

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 26 – MARCH 26, 2015

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

- 9:00 am** **Breakfast Meeting**
Introduction of the new Panel members
- 9:45 am** **Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of November 27, 2014 Meeting
- 9:50 am** Pre-Application File Number: PAC.14.078
Southeast Corner of Rutherford Road and Dufferin Street
8 blocks of three-storey stacked townhouses (206 units)
Fieldgate Developments Inc.
Presentations:
Farhad Jalili and Margaret Holyday, Development Planning
KirKor Architects Inc. and KLM Planning Partners Inc.
- 10:50 am** **Break**
- 11:15 am** **Presentation**
City of Vaughan VMC Urban Design Guidelines
1st Review
Presentation:
Paul Kulig, Clara Romero, regionalArchitects
Amy Roots, Development Planning
- 12:15 pm** **Adjournment and Lunch**

CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 34 – APRIL 30, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of November 27, 2014 and
March 26, 2015 Meetings

9:45 a.m. Plazacorp Investments Inc.

Pre-Application File Number: PAC.12.066
7895 Jane Street, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
High-Rise Mixed-Use Development
Plazacorp Investments Ltd.

Presentations:
Stephen Lue, Development Planning
Marco Jacob, Urban Designer
Quadrangle Architects Limited

10:55 a.m. Break

11:10 a.m. City of Vaughan Fire Station and EMS

7690 Martin Grove Road
Fire Station 7-3 and EMS Station 31
City of Vaughan Project

Presentation:
Thomas Brown Architects Inc.

12:20 p.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 34 – MAY 28, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Appointment of Vice Chair

9:45 a.m. Royal Park

Pre-Application File Number: PAC.14.111
9681 and 9691 Islington Avenue
Mid-Rise Residential Development

Presentations:

Clement Messere, Development Planning
Marco Jacob, Urban Designer

Kirkor Architects + Planners

10:55 a.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 36 – JUNE 25, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of May 28, 2015 Meeting

9:45 a.m. Norstar Group of Companies

File Number: Z.15.023, DA.15.022
1176 Rutherford Road (Carville)
High-Rise Mixed-Use Development
1st Review

Presentations:
Mark Antoine, Development Planning
Farhad Jalili, Urban Designer

Turner Fleischer Architects

10:55 a.m. Break

11:10 a.m. Genesis Homes

Pre-Application File Number: PAC.15.052
South Side of Springside Road, East of Jane Street
Low-Rise Residential
1st Review

Presentations:
Stephen Lue, Development Planning
Audrey Farias, Urban Designer

RN Design Ltd.

12:20 p.m. Break



12:35 a.m. Woodbridge Park Limited

File Number: Z.14.024, OP.14.003
North side of Steeles Avenue West, east of Martin Grove Road
Mixed Use Development
2nd Review

Presentations:
Mary Caputo, Development Planning
Farhad Jalilli, Urban Designer

Kirkor Architects & Planners

12:45 a.m. Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 37 – AUGUST 27, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of June 25, 2015 Meeting

9:45 a.m. Berkeley Developments Inc. / Plazacorp Investments Limited

File Number: Z.15.023, DA.15.022
7895 Jane Street
High-Rise Mixed-Use Development
3rd Review (2nd Review: April 30, 2015)

Presentations:

Stephen Lue, Development Planning
Marco Jacob, Urban Designer
Amy Roots and Gerardo Paez Alonso, VMC Project Management Team

Quadrangle Architects Limited
Janet Rosenberg & Studio

10:55 a.m. Break

11:10 a.m. FCF Old Market Lane 2013 Inc.

File Number: Z.14.026
177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue
Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development
2nd Review (1st Review: February 27, 2014)

Presentations:

Marco Jacob, Urban Designer
Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator
Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Architecture Unfolded



12:20 p.m. Break

12:35 p.m. Stateview Homes

File Number: PAC.12.086

89 and 99 Nashville Road, Kleinburg

Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development

2nd Review (1st Review: September 25, 2014)

Presentations:

Marco Jacob, Urban Designer

Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Judy Jeffers, Development Planning

A. Baldassarra Architect Inc.

1:45 p.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 38 – SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of June 25, 2015 and August 27, 2015 Meeting

**9:45 a.m. York Region Rapid Transit Corporation (VMC Bus Terminal)
SmartREIT Terminal**

Presentations:

Amy Roots and Gerardo Paez Alonso, VMC Project Management Team
YRRTC and Diamond Schmitt Architects

10:55 a.m. Break

**11:10 a.m. Liberty 180-190 Maplecrete / 2951 Hwy 7 Development in Vaughan
Metropolitan Centre
Mixed-Use Development**

Site Development Application, 3rd Review

Liberty Development Group

Presentations:

Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Marco Jacob, Urban Design
Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.

12:20 p.m. Break

**12:35 p.m. City of Vaughan - Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Urban Design Guidelines
2nd Review**

Presentations:

Paul Kulig, regionalArchitects

Amy Roots, Development Planning

1:45 p.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 39 – OCTOBER 29, 2015

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 September 24, 2015 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. Riocan – Spring Farm
441 Clark Avenue
Mixed-use development**

Presentations:
Moira Wilson, Urban Design; Laura Janotta, Development Planning
Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.

10:40 a.m. Break

**10:55 a.m. Camelot on 7 Inc.
4908 & 4902 Highway 7
Mid-Rise Mixed Use development**

Presentations:
Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Mary Caputo, Development Planning
E.I. Richmond Architects Ltd.

12:05 p.m. Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 40 – NOVEMBER 26, 2015

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 October 29, 2015 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. Zzen Group of Companies Limited / Midvale Estates Ltd.
2938, 2966 and 2986 Highway 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
High-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Graziani + Corazza Architects Inc., MBTW Group

10:40 a.m. Break

**10:55 a.m. York Major Holdings Incorporated
Indigo Condominiums, Maple
99 and 111 Eagle Rock Way
Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Quadrangle Architects Limited

12:05 p.m. Break

**12:20 p.m. York Region Affordable Housing Development
259-275 Woodbridge Avenue & 64 Abell Avenue, Woodbridge
Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Judy Jeffers, Development Planning
Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.

1:30 p.m. Adjournment





CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 33 – March 26, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 26, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects
Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec
Megan Torza, DTAH
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.
Guela Solow-Ruda, ARK/Petroff

Absent

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Maira Wilson, Development Planning
Amy Roots, Development Planning, recording personnel
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning, recording personnel
Margaret Holyday, 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

Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict of interest for Item #2.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for November 27, 2014 will be forwarded to April meeting for approval.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Pre-Application File Number: PAC.14.078

Applicant: Fieldgate Developments Inc.
Architect: KirKor Architects & Planners
Location: Southeast Corner of Rutherford Road and Dufferin Street
Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

- a. How well do the proposed community and its site layout address the surrounding context and urban environment?

Staff Presentation:

Farhad Jalili, Urban Design, Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Overview:

- Panel acknowledged the importance of responding to the existing market and surrounding conditions; however, “future proofing” the development site should be considered, understanding how this site will evolve as the area evolves, and contributing to the future conditions. Considerations in this regard include: a) Enable future public realm and trail connection to TRCA lands: b) Create positive relationships with Regional Roads, anticipating a future condition that is more compact and pedestrian oriented; c) Enable opportunities for ground-related units to be live-work in the future, and; d) Connecting with and enhancing natural systems including water, energy, and wildlife. The applicant is encouraged to include other building types to achieve higher density to respond better to the intensified vision for the area.

- Panel commended the applicant for bringing forward the design in its early stage which enables the Panel to provide the applicant with more fundamental design guidance.
- The design team should consider the reasons for future residents to move to this area and develop the design based on the existing (and future) amenities and natural features.

Comments:

Site Layout and Landscaping

- Consider the grading as an important design condition and take advantage of the adjacent open spaces and natural heritage areas to create a better quality development that offers visual and physical connections to open areas.
- The urban plaza or gathering space at the corner of Rutherford Road and Dufferin Street should be designed to play a central role that defines the corner and as a prominent feature of the development. The built form interface, frontages, mailboxes, regional sight triangle requirements, and YRT bus stops should be considered and integrated into the design.
- Include enhanced landscaping features along the Regional Roads and within the development to create a more welcoming and safer pedestrian environment through the site. Removing or re-designing the proposed driveway and strengthening the village community type concept to create open space amenity focal points would greatly enhance the overall quality of living within the development.
- The amenity areas are dispersed across the site and don't yet function as an integrated system, with a community focal point or 'heart'. Moving the amenity room and tot lot amenity space to a more centralized location – in conjunction with reducing the prominence of surface parking – was recommended.
- The proposed surface parking seems excessive. Replace most of the proposed surface parking with amenity areas to create an urban street environment along the proposed driveway and to enhance the overall pedestrian experience within the site.
- A proper urban design, building frontages, pavement texturing, and lighting should be utilized to further support pedestrian movement and maximize their safety. The pedestrian network should conveniently connect the development to the Rutherford Road and Dufferin Street sidewalks.
- The driveway passes through different conditions, and the design of it should be reconsidered to respond to these functional and aesthetic concerns. At the same time, the design treatment of the driveway should be improved to contribute to a sense of place and identity for the development.

- Consider parallel parking along the proposed driveway to change the proposed driveway's aspect to a local street arrangement and for a better interface with proposed open spaces.
- Consider the inclusion of the interface and connection to the open space on the south as a crucial factor to develop a balanced and thoughtful design concept.
- The proposed ground related residential units should be carefully designed to address Dufferin Street's traffic noise without resorting to the noise attenuation walls. This issue can be address through providing a robust and deep landscaping. A panel member suggested changing the building orientations to face the townhouse block's side elevation toward the street for increased permeability to the valley lands
- The development should not turn its back onto the adjacent valley lands (south and east). Coordinate with the TRCA to explore the possibility of connection of the site's internal pedestrian network to the future natural trail system. If no plans for a trail are currently in sight, the development should be designed to connect with TRCA lands if they are made accessible to the public in the future with a trail system As it is proposed, the loading area and underground parking ramp may create a hazardous and uncomfortable environment for pedestrians and future residents and should be redesigned.

