

# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 41 – JANUARY 28, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of November 26, 2015 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. City of Vaughan Vellore Village South Library  
1 Villa Royale Ave, Vellore Village Community Centre  
Institutional Use Development**

Presentations:  
ZAS Architects + Interiors

**10:40 a.m. Break**

**10:55 a.m. SmartReit (Integrated Community Centre/ Library and Office Development)  
North West corner of Millway Avenue and Applemill Road,  
Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:  
Amy Roots, VMC Project Management Team  
Diamond Schmitt Architects

**12:05 p.m. Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 42 – FEBRUARY 25, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of January 28, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. Kleinburg Village Development Corporation  
357, 365 and 375 Stegman's Mill Road (Kleinburg)  
Low Rise Residential Development**

Presentations:  
Marco Jacob, Urban Design  
Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

**10:40 a.m. Break**

**10:55 a.m. Cedarbrook Residential Inc.  
Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road (Carrville)  
Low Rise Residential Development**

Presentations:  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

**12:05 p.m. Adjournment**



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

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

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

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

Presentations:  
KFA Architects + Planners Inc.

**10:40 a.m. Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 44 – APRIL 28, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of March 31, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. SmartReit (Integrated YMCA Community Centre/ Library and Office Development)  
North West corner of Millway Avenue and Applemill Road,  
Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:  
Amy Roots, VMC Project Management Team  
Diamond Schmitt Architects

**10:40 a.m. Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 45 – May 26, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of April 28, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. 9637133 Canada Inc.  
8188 – 8178 Yonge Street, and 5 Uplands Avenue  
Mixed Use Development  
Ward 5**

Presentations:  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Carol Birch, Development Planning

Kirkor Architects + Planners

**10:40 a.m. Break**

**10:55 a.m. Ace Developments Ltd.  
2057 Major Mackenzie Drive (Maple HCD)  
Low Rise Residential Development  
Ward 4**

Presentations:  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator  
Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Icon Architects Inc.

**12:05 p.m. Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 46 – June 30, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of May 26, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. City of Vaughan - Woodbridge  
Heritage District and Streetscape Plan Study  
1<sup>st</sup> Review**

Presentations:  
Gail Shillingford, DIALOG  
Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer

**10:40 a.m. Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN – DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 47 – August 25, 2016**

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

**9:00 a.m. Pre-Meeting**

**9:15 a.m. Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of June 30, 2016 Meeting

**9:30 a.m. 7700 Bathurst Street, Thornhill  
High-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:  
Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design  
Christina Napoli, Development Planning  
Quadrangle Architects Limited

**10:40 a.m. Break**

**10:55 a.m. York Region Affordable Housing Development  
259-275 Woodbridge Avenue & 64 Abell Avenue, Woodbridge  
Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Presentations:  
Marco Jacob, Urban Design  
Kathryn Moore, Development Planning  
Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.

**12:05 p.m. Adjournment**



# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 48 – SEPTEMBER 29, 2016

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

9:00 a.m.

## Pre-Meeting

9:15 a.m.

## Call to Order

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of August 25, 2016 Meeting

9:30 a.m.

## Expo City, Tower 3 and 4

2916, 2908 Highway 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

High-Rise Development

1st Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

AJ Tregebov Architect

10:40 a.m.

## Break

10:55 a.m.

## Norstar Group of Companies

File Number: Z.15.023, DA.15.022

1176 Rutherford Road (Carrville)

High-Rise Development

2nd Review

Presentations:

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

Turner Fleischer Architects

12:05 p.m.

## Adjournment





# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 49 – OCTOBER 27, 2016

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

9:00 a.m.

## **Pre-Meeting**

Staff and Committee Members

9:30 a.m.

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of September 29 , 2016 Meeting

9:30 a.m.

## **Mackenzie Vaughan Hospital**

### **Stage 2 Site Development Application**

### **Vaughan Healthcare Centre Precinct**

### **Ward 1 - Vicinity of Major Mackenzie Drive and Jane Street**

### **1st Review**

Presentations:

Moira Wilson, Urban Design

Christina Napoli, Development Planning

Stuart Elgie, Project Principal, Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Eugene Chumakov, Building Design Lead, Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Gunta Mackars, Landscape Architecture, Stantec Architecture Ltd.

11:00 a.m.

## **Break**

11:10 a.m.

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

### **Introductory discussion with Brook McIlroy**

Presentation:

Anne McIlroy and Matt Reid

Brook McIlroy Inc.

12:10 a.m.

## **Adjournment**



# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 50 – NOVEMBER 24, 2016

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

9:00 a.m.

## **Pre-Meeting**

Staff and Committee Members

9:15 a.m.

## **Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda

Disclosure of Interest

Confirmation of Minutes of October 27, 2016 Meeting

9:30 a.m.

## **Liberty Maplecrete (Cosmos Condominiums)**

**2951 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

**Mixed-Use Development**

**Site Development Application, 1st Review- Phase 1B**

**Update on Overall Development Plan**

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

David Butterworth, Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Company

11:00 a.m.

## **Break**

11:15 a.m.

## **Hilton Garden Inn**

**3201 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**

**Mixed-Use Development**

**1st Review**

Presentations:

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page + Steele / IBI Group Architects

John Zipay & Associates / Weston Consulting

12:25 p.m.

## **Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 41 – January 28, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 28, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

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

John Tassiopoulos, MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

##### **Absent**

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Drew Sinclair, SvN (Acting Chair)

##### **STAFF**

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Gerardo Paez Alonso, Development Planning, Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording personnel

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

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

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for November 26, 2015 were approved.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. City of Vaughan Vellore Village South Library**

Architect:	ZAS Architects + Interiors
Location:	1 Villa Royale Ave, Vellore Village Community Centre, Vaughan
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- How well does the proposal fit in with and contribute to the existing Vellore Village Joint-Use Complex, district park campus and surrounding residential neighbourhood?
- Please comment on the success of the architectural design of the library as a distinctive yet complimentary addition to the complex.

**Staff Presentation:**

Marco Jacob, Urban Designer

**Overview:**

- The Panel appreciated the effort and complexity of the project and applauded the architect for a good narrative in presenting the proposal. The programmatic portions of the project could have been better outlined in the presentation documents.
- Although communication with the library has been maintained through the development of the project, it was felt that the community centre requires a higher level involvement with the project. In particular, an understanding of a master planned site and the integration of future opportunities.
- Panel felt it was imperative to improve the resiliency to the future demands of the complex, more specifically to plan for future expansion of the library and/or the

community center and ancillary program).

- Although a landscape architect had been engaged for the project, a landscape plan had not yet been brought forward. Panel felt that landscape architecture should be integrated into the design proposal, from the outset.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Layout

- The Panel felt that the proposed extension felt disconnected from the rest of the Vellore Village Joint Complex. Better efforts could be made to better interface with the existing complex. The proposed library would block access to natural daylight for the existing Youth lounge.
- Panel felt it imperative to address the needs of the teenagers for the complex and the library. The entrance of the proposed library could be reconfigured so that the Youth lounge could be accessed through the library. It was also suggested that more space could be allotted for the Youth Lounge area. Panel would like to keep the existing Youth lounge window.
- More integration of the proposal to the skate park was requested in order to ensure visibility, safety, and CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). Barrier-free access to the skate park is also something to address.
- Panel felt that access to the proposed library is considered mainly from the point of view of vehicles, oriented around drop off, and felt that more consideration should be given to pedestrian access, particularly the connection from the bus stop at the corner of Weston Road and Villa Royale Ave.
- The walkway connecting the public sidewalk to the complex is currently 4 m wide. The proposal will substantially narrow this walkway as it approaches the library entrance. Panel felt this was the wrong direction for access to a public building.
- Panel felt that the main entrance to the library was cramped and questioned the strategy for the main access through the community centre vestibule. Panel also felt that the library required more open space in its floorplan for its patrons to congregate. More visibility of the entrance and direct access from outside was recommended.
- Panel felt that the location of the proposed library limits the potential of its growth in the future as there is little room for expansion. The issue of phasing was raised as a consideration. The applicant needs to ask themselves the question of where to put an additional 10,000 sq. ft. in year 10 of the project. Asking these questions at this stage was a way to more comprehensively address campus planning and to ensure futureproofing of the campus and community centre.

#### Landscape Architecture and Public Realm

- Although a landscape architect has been engaged, a landscape plan has not yet been submitted. Panel viewed the landscape as a huge potential, given a large

portion of the site is open space, and could serve as a mediation point between the library and the skate park.

- Instead of a stair connection, a better landscape strategy should be provided to connect the skate park with the rest of the facilities. Consider constructing a portion of the library at the skate park level.
- The location of the bike racks should be part of the greening strategy of the proposal.

### Architecture, Built Form

- Panel questioned the placement of the service functions on the western side of the building as that is the public frontage viewed by patrons arriving by car from the parking lot or from the walkway. The north façade is a blank wall and is not very inviting from the pedestrian point of view.
- The mechanical services are located below ground to allow the roof to be articulated. Panel felt that the architectural expression was perhaps too strong and should be more in keeping with the rest of the complex.
- A portion of the library cantilevers on the east side. It was felt that the 2 to 2.5 m deep area beneath the cantilever could be used as a sitting area or a change area for the skaters below. The foundation wall and cantilevered soffit are potential areas for graffiti, if left without a program. A skate rental facility and sitting area with benches could be integrated into this space.
- Panel questioned the sun control strategies given the generous use of glazing. Shading strategy is required for sun exposure even on the eastern façade, but also from the head beam of cars as currently the west curtain wall is perpendicular to a drive lane in the parking lot. Patterned glazing or fritted glass were suggested as ways to mitigate and control the sun exposure.
- Panel felt that the railing concept for branding on the eastern façade may take away from the intent of transparency for the building and also interaction between the library and skate park facility.

## **2. Integrated Community Centre/ Library and Office Development**

Applicant:	SmartReit
Architect:	Diamond Schmitt Architects
Landscape Architect:	Claude Cormier + associés
Location:	North West corner of Millway Avenue and Applemill Road, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Review:	First Review

## **Introduction:**

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

- How successful is the site organization in connecting various elements of the core Mobility Hub?
- How successful is the architectural expression in creating a landmark on a focal site?

## **Staff Presentation:**

Amy Roots, VMC Project Manager

### **Overview**

- Panel complimented the well resolved programme and interesting site plan, and felt that this was an exciting and important project for Vaughan and the VMC.
- The architectural language of the building should be refined to reflect and respond to the civic function of the YMCA and City community spaces. Currently the vertical distinction of civic versus office uses is not legible through the expression of the building design. A test of the project's success will be in whether the project achieves an intuitive wayfinding of the various uses perceptible from the street.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to be mindful of the long term vision for the area when the existing Walmart is replaced with other development and how the design of the parking structure can best contribute to that ultimate vision. Panel suggested the applicant develop a phasing plan to demonstrate the long term transition and redevelopment of the precinct over time. Future proofing for the potential ground floor conversion of the parking structure into active uses in the future is an important consideration in the design from the outset (by protecting for appropriate depth and height of potential future retail spaces as well as keeping the space free of encumbrances). Panel asked the applicant to take a closer look at the west façade (future street frontages) of the building and parking structure and design for the ultimate condition.
- Panel encouraged the architect to show how the big moves of the larger precinct plan are expressed at the smaller scale of the block with subtle nuances (through articulation, materials, planting, etc).

