

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 60 – January 25, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of November 30 , 2017 Meeting

9:30 am

Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Block 2, QuadReal Residential Development 1st Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Jay Claggett, IBI Group

Russell Fleischer, Turner Fleischer Architects

10:40 am

Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 60 – January 25, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 26, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

STAFF

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Peter Turner declared a conflict of interest.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for November 30, 2017 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Block 2, QuadReal

Architecture:	Turner Fleischer Architects
Planner:	IBI Group
Location:	Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Review:	First Review

Introduction:

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

1. Please provide comments on the overall framework and site organization, including pedestrian circulation, amenity space, road network and linear park.
2. Please comment on the massing, height transition and microclimatic impact on the overall framework.

Overview:

Panel appreciated the well-developed presentation package and the willingness of the Applicant to receive feedback so early in the planning process. Panel commended the ambition of the development, and felt confident that a good human scale and material quality would be achieved through further design development.

Panel provided the following overall summary comments:

1. *Phasing of Development – consider the site at two scales:*
 - Ensure that the site is self-sufficient and functions as a standalone community in the initial build out of the VMC with respect to greater diversity of use and built form, and provision of public space.

- Ensure that the site is knitted into its broader context and relates well to its future planned surroundings, particularly with regards to street and hierarchy and linkages to the future parks and open spaces.
2. *Placemaking – create a heart for the site:*
 - Provide a parkette at centre of the site that is connected to indoor/outdoor amenity spaces to support the community.
 - Strengthen the mews / pedestrian connections with strong visual termini.
 3. *Greater Diversity*
 - Introduce greater diversity in building form, height and use.
 - Break up the long rows of townhomes, consider opportunities for framing visual termini, and introduce a change in architecture language that is punctuated at certain locations.
 - Create different characters for the pedestrian alleys to improve the way-finding strategy.
 4. *Create a Hierarchy of Open Spaces, Streets and Buildings*
 - Currently, Interchange Way is being structured as the only major street frontage. Strengthen Millway Avenue as a prominent street that could support higher density, particularly if the linear park proposal comes to fruition, and a gateway and primary route toward the subway.
 - If the linear park is to be maintained, active uses facing the park are strongly encouraged.
 - Consider thinning out the 15 storeys buildings and extend some of the density along the Millway Avenue frontage.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- Panel were concerned with the lack of variety and hierarchy of public spaces, amenities and streets in the project.
- Pedestrian connections and open spaces within the project are very functional and linear, act as flow spaces, but lack destination. While the linear park provides good connectivity to the larger park network in the quadrant, it will not serve as an everyday destination. Panel strongly encourage the design team to consider what pathways are terminating to, understanding how residents would move through the community.
- Panel challenged the design team to look at introducing a neighbourhood park concept as the anchor for the site, to which every other design move should relate (amenities, servicing, access to parking, etc). Panel commented that

they would appreciate seeing the options explored to understanding further design development.

- A different scale gathering space is required for the over 1,000 new residents that will occupy the community. Create a large central gathering space for the community and reconsider how to treat building edges to create smaller open spaces and courtyards that are functional. These at-grade spaces are great opportunities to build a sense of community. Greater amenity space should be provided, even if small scale, to provide spaces for families and children.
- Programming of the linear park and how it connects to the site need to be considered. If the linear park to the east and urban park to the north are key points of connection for the project in context, pick the streets that will be treated as the main pedestrian corridors to define a stronger hierarchy of connection. Ensure that these streets have a character that support pedestrian and retail activity.
- The alternative location of a public square at the north-east corner of the site is not appropriate with the current plan and uses.
- Re-examine the design of the pedestrian mews to introduce green spaces that can 'push and pull' into it. A strong entry point from the mews that connects to the linear park is missing.
- Panel questioned whether the townhouse units facing Interchange Way have the most appropriate relationship, and raised concerned that the project is relying on other owners for the quality of spaces for the Phase 1 units facing west.
- Given uncertainty around timing for redevelopment of the quadrant, the project has a responsibility to work as a stand-alone community. Ensure that the ground floor is "alive" with a place to meet and spend time.

Massing

- Panel were encouraged to see the introduction of different building forms for the VMC and felt the development was the right scale to create a tightly knit community. Notwithstanding this, Panel strongly encouraged the addition of other building typologies that will free up ground floor space by allowing for a more generous landing of tower and stepping down in massing from the tower to the townhouses. An intermediate scale (6-8 storeys) that provides a better transition from the 15-storey towers to 4-storey blocks is important. Transfer density lost by freeing up space in the plan to the missing building typology. This will "solve a lot of problems with a few moves".
- Tall building guidelines will need to be examined in terms of maximum building footprints for the tower portions about 10-storeys.
- Break the long view created by the repetitive alignment of the townhouse units along the mews by introducing different setbacks to support placemaking.

- The tight massing of the townhouse blocks results in internal pedestrian connections with little street frontage that generate issues in terms of circulation and wayfinding. Assign temporary areas as main gateways to provide easier access across the site
- The massing along Interchange Way is resulting in shadows across both sides of the street which will impact the viability of the ground floor active uses in the future development(s) to the north.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 61 – March 29, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of January 25, 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Dulcina, 8960 Jane Street

High-Rise Development, Phase 1A, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

City Park (Woodbridge Gates North) Inc.

260 Woodbridge Avenue

Mid-Rise Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Eugene Fera, Development Planning

Enzo Corazza, Graziani + Corazza Architects

12:05 pm

Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 61 – March 29, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 29, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

STAFF

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Katrina Guy, Cultural Heritage

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2018 were approved.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW**

1. Dulcina Investments Inc.

Architecture: Kirkor Architects
Planner: IBI Group
Location: Vaughan Mills Secondary Plan
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well do the proposed design concepts integrate and relate to the surrounding context, including the future transit hub, the adjacent commercial use and the proposed neighbourhood park?
2. How successful are the proposed designs in establishing an active street wall frontage that supports different uses at grade, promotes walkability and reflects the vision of the Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan as a vibrant, mixed use urban destination and transit oriented development?

Overview:

- Panel stated their disappointment with the insufficient information provided for the project and lack of representation from the involved parties. It is difficult for the members to provide fulsome comments when panel's questions are unanswered.
- Panel urged the applicant to carefully consider the relationship of the project to not only the existing context, but also to the future context of Vaughan Mills within the overall vision of the secondary plan. Considering this development is the first of many, it is imperative for the proposal to set an exemplary precedent for others to follow.

- While Panel understood the challenge that the placement of the buildings have been decided through the OMB, they asked the applicant to look at edges and ground floor relationships.
- Panel felt that there was no real thought process of integration of uses with the landscape design around the site, and questioned the relationship between the indoor and outdoor spaces.
- Panel urged the Applicant to continue to develop the architecture, understanding the relationship of the two towers and the impacts on the views and privacy for the windows facing each other, as well as the shadowing impact, and to try to mitigate those factors through design. Re-examine the value of the proposed arcades along the private park.
- Panel encouraged the Applicant to explore sustainable approaches to the building design and materiality, instead of employing the industry standard combination of window wall glass and precast concrete panels.
- Lastly, Panel requested that the Applicant explore the entry sequence and main entrance wayfinding for the pedestrian.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- Panel asked that the applicant look at pedestrian connectivity in the broader context, and re-examine and further develop the connectivity between the neighbourhood park, the private parks, transit hub and future transit stops along Jane Street.
- While it is clear that a lot of thought had been put into the design of the private open spaces, the design of the public spaces is bare in comparison and should be progressed to the same level of detail.
- The ground floor programs and the streetscape design of the westerly edge of the development needs to be more engaging with the Vaughan Mills Shopping Centre, transit hub and proposed neighbourhood park to the south.
- The panel cautioned the applicant about the amount of retail proposed in the development and the viability of retail along Jane Street within close proximity to Vaughan Mills Shopping Centre.
- The ground floor needs to be designed for pedestrians. If pedestrians on Jane Street are going to walk on the north side of the building, then the opportunity for safe pedestrian connection should be provided within the easement.
- Panel commented that the Block B private open space is almost entirely in shadow throughout all seasons and questioned the programming of the space.
- The microclimatic condition around the site should be further reviewed to ensure comfortable conditions in all seasons.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel expressed concerns with the large tower footprint and the 20 m separation distance, referring to the towers as bulky with little space in between. They asked for relief and permeability through introduction of slender tower footprints using angles and truncates and increasing separation distance.
- Considering that the main entrance to the building is not visible from the surrounding public streets, there is a need to clearly mark the entrance. Design the lobby to have multiple entrances from different sides, especially from Jane Street to allow for better pedestrian porosity.
- The servicing and loading on the north side should not take the entire frontage of the development. Internalize the loading and relocate the corridors connecting to the retail inside to allow some animation along the north frontage.
- Consider dedicating the north side to vehicular activities, such as servicing/loading, underground ramp access and drop off, and relocate the lobby out into the drop off area for more visibility, this will provide the opportunity for deeper retail along Jane Street and the south road, truly activating the front of the building.
- While it is acceptable to employ the precast window wall systems, there is an increasing expectation of Panel and the City to have better materials that reflect orientation and sustainability. Reconsider cladding and articulation of the façade to elevate the building above the industry standard, to distinguish the development, and respect the vision of the secondary plan.
- The ground level and the podium material should create an architectural expression that is different from the tower. Attention should be given to the design and finishes of the soffit, columns, lighting and canopies, adding architectural finesse into the pedestrian experience at grade.

2. City Park (Woodbridge Gates North) Inc.

Architecture: Graziani + Corazza Architects
Planner: Weston Consulting
Location: Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District
Review: 1st Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the proposed building massing and height fit into the surrounding context?
2. Is the proposed development compatible with the policies of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan?

Overview:

- Panel asked the Applicant to approach the project with three lenses; first respond to the village character of the Woodbridge Heritage District; second respond to Woodbridge Avenue as a main street, a destination and a place for gathering. And third respond to Woodbridge as a cultural landscape that includes the railway, bridges and native trees.
- The massive retaining wall has significantly diminished the character of Woodbridge as a cultural landscape. Panel recommended bringing the expertise of the Heritage Architect into the design development to add definition and sympathy through the heritage narrative.
- Panel stressed the importance of the required setbacks as regulatory frameworks whose purpose are to build a rationale around the heritage narrative. Currently there is a conflict between the 0 setback and residential frontage.
- Remove the drop off and bring the entrance close to Woodbridge Avenue to celebrate the street.
- The proposed underground parking leaves no opportunity for tree planting on the site. Bring an arborist into the design discussion for possible alternative solutions.
- The proposed materials and architectural style demonstrates a context sensitive response, bring that same awareness into the massing organization of the site.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- There is a need for a larger context plan to demonstrate the relationship to the application across the street, the grading around the and the opportunities and constraints. Provide cross sections north-south and east-west to demonstrate how the proposal relates to the broader context.
- Panel asked the Applicant to revisit the ground floor layout and consider exchanging the drop off location with the north amenity location to create a better frontage along Woodbridge Avenue.
- Panel questioned the appropriateness of the location of the loading and underground parking ramp and asked the Applicant to explore other options such as the west edge that may lead to better site layout with more opportunities for open space.
- Panel understood the Applicant's apprehension for including retail considering the constraints of the site across the street; however they asked the Applicant not to exclude retail as an option because the way the lower portion of this building lands on site provides a much better frontage for retail along Woodbridge Avenue.
- Use the railway setback as an opportunity to explore other uses that may be permitted within the required setback.