Architecture, Built Form

- The northwest corner of the site should better address the context by utilizing more responsive built form and landscaping. For example, converting the proposed landscape features to an urban plaza or gathering area, and facing the surrounding units with higher density to the plaza could provide a better transition from the high-density developments on the north to the surrounding lower density communities. Also, incorporating front porches in addition to the front/side yards for the surrounding units will help to create more active environment within the plaza.
- Panel members commended the applicant for the intention to improve the stacked townhouse building type to a higher quality. For a more fulsome design review, detailed drawings and graphics to explain the merits of the design concept are required.
- CPTED / safety will need to be carefully considered in the design with the proposed extensive grade changes, including how the front and back parts of the buildings relate to the grade as one moves through the site.
- More variety of built form, building types, and landscape qualities should be considered to establish better hierarchy from the intersection to the adjacent open spaces.
- Improve views from the Regional Roads to the adjacent valley lands through the development.

b. Draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Urban Design Guidelines

Location: Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Design Firm: regionalArchitects planningAlliance
Review: First Review

Introduction:

regionalArchitects planningAlliance provided a presentation summarizing the draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Urban Design Guidelines (sections 1-3), and invited comments from Design Review Panel Members.

Panel's Comments:

Overall Approach

- Document is symptomatic of a time in Vaughan where the City is facing new issues associated with intensification and transition.
- Recognition of the tension between prescriptive vs. performance-based measures – may approach the document with more prescription around the perimeter block, and with more flexibility in the interior of the block.
- Similarly to the VMC Streetscape and Open Space Plan, the document should consider a philosophy about priority investment zones in certain Character Areas where more prescription may be necessary (ex. Millway Avenue).
- Panel commented positively on the graphic nature of the document, as it helps communicate ideas. Suggest reviewing image collection to ensure full applicability of each selection.
- Suggest including a comprehensive diagram in the framework section where the layers of all the key elements are overlaid as a base.
- Climatic connection to built form needs more elaboration.

Open Space

- Recognizing that the scope of the project is only dealing with the private realm, there is still a need to pull out from the built form considerations to address urban design issues in a broader sense by detailing the relationship to open space and public realm principles, as well as streets and movement corridors. The design guidelines can act as a nesting document within other volumes (VMC Secondary Plan, VMC Streetscape and Open Space Plan), and some repetition may be useful.
- Given that the Character Area methodology is centered around open space, the articulation of the ROW (and associated street cross sections) should be part of the document.
- Clarity on the relationship to and interface with public realm standards needs to be included.

- There is a real challenge with animated frontages in large ROWs and single sided retail environments. Consideration should be given to these conditions.
- Typical blocks should begin to explore a broader range of POPS (publicly accessible, privately owned open spaces) types.
- Some of the most successful POPS front onto streets.
- Private open spaces should include standards for preservation of soil volumes.

Character Areas

- Each Character Area strategy needs to ensure active environments, clarify how the urban environment should perform and provide an identity that is aspirational.
- Overlapping Character Area zones is a bit confusing as it provides too little direction. Suggest elaborating more on the mix/transition between zones (but keep overlap in zones as an overall approach).
- Special zones within Character Areas needs a finer grain of detail and hierarchy.
- Suggest including the overall key plan within each Character Area page layout for context.

Typical Blocks

- Typical blocks need to acknowledge the varying impacts of the differing ROW conditions.
- Typical blocks need to highlight more clearly where there is room for flexibility and variety, and where there is more fixed prescription.
- A street wall section study is a needed missing element to highlight the interface with the public realm and demonstrate pedestrian oriented design considerations.
- To address the interim condition, suggest illustrating typical blocks where only a portion becomes developed to address future proofing where a temporary condition may stay for a longer period of time.

Implementation

- As these guidelines reflect a new approach to urban regulation (performance based), suggest the City implement a pilot period to test the program and ensure that the guidelines work for both private and public users.
- Where there is an interim condition, perhaps the public realm and ROWs should be implemented in anticipation of private properties being developed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 34 – April 30, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 30, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects (Acting Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, ARK/Petroff

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John MacKenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Tim Simmonds, Executive Director, City Manager's Office

Rob Bayley, Development Planning

Amy Roots, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, recording personnel

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Michael Rietta in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Wayne Swanton and Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict of interest for Item #1.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for November 27, 2014 and March 26, 2015 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Pre-Application File Number: PAC.12.066

Applicant:	Plazacorp Investments Limited
Architect:	Quadrangle Architects Limited
Landscape Architect:	Janet Rosenberg & Studio
Location:	7895 Jane Street, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- a. How does the proposed massing impact the site and context?
- b. How well does the proposed design integrate with the vision for Edgeley Pond?
- c. Please comment on site organization with respect to pedestrian connectivity/permeability, viewsheds and servicing access?

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design, Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Overview:

- Panel commended the applicant on the quality of the presentation materials and review package and hope that the aspiration of the conceptual plan and precedent images will carry through the next stages of design development.
- Items that require further attention include: a) redistributing the density across the site in a more balanced way; b) massing and articulation of tower as the building

footprint is currently too large; c) improve north-south connection through the site and with the interface of Edgeley Pond; d) Exploration of stepping the south west corner of the building so that it gradually opens up with views of the Black Creek Corridor and Edgeley Pond; e) architectural expression of the buildings to relate to the specific character of the site.

- The applicant is encouraged to better relate the proposed tower(s) to their context and ensure that the buildings conform to the requirements outlined in the VMC Secondary Plan.

Comments:

Site Layout and Landscaping

- The renewal of the existing Black Creek corridor and the vision for Edgeley Pond make the site a privileged place in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. The connection of the buildings to their site is not yet well defined.
- Consider how the architecture could better frame Edgeley Pond. Rotating the tower to relate to the Black Creek corridor and Edgeley Pond would lead to a more dramatic design solution. There are also opportunities for improved permeability through the site. This project, if well executed, could set a new standard for development in parks.
- The northwest corner of the site is significant as it acts as a gateway to the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. Create more of a presence at the corner of the site through public art, landscape or massing articulation.
- The perimeter walkway around the proposed development needs to be more generous. The south side of the site requires more permeability which would facilitate access to and provide views onto Black Creek and Edgeley Pond. The north-south connection through the site could also be improved by widening the walkway, especially between Buildings B and C and between Buildings E and F. Articulating pedestrian pathways in a different material would also emphasize the north-south access.
- Review the site organization in order to redistribute density in a more balanced way.
- Widening/extension of Portage Parkway needs to be completed as part of the development to ensure appropriate interface.

Architecture, Built Form

- Panel members commended the applicant for the use of high quality building materials and landscape elements.

- The tower floor plate is too large and is substantially larger than the maximum floor plate requirements outlined in the Secondary Plan. The projected balconies make it appear larger. Other massing alternatives should be considered.
- The large floorplate and scale of the slab tower casts significant shadows onto the site. The sun/shadow studies reveal that the grade related units are in shadow the better part of the afternoon and evening year round. Consider the use of podiums and point towers in order to break up the mass.
- The scale change is very abrupt between the proposed 30-storey tower and the 3-storey grade related residential units. The tower building should gradually scale down towards the grade related units for a better built form transition.
- Panel hopes that the detailed design of grade related units will allow for the rooftop gardens as proposed.
- Consider how the development is framed by its built form context. The base of the tower should better relate to the planned 4 and 6-storey podiums west of Jane Street.
- Special attention should be paid to the architectural expression of the buildings. It was felt that the proposed buildings do not particularly relate to their specific site. For example, the design of the buildings including selection and use of materials could represent the landscape through the use of colour or organic frit patterns, making the building unique to its site.

d. City Of Vaughan Fire Station and EMS 31

Location: 7690 Martin Grove Road, Woodbridge
 Design Firm: Thomas Brown Architects
 Review: First Review

Introduction:

Thomas Brown Architects provided a presentation summarizing the design of City of Vaughan Fire Station 7-3 and EMS 31, and invited comments from Design Review Panel Members.

Panel's Comments:

Overall Approach

- Panel members commended the applicant for a thorough presentation and its sustainable aspirations. Building aims to achieve LEED Silver or Gold.
- Panel would like to see the building have a more civic presence, based on Canadian civic architectural precedents. They emphasized the civic importance of fire halls. It

was strongly urged that following a civic tradition is an obligation of the architect. The design of buildings cannot be based solely on functional diagrams or resolution of purely technical functions. Architects have a role in serving the public, especially in the design of its civic buildings.