## **Comments:**

### Architecture

- Panel suggested the applicant provide a Nolli map of the entire precinct, including the public and publicly accessible spaces within the integrated mixed use building, to better understand the synergies between public and private space in the quadrant. Within the mixed use building, both lobbies should

dissolve into the surrounding streets and exterior public spaces in order to establish a cohesive and seamless public connection.

- The image of the building does not represent the public function of the building. The architectural language is more reflective of the corporate character of the office component. The richness of mixed programme should be expressed vertically on the exterior of the building. The façade of the two portions needs to be distinctive but complementary to each other.
- The civic overhang could benefit from a bolder design to emphasize the public entrance and programmatic uses.
- The different programmes should be more integrated. The current office lobby could be designed as part of the internal street to allow for more interaction between different age groups.
- Panel suggested that the location of the office lobby and civic lobby be flipped to better engage the YMCA with the YRT Bus Terminal and to provide better visibility for the community centre.
- Consider relocating the pool away from the pedestrian traffic along the allee with the YRT Terminal and replace it with active usage, such as retail, that can benefit from pedestrian foot traffic. This could be achieved by flipping the location of the pool and the daycare. Panel also suggested relocating the daycare outdoor area further to the south in order to take advantage of the south west light.
- The applicant should prepare a detailed study of how the parking structure will develop over time. The Panel appreciated the architect's consideration for future proofing a potential conversion of ground floor uses over time. The Panel suggested consideration for adding another added level to the parking structure in order to open up the ground floor for veneering the building with active usage.
- As Buttermill Avenue will extend north and become a public road in the fullness of time, the Panel encouraged the applicant to take a closer look at the integration of the buildings and the plaza with the streetscape design. The Panel questioned whether the pick-up and drop-off space on Buttermill Avenue would be adequate for when the surrounding area fully develops.
- A wind study should be conducted to ensure a comfortable pedestrian environment is created on all streets and in all public spaces.

#### Landscape Architecture and Public Realm

- The development will set a precedent for the design of future streetscapes as more developments come forward on the west side. As such, it is important to future-proof the landscape design and east-west connections on Portage Parkway, Applemill Road, and the internal woonerf from the outset.
- Consider the long term vision for the development of the woonerf as it turns into a more active street over time and plan for its design and transition over time.
- The pavement in front of the YRT Terminal has a strong design. Panel



suggested considering the extension of the pavement pattern across Applemill Road to connect the public spaces and pedestrian connections seamlessly with Transit Square, TTC Plaza and the TTC Station. Resolving the geometries between the various patterns will be an interesting design challenge.

- Consider the winter landscape condition.
- The rooftops will be visible from all surrounding buildings. Panel urged the applicant to look at the landscape design of the roofs.

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



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 42 – February 25, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, February 25, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Katrina Guy, Development Planning, Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording personnel  
Mark Antoine, Development Planning

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Peter Turner declared a conflict of interest for Item #2.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for January 28, 2016 were approved.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Kleinburg Village Development Corporation**

Architect: Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

Location: 357, 365 and 375 Stegman's Mill Road (Kleinburg HCD)

Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- How successfully does the development contribute to its context and character of the Kleinburg – Nashville Heritage Conservation District, specifically with respect to setbacks, massing, materiality, streetscape and cultural landscape.
- How successful is the proposed development's interface along Stegman's Mill Road and the publicly accessible promenade?

**Staff Presentation:**

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Katrina Guy, Cultural Heritage; Mark Antoine, Development Planning

**Overview:**

- This is an intensification project, with the proposition to provide luxury housing in a fantastic location. The key issue is what does this development contribute to Kleinburg village and its urban / pedestrian context?

- The design proposal is too monotonous, with evenly spaced modules that will not create an interesting place.
- The proposal for public art is a distraction from the site plan, architectural and landscape issues. Need to see a physical plan that has some kind of life and community feel. People will be entering their houses through underground parking. Therefore, it feels like it will be dull with no compelling reason for residents and visitors to walk on these streets.
- Reduce the number of units or rearrange the layout of the site to create more open space and variety within the site, including a common amenity space.
- Should have a more public face to the valley to the east. Recommend flipping units and promenade to create this visual and physical access with a public promenade along the ravine. This would better contribute to the Kleinburg community.
- Struggling to relate this proposal to the Heritage Conservation District character, including parcel size, the relationship to the valley and connections with the public realm, which are all components of the district's character.
- The rhetoric of the proposal does not match the proposed design. The development needs to make a stand, if it is a new building form being introduced, then should propose how this new form will build on and contribute to the HCD character and qualities in a positive way.
- The loading dock / driveway area configuration creates challenges and prevents pedestrians from taking a desire line across the site to walk to Islington village core.

## **Comments:**

### Site Layout

- Need more variety. Everything spaced very equally and with units all the same. This homogeneity is not in keeping with the village feeling of Kleinburg. Recommend the inclusion of other building typologies (such as semis and fully detached) and to play with varying setbacks to create variety with different scales and sizes. Additionally, the site plan would benefit from different treatments, widths and materials between the north-south and east-west streets.
- A variety of setbacks along the streets will soften the landscape.
- Consideration needs to be given to provide more soil volume to the roots of the trees along the promenade. Suggest lifting the promenade to achieve this.
- The strategy of “lollipopping” of trees along a promenade (homogeneous approach with same rhythm, setbacks etc.) was questioned. Instead, it was suggested to agglomerate green space and tree plantings into clusters. This would both contribute to character of place and give trees more space to grow.
- A real story should be told through the design concept. Given the location of the site, taking some units away from the proposal would create more open space and open visual connections to the valley. The design narrative should have a

beginning, middle and end. The more interesting things you can do will tell a more interesting story, rather than the homogeneous plan proposed.

- Suggest the creation of a common element space to look over the valley as part of the storyline.
- The layout of the buildings and open spaces within the site should be improved to improve sunlight access and sun angles.
- There is no focal point in the Plan, such as a community meeting space.
- The Plan looks like a flat site, but there are lots of existing grade changes that should be worked with to inform the design.

### Architecture

- The visual relationship between the two “heritage architecture” front units on Stegman’s Mill and the contemporary architecture internal units is jarring.
  - Use siting, scale, materiality, rhythm to make better connections and visual transitions, if two different styles are used.
  - Could the two traditional style houses fronting Stegman’s Mill be restored and relocated heritage homes? These houses need to be more authentic.
  - The two front units need to be more true in their architectural expression so that there is no need to use spandrel windows.
- Contemporary Elevations: the placement of materials is a collage, a patchwork. It is worth trying to simplify and to tie material to the function of the wall (i.e. a party wall is masonry etc.) Clean up elements in their materiality and this might help with the reading of the development and the connection to the two front units.

### Public Access

- Because the north-south promenade does not connect into any pedestrian system, there is no connection through the neighbourhood, this will not be a successful destination used by residents as the proposed art-walk.
  - The promenade does not have a public quality to invite Kleinburg residents to use it.
  - It should feel like it is on the way to something versus a destination. The dead end is not inviting.
  - The inclusion of art will not address the essential issue of lack of connectivity.

- The Site Plan should be adjusted to alleviate the problematic positioning of the gateway front unit between street, garbage pickup and ramp, which will not be a pleasant place to live.
- There should be a tot lot as a destination within this large site as families will need a place to go.
- Given that this proposal is positioned as a high end market development, individual air conditioning units should be in basements or screened appropriately if at grade so as not to negatively impact the utility of the rear yards.
- Lighting deserves special consideration because the proposal is a series of dead-end streets. As part of a CPTED strategy, suggest protecting entrances with a canopy to allow for a more gracious entry.
- Some units facing the corner will be facing blank walls at the west edge of the site.

## **2. Cedarbrook Residential Inc.**

Applicant: Norstar Group of Companies (Cedarbrook Residential Inc)

Architect: Turner Fleischer Architects Inc

Landscape Architect: MEP Design Inc.

Location: Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road

Review: Second Review

### **Introduction:**

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

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

### **Staff Presentation:**

#### **Overview:**

- The panel acknowledged the challenges of the site to create a high rise development. The site is an island surrounded by two wide arterial roads with wide daylight triangle on two sides and naturalized open space on the other two.

It creates an anti-urban condition in which combination with the market forces prevents gateway developments.

- The grade change is a challenge that needs to be further studied.
- The panel encourages the applicant to take a new approach towards the design by considering midrise built form.
- The overall design is constricted both within the units and on the outside; although the density has been decreased it has not resulted in a spacious site plan. The site plan appears overcrowded; the Panel encourages the applicant to relieve some of the tension of the site plan by increasing the density.
- The application is disconnected from the surrounding area. The open space is scattered and discontinuous. A more cohesive design approach to open space and the pedestrian movement from public realm to private space will benefit the site.
- Unfortunately the current proposal is not a positive step towards the Carrville District Secondary Plan and at this stage the panel could not endorse the proposed development.

## **Comments:**

### Layout

- Designated density in the Official Plan is high rise, the proposed development does not respond to OP in any way. The reduction in density and built form massing has resulted in a nondescript development. The application can be phased in order to respond to the long term market that does not preclude high rise development. There is a need for a long term vision that is in keeping with the future demand for density.
- This development is designated as a gateway and setting up a precedent for place making.
- Recent changes to the OBC to permit up to six-storey wood frame structures is an opportunity that can be explored.
- Reexamine the height and explore higher building to maximize the opportunities within the site. If there is a need for a full loop for circulation, increased height in some of the buildings will free space on the site for open space opportunities.
- Street connections between buildings should be located so that they are integrated with internal pedestrian walkway circulation.

### Landscape

- There is no value to the current corner plaza. The detailing, walls, and furniture need to be richer and bolder; the grade change can be used to suggest the

gateway condition using terracing in the corner to create a focal point. The waiting area for transit is disjointed with sod and needs to be incorporated within the design of the plaza. Panel proposed to relocate some of the development to the corner and create a more meaningful space somewhere else.

- The opportunity to create meaningful outdoor space is diminished; the open space within the site is very tight to the point that there is no room for trees, only small planters
- Panel requested that applicant consider the bigger context to evaluate the pedestrian movement within and around the site relating to the upcoming north and east development.
- The hierarchy of the open space is not clear. Consolidate the open space and incorporate the surrounding natural area. Make a continuous public/private open space. The central passageway/mews are not resolved. The open spaces can be programed to be more meaningful.
- It is not clear whether the west border with the TRCA land is public or naturalized private space, Make it public and relocate the tot lot next to the TRCA land to integrate the TRCA lands with the site's open space visually.