- Panel expressed their concerns with the proposed crash wall in terms of its scale, height and impact on the perception of the site, shading the space and hiding the trees. Panel asked the Applicant to consider the existing mature trees as assets that are worth preserving.
- The setbacks are so tight that it is almost impossible to put any significant landscape in the site. Extend the landscape forecourt of the heritage building into the site and reinforce the green frontage along Woodbridge Avenue. Increase the front setback for both the underground portion and the building to maintain the green character of the area.
- Propose similar compelling columnar trees that are existing in front of the adjacent heritage building to create a row of robust trees and provide more amenity to residents and privacy from sidewalk. This would also help to achieve the angular plane requirement.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel asked the Applicant to not only look at direct application of angular planes from cardinal points, but also to think of the buildings in the opposite side of the rail corridor and respond appropriately to nuances along Woodbridge Avenue.
- Panel commented on the extensive amount of hard surface and considered the massing too bulky for the site. If the proposed massing acknowledges and addresses the 45-degree angle from the street, and incorporates the recommended podium heights, the massing would be more suitable for the site.
- To further unify the look of the podium, Panel suggested reducing the podium height by one level and introducing a datum line to differentiate the plane and adjust the proportions.
- Because of the urban fabric of the area, it is important to protect the 4-storey edge along the street to preserve the pedestrian scale within the Heritage District. The podium rooftop could become an important amenity terrace.
- Panel expressed concerns with the depth of the building and its impact on the floor plan layout, such as the proposed lockers in the typical floors and irregularly shaped units.
- Panel praised the architectural language of the building and the approach to unify the building with a contemporary expression in brick. They also suggested to look beyond the residential buildings within the heritage context and at some of the industrial buildings by considering metal and warmer secondary materials such as wood or bronze to elevate the building elegance building with a more refined expression.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 62 – April 26, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of March 29 , 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Promenade Shopping Centre Revitalization Proposal, Promenade Limited Partnership, 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Christina Napoli, Development Planning

David Moore, WZMH Architects

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Company

10:40 am

Adjournment



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 62 – April 26, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 26, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.
Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD
John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc
Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

STAFF

Amy Roots, Urban Design
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design
Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design
Christina Napoli, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

None.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for March 29, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1.Promenade Shopping Centre Revitalization.

Architecture: WZMH Architects
Location: Promenade Mall
Review: 1st Review

Introduction:

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

1. How can the proposed overall scheme be improved to better create an urban environment based on the principles of “place making” allowing a diverse range of use and typologies to be incorporated to revive the mall to a vibrant destination complete with active walkable streets?
2. How successful is proposed phase 1 of the development in incorporating all the necessary components for the success of the future phases?

Overview:

- Panel thanked the applicant for bringing the development concept forward at such an early stage and stated the importance of getting feedback at this point. Panel emphasized the importance of understanding the relationship of the project with the upcoming Secondary Plan to ensure a better understanding of how the two plans will impact and inform one another.
- Panel acknowledged that the proposal has the potential to become the new heart of Thornhill District and asked the applicant to recognize the ambition and the immense opportunity this project presents to create a forward thinking, renewed center with appropriate volume of open space to support the growing population.
- Considering the proposed density of the ultimate built out, the proposal should recognize the future need for community resources such as schools, daycare, library expansion and open space amenities recognizing that the project is more than just visioning the

future of a mall but rather the future of a community and a region and needs to consider all present and future infrastructure layers.

- At the scale of the overall Master Plan, Panel asked the applicant to understand the character of development by looking at the scale and granularity of the blocks to establish a pedestrian friendly experience. Prepare a figure ground analysis to compare the development with other places (West Don Lands development was used as an example).
- Create a sense of arrival from each side of the development.
- Panel stated the need to achieve a land use balance in terms of the ratio of residential to commercial and public versus private space with consideration for providing opportunities within each phase to develop two-sided dynamic spaces.
- Panel was not convinced that the Promenade Circle needs to keep its existing alignment and suggested building some flexibility into the design of the roadway.
- Further evaluate the street sections with the notion of achieving pedestrian priority. Consider reducing the vehicular pavement width to expand the territory of the pedestrian realm.
- Panel was concerned about the distribution of the massing in Phase 1 of the development. Creating a single loaded street may not be successful at the initial stage.
- For Phase 1 of the development, Panel asked the applicant to evaluate other design options to achieve a north-south connection that can support vibrancy of the phase on its own as well as establishing a road network for the future success of the overall Master Plan.

Comments

Overall Master Plan

- Density alone does not ensure creation of a high quality urban condition if not supported appropriate programming and a robust open space network. There is a huge opportunity to create a foundation to guide the Master Plan through the establishment of a strong public realm, ensuring solid ground for future phases by laying out a flexible and robust framework that is less concerned with cars and emphasizes a continuous pedestrian experience.
- The design needs less granularity on Phase 1 A and more granularity at the Master Plan stage. Consider these four principles to further flush out ideas;
 1. Block Size: explore the idea of further breaking down the mall and the surrounding blocks as the proposed blocks are extremely long.
 2. Road Structure: explore changing the alignment of Promenade Circle for the segments that are flexible. Reevaluate the two proposed accesses from Bathurst Street, taking into consideration the location of the two existing traffic lights.

3. Open Space Structure: develop a comprehensive open space strategy with parks, woodlot, plazas and privately owned public spaces. Create a stronger sense of arrival to the mall, provide a heart for the development, and pepper blocks with residential open spaces. Further explore the design of the east-west and north-south connections that directs the pedestrian to the center of the mall.
 4. Land Use: explore how the land uses transition from the outer edges to the interior of the mall. The street and block pattern may unlock further potential with regards to land use transition.
- While the overall vision for the project is very bold with respect to the proposed program, the street network as the foundational piece of the plan is relatively timid in its approach to the future public road network and how it connects the development to the surrounding context. While the Promenade Circle configuration has fixed edges on the northwest and southeast quadrants dictated by the existing high-rise developments, in the other areas there is an opportunity to rethink the connections to improve the overall Master Plan.
 - The west edge of the mall is completely exposed and acts as the back of the building. Panel suggested exploring relocation of Promenade Circle to add a layer of buildings to create an active façade on that edge.
 - If the retail street is to be the “high street” acting as a destination on the east side of the mall, then there is need for a “low street” on the west side to strengthen that edge. The “low street” should have a distinct character serving the needs of the residents in the Master Plan.
 - Panel compared the scale of the project to other recently built precincts in the GTA with roughly the same footprint and noted that the project is big enough to have distinct neighbourhoods with distinct characters in terms of the public realm, and the scale of buildings. The plan has interesting quadrants such as the park/open space quadrant, transit/civic quadrant, high density mixed-use quadrant, and the south residential quadrant. Panel requested that the applicant explore emphasizing the identities of each quadrants to create a more varied Master Plan.

Phasing

- Panel noted that renewing a mall of this scale is extremely hard and a complex with respect to economic viability. While There are related literatures with regards to mall revitalizations, they are usually modest in their proposed changes or contrarily the change is to demolish the mall entirely. This project is unique in its ambition to save the mall and incorporate additional density. The challenge for such an ambitious project is to set the stage for a successful Phase 1 that would enable the Master Plan vision to manifest effectively.
- Resolving the extension of Promenade Street in the early phases to connect to Disera Drive to reinforce its character as the main/high street is critical to achieve the Master Plan vision. This will improve the street condition providing pedestrian connectivity with

at grade retail. Panel asked the applicant to explore the opportunities for the T&T Supermarket to relocate to Phase 1 for the extension to Disera Drive to be constructed as part of Phase 2. Development of the lots along the main street should also be considered in the early phases since retail streets need a sense of enclosure with frontage on both sides to be successful. Consider an interim condition to frame both sides at minimum.

- While evaluating the phasing of the project, Panel suggested the plaza connecting to Bathurst Street be constructed as part of Phase 2 acting as the local public place in the short term. Blocks adjacent to Bathurst Street should also be constructed in the early phases of the development to create a stronger urban frontage along Bathurst Street. The transit terminal and community center may be considered as part of the later phases of the development.
- Panel emphasized the importance of exploring the pedestrian circulation network in all phases, overlaying the cycling and pedestrian network on the phasing diagram to better understand the gaps in the design. Panel stressed the need to understand how a pedestrian could walk from Clark Avenue to Centre Street prior to the construction of Phase 2.
- In the planning of the Phase 1, Panel requested reevaluating the location of Tower A in light of the possibility of Promenade Circle's realignment. The current location of Tower A may be too far south and the tower may need to be shifted slightly to the north for a better realignment of the road.

Open Space and Public Realm

- Considering the magnitude of the project, open spaces need to be more urban in character to enable flexible programming. The size of the park in the overall Master Plan seems small. Smaller parks can act like bigger parks but they must be extremely well connected, with exquisite design, and framed with active uses.
- Panel asked the applicant to be cognizant of the location and the size of the private exterior spaces such as privately owned public spaces, and amenities as they will not be successful if located internal to the block and orphaned from the street network. These spaces should be located at the corners, connected to the streets and framed with proper uses for activation.
- Panel questioned the size of the plaza and whether it is sufficiently activated, Panel suggested that instead of a large plaza, the applicant should consider a well-designed mews connecting to the pedestrian atrium.
- To strengthen the Master Plan, Panel asked the applicant to review the existing and future context of the development for stronger place making opportunities incorporating an open space strategy consisting of both hard and softscape that better relates to the future civic infrastructure. As an example, Panel suggested switching the location of the transit hub with the community center, and proposing an open space next to the

community center functioning both as an outdoor amenity for the center and a neighbourhood park for the residents.