- Proposal includes too many architectural languages that result in a conflicted and unsatisfactory resolution of the massing and elevations. Proponent is encouraged to take queues from the relative clarity and rationality of the floor plan as inspiration for the massing and architectural language.
- The sloped roof should be replaced by a flat roof, especially above vehicle and apparatus bays.
- The building needs to have meaningful integration into the neighbourhood. A more welcoming façade needs to be considered with a friendlier treatment: landscaping, repositioning of signage, and an entrance canopy were suggestions.
- The proposed clock tower at the entrance of the building should be removed as there is already a tower-like structure used for hose hanging near the rear that can easily accommodate the clock feature.
- The island between the vehicular access routes of the fire and EMS trucks should be increased by at least 50 percent in length. This is to ensure that there is sufficient relief from the large curb cut required for the fire hall.
- It was recommended that planting beds be incorporated in front of the electrical room. Landscape on north and south ends of site could also be further explored.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 34 – MAY 28, 2015

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

9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting

9:30 a.m. Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Appointment of Vice Chair

9:45 a.m. Royal Park

Pre-Application File Number: PAC.14.111
9681 and 9691 Islington Avenue
Mid-Rise Residential Development

Presentations:

Clement Messere, Development Planning
Marco Jacob, Urban Designer

Kirkor Architects + Planners

10:55 a.m. Adjournment





CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 36 – June 25, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 25, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, ARK/Petroff

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Megan Torza, DTAH

STAFF

John MacKenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Rob Bayley, Development Planning

Amy Roots, Development Planning

Moira Wilson, Development Planning

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Audrey Farias, Development Planning, recording personnel

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, recording personnel

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Peter Turner declared a conflict of interest for Item #1.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for May 28, 2015 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

1. File Number: Z.15.023, DA.15.022

Applicant:	Norstar Group of Companies
Architect:	Turner Fleischer Architects
Location:	1176 Rutherford Road (Carville)
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- To what extent does the site organization, layout and massing of the proposal meet the vision and principles of the Carville District Centre?
- Does the proposed design concept encourage pedestrian movement and presence, create a vibrant public realm and amenity space, and develop connections to the surrounding open space system?

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design, Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Overview:

- The project is moving forward in a positive direction with respect to the intentions for the massing and to deliver a high quality of details and finish.
- Panel commented on the ambitious scope of the project and recommended further rationalization in order to deliver the high quality details.
- In summary, scale, pedestrian experience, vehicular circulation and access, building massing, simplification of the architectural language and integration of the

architecture with the landscape and public realm were seen as the most important aspects to develop.

Comments:

Site Layout

- The site layout needs further development to organize the flows between spaces, with consideration of built form fronts and backs, servicing needs, and parking.
- Panel recognizes the activation of the public realm as critical to the success of the project. It also acknowledged the difficult condition of an isolated site fronting wide regional roads with currently few pedestrians.
- The organization of amenity spaces feels disjointed and needs to be rationalized. Further consider the pedestrian experience through the site and the relationship to the adjacent natural open space.
- Panel noted that this proposal has less greenspace than the previous. Can the driveway at the northeast corner be squared off to reclaim some green space?
- It is unfortunate that the pedestrian connection on the east side of the site is next to the ramp to the underground parking. To mitigate this condition, there should be a separation of a few meters including landscaping.
- Opportunity to connect the pedestrian walkway(s) across the site to the east.
- The driveway connection on Rutherford Road negatively affects the pedestrian pathway.
- The need for two loading spaces was questioned. Consider consolidating loading spaces.

Landscaping and Public Art

- Panel commended the applicant on the aspirations of the public art program and recommended engagement of the artist early to collaborate on the design of the outdoor spaces, to be integral with, rather than an enhancement to, the landscape. The corner plaza is the best space for public art as it provides the greatest value for the public. The gazebo at the northeast corner of the site could be included in the sequence of the public art plan.
- The location of a plaza at the corner will create an attractive and inviting place. The next step is to look at the reality of the site and design for it. The treatment of the corner requires further development for activation of this space and connectivity with a linked system of amenity spaces.
- The location of the plaza at the southwest corner of the site will bring sunlight into the internal amenity space. Panel recommended further exploration of how retail will

reinforce the corner plaza, and to explore the best direction for retail to face in order to activate it.

- Public amenity spaces have been placed at the southwest and northeast corners of the site, however the connection between the two spaces, what is proposed as a central courtyard, is essentially a parking lot. The proposed enhanced materiality, while appreciated by Panel, is not enough to create a pedestrian-first space. Parallel parking spaces may improve the condition.

Architecture, Built Form

- Panel commended the architect on the quality of materials and finish, and recommended that the project be simplified and rationalized to ensure that this quality is delivered. It was felt that the buildings contained too many materials and styles. Often the result of this approach looks artificial.
- The massing is moving in the right direction and it is a good story about verticality and horizontality, however need to think more carefully about the components. Consider breaking up the massing with deeper reveals or recesses in the upper portion of the buildings rather than breaking up the facades with too many architectural languages.
- The viability of the retail spaces along Rutherford Road was questioned in terms of the lack of pedestrian activity on the Regional Road and also because of the 3-meter grade differential along the street. The northwest view from Rutherford feels like a wall has been created. Consider placing retail along Dufferin Street to take advantage of the adjacent mixed-use centre on the west side of Dufferin Street.
- Panel commented on the confusion about fronts and backs of buildings as buildings seek to address both the street and the interior courtyard space. For example, in a sequence of walking from the corner to the rear landscape feature, a pedestrian will encounter backs of retail with blank walls, loading, residential entrances, parking for visitors – “a confused direction of life”. Better resolution of these conditions is required.
- The townhouses have blank walls facing the open space to the east.
- The bridge connecting the second floor amenity spaces at the corner plaza is thin and does not have a strong enough presence for a gateway corner. Either new mass should be introduced or dissolve it completely.

2. Pre-Application File Number: PAC.15.052

Applicant:	Genesis Homes
Architect:	RN Design Ltd.
Location:	South side of Springside Road, East of Jane Street
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

- Does the proposed design concept encourage pedestrian movements by providing sufficient pedestrian permeability to the site and high quality landscaping?
- Does the proposed site organization/layout fit appropriately within the site boundaries?
- How successful is the proposed development in providing adequate amenity areas for the residents?

Staff Presentation:

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Overview:

- Panel commended the applicant for a good elaborate presentation and the comprehensive sections provided.
- Panel further commended the applicant for their resistance to front rear yards onto the streets.

Comments:Site Layout

- The Panel acknowledged that the site backs onto the green. It was felt that the building types/blocks were too 'generic' and not sufficiently responsive to (or adapted to) this particular site. It was further noted that some front doors are on the street, some on the amenity, and some on the ravine. This is not an ideal condition from a safety perspective. The applicant was encouraged to reorganize the site plan to frame the street and the ravine from a larger perspective.
- The Panel appreciated the concept of parking with easy access to units as much as possible. However, it was felt that there were too many ramps on site and the applicant was encouraged to consolidate them into one ramp. The proposed parking at grade was tucked into too many places and it was further recommended to put most of the parking below grade. The at-grade parking posed a problem of doors opening into retaining walls.
- It was felt that the current configuration of building blocks makes it very challenging to access any front doors and makes internal pedestrian circulation within the development very inefficient and, in areas, unsafe. Panel recommended that the applicant further explore the types of building blocks to be used for the proposal.

- It was further felt that the proposed driveway connection from Springside Road was conflicting with the existing bus stop.

Landscaping and Utilities

- It was felt that the buildings are too close to the street and that tree planting would not be successful in the proposed 2-meter setback.
- Panel felt that the proposed amenity space looks like a remnant space. It was recommended to consider two blocks with a larger green space in the middle that would make a larger meaningful space.
- Panel posed a question to the applicant if any thought was given to how the utility meters would be placed on the units.

Waste Management

- It was unclear how the proposed exterior garbage would work for the residents considering our extreme climate. Also, the alternatives provided did not seem viable for a garbage truck to pick up the garbage from the spots identified. The applicant was encouraged to rethink the garbage collection location.

3. File Number: Z.14.024, OP.14.003

Applicant:	Woodbridge Park Limited
Architect:	Kirkor Architects + Planners
Location:	North side of Steeles Avenue West, east of Martin Grove Road
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

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

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design, Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Overview:

- Panel acknowledged that the project has come a long way and has developed much needed rigour. However, the following aspects require further consideration and development: access to the site; interface of units to retail and open amenity spaces; monotony and repetition of buildings across the site.

Comments:

Site Layout

- Panel recognized that the access to the site was an important aspect of the project. In the current proposal, the first thing you encounter upon entering the site is the loading space. As there is only one access into the site, it was felt it should be treated as the gateway to the community and should be enhanced appropriately.
- The interface between the commercial and residential areas also needs further development. Currently, the back of retail faces the back of residential. The mixed-use buildings need to be better oriented to create a better relationship to the residential buildings. Explore access through the commercial building to the west into the residential units to the east.
- The site plan shows a lack of porosity from a pedestrian perspective. Panel cautioned against the dead end streets.
- The central spine that runs east west across the site, street A, should have units facing onto it. Rotate units that currently flank this street. The Parkland amenity space is also important and should have units facing onto it. The current proposal shows rear yards facing the park.

Landscaping

- Panel felt that the project is missing green space and a well resolved interface between the proposed parkland and the residential units. Well defined hierarchy and variety of outdoor amenity spaces is required.
- Extend and integrate the central parkland to the northern green buffer creating a unified green network.
- The Outdoor Courtyard of Building 'A' should be exposed to and accessible by the adjacent residences. Remove units that block the view into this space.

Architecture, Built Form

- Panel felt that this project still suffers from the monotony of its repetitive facades. Exploring alternatives to the orthogonal grid are encouraged, as this would mitigate the repetition of the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 37 – August 27, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, August 27, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects
John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited
Megan Torza, DTAH
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec
Guela Solow-Ruda, ARK/Petroff

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design
Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design
Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development
Maira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design
Mary Caputo, Development Planning
Stephen Lue, Development Planning
Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, recording personnel

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Wayne Swanton declared a conflict of interest for Item #1.

Brad Golden declared a conflict of interest for Item #2.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for June 25, 2015 to be approved at the next meeting.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Pre-Application File Number: PAC.12.066

Applicant:	Berkeley Developments Inc./Plazacorp Investments Ltd.
Architect:	Quadrangle Architects Limited
Location:	7895 Jane Street
Review:	Third Review

Introduction:

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

- How does the proposed massing impact the site and planned context?
- How well does the proposed design integrate with the vision for Edgeley Pond and Jane Street?
- Please comment on site organization with respect to pedestrian connectivity/permeability, viewsheds and servicing access.