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





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 43 – March 31, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 31, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

##### **Absent**

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording personnel

Diana DiGirolamo, Development Planning

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflict of interests.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for February 25, 2016 were approved.

4. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. **77 Woodstream Inc.**

Architect: KFA Architects + Planners Inc.

Location: 77 Woodstream Boulevard, Woodbridge

Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- How well does the development integrate with and transition to adjacent land uses?
- To what extent does the site organization, layout, and massing of the proposal create a safe and healthy environment?

**Staff Presentation:**

Marco Jacob, Urban Design; Diana DiGirolamo, Development Planning

**Overview:**

- Panel commented that the quality of life with respect to creating community and support of active lifestyles will not be high with this design proposal.
- Panel highlighted that the contextual fabric that has worked for commercial and industrial uses in the past will change with the addition of mixed use development. As a different future is envisaged for the site, the current proposal will need to respond to uses beyond its property line and provide a demonstration plan for the future redevelopment of Woodstream Boulevard from Highway 7 to the adjacent employment use site.

- This is a pioneer project. The properties to the north (Mid-Rise Mixed-Use) which would create a transition to the proposed residential use in this application are not yet developed:
- Address the street – Proposal has taken a vehicle-oriented approach however it should be designed as a transit oriented development (T.O.D.) that supports and encourages pedestrian and cycling modes. Commercial is currently on the second floor but would benefit from being located on the ground floor to begin the conversion of Woodstream into a pedestrian-oriented street. Occupants will change over time. Although this project stands alone today, it will be the terminus of a much more intensified urban system in the future.
- Connecting to the valley – Ensure a clear connection from internal spaces to ravine, going south to the amenity area. Align breaks in east-west built form with landscaped areas so that the central north-south courtyard is visually and physically connected to the valley beyond. Redistribute open spaces and remove the burden of traffic to the periphery of the site. Panel strongly recommended a townhouse typology which would have windows and doors to animate and provide security for the internal circulation routes and amenity spaces.
- The proposed development is internal looking. Development must deal appropriately with edges. South edge is still employment while applicant must speculate how the north edge could redevelop.
- Panel commended the applicant for planning the future vehicular connection to the adjacent north property in anticipation of its redevelopment. However, there needs to be more thought about pedestrian and cycling connectivity and how the surrounding context will evolve in the future including how to transition to residential from commercial uses, how Woodstream Avenue will evolve, and how to connect to the ravine system, to transit, etc.. Additionally, further thought is needed to successfully transition to the industrial use interface to the south.
- Developer/client could not be present. Panel strongly urges client to be in attendance at the Second Review.

## **Comments:**

### Site Layout

- Panel recognized this as a complex design project given the adjacencies. This project will set the stage for development in the future. Although Panel commended the ambition in regards to scale and program of the proposal, it acknowledged that the responsibility is enormous and heeded that more attention must be paid to the key moves that will inform the future redevelopment of the area, including its relationship and proximity to the river valley.
- There is a lack of continuity and connectivity within the site disposition. There are few connections on the ground level – for example, podium building does not provide direct access points to the rest of the building. In addition there are no connections to the ravine. Nothing of the design of the buildings reflects its context.

- There is an over provision of space allocated to drop-off functions. Plan should provide a hierarchy of circulation and could benefit from better organization and prioritization of function.
- The plan would greatly benefit from bringing vehicles directly off the street to the garage rather than having to drive around the loop internal to the site. Similarly, loading should not go into the site – trucks should stay close to the street and away from the interior. Current Site Plan proposes a circuitous long way to go around to reach parking and loading, which will have winter maintenance implications on this space. This loop system is not animated by adjacent architecture and open spaces which is a lost placemaking opportunity.
- One way ramp system is unnecessary. A two way ramp could be a better option and should be explored. Turnaround circulation path creates conflicts in vehicular and pedestrian movement. Relocating ramp would help take traffic away from the interior of the site and focus on creating a good public realm. It was suggested to create a fourth plaza on the North East corner of the site that would connect to the future north site, by eliminating a ramp connection but still maintaining a fire route and a turnaround for motorists
- Garbage and loading is the first thing you see from Woodstream Avenue and should be relocated. This would also create more room for more generous lobby and entrance spaces.

### Architecture

- Panel has been asked whether the proposal creates a safe environment. The Proposed built form needs to leave room, in the way of separation distances and setbacks from property line, to ensure sunlight penetration, sky views and views to the ravine. None of this is provided in this proposal creating neither a healthy nor safe environment.
- Panel felt the massing was not right for the site and was concerned with the living quality of the proposal. The transition from valley lands on the east to the mixed-use buildings on the west requires further work and refinement. Panel suggested a transition/ demonstration plan for Woodstream Avenue to provide a conceptual massing study to prove that the current proposal works and is coherent regarding: facing distances, setbacks, location of loading, etc.
- The design of the towers as large slabs perpendicular to the street has negative impacts:
  - Two slab buildings facing each other tightly. Proposed built form leaves little room between buildings or setbacks from property lines.
  - Views - Views to ravine were described as one of the main goals of project. Current proposal has units looking at other units, not facing the ravine.
  - Shadow impact – At approximately 50 m in length, the buildings cast significant shadows in the courtyard space for the majority of the year, as seen in the Sun/Shadow Study. Shadow studies are a big concern.

- Slab buildings contain window wall to grade resulting in a monolithic and monotonous material treatment. Set against a 4-storey building consisting of brick, the 15 and 13-storey glass and metal cladding create a mix of building materials that are incoherent.
- Although the ground floor drop-off area is articulated as a podium, suggesting a street edge, it is not a true podium in how it addresses the street. Unlike a true podium, it fails to relate directly to the sidewalk, create a comfortably proportioned pedestrian environment, and relate appropriately with immediately adjacent buildings. Second floor commercial space is a meagre nod to trying to create a streetscape and should be brought to the ground floor.
- Panel encouraged applicant to look at different built form alternative options:
  - 2 to 4-storey wall buildings and a point tower may free up the ground floor for amenity area and sunlight penetration.
  - Development needs better transition in scale between buildings. Setting a 4-storey building in close proximity to a 15 and 13-storey building will have negative impacts. Remassing the building to terrace down into the ravine may ease the transition between buildings and reduce shadow impact on the courtyard.
  - The incorporation of townhouses on the ravine side has the potential of animating all sides of the courtyard. Currently proposed mid-rise building turns its back on this space. Building adds little to the adjacent landscaped area and internal street with minimal glazing/ transparency and no front entrances.
- Reducing the number of loading space will bring efficiencies to the site plan and vehicular circulation. Currently, 40% of frontage on Woodstream Boulevard is for loading and lockers. Explore locating material management and servicing within the building.

#### Public Access

- Panel criticized the circuitous vehicular traffic that forces cars through the development and up and down a ramp on the north side. Panel suggested vehicular access between the towers and opening up the development for pedestrian access.
- Pedestrian connections through the site to the mid-rise building are currently along a ramp to the north, through the building, or along a loading bay. Driveway could become open space and echo what is proposed on the ravine side. Frontage facing the courtyard is not animated. Proposal shows the rear of a mid-rise building and flank sides of high rise building facing this space. Site plan needs to be simplified and more pedestrian friendly.

- Public spaces, amenities and tot lot should be more deliberately located and supported by adjacent architectural form and use. Play area is cut off from the rest of the development. Amenity space is located on the third floor. Tot lot is next to loading. Internal space with lawn cast in shadow. In addition, buildings surrounding the internal space turn their backs on this space.
- Panel questioned the feasibility and functioning of the bike parking and circulation. Access through underground parking is problematic from a bike circulation perspective.
- Improve connection through the site. Private space currently connects to public space in the central courtyard and should be differentiated. Comfortable and generous public access to the valley open space needs to be provided through this site. Access to the valley is currently provided under a porte-cochère and through a private lobby or along driveways at the north and south ends of the site.
- Ground floor units of the 4-storey condominium have direct access to valley land pathway and central amenity space via the private terraces. Explore joining the pedestrian pathways to the valley lands. Explore the same treatment for the slab buildings.

### Landscape

- Although Panel recognized the efforts to provide distinctive landscape areas and features, it felt that the common spaces should be aggregated to create more successful open spaces for people to enjoy. The three proposed open spaces do not align or connect.
- Open spaces should be redesigned with animation of the ground plane for social activities from reorganized system and a better relationship with adjacent architecture.
- Direct and comfortable pedestrian routes and visual connections need to be created between Woodstream Avenue and the river valley open space.

**The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 44 – April 28, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 28, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

##### **STAFF**

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording Personnel

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflict of interests.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for March 31, 2016 were approved.

4. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. **SmartReit (Integrated YMCA Community Centre/ Library and Office Development)**

Architect: Diamond Schmitt Architects

Location: North West corner of Millway Avenue and Applemill Road, Vaughan  
Metropolitan Centre

Review: Second Review

**Introduction:**

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

- Has the revised design been successful in creating a vertical architectural expression that is reflective of the different land use components and yet still maintain a complementary approach?
- How successful is the revised ground floor layout in animating Applemill Road and Buttermill Avenue?

**Staff Presentation:**

Amy Roots, Urban Design

**Overview:**

- Panel commended the applicant on the ambitious vision and complex program, and felt that this was an important and exciting building type for the VMC.
- Panel complimented the applicant on the quality of the package and presentation materials. Panel appreciated the thorough explanation of how the design development had progressed to address previous DRP comments.



- Panel felt that there had been refinements to the design since the first review, but voiced concern about the expression of the ground floor and other programmatic elements. Panel questioned why only 2 architectural treatments were being applied to the project, despite the diverse and rich program. Panel encouraged the overall architectural expression to be more varied to reflect the different uses, particularly in the first 3 floors.
- Panel felt the main entry points into the building and public lobby were under celebrated and required a stronger presence and design prominence.
- The scale and prominence of the mechanical penthouse needs to be reviewed.
- Panel questioned the hierarchy of public space, and the function of the atrium as a transparent shared arcade versus simply a lobby. Will this connection truly function as public space?

## **Comments:**

### Site Plan

- Panel noted that the ground floor plan has been evolving well since the January presentation, resulting in the creation of better spaces. However, the extent of the opaque walls along the ground floor atrium was a concern.
- Panel recommended that spaces above the ground floor atrium, noted as “open to below” on the level 2 Floor Plan, could read more as an animated 2 storey space.
- Panel restated its concern about the location of the office and retail uses at grade, and suggested inverting them with retail at the south east corner of the building to create a more engaging and public relationship with the YRT plaza.
- Panel questioned why there was no access to the public atrium from the office lobby?
- Explore designing the retail space to accommodate new formats which would allow for the activation of the interior atrium with the public realm.
- Panel is looking forward to seeing this building integrated with the other developments in the block. The project should be shown in context, as it is difficult to evaluate the building in isolation to its context.
- The importance and potential of the east-west connection to the north of the building was highlighted. This will likely become a short cut that people travel through from the westerly neighbourhoods to reach the transit hub. Panel was interested in understanding how the design and integration of the east-west connection will extend into the neighbourhood to the west.
- Continuation of sidewalks on both sides of the east-west connection is important.