- Panel expressed concern about the safety of the existing crosswalks as the main access points on Promenade Circle and asked the applicant to look at the overall character of the road and provide opportunities for safer crossings.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 63 – May 31, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of April 26 , 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Dulcina Development (Greenpark) Block B, 8960 Jane Street High-Rise Development, Phase 1B, 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Charles Gane, Core Architects

Gus Maurano, MBTW Group

10:40 am

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 63 – May 31, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, May 31, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

STAFF

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

None.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for April 26, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

Dulcina Development (Greenpark) Block B

Architecture: Core Architects

Landscape MBTW Group

Location: Vaughan Mills Secondary Plan

Review: 1st Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the proposed design concept integrate and relate to the surrounding context, including the Block A, and the proposed neighbourhood park?
2. How successful is the proposed design in establishing an active street wall frontage that supports different uses at grade, promotes walkability and reflects the vision of the Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan as a vibrant, mixed use urban destination and transit oriented development?

Overview:

Comments

- Overall, Panel categorized the comments into three categories;
 1. Context;
 - While Panel recognized the complexity of the proposal within a changing context, they recommended further evaluating the design and the programming in relation to the existing shopping centre, Phase 1 Block A, Phase 2 Block C and the

secondary plan to better integrate the development into the future of Vaughn Mills Centre;

- Panel encouraged the applicant to further invest in background studies such as transportation analysis, retail analysis, pedestrian level wind study, and shadow study considering both interim and ultimate context to better understand the reality of the streetscape.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to look at the site holistically in terms of pedestrian connectivity, future character of Jane Street and the mall.

2. Ground floor plan;

- Panel was concerned about the location of parking ramp and loading space as the visual terminus of the east-west road, blocking the pedestrian desire line between the development and the park. They recommended the development to look at Block A and respond similarly in terms of serving and loading.
- Panel advised the applicant to consider a more intimate grouping of the amenity spaces to bring residents together rather than dispersing them in different levels.
- Panel asked the applicant to revisit the proposed uses that are flanking the park. The indoor recreational space should be easily accessible by both public and the residents from the park and Jane Street.

3. Massing and materials

- Panel appreciated the broad design moves such as the L-shape form and the towers orientation, but recommended evaluating the solar alignment of the towers that may inspire deeper recesses in the balconies of the south facing glazed façade.
- Create a prominent entrance on Jane Street by forming a break in the design rhythm that could reflect in the floors above and providing relief in the long facade of the podium, and the tower balconies.
- The architectural language of the penthouses is not reflected in the programming of the space which is mainly a mechanical room, and the form is not reflected in any other part of the design. In general, Panel felt that there is disconnect between the curvilinear form, its program and the rest of the proposal.
- Panel encouraged the Applicant to explore sustainable approaches to the building design and materiality instead of employing the industry standard combination of window wall glass and precast concrete panels.

Site Organization and Public Realm

- It is important to understand how the entire site will be developed in the future. Review the overall site and classify the ground floor uses into different zone categories to create a place with corresponding zones in close proximity.
- Panel questioned the location of the loading and parking access and asked the applicant to take into consideration the impact of this development on the possible layout of the future Block C and how these two blocks contribute to the vision of the central spine.

Panel recommended creating a situation where both servicing/loading bays can be aligned away from the main pedestrian routes and building entrances.

- Panel noted that the west façade should better address the park and suggested living walls, or townhouses as two potential approaches to the park frontage.
- While Panel understood that not every edge can be vibrant, they stated that the residential courtyard edge next to the park will be the edge with the most pedestrian traffic. This area currently has the most conflict between the pedestrian and the vehicular/ truck traffic. Relocating the loading and ramp to the north building and proposing townhouses on the park can resolve this conflict.
- Panel stressed concerns about the design approach to commercial use and asked the applicant to review the viability of retail. Panel asked the applicant to generate a retail vision, understanding how retail traffic is driven, and what type of retail will be successful in the area. If restaurants are viable then provide an opportunity to make a food scene statement, creating a flexible space by the park to leverage food.
- Panel felt that “the project is drowning in public realm” and that there is not enough people to populate all the open spaces and the streets. Panel questioned the necessity of the private parkette to the north since the parkette is in shade most of the time and that there are two other more generous open spaces in close proximity. Panel suggested the applicant to re-examine the public realm plan with an understanding of pedestrian destinations and desire lines, tightening the space to create a more animated place.
- Panel asked the applicant to review the location of the indoor recreation centre in order to provide better visibility and access to the centre.
- The project has a strong east-west axial relationship that ties to Jane Street on the east but faces the back of the mall on the west. Panel proposed revising the design to create a north-south axial relationship with Block A main entrance to the north and Block B main entrance and the park to the south.
- Panel asked the applicant to look at the project from inside out, understanding how people will use the space and provide the necessary connections. Create a front door to the park and propose amenity spaces in proximity to each other to increase the opportunity for the residents to meet.

Architecture

- Panel appreciated the break in the façade module differentiating the long facade from the short one, and asked if is there a way to further break the long facades and the balconies?
- Panel appreciated the architecture and the massing of the proposal and stated that the L- shape configuration is interesting, and the building is elegant. However, the podium should be further articulated to further emphasize the entry point.
- Panel questioned the design of the penthouses and referred to them as overpowering, and asked the applicant to review the design considering that the towers are elegant by themselves.

- While the perspective renderings detail the penthouses with curtain wall glass filled with light similar to a sky lobby, the program of the space is dominated with mechanical room. Panel also noted that the curved form has not been replicated anywhere else in the design. Overall, Panel felt that the penthouses are unnecessary and more of an add-on to the project rather than being an integrated part of the project.
- Panel asked the applicant to explore a variety of materials and look beyond the industry standard of precast panels incorporating more sustainable materials.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 64 – June 28, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of May 31 , 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Indigo Phase 3 - 120 Eagle Rock Way High-Rise, Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Shahrazad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Les Klein, Quadrangle Architects

Ryan Mino, KLM Planning

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

2338 Major Mackenzie Inc. Low-Rise, Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Kregg Fordyce, KFA Architects

Julia Pierdon, Weston Consulting

12:05 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 64 – June 28, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 28, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Absent

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Katrina Guy, Cultural Heritage Coordinator
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning
Mark Antoine, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

None.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for May 30, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Indigo Phase III (York Major Holding)

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects
Location: Maple GO Station Secondary Plan
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction:

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

1. How successful is the revised proposal in responding to the first round of DRP comments related to;
 - a. Massing and scale of the development within the context of the maple GO station and Indigo Phase 1& 2.
 - b. Responding to the grade, and the adjacent transit facilities.

Overview:

- Panel complimented the evolution of the proposal and appreciated that many of the comments from the first round have been incorporated. Panel also commended the applicant for its efforts to reduce the floor plate of the tower.
- Panel requested the applicant to continue the conversation with Metrolinx and strongly urged Metrolinx to be part of this project to successfully set the stage for a transit oriented hub catering to all users.

- Panel stated that the project's design direction should prioritize the needs of the pedestrians over the buses and cars.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to view the plaza (both upper and lower levels) as a place to linger, and design the landscape elements and its materiality to convey the sense of one continuous space responding to the needs of retail.
- Panel asked the applicant to ensure that elevation articulation, materiality and the architectural expression maintain their quality and are not value engineered.

Comments

Site and Streetscape

- Panel stated that collaboration with Metrolinx is imperative for the success of the two projects and asked if there are opportunities for further partnership with Metrolinx Site such as removing some of the parking spots from the p2 level and repurposing the area for active use, or incorporating the loading through the Metrolinx site to create a better frontage on the north elevation. Loading relocation will allow for the lobby to move west to propose retail along the promenade.
- Panel noted that proposing the feature pavement in the lower plaza is appropriate since the area is a destination at the end of a sequence of urban spaces but asked the applicant to consider the entire cul-de-sac, incorporating the center feature and the other side into the design creating a huge plaza that happens to have buses. Panel used Seville's Plaza Nueva as a precedent where trams go through the plaza with a slow speed and noted that there is no conflict between different modes of transportation when the speed is lowered to ensure safety of all.
- Panel questioned the location and design of the proposed two softscape areas on the lower plaza. Considering these areas are blocking the pedestrian desire line from the east to the station and are located adjacent to the coffee shop, Panel suggested to remove/reduce the expanse of the areas, and extend the staircase west. Panel also proposed to revise the design utilizing the grade change for seating around the coffee shop and providing walkway opportunities.
- Panel asked for the north south pedestrian/cyclist crossing to be implemented in front of the pedestrian promenade. They noted that Eagle Rock Way will be a very busy roadway with an inherent conflict between pedestrians and buses, noting that the cyclists also need to dismount in this area to cross the road to access the GO cyclist facility in the parking structure. Panel asked the design team to ensure the curb radii to the south are as tight as possible to promote safe crossings.
- Pavement is an intuitive method of wayfinding, Panel suggested to extend the pavement feature to the upper plaza for the two spaces to have the same language, to be visually connected and considered as one continuous space.
- Panel asked the applicant to explore LID features within the landscape planters on the Eagle Rock Way and ensure that the proposed stramp does not require railing.

Architecture

- Panel recommended to turn the glass staircase into a grand feature producing a terrific land mark at the end of the street.
- Panel stated that the architectural articulation needs to wrap around the north elevation to create a more articulated façade on the north side.
- Panel suggested providing a straight forward access to Go Parking for the residents of the condominium.
- As an alternative ground floor layout, Panel suggested the applicant to explore flipping the retail and lobby to give retail three-sided frontage.
- While Panel appreciated the proposed Bike Repair Shop they questioned the associated bike parking since Metrolinx bike facility is across the street.
- Panel appreciated the architectural articulation and the use of brick as the main material, and asked for commitment to the quality design and proper attention to resolving the layout of bricks on the curves.

Public Art

- As a potential location for Public Art, Panel suggested since Metrolinx Public Art is on the retaining wall that the applicant's public Art rises from the wall and nestles into the site tying the two pieces together.
- As another alternative to the proposed Public Art location, Panel suggested to consider the crystal box (glass fire exit) as the potential Public Art.

2. 2338 Major Mackenzie Drive

Architecture: KFA Architects
Location: Maple Heritage District
Review: 1st Review

Introduction:

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

1. Please provide comments on the overall framework and site organization including building orientation, pedestrian circulation, amenity area, and servicing/loading.
2. How successful is the interface along Major Mackenzie Drive in the context of Maple Heritage District?

Overview:

- Panel questioned the site layout, stating that many units are facing either the ramp, the gaps in-between or the side of the neighbouring properties and the proposed open space is tucked behind parking spots and permanently in shade. Panel proposed the applicant to look at alternative L-shaped or C-shaped built forms that could provide a better layout for the site.

- Panel stated that in response to the Heritage District, the proposal has mainly emphasized the architectural style ignoring the character of the district and the overall story of the main street as the commercial core for the district. Retail is a major part of the character of the area but the two proposed retail spaces with the large gap in-between do not positively contribute to the main street character.
- The site should have a compelling story; as one walks through the site, one should have a positive experience. It is hard to imagine how the residents walk to their units on the sidewalks that are located next to privacy fence.
- Panel stated that servicing and loading are dominating elements in the proposal, and the design should be revised to imbed the ramp into the building and locate the loading closer to Major Mackenzie drive.
- Panel mentioned the rich and robust vegetation character of the Maple Heritage District and noted that an increase in density requires a rich canopy of trees and vegetation to support it. In general, Panel questioned the removal of all the trees and the lack of opportunity to reestablish the canopy within the proposal.