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Amy Roots and Gerardo Paez Alonso, VMC Project Management Team

Overview:

- Panel commented on the improvements to the project since the previous iteration of the plan and recommended further design development, specifically to improve the relationship of the development to Edgeley Pond and the articulation of the southern elevation of the podium.

- Panel requested that this proposal address the future planned condition of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, not merely the present interim condition, particularly with respect to the treatment of the east elevations of the grade related units and associated eastern interface with Edgeley Pond.

Comments:

Site Layout

- The organization of the grade-related units does not take advantage of their adjacency to Edgeley Pond. Explore more opportunities for integration with the future condition of the park and consider realigning the ground related units to better address the park.
- The designs of dropoff and loading area could be improved. There is an opportunity for the loading/drop off area to become a plaza with views and pedestrian connections opening onto Edgeley Pond.
- Outdoor amenity on the south west corner could become a destination café, creating a draw for people exploring the park, and the pedestrian access to Jane Street could be improved.
- The proposed plaza at the northwest corner of the site could benefit from a publicly accessible program on the ground floor of the building, rather than the proposed indoor amenity gym.

Landscaping and Public Art

- Panel commented on the improvements of the project with regards to the streetscape experience. However, there is an opportunity to better integrate the project with the adjacent park and Jane Street. Carrying the decorative paving materials to the curb and creating a uniform pathway system would create seamlessness between the public and private spheres. The introduction of public benches at the entrance of the tower building would also serve this goal.
- Scale and layering of interim landscape features along Portage Parkway were deemed to be appropriate. The landscape features on the east and south of the property, and specifically how they connect with adjacent landscapes has not been fully explored. The creation of views towards the park can be further developed.
- Panel encouraged the architect to consider lighting as an important element in the design. The night time expression of buildings in the future Vaughan Metropolitan Centre is paramount.
- Panel noted that if the project were not adjacent to a park, an outdoor amenity space would be requested by the City. Adjacency to Edgeley Pond has provided a gratuitous amenity in this respect. As a result, the project needs to reciprocate to park users with public amenities – especially considering the cold-season use of the park. It was felt that future users of the park do not currently benefit from the proposal. Thinking of the site as publicly accessible, with public uses complimenting the park would serve as a good starting point.

Architecture, Built Form

- Panel commented on the improvements of the tower. The corner expression is now stronger, creating a landmark statement at the gateway intersection. However it was felt that the mass could be better distributed to address the different adjacencies and site characteristics. It was felt that the majority of the massing and detailing is on one side of the site.
- The south elevation facing Edgeley Pond could be improved. The iconic architectural expression of the north tower component could be wrapped around the podium and extend with the south elevation to improve the façade treatment and public/private interface with the park.
- Although the vertical elements break up the apparent mass of the tower, it was still felt that the tower floor plate is still too large. It was suggested that the podium could use more terracing and the point tower could become more slender and possibly taller. Currently, the setback of the point tower from the podium is not significant enough to mitigate its presence.
- The vertical articulation of the tower at the northwest corner draws attention downward, appearing to announce an important program on the ground floor. Carefully selected retail could animate this corner.
- The introduction of additional colour on the northwest corner of the façade was deemed unnecessary.
- Blank facades facing east of the ground-related units should be addressed.

2. File Number: Z.14.026

Applicant: FCF Old Market Lane 2013 Inc.
Architect: Architecture Unfolded
Location: 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue
Review: Second Review

Introduction:

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

- How successful is the proposed development at integrating and preserving heritage resources at both the site scale and contributing to the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District as a whole?
- How well does the proposed development interface with the surrounding context and the public realm, in particular Woodbridge Avenue?

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator; Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Comments:**Summary**

- Panel noted a net improvement to the proposal, from the previous iteration, in regards to an increased building setback from the street (Woodbridge Avenue), the quieter industrial aesthetic of the proposed architecture, and the conservation of the heritage houses.
- Panel felt that the architectural proposal appears too big and too tall from the street level. The proposal is challenging in terms of scale, relationship to the ground plane, relationship to the upper level, and overall building articulation.

Site Layout

- The proposal does not make good use of existing grades, nor does it incorporate a historical reference to the relationship of buildings with the grade changes. In this segment of Woodbridge Avenue, the existing condition has rolling topography with buildings “floating” in the landscape. The existing cultural landscape creates transitions in grade with heritage building elevations that respond in their elevations and use to the various grades.
- In contrast to this approach, the development is proposing to level the grade and to extend the leveled built form character further west along Woodbridge Avenue. Grades are not being used to create connections with buildings or to transition towards a rising topography.
- The proposed ground-level condition does not contribute to the fine-grained, permeable, and interactive character of Woodbridge Ave. In the proposed design, there are limited doors opening directly to the ground level, and the use of light wells further compromises the condition at grade. The ground level condition behind the conserved portion of the heritage buildings is not welcoming.
- The increased setback from Woodbridge Avenue improves the streetscape from the first iteration. However, given that large trees are proposed to be removed and the boulevard flattened, a stronger contribution to the public realm could also be provided, such as a more spacious boulevard with trees and amenities.
- The configuration of the loading, parking, and drop off area off Wallace Street needs further consideration. The sidewalk on Wallace Street is severe and unwelcoming. The circuitous routing of pedestrians between the retail parking and retail destinations is problematic. Concern was expressed about the location of entry vestibules and the long overhang in terms of pedestrian navigation and experience. Site plan needs to be modified to create a more pleasant pedestrian environment for those parking at the back for retail or picking up or dropping off.

- Because of the grade difference, elevators could be added so that visitors arrive at the level above and come down one floor. Consider this entrance between the two heritage buildings.

Landscape Architecture

- Panel appreciated the comprehensive landscape package for review and saw a link between the diverse landscape material and the diverse materiality of the buildings. However, a more cohesive landscape frontage could be used to tie together the diverse architectural elevations.
- Privately Owned Publicly-Accessible Space (POPS)
 - It was felt that the Woodbridge Avenue landscape frontage could be further improved. The distribution of the buildings along Woodbridge Avenue creates a series of open spaces (POPS). However it was felt that more permeability of the buildings into these spaces is necessary.
 - Further consideration should be given to: How will the two POPS actually be used and activated? What makes the space usable? Is there an overlook (“eyes on”) onto the spaces? Is there an opportunity to make the POPS openings wider to be more inviting to the public and to be more tied into retail and lobby frontages? Need to pay attention to adjacencies and uses for a successful design.
 - The landscape plan of the POPS should offer an open, inviting landscape space. Provide active frontages onto the POPS, including side entry accessibility to the conserved heritage structures.
 - Wallace House may make a more successful contribution as an amenity, a retail or a restaurant, instead of the proposed residential.
 - Combine the two POPS to create one bigger amenity rather than two smaller spaces. The grade changes on the site are a challenge that can be worked through landscape architecture and architectural design.
 - The POPS fronting Woodbridge Avenue will be permanently in shadow. A break in the upper levels might allow some sunlight and skyviews, as well as articulation of the vertical plane.
- Panel would have liked to review the Arborist Report as it acknowledged that the cultural landscape with existing trees is as important a part of the heritage as the buildings.
- There are further opportunities for planting to soften the appearance of the building along Woodbridge Avenue.
- The corner of Wallace Street and Woodbridge Avenue could be opened up more.
- The armour stone retaining wall along Old Firehall Lane is a design issue now that this proposal is bringing aspects of the built form character and density of use, from

further east along Woodbridge Ave, up to this street corner. It creates a large barrier. Removal of the wall was recommended to expose the west façade of the heritage house and to connect the streetscape to grade-related uses within the new building.

Architecture

- This project must be studied in 3D to make sure the proposal works in terms of scale and massing in relation to the Heritage Conservation District.
- Panel noted that the review of this development should learn from previous developments along Woodbridge Avenue that have also levelled the topography and created single points of entrances that are grade separated, thereby creating a more aggressive street frontage and changing the character of Woodbridge Avenue. Panel noted that the 45 degree angular plane in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan is meant to adequately separate buildings and articulate a transition.
- Panel encouraged doing something honest with the heritage buildings. Perhaps it is better to attach the proposed mid-rise buildings to the heritage buildings instead of using false spandrel glass windows facing the backs of the heritage houses. Connecting the backs of heritage buildings with the new building would allow for more successful frontages onto the open spaces (POPS), by providing entrances and windows.
- As heritage buildings consist of more than one façade, keeping the heritage houses whole was recommended.
- The ground level experience is not welcoming or in keeping with an active Woodbridge Avenue character. The fine grain at ground level should be more permeable and responsive in its relationship to the grade. It is hard to understand the location of doors and windows in the drawings to understand what are the views and where are the entries. Doors need to appear on the elevations and sections. Ground related units should have doors at ground level and windows.
- The lower portion of the building feels restrained, quiet and resolved. Further development of the building envelope is recommended with respect to the relationship between brick and fenestration.
- More glazing on the ground floor level at the corner would open up the corner at Wallace Street. The punched windows in this location are not as successful, especially if you have a retail, café or restaurant use.
- Panel suggested modulating the three storey podium into three bays like the heritage building.
- The upper levels of the building need further development; a combination of applying a similar kind of fine-grain discipline as applied to the lower portion and mitigating the height.
 - Although the ambition is to make the top of the building visually disappear through the use of glass, Panel advised that the building will not visually

disappear, especially when conventional window wall systems and exhausts are used.