- Phasing of the block is an interesting variable. If the north property incorporates future at grade retail, the east-west connection at the north edge of the building will become even more important.
- Panel noted that the parking structure that was included in the first review has been removed from this presentation as a feasibility assessment is underway to determine whether a mixed use option is viable for this block. This building will be brought back to a future Design Review Panel meeting, and will be reviewed comprehensively to better evaluate the appropriate pedestrian circulation.

### Architecture

- Panel appreciated the changes that had been made to the materials and façade to warm up the spaces closest to grade.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to revisit the podium expression. More animation of the podium is encouraged.
- Panel commented that the vertical integration of uses in the project was interesting, meaningful and complex, but that the horizontal expression of the building was almost relentless in its 'sameness', given the continuous application of the bronze screen. Panel encouraged an additional level of thinking and development along the horizontal plane in response to the context, and felt there were places with opportunities for playfulness. For instance, along Applemill Road, a 1/3 of the building is fronting the urban plaza, yet the corner of the building is treated the same way all the extent of street frontage. Panel suggested the applicant to consider distance variation between the vertical bronze screen slats in response to sunlight exposure.
- Panel questioned the expression of the façade at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor which appeared to be treated in the same manner as the office uses above and is not differentiated as public space.
- Panel felt comfortable with the expression of the office space above and liked the shifts created in the building to allow for outdoor spaces higher up but noted that the mechanical penthouse was too dominant. Panel felt that there was an opportunity to do something special with the façade treatment of the mechanical penthouse.
- The main entrances of the building should be more pronounced and the west entrance could be treated in a much more fun and playful way. For instance, planes could project out of the building, and colour could be added to the soffits and under surfaces as a wayfinding device.
- The overhang of the glass box on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor above the bronze screen is underscaled and is not contributing to the design in a meaningful way.

- Given that the west façade has been primarily geared towards children, and with the introduction of coloured columns below the children’s library, is there a way of pushing the design of children’s space and playfulness further through the use of colour or landscape?
- Panel questioned the application of white brick for the daycare space, and whether this elevation was too disjointed from the rest of the building.
- Panel expressed concern with the lack of program under the projection along the western elevation, and the potential for the plaza below to become dead space.
- The design of the north façade at grade is very important. This is the only façade that operates as back of house, and is challenged in its need to service the building, integrate with the future phase of development to the north, provide porosity with the YRT Bus Terminal, and frame the important east-west connection. Panel was not sure the loading dock needed to be as porous as it is currently being considered. Panel questioned how the façade could continue to be visually interesting in its opaqueness? Should the aperture to the loading dock be smaller and provide more visual interest to an otherwise quiet façade?
- Given the nature of the future surrounding high density residential development, Panel encouraged the applicant to revisit the roof design to ensure that a green roof was incorporated.
- The treatment of the penthouse floor is foreboding and appears very top heavy and could be designed to be less conspicuous.

#### Signage

- Panel encouraged the material integration and lighting of signage into the bronze screen and façade design, rather than treating it as an appliqué.
- Branding of users should be emphasized.

#### Streetscape

- Panel expressed concern about the street trees being planted too close to the building and noted that columnar species were shown in the rendering. Panel encouraged the selection of larger canopy heritage street tree species.

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



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 45 – May 26, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, May 26, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Alfredo Landaeta, Stantec

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Drew Sinclair, SvN

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Development Planning, Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

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

Behnaz Djabarouti, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design

Daniel Rende, Development Planning, Cultural Heritage

Carol Birch, Development Planning

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

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflict of interests.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for April 28, 2016 were approved.

4. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. **9637133 Canada Inc.**

Architect: Kirkor Architects + Planners  
Location: 8178, 8188 Yonge Street, and 5 Uplands Avenue  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- Please comment on the proposed built form and architectural expression in the context of the adjacent residential, commercial and institutional land uses?
- How successful is the proposed design concept in its contribution to Yonge Street, both framing and activating the streetscape as a vibrant destination and movement corridor for pedestrians?

**Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

**Overview:**

- The panel provided suggestions on how to manage the scale of the proposal to better integrate the development with its low density residential context and also how the site and building design could be improved to contribute to the evolution of Yonge Street.
  - The Yonge Street Corridor Secondary Plan envisions the future of Yonge Street in this area as intensifying with maximum 8 storey mid-rise mixed-use buildings; the panel recommended that the applicant provide a contextual analysis/avenue study including all the applications on both sides of Yonge Street demonstrating how the proposed application will fit within and seed the future context of Yonge Street.

- The Uplands Avenue portion of the building should be more residential in look and feel; the massing, elevations and step backs need to be more articulated.
- The Yonge Street elevation has too many architectural moves. Orient the building parallel to Yonge Street to create a continuous street wall that will connect with future built form context along the corridor.
- The retail frontage, awning, and the streetscape along Yonge Street needs to be more fine-grained and urban. The design looks suburban, as if it were designed for vehicular traffic driving by rather than for people walking.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan

- The pedestrian circulation system around and through the building to Yonge Street and the outdoor amenity space requires more consideration; the connection from Uplands Avenue underneath the building with blank walls is not ideal, and the access from the visitor parking to the retail is not functional.
- The access to underground parking is not easy to navigate; the driveway can be pushed closer towards the ramp for a more efficient vehicular access; alternatively, the driveway from Uplands can be eliminated and the underground parking can be directly accessed from Yonge Street. Relocating the parking ramp also creates space for increased building frontage along Yonge Street and also increased depth of retail units fronting Yonge Street.
- The Panel encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of sharing the loop access with the south property to create a better open space.

#### Architecture

- Rethink the relationship of the main pedestrian entrance to the site; the entrance should be more ceremonial.
- The residential lobby could be relocated to Yonge street mid-block or alternatively to Uplands Avenue. The mailroom and CACF room should be relocated to create a better relation between the building and the street at the corner.
- The proposed service retail on Yonge Street should have a stronger idea and be more substantial; Shallow service retail units will not contribute to the character of Yonge Street as a major retail and commercial street.

- The layout of garbage and loading for the retail units is not functional, the design can benefit from a commercial active corner with a bolder and a more meaningful retail space as an anchor.
- Uplands Avenue is a residential street with a character different from commercial Yonge Street. The architectural design should respond to this difference with the character of the building on Uplands Avenue distinct from the character of the building on Yonge Street. The elevation of the townhouses respond well to the character of Uplands Avenue, but the upper levels of the building is monolithic, lacking the fine grain detail that is shown on the townhouses.
- Along Uplands Avenue break the building massing up into 2 or 3 freestanding buildings rather than a monolithic building mass to respond to the character of Uplands Avenue

#### Landscape/Streetscape

- The open space needs to be more integrated and connected. Consider undergrounding the visitor parking and using lay-by parking to increase the area for open space, improve pedestrian connectivity, and create a more meaningful back yard/outdoor amenity area for the development.
- The panel encouraged the applicant to incorporate the tree planting as continuous trenches incorporated into the grade on-slab, rather than as raised planters above the parking.

## **2. Ace Developments Ltd**

Architect: Icon Architects Inc.  
 Location: 2057 Major Mackenzie Drive, (Maple HCD)  
 Review: First Review

### **Introduction:**

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

- How well does the development integrate with and transition to the adjacent land uses and built form?
- To what extent do the site organization, layout, massing and architecture of the proposed development complement and enhance the landscape and cultural heritage value of the Joshua Oliver House?

### **Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

**Overview:**

- The panel acknowledged the challenging nature of the site for intensification taking into consideration all the restricting factors of the site such as the railway corridor setback, the grade, the shape and size of the land and the heritage home. It becomes clear that the site cannot be well designed and accommodate the maximum FSI.
- The proposal should better relate to the context of the adjacent single family houses and better accommodate the landscape and history of the heritage home and rural way of life into its narrative.
- Panel stated that for the second review they will need more information such as 3D model and shadow study to better assess the proposed development and its constraints.

**Comments:**Site Plan

- The concept is too dense and does not provide breathing room for the heritage home. In order to provide the ample open space feel in character with the rural heritage of the site, the development needs to reduce the development footprint and create more landscape space. The proposed setbacks throughout the site should also reflect the heritage character.
- The current design is inaccessible, there is no connection to the public transit on Major Mackenzie or the trails that connect to Maple GO station to the north and the woodlot to the south.
- Since the concept proposes the removal of all the existing berms with mature vegetation along the railway corridor to provide underground parking, the panel suggests incorporating crash walls and other mitigating measures to increase land area and assign this gained space to solve the vehicular access issue. Otherwise retain the berm and the existing mature vegetation.
- The grade difference along the east boundary with the proposed retaining wall and the half level below grade entrances of the stacked townhouses will create an undesirable environment. The proposal and adjacent community will benefit from moving the built form towards the westerly portion of the site.
- Since the development has no frontage on Silk Oak Court; the panel strongly recommends eliminating the ramp from Silk Oak Court and providing a secondary access from Petticoat Road using that stretch of site to provide a public pedestrian access to Major Mackenzie Drive for the community. Locating the secondary access in front of the entrance of the heritage home can also provide desirable natural frontage for the building.



### Architecture

- Proposing an architectural contrast between a contemporary design and the heritage home is a valid approach, however the site has to be designed to provide room for the heritage home to be celebrated and echo its geometry in its surrounding buildings.
- The 4 storey building (Block 3) along Petticoat Road will block sunlight access to the community amenity and child play space. There is a need to sculpt Block 3 to allow for more sun penetration.
- Terraced building(s) along Major Mackenzie could incorporate the grade difference and provide a better transition between the development and Major Mackenzie Drive.

### Landscape

- The proposal should strive to replace the high canopy trees back into the site. However, the current layout and the extent of underground parking do not allow for the canopy replacement. In the current proposal which has underground parking everywhere except around the heritage house, the large scale canopy trees can grow to maturity around the heritage house with undisturbed soils. There is too much hardscape within the site.
- The garbage room location which requires residents to walk across the site to deposit their garbage, does not function well, especially in wintertime and needs to be further studied; it could be moved underground and/or better integrated into the development.
- The front door of the heritage home is too close to the front yard of the Block 2 and the building is overpowered by the proximity. The front entrance should be celebrated and would benefit from more open space on the east side.

