the design team.
- One approach to include topography of the site into design process is to divide the site into two sections. One section should be oriented toward Nashville Drive and the other segment should be designed to respond to the Regional Road 27 frontage.

Site Plan and Pedestrian Access:

- The design concept should be developed by considering the subject lands have three public frontages with different urban conditions, but equally important.
- Nashville Road should be treated as the main frontage for the proposed development by orienting the development toward the street.
- Provide a plan of severance that clearly marks the division lines between the subject site and the Montessori School property.
- Improve the gateway function by taking the ownership of the corner and creating a public amenity and facilitating pedestrian access to the village core.
- To animate the gateway, explore the opportunity to include commercial or live-work units at the gateway and along Nashville Road.
- The proposed courtyard should be converted to social space not dominated by traffic circulation.

Heritage Conservation and Architecture:

- The selection of appropriate building types is essential to mark the gateway and make the development as an integrated part of the village fabric.
- The corner units should be designed to respond to both streets. These units should be treated with more importance by considering various design tools, such as massing, building form and rooflines.
- The proposed cherry picking of different building styles and architectural motives has resulted in an unsettled building appearance. It is more appropriate to select a particular style for each proposed building.
- In general, the proposed material compositions should be arranged in vertical not horizontal direction. In other words, each vertical strip should be distinctively designed to break the length of the proposed buildings.
- Heritage matters; the design team should consider the heritage values from the initial stage of the project and develop the design concept by respecting

those values. To do so, a heritage assessment study to determine the typical building massing, styles and arrangements in the district should be conducted.

- The existing heritage building and the proposed development look unrelated. The proportions of the existing heritage building should be considered and incorporated into the new building design.
- The proposed architecture looks to be too disjointed and unrelated to the area. More research on local architecture is needed to provide more context sensitive building forms.
- It appears that the existing heritage building has been modified in recent years. Bringing back the original appearance of the building should be considered as an essential part of the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 31 – October 30, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, October 30, 2014 in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)
Alfredo Landaeta, ALA
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning, Recording Personnel
Amy Roots, Development Planning
Audrey Farias, Development Planning
Daniel Woolfson, Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest declared

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 25, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

Applicant: Woodbridge Park Limited

Architect: KirKor Architects & Planners

Location: North side of Steeles Avenue West, east of Martin Grove Road

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well do the proposed community and its site layout address the surrounding context and urban environment?
2. How successful is the proposed site layout in creating a sense of community, a vibrant and active urban environment within the site.

Presentation:

Farhad Jalili, Daniel Woolfson, Development Planning

Overview:

- Panel commended the design team for providing sufficient information and appreciated the amount of detail provided through the presentation and comprehensiveness of the package. The Panel also, acknowledged the property owner's presence to directly hear the Panel's comments and design directions.
- The applicants were encouraged to study existing precedents in the surrounding context and apply the positive attributes inferred from these to their site. It was further recommended to address the functional aspects in order to make this development a place.
- To develop a better site layout and urban form, the design team is advised to review and analyze successful developments in Toronto with the same site context.

Comments:

Urban Environment and Site Plan:

- The proposed development is suggested by the applicant to be affordable for young families; however, the low quality of the proposed urban environment will not create a family friendly environment.
- The lack of integrating public space with the neighbourhood, absence of eyes on the park, and lack of pedestrian connection between the units to the site's amenities will reduce a sense of community and safety within the site. The site looks to be extremely congested with excessive number of units which are surrounded by hard surfaces. The low quality of development is the most apparent at its entrance where at the entry point, surface parking for the commercial plaza has been located.
- The proposed commercial plaza with surface parking in the front is an obsolete typology which is no longer allowed in many jurisdictions. The commercial component should be designed with a more contemporary arrangement to be street oriented and accessible to the pedestrians.
- The proposed site layout does not create any sense of community. Alternative urban forms should be explored to allow for more quality space and amenity areas.
- Explore the possibility of creating an east-west public street to make the existing neighbourhood park more accessible to the residents. This design scenario would allow for a more street related and vibrant community development.
- The fire route access to the development could be more thoughtfully designed to meet the safety standards with minimum impact on the site plan layout.
- The design team should consider that the impact of utilities such as light posts and traffic signs on the already congested site will contribute to a harsher environment.