- The balconies create a distracting upper portion, which contribute to the sense of a large building. Recessing the balconies may help in this regard.
- A lack of breaks and lack of finer grain in the upper levels of the architecture creates a “relentless condition” that is not typical of Woodbridge and takes away from the character of the Heritage Conservation District.
- More active uses than the proposed residential were suggested for the heritage buildings: cafes, antique shops, etc. Creating side entrances to heritage buildings would provide access to POPS and animate those spaces.
- More architectural articulation is required between the three blocks. There is a lack of breaks in the mass on the upper levels. The back of the building contains an excessively long, uninterrupted façade that needs articulation. The stepping condition that is proposed on Wallace Street to the east could also be repeated on the west.
- Panel questioned whether a double loaded corridor could work in a building with a depth of 12.5 – 13 metres.
- In order to facilitate garbage and loading, and in case of a non-functioning elevator, it was suggested to locate two elevators together rather than the single elevators separated from each other.
- Panel highlighted the opportunity to animate the roof on top of the four storey building.

3. Pre-Application File Number: PAC.12.086

Applicant:	Stateview Homes
Architect:	A. Baldassarra Architect Inc.
Location:	89 and 99 Nashville Road, Kleinburg
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- Is the proposed built form and massing compatible with that of the Kleinburg – Nashville Heritage Conservation District?

- How does the proposed development connect with the commercial main street of Islington Avenue and transition with the existing residential? How could the development proposal improve and promote pedestrian activity and add to the vibrancy of the public realm?
- How could the heritage resources be integrated into the development proposal?

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Overview:

- The site is in the Kleinburg Heritage District. Panel strongly encouraged the applicant to include a heritage consultant as part of the design team as a contributing participant throughout the design process, and future presentations to the Panel.
- This development should create meaningful public and publicly accessible spaces between the building façade and the street. Although Panel noted this iteration is less inward-looking than the previous proposal, further development of the site plan is required to achieve a meaningful relationship with the community, and the heritage and landscape context.

Comments:

Site Layout

- Panel noted that Kleinburg is a draw and a destination, and as such, this gateway site does not need to be heralded with a large building. It was suggested that the representation of the image of the village on Highway 27 is misguided. Rather it was felt that this project needs to contribute in quality to provide value to its residents and to the context. It should successfully transition to the main core and better respond to its site and streetscape frontages.
- Panel felt that the designed landscape gateway area at Highway 27 and Nashville shows potential and encouraged conversation with the Region to implement it. Given that the proposed 3 metre building setback from the Highway 27 frontage is limited, the development needs to build a better relationship to the landscape. This landscape gateway element should be treated as prominently as the architecture.
- The proposed interior courtyard / piazza should be designed with further consideration for residents to be able to enjoy it. In sum, a paving pattern does not make a piazza. Panel suggested moving the piazza closer to the Nashville Road frontage so that it would be inviting for public use and removing parking spaces to create a space that will actually be used. It was further recommended to provide frontages with active uses.
- Panel discussed ways of distributing the mass on the site, such a rotating the L-shaped building so that its long façade ran along the eastern property line, creating an open space setback from Highway 27. Additional stepping of the mass facing

Highway 27 was also discussed as a way to reduce the scale of the building. Flipping the plan could allow for retention of the heritage asset at the corner of the site.

Landscaping

- Panel noted the large amount of cut, fill and use of retaining walls and called for a better relationship of the development to the existing landscape. It was suggested that the required cut can be used as fill for the area below the piazza.
- Creating severe slopes will create hazardous conditions. Panel noted that to be accessible space, slopes should be a maximum 3-4%.
- Panel asked if the landscape gateway work outside the property boundaries will be delivered as part of the project and suggested phasing the landscape if necessary with plans that reflect the existing pumping station as Phase 1 and without the pumping station as Phase 2.
- Panel felt that the 3 metre setback for landscape along the westerly property line (Highway 27 frontage) was insufficient. Increasing the setback would allow for tree planting between the property line and the building to screen and reinforce the architecture as required.

Architecture, Built Form

- The site is in the Kleinburg Heritage District and the two existing buildings are designated Part V, one of which is listed on the Register.
- Massing of the building is a misinterpretation of the Heritage Conservation District Guidelines, in that it is typologically a modern building. The application of different historical building styles applied onto the large scale massing reads like a collage. The architecture requires a more cohesive and simpler approach. Working with a heritage consultant would greatly benefit the development in this regard.
- Consideration should be given to breaking up the massing, perhaps into multiple buildings. Panel also suggested that the architecture does not have to contain excessive indentations in order to break up the massing.
- Panel commented on the Villagio building across the street as a building that responds better to its site and context. It was raised as an example of how to achieve density with greater simplicity, proportion and elegance, in contrast to the larger scale and extensive massing of the proposal. The durability of the brick used in the Villagio, as opposed to the proposed stucco, is more enduring and higher-quality, which is significant given that it is a gateway site to the community.
- Panel provided suggestions on how to better integrate the architecture with the landscape, to take advantage of the slope rather than relying on parking, plinth and elevators with excessive fill and retaining walls. Removing the ramp access from the south where it cuts the most, frees up land, creates views, and takes advantage of the slope in practical ways. This would retain the natural condition at the south edge of the property.

- Maintaining a strong street edge is a key challenge of the project. The overpass along Nashville was deemed heavy and out of place and did not reinforce this goal.
- The visual prominence of the parking structure from the public realm was deemed as significantly detracting from the gateway condition, the heritage character, the public realm surrounding the site, and the overall quality and experience of the development. Panel discouraged the two storeys of parking above grade as a frontage, and instead recommended active frontages and uses at grade.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 38 – September 24, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 24, 2015 in Committee Room 243,

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, ARK/Petroff

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, recording personnel

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict of interest for Item #1 and #3.

John Tassiopoulos declared a conflict of interest for item #1.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for June 25, 2015 and August 27, 2015 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

1. YRRT VMC Bus Terminal – SmartReit Terminal

Applicant:	York Region Rapid Transit Corporation
Architect:	Diamond Schmitt Architects
Location:	Applemill Road, Vaughan
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

- How well does the plaza integrate with the other public realm projects in the Mobility Hub?
- How successful is the architectural expression of the building as an important piece of public infrastructure?

Staff Presentation:

Amy Roots, VMC Project Manager, and Stephen Lue, Senior Planner

Overview:

- Panel acknowledged that the site forms an important part of the Mobility Hub in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan and has the potential to be a prime destination. The location of the station is generally integrated within the urban environment, but the architectural expression of the terminal needs further work to stand as a welcoming piece of civic infrastructure.
- Panel appreciated the simple and straight forward scheme. The plan is logical and derives its form from the function of the transit uses and pedestrian connections.

- Panel encouraged better celebration of the civic position of the terminal from an architectural and public realm perspective. The presence and integration of the canopy is an important feature that requires further design refinement. Given the terminal's adjacency to Millway Avenue and Transit Square, better integration of pedestrian movement, public art, landscape, and the cycling network into the current scheme is required.
- The Panel noted the importance of communicating how the project fits into the bigger picture of the Mobility Hub, beyond its transit function. The underground tunnel connecting the transit facilities should be part of the bigger picture. The Panel was interested in better understanding how the proposed surrounding developments will be integrated with the project.
- The Panel noted the potential for extension of the subway north of the Bus Terminal. It was suggested that this proposal consider future conditions for subway and transit facility expansions as well as for TOD growth and intensification as land values increase over time, even at a diagrammatic level.

Comments:

Site Layout

- Panel identified Millway Avenue as an important street in the VMC. As such, the terminal's frontage along Millway is an important one, and the streetscape design should be well integrated with the site plan, reducing physical and visual barriers.
- Panel expressed the importance of having a strong retail edge between the terminal and Millway Avenue in order to activate the site and continue the Millway function north and south.
- Panel suggested a potential drop-off to the terminal on the west side Millway Avenue where the proposed retail uses are located.
- Panel recognized two main axes to the project: a north-south and an east-west axis.
- North-South Axis: Panel encouraged visually extending Transit Square into the Entry Plaza to the south of the bus platform. The quality and richness of materials used should tie the transit station to the rest of the Mobility Hub and the architecture should frame the urban plaza. Consider running the stairs in the Concourse in the opposite direction in order to provide a view opening onto the plaza.
- East-West Axis: The proposed future Mixed-Use Building to the west should provide a pedestrian-oriented ground floor edge to the bus terminal. The proposed pedestrian spine running between both developments needs to be carefully considered and day-lit.
- The intensification of the VMC will have an impact on changing wind conditions in the area over time. Panel suggested flexible and movable wind screens to address changes in wind conditions as development of the area increases.
- Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure has not yet been resolved. Furthermore, pedestrian connections to the terminal and through the site need to be refined.

Landscaping and Public Art

- The design of the site should be coordinated with the landscape design for Transit Square so that it reads as a cohesive plan. Landscape design should have continuity across Applemill Road, stitching together the two sides of the street, and connecting into the interior of the building as a continuous ground plane. Landscape should also have continuity from the terminal into the Millway Avenue streetscape without creating an obstacle for pedestrians.
- Panel recognized the soffit surrounding and the ceiling inside the terminal as a potential site for public art.
- The project is at a stage of design development where an artist can be retained and can have a meaningful contribution. Panel advised against an 'art goes here' philosophy and urged the applicant to secure procurement for an artist as soon as possible.
- Considering the civic nature of the project, lighting the soffit becomes a prominent design potential. A dynamic treatment of the soffit and ceiling could tie into Claude Cormier's patterned design of the adjacent plaza.
- The expression of the wind screens needs to be studied further as potentially dominant vertical features in the project.