### Heritage

- In this scheme the heritage home is internalized and effectively “privatized” by the development, and therefore will no longer be part of the overall cultural conversation of Vaughan
- The proposed development needs to have a better relationship with the heritage house; the design should scale back and provide more space, both in the site plan and the building massing.
- The Heritage Impact Assessment should address the existing landscape on site and the proposed development’s compatibility with the heritage home.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 a.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 46 – June 30, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 30, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will (Acting Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Grant Uyeyama, Director of Development Planning

Moira Wilson, Development Planning, Urban Design

Amy Roots, Development Planning, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Development Planning, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Development Planning, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Development Planning, Urban Design, Recording Personnel

Daniel Rende, Development Planning, Cultural Heritage  
Musa Deo, Transportation Analyst, Development and Transportation Engineering

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio declared a conflict of interest for Item #1.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for May 26, 2016 were approved.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Woodbridge Heritage District and Streetscape Plan Study**

Team: City of Vaughan and DIALOG  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- Is the streetscape design delivering on the heritage character of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District?
- Does the streetscape design deliver a walkable public realm that is both inspiring and functional for daily life?
- How well does the streetscape design respond to and support the future of Woodbridge Avenue, based on the Secondary Plan and the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan policies?

**Staff Presentation:**

Gail Shillingford, DIALOG

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer, City of Vaughan

## **Overview:**

### **Panel's Comments:**

- Woodbridge Avenue is a fascinating urban design study because almost every single urban condition is contained along the length of the street, in a very compressed manner.
- Panel appreciated the proposed integrated design approach to address not just beautification but also how the street functions, including pedestrian safety.
- The streetscape plan needs to be a very strong public realm framework, reinforced by zoning and urban design.
- Emphasize the continuity of Woodbridge Avenue along its length.
- Do not make the design too complicated.

### Integrated Design

- The two levels of integrated design were discussed – technical integration and integration between zoning, urban design, engineering and landscape considerations. Go even deeper into the integrated design approach to maximize the streets' potential.
- Consider how the buildings on Woodbridge Avenue support the public realm. Does the streetscape design generate suggestions of design elements for buildings? How do the buildings meet the space?
- The integration and continuity of this plan is important so that in 10+ years, it will be coordinated and referenced with other plans and studies.
- The final document should explain the benefits of investment into Woodbridge Avenue generated by the key design moves, such as economic benefits and a pedestrian realm that brings people together.
- Panel appreciated the plan's move to de-clutter the streetscape. Refinements to the Plan should continue to integrate seating, lighting, newspaper boxes, etc. in a simple strategy.
- Noting that the proposed 3.5 m boulevards are very tight, what happens beyond the property line so that the clutter can be taken out of the right-of-way?
- Proposed seating could be built in and integrated into fabric of the street. St. George Street, Toronto was cited as a successful example of this. In this way, the conversation of choosing between a traditional versus a modern designed bench can be avoided.
- Another advantage of more integrated seating, lighting and furnishings is that they allow space for patios and pop ups in front of buildings.
- With an integrated design approach, every element is an opportunity for visual identity (tree guards, bollards etc.).
- There are passive irrigation opportunities with the integration of SWM into the design. However, there is not much space in the boulevard given the narrow right-of-way.

## Concept

- There has to be a theme to the streetscape design as a place. The High Line was cited as an example of a strong concept. Can also extend the theme to use with mobile technology/ apps.
- There are two very different ways to conceptualize the study that require different approaches. The street could either have a minimal design that accommodates basic needs, or it could be designed to become a high street destination.
- There should be one very strong sense of place from one end of the street to the other, from Kipling to Islington, with Market Lane the key destination. Expressed concern with the distinction between “Green” and “Urban” in such a small area.
- Currently, the Greenscape exists in front of residential uses. Is there a way that the residential Greenscape could become Urbanscape in the future, if intensification occurs? Need work on how to distinguish the transition between typologies of Urban/Green.
- Consider what happens east and west of the study area. The plan presents a strong feeling of how the street ties into the north-south context, but less so east-west linkages.

## Transportation

- This is a street that may benefit from tabletop intersections, using grade change at key moments, as a traffic calming strategy. Need something big to strengthen the proposed pedestrian focus of the street.
- Cycling facilities need further resolution. Panel was unsure whether the proposed on-boulevard bike lane located between Islington and Clarence is sufficiently wide to be a two-way bike lane. Also questioned if such a short stretch of street warrants a different treatment, considering it turns into a sharrow at Clarence Street. Cyclists may prefer to be on the street the entire length rather than navigating a sudden shift. The boulevard space might be better used for an increase of the pedestrian realm.
- Panel challenged the design team to further highlight pedestrian safety and cycling, noting that a transportation review will be required prior to finalizing the document, including for proposed cycling infrastructure.
- This design speaks to pedestrian safety as a priority and therefore the final streetscape plan document should include a chapter on safety, explaining why the plan proposes a road diet, radius changes, bump outs etc. and that it is not just about beautification.
- The bones of this Plan are traffic calming and functionality of the street – outline the key moves for traffic calming. Show how the elements of the plan cannot be separated from each other or removed as extraneous elements.

### Topography and Heritage

- Panel appreciated that the Plan takes cues from the historic fabric of Woodbridge Avenue. With no historic street decoration, as it appears in the archive photo, then it would be appropriate to look to a contemporary language.
- Encouraged the design team to look more deeply at the historic landscape and topography to inform the final design. Topography presents a host of opportunities, such as grade changes, thresholds, accessibility. Topography can provide the inspiration for the whole streetscape plan, as well as its individual details, such as wayfinding and L.I.D.s.
- Panel encouraged the design team to further explore topography to understand how it can help resolve issues. Retaining walls, steps, ramps, railings, terraces, belvederes are all vertical elements that can double as seating, signage and wayfinding.
- Need long sections between Kipling and Islington to understand the topography that will inform the plan.
- Need a north-south section that shows the steps up and down, for example, from the Fairgrounds to the War Memorial Tower.

### Built-Form

- The future of Woodbridge Avenue should be clearly defined within the anticipated/ planned built form context.
- Critical to the success of the project is the understanding of how buildings will support the public realm, integrating the built form with the theme and character of Woodbridge Avenue. How are buildings/ uses engaging spaces, including the nodes? What is the program at ground level?

### Pedestrian Nodes

- Panel questioned whether the nodes are diagrammatic or programmatic.
- How are we engaging the newly created gathering spaces? Need to consider urban program.
- Panel questioned how the buildings support and meet the pedestrian nodes, noting how buildings frame spaces to create a sense of enclosure.
- There are additional interstitial spaces that are underutilized that should also be considered.

### Parking / Seasonality

- Recommend removing parking spaces from the street, or from some areas of the street, in the summer to create more boulevard space. In the winter, could put cars (parking spaces) back. The revitalization of Main Street, Newmarket is a good example of seasonal change within the street using parklets.
- Details in the design are very important to get right. For example, the parklets could begin with a mock-up as a pilot project.

- What do you do when Woodbridge Avenue becomes a successful destination due to the revitalized public realm and there is a demand for more parking? Could introduce rear parking or shared/ satellite parking areas rather than street parking. Need a parking strategy for Woodbridge Avenue.
- Seasonal lighting should be considered as part of design.

### Wayfinding

- Panel encouraged further exploration of wayfinding. Demarcation with paving is not enough especially in winter.
- Is there a vertical representation moving along the streetscape? Opportunity for integrated vertical cues / landmarks.

### Hierarchy

- Panel noted some issues around hierarchy – for example, in the paving patterns.
- As a costing exercise, outline the hierarchy of elements and decide which elements must stay as integral to the design and which are secondary or supplemental.

### Implementation

- Given the tight right-of-way, ensure the proposed design is properly vetted so that it is achievable/ buildable. For example, how does the reality of utility locations impact the proposed 6 m tree spacing?
- Panel emphasized that the document must be easy for developers to use, and include a clear summary of how to use document. It must also make clear the vision of the study which is key to integration with other plans and continuity of the plan into the future.
- Put effort into showing detailed examples for owners to make changes on their properties in order to truly implement this plan.

**The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 47 – August 25, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, August 25, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Drew Sinclair, SvN (Vice Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design & Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design & Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Marco Jacob, Urban Design

Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage

Clement Messere, Development Planning  
Christina Napoli, Development Planning  
Musa Deo, Development and Transportation Engineering

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for June 30, 2016 were approved.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**7700 Bathurst Street  
High-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Architect:      Quadrangle Architects Limited, Presentation by Les Klein  
Location:       7700 Bathurst Street, Thornhill  
Review:          First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff requests the Panel's advice on the following questions:

- Is the proposal successful in achieving the vision for Centre Street as a destination with a strong visual identity and sense of place by enhancing the landscape and built environment?
- How successful is the site organization in connecting the various elements of the Town Centre? Anticipating the built form evolution of the Town Centre, is the proposal successful in framing and activating the streetscape as a vibrant destination and providing inviting and functional multi modal movement corridors through the site?

**Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Designer, City of Vaughan

### **Panel's Comments:**

Overall, Panel appreciated the ambition and level of detail of the project, and the desire to provide significant public amenity; however, concern was expressed about incremental planning at this scale without a comprehensive plan.

A more comprehensive planning approach is needed to:

- Define the infrastructure framework and grid
- Create a refined circulation network and meaningful pedestrian connections
- Identify the location and provision of public streets, community facilities and infrastructure, considered in relation to the context
- Define what is public and what is private realm
- Set the hierarchy, scale and massing of built form
- Outline a phasing strategy
- Identify when multi-modal transit facilities will come into play, and how they will be considered
- Understand and address the long term opportunity for the evolution of the Walmart site to the north and Promenade Mall to the south.

In the early stages of planning, it is important to get the urban structure right.

### Informing the Future Evolution of the Town Centre

- There needs to be a better understanding of the future evolution of the area.
- Need to study the surrounding context (existing and planned); including infrastructure, networks and connections, and stitch the development proposal into the broader planned future condition.
- The scale of the project is that of a neighbourhood, yet the civic component is missing from the master plan, i.e. schools, daycares, libraries.
- There is no sense of how diverse, urban neighbourhood life will take place.
- How will the civic components integrate with the mixed uses and transit facilities over time?
- Design proposal feels monolithic in approach. Need to consider additional building and open space typologies, including mid-rise buildings, to benefit the overall distribution of massing, to frame animated open spaces, to respond to specific conditions, and to provide for more variation and diversity.
- The relationship and layering of retail to other uses should be reconsidered.

### Blocks

- Need to rethink the definition of blocks and circulation systems, including public infrastructure, and refine how the built form and open space frame and define components within the block.
- Consider breaking the block with a public street, to create a finer-grain pattern.
- The site organization creates public spaces (streets and open spaces) with inhospitable microclimatic conditions, and removed from the core of the site.

Concern that the development blocks are only as wide as the tower, with no room for step backs, which may result in unfavourable wind issues for pedestrians.

- There are great opportunities to organize the blocks in different ways to address issues related to the long blocks and pedestrian connectivity. Could create servicing linkages underground to help make a more pedestrian-oriented environment.
- Think about integrating restaurant uses to activate spaces and define block depths that will allow for these kinds of uses.