Pedestrian Access and Parks:

- The proposed design does not provide sidewalk access for a majority of the units. The moment we are not able to walk within the neighbourhood, we lose the opportunity for social interactions which is essential in creating a sense of community. For this reason, all proposed residential units should be designed with direct access to the sidewalk and other shared amenities.
- The design should take advantage and be responsive to the adjacent existing conservation and recreational area by creating a meaningful pedestrian network with connections to the park.
- The proposed park is located on the rear side of residential and commercial units. As a result, the park will be surrounded by privacy fencing which will create an unpleasant and unsafe environment within the park.

- The park can be internal to the development which will be more attractive to the local residents and a safer place for their children to play. A centrally located park would serve as a better amenity for the community and its residents.
- The connection to the existing transit stop should play a major role in designing the site plan layout and its pedestrian network.
- The proposed park programming needs to accommodate enough space for children's activities and social interactions and should be designed for flexibility.
- Include high quality outdoor furniture on appropriate locations to increase the opportunity for social interactions.

Built Form:

- The relentless repetition of 271 similar units along narrow driveways with no hierarchy of built form and arrangement has created a characterless environment with no sense of place, address or definition.
- Consider the inclusion of other building types and densities with appropriate transitioning from Steeles Avenue to the north of the development.
- A quantum of similar units along similar driveways with insufficient pedestrian amenities impedes safety and comfort, and results in a mean, harsh and inhospitable environment.
- At ground level, the proposed streetscape includes only repetitive parking and main doors which results in a monotonous and unattractive development.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 32 – November 27, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 27, 2014 in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Harold Madi, City of Toronto
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Development Planning
Moir Wilson, Development Planning, Recording Personnel
Amy Roots, Development Planning
Clement Messere, Development Planning

DRP Coordinator

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Paul Nodwell declared a conflict of interest for Item #1.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for October 30, 2014 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

Applicant:	Royalpark
Architect:	KirKor Architects & Planners
Location:	9881 Islington Avenue West, City of Vaughan
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How successful is the proposed site layout in creating a high quality pedestrian environment connecting the new development to the surrounding communities, natural resources and trail systems?
2. How well do the proposed building massing and architecture respond to the surrounding urban context?
3. How appropriate is the proposed east frontage along Canada Company Avenue?

Staff Presentation:

Farhad Jalili, Clement Messere, Development Planning

Overview:

- The proposal is a significant departure from what is anticipated in the newly completed Official Plan. Therefore, the proponent is obligated to provide a planning and urban design rationale, based on the site and its context, for how and why the proposal will positively contribute to the community. Official Plan and Zoning Amendments on this site should be treated as a special project: A proposal that creates identity, provides amenity and services for the neighbourhood, and organizes entry into the nature conservation area.
- Panel emphasized the significance of this site from an urban design perspective given its location, topography, and surrounding land uses. Architectural typologies, massing, form and approach must respond to the specific opportunities and responsibilities created by the site, including consideration of the community context, topography, and its multiple frontages.

- Panel advised that it would behoove the proponent to include the conservation lands in the plan as context, as it is important to the story of the site. Frontage at the gateway and to the nature conservation area is a privilege that needs to be addressed by the development proposal.
- The proponent was strongly encouraged to invite the owner and the urban planner to attend future presentations to the Panel. This was expressed as having the potential to maximize the value to the proponent of the Panel's observations.

Comments:

Frontages

- The four frontages of the site are dramatically different conditions and all are equally important in their potential for placemaking. Panel agreed that the proposed architectural form and language does not successfully work with its frontages, specifically:
 - The frontage along Canada Company Avenue offers an existing rural/ pastoral quality, views to nature, and marks the gateway to the nature conservation area.
 - The “flat iron” point of land to the south has the potential be activated by this development proposal to transform it into an exciting public realm node. Consideration should be given to the remnant piece of land adjacent to the site.
 - The Islington Avenue frontage includes both low density residential and commercial uses on the west side across the street. The commercial sites, in combination with this site, could potentially transform over time into a pedestrian-friendly community “node” (rather than a “corridor” development) providing residents in a suburban context with additional destinations amenities.

Built Form, Orientation and Context

- Panel acknowledged the contained nature of the subject site, bound by fixed low rise on the west side of Islington Avenue, and a nature conservation area to the east.
- Panel raised the proposed increase in height as an issue that needs thoughtful consideration. Given the island-like context and topography, any building that is higher than four stories on this site will appear very prominent and iconic. It will effectively act as a stand-alone architectural object and mark the gateway into the nature conservation area.
- The proposed increase in building height cannot be solely justified by an angular plane calculation. The issue is not the relationship of the building height to the width of the street, but rather the relationship of building height to the surrounding context. Panel felt that the height, massing, frontages, and footprint of the architecture as

proposed would have a negative impact on the adjacent Kortright Conservation Area.

- The development must consider the assets of the adjacent nature conservation area to inform site layout, architecture, and landscape. For example, the view from the adjacent open space into the development as proposed includes many blank walls, and a substantial amount of paving, garage doors, and suburban fencing.
- The proposed height and architecture of the proposal would suggest that this building is part of an existing or future street wall with other buildings continuing to the north and south of it, which it is not.
- The architectural form and materiality, including the use of precast, feels like a commercial template commonly used in Woodbridge, versus a specific architectural design response to the site.
- Rather than articulating and humanizing the façade as intended, the banding has the visual effect of making the building feel even heavier.
- Understanding all the views to and from the site will be important to the layout. Loading and servicing will need to be internalized.
- The architecture can be a shift and step building to respond to grade challenges.

Building Types and Architecture

- Panel recommended that more diversity of architectural typologies is needed to respond to the issues and opportunities for each frontage. Suggestions included townhouses in the north of the block for low impact on the surrounding low density community, stepping up in height towards the south in relationship with the 4-storey commercial on the west side of Islington, and providing a better transition to the nature conservation area with double height townhouse units fronting onto Canada Company Avenue.
- Panel agreed that any proposed higher-density development for this site must be mixed-use to service the community, including publically-oriented amenities, potentially future live-work town house units, and grade-level units that could be designed to support future commercial at the nodal south end as the market develops. The potential for this development is to create a node that anticipates and contributes to a more walkable community.
- More diversity in unit typologies would also be a positive offering for the development. The development should focus on creating a better ground level experience with positive interaction along Islington Avenue and Canada Company Avenue frontages. Vancouver-style, two-storey garden units with at-grade entrances would create a more appropriate rhythm and massing along the street. These two-storey townhouse units could be sold as premium units, offering residents access to sunlight and increased privacy.

- The proposed secondary exits and emergency exits along the Islington Avenue façade detract from the experience of the architecture at the ground plane and should be re-designed to speak to the aspirations of the project and the natural heritage of the context.

Landscape

- Panel members challenged the proponent to understand the relationship of the built form to the surrounding spaces to determine the proper dimensions needed for the landscape spaces. For example, the 2.5 m setback provided should be increased to minimum 3 m to accommodate trees and front yards. Four (4) m is ideal to create a sense of distance and privacy between the front doors and the street. The landscape should be approached as a continuous whole, with thoughtful consideration given to the linkage with the nature conservation area. Development frontage onto Canada Company Avenue is an opportunity to introduce outdoor amenity areas that are linked to the nature conservation area.
- The proposed amenity areas will not be successful congregation areas with the organization of the built form as proposed. The proposed amenity space on the north will be shaded and therefore less likely to be used in the shoulder and cold seasons.
- The centre median in the driveway entrance could be more substantive and character-defining landscape, with more height and a more natural quality, to bring the natural feature through the site to Islington Avenue.
- Along Islington Avenue, a slight grade shift and/or landscape treatments should be used to create privacy for residents with at grade entrances fronting the street.
- Panel recommended a double row of trees along Islington Avenue streetscape, one within the R.O.W. and one within the private setback.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.