Architecture, Built Form

- For the bus terminal, the conditions that inform the design will change as the site densifies. In this regard, the bus terminal proposal should advance an integrated concept and a relationship to the adjacent civic square, for both a short- and long-term condition.
- Although Panel acknowledged the importance of having a busy bus terminal, like Grand Central Station in New York City, it questioned whether the waiting area was large enough to handle the future capacity of its users?
- With the intensification and the introduction of taller buildings to the area, Panel recommended paying close attention to the view from above. A roof plan should be included in the design-process and in the submission package.
- Panel commented that although the architecture has a simple and appealing shape that attracts attention, the architecture is currently 'safe'. The success of the project relies on the expression and quality of materials and as such should be of the highest quality.
- With relation to the scale of the proposal, the use of white precast concrete was questioned as it will become grey quickly and risks looking corporate, rather than civic. The architecture and the base it sits on could be monolithic, made from one material. Instead of using small precast blocks, something better and more precious was suggested.
- Panel wondered whether the functional aspects of the building, ticketing and elevator shaft, could be located off axis and tangential to the entrance, thereby opening up important sightlines. Locating bathrooms at the end of a hallway creates a safety/circulation issue and should be reconsidered.
- The scale of the platform doesn't feel sufficiently sheltered for pedestrians. Panel suggested that the scale of where people will stand be further reviewed.

2. File Number: DA.13.021

Applicant: Liberty 180-190 Maplecrete
Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.
Location: 2951 Regional Road 7
Review: Third Review

Introduction:

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

- How successful is the site organization in providing for pedestrian permeability and connectivity through the development and into the public park?
- How successful is the built form interface in animating the park?
- Please comment on the architectural expression of the built form, its impact on the pedestrian realm, and its design integration with the Highway (Regional Road) 7 streetscape.

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Comments:

Summary

- A strong and highly visible pedestrian connection to the mews and the revitalized Black Creek corridor through the site to Highway 7 should be an integral element to the site plan.
- The project would benefit from a clearer distinction between the public and private spheres.
- The built form needs to better define and contribute to the public realm and the pedestrian experience of it. The facades and uses facing the park need to be better considered to animate the park and create active edges.

Site Layout

- Panel recognized the tough conditions pedestrians currently face on Highway 7 and as a result the short-term challenges for retail that this poses for developments fronting onto Highway 7, until more development in the VMC takes place. However, more attention needs to be paid in designing a quality frontage that will animate Highway 7 and deliver the long-term vision for the area.
- The design of retail frontages along Highway 7 should consider the pedestrian movement and transit stops.

- It was felt that the connection from Highway 7 to the park through the buildings was not visible or public enough. Its entrance was not clear and instead should be treated as a prominent feature.
- Panel felt that pedestrian permeability and connectivity through the development and into the public park was not yet successful. Open and inviting linkages to the proposed park from Highway 7 would help it feel more like a public park. The park currently feels too introverted and cutoff from the public sphere.
- A diagonal connection through the site and onto the mews should be explored. To ensure connectivity of pedestrians to the revitalized Black Creek corridor, coordination with adjacent land owners is essential.
- Panel felt that the project could benefit from a clearer distinction between private and public. Perceptively, the driveway is not clearly accessible to the public by pedestrians, dividing the building from the park. The layout and lack of connectivity of the park makes it read as a private space.
- The interface of built form to park needs further development. The proposed ground floor uses– loading, valet parking – should be reevaluated to create a more public and animated connection with park. A strong edge with active uses should face the park.
- Back of house uses should be relocated so that they do not face the park, opening to south edge of the building for active retail uses. It was suggested that eliminating or significantly reducing the parking spots for valet parking would help increase the pedestrian and public appeal of the building/park interface. . Garbage/Recycling/Loading could be relocated to the P1 floor, thereby eliminating ramps facing the park. Access could be relocated onto Maplecrete Road.
- According to the shadow studies, the south tower casts significant shadows on the park. Its location should be reconsidered.

Landscape Architecture

- Panel recognized the use of a rich palette as well as a thoughtful, performative landscape that both referenced the curvilinear architecture, water systems, and Black Creek.
- Panel advised that the park design should take measures to address the quantity of people and dogs that will introduce a heavy load on the park and potentially destroy certain design components.
- The park layout should consider public programming needs, durability, and be more open to the public realm edges.
- Panel encouraged the introduction of public furniture such as benches into the streetscape setback frontage of Highway 7.

Architecture

- Regarding the architecture, Panel was disappointed with the evolution from the second to the third and current submission.

- Panel felt that the expression of the architecture, including variation in the facades, has been lost on this submission. The towers are generic and monotonous. The precedents shown on the package are not indicative of what is being proposed.
- Towers A and B should not be the same. Panel encouraged manipulating heights and shapes to provide more variety to the community. The balconies shift the expression from vertical to horizontal.
- The entrance canopy on the North Elevation needs to be reworked as it appears to use an architectural language not present in other parts of the project.
- The design of the podium feels underwhelming and driven more by the requirement of streetscape shop signage than by the need to create a street. As a result, engagement of the public realm is lost.

3. Draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Urban Design Guidelines

Location:	Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Design Firm:	regionalArchitects planningAlliance
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- Given the desire to maintain flexibility in the Guidelines, and the intention to use performance based guidelines, where appropriate, are there particular elements of the Plans related to these items that should be fixed? And are there others that can benefit from increased flexibility?
- Do the Character Areas represent the built form vision for the VMC?
- Do these Typical Block concepts respond to the unique context of each Character Area? (i.e. land uses, landscape, access to transit, or block dimensions)

Panel's Comments:

Overall Approach

- It was recognized that drafting the Urban Design Guidelines has been a participatory process. The intent of the guidelines is place making and supporting economic development. The challenge was ensuring a balance between prescription and flexibility.
- It was recognized that Urban Design Guidelines have limitations, preventing bad development but not necessarily ensuring excellence – therefore their implementation still requires a collaborative process and the engagement of urban design professionals.

- Guideline language (*shall, should, must, may, can, etc.*) needs to be cleaned up throughout for consistency.

Structure of document

- Panel felt that in general, the document was well structured and had a logical progression, organized in an index-based logic. It was also graphically attractive. The 'How to use this document' section is useful.
- Panel suggested inserting a more detailed key map / matrix providing clarity on how to read the cross references and annotations between sections.
- Panel identified the need for an overall summary sheet graphically depicting the relationship to other VMC documents and guidelines and clarifying the jurisdiction each one has.
- Suggest inserting text in the purpose that clarifies that this is a working document and will evolve and be reviewed as the VMC develops over time.
- The document could still use some refining regarding its organization. Section 6.0 Design Guidelines could be restructured into logical categories and formatted with bullets to ensure consistency with other sections.
- The landscape guidelines need to be further development. Use the word 'landscape' instead of 'landscaping'.
- The implementation section should include guidelines for transition. Phasing needs to demonstrate not only phasing of elements within a block, but transitions across blocks, heights, typologies, land uses and densities.
- Idea of implementing a pilot period to review how the document is working.
- Provide a 'Glossary of Definitions'.

Precedents

- Panel questioned the use of precedents and recognized that some were more appropriate than others. For example, the sections that showed colonnades in the VMC and stating that civic buildings should be inspired by classical architecture were criticized.
- Photographers are credited, but not architects and designers.
- Idea that precedents should be reviewed every 5 years for relevance.

Built Form

- Suggested the inclusion of cross sections across streets and blocks that explicitly demonstrate the quality and interface streetscape and built form.

Prescription vs. Flexibility

- Panel questions how much is regulated through the design guidelines. It was stated that in practice, a prescriptive approach is appreciated as it is useful in discussions with clients.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 39 – October 29, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, October 29, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Drew Sinclair, SvN (Vice Chair)

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

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, recording personnel

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design, recording personnel

Laura Janotta, Development Planning

Mary Caputo, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 24, 2015 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Riocan – Spring Farm

Applicant:	RioCan – Spring Farm
Architect:	Kirkor Architects
Location:	441 Clark Avenue West, Vaughan
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

- How successful is each masterplan option in encouraging pedestrian movement and presence, and developing connections to the York Hill District Park, the York Hill Elementary School and Garnet William Community Centre?
- How well does the proposed design respond to the street edge of Clark Avenue and Hilda Avenue?
- Please comment on the architectural expression of the built form, and its impact on the pedestrian realm.

Staff Presentation:

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer; Laura Janotta, Development Planning

Overview:

- Panel noted that the location of the site within a stable neighborhood surrounded by a school, community centre, commercial uses and park creates a prime destination in the community, and has the potential to be developed as a great example of successful mixed use intensification development.
- Panel encouraged greater pursuit of diagrammatic master plan options for the long term plan and considering the whole site cohesively. The phase one design has been detailed without commitment to a long term plan and with little accuracy. Given the density proposed, phasing plans should demonstrate a long term urban solution for parking, loading, and site organization including north-south connectivity.
- Provide more analysis of the existing character of the neighborhood, its architecture and the ways people access the site now and potential for the future (access to the existing park and walk, public transit, frontage relationship to the school and community centre.
- Panel commented that the six master plan options are all minor variations of the same proposal and recommended that the applicant explore different options starting with the long term vision for the site. The options should demonstrate how the logic of Phase one fits with the long term master plan and include a phasing plan unrestricted by the current format of Sobey's, exploring urban format options for the tenant. It was also recommended that future submissions to the panel indicate a preferred full build-out of the site, and illustrate how Phase fits.
- Of all the master options, Panel noted that options 1,2 and 3 are the least successful in creating porosity through the site, creating too much of a barrier between the street and community features of the area.
- The Panel noted the importance of the Sobey's retail on site and encouraged the applicant to engage Sobey's to participate in the design process. More attention should be paid to how phase one can be strategically leveraged to create a successful short term and long term phasing of the project.

Comments:

Site Layout

- The connection to the commercial center is not realized; the location of the mews is not ideal and the development should be flipped so the mews provide continuous connection to the retail and also to receive more direct sunlight.
- The mews was highlighted for its interesting placemaking potential, but more consideration needs to be given to its design and location for pedestrian activation of the space. It needs to either be in a different location to take advantage of pedestrian flows, or uses need to be double fronted. This condition is increasingly critical as the full site is developed.

- Panel felt that waiting 25 years for the vision to become reality is challenging and applicant should explore the opportunity to reformat the Sobey's in phase 1 to narrow the timeline gap between the two phases. Panel recommended exploration of an urban 2 storey retail format for Sobeys that would respond to the corner and to unlock the potential design opportunities for phase 2, including the potential to achieve the same proposed density through a mid-rise development format. The application is still a traditional car oriented development with one-storey retail with surface parking in front. The applicant should explore mixed use higher density urban retail options. A more urban form of retail store with 2 levels and better street frontages should be considered.
- There has been no attempt to connect to the community center, the park or the school, the applicant should consider mid-block physical and visual connections.
- The school should not be fronted by back doors and service lanes. The long-term option should provide the green spaces (and pedestrian connections) with active frontage; there should be townhouses facing the school with a public/semipublic road connection towards the park.
- The corner of Hilda Ave and Clark Ave is not robust enough in the design proposal; the corner should be designed with more importance rather than the proposed stack townhouses that turn their back to the street.
- The proposed application should consider fronting Clark Avenue with a commercial building. Parking should be concealed from the street.
- The site can benefit from more porosity towards the park. Since the parkland is land locked, the Panel recommended that the city obtain an easement for a public right of way north-south to access the park. An extra setback is also suggested on the south property boundary to provide a higher level of service and accessibility for the park from Hilda Avenue.
- The block is long at 118m wide east to west with no public right-of-way and would benefit from mid-block connections Panel recommended that dividing the development into 3 parcels; 2 parcel of mixed use development and 1 commercial will benefit the site in terms of walkable block proportions and site accessibility.
- Given the density proposed, the application should have a more urban cross section with all loading and parking underground and/or concealed from public view.

Landscaping and Public Art

- The Panel commended the application on its storm water management initiative.
- The landscape treatment of Clark Avenue needs to be reworked to provide a more active streetscape.
- It was noted that the majority of the site has been raised to accommodate the parking ramp.
- Mitigate the grade more generously on the corner of Hilda and Clarke Avenue and creating a wider path for more inviting public access should be explored.

- The connection to the street is confined by the grading; rethink the corner ramp to alleviate this issue.
- The underground parking structure does not seem to accommodate the planting depth required for proposed landscaping of the mews and the streetscape on Clark and Hilda. Explore short term public realm improvements that can be done to improve the site's accessibility.
- Consider flipping the multi-use trail path and the street trees on Clark Avenue to provide protection for the users from the street.
- The open space on the north side fronting the parking space may be challenging because of the grading change and should be further studied.

Architecture, Built Form

- The tower on the adjacent site does not in itself justify the need for a high rise building on this site. The opportunity to distribute the GFA on the whole site is not adequately explored. The site could accommodate the proposed GFA with midrise buildings.

2. File Number: DA.15.057

Applicant:	Camelot on 7 Inc.
Architect:	Richmond Architects Ltd.
Location:	4908 and 4902 Highway 7
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- How well does the proposed site plan orientation and building massing protect privacy for the neighbouring community and provide transitioning to its adjacencies?
- To what extent does the overall design strategy and site organization of the proposed development encourage pedestrian presence and activities within the site and on the nearby public realm?

Staff Presentation:

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Comments:

Summary

- Panel commended the client for being present at the meeting.
- A detailed comparison of the previous and current proposals should be provided and a Heritage Impact Assessment is necessary to understand the site from a cultural and natural heritage perspective.
- Panel recognized that the project is on a challenging site and that the proposal shows improvement from the first submission. The absence of an arcade in this submission along Highway 7 was seen as an improvement to engage the street.
- Although there are no detailed streetscape drawings yet for the design of the future Highway 7 rapidway, the standard vivaNext streetscape design should be referenced to integrate with the proposal, both vertically and horizontally.
- Grade level units fronting the street should be designed to allow for a future change of use into commercial units. By virtue of its high topographical position, the proposed building is an architectural landmark and therefore the expression of the building facing the cemetery needs to be designed as an enhancement to the view from the open space and from the valley.
- Greater attention should be paid to the landscape architectural and grading interface between the site and its neighbours, including the cemetery. For example, trees will not be allowed over the new sanitary easement.
- Because no HIA was provided, Panel had no information on the existing cultural heritage landscape and structures. However, it was noted that the preservation of a few trees in the back corner of the site is likely not a robust enough landscape plan.

Site Layout

- The relationship of the building to the valley to the west and to the property to the east needs to be further developed. Opportunities for visual and physical connections need to be better explored. More generous setbacks were also requested.
- Panel was critical of the location of the access point and the 3 point turn required by vehicles dropping off visitors to the building – resulting in a predominantly vehicle oriented frontage to the cemetery, at grade-level. Panel also questioned the location of the Amenity Space (Intermediate Floor) and its access to sunlight.

Landscape Architecture

- Panel felt that the existing grades are an opportunity and a challenge, and urged the applicant to be more knowledgeable about the grades. Better grading information and more cross section drawings are necessary for review.
- As the difference in grades is roughly 3.5 metres, roughly one storey in height, Panel felt that more retaining walls will be needed than are currently shown on the drawings. Also, it is unclear how the proposal transitions to neighbouring

sites. It appears that the common patio at the northern end of the site is at a different elevation than the neighbours to the north and east.

- Panel questioned what will happen to grades when the Highway 7 widening occurs.
- Panel was unclear about the tree replacement strategy and is certain that more replacement trees will be required. Retaining a few trees in the northwest corner of the site was not seen as sufficient. Panel was also concerned about trees added to the renderings that clearly do not exist on the landscape plan.
- Panel recommended a more intensive landscape investment along Hwy 7 and to investigate whether smaller planting was allowed within the storm easement.

Architecture

- Panel felt that there were too many architectural languages on the façade. Panel felt that the west elevation of the building was weak and encouraged further development of this façade. The best image of the building is not the loading, vehicle parking entrance and garbage. These elements need to be relocated and incorporated onto the built form.
- The west facing elevation, facing a cemetery and community centre, is a highly visible façade. As visitors of the cemetery have prominent views of the west elevation, panel encouraged presenting a more dignified architecture to the west. A more robust landscape screen might also help to soften the west elevation.
- Panel questioned the proposed location of the residential lobby and felt that it could be brought to the south west corner of the building. The residential entrance should address and have prominence on Highway 7.
- An office space with prominence on Highway 7 was felt as the wrong direction for Highway 7. Panel encouraged the applicant to think of the commercial façade on Highway 7 as a publicly accessible commercial space with the future users in mind.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 40 – November 26, 2015

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 26, 2015 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Drew Sinclair, SvN (Acting Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

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

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording personnel

Daniel Rende, Development Planning, Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Drew Sinclair in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Fung Lee declared a conflict of interest for Item #3.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for October 29, 2015 were approved.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Zzen – Midvale Mixed Use Development

Applicant:	Zzen Group of Companies Limited / Midvale Estates Ltd
Architect:	Graziani+Corazza
Location:	2938, 2966 & 2986 Highway 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, Vaughan
Review:	Second Review

Introduction:

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

- How successful is the site organization in providing for pedestrian permeability and connectivity between the development and the public park?
- How successful is the built form interface in animating the park?
- Please comment on the architectural expression of the built form, its impact on the pedestrian realm, and its design integration with the Highway 7 streetscape.

Staff Presentation:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Designer; Gerardo Paez Alonso, VMC Project Manager
Parks Development Department

Overview:

- The Panel appreciated the effort in the contemporary building design but noted that the challenging site conditions were resulting in a series of technical issues

that were being resolved at the expense of the public realm and pedestrian space. More gracious public and amenity space should be created at grade with more thought given to visibility and accessibility, function, access to daylight, and sufficient space for quality planting.

- The main issue of the site is the redundancy of the access, servicing and loading areas, reinforced by the symmetry of the design. As a result, efficiency of circulation is not being achieved, nor is permeability through the site. Cooperation between the landowners is highly encouraged.
- The continuity in the podium façade is overwhelming. Explore opportunities to create some relief in the streetwall through terracing or by introducing further breaks into the massing.
- The design of the north-south connections should be revisited, both centrally and to the east of the property. The 7m gap between the podium buildings and the inactive façade facing condition is harsh. The design should consider how this north-south edge will function over the long term as a safe pedestrian connection to Edgeley Pond/Park, and an appropriate architectural response should be provided.
- Active edges along the northern frontage should be explored to better integrate the design of the site with Edgeley Pond/Park and the east-west pedestrian connections. This edge will function as a busy pedestrian and recreational corridor. As such, the architectural response should be revisited.
- There are concerns regarding the safety of the pedestrian crossing the east-west connection considering the volume of traffic from the development and the Expo development.
- Add more dimensioning to the plans and provide cross sections.

Comments:

Site Layout

- The existence of four ramps creates many conflict points. Consider consolidating the two sites to have one loading area, one ramp system and one drop-off point to simplify circulation, solve some of the technical challenges, and liberate space for pedestrians.
- The role and vision for the roads should be revisited, as each connection is trying to solve pedestrian, vehicular and servicing needs, and none are working well.
- There are concerns regarding the safety of the pedestrian crossing along the east-west connection and the volume of traffic generated from this project and the adjacent development. The Jane Street entrance design gives a false sense of security to the pedestrian, given the amount of potential traffic. Carefully consider pedestrian access and safety.
- Choose one of the entrances as the primary vehicular access. If the main vehicular access to the site is the entrance from Highway 7, suggest turning the east-west connection into more of a pedestrian friendly connection and vice versa.

- Consider moving the residential lobbies north to provide some activation along the northern frontage.
- Consider chamfering the corners facing the central north-south connection and wrapping with active uses.

Landscape Architecture and Public Realm

- The site plan is telling of the technical issues in the project, as all the landscape detail is focused on public lands, with very little amenity or pedestrian space provided within the property. The small planting area shown within the site has no light. The project should revisit the design of the ground floor, particularly along the northern frontage.
- Panel questioned the need for four disparate zones within the plaza concept. The materiality of the plaza should be continuous.
- The plaza would be more successful if it engages more with the retail uses.
- Suggest incorporating Black Creek into the design of the plaza, with integrated storm water management design. The plaza should act as a threshold to Edgeley Pond/Park and needs to be more permeable.
- The north connection between the park and the development could act as a bridge. The design should be conceived more as a green corridor and read as an entire precinct seamlessly with the pond.
- The Panel appreciated the inclusion of precedent studies for the landscape design of the plaza but noted that the scale of the precedents do not match the scale of the plaza and asked the applicant to further investigate the elements of the plaza.
- The streetscape design needs to be coordinated with the vivaNext project including the VMC Highway 7 streetscape design.
- Concern with the depth of planting beds. Panel assumed the proposal is relying on use of structural soil cells to enable growth of a mature tree canopy.

Architecture, Built Form

- The massing is well conceived.
- While the frames on the podiums are a positive feature, the continuous streetwall should be broken up with more articulation and breaks in the architectural expression. The podium should be more permeable.
- The residential units in the podium facing north are not really viable and not providing any benefits for the park. Consider moving these units to the south façade and provide terracing and relief in the north elevation of the podium to reduce the overwhelming presence of the mass.
- The height of the ground floor on the east side seems too low to accommodate retail. Consider lifting the skirt on the podium, increasing the second floor elevation for the northern half of the development, and raising the soffit to provide

light and air to the interior and to introduce the potential for extending the residential lobbies north and creating a more animated rear to the retail portion of the podium.

- The podium landscape should be designed to provide a contributing edge to the streetscape.
- A wind study needs to be completed to test the impact of the massing and step backs on pedestrian comfort in the plaza and surrounding public realm.

2. Indigo Condominium

Applicant: York Major Holdings Inc.
Architect: Richmond Architects Ltd.
Location: 99 and 111 Eagle Rock Way
Review: Second Review

Introduction:

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

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

Staff Presentation:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Designer

Overview

- The Panel appreciated the quality of the submission and its level of detail as well as the architecture of the building and high quality materials used.
- The Panel questioned the location of the loading and servicing on Glenngarry Crescent, a residential street, and suggested that the applicant explore other options including Troon Avenue. Explore providing flexible spaces on the ground floor that could respond to short term and long term market demand, should retail not be viable in the short term.
- Further investigate the material quality, length and height of the passageway as well as the treatment of the Eagle Rock Way at the cross section to slow down vehicular traffic for safe pedestrian crossings.

Comments:

Site Organization

- Panel asked whether locating the servicing on the extension of the Troon Avenue next to Walmart's servicing area is an option for the site. The future of Troon Avenue should be visualized and considered through this project and adjacent landowners should be engaged to determine where servicing should be located.
- Panel liked the public realm face on Eagle Rock and main amenity elements facing the community on Glengarry Crescent.
- While the "backyard" of the building is the park where the amenity area is located the park is the front yard of the residential community. The building needs to have two frontages. One solution is to relocate the café to the south and the lobby to the north to have both north facing and south facing retail. The same thing can be done for the amenity space to improve the ground level function. Panel suggested flexibility of use on the ground floor, to start with rental residential units that can be repurposed for retail in the long term with simplified landscaping flexible enough to work for both retail and residential.
- The Panel expressed concern regarding the shallow depth of the ground level retail floor plates; while shallow depth works well for residential it is challenging for most retail operations. The Panel suggested reorganizing some of the amenity space to a rooftop which would allow the retail to extend all the way to the back of the building.
- Having the retail instead of the townhouses close to GO station will make the retail more successful. The east corner next to Walmart's service and loading area is not a good space for retail until the Walmart site is re-developed.

Landscape Architecture and Public Realm

- The mid-block connection across the Eagle Rock Way needs to be improved. In order to make the mid-block connection successful, the same width of the pedestrian link needs to carry through the Eagle Rock Way.
- Panel commended the attention paid to the landscape of the north side and would have liked to see how the south side will be treated with the same level of detail. The plan reads as one very long curb cut with potential conflicts between amenity and servicing. A very clear pedestrian connection along the north side of Glengarry Crescent is required.
- The parking layout on the south side should be revisited, including consideration of layby spaces if required. The design elements on the south side need to be in place to make sure the pedestrian connection is not used as an extra parking space.
- The amenity area would benefit from visual connection and continuity of design with the park.
- The Eagle Rock Way streetscape design has been thoughtfully considered, however, a simpler and flexible treatment of paving and trees planted at grade would create a better forecourt, with raised planters at the roof slab location.

Architecture, Built Form

- The Panel appreciated the carefully considered layout of the plan, and dynamic quality of the architecture. It was suggested that the façade is pulled back at the passageway to allow more light to penetrate the passageway.
- The passageway needs a stronger architectural expression to convey the message that it is a publically-accessible thoroughfare; for example, the soffit should be one level higher, the bridge between the two portions should be more indented to alleviate the bulk of the mass, and the materials used should convey the public sense of the path. Panel noted that the passageway will probably read better at night due to lighting.
- The architecture of the façade needs some breaks in the mass to reduce the perceived length of the building. Panel suggested some terracing at the top to give some dimension to the building.
- One way to diversify the façade could be to bring the brick treatment all the way to the ground where there are residential units.
- The opaque west elevation facing the GO Arrival is not welcoming if the intention is to have a welcoming gesture to the people exiting the GO station.
- Retail units at grade closer to the GO station would be a more welcoming and well used location attracting GO station users, rather than the proposed townhouse units.

3. York Region Affordable Housing Development

Applicant:	York Region / Housing York Inc.
Architect:	Kirkor Architects+Planners
Location:	259-275 Woodbridge Avenue & 64 Abell Avenue, Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

- How does the development contribute to the preservation of the heritage conservation district character and enhancement of the public realm?
- To what extent does the site organization, layout, and massing of the proposal create a safe, secure and healthy environment?
- How well does the development integrate with and transition to adjacent land uses?

Staff Presentation:

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer; Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Overview

- Panel recognized the successful logic of site organization in response to the highly unusual site, however given the change in topography; further refinement will be required to ensure safety (CPTED) and operational functionality.
- Redesign the upper portion of the façade to make it appear less institutional with focus on the proportions of the glazing, rigours of the facade, articulation, and materiality.
- The north-west portion space should become the focal point of the project. The vertical elements of the retail could reference the heritage character of the area.
- Location of the amenities should be further investigated.
- The architecture of the courtyard drop-off is very opaque and there are no eyes on the courtyard from the street or the building.

Comments:

Site Organization

- Main lobby entrance should be fronting the street for legibility and safety. Flipping the locations of the lobby and ramp would create a more prominent, active and dynamic context for the lobby entrance. Retail could be combined with the residential lobby entrance.
- The two lobbies – one at the front and one at the back – should be carefully considered with respect to the hierarchy of circulation and security.
- Panel noted that the retail is not connected to convenience parking or loading and that connectivity for loading on the south side to the retail on the north side should be further investigated.
- The south east parking, loading and servicing area next to the rail line should have further attention to its design given the lower level of “eyes on the space” in the area. A reduction of parking requirements would allow for the liberation of some of the ground plane to animate this rear space.
- The courtyard drop off has a second commercial front look but the internal uses (mail room, bike room) do not support the intended façade treatment.
- The transportation consultant will need to ensure that the sightline looking east along Woodbridge Avenue is sufficient for the proposed driveway.
- Provide proper screening between the type G loading and the outdoor amenity area on the south east.
- It was unclear where retaining walls or fencing are proposed, given conflicting information between plans and renderings. Panel advised that the accurate grade relationship to the neighbouring property should be represented in the renderings and described further in the site plan.

Landscape Architecture, Public Realm

- The Panel appreciated the well-rounded landscape design and amenities;

however the applicant needs to consider adjacencies, such a playground next to smoking area. In addition, screening may be required for some uses.

- Pedestrian connectivity through the site can be improved; a better relationship is needed between the lower drop off area and the upper level amenity area.
- Review the ratio of bike parking provided at north versus south entrances to meet contextual demands. More bike parking will likely be required at the Woodbridge Avenue entrance.
- There is no continuation of the sidewalk to the east (under the rail bridge). Consideration should be made as to how people living in this development will use the sidewalk and what improvements will need to be made for connectivity.
- The planting between the driveway and building to the west should be more substantial.
- If the lobby is reconfigured to front Woodbridge Avenue, recommend to pull back the landscape planting in order to draw the eye to the lobby and reinforce its prominence.

Architecture, Built Form

- The architectural expression is very “institutional” in appearance, looking bulky and flat.
- Revisit materiality, articulation, and fenestration pattern of the elevations with the goal of high quality architectural design that positively contributes to the character of the district and the resident’s sense of pride, honour and quality in the place they will live.
- Panel recommended the exploration of more durable materials than stucco, and also noted that the neighbouring condominium building to the west should not be used as a material precedent. Instead, the architectural theme should pay homage to the historic materials of Woodbridge and set the standard for the future of Woodbridge looking forward.
- A more “up and down” approach to the windows should be considered for ordering of the façade. Combined with a simplification of the material palette, would allow the NW corner element to become the focus of the façade.
- North facing windows do not require solar shading.
- The retail component has a very commercial plaza feel. Explore the expression of character and how it relates to the heritage district character to be more rooted in Woodbridge.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.