Comments

Site Layout

- Looking at the larger context, Panel asked if the applicant or the City is looking at opportunities to consolidate access with adjacent land owners and carry a laneway system to help mitigate the traffic along Major Mackenzie Drive.
- Panel asked the applicant to use “People’s Place” as a lens to review their design stating the design is not very people friendly. Panel questioned the quality of the edges on the east and west of the site, forcing pedestrians to walk next to the outbuilding and transformer to access their units.
- Panel stated that pulling the vehicular traffic all the way through the site is problematic. They suggested to push the ramp and loading closer to Major Mackenzie Drive and separate retail parking activity from the residential core.
- Panel felt that the proposal has looked at the site on its own and not in the context, they felt the proposed symmetry was a wrong move for the site considering the symmetry starts to functionally break down as one enters the site. They suggested to consolidate the ramp and loading either on the east or the west of the site and locate the open space where it receives ample sun exposure.
- Panel called the sunken terraces “mean and uninhabitable” and raised the issue of safety where 6-foot-high walls separate pedestrians from being viewed.

Landscape

- Panel expressed concerns about the extent of the parking garage slab resulting in the removal of all the trees instead of proposing a second level. They asked the applicant to look at the existing trees as an asset to their site.
- Panel mentioned that the amenity space is very small and the visitor parking spots in front of the space is exacerbating the situation. One alternative is to join the landscape

buffer to the north and the amenity to maximize the opportunity for amenity space. Panel also noted that moving the driveway may provide opportunities for a prominent central open space.

- Panel noticed that the proposed soil volume is half of what a large tree needs to reach maturity and stated that If the applicant is to remove every other tree from their design then it becomes clear that the site doesn't have sufficient tree canopy.
- In general, Panel felt that landscape has been a remnant after thought and asked the applicant to bring landscape to the forefront of design by protecting existing trees on site and along street, creating a large amenity space in a sunny spot and provide enough soil volumes for trees to grow to maturity.

Architecture

- Panel stated that the design has missed the opportunity to create a mixed-use development in a built form that is appropriate in massing and scale along Major Mackenzie Drive.
- Panel questioned the style of the architecture along Major Mackenzie Drive and the proposed step back of the residential portion on top of the retail. They felt that retail was added to a residential style and that second empire style is not suitable for the mixed-use building. Panel proposed the applicant to look at Victorian commercial buildings or stagecoach houses with a straight three storey to better address Major Mackenzie Drive.
- Panel also questioned how the architectural style relates to our time and proposed not to recreate the style but rather a system of proportions and materials that relates to the heritage Character of the District.
- If the applicant wants to differentiate the retail from the residential within the mixed-use building, Panel suggested to change the materiality between the two uses.
- Panel also suggested a porte-cochere design to create a visually continues street wall along Major McKenzie Drive.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 65 – August 30, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of June 28 , 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

7082 Islington Avenue (Sterling + Primont) High-Rise Residential, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Natalie Wong, Development Planning

Sabrina Sgotto, Weston Consulting

Sami Kazemi, Quadrangle Architects

Ladan Sadeghian, NAK Design Strategies

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Dulcina Block B, 8960 Jane Street (Greenpark) High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, Phase 1B, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Charles Gane, Core Architects

Gus Maurano, MBTW Group

12:05 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 65 – August 30, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, August 30, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Absent

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Natalie Wong, Development Planning

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

None.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for July 26, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. 7082 Islington Avenue (Sterling + Primont), Phase 2

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects

Location: Steeles and Islington

Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

How successful is the revised proposal in responding to the first round of DRP comments related to:

1. Creating a strong relationship to Islington Avenue that supports more pedestrian movement and street life.
2. Providing a friendlier transition and spatial relationship to the neighbouring community and open space system.

Overview

Panel provided the following recommendations for the proposal:

- Explore ways to improve the visual and physical connectivity to the valley and to Islington Avenue. Use landscape design to connect the project to the valley. To celebrate the natural features and heritage of the site, provide access, view and penetration.
- Use diagrams to explore the big picture ideas regarding pedestrian circulation and views.

- The interfaces along the perimeter of the site require careful attention:
 - There is a strong desire line for a connection to Islington Avenue along the railway corridor; to facilitate this connection, the grade differences should be resolved. Is there a possibility to provide entrance from the outside to the units along that edge?
 - Provide an alternative architectural design solution to the blank wall that faces the townhouses at the ground level.
- The open space is dominated and bisected by vehicular circulation; explore ways to disconnect the two to provide an integrated open amenity space.
- The 20m separation distance (16m between balconies) between towers 1 and 2 and between towers 3 and 4 creates a “pinch point” and limits the views to the valley. Consider a flexible and variable design for the towers to reduce the impact of the tower separation.

Comments

Site Layout

- All the development phases should be designed in an integrated manner.
- The reconfiguration of the townhouses from the previous iteration has privatized the valley lands. Panel asked the applicant to consider removing some of the townhouse blocks (e.g. block 9, 13, 14) and absorbing the density in the towers to provide stronger connections and views to the valley lands.
- Panel asked the applicant to consider pedestrian connectivity within the overall site and to Islington Avenue and the TRCA lands. Also, to explore ways to open and improve the future trail connection along the west edge of the site (phase 2).
- The outdoor amenity space is cut into two parts by proposed vehicular circulation to the underground parking, loading, and visitor parking, and is faced by the service area. Panel suggested the applicant to consider the following ways to consolidate this space and to provide better connection to the building face:
 - Explore an option to provide the drop-off area west of tower 2 at a higher elevation such as level 1.
 - Combine the access to the loading and underground parking with the relocated drop-off area at level 1; alternatively, relocate the service access below the outdoor amenity space.
 - Consider moving all the visitor parking spaces to the eastern parkette.
- The design of open space along the railway corridor should be improved to provide a proper pedestrian connection to Islington Avenue.
- Consider combining the loading areas for all the towers.
- The project serves as a gateway to the valley, but currently the connection to Islington Avenue only acts as a vehicular access. Explore opportunities to extend the nature into the site towards Islington Avenue through design and materiality.

- For the townhouses facing the railway, consider providing privacy by other means than fences to bring the nature into the site. Alternatively, adjust the levels of the units to follow the grade and provide them with entrances from the outside.
- The proposed layout of phase 2 (towers 3 and 4) is shown as a mirror of phase 1, however the conditions of the two sides are different and the layout should be adapted to respond to those different conditions.
- Provide cross sections to demonstrate the grades in the site.

Landscape

- Panel cautioned the applicant to ensure that the strong geometry of the pattern does not confine the overall circulation within the site. Consider subtler moves closer to TRCA lands to ensure that the desired east-west pedestrian connectivity is achieved.
- An integrated landscape master plan is required for all phases.
- Explore how the outdoor amenity space can be connected between the 4 towers cross the road.
- Threshold spaces along Islington Avenue and the railway corridor should be considered holistically.
- A more gradual transition from private to public realm along Islington Avenue is required.

Architecture

- The tower separation distance impacts privacy, limits views, blocks the morning sun on the outdoor amenity space and creates an adverse wind condition. It is important to increase the separation distance to alleviate those conditions. As an option, Panel suggested to increase the building height while maintaining the density; this allows slender towers and increases the tower separation.
- Consider higher heights along Islington Avenue and lower heights further away to provide a height transition to the townhouses. Another alternative is to rearrange the tower heights as high-low-high-low to reduce the impact of the limited separation distance.
- Consider increasing the height of the podium elements to provide a stronger edge along Islington Avenue.
- The underground parking has a blank wall facing the townhouses. Revisit this threshold area and introduce podium townhouses at the edge of the parking to create an active edge.
- While the curvilinear vs. rectilinear differentiation between the Islington facade and the other facades of the towers is a nice gesture, it is insufficient to address climatic considerations; the materiality and the design of the balconies should also reflect the solar orientation and micro-climatic conditions of the site.
- Consider a better access to the lobby, currently the access from Islington is complicated.
- Consider linking the 4th level indoor amenity spaces of phase 1.

2. 8960 Jane Street (Greenpark), Dulcina Block B, Phase 1B

Architecture: Core Architects
Location: Vaughan Mills
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

How successful is the revised proposal in responding to the first round of DRP comments related to:

1. The overall site organization within the broader existing and future context, through the lenses of pedestrian connectivity, retail feasibility and transportation.
2. The layout of the ground floor plan providing clear wayfinding, maximizing active frontages, and bringing residents together.
3. The architectural language and materiality of the building complex both aesthetically, in consideration of sustainable approaches and in response to the context.

Overview

- Panel appreciated the applicant's efforts to address the first round of DRP's comments.
- Panel asked the applicant to re-examine the south west corner of the site and its interplay with the park. The current configuration has resulted in a blank wall with special glazing where it is highly visible, relocating the loading somewhere else will resolve this issue.
- Panel asked for a clear rationale for the orientation and design of the facades and how they respond to sustainable approaches and solar orientation.
- Panel asked the applicant to refine the building and open space interface, consider the visibility of the recreation centre and provide a clear access wayfinding.
- Panel questioned the character of the internal street and whether it is appropriate for a market lane.
- Panel asked the applicant to refine the programming of the park and approach both park and the building design holistically.

Comments

Site Layout

- Panel appreciated the refined alignments for the north-south private road but questioned the proposed internal street terminating at the parking ramp entrance.
- Panel suggested relocating the parking ramp and loading to the north wing where the Billiards room is located to create an active edge along the park.
- Panel suggested pulling back the planters and street parking adjacent to the west lobby entry as an opportunity to make a grand gesture.

- The development of Block C will impact the pedestrian comfort of the private road; Panel noted that the interim condition will work better than the ultimate condition since the internal street space will not receive much sun. In the future the Fisherman's Way facade will be a more important edge therefore, a comprehensive understanding of Fisherman's way's both short and long-term function is required.
- Panel wanted assurance that when Block C gets developed the public realm will be maintained for Block C and not removed to allow a bigger foot print of the building
- There is a need for a strong address in the park to announce the community space and for emergency services to be aware of its location. As an example, Panel suggested protruding the community space a meter west, beyond loading and into the park with a hardscape path leading to the entrance.
- The edge treatment of the park is important to indicate that the community space is a public amenity and permeability to the park is crucial. As the interior road is very private and not used by the broader area residents, Panel suggested to have an address on Jane Street in the form of a trellis to refine the edge at the corner.
- Panel also recommended to provide pick-up/drop-off on Fisherman's Way for recreation centre users.
- Panel asked the applicant to ensure a continuous public pedestrian promenade between the park and public transit.
- Panel recommended examining the future bike flow from Fisherman's Way to Jane St. and thought an opportunity to provide bike parking at grade was missing. It was eliminated from the last round, previously located adjacent to the parking ramp.
- Panel noted the absence of exhaust shafts on the site plan.

Landscape

- Panel suggested that the proposed market be closer to park. The market can happen in the park proper, to the north, and not on the street. Panel suggested rotating the market east-west, visually aligning with Vaughan Mills.
- Panel advised the applicant to be mindful of the risk of over salting on the internal street and the likelihood of the LID plants' survival.
- Panel doubted the required soil volume could be achieved on the internal street.
- Panel noted that the park programming has too many voids and there is a need for shade structure within the park.

Architecture

- Panel suggested to improve the podium along Jane Street as the proposed indentation on the facade do not read strongly across the 100m plus length. Explore the variation between retail and amenity spaces; the facade treatment could be different to promote variety.
- Further to the above, Panel encouraged the applicant to provide strong visual cues to define the entrance to visually signal change. For example, making the reveal twice as

deep, fully glazed with no balconies and carrying the precast all the way to the edges to emphasize the indentation.

- At the ground floor, Panel recommended reducing the interior amenity space moving some of the retail to the interior façade flanking the private north-south road where there is an opportunity to provide pick-up/drop-off.
- The peanut shaped canopy is not a necessary building feature if the entry architecture is more accentuated. The canopies on Jane Street and on the west side of the building should add more life to the architecture.
- Panel suggested that there is an opportunity to make the development more than a basic set of towers. The peanut shape tower top is not enough of a feature. Panel challenged the applicant to go a step further and encouraged a response to an improved sustainable approach that higher than the industry standard of window wall and precast. Panel asked why the linear south balconies do not continue east and west for sun control to be visually interesting and functionally better.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 66 – September 27, 2018

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Hearing Room (Room 241, beside Room 242), Second Level

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of August 30, 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Block 2, QuadReal+Menkes, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Residential Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots and Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Jay Claggett, IBI Group

Russell Fleischer, Turner Fleischer Architects

Sibylle von Knobloch, NAK Design Group

10:40 am

Break

10:50 am

Block 3, QuadReal, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots and Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Jay Claggett, IBI Group

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Neno Kovacevic, IBI Group

12:10 pm

Break

12:30pm

2901 Highway 7, Liberty, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike and Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Simon Ko, Dialog

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design

1:40 pm

Break

1:50 pm

Transit City Tower 3 - Public Art Program, Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, 1st Review

Presentations:

Sharon Gaum-Kuchar, Senior Art Curator and Planner

Mitchell Chan, Studio F Minus

Brad Hindson, Studio F Minus

Mike Szabo, Diamond Schmitt Architects

3:00 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 66 – September 27, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 27, 2018 in Committee Room 241, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Absent

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development

Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering

Sharon Gaum Kuchar, Economic and Cultural Development

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am with Antonio Gomez-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 August 30, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Block 2, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: Turner Fleischer Architects

Landscape Architect: NAK Design Group

Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the revised site organization and overall framework in responding to DRP's overarching comments about:
 - Phasing of development – *consider the site at two scales*
 - Placemaking – *create a heart for the site*
 - Greater diversity
 - Create a hierarchy of open spaces, streets and buildings

2. How successful is the massing and architectural expression of the multi-family residential buildings in creating an animated and engaging development?

Overview

Panel summarized the comments into the following categories:

- **Open space** – the development is still missing a ‘heart’, and needs a large, meaningful open space central to the development. Panel commented that it was hard to envision the function of the linear park in absence of understanding the plans for the development block to the east and feared that it could become an orphaned space.
- **Variation of expression** – greater variation in open space, building height and architectural expression is required, panel suggested increasing the height of some townhouse blocks to achieve a mid-rise transition to the taller components.
- **Distance** – separation and flanking distances between townhouse blocks were identified as a concern, particularly in situations where the only window providing sunlight to the unit is facing the flank of another series of townhouses, and where half the units are basement units.
- **Connection between the buildings on the north side** – there is a missed opportunity to connect the north/south pedestrian spine extending throughout the site to Interchange Way. Reconsider a breezeway condition or separate the two buildings.
- **Greater detail required to resolve the ground related context and function** – more information needs to be provided to communicate the details of the project, including the extent of private versus public space, facade of basement units and threshold conditions (e.g. resolving grade separation through use of porches, stoops).

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- The original comments about the open space layout, overall allocation of amenities and meaningful public space within the site have not been addressed. The open space is still not central to the development and the cross roads of the pedestrian mews are screaming to become ‘the heart’ of the new community by creating a larger central space that could achieve the program aspirations of the precedent photos. The sameness and nature of the linear spaces are for transient use and circulation, and do not invite lingering and gathering.
- Consider the possibility of structuring the development as three simple north-south blocks with a clear hierarchy of streets and driveways and give graciousness to the public space on these blocks.
- The programming and design of the linear park on the east side of Millway Avenue would be more meaningful if located centrally to the development. Consider flipping the park to the west side of the road with the density of housing on the east side of the boulevard.

- Families should not have to cross Millway Avenue to access a playground; it could be accommodated within the development and help create a place. The intersection of the mews with the north/south spine is the right place for a playground.
- Although the plaza at the corner of Interchange Way and Millway Avenue was very well received, the overall design and programming of the outdoor space requires further thought. A richer variety of landscape treatments should be explored. Prioritize pedestrians and the creation of a high quality public realm.
- The symmetry and alignment of the two-storey building connection with the central north-south spine is not well resolved and is resulting in an awkward relationship with the facing townhouse unit.
- Consider opening the ground floor of the 15-storey buildings to allow the pedestrian spine to connect with Interchange Way, particularly as the biggest desire line within the site is to walk to the quadrant's central park. Given the scale of massing, there is value in allowing breathing room between the buildings. At minimum, introduce a breezeway connection all the way through. If the intention is to create a fine grained, pedestrian oriented residential precinct, having a wall there is not the right gesture.
- The location of the parking ramp needs to be reconsidered to avoid directing significant volumes of traffic into the core of the site and impacting the potential for creation of high quality public realm.
- Extend the feature paving in the mews across the private road and Millway Avenue to facilitate an improved pedestrian crossing and sense of inviting public space through the development.
- The retail unit facing the plaza at Millway Avenue has the potential to become a great corner store and community gathering space, given its context in relationship to the rest of the VMC.
- Provision of meaningful family zones and parkettes is missing. Eliminate the smaller open space pockets to create 1 or 2 significant open spaces and emphasize smaller scale park infrastructure such as an urban playground.
- The development would be improved through the creation of a stronger street network reflective of the VMC Secondary Plan. Consider upgrading the east-west link to a public road with a sense of purpose.

Massing and Architecture

- The development suffers from relentlessness and lack of variation in the building massing and expression.
- Shift the building massing within the structural grid to create a stronger village feeling, and less of a suburban quality. Introduce variety and misaligned facades by redistributing building forms, particularly along the mews. Introduce swells along the north-south spine to improve a village or campus character. At the intersection of the mews, the townhouse blocks should respond to the opening of the central square by creating more variation.

- Consider eliminating the small open space south of blocks 13 and 14, and shift the townhouse blocks down to provide a more contiguous open space continuous to the mews.
- Transition in massing of the buildings from the 15-storey towers to the townhouses needs improvement. There is a harsh connection in scale from the bar buildings along the north frontage to the townhouse blocks.
- While the 15-storey buildings have step-backs introduced, the massing is still creating a massive street wall with shadowing impact on the north side of Interchange Way.
- Separation distances between the townhouse blocks is a concern, particularly where there is only an 8-metre front-to-flank separation. This will create a 'canon effect' and 'back alley' frontage. Consider increasing the distance to 11-13 metres to create a more generous separation.
- Explore different façade treatments within each of the 3 building typologies, and use varied architectural expression to provide relief in setbacks.

2. Block 3 Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: IBI Group
 Landscape Architect: IBI Group
 Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the ground floor public realm design in attracting pedestrians to support the retail and restaurant uses at grade?
2. How successful is the architectural expression in creating a distinct identity and character for the development block?

Overview

Panel commended the applicant on the quality, detail and vision presented for this first review. Panel were impressed by the ambition of the project and summarized comments into the following categories:

- Acknowledging the context of future development surrounding the site is critical to ensuring an integrated approach
- While there is a strong notion of variance in the architecture within the site, there is a need to look at the larger scale to ensure that repetition in context is avoided. The expression of the towers may need to vary as the design evolves further.

- Concerns were raised for the symmetrical scheme, particularly regarding retail function, access/servicing and phasing.
- The success of the environment will depend on the character of the retail. Finalization of the retail strategy and size of the retail floor areas is critical to ensuring creation of a true destination. Explore the 24-hour function of the site to help identify needs that may not be addressed in the retail strategy
- Programming of the central mews needs further work to ensure that the design compliments the retail uses
- The quality of the courtyards needs refinement to ensure that a different character is created from the central mews. There is an opportunity to programme them as gathering spaces for people with strong frontages so that they function for more than drop-off and circulation.
- Refinement in the design should consider greater development of the roof-top amenity spaces, access points, entrances, condition of ground floor units, bicycle use and overall CPTED principles.

Comments

Site Organization and Land Use

- While the logic of the plan is strong, the symmetry of the project is creating issues. Continue the exercise of breaking down the symmetry of the plan to create a finer grain quality and testing of the site functionality.
- Refine the phasing strategy for the development. Is the phasing split north-south or east west? In either case, the mews should be included as part of Phase 1 to ensure delivery of a sense of place. Site servicing could be rationalized in such a way as to avoid requiring 2 ramps, 2 loading areas, 2 back of house areas, etc. What happens if Phase 1 is not successful? How would a 1-sided mews function?
- Developing the plan further will be challenged in absence of the detailed retail strategy. Without a clear idea about future tenants, the project has been filled with a lot of programming and event uses to fill the void. The retail and programming must be considered together to bring vibrancy. Refine the programming to key areas of the site that respond to the retail strategy.
- The Achilles heel of the plan is the loading dock location. Finalization of the retail strategy might reveal that a smaller loading dock is warranted; explore the opportunity for a centralized loading dock.
- Ensure that the retail strategy considers the relationship of blocks to the south. Massing and shadowing of built form to the south of the site will have to match the intentions for this block; ensure that the character of the central pedestrian spine is continued to the south.
- Create a finer grain of entrances along the mews.

- The ground floor plan is showing long corridors with fronting townhouse units. Panel felt that it was too far to walk to the elevator core and remarked that there was a 'lonely townhouse beside the service entrance'.
- Re-examine the interface along the east-west mews. Currently, the spine does not provide for interest or activation apart from the lobbies and stair corridors.
- Consider removing the south facing residential units on the roof top terrace and replace with amenity space.
- Review the plan in consideration for cycling. On the public side, provide for a protected bike design within the roadway. On the private side, find a way to get as much of the long-term bike park at grade as possible, even if it means burying the garbage room. Each tower should have its own bike parking at grade. The location of the elevators for the shorter towers may benefit from a more centralized lobby elevator with access to bike parking.
- Review the plan in consideration for safety and CPTED principles.

Massing and Architecture

- The position of the towers provides for an interesting composition.
- While the towers within the site look very different and provide for great visual interest, the façade expression may be too similar to others in context. Introduce architectural elements that will help distinguish this project from others in the VMC.
- Explore the opportunity to introduce a bridge connection across the mews to link the amenity spaces between towers.
- The provision of broad, shallow units in the towers were commended for the opportunity they provide to introduce natural light into the corridors and raise the quality of life for residents.
- Notwithstanding the comment above, the proportion of the south towers could be further explored, as they are not quite working as point towers, but not quite as slab buildings either. There might be an interesting opportunity to stretch the floorplate and lower the building height.
- The main facades of the podiums along Highway 7 should wrap in the corners into the mews as a gateway to invite people in.
- Refine the townhouse elevation to bring the units out from under the building overhang through projection, colour, and materiality. Currently, the townhouse units are hidden by the bulk and mass of the towers.

Landscape and Signage

- Panel appreciated the project's vibrant landscape plan providing a hierarchy of spaces, and richness in scale and detail.
- Panel commended the project's aspiration towards public art and digital media.
- The digital atmosphere of the site might allow flexibility for residents to reclaim the space during off peak hours, providing a sense of place for the local residents. Allow the architectural features (ex. canopies, fascia, etc.) to bring a sense of community identity to the environment when retail is not active.
- A clear armature and framework needs to be considered for the retail signage. Develop the signage plan to rely more on intuitive wayfinding and avoid the need for pylon signs.
- As the quadrant builds out, there may be a desire line for pedestrians through the service and retail entrance corridor, particularly if there are residential towers to the south. Consider that possibility in the design of these spaces.
- Re-examine the design of the courtyards to create a special place for the residents and celebrate the access to these spaces with more finesse. If the courtyards were to feel more local with a neighbourhood focus, a sense of place for the residents should be provided to balance the public atmosphere of the pedestrian mall.
- Break up the symmetry of the ground floor programming to provide community amenities and community-oriented spaces.
- Eliminate the symmetrical "sawtooth and jaws" to provide a singular lawn with a focus on patios, tenants and programming.
- Reduce the daylight triangle along Highway 7.

3. 2901 Highway 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: Dialog
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the architectural expression of the residential towers and mid-rise building?
2. How successful is the design of the public realm and central courtyard?

Overview

Panel thanked the applicant for the detailed presentation and appreciated the clear rationale provided in the package. Panel commented that:

- While the design has greatly improved since the first submission, locating the amenity space on the south east corner has created a negative shadow impact compared to the previous design. To determine the appropriate location, Panel asked the applicant to define the amenity space program and determine for whom it is intended - if it is for residents only then maybe the location is right; however, if it is to serve the broader community then it is better to relocate it to the south-west corner to better connect to the open spaces in the overall context.
- Further refinements are required for the at-grade program and circulation to create more direct visual and physical connections to the amenity space. Such refinements should be intended to improve the flow from the buildings to the open space without crossing a road and activate the space with animated edges.
- Panel commented on the visual quality of the original sketches and noted that the design has been value engineered through the process. They asked the applicant to revisit the original ideas, further modulating the façade and creating more vertical segregation in the podium.

Comments

Site Layout

- While the overall massing of the project has improved, Panel commented that the open space will be impacted by the shadow of the proposed tower to the west. Panel asked the applicant to improve the microclimatic condition of the proposed amenity space by refining the massing of the tower.
- Looking at the broader context, Panel suggested that the amenity space should be relocated to the south west corner closer to the Edgeley Pond and Park to better integrate into the broader open space network.
- Panel questioned the viability of the townhouse typology along Maplecrete Road considering that the other side of the street did not have residential uses as per the Cosmos development application.
- To improve the interface along the amenity space, Panel asked the applicant to relocate the loading and underground ramp to Street B creating opportunities for active uses (lobby or indoor amenity) on the edges of the outdoor amenity space.
- Panel noted that while the southern facing façade has the most favourable microclimatic condition, it is currently dominated with service, loading, bike storage and blank wall and requested the applicant to revise the ground floor layout to better address the edge.
- Panel asked the applicant to re-evaluate the surface parking strategy to further tighten the vehicular space requirements and give prominence to pedestrian circulation as is expected of developments in the VMC urban area.
- Relocate the underground stairs out of the amenity space.

Architecture

- Panel asked the applicant to further articulate the podium and mid-rise building, reducing the horizontal elements and breaking the expanse of the façade. Panel felt that the podium is top heavy and suggested to make the bays more prominent with a different typology to balance the top. Panel also asked the applicant to pay attention to and further refine the architectural expression of the corners.
- While Panel recognized that the architectural expression of the buildings has been refined, they felt that the refinements were not enough. Panel discussed the original sketch and its great potential, referring to the extruded white massing in the sketch as an element that has a showcasing quality like a “billboard” and should be treated as a special feature breaking away from the linear balconies.

Landscape

- Panel requested a stronger language in the landscape along Maplecrete Road by providing another row of trees to emphasize connectivity to the broader context.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to have a bold vision with regards to the program of the amenity space. Currently, the program is too flexible. If socializing is the main programming notion, add a dining area with a strong design gesture such as a bosque of trees.
- While Panel appreciated the woonerf idea, they suggested to ‘loosen up the geometry’ and incorporate elements that can reference the natural feature of Black Creek.
- Panel commented on the size of the dog run area being too small even for the residents and asked the applicant to reconsider allocating more area to this use.
- Panel commented on the size of the amenity area for the mid-rise building being too small and asked the applicant to incorporate rooftop amenity for these residents.

4. Transit City Tower 3 - Public Art Program, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Public Art: Studio F Minus
Architect: Diamond Schmitt Architects
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the daytime experience of the integrated public art installation?
2. How successful is the public art strategy in the context of the development block?

Overview

Panel celebrated this pioneering moment for the City in bringing forward its first public art project and was highly appreciative and encouraging of the work.

Panel was excited about the notion of a curated rotational art wall and felt that limiting the 'bandwidth' of the project's technological scope was appealing as a more artistic form.

Panel encouraged the applicant to continue to 'think outside the box' in exploring development of a broader public art strategy as an ongoing process for the area with consideration for extending the impact of this first piece to other walls in context to create even greater impact.

Comments

Public Art

- Panel felt that this first public art project presented an incredible opportunity for the VMC in creating a landmark and offered a good precedent for the evolution of art.
- Panel felt that the low-res approach to the piece was more artistic in nature, and also reduced the risk of this media operating as advertising in future.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to consider other facades that could tie into the public art program by integrating the notion of wall graphics throughout the city.
- Consider seasonal work and 24-hour pieces.
- Review the ambient light levels to ensure that they are not disruptive for the adjacent residential units by creating light pollution.
- Implement hours of operation for the work, with coding for a more muted program and softer colours as the night progresses.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 67 – October 25, 2018

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Hearing Room (Room 241, beside Room 242), Second Level

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of September 27, 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Cortel Group, Expo City Tower 5, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Harim Labuschagne, Quadrangle Architects

Michelle Xuereb, Quadrangle Architects

James Roche, DTAH

10:40 am

Break

10:50 am

Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, N/E Block, 1st Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Sophie Beaudoin, Claude Cormier + Associés

12:10 pm

Break (Lunch)

12:30 pm

Highview Building Corp, Highway 27 and Nashville Residential Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage

Alfredo Casati, Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

1:40 pm

Break

1:50 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 67 – October 25, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, October 25, 2018 in Committee Room 241, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD (Acting Chair)
Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.
Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.
Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)
Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will
Margaret Briegmann, BA Group
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects
Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.
Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design
Amy Roots, Urban Design
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design
Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design
Gaston Soucy, Urban Design
Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage Coordinator
Judy Jeffers, Development Planning
Stephen Lue, Development Planning
Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development
Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am with Alfredo Landaeta in the Chair.

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Sheldon Levitt declared a conflict of interest with the first item.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 27, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Expo City Tower 5

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects Limited
Landscape Architect: DTAH
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the overall architectural expression of the façade?
2. How successful is the revised design in responding to the first round of DRP comments on resolving:
 - Vehicular circulation wrapping a majority of the site
 - More focus on the northern frontage and pedestrian connections to Edgeley Pond and Park
 - Resolution of the podium design, setbacks and public realm interface

3. How successful is the design of the ramp and structures within the site?

Overview

Panel commended the applicant on a comprehensive and thoughtful proposal. There was overall consensus that the project is evolving in the right direction. Panel summarized the comments into the following categories:

- **Vehicular circulation, layby and access** – There is concern regarding the proposed location and safe functioning of the ramp and layby in relation to the anticipated vehicular circulation along the driveway. Other locations for the layby should be explored including eliminating it altogether. Alternatively, consider raising the entire layby area with rolled curbs to create a clear separation from the driveway to public space and discourage thru-traffic from using the space as a shortcut. This simple move would also improve the connections between the park and the building and help consolidate and strengthen the pedestrianized environment and overall landscape strategy. Explore alternate solutions to resolve the potential conflict from vehicles entering /exiting the ramp and vehicular traffic entering/exiting Maplecrete Road.
- **Podium location** – The move to setback the podium farther away from Highway 7 was well received and thought to be a clear and strong urban design move that not only provides breathing room to the overall development but enhances the pedestrian realm.
- **Landscape and public realm** – The overall high-quality landscape strategy was well received. The panel encouraged the applicant to maintain this high-standard as the project moves forward. The strong design commitment to the public realm should be consistent to the end.
- **Servicing** – There are concerns about the only local street façade along Maplecrete Road being perceived as a service access area. More information needs to be provided on design strategies to mitigate the negative effect on the public realm.
- **Building massing** – The proposed high-quality design and material selection was well received. The panel encouraged the applicant to maintain this high-standard as the project moves forward. Refinements to the design and selection of windows and fenestrations are required to help animate and soften the monolithic character of the tower.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- Provide more information on a wayfinding strategy as there is currently no clear sense of wayfinding to suggest where the building's entrance is from Highway 7 or Maplecrete Road.
- The project would benefit from additional analysis on how the ground floor works to better understand general circulation and location of services and accesses. More

questions should be asked: how will deliveries be handled? Where would a truck go and park when arriving to the site? How does the interim condition work?

- The location, design and/or presence of the layby should be reconsidered as it does not seem to be beneficial for the pedestrian realm at its current location. The current layout allows for it to be used as a shortcut for actual vehicular traffic. Consider relocating it or eliminating it altogether.
- Location of the vehicular ramp was questioned, as it is in the middle of what should be a pedestrian-first area and creates concerns regarding potential conflicts between vehicles coming in/out of the ramp and traffic from the 2-way driveway. Consider relocating it closer to the proposed loading area within the building to consolidate vehicular uses in one place away from the pedestrian-friendly public realm on the north side.
- Consider simplifying and integrating the vehicular and pedestrian realms throughout the site with cleaner and more direct moves. The connection to the park and Edgeley Pond is an excellent opportunity to design something special at the north side with landscaped areas, rolled curbs and woonerf solutions that create one continuous, pedestrian friendly plaza.
- Panel suggested looking into relocating the parking stairs/vent volume along the Highway 7 frontage as it is currently protruding from the ground and interfering with the openness of the landscaped space.
- Consider a more permanent and sustainable 'heritage' solution to the trees being proposed above the underground parking slab as they are currently designed to be replaced in 40 years. Study shifting pedestrian access to take off slab so that at least some trees could be planted unencumbered.

Massing and Architecture

- In spite of the visual strength from the elegant staggering of the tower volumes, the architectural expression and materiality of the building is still very monolithic. The design moves to create deep window mullion caps are not strong enough to break the monotony and create the desired expression and variety that can stand the test of time. It was proposed that the balcony depth should be more visible/evident to help animate the façade more, break the monotony and recreate the window depth from the original proposal which gave it a more desirable residential feel – at least along the podium levels where it is more visible from the ground. The balcony guards' style should also be reevaluated as the currently-proposed metal pickets do not match the rest of the building's aesthetics.
- The wind mitigation strategies – trees, podium canopies and window fins – might not be enough to create a comfortable public realm. Consider alternatives to address wind concerns at pedestrian levels.
- The canopy at the podium is too large, high and not at a pedestrian scale. It does not provide a comfortable human scale, nor proper weather protection to pedestrians.
- Consider a stronger gesture at the pedestrian entrance that clearly demarcates the building's main access point.

- The originally-proposed concept of a pedestrian ‘green’ ramp connection from the park to the building’s podium was lost due to functional and massing issues. Perhaps a ‘visual’ green linkage might help re-establish this connection between the building and the park.
- Consider bringing down some of the materiality from the tower to the podium to better integrate the two and visually allow for the heavier tower to connect to the ground. Alternatively, consider glass from the podium to move up to the tower.
- There were questions as to how the ground floor lobby space would function as an open, free-flowing space without affecting privacy and security. The separation between the public (café, gallery access) and the private, residential lobby should be addressed by considering separate entrances.

2. VMC East Block-Phase 1

Architecture: Diamond Schmitt Architects
 Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associés
 Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the overall site organization, including land use distribution, circulation, loading and servicing, access and public realm design?
2. How successful is the design of the podium in framing the open space and public realm, and in reflecting the spirit of the precedents?

Overview

Panel thanked the applicant for the detailed presentation and appreciated the overall rationale provided in the package. Panel summarized the comments into the following categories:

- **Phasing** – While the panel commended the applicant on the overall preliminary design strategy and approach, and understanding that the application is for Phase 1 (north part of the site) only, there was concern that not looking at both the north and south phases together presents a challenge in understanding the overall functioning and performance of the entire project. Panel asked the applicant to consider a more holistic approach that further develops Phase 2 in terms of massing, connectivity, traffic, shadowing, winds, etc. in order to make more informed decisions moving forward with Phase 1.

- **Sun and Shadows** – Panel expressed great concern from the shadow studies provided as they show a negative impact from the south-west podium and tower on the proposed open courtyard. Furthermore, the potential shadows from the Phase 2 development to the south would put the proposed open spaces in Phase 1 under permanent shadows for most of the year.
- **Building Massing and Expression** – The podium’s height was deemed to be too high by the panel members. At 8-storeys, it is 2-storeys taller than the Secondary Plan built form policies and is not achieving the desired pedestrian-friendly scale. Panel agreed that the expression and materiality of the podiums and towers should also be looked at to create more architectural diversity.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- It was recommended that both phases - 1 (north) and 2 (south) - should be studied at the same time to better understand their effects and implications on each other. Items like traffic, wind and shadow impacts as well as connectivity, should be explored in more detail.
- While the panel applauded the proposal of the privately owned, publicly accessible corner plazas and central courtyard, there were serious concerns regarding wind speeds and shadow casting on these areas. Special attention was drawn to the 2 diagonal plaza accesses, as they appear to be under long-term shadowing for most of the year. Consider looking ahead at the Phase 2 development design as it could have a negative effect on the central landscaped courtyard by also exposing it to shadows for most of the year. Wind speeds were of particular concern at the pinch points between the diagonal connections and the central courtyard resulting in unfavourable micro-climate conditions.
- Consider additional strategies to mitigate high winds and lack of sun at central courtyard and north-east and north-west diagonal connections. Consider bouncing light into the space. Consider planting that is resilient to wind and shadow conditions.
- Creating a summary of the comprehensive wind study would help the panel better understand the wind impact more efficiently.
- The current tree planting strategy at the central courtyard would require trees to be replaced after approximately 45 years. Consider a tree planting strategy that allows for a more sustainable, longer tree lifespan.
- The panel was supportive of the inclusion of rental units as part of the development.
- The panel questioned the idea of deleting the north-south road with respect to the portion providing access to the office development to the south, as it will help alleviate the development’s access and servicing. Consider a woonerf solution to maintain a pedestrian-friendly, functional connection.

- Panel recommended carefully studying the relationship between the landscape courtyard to the north and the proposed mid-block open space to the south. Special attention should be placed on the design of visual and physical connections, building placement and proposed active uses.
- Consider studying the pedestrian flow between the north and south blocks with more detail as there will be a greater amount of movement towards the south to take advantage of the connections to public transit and Transit Square. The design of the phase 2 development's south façades and public realm will be extremely important.
- Consider flipping the northwest entrance plaza to the southwest to enhance the pedestrian flow through the site.

Massing and Architecture

- The panel agreed that the expression of the towers may need to vary as the design evolves further and encouraged the applicant to look at the larger scale to ensure that repetition in context is avoided. The podium expression and materiality should also be reconsidered as it was deemed to be lacking the finer craft/grain and monumental qualities recommended in the Urban Design Guidelines. Energy performance of buildings should be considered as predominantly glass façades are highly inefficient.
- While the panel liked how the proposed landscaped courtyard was framed from three sides, it was determined that a lower, 6-storey podium would create a better, pedestrian-friendly scale on the overall composition of the space. The same applies to the exterior periphery along all four roads.
- Consider relocating the towers, chamfering back buildings at the south-east and south west corners and/or stepping-back the podium's 5th and 6th storeys to allow for maximum sun penetration to the central courtyard.
- There is concern regarding the pinch point at the north-west and north-east corners diagonal pedestrian connections as the podiums compress and funnel to the central courtyard. Besides the negative wind and shadow impact, the facing distance between podium units at those narrow connections might compromise the resident's privacy. Consider widening the distance to something more appropriate.
- If a building has shared uses, contemplate creating separate lobbies for each use. Consider relocating lobbies towards the centre of the buildings, away from corners and adding retail and community spaces at the southern ends of both buildings.
- Consider creating more porosity and flexibility at the ground floor level by having smaller, retail uses – and/or community spaces – spread out along the periphery. Expanding retail or a potential community use towards the central courtyard should also be considered to help animate the space.
- Consider opening the ground floor residential units to the courtyard common space and giving them a small private 'back yard' area that is visually buffered from the public

central space with low fencing and/or dense planting. Creating a secondary access from the courtyard space to the ground floor residential units would also allow for flexibility, as these could be easily converted to commercial uses with independent accesses if required.

- Study the possibility of spreading amenity space to all 3 buildings as opposed to centralizing it in one area. One option could study adding a rooftop bridge to connect all rooftops and create amenity spaces on all 3 podiums. Inclusion of at grade amenity space was encouraged.
- While relocating most loading and garbage below grade was most welcomed, leaving only one single garbage collection area on the north building's ground floor might prove to be an operational problem for such a large-scaled project. It was strongly recommended that this should be looked at in more detail to guarantee that it is not undersized.
- Portage is becoming too service oriented. Concentrating servicing, loading and parking along Portage Parkway is creating a negative effect on the pedestrian realm. Consider activating this area with more uses and animating the blank façades to improve the pedestrian experience.
- Parking access ramp on west building could open to Millway Avenue to eliminate any curb-cuts and vehicular traffic along the sidewalk.

3. 89 & 99 Nashville Road, Village of Kleinburg

Architecture: Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
Landscape Architect: Strybos Barron King Landscape Architecture
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please provide comments on the overall framework and site integration including built form, massing, pedestrian circulation, amenity area, and servicing and loading?
2. How successful is the interface along Regional Road 27 and Nashville Road in the context of the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District?

Overview

Panel thanked the applicant for the thorough presentation and appreciated the cross sections and renderings provided in the package. Panel commented that:

- The quality of the development should feel more like a village instead of dense residential housing. Provide an opportunity to see around buildings and open up the amenity area, between units #11 and #12, by remove 2-3 units.
- To ensure the heritage houses are well located and clearly communicate to the public that they are heritage homes, Panel asked the applicant to consider the alignment and placement of the structures.
- Panel commented on the podium wall on Regional Road 27 (RR 27) and the massive scale. They asked the applicant to consider revising the stone wall so that it is not flush with the brick above.

Comments

Site Layout

- Panel questioned the leftover spaces and wedges and noted that they appeared to be unusable.
- Panel asked the applicant if they had considered grouping up some units, so residents could have views out of the development. The wedges and slots are too tight.
- Panel asked the applicant to consider opening the gap between units #11 and #12 to provide view to amenity area.
- To create a village feeling instead of dense residential housing Panel recommended removing some units.
- Stairs from the central green connecting to the south should be considered to integrate the public landscape with the private amenity area.
- The spacing around the heritage homes is too tight and could use 3 additional meters between them.
- Panel noted that the alignment of the heritage homes, could benefit from a slightly skewed alignment rather than a strict alignment.
- Panel recommended that the townhome block (units #3 and #4) lose one floor or provide more space beside 89 Nashville Rd. The scale of the block appears overwhelming next to the heritage home.

Architecture

- Panel questioned the differentiation between the entry doors internal to the development versus along RR 27.
- Panel commented that the mill wall along RR 27 is too massive and the units appear repetitive.
- To improve the interface along RR 27, Panel suggested bringing the brick materiality all the way down or alternatively to provide a physical break and setback above the stone wall to reduce the scale.
- Reconsider use of fake field stone to express historic style architecture.

- Review material palette for quality and simplicity for elegant and attractive housing to promote the valuable property.
- Panel recommended reviewing the Loretto Lofts, on 385 Brunswick St. in Toronto, as an example of Victorian-Georgian housing.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 68 – November 29, 2018

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of October 25 , 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Yonge & Steeles Developments Inc./Gupta Group, 7028 Yonge Street High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Don Given, Malone Given Parsons Ltd.

Mansoor Kazerouni, IBI Group

10:40 am

Break

10:50 am

Cortel Group, Jane & Rutherford Block 4 High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Clement Messere, Development Planning

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects

12:10 pm

Break (Lunch)

12:30 pm

York Region Transit, Vaughan Hospital YRT Bus Terminal in front of MacKenzie Vaughan Hospital, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Richard Montoya, York Region Transit

Manny Ng, Stantec

Jim Vafiades, Stantec

1:40 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 68 – November 29, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 29, 2018 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH (Vice-Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design
Nancy Tuckett, Development Planning
David Marcucci, Policy Planning
Clement Messere, Development Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair.

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Sheldon Levitt declared a conflict of interest with the first item.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 27, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. 7028 Yonge Street – Yonge & Steeles Development Inc.

Architecture: IBI Architects and Engineers
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design Landscape Architects Inc.
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please comment on the massing and scale of the development within the context of the Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan and future intensification with proposed subway expansion.
2. Please comment on the ground floor circulation and layout, and potential to establish a successful urban public realm that interfaces Yonge Street and Steeles Avenue.

Overview

Panel noted difficulty in providing comprehensive comments as the package lacked information on how the proposed development connects to the future transit station

making it difficult to get a sense of the public experience. Panel provided the following summary of comments:

- Panel noted that the design team needs to provide quality grade level open space and noted that rooftop outdoor areas supplement exterior amenity areas, but do not replace grade level outdoor space.
- The drop-off cannot be considered an outdoor space for public enjoyment as it is predominately a car-oriented space. Panel recommends redesigning internal circulation and maximizing north and west laneways for drop-off as a potential to solve the internal problems.
- Panel asked the design team to consider the character of the laneway in the future context and how it will evolve.
- Panel encouraged the seven-storey podium to be more visually and physically permeable with greater articulation.
- The visual language of the towers should provide some variance as a family of towers, not replicas.
- Regarding sustainability, the panel encourages the applicant to take leadership on this important site and set a high sustainability design benchmark.
- Note to design team, as well as city staff, to review the site with open communication between the adjacent Markham and Toronto municipalities, York Region and adjacent landowners.

Comments

Site Organization

- Panel requested that the design team consider the ground floor as an open lattice and promote public access from Steeles Avenue to make it more visibly open, connective and porous.
- Currently the interior court gets no sunlight. The design team should plan for an opening in the south facade.
- The panel recommended abandoning the typical suburban “lollipop” response to the drop-off configuration in the middle. Instead, propose and consolidate servicing and loading around the site perimeter.
- Panel thought the site plan is suffering from being introverted and recommend referring to the Four Seasons plaza by Claude Cormier + Associés as a successful example.
- Most of the vehicular circulation is directed within the block through townhouses. Panel strongly recommended delivering a more car free zone.
- Consider abandoning the townhouses where it is dark and consolidate the loading dock.
- As an alternative to the proposed site organization, Panel proposed to relocate the hotel to tower 1, on the north, to take advantage of the northwest park view for the hotel lobby.

- At grade amenity space should consider where the park is going to be.
- From Steeles Avenue to the park, pedestrians must cross three driveways; ensure the connection is safe and comfortable.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel felt it was difficult to comment on massing without knowing what happens on the other three corners.
- Panel expressed concern about the massiveness of the buildings and the perceived massiveness for pedestrian friendly environment.
- Reconsider hotel distribution along the podium relative to lobby and elevator core on ground floor. Consider the hotel use along Yonge Street or split in the middle.
- The seven-storey podium should be refined. More horizontal movement reflective of the tower language would help to break-up the podium. The podium could include recesses.
- Panel continues to see window wall systems on towers even though they are not sustainable. Panel asks the design team to strongly reconsider the nature of these buildings, to pioneer sustainable design and set an example for projects to come.

Landscape

- While podium amenities are interesting, people still want to come to the ground. Panel asked the applicant to create a strong public realm.
- The amenity space should shift south to create a POPS; the internal courtyard space is too tight for the proposed massing.
- The wide pedestrian sidewalk proposed in the perspective rendering does not correspond with the landscape plan. The Steeles Avenue pedestrian clearance is better maintained on the inside for protection. Investigate the boulevard's hierarchy of space: include a line of trees and spill out space. Panel referenced One Bloor East that included a second row of trees and public art.

2. Cortel Group, Jane & Rutherford Block 4 High-Rise Mixed-Use

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects
 Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please comment on the overall architectural expression of the development.
2. Please comment on the quality of the public realm and the proposed privately owned publicly accessible space (POPS)

Overview

- Panel felt that key information was missing from the overall concept about the location of the public park; whether it is going to be where Blocks 5 and 6 are shown or in the block to the south needs to be clarified so the architect can design accordingly and give it the level of thought it needs. This uncertainty also creates doubt about eastern and southern elevations; depending on what the development will be facing these elevations may need to change to properly respond to the context. If there is no park as part of this development, then the open space/POPS should be located at grade.
- Panel asked the applicant to finalize the details of the POPS addressing issues such as function, public access, hours of operation, CPTED, and usable spaces.
- Panel felt that the podium to the south and east should be reduced in height to further improve access to direct sunlight within the POPS.
- Panel expressed concerns about potential wind issues and encouraged the applicant to resolve microclimate conditions to the greatest extent possible to provide a comfortable environment for pedestrians.
- While Panel acknowledged that the new approach to the design and materiality is a better solution in terms of sustainability, they felt that some of the magic of the earlier sketches and scheme was lost, they asked the architect to revisit the earlier schemes to see if they can reintroduce some of the earlier dynamism into the design.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- Panel thanked the applicant for the comprehensive and detailed package and acknowledged that the proposal has a level of urbanity that all developments should strive for; Panel appreciated the architect's efforts to move away from lollypop drop offs using perimeter roads efficiently to address servicing/loading requirements.
- While the POPS is very interesting, it is located on the north of the development and impacted by shadow, orienting the POPS entrance to south-east would allow the space to get better sunlight and create a better connection to the proposed public park.
- Panel asked the applicant to include the application to the south into the shadow study analysis to get a better understanding of the shadow impact on the POPS.
- Panel asked the applicant to look at the POP space with the CPTED lens introducing porosity through the development with multiple safe exits for users, understanding the hours of operation, whether the space should be closed at night and demarcating the point of closure.
- Panel expressed concerns with the pinch point between tower A3 and the podium and noted that facing distance of 25m is a minimum distance requirement, the applicant is still required to resolve the microclimate issues.

- The live-work units are well presented but Panel questioned the impact of the microclimate on these units and asked the applicant to ensure comfortable environment based on the result of the detailed wind tunnel analysis.
- Panel had mixed emotion about the POPS terracing and while they felt that it does create a compelling setting, they noted that the success of the space above depends on the at grade interface.
- Panel questioned the programming layout of the POP space and provided alternative suggestions to better animate the at grade and upper level spaces:
 - Pull the community center to the thresholded entrance where it has access three levels to make the ramp more public but the space above more private; this will help to demarcate what gets shut after 6 o'clock.
 - Switch to a stramp which is multi-function in nature and allows for a quick transition and a more generous space above.
 - Locate the playground at grade with more eyes on the space, and propose a dog run or adult fitness at the upper levels.
 - Bring some of the open space/civic programming to the grade to activate the street level.
- Panel asked the applicant to provide an alternative way up for bikes as they can't zig-zag through the ramp.
- Depending on the final location of the proposed park, the community space should be proposed next to the park with an inside/outside connection to the park.
- Panel recommended the applicant to consider pick-up/drop-off inside, from the ground level of the parking structure.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel appreciated the architectural language and the sustainable approach to the materiality and the design of the elevations and balconies; however, the expression no longer has the dynamic look of the previous scheme. Panel suggested the applicant to explore ideas such as a change in the texture of the panels or the depth of assembly to reintroduce the previous massing dynamism into the skin.
- Panel also asked the applicant to explore a different response in the facades with higher solar heat gain.

3. Vaughan Hospital Bus Terminal – York Region Transit

Architecture: Stantec
 Landscape Architect: Stantec
 Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the site organization of the new bus terminal to promote ease of accessibility for all modes of transportation and safety of the public realm?

Overview

Panel commented on the following issues:

- Terminal clearly designed for bus operation but should be more oriented for intuitive pedestrian connections and experience. Pedestrians should be the #1 priority, beyond operational concerns.

Comments

Site Layout

- Panel recommended a hybrid system where buses would provide street side pick-up/drop-off on east side of Amusement Way and provide maintenance and operation bus services loop on the west side of Amusement Way.
- The uncontrolled crossing combined with the likelihood that pedestrians will cross anywhere does not support this scheme to be the ideal option. Panel recommended the design team to consider figure 1 as a design concept where there is one large loop without a through connection.
- Figure 1 option addresses most concerns even though there is some sacrifice to operations and pick-up/drop-off. The latter could be made up on Coaster Way.
- Regarding the pedestrian underpass, panel noted the length is undesirable and indirect for someone with mobility issues. Also, the pinch point at the end of the path created by the central median adds to an unfavourable non-standard condition.
- Determine the use, frequency and desire line from the underpass to improve the connectivity.
- Pedestrian connection from Wonderland is a concern with buses exiting at the south-east corner.
- More attention is required for bicycle storage. Provide shelter for bicycles and investigate a bike share program with the hospital.
- Thorough examination of micro-climate conditions is required with analysis of wind pattern and wind screen mitigation. Also, consider providing continuous canopy protection from the elements.
- Lighting considerations and signage/wayfinding are fundamental to user safety and should be considered and integrated with hospital's eastern underpass and elevator pavilion.
- Snow storage requirements should be considered.
- Panel noted other agencies are decommissioning their transit hubs and questioned the need to move the terminal from curbside service. Panel used the VMC bus

terminal which provides 9 platforms as an example and questions why this station requires 12.

- Panel recommended better site organization to avoid the empty space in the middle of the platform which is filled in with landscape.

Architecture

- Panel required more material indications.
- Universal washroom requirements on west platform should be considered.

Landscape

- Panel recommended harvesting water from the entire platform and not just the building roofs.