#### Hierarchy of Streets and Open Spaces

- There is a lack of clear articulation of the character of active frontages and the hierarchy of streets and open spaces. How does the built form frame and define public space, and create identity within the site? Define which streets are retail streets, residential streets and servicing and loading streets.
- The result of the monolithic design approach is a similar looking landscape through the site, which is exposed to shadowing and inactive frontages.
- Recommend creating bigger and more meaningful open spaces. The proposal creates a dense, busy area, but the outdoor space offering is not adequate for the number and variety of people who will be here, including families and children.
- Public spaces are not connected.
- The square at the north-east corner of Bathurst and Centre Street creates a “dissolving corner” and will not be a successful public space. The intersection should be defined as a gateway through built form.
- Suggest the location of a new urban square to the interior of the site, possibly near the west corner of the site to provide a strong connection to the BRT platform.
- The internal main street is not realistic in terms of vision because it needs a more incremental concept for the phasing of the project. The internal street dilutes the energy of the retail on other streets and especially takes away from Promenade Circle as a future retail street by turning it into the back-of-the-house. Parking on the internal street overwhelms the amenity character and function.

#### Retail and Mixed Use Town Centre

- To become a Town Centre, the plan needs to be more urban in structure and the whole approach to retail needs to be more fine-grained and related to well defined open spaces.
- Creating a great retail street is challenging and more attention needs to be paid to what kind of environment is being shaped. For example, suggest less gap between buildings to better connect with adjacent transit facilities and to leverage the public open spaces for the development of this neighbourhood as a place.

### Architecture

- There are no step backs on the towers, which are critical. Need to look at articulating the masses of the towers from the base to enhance the pedestrian experience.
- The spaces between the podiums do not need to be all the same. Could connect some of the building podiums to increase outdoor amenity space and provide smaller scale covered outdoor amenity spaces which would help break the monotony and sameness of the spaces between the towers.
- Consider a mid-rise typology as part of the built form mix.

### Active Street Frontages and Architectural Edges

- The North Promenade should be designed with an active street frontage to leverage the existing main street condition of Disera Drive to the north of Centre Street.
- The plan shows a large amount of double-sided retail which is challenging. Reexamine the plan and minimize their number.
- Could turn the west building north-south to face North Promenade and the bus terminal and continue retail along the edge.
- The continued frontages along North Promenade are too long at 100m. Make a more permeable west edge of the site to draw in transit users.

### Distribution of Density

- It was noted that the opposite sidewalk on Centre Street will not have 5 hours of sunlight a day, which would suggest a lowering to a 21 storey maximum on the Centre Street frontage.
- Reallocate some of the density onto the proposed big-box.

### Parking and Street Design

- Re-examine the parking strategy. As a precedent, the Shops at Don Mills are currently removing some on-street parking and making parking spaces parallel instead of diagonal to break up the masses of cars, as they have found that it obstructs the retail experience. Most parking will need to be accommodated through structured parking solutions, or by integrating more parking underground.
- The width of space dedicated to vehicles along the internal main street is too wide and will be very hard to cross as it is currently designed. Tighten the street by replacing diagonal with lay by parking.
- Revisit if structured parking is really necessary and if most parking could be accommodated underground.

### Phasing

- The ambition for symmetry in the plan is problematic for phasing. The phasing should be defined and the plan should be designed so that the phases can be more discrete.
- How does the delivery of public space work with the phasing strategy? Build the public spaces in the first phase to add value to the development.

### Promenade Circle and Promenade Mall

- Recommend that the applicant speak with the owner of Promenade Mall for the coordination of parking and location of community spaces in the plan to tie into the Promenade Mall and inform its future evolution.
- Consider the drop in elevation from Centre Street to the mall, which is a one storey grade differential, to better inform the site organization and architecture. The southern-most building at Promenade Circle could have an accessible and programmable green roof to increase the outdoor amenity space offering and as important visual interest from the residential towers. There is also an opportunity to use that section created by the grade change to accommodate larger scale retail, if that is part of the retail program.
- In terms of the built form fronting Promenade Circle, the scale of the blocks and the two storey building on top of structured parking will be difficult to redevelop over time. Consider providing more density on top of the parking. The urban big box precedent on Queen Street was provided as an example of a finer grain and pedestrian-friendly retail condition at grade, with big-box at the upper podium levels and residential above.
- Treat Promenade Circle as a public road in its design (i.e. sight triangles, locations of ramps and treatment of edges to set the conditions for its future potential evolution).

### **York Region Affordable Housing Development Mid-Rise Mixed Use Development**

Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc., Presentation by Cliff Korman  
Location: 259-275 Woodbridge Avenue & 64 Abell Avenue,  
Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District  
Review: Second Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff requests the Panel's advice on the following questions:

- How successfully does the proposed architecture respond and contribute to Woodbridge's evolving built environment while respecting the cultural and natural heritage context?
- How well does the development interface with its two public street frontages, Woodbridge Avenue and Abell Avenue, to foster a pedestrian, cycling and transit-oriented environment?

#### **Staff Presentation:**

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer, City of Vaughan

## **Panel's Comments:**

### Architectural Expression

- Architecture should be an expression of its own time with the right quality, scale and materiality to complement the Heritage Conservation District. The proposed 'heritage style' façade treatment applied to a contemporary building which has a larger massing and height than historical precedents is not felt to be an authentic or appropriate architectural response to the program, nor is the use of a 'heritage looking style' required by the Heritage Conservation District Plan.
- The substantial grade change of the land provides an opportunity for the architect to respond to the site, such as the podium relating to the street (Woodbridge Avenue) and the rest of the building as something different.
- The architectural expression of the façade is less interesting than the previous submission, and should better relate to the dynamic interior program of the building. For example, the lounge space on each floor, which as a programmatic unit projects out from the elevation, presents an opportunity to break up the façade treatment.
- In general, the building mass suffers from an economy of articulation. While Panel understands the impetus to keep construction costs low, even some small gestures in this direction would go a long way to break up the mass, and make it feel like a more welcoming residential building.

### Woodbridge Avenue Frontage

- The podium projects out beyond the streetwall of Woodbridge Avenue, detracting from the public realm which has a tight negotiation of grade at this location along Woodbridge Avenue. The projecting podium will also be visually prominent, especially from the west. It would be better to pull the building back from the street to increase the amount of pedestrian space and the amount of landscape at grade.
- Within the circular driveway area from Woodbridge Avenue, look for ways to animate or improve the building façade visible from the street for CPTED and improved quality of place. For example, if it cannot be an animated frontage for programmatic reasons, the façade could be designed to integrate with a landscape solution, providing a beautiful stone wall that expresses materiality of the district, and/or potentially integrated as a ramp to the upper amenity area. Scooter parking area in front of this façade could be shallower to provide more pedestrian space.

### Parking

- The higher supply of parking spaces than required creates issues for the organization of the upper portion of the site. If surface parking is reduced by 18 spaces, opportunities will be created for pedestrian and cyclists.

### Loading, Servicing, Pick up and Drop off

- The current organization of vehicle access, pick up, drop off and loading is creating issues for the Woodbridge Avenue public realm which is a pedestrian-oriented main street.
- The amount of space available for pick-ups, drop off and vehicle circulation from Woodbridge Avenue may not be enough as designed, given the anticipated demand that is intensified by the location of the underground garage ramp at this access point.
- There is an opportunity for the entrance courtyard area on Woodbridge Avenue to be a pedestrian space that complements the public realm streetscape, designed as a social space for people. Residential units could front this courtyard to animate this space. Taxis and deliveries should be directed to the Abell Avenue secondary frontage.
- The entrance on the south side (Abell) is also dominated by parking, drop off and round-a-bout and vehicle infrastructure. The minimal pedestrian and cycling infrastructure provided is underwhelming, therefore further consideration should be given to improve this area. Look at ways to improve loading and servicing elements to improve their spatial efficiency and reduce their scale on the south side - for example, the drop off area should be made smaller, the number of loading spaces could be reduced to one, and also loading could be better integrated with the building and pedestrian circulation.

### Pedestrian Linkages

- This new development can create the context for additional pedestrian connectivity through the rail lands to the east. The Site Plan should protect for a potential future pedestrian connection along the east side, which currently includes a pedestrian path through the rail lands used informally by the community.
- The proposed ramp from Woodbridge Avenue along the west side of the site is not a successful pedestrian connection and will be dangerous to negotiate.
- Pathways for pedestrians and cyclists around the site seem convoluted in their routes. There seems to be an unsympathetic relationship between people using the new pathway and the uses that are strung out along the pathway.





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 48 – September 29, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 29, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Chair)

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Megan Torza, DTAH

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am with Sheldon Levitt in the Chair

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Peter Turner declared a Conflict of Interest for item #2.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for August 25, 2016 were approved.

4. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. **Expo City Phase 2**

Architect: AJ Tregebov Architect  
Location: North East corner of Maplecrete Road and Highway 7, Vaughan  
Metropolitan Centre  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

- How the design of Phase 2 could be improved to better activate and engage the mid-block public realm and frontage connecting to the future Edgeley Pond and Park (to be designed by the City in 2017)?
- Is the architecture and massing successful in addressing the policy context and intent of the design guidelines?

**Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

**Overview:**

- In the context of the proposed density and the anticipated volumes of traffic from both within and outside of the site, the proposed central courtyard layout does not adequately address functional circulation or navigation issues for either pedestrians or vehicles.
- Panel questioned the skewed orientation applied in repetition to all the towers and site plan layout which, all together, creates "*tremendous monotony in the whole design*".

- Panel recommended that the architect reexamine the proposed window wall cladding of the towers to explore more sustainable options and add more visual interest to the elevations.
- The north-south pedestrian passageway through the building should be designed with greater prominence and consideration of the pedestrian experience through the site. The architecture does not do enough to signify that this is an important connection or convey its public nature.

**Comments:**

Site Plan

Loading

- The organization of loading for all four buildings has been organized in a rational and coherent manner.

Central Courtyard

- Panel expressed concern regarding the nature of the central courtyard. The proposed idea of the central courtyard as a pedestrian priority place does not translate into the Site Plan which, *“feels like a car place”*.
- More careful consideration needs to be paid to the allocation of space for all the various activities and functions that will happen in the central courtyard, including short term deliveries, daycare drop offs, morning and evening peak hour traffic volume, visitor arrivals etc..
- Panel strongly recommended the removal of the underground ramp from the north side of the central courtyard to reduce the number of vehicles in this area proposed as pedestrian priority. It was noted that the resulting improvement in the pedestrian experience will also work to strengthen the retail experience for towers 3 and 4.
- The connections through the central courtyard are not clear. Further detailed drawings are needed (including sections) to clearly understand and represent the relational experience of place, the critical connections, how activity will flow at grade, relationships to amenity spaces, and how people will move through the buildings and the site.
- More generous and safe pedestrian spaces and connections are needed. There are pedestrian safety concerns with regards to crossing the driveway (street) north-south multiple times to reach the building entrances, especially for wheelchairs. The same issue of how pedestrians move through the site in the east-west direction was also raised. Consideration should be paid to a strong pedestrian desire line going through the central courtyard from both outside and within the site.

- Pedestrian sidewalks should be more generous and with weather protection. The proposed sidewalks are minimum width with clearways constrained in places between the building and planters.
- With a 6.5m wide vehicular travel width, on-street parking will spill over into the sidewalk.

### Architecture

The five towers of Expo City will have a significant visual impact on the sky line of the VMC. Panel discussed how the architectural expression will contribute to the experience of place.

- The proposed towers look banal. More variety is needed within the family including use of detail, material quality and colour to articulate the design intent. *“They can’t just be big, solid, glass blocks.”*
- Panel requested that the architect consider a more sustainable approach to design and materials of the towers. Concern was expressed for using the window wall method with no solar shading, noting that more advanced technologies are available. If the project uses window wall, consider what sustainable elements can be added to detail the façades and break the monotony.
- Active frontages of the architecture along all streets need to be strengthened.
- There is not a clear mid-block connection through the galleria north of the courtyard. The galleria needs to be wider, taller, more transparent and more evident. The heavy corten steel on top of the galleria does not contribute to the pedestrian experience.
- The pavilion idea could be stronger and more focused, framing something happening on the ground plane in front of it.
- The development proposal needs an insertion of the residential scale and quality. The expression of the north elevation podium, in both materials and scale, feels more commercial than residential.
- Panel expressed concern about the portions of towers that reach the ground without a podium and the resulting negative impacts. This is a powerful, expressive gesture that should only be used as a contextual response in strategic locations, to maximize public space, and mindful of the impact of wind on the public realm. Panel suggested wrapping the corner pavilion of tower 4 to reduce the exposed tower foot print in order to mitigate some of the adverse environmental effects and enlarge the retail footprint facing the park.
- Panel encouraged the architect to reorient towers 3 and 4 and to reconfigure the landscape plan to break from the skewed pattern. It was noted that the shape and angles that a pedestrian will have to move through within the site does not follow natural desire lines.

## Landscape

- The landscape plan of the central courtyard should be more bold and dramatic. It was noted that many people will be looking down onto the landscape from the towers above.
- Do not use coloured asphalt for the roadway but rather concrete or pavers.
- Courtyard is inhospitable in its current design with no wind mitigation. The shadow impacts of Towers 1 and 2 also need to be considered.
- Pedestrian areas should be continuous, generous and connected. A detailed drawing of the central courtyard supported by elevations is needed to understand the interface with all the edges.

## **2. File Number: Z.15.023, DA.15.022**

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

### **Introduction:**

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

- Does the site organization and architecture achieve the vision and principles of the Carville District Centre?
- How successful is the revised concept in encouraging pedestrian movement and presence through the site with connections to the surrounding open space creating a vibrant public realm?

### **Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

### **Overall:**

- This submission is more in alignment with the Secondary Plan vision than the previous proposal.
- Overall the site is too crowded and the final expression of this site will be compromised by that crowding. The open space needs to be increased to be more substantial and meaningful. Mid-rise scale could be introduced.

- While the diagonals (east-west connections) are a bold gesture and create graphic interest, the symmetry does not create a practical central open space. Panel recommended exploring alternate options to improve the scheme.
- The quality of the architecture needs to be further refined to reduce the perceived massing of the tower, reduce shadow impacts, better transition from tower to townhouse scale, and for a more meaningful corner at Rutherford and Dufferin.

**Comments:**

Site Plan / Landscape

- The current proposal feels like the overall amount of outdoor amenity space has been reduced, while the unit count has increased. Some reconfiguration is needed and an open space hierarchy established to create more significant landscape and higher quality amenity spaces.
- The bold diagonals of the two east-west paths from Dufferin through the site does not create a good quality central green, given the relocation of the ramp to this area. The ramp has created a fragmented open space. Additionally the view terminus from the open space to the architecture (townhouses) created as a result of this geometry needs to be re-considered.
- The grade change along Rutherford frontage has created a challenge for site permeability; the garage elevator can be relocated into the building to create a gap between the podium and the townhouse for a set of stairs to connect the internal space to the street.
- The 1.2m distance from the face of the townhouses to the sidewalk on the internal street is not sufficient for tree planting.
- Creating a multi-trail path on the TRCA lands is a great gesture. The Panel encourages proper completion of the design, integration with the broader trail network, and consideration of the maintenance regime through engagement with the Conservation Authority and City.

Architecture

- The scheme is an improvement by making the corner of Dufferin and Rutherford into something of significance with the proposed tower. However, Panel encouraged the architect to explore other options to the tower rather than simply an extrusion of the base. The floor plate of the tower (895 m<sup>2</sup> on floors 13 and up) creates a heavy visual mass, and the proportion of the tower in relation to the townhouses, is overwhelming. The tower should be more slender (750 – 800 m<sup>2</sup>), with a smaller footprint, and perhaps more rectangular to reduce the impacts of shadowing and on the sky view.
- The podium at the corner seems to be a hybrid expression. Is it a tower-podium relationship or a unique expression at that corner with a relationship to microclimate, sun/shadow, and wind?

- Suggest eliminating chamfering the corner of the tower; create a bold form for the tower to own the corner. The tower can be rectangular oriented along Dufferin Street to reduce the shadow impact. Explore if the mass of the tower can reach the ground to mark the corner with a bold movement.
- Suggest the introduction of a mid-rise piece to help break up the massing.
- In order to create an engaging tower, rely more on the design of the massing and less on the envelope.
- Materiality of the tower seems to be still in progress, the balcony proportions are good but the design can be simplified to a more singular expression for the corner.
- The Block 6 south units are 1 storey lower than the north units which has created blank walls facing the street; these units should match the elevation height of the back units.
- The pedestrian connection through the lobby should be visually stronger, regardless of whether or not it is a controlled access. The building would be interesting if you could see through the building to the space beyond. The landscape beyond the lobby should be something more significant than a 1.2m wide planting area between street and townhouses.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 49 – October 27, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, October 27, 2016 in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Drew Sinclair, SvN (Acting Chair)

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd. (Item #2)

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Megan Torza, DTAH

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Mauro Peverini, Development Planning

Christina Napoli, Development Planning



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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Fung Lee declared a Conflict of Interest for item #1

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for September 29, 2016 were approved.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Mackenzie Vaughan Hospital, Stage 2 Site Development Application**

Architect: Stantec Architecture Ltd.  
Location: Vaughan Healthcare Centre Precinct, Vicinity of Major Mackenzie and Jane Street  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

1. Does the location, configuration and design of the central public gathering space set up the conditions for an animated, accessible and successful public destination in the Precinct? (interim and long terms)
2. How well does the proposed architecture and landscape architecture deliver a comfortable, multimodal and high quality environment that supports public life, urbanity, health and wellness?

**Staff Presentation:**

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer

**Overview:**

Panel comments focused on the following key areas:

- Further development of the Site Plan using sectional relationships to resolve circulation issues and opportunities.
- Visibility of the frontage of the hospital on Major Mackenzie Drive and ease of pedestrian access to hospital entrances from public streets.

- The organization of views for high visibility and wayfinding.
- Architectural materials including articulation of the base and main public entrances.
- The use, animation and program of outdoor spaces including pedestrian connectivity with the public realm, the inhabitation of spaces, and how interior building uses relate to exterior spaces.
- How the phased full build out of Block 2 can achieve a more urban environment described in the Precinct Plan through the configuration of additional buildings and their interface with public spaces.

**Comments:**

Site Plan / Landscape Plan

Circulation, Building Entrances, Wayfinding and Organizing Views:

- In general, the importance of pedestrian circulation to ensure a comfortable and safe pedestrian experience was noted. There is an opportunity to improve pedestrian connectivity.
- The potential for pedestrian conflicts with vehicular circulation should be further considered as the design progresses. It was recommended to explore the three dimensional relationship between levels to resolve conflicts. For example, can the road be depressed in places to create spaces for people that are not compromised by vehicles? The drop off area could be depressed to separate cars from the piazza. It was also suggested to further explore the Level 0 zone with the transit hub connection and underground parking/ vehicle circulation.
- A panel member recommended using the proposed bioswales as an integrated system to create meaningful pedestrian connections and access points, and to create a stronger north-south pedestrian linkage from Major Mackenzie Drive to the north edge.
- Pedestrian connections from streets to the main entrance(s) are not yet clear. Connections can be more direct, intuitive and simple from both Jane Street and Major Mackenzie Drive sidewalks with a more compact and urban plan. It appears that most of the circulation will be accessing the building from the west edge (Street 'D').
- The consideration of weather protection and comfort for people walking from public streets to main hospital entrances should be further reviewed.
- The south entrance landscape could be softer and more visually engaging through architectural elements and landscape.
- The proposed landscape treatment and large building setbacks hinder visibility to the south and west entrances. The proposed landscape treatment along the front (south) portion of the site will obscure views to the building from Major Mackenzie

Drive. The previous more bosque-like iteration from the Phase 1 illustrative design provided more structured view corridors and was more urban in treatment.

#### Amenity Spaces:

- The panel questioned who would use the main piazza and how would it be used, noting that a successful piazza has clearly defined edges, a clear program, a comfortable microclimate, high animation uses adjacent, and no confusion between pedestrian and vehicular circulation. It was recommended to test the design validity of the proposed open spaces through narratives of how spaces will be used.
- A road bifurcating a piazza will create conflicts and low use by pedestrians.
- Courtyards should be physically connected with the interior volumes of space. Could there be a circuit or route in plan and section to create a “village hub”.
- Sun/shade conditions within keyhole landscape spaces should be analyzed in more detail through design development to ensure comfortable microclimates. For example, the courtyard proposed off the main entrance will be mostly shaded; can it be shifted to get out of the shadows of the building?
- Explore how the exterior landscape spaces can better knit together, including the opportunity to create a connection between the “walking loop” and the city’s public landscape amenities to the west of Block 2.

#### Location of Parking Structure:

- Consider flipping the location of the parking structure with the adjacent parking lot/ future building site to create a more generous civic way of approaching the hospital and for greater visual connectivity with the greater precinct.

#### Architecture

- The massing could have more variety, warmth and visual interest.
- Highlight and create more differentiation between the entrances.
- It was recommended to distinguish the public entrance(s) with natural material, tactile qualities, colour, craftsmanship and detailing to appeal to the senses.
- The animation and use of open spaces adjacent to building was raised with consideration of how the building edges can engage the exterior landscape spaces in a greater way. Can café and retail be clustered to concentrate activity in the area next to the south entrance?
- With respect to architectural expression, it was recommended to differentiate building elements a little more strongly.

- The base of the building feels a little boxy. Consideration could be given to creating protective edges where people are walking to create pedestrian scale at the base. Additionally, consider how to incorporate some of the canopies into landscape ideas, using screen elements and things that will blur the line between building and landscape, as the building does not yet fully integrate with the landscape.
- Green roof opportunity on the parking structure.
- Parking structure should be faced with a veneer of activity for a three-dimensional, connected experience.

### Phasing

- Include how the future buildings can be used and integrated over time to create a tighter, more urban environment to achieve the Precinct Plan vision at full build out.
- The future hospital ancillary buildings could help to activate public space(s).
- The future L-shaped building at Major Mackenzie could be used to create a stronger pedestrian connection with the transit hub
- Recommend building over loading dock area as a future expansion area. This will help address the Jane Street building frontage.

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

Project: The City of Vaughan

Consultant: Brook McIlroy

Location: All Wards

Review: First Review

### **Introduction:**

The purpose of the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines discussion was to hear from design professionals working in Vaughan, including Design Review Panel members, focusing on the design issues and opportunities encountered while developing in Vaughan. The information will inform the preparation of the Vaughan City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines and implementation recommendations.

**Presentation:** Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy

### **Additional Professional Attendees:**

Christine Abe, MBTW

Antonio Baldassarra, A. Baldassarra Architect Inc.

Jeff Craft, Terraplan Landscape Architects

Enzo Corazza, Graziani & Corazza Architects Inc.

Hoordad Ghandehari, Icon Architects Inc.

Berardo Graziani, Graziani & Corazza Architects Inc.

Michael Hannay, MBTW

Paul Marsala, Terraplan Landscape Architects

### **Discussion Overview:**

- Need a “refreshed” approach to design guidelines, specific to Vaughan. What is the DNA of Vaughan and what do urban design guidelines mean here?
- How to ensure the base line is good enough while providing the platform for truly remarkable architecture to happen.
- Encourage general excellence in architecture, not conformance. Overly prescriptive guidelines hinder creativity and the ability to respond to specific site conditions.
- Must consider that within the City there are many different conditions and contexts.

### **Topics of Discussion:**

#### Land Use

- Individual development projects must better relate to the broader context.
- Separation of land uses is a big challenge in Vaughan; there is no ‘finer grain’.
- How to implement a broader mix of uses within a single development proposal.
- Multi-family buildings and affordability; building forms need to reflect these users.
- Retail is relied upon to animate the street, but it is diminishing as a trend and a lot of the proposed commercial is inviable. Consider what else can happen at the ground floor to draw people to the street.
- Deeper thinking is required about retail and commercial on the street; where it should be located, and how it should be designed to be successful.

- Greater connectivity between nodes / important landmarks in the city is required.

### Built Form & Height

- Encouraged by guidelines, the podium/tower concept is used everywhere – it can be “relentless and thoughtless”.
- Podium/tower schemes do not always create a human scale and do not always address program well. Towers often look the same.
- Guidelines that include step backs and angular planes often do not allow for a site specific response to surrounding conditions.
- Should encourage investment in high quality architecture and materials, with less emphasis on arbitrary details.
- Mid-rise built form guidance needed to close the gap in scales. Mid-rise development in Vaughan will differ from City of Toronto (streets are wider).
- Townhouses are challenging as they are often proposed on major streets, and tend to use defensive measures to try to segregate people from the busy street edge.
- Densification of existing commercial plazas is an important opportunity for Vaughan.
- Differentiation in the horizontality of facades should be encouraged.
- Guidelines should facilitate a more robust exploration of high quality contemporary responses in heritage-related proposals rather than always relying on historicism.
- The Panel sees a lot of intent in development proposals that is not executed, i.e. ground floor often lacks direction (internal vs external use).
- Guidelines should address how to evaluate how well the building performs under the measures of performance standards

### Site Design & Landscape

- Block and lot sizes in Vaughan are generally large and should be studied carefully.
- Adjacent development and proposed development concepts must be considered and shown on drawings as part of the development review process.
- Failing projects don't understand context, including the flows of people to create spaces where they actually want to be.

- Need to create more space within the site plan for landscape; provide breathing space.
- Consider sunny side of the street versus shady side.
- A common design response in Vaughan is “dissolved corners” at the intersection of arterials, with buildings set back from large site triangles, creating dead spaces. Studies alternative design responses to provide frame and definition.
- It is difficult to get enough landscape area within townhouse developments (need to set minimums).
- Service entrances often conflict with pedestrian circulation.
- Parking is an issue in a fast growing city such as Vaughan, particularly with fractured parcels. Phasing of developments, interim uses and access are key aspects to address.
- The approach to parking and loading must be carefully considered as these functions drive the site plan.

#### Natural Areas & Sustainability

- 40% natural area is a significant asset.
- Sustainability will be key given the City’s natural heritage assets and context.
- How does architecture address natural areas? The city fabric should better connect and engage with natural areas.
- Valleys are a challenge with much development backlotting onto open space. Real value could be achieved by opening up views (i.e. public access, development frontage opportunities).
- Linking green spaces is an important opportunity to capture.

#### Streets

- Developing animated and pedestrian-friendly streetscapes along large regional transportation corridors is a challenge.
- Need to consider differences in scale, density and contextual conditions along Intensification Corridors.
- Does a 1:1 ratio and other conventions make sense in Vaughan given the City’s larger scale roads?
- Highway 400 bisects the city. Guidelines should consider measures that link the city through its urban frameworks.

- Consider seasonality, parking, loading, etc.

### Implementation of Guidelines

- Guidelines should be geographically specific for Vaughan. How do these guidelines differ from other areas? How does Vaughan compare to other cities?
- 'Urban' is a generic term; how do we define that?
- A general trend now for "urbanized guidelines" rather than "urban guidelines".
- Should the urban design guidelines have an expiration date? The document needs to be reviewed at regular intervals.
  - mid-rise pilot period?
  - tie to five year review of the Official Plan
- Use case studies to illustrate transitions in scale.
- Use case studies to explore and illustrate "what works".
- Modelling should be street view rather than aerial.
- Add retail and commercial uses to the 'frameworks' section.
- Guidelines should allow for creative design responses in response to a specific site context (i.e. alternates to tower and podium for high rise buildings).
- As conditions and technologies change, guidelines need to be flexible.
- Urban design guidelines should be based upon principles and a vision.
- The document should clearly explain how architecture will be critiqued, such as how does the building perform under the measures of performance standards.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 50 – November 24, 2016**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 24, 2016 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Megan Torza, DTAH

Fung Lee, PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

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

John Tassiopoulos, WSP / MMM Group Limited

Peter Turner, Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.

##### **Absent**

Margaret Briegmann, BA Group

Paul Kulig, Perkins+Will

Drew Sinclair, SvN

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Alfredo Landaeta, AL-UD

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Architects

Guela Solow-Ruda, Petroff Partnership Architects

##### **STAFF**

John Mackenzie, Deputy City Manager Planning & Growth Management

Rob Bayley, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Moira Wilson, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage

Amy Roots, Urban Design

Audrey Farias, Urban Design

Shahzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

Behnaz Djabarouti, Urban Design

Stephen Lue, Development Planning

Mark Antoine, Development Planning

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Fung Lee declared a Conflict of Interest for Item #1

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Meeting Minutes for October 27, 2016 were approved

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Liberty Maplecrete (Cosmos Condominiums) Phase 1B, Mixed Use Development**

Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.  
Location: 2951 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

1. How successfully integrated is the Phase 1 Block 2 with regards to the overall site organization and surrounding context?
2. Please comment on the massing and architectural expression of the built form in conjunction with the Phase 1 Block 1 towers, overall impact on the public realm and design integration with the Highway 7 streetscape.

**Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

**Overview:**

Panel comments focused on the following key areas:

- The consolidation of loading for all phases was well received.
- Future development in the adjacent site to the west may be encumbered by the

proposal. Panel suggested the applicant provide a diagram demonstrating how development opportunities on both sites can be achieved.

- The materiality of the overall design looks monotonous and the expression of the office is not fully resolved. The architectural expression of the development needs to be further explored.
- There is need for better transition between the Phase 1B office building and the Phase 1A residential podium.
- The recessed ground floor is not contributing to an effective retail experience; concerns were raised about the quality of the space under the colonnade.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan / Landscape Plan

- It is important to understand how the development fits within the context of adjacent lots.
- The breakdown of the scale from high rise residential to midrise office is a good move but the phase 1 residential tower 1&2 should also come down to a midrise podium to create a better transition.
- The wraparound retail on the north-west corner of the site may not be feasible depending on the design of the adjacent site.
- Panel questioned the pedestrian conditions and activation of Street A and asked the applicant to further activate ground floor conditions along the park edges to increase pedestrian movement.
- In order to achieve the vision for the mews and a proper connection to Black Creek, there needs to be a discussion between the landscape architect and the traffic consultant as to the design of the space to ensure that a pedestrian friendly environment is created. Traffic calming measures should be explored.
- The proposal needs to take advantage of the City's investment in the Black Creek renewal synergizing with the larger vision for the public realm in the VMC. A stronger relationship to the channel that responds to the slope is needed.
- The ramp to the west adjacent block should be treated as an extension of the street. The mews should be well designed with proper boulevard elements and pedestrian-first considerations.
- The opportunity to create a pedestrian connection with Black Creek in the NW quadrant of the development should be captured.
- The park is in the shadow for most of the time. Park design and programming should capture areas with windows of sunlight.
- Consideration of use by dogs and their owners is needed for the park design.
- Below grade circulation is confusing and could be simplified.

## Architecture / Massing

- The materiality of the overall design looks monotonous and the subtle changes in the balcony material do not create a noticeable change. Greater differentiation needs to be created. Panel encouraged the design to break the monotony by:
  - Incorporating sustainable approaches for different exposure in the design of the elevations.
  - Designing the office curtain wall protrusion as a big and bold gesture.
- Encourage pedestrian life on Highway 7 by creating an inviting ground floor design; signage can be introduced through banners, and the opaque wall can be eliminated and replaced with glazing. The ground floor overhang with deep setbacks and the office atrium design do not contribute positively to the at grade experience; microclimatic conditions such as the downdraft along Highway 7 can be addressed differently than as proposed.
- The spatial quality of the mid-block breezeway should be further studied to ensure light penetration and creation of a pedestrian friendly environment. As well, this space should be studied as a potential second connection to Black Creek, as it is a natural desire. If the two loading areas are configured to face each other, the hammerhead turnaround can be eliminated to provide more room for landscape to the west.
- Elevations should show grades.

## **2. Hilton Garden Inn, Mixed Use Development**

Architect: Page + Steele / IBI Group Architects  
Location: 3201 Hwy 7, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre  
Review: First Review

### **Introduction:**

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

1. Site organization with respect to ground floor uses, circulation, permeability and servