

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 69 – January 31, 2019

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, **Committee Room 249**,
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 29, 2018 Meeting

9:30 am

Penguin-Calloway (Vaughan) Inc. and CentreCourt Developments, East Block, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, High-Rise Mixed Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Mike Szabo, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Claude Cormier, Claude Cormier + Associés

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Daniels Baif Thornhill Inc., Beverly Glen Boulevard and Bathurst Street High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design

12:15 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 69 – January 31, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 31, 2019 in Committee Room 249, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Nancy Tuckett, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development
Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering
Samar Saadi Nejad, Development Engineering - Transportation
Musa Deo, Development Engineering - Transportation

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest by any of the panel members.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for November 29, 2018 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. VMC East Block-Phase 1

Architecture: Diamond Schmitt Architects
Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associés
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How well has the revised concept addressed the first round of comments related to phasing, microclimate (sun, shadow and wind), building massing and expression?

Overview

The Panel appreciated the overall evolution and improvements to the design, complimented the applicant on a very thorough and comprehensive package, and summarized their comments into the following categories:

- **Site Organization and Landscape** – Panel asked the applicant to carefully analyze the ground floor functionality throughout the site and its relationship with the public realm. Panel commented that it is vital to protect the investment of the Privately Owned Publicly-Accessible Space (POPS) and make sure that it is not jeopardized

by the programming, design and built-form of the surrounding buildings, including Phase 2.

- **Massing and Architecture** – Panel recommended further studying the materiality of the podium and its relationship to other elements, including the bridges and towers to ensure a more seamless visual blending of the components. Panel suggested looking at the precedents carefully to distill the basics from the examples provided without being literal.
- **Shadow and Wind** – Panel looks forward to seeing the design development of shadow impact and wind mitigation design strategies as Phase 2 moves forward and urged the applicant to carefully consider the impacts that this will have in the microclimate that's being created within the public realm and exterior amenity spaces.
- **Sustainable Design** – Panel advised of the importance of integrating sustainable design strategies into the proposal. The tower design should incorporate architecture that goes above and beyond the minimum sustainable design standards, and includes long-term technologies that increase insulation values, reduce thermal bridging, etc.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- Panel commended the applicant on a well-organized site plan and appreciated the manner in which vehicles are controlled, and site servicing is resolved.
- The previous comments from the first DRP presentation regarding the impact of the Phase 2 massing on Phase 1 were reiterated. Panel urged the applicant to start looking at Phase 2 with more detail in order to determine the potential effects on the Phase 1 open space design, shadow impacts and ground floor programming.
- Panel continued to express concern with the proposed massing on Phase 2 with respect to the impact that it would have on the POPS and the larger Open Space design in terms of microclimate, shadow and sense of enclosure.
- The central courtyard is the heart of the project and how everything works around it will be key to the success of the project. Currently the design has not clearly defined the POPS as a community-oriented space, nor as a fully public space that includes retail and public activities. A decision on the usage and programming strategy must be made to guarantee the success of the space. Consider looking at the holistic picture of both Phase 1 and 2 under the lens of performance standards rather than the lens of a master plan to help clarify how the ground floor should function.
 - If the POPS is designed as a community-oriented space, more private activity engagement would be necessary. For example, ground floor units should have direct access to the POPS and rooftop amenities could be expanded or relocated at grade to have a strong interface with the POPS. The podium's exterior rooftop amenity spaces could then become private terraces for individual units.

- There's continued concern for the lack of provision to access the proposed residential ground floor units from grade. The design rationale and business case for not having these units open to the POPS are not clear and should be clarified.
- If the POPS is designed as a fully publically accessible space, then the ground floor units' uses could be rethought to support an active urban edge condition around the courtyard.
- The ground floor of the rental building could function differently than the ground floor of the other two buildings.
- The enclosed off-leash dog area is working against the courtyard's open concept design. It was suggested that this area should be part of the open green space, or an adult fitness area that better integrates with the POPS. Off-leash dog activities could happen at Edgeley Pond and Park to the east.
- Consider a longer tabletop along the new east-west street that visually expands the length of the POPS and establishes a better connection with the future Phase 2 development.
- Phase 2's future courtyard could echo Phase 1's in shape, creating a large quadrangle that expands both phases in the ultimate condition. The north could have a more community-oriented character and the south a more public, commercial character. A perspective view from Phase 1 looking south to Phase 2 would showcase the grandeur of this space.
- The current POPS design is very rigid in its form. Perhaps a less formal design would allow for the space to be more flexible in use and allow for people to walk around and use the space as they please.
- It was suggested that the building setbacks around the peripheral roads could be minimized in order to transfer that additional area to the interior courtyard space.
- The design of the two corner plazas to the north-east and north-west could be fine-tuned. The north-east entrance garden feels like a 'pass through' space while the north-west entrance plaza has a more 'sit and stay' quality. It was suggested that perhaps these spaces could be tighter and smaller in scale to give them more character through a sense of containment.
- While the public realm's general circulation and desire-line paths look good, the circulation to the development's south-east corner could be improved by widening the boulevard and adding more greenery to enhance the connection towards Edgeley Pond and Park.
- Bicycle parking will need to be considered at the POPS. Although it has been proposed along the surrounding boulevards, people will bring, and lock, their bikes in the POPS.
- Although the tree planting strategy is compelling, the City might not accept groups of similar tree species in large numbers. It was recommended that a comprehensive street planting strategy, that captures the larger vision for streetscapes in the quadrant, be developed to help advance discussions with Parks and Forestry.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel agreed that the overall design and expression of the podium improved considerably but determined that the interpretation of the precedents was taken too literally. Previous comments referred more to finding the right balance of materials, craftsmanship and detail within the overall composition.
- The connection point where the towers meet the podiums needs to be addressed as they are currently too disconnected from one another creating an awkward condition. Consider looking at extending the podium's materiality to the towers to create a unique and common character for the entire development.
- The bridges connecting the podiums could benefit from more design expression by using other materials that, while maintaining their lightness, reinforce their physical presence and create a stronger visual connection with the rest of the development. The bridge designs could also be enhanced to potentially contribute to the wind mitigation strategies at ground level.
- Although it is understandable for the ground floor retail to be heavily glazed, the ground floor feels disconnected from the rest of the podium. Consider adding more solid features, such as brick, to visually ground and connect the podium while providing more texture at the pedestrian level even if just as a gesture.
- The podium mid sections are looking too heavy. Study exploring options to make the façade lighter and more diverse without compromising the quality and textures that the design is starting to achieve.
- There is an excellent opportunity to create double-height spaces at the podium's top levels where the mansard roofs are located. Consider 2 storey residential units and/or double-height amenity spaces.
- The mansard roof components of the podium need more work. The curvature needs to integrate better with the rest of the design, especially at the corners. Consider adding balconies that open towards the POPS to animate the frontages.
- The facade along Portage Parkway needs work as there are too many elements and design moves happening at the same time. There is also a lack of permeability and fine grain at the pedestrian level that needs to be addressed. It was recommended that the language of the tower that has been successfully transferred to the podium come all the way down to the ground to simplify the form. Consider the use of green walls to soften the blank walls in some locations.
- The panel commented that, echoing to the podium's more environmentally conscious design approach, the applicant should consider a more efficient way to design the towers using up-to-date information on climate and sustainability. It was suggested that the tower designs should incorporate more sustainable solutions that include the reduction of the use of balconies that create thermal bridges and of window wall systems. The utility of balconies above the 30th floor was also questioned.
- The best value for balconies would be at the podium level, especially around the courtyard and open spaces.

2. Daniels Baif Thornhill Inc. – Beverly Glen Blvd. High-Rise, Mixed- Use

Architecture: Kirkor Architects
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please comment on the distribution of at-grade program uses, overall circulation and potential for successful public realm design.
2. Please comment on the vision for the architectural expression of the buildings in creating a sustainable, animated and engaging development.

Overview

Panel highlighted the following issues:

- At the ground floor, the transitions between program uses, frontages and buildings on east and west need to be refined. Amenity and lobby spaces should better relate to each other. Residential, retail and green spaces feel orphaned, they need stronger connection in effort to make one cohesive development.
- A single drop-off at the courtyard is encouraged to provide a better residential frontage that is more pleasant.
- The floorplate for the north-east tower is above the control limit. Refinement is required to reduce the floorplate to the 850 m² threshold and ensure limited shadow impact on the east low-rise community area.
- Exciting precedents are suggested for innovative expression for the architecture and elevations but further development of the facades is required.
- Landscape inspiration and branding for the site could continue to connect to landscaped green corridor on the west.

Comments

Site Layout

- Panel noted that although the parking ramp and garbage loading spaces are located outside the internal circulation of the site, the courtyard is still dominated by car traffic. Examine the function of the internal courtyard as it feels like a “back alley” and consider eliminating one leg of vehicle traffic to provide a true courtyard space to serve residents in a meaningful way.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to look at the lobby organization to align entries for pedestrian connection from the west buildings to Bathurst Street and the larger community as an important mid-block connection.
- Panel felt that the amenity space is not well located at the corner and provides passive observation instead of a potentially active corner opportunity. Explore alternative locations for amenity on the second floor of building A or consolidating

the gym and pool at the north-west corner into a strong amenity space facing in/out of the courtyard to provide activation to the back of the development.

- Grouping amenity along west side of development will enhance the feeling of safety with more eyes on the landscaped green corridor.
- The proposed retail area is not taking advantage of the corner location for visibility and pedestrian traffic. An active retail use like a café could be envisioned at the corner with more active uses along Beverly Glen Blvd.
- Panel cautions against increasing the north-east tower footprint as it increases the shadow impacts on the east low-rise community area.
- South building A could be more sculpted to give a bit more daylight into courtyard.
- The co-work office space is an interesting proposed use that could potentially be located on the second floor.

Architecture

- Panel recognized the ambitious 50/50 window to wall ratio and the intent to break away from the conventional window wall towers. Also, the precedents for the architectural expression are very attractive, but perhaps too simplified in the applicant's proposal. Panel suggested to break away from the pattern of solid and glass and propose some areas of glass.
- Panel is concerned with how the north-east tower lands at the street with minimal articulation of at-grade retail. The tower seems heavy when it lands at the street level and the pedestrian experience is compromised.
- The datum height for the retail appears too low and could either be increased to 5-6m or the canopy could be emphasized.

Landscape

- Panel was concerned that the courtyard is a missed marketing and financial opportunity to consolidate experience for residents, pedestrians and children.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to explore the transitions for the west landscaped green corridor at the access from Beverly Glen and the neighbours to the north as a broader connection and potential linear pedestrianized link.
- The Jackson Pollock approach brands the site and provides interesting opportunity for topography and seating. Panel questioned the placement of patterns and suggested integration with wayfinding strategy to indicate entrances and pedestrian moments on the site in a logical way.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 70 – February 28, 2019

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 January 31, 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

Liberty Development, Rose Garden, 1890 Highway 7 High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Carol Birch, Development Planning

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Company

David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Chabad Flamingo, 8001 Bathurst Street Mid-Rise Residential Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Carol Birch, Development Planning

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Sandra Patano, Weston Consulting

Jenna Thibault, Weston Consulting

Vladimir Losner, IBI Group

Gus Maurano, MBTW Group

12:15 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 70 – February 28, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, February 28, 2019 in Committee Room 242 & 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Alfredo Landaeta, FORREC

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Absent

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Nancy Tuckett, Development Planning

Carol Birch, Development Planning

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Henry Burstyn declared a conflict of interest for item #2.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for January 31, 2019 were approved.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW**

1. **Liberty Development, Rose Garden, 1890 Highway 7**

Architecture: Kirkor Architects
Landscape Architect: Scholen & Company
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Considering the grade change along the regional road 7 and west property line, how could the site plan organization and courtyard design be improved to foster urban streetscape, pedestrian connectivity and place making.
2. How could the proposed massing and transitions be improved to better fit within the proposed context of Concord Go Centre Secondary Plan?

Overview

Panel noted that there were critical drawings missing such as elevations, site cross-sections and underground parking plan proving difficult for the Panel to analyze this development. This is an important site with many complicated issues to be resolved for a successful neighbourhood to be envisioned. Panel summarized their concerns into the following categories:

- **Masterplan:** Panel emphasized that the masterplan is the backbone for all the phases of development and will set the stage for high quality work. The masterplan should confirm in detail the current and future conditions for the following: context, transit, ravine and trail network and phasing strategy.
- **Highway 7 frontage:** Maintain ongoing, consistent discussions with TRCA to resolve grading on the south and advocate a positive approach to TRCA lands such as the importance for transit connections.

- **Key Building Elements:** The courtyard, plaza and lobby are disconnected. The courtyard is overburdened by cars and Panel recommended review of its orientation on the site. The plaza is the gateway for the site and should establish desire lines and movement through the site. The lobbies should also invite movement through the site and be connected to engaging frontages.
- **Landscape:** Proximity of the ravine and language of trails should give priority to landscape within each development phase.
- **Architecture:** How can the architecture speak directly to sustainability, ecology and negotiation of grade.

Comments

Masterplan

- Panel felt that the masterplan is incomplete and important pieces need to be resolved. There was not a clear vision for how it will look in the end and connect to the vivaNext, Bowes Road and the potential Go Station.
- The one item that responds to the intended transit context is the proposed density.
- Panel strongly recommended to do everything possible to promote public transportation and to encourage ground floor connections to the vivaNext station and potential Go Station.
- Panel noted the importance of planning for phasing and long-term vision when other key neighbourhood elements come online such as the community centre. Perhaps current amenity spaces transition to larger retail spaces; a clear long-term retail strategy needs to be investigated.
- Panel emphasized the importance of the main road as a ceremonial drive and to plan for retail as soon as possible. Early thought should be given to the east side of the main retail road to complete this vision. Panel suggested zero setback to promote retail.
- Panel recommended more variety in the massing of the masterplan as the 27-storey building height is a bit “soldier” looking.

Site Organization and Landscape

- The development should elevate the community to have interesting ground floor spaces and positive connections. For example, Panel recommended a strong pedestrian connection from the courtyard to the vivaNext station.
- Focus on creating an interesting gateway opportunity at the south-east corner. Re-think the location of the private pool adjacent to the gateway plaza and consider an opportunity for retail and/or an open-air connection to the courtyard to promote pedestrian connection.
- Bicycle storage is located underground, explore the ground floor layout for opportunities to bring it to the ground floor to support active transportation and better connection to the GO and vivaNext station.

- Consider the steps on the south as grand features, i.e. the Spanish Steps and revise adjacent amenity spaces to more active uses such as a café.
- Pull the pedestrians away from Highway 7 and up against the building where there are canopies and amenity spaces.
- Panel noted that the courtyard should be as “car-less” as possible and to organize all loading and underground access on the north private road. The private lane should be more utilized and garbage loading should be consolidated and kept out of the courtyard. Limiting the vehicle circulation will allow more room for landscape opportunities in the courtyard.
- Panel suggested flipping the massing along the east-west axis to allow for a south facing courtyard that ties into the berm on Highway 7.
- Lobbies are oriented to serve the pick-up/drop-off and don't face the perimeter for residents using transit.
- The townhomes on the west should also better engage the street.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel encouraged more solid facades instead of window wall and projecting balconies.
- Consider the ecology of the site to determine how the idea of sustainability can be furthered in the architecture and quality of the building.

2. Chabad Flaming, 8001 Bathurst Street

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

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How could the proposed massing and transitions be improved to better fit within the surrounding context?
2. How could the site plan organization and design be improved to maximize potential for streetscape, landscape and overall circulation?

Overview

- Panel acknowledged the clear and comprehensive material presented and had positive responses to the scale of the development and the meaningful integration of residential on an institutional site for good community building.
- Concerns were raised regarding vehicles being a main driving force in the development of the ground floor and Panel suggested a more consolidated solution by locating the loading and garage access on the south.

- A more unified approach to locating the building entrances would provide pedestrians with better movement across the site.
- The architecture is very considerate of the existing synagogue building, but the panel encouraged the applicant to look at other ways of addressing the existing building context and the juncture between the buildings such as a reveal.
- Allow for a rational density distribution, revisit the single laded residential arm that is expensive and inefficient.

Comments

Site Layout

- Panel recommended integration of the new and existing building entrances on the east. The existing synagogue entrance plaza is being beautified but is adjacent to a “back-of-house” use that is the u/g garage access. The relocation of the loading and garage access to the south end of the site would allow for better adjacency between the new residential and synagogue entrances.
- Panel recommended moving the drop-off closer to the middle of the site.
- Panel noted too much space is dedicated to vehicles, including 3 driveway access points, and very little space for people. An effort to segregate cars and people would benefit the site especially for young families with children.
- As the location of the residential entrance on Bathurst is relatively arbitrary the Panel encouraged the applicant to create a fantastic entrance opportunity for both uses at the location of the “Social Hall Extension” by creating an allée for the residential and synagogue entrances.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to consider a straight forward ‘L’ shape addition instead of ‘U’ shape. The 2 and 3 bedroom townhomes on the south are generally very expensive and the development could benefit from choosing not to extent out on the east creating a sunnier community oriented space. Also, eliminating the three-storey component and maintaining the new building footprint as north as possible would be a positive intervention in the eyes of the residential neighbours.
- Pedestrian connection between east-west is important to connect the existing community to bus transportation on Bathurst.
- Investigate opportunity to provide dedicated access for visitors to synagogue with direct access outside from u/g.
- Panel noted a cost analysis should be investigated to determine if there is any incentive to build a new synagogue on the existing parking lot and locate the residential building at the corner proper.

Architecture

- While the applicant is considerate of the existing synagogue architecture, but the Panel does not recommend integrating features of the existing building into the new building treatment.
- The architecture could benefit from breaking away from the existing architecture. Consider a clear cut from the old building in terms of architectural expression.

- The glazed 12-storey addition that cantilevers over the existing synagogue could be more solid with smaller more solid balconies.

Landscape

- A zero setback along Bathurst Street is unreasonable, Panel recommended the building frontage to align parallel to Bathurst Street.
- Given the proximity to the regional intensification corridor, 2 m sidewalk on Bathurst Street is insufficient, Panel encouraged a greater setback on Bathurst to improve the streetscape condition.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 71 – March 28, 2019

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of February 28 , 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

Block 3, QuadReal, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Gaston Soucy, Development Planning

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Jay Claggett, IBI Group

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Neno Kovacevic, IBI Group

10:40 am

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 71 – March 28, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 28, 2019 in Committee Room 242 & 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Absent

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Alfredo Landaeta, FORREC

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

STAFF

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Gerardo Paez-Alonso, Parks Development

Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, Development Engineering

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Henry Burstyn declared a conflict with item #1.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for February 28, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Block 3 Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: IBI Group
Landscape Architect: IBI Group
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the revised design in addressing the first-round comments related to:
 - ensuring an integrated approach with the context of future development;
 - providing variation in site design and tower expression;
 - reconsidering the symmetrical scheme, particularly regarding retail function, access/servicing and phasing;
 - refining the retail strategy and exploring the 24-hour function of the site to help identify needs that may not be addressed in the retail strategy; and
 - developing the courtyards so that they function for more than drop-off and circulation.

Overview

Panel complimented the applicant on a well-organized, thorough and comprehensive package, appreciated the overall evolution and improvements to the design, and summarized their comments into the following categories:

- **Masterplan and Phasing:** Panel was pleased to hear that there is a holistic strategy integrating different scales towards the development of the masterplan and suggested that this should be used as an essential tool to further develop some of the site-specific design moves being undertaken in this phase. This strategy should inform and help fine-tune the overall approach and future phasing of the entire quadrant.
- **Site Organization and Landscape:** Panel remarked that this development could become a beautiful destination led by the richness and variation in the design of the public realm but cautioned that room should be left in the design for surprise developments over time that could result in truly unique and special place. Irregularity and difference would be welcomed assets to the proposal as it moves forward.
- **Massing and Architecture:** The design approach along Highway 7 is key to redefining the character of the street as a pedestrian corridor instead of a vehicular corridor. There is an excellent opportunity to work with the podium's architectural design features to create an environment that promotes foot speed rather than car speed by having the big anchor language along Highway 7 transition into a finer grain as it moves towards the mid-point of the block. This important move could set a strong precedent for future developments throughout the VMC and the City of Vaughan that changes the perception of Highway 7 as something other than a high-speed corridor.

Comments

Masterplan and Phasing

- The comprehensive multi-scale design approach and relationship to the south-west quadrant masterplan should be taken as an opportunity to diagrammatically showcase a stronger strategy of connections and opportunities that informs both the intricate design of the individual spaces, as well as the overall large-scale strategy for future phasing and development.

Site Organization and Landscape

- As the project progresses, consider creating more dissimilarities between the two symmetrical sides to generate more diversity. Symmetry should evolve into asymmetry.
- Panel reiterated that the proposed 1,800-unit development implies the introduction of a vertical town that will require adequate parking, services, amenities and open spaces. Given that the project is developing in the direction of becoming a destination that goes beyond its immediate context, Panel advised that the development should ensure as much amenity and offerings to the residents as it does to the visitors.

- Review the enlarged shadow studies to ensure that the courtyards and mews will be getting enough direct sunlight throughout the year.
- Review the opportunity of creating a better route for pedestrians and improving the long, glass lobby corridors along the drop-off courtyard by expanding/opening the anchor retail activities to the south. This might also be a good opportunity to bring people directly into the scheme.
- Consider allowing some of the mews retail functions to open towards the residential drop-off courtyards, as this would encourage social interaction and help strengthen the public/sitting areas being proposed within these spaces.
- Ensure that the programming and design intentions of the public/sitting areas at the drop-off courtyards are strong enough to balance the functional and operational drawbacks of vehicular traffic so that they are utilized as originally envisioned. Reconsider whether the central islands will be used if too many cars are going through the space.
- Ensure that the planting and green walls being proposed within the courtyard spaces will have favourable conditions for suitable and healthy development and survival as they are a key component of the courtyards quality and success.
- Instead of bringing the Highway 7 façade into the mews, consider extending the mews towards Highway 7 to create an inviting ‘vestibule’ that draws people inside.
- To better promote the commercial activities within the mews, study the possibility of enlarging the entrance opening along Highway 7 to allow for more views into the space.
- Consider adding more variety to the mews by expanding and contracting the linear sequence of spaces. Explore the potential of three main opportunities along the mews where the space could be enlarged to create an urban moment:
 1. at the north Highway 7 entrance;
 2. where the east-west courtyards connect with the mews; and
 3. at the south courtyard.

This would not only help animate and create diversity along the mews but would also help acknowledge each condition as a special place within the proposal.

- Ensure that the mews is designed and programmed to work as a year-round destination as activities and programming will be crucial to support retail. e.g. consider envisioning winter activities within the mews as a test of the year-round success of the space.
- Revisit the overall design and look at the functionality and programming of each space’s true and unique character so that the overall is not overdesigned and what’s proposed functions properly. Less is more when it comes to programming.
- Be careful with the overall mews design ambitions and proposed features as the condominium corporation may consequently inherit a significant amount of operational costs.

Massing and Architecture

- The language along the Highway 7 frontage is too big-box like. There is an excellent opportunity to work with the podium's architectural design features to create an environment that promotes foot speed rather than car speed. Consider having the big anchor language along Highway 7 transition into a finer grain as it moves towards the mid-point of the block and gradually transforms into a more refined pedestrian scale at the mews entrance.
- Although the proposed tower lighting strategy is compelling, be careful not to overdo it, as it might become a distraction to the rest of the project and the overall masterplan. Look at the broader masterplan to see how this development relates to the rest of the quadrant. Consider selected locations tailored to specific views and away from the more sensitive residential components of the project. In addition to light, consider art or other special features that produces different experiences throughout the evening/night and during the year.
- Panel is pleased with the proposed height drop along the east and west podiums, as it is beneficial to the development and more in tune with the intended human scale of the neighbourhood's residential character.
- Consider connecting the east and west rooftop amenity areas with an animated bridge that spans across the mews.
- Use sustainability as a tool to incentivise and promote diversity in design. Even though the towers work well together as a 'family', there is an opportunity to give each tower a unique, subtle character that benefits the scheme based on the orientation of faces relative to shading and how these respond to the context and sun. e.g. less glass and deeper window frames on the west facades to mitigate the effects of sun exposure.

Signage and Wayfinding

- This is a very thoughtful project that merits developing a clear signage framework strategy so that this is not left in the hands of future tenants and retailers.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 72 – April 25, 2019

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 March 28, 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

Promenade Shopping Centre Revitalization - Phase 1, Promenade Limited Partnership, High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

David Moore, WZMH Architects

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Company

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Avalee (Vaughan) Inc., 4-24 Lansdowne Avenue, Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Clement Messere, Development Planning

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Eldon Theodore, MHBC Planning

Derek Bonnett, Diamond Schmitt Architects

Brian Roth, GSP Group

12:15 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 72 – April 25, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 28, 2019 in Committee Room 242 & 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Absent

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Alfredo Landaeta, FORREC

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Misha Bereznyak, Urban Design

Gilda Giovane, Urban Design

Mary Caputo, Development Planning

Clement Messere, Development Planning

Nancy Tuckett, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest by any of the panel members.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for March 28, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. Promenade Shopping Centre Revitalization - Phase 1, Promenade Limited Partnership, High-Rise Mixed-Use Development

Architecture: WZMH Architects
Landscape Architect: Schollen & Company
Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the updated Phase 1 design in addressing the first-round of DRP comments relating to the following?
 - Providing a functioning pedestrian and cycling circulation network for Phase 1
 - Creating a sense of arrival from each side of the development, specifically at the south and on the east
 - Ensuring a successful Phase 1 that allows the Master Plan vision (Secondary Plan) to integrate along the retail street with the future phases of development
2. Is the proposal successful in creating an engaging pedestrian experience?
3. How successful is the proposed Phase 1 in their approach to sustainability for the architectural expression of the buildings and streetscape design?

Overview

Panel expressed the exciting opportunity this development will provide for Vaughan, specifically Phase 1, in creating a great urban street into the future and note the following:

- The Phase 1 works will affect the Promenade Mall Secondary Plan and future phases of development. Panel acknowledged the shifting economy and shifting retail market, however they stressed the importance of having clear rational goals that can coherently align with the Secondary Plan.
- Panel emphasized the importance of timeline for the phasing of next steps and the opportunity to complete the 'Highstreet' and connect it to Centre Street.
- Determine a clear hierarchy for pedestrian and vehicle circulation for Phase 1 and future phases to be established with the Secondary Plan.
- Phase 1 needs a stronger presence for landscape to create a sense of place.
- Review sustainability goals for Phase 1 and incorporate them into the details of the project.

Comments

Masterplan and Phasing

- Panel questioned the certainty of the retail strategy and the demolition of key components of the mall, however sympathized with the proponent for wanting to create something in the foreseeable future in the void that the Sears has left.
- Panel questioned eliminating the possibility of a street through the current mall as a future phase developed through the secondary plan.
- Panel encouraged the proponent to study site sections along the 'Highstreet' to examine how future developments will work with Phase 1 in the vertical context at the changing elevation across the site.

Site Organization and Landscape

- Panel stressed the importance of connecting to existing community facilities like the park, library and transit terminal through strong circulation links from the new public realm. Also, consider circulation after mall hours.
- Panel noted that there are large shaded areas on the 'Highstreet'.
- A pedestrian hierarchy between the plaza, 'Highstreet', and main interior retail corridor needs to be established through a circulation diagram and kept relevant for each phase of work (i.e. how people access the mall from the west side and how does the plaza facilitate a connection all the way to the Bathurst Street curb).
- The level and quality of materials needs to complement each area of public realm.
- The landscape component of Phase 1 needs to take priority over parking and Panel recommends that the landscape consultant take the lead in this dialogue.
- Panel questioned proponent's response to previous comments about a 'Highstreet' and explore what encourages people to walk the 'Highstreet' when they could be at concourse level.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel acknowledged the urgency of the proponent to move forward but cautioned to avoid the project from being developed as a series of placeholders and conventional techniques.
- Focus on the mall frontages to ensure a positive experience on the 'Highstreet' and to avoid the multiple narrow corridors exiting on to the 'Highstreet'.
- 'Highstreet' sectional width is similar to Queen Street West that has successful granular retail opportunities. Look for opportunities to provide variety at a scale smaller than large retail uses.
- Consider providing an incubator space. It maybe a financial loss but it is a space that can be used for the community.
- Panel recommended exploring a greater understanding of retail in future regarding a finer grain retail 'Highstreet'.
- More thoughtful consideration for the architecture of the podium, tower and retail components is required to ensure differentiation.
- Rendered glass elevations do not promote a sustainable development. The towers need to be more than window wall with a twist. The highlighted sustainable items need to be developed and incorporated into the details of the design and not just a list of aspirations.

2. 4-24 Lansdowne Avenue, Avalee (Vaughan) Inc., Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Architecture: Diamond Schmitt Architects
Landscape Architect: GSP Group
Planning: MHBC Planning
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please comment on the quality of the public realm including the mid-block connection.
2. Please comment on the overall massing and architectural expression of the development.

Overview

- Panel questioned the viability of the proposed north-south mid-block connection considering its narrow width, limited access to sunlight and its dependence on the adjacent property's land contribution. Panel recommended to either consider shifting the building to the east, or improving the east-west connection which has more potential.

- Panel considered the bulk of the building to be excessive for the site and that a reduction in its bulk will allow it to fit better in its context, especially in relation to the short separation distance from the west property line.
- Panel stressed that the building should not encroach into the rear angular plane and that vertical circulation in the building can be resolved without protruding into it.
- The massing, materiality and scale of the third level contribute to an unfriendly design and suggest a commercial use rather than a residential use; the design should be adjusted to be more attractive and fit better with the overall design of the building and its residential context.
- Panel questioned the function and location of ground floor uses in relation to the existing and future context and felt that a more nuanced approach is required in the design of the ground floor plan.
- The 'hat' at the top of the building is inconsistent with the expression of the rest of the building and adds unnecessary complexity.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- The proposed north-south mid-block connection will not create an inviting public space as it will be in shade most of the time and might be subject to adverse wind conditions. To improve the space, Panel suggested widening the gap between the buildings and to using 3D modelling to ensure that enough sunlight penetrates the space.
- In its current configuration, the proposed north-south connection will not be able to support the growth of trees until the site to the west is redeveloped. Since there is currently no plan for the redevelopment of that property, the design of the mid-block connection has to provide that opportunity by itself.
- Panel suggested to consider creating a focal point at the intersection of the east-west and north-south mid-block connections.
- Panel questioned the necessity for the north-south mid-block connection, considering the dimension of the block and the fact that the connection does not link to any streets or crossings to the south or north. Instead, Panel recommended focusing on the east-west connection since it corresponds to a more substantial desire line, and the required angular plane allows for better light penetration into this connection.
- However, Panel noted that to create a usable east-west public space requires resolving the conflict with traffic on the service lane and adding active uses to the north side of the ground level instead of only having service uses.
- Panel recommended extending the upgraded pavement into the laneway and the drop-off area.
- Panel questioned the viability of the public and semi-public uses in the ground level: the context may not support street retail, and the indoor and outdoor amenity areas

are not likely to be well-used considering the large size of the units. Panel suggested that the applicant should further explore the ground floor uses in the existing context.

- Given the location of the site and the size of the units, Panel questioned the necessity for a drop-off area and the justification for using the public right-of-way at the expense of boulevard trees to create the drop-off area.

Massing and Architecture

- Panel commended the ambition of the materiality and design details but considered the design too rigid and suggested softening the appearance by incorporating other materials, e.g. the wood used in the balconies, and/or breaking the symmetry.
- Panel thought that the podium design should be better articulated, and that a separate podium might not be necessary for a mid-rise building.
- Panel questioned the 45-degree rotation of the elements on the ground level as they counterproductively screen the public uses of the building.
- Panel questioned the 'hat' on the building and called it unnecessary considering that the building already has a complex design; Panel thought that as a contextual mid-rise building, it is better to downplay the mechanical penthouse rather than to emphasize it.
- Containing the building mass within the 45-degree angular plane can be achieved and is often done in similar projects. Panel asked the applicant to try to stay within the 45-degree plane.
- Panel was concerned about insufficient setback from the west property line: a future redevelopment of the property to the west with similar setback would create a facing distance between windows of only 14 m while at least 20 m should be provided.
- Panel was concerned that the floor height of the retail space (a little over 3 m) was not enough for retail uses to function. Panel stressed the importance of flexibility of the commercial space since the best use for the space may change as the area is being redeveloped.
- Panel was worried that the protrusion and the articulation of the third level made the ground-related portion of the building crude and unwelcoming and thought it can be made more attractive and friendly.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 73 – June 27, 2019

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of April 25, 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

2851 Highway 7, Melrose, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

Natalie Wong, Development Planning

Bonnie Chan, Kirkor Architects

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design Landscape Architects

10:40 am

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 73 – June 27, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 27, 2019 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Alfredo Landaeta, Forrec (Acting Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Absent

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

STAFF

Christina Bruce, Director VMC Program

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

Natalie Wong, Development Planning

Jennifer Cappola Logullo, Development Engineering

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Parks Development
Monica Vacca, Development Engineering
Cory Gray, Parks Development
Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design
Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

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

Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict of interest via email.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for April 25, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. 2851 Highway 7, Melrose. - Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: KIRKOR Architects
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design Landscape Architects
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 addressing the context and massing?

Overview

Panel commended the applicant on a comprehensive proposal. Panel summarized the comments into the following categories:

- **Site organization, functions and massing** – The site is very tight so optimizing the ground floor functions will be crucial to the success of the project. Consider shifting some functions around to take advantage of the ground floor organization while improving the activation of the urban edge and defining a stronger street wall condition.
- **Courtyard drop off & north-south street** – There are better opportunities for the courtyard than the proposed vehicular drop-off functions. Consider leveraging conditions along the north-south street to accommodate the vehicular drop-off functions within the proposed right-of-way while exploring more pedestrian friendly, community functions within the central courtyard.
- **Landscape and public realm** – The project would benefit from better connectivity throughout the site. The Highway 7 boulevard design will need to be revised so that it follows the vision, intent and recommendations of the VMC placemaking framework documents and guidelines.

Comments

Site Organization and Landscape

- The functions at the ground floor are currently too car and service oriented for such a tight site. Make sure that the design is consistent with the vision statement presented by creating a comprehensive placemaking, community-based project that's family-friendly, walkable, accessible and permeable.
- The site plan should have a more urban character with additional frontage dedicated to active uses and saleable spaces. Currently about 50% of the frontage is dedicated to servicing/drop off and other non-active uses which could be relocated elsewhere.
- The ground floor townhouses should be at least 2-storeys high and be relocated so that they define and activate the proposed streets to the west and south. Move the loading area further in and the amenity spaces to the podium's upper floors.
- There's no need for a courtyard drop off as this could be resolved by providing a layby along the proposed north-south street. The courtyard could then become a car-free, centralized, community oasis for the residents.
- The proposed u-shape is creating an odd alignment condition between the proposed courtyard and the POPS to the west. Consider relocating the courtyard to the east to strengthen the street wall condition along the north-south street and clearly separate the two proposed open spaces. Take advantage of the relocated courtyard so that it acts as a 'light well' that provides natural light to the inner podium.
- The POPS to the west of the site is a special place that should be used as an opportunity to generate a unique contextual response through the massing, materiality and overall design of the buildings.

- The project would benefit from a more holistic analysis of how the ground floor works around the clock to better understand general circulation and location of services and accesses. Do a mental walk through the site and imagine how each condition will be experienced by the residents. More questions should be asked: how will people move through the spaces? How will deliveries be handled? Where would a truck go and park when arriving to the site?
- Explore the possibility of adding bicycle storage at the ground floor level to promote active transportation usage.
- Revisit the design of the underground P1 parking level in relation to the proposed north-south street as the parking depth might need to increase in order to accommodate the municipal services including streetscape design, utilities, tree planting, etc.
- The integration with the future project to the east will be critical. Imagine how the relationship of buildings and spaces would be in designing the other side. How would it work in plans, elevations, mid-block connections, facing distances?
- The north-south pedestrian connection along the east property line should be given additional space to generate a wider, better lit, more pleasant walkway that feels safe.
- The design of the spaces along Highway 7 should be flexible to allow for other uses to develop in circumstances where retail uses are not successful. Promote other active uses along Highway 7 such as a secondary pedestrian residential entrance.
- The current streetscape design along Highway 7 is not providing for the double row of trees envisioned for the VMC.
- There might be an advantage in proposing the east-west road as strata. This could provide an underground parking connection to Phase 2 and would be an opportunity to eliminate one of the access ramps.
- The loading area in Phase 2 needs to be indoors and have the proper height clearance.
- Consider consolidating the vehicular access and loading/services in Phase 2 to the west of the mid-rise building in order to promote a more pedestrian friendly, residential frontage along the east west street.
- Consider providing additional exterior amenity rooftop spaces to accommodate flexible areas for families.
- Panel is very supportive of the idea to incorporate sustainable systems such as bioswales and other storm water management strategies along the proposed roads.

Massing and Architecture

- The reorganization of the site functions should be used as an opportunity to create a distinction between the design and materiality of the podium and the towers.
- Consider a more sculptured massing for the tower design that allows for great sight lines, sky views, sunlight penetration and a more subtle transition to the south.
- The podium is not providing a strong street wall. Consider following the more solid material examples that were included on part 4.6 of the presentation as an alternate to the proposed glass and spandrel frontages along the Highway 7 frontage.
- There could be an opportunity to shift the podium massing and create a loggia that generates a more intimate and interesting frontage.
- The relationship between the front lobby and the elevators is not working well as they seem to be located too far apart. There is a need for a more efficient pedestrian access strategy to reduce distances and eliminate long corridors. Consider providing separate entrances and lobbies for each building.
- The large distance between the Highway 7 retail and the loading and waste management areas is not efficient. Relocate the loading areas to a more centralized area that better serves the retail and towers.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 74 – August 29, 2019

City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Hearing Room 241,
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 27, 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

2 Beverley Glen Boulevard - Public Art Program, Daniels Baif Thornhill Inc., 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Catherine Williams, Public Art Consultant

10:40 am

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 74 – August 29, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, August 29, 2019 in Hearing Room 241, City Hall, 2141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will

Absent

Alfredo Landaeta, Forrec

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Carol Birch, Development Planning

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest by any of the panel members.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Approval of Meeting Minutes for June 27, 2019 was deferred to September Meeting.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW**

Beverley Glen Boulevard - Public Art Program, Daniels Baif, Thornhill Inc.

Public Art: Catherine Williams
Architecture: KIRKOR Architects
Landscape Architect: Land Art Design Landscape Architects
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Do you feel successful experiences can be achieved through public art installation(s) at each individual and/or all of the proposed sites?
2. How successful is the public art strategy within the context of the development block?

Overview

Panel commented on both the experience of public art and the structure of the strategy

Experience:

- For the experience to be successful panel asked for the potential strategy to expand the site option territories for art to have a larger presence. Panel recommended the strategy to include the corner of Bathurst Street and Beverley Glen Boulevard, the gym façade, and canopies along Bathurst Street for integrated art with architecture.

- Panel questioned the viability of art at the proposed location Site #3 (along Bathurst Street) and considered it as adding one more challenge to an already challenging circumstance creating safety concerns and conflict between uses.

Strategy

- Panel praised the proposed mentorship program and called it inspiring. They fully supported the collaboration between mentors and proteges giving opportunity to young artists to learn from established artists.
- Panel felt that too many decisions have been made without the feedback of the Design Review Panel and stated that DRP comments would have been more useful earlier in the process. Panel asked for future Public Art Plans to be presented to DRP early in the process.
- Panel recommended that the architect and the landscape architect to be involved in the public art process, be present in the debriefing meeting, and make themselves available to the artist for a successful fully integrated art with the building and landscape.

Comments

- Panel was concerned with the budget and the fact that there are a lot of people involved in the process which will reduce the budget for the actual art.
- Panel asked the applicant to make a conscience decision about stand-alone vs integrated art. For integrated art the building structure can be designed to hold the art piece which is more cost effective than a stand-alone art piece which needs its own foundation.
- Panel was in favor of a more integrated approach to art, making it part of the DNA of the project rather than staying at the surface.
- Panel felt that the corner of Bathurst Street and Beverley Glen is the logical place for the art piece as it will be viewed by most people and suggested the art to be integrated with the façade to avoid the conflict with the existing easement. The other locations seem to be tertiary in comparison with the corner canvas.
- Panel liked the location Site #1 at the entrance but asked for it to be extended to the entire gym façade and the canopies along Bathurst Street. They stated that a clever artist can cover the entire canvas with art and stays within the allocated budget.
- Panel raised concerns with location Site #2 as it is a long linear frontage which will stretch the budget for public art and is in townhouse residents' front yard.
- Panel recommended against the location Site #3 as the requirement for movable planters and art piece is challenging. The potential planting scheme of tall grasses combined with art piece might create lack of visibility for retail and raise issues of safety for public against the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 75 – September 26, 2019

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of June 27 and August 29, 2019 Meetings

9:30 am

Sorbara Group, 7887 Weston Road Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects

10:40 am

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 75 – September 26, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 26, 2019 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will (Vice Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, Forrec

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Absent

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning

Frank Marzo, Policy Planning

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Shirin Rohani, Urban Design

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Paul Kulig declared a conflict of interest. Margaret Briegmann declared a conflict of interest via email.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for June 27, 2019 and August 29, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

Sorbara Group, 7887 Weston Road, Mixed Use Development

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. Please comment on the massing, scale and overall site organization of the development as it sets the precedent for future developments within the forthcoming Weston 7 Secondary Plan.
2. Please comment on the ground floor layout, parking structure and potential to establish a successful urban public realm and privately owned publicly accessible space (POPS) informing but not precluding the forthcoming Weston 7 Secondary Plan vision.

Overview

- Panel commended the quality and the completeness of the submitted package.
- Panel highlighted the important role this development plays in setting a precedent for the Weston 7 Secondary Plan Area and the responsibility it carries to influence future developments in the right way.
- The proposed POPS implies continuity to the adjacent block (current Home Depot site) however in the absence of an approved Secondary Plan, Panel questioned if that connection is feasible and practical. Panel also expressed concerns about the

microclimate condition of the POPS and lack of exposure to direct sunlight when the lands to the west are developed in the future.

- Panel raised concerns about the east frontage considering what is proposed may not be a right strategy for the future development of the Home Depot site and may prevent proper development of that site.
- Panel proposed multiple design alternatives as proven strategies for vibrancy:
 - proposing point towers instead of slab built-form;
 - wrapping the podiums with residential units;
 - using the podium for larger family units with connection to outdoor space;
 - rethinking the ground floor and structured parking floors to be adaptable to future needs (i.e. retail, community space, etc.);
 - connecting indoor and outdoor amenities.

Comments

Site Organization & Architecture

- Panel questioned the rationale for proposing slab towers instead of point towers. While the separation distances are appropriate, Panel considered the tower floorplates very large.
- While staff appreciated that the first two floors are veneers with retails and lobbies, they proposed the levels 3,4 and 5 to also be veneered with 2-3 storey townhouse type residential units.
- Panel noted the inefficiency of two separate parking structures. Considering the connection to the future open space to the east may or may not be realized in the future, Panel suggested not to have a full through space consolidating the above parking structure to allow for more parking efficiency and potential veneer units.
- To break the rigid geometry and the austere look of the towers facing Weston road, Panel asked the applicant to look at directionality, stepping and realigning the towers.
- Panel acknowledged the eastern edge as a challenging one with 8 access points and potential conflict of cars, trucks, bikes and pedestrian. Panel asked the applicant to explore consolidating services to one access for parking and one loading area reducing the number of curb cuts and providing safe access for pedestrian (using parking or drop off) through strategic landscape design and pavement.
- Panel commented that the exterior amenity on the podium should be connected to the interior amenity on the same floor.
- Panel requested the at grade retail spaces (structure and MEP services) to be designed with flexibility/adaptability in mind.

- Panel appreciated that the lobbies are located interior to the site leaving the corners for double sided retail spaces.
- Panel directed city staff to draft a skyline strategy that can be applied to all developments.

Privately owned publicly accessible space (POPS)

- One of the ways to differentiate this area from VMC could be the density distribution in favour of microclimate conditions of proposed open spaces and public realm.
- While the site contains a lot of GFA, the proposed open space as a main feature is mostly in shadow resulting in an uncomfortable space especially in the shouldering months of summer. The skyline strategy should consider maximum sun exposure for the space. Panel recommended an alternative height distribution with higher heights north of the POPS and realigned towers to improve the sunlight condition in the POPS.
- Panel also noted the possibility that a similar development be proposed west of Weston Road that will eliminate the sunlight exposure on the POPS in the evening hours.
- Panel describe the POPS as a main avenue that connects to nothing and felt that narrowing along Weston road is a missed opportunity for POPS western frontage. The opening should be on the Weston road to capture more of the afternoon/evening sunlight.
- Panel mention that relocating outdoor amenity on the roof overlooking the POPS will create a dialogue between the two spaces and adds to the animation of the space.
- As the landscape design is developed, Panel stressed the importance of getting the proportions of softscape vs hardscape right for the space to be successful.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 76 – October 31, 2019

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

9:00 am

Pre-Meeting

Committee Members

9:15 am

Call to Order

Chair's Review of Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of September 26 Meeting

9:30 am

3300 Highway 7 - Vaughan Metropolitan Centre High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design - VMC

Jessica Kwan, Senior Planner - VMC

Sami Kazemi, Quadrangle Architects

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Dufcen Construction Inc, 7850 Dufferin Street Inc. Mid-Rise Residential Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Sean Lawrence, Kohn Partnership Architects

Michael Vani, Weston Consulting

12:15 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 76 – October 31, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 26, 2019 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Alfredo Landaeta, Forrec

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Absent

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will (Vice Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

STAFF

Jason Schmidt-Shoukri, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

Christina Bruce, Director VMC Program

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Amy Roots, VMC Urban Design

Gerardo Paez-Alonso, VMC & Strategic Parks Initiatives

Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, VMC Development Engineering

Gaston Soucy, VMC Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Natalie Wong, VMC Planning

Jessica Kwan, VMC Planning

Carol Birch, Development Planning

Cory Gray, VMC Parks Development

Chrisa Assimopoulos, Urban Design

Shirin Rohani, Urban Design

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest by any of the panel members.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 26, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. 1042710 Ontario Ltd., 3300 Highway 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: Quadrangle Architects

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 in relation to the pedestrian quality of the mews and the internal atrium?
2. How successful is the design of the podium in addressing the context, massing and public realm interface?

Overview

- **Overall Presentation** - Panel complimented the applicant on a well presented, thoughtful, detailed and interesting proposal.
- **Frontages** - Carefully look at the project frontages, corners and main building entrances facing the public realm to ensure that they are addressing the hierarchy and conditions of the surrounding streets and ensure proper integration with project interiors.
- **Circulation** - Strengthen the pedestrian quality and consider the human scale and natural circulation throughout the project. Reconsider the pedestrian role in the central atrium as there are conflicts with the vehicular-oriented service functions being proposed. Focus on making the central atrium more functional and efficient for vehicular activities and encourage the pedestrians to use the surrounding streets instead.
- **Phasing**- Consider a phasing strategy that works while future development takes place.
- **Sustainability** - Explore the integration of more sustainable design features into the proposal.

Site Organization & Architecture

- The project is very thorough and contextual, and the commercial spaces, office and residential towers are well placed.
- The podium's materiality, height and massing are well designed and articulated. However, the residential and office buildings above the podium could be more interesting and aligned with the sketch ideas provided.
- There are conflicts as to how some of the big exterior design gestures relate to the interior functions - particularly on the north-south central connection where the heroic grand entrance along Highway 7 leads to a service-oriented vehicular atrium.
- Consider enclosing the grand entrance along Highway 7 and integrating it with the office lobby so that it creates a monumental access space for the building.
- Separate the central atrium from pedestrian uses and develop it to efficiently serve it's intended purpose as a garage and service area. Consider adding a loading space for Tower A, redesigning/straightening the curved ramp, improving parking and circulation, relocating loading below ground, etc.
- The entrance to Tower B is dark and not as welcoming. Study the possibility of relocating the entrance to New Park Place, as it is a more desirable location that creates more active uses along the street.

- Look at options that allow more light to flow into the atrium. Explore carving additional lateral openings or inserting light wells from above.
- Take most of the pedestrian traffic out of the service atrium and redirect it to the surrounding streets, as the block is not big enough to merit a thru-block connection. In doing so, ensure that light and safe pedestrian circulation are protected at the atrium as there will be occasional pedestrian activities.
- The exterior façades knit well with the surrounding streets but fall apart at the corners. Consider looking at more retail use instead of residential at the corners.
- The move to carve the southeast corner was very successful. Consider doing the same at the northeast corner and eliminating the townhomes in that location as they are currently the weakest frontage.
- The design of the northwest corner is key to the success of New Park Place. It is currently being ignored and framed with blank façades. It is imperative to start coordinating with the neighbours to the west to study the possibility of integrating this corner into the overall design strategy. Potential strategies could include an open space, children's playground, dog park, etc. and adding fenestrations to animate the blank façades.
- The podium setback along Edgeley Boulevard seems tight. Study the idea of increasing the setback to enhance the public realm and encourage pedestrian circulation from Highway 7 to the future Urban Park to the north.
- Consider improving the design of the mews so that it has a more pedestrian friendly character. Coordinate an interim and ultimate design with the neighbours to the west and study the possibility of integrating the northwest corner as part of the mews design strategy.
- Look into screening the upper-west side of the above grade parking with other uses, rather than a blank façade.
- Show an interim and ultimate design proposal for New Park Place and demonstrate how the street will function while the Urban Park to the north and future development to the west are built.

2. Dufcen Construction Inc, 7850 Dufferin Street, Mid-rise Residential Development

Architecture: Kohn Partnership Architects
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How can the overall site organization be improved to create a better building and open space distribution, efficient pedestrian/bike and vehicular circulation and a successful public realm?

Overview

- Panel pointed to the misalignment between the Centre Street Urban Design Guidelines principles and objectives and the proposed development and asked that the development be revised to better align with those principles and objectives.
- There should be clarity and hierarchy of street network and blocks with an understanding of the location of building frontages/entrances vs servicing/loading.
- The proposed development should be revised to create a balance between roads/driveways and built form.
- Walkability and pedestrian comfort and permeability should be at the forefront of the design and not secondary to the vehicular accessibility.
- Take into consideration the promise of the Hydro corridor as a future open space for connectivity both visually and physically.

Comments

Site Organization & Architecture

- Panel encouraged the applicant to look at the proposal as a neighbourhood and design with the urban design principles in mind:
 - The proposal needs a fine grain network of streets and blocks. there are too many driveways. There is a need for hierarchy of streets (8m vs 6m width)
 - The proposal is completely vehicular oriented and should be designed with pedestrians as priority; there is no need for two underground ramps. Panel also raised concern about the lack of visibility for the north ramp. The one ramp should be incorporated into one of the mid-rise buildings and redundant driveways should be eliminated.

- The building entrances are isolated and there is no sense of front and back to the streets and built forms. Reorganize the buildings to have front facing front and back facing back.
- The amenity spaces are left over spaces and isolated, not creating a sense of place and gathering area for the neighbourhood. Panel stated that *“the whole is greater than sum of its parts”* and suggested mixing the townhouse and mid-rise typologies in favour of better/bigger open space(s).
- The design should be contextual, recognizing the community centre to the north and the potential of the Hydro Corridor as a future public park to the west.
- Panel expressed concern about the proximity of the proposed access on Dufferin Street to the potential future access of the south property. Panel asked the applicant to resolve this issue with City Staff upfront and if the site is required to provide access easement to both adjacent properties, design the main north-south road appropriately for the traffic avoiding cutting through the townhouse blocks.
- Panel asked the applicant to explore land swap with south property.
- Panel raised concern about the safety of the exposed stairways from underground parking especially in winter season and asked the applicant to improve the quality of the stacked townhouses by introducing central elevators and covered stairways.

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 77 – November 28, 2019

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 31, 2019 Meeting

9:30 am

2851 Highway 7, Melrose, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre High-Rise Mixed-Use Development, 2nd Review

Presentations:

Gaston Soucy, Urban Design

Bonnie Chan, Kirkor Architects

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design Landscape Architects

10:40 am

Break

10:55 am

Carrville - Block 11, The Remington Group Inc, Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road, High-Rise Residential Development, 1st Review

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Howard Nauboris, Cosburn Nauboris Ltd

12:15 pm

Adjournment

CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 77 – November 28, 2019

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 28, 2019 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major MacKenzie Drive, Vaughan

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Megan Torza, DTAH (Chair)

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Wayne Swanton, Janet Rosenberg & Studio

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins + Will (Vice Chair)

Ute Maya-Giambattista, SGL Planning & Design Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Absent

Alfredo Landaeta, Forrec

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Henry Burstyn, IBI Group

STAFF

Jason Schmidt-Shoukri, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Urban Design

Amy Roots, VMC Urban Design

Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, VMC Development Engineering

Nancy Tuckett, Development Planning

Gaston Soucy, VMC Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Jessica Kwan, VMC Planning

Cory Gray, VMC Parks Development

Shirin Rohani, Urban Design

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Michael Rietta declared a conflict of interest with the Carrville Block 11

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for October 31, 2019 were approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

1. 2851 Highway 7, Melrose, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Architecture: Kirkor Architects

Review: 2nd Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the revised design in responding to the first round of DRP comments on resolving:
 - Shifting some functions around to optimize and take advantage of the ground floor organization while improving the activation of the urban edge and defining a stronger street wall condition?
 - Improving the overall ground floor connectivity throughout the site?
2. How successful is the podium's architectural expression in creating a distinct identity and character for the development block and public realm?

Overview

- **Overall Presentation** - Panel complimented the applicant for a thoughtful, and comprehensive project update and for taking advantage of the previous DRP to successfully respond to previous comments.
- **Overall Design** – Now that the project is better organized, the next steps should involve fine-tuning the big moves and addressing the fine-grain details of the proposal. e.g. architectural expression needs to improve, particularly at the public realm level, courtyard functions need to be better defined to activate the space accordingly.
- **North-South Road** - Recognize the importance of the north-south road as the main entry point to the development and ensure the design reflects a great public realm.
- **Phasing**- Consider a phasing strategy for implementation of the east-west road, including the interim landscape design of the south lot.

Site Organization, Architecture & Landscape

- Even though the podium's height and massing has improved, the fine grain and choice of materials such as prefabricated concrete is concerning. Explore higher quality material alternatives that are more in tune with the pedestrian, human condition such as the ones shown in the precedent images. Use the datum of the 'roof' soffit to determine what happens above and below that line.
- The second-floor units around the courtyard could also take advantage of the podium's higher design by way of more attention to detail and materiality.
- The curved shapes on the towers seem randomly placed. Consider rationalizing the curves so that they respond to the placement of the towers and their context.
- The proposed north-south private road might be too car-oriented. Explore the opportunity to break it down and reconfigure the space to allow for a better-flow through more generous pedestrian areas, wider sidewalks, trees, etc. Consider extending the pavers into the road to create a more pedestrian friendly environment.
- The proposed private north-south road does not have a suitable tree canopy. Ensure that these boulevards are lined with as many trees as possible.
- The proposed 1-metre depth for servicing below the private north-south road should also be utilized to provide sufficient tree soil volumes along the boulevards.
- Study the possibility of extending the lobbies to the central courtyard, without compromising the corner entrances, as this would provide an excellent opportunity to activate the courtyard as the main entrance to the entire complex. Additionally, consider having uses in the amenity spaces around the courtyard that better promote the activation of the courtyard space.

- Consider mirroring the floor plan along the courtyard to create a large, private interior courtyard and a strong exterior frontage along the proposed north-south road.
- The north tower's secondary lobby at the east end of the podium might not be necessary. Consider eliminating it altogether.
- Consider relocating some of the ground floor amenities that are not contributing with the activation of the courtyard and the public realm to the upper podium levels.
- Consider replacing some of the amenity spaces along the building's west frontage with residential ground floor units to create active uses along the north-south boulevard. This would also help improve the architectural scale and expression at the pedestrian level.
- The open spaces to the east have improved greatly but are still too contained and congested. Study the possibility of integrating these into one space that's more flexible, fluid and better integrates with the proposed adjacent pedestrian walkway.
- The east walkway is an excellent initiative to promote pedestrian connectivity within the site. Study the possibility to improve the experience by widening and screening it more along the vehicular loading/service areas.
- The location of the loading/service and vehicular ramp area towards the back of the development was well received and the location and size of the ground floor bicycle room was also commended.
- Loading/servicing to the north tower and retail space needs to be better resolved as the only formal loading area seems too far away to the south. Concern was expressed that some of this loading function might informally take place along the north-south road which would be detrimental to the quality of the pedestrian realm.
- The south lot needs to be designed with an appropriate interim solution that addresses the public realm until the future mid-rise development takes place. This will be critical to the success of phase 1.
- Ensure that the location of the double row of trees along Highway 7 is not too close to the building frontage as this might create conflict that could affect the tree's opportunity to thrive.
- The large and flexible retail space proposal was well received, as it can more easily adjust to future market-driven demands. However, look at ways to take better advantage of the double-height spaces by adding architectural elements such as mezzanines, etc.
- The signage strategy does not seem to be resolved. Look for suitable locations that are achievable in relation to the building's aesthetics and structural design.
- Carefully study the wind mitigation design strategies to make sure that they are well integrated with the building design while achieving wind level targets that are suitable for the intended uses of each of the affected areas in and around the development.

2. Carrville - Block 11, The Remington Group Inc, Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road,

Architecture: Giannone Petricone Associates Architects
Landscape: Cosburn Nauboris Limited
Review: 1st Review

Introduction

City staff sought Panel's advice on the following:

1. How successful is the proposal in establishing an appropriate interface on both Rutherford Road and Carrville Woods Circle?
2. Please comment on the overall site organization, massing, the ground floor layout the podium expression, integration into the existing grade and relationship to woodlot feature.

Overview

- Panel mainly focused their comments on having greater connectivity to the surrounding woodlot both visually and physically and permeability through out the site and highlighted the following connections for consideration;
 - a. Connection and appropriate integration to the woodlot environment, Bringing the landscape onto the roof. Considering landscape buffer as a connector of the two environments rather than a separator.
 - b. Connection of the built form to Rutherford Road and the character of the podium juxtaposed against the topography of the Rutherford Road
 - c. Publicly accessible pedestrian connection from Carrville Woods Circle neighbourhood to transit stop
 - d. And pedestrian connection for the residents penetrating the building onto Rutherford road
- Panel also commented on vehicular circulation and its impact on the site organization and made the following suggestions;
 - a. Relocate the central vehicular entry to the north in order to consolidate the two lobbies into one central lobby.
 - b. Improve vehicular connectivity to Rutherford Road to reduce the traffic on the local roads.
- Panel also encouraged the design to take advantage of the unique opportunity to incorporate sustainable landscape approaches to stormwater management, and habitat restoration.

Comments

Site Organization

- Panel agreed that the subject site is unique in its relationship to the landscape, communicating complex topography that is particular to Vaughan.
- Panel suggested to embolden the idea of the tower in the landscape by pulling the carpet of the forest into the site and embracing the woodlot environment;
 - a. While parking is dipping into the land, the woodlot should be rolling over the 2nd floor roof, remove the fences and blur the boundary between built form and landscape.
 - b. Propose organic forms at grade level along the Carrville Woods Circle.
 - c. Design the turn around as if it is reminiscent of the landscape woodlot feature.
 - d. Propose restorative habitat that ties into the existing habitat in the woodlot
- Provide pedestrian connection for the townhouses, move the underground staircase out of the way and propose a strong public connection in the berm.
- Panel pointed to the pedestrian desire lines along the western edge of the built form to get to the lobbies.
- Explore vertical opportunities for connectivity in P1 and ground floor plans. Enhance connection to the south elevator core providing access to transit destination for people with mobility challenges.
- Remove the gates from the site, relocate the ramp between the two lobbies to the north side to consolidate the two lobbies into one central lobby with a grand architectural statement.
- Panel suggested a gradient approach to the landscape with public area on the north transitioning to semipublic in the middle, and more private on the south.
- Panel encouraged the design team to explore how sustainability is communicated to tell a story about the site.

Architectural expression

- On Rutherford Road, Panel recommended a horizontal bold move for the podium such as a plinth emerging from the topography, a simple man-made structure rising from the nature acting like a bar to measure the landscape against.
- Panel commented on the tower's expression and the discrepancy between the fluid forms of the precedent images and the rigidity of the proposal. Panel recommended the design to be more in keeping with the precedent images. The tower forms should also be responding to sun exposure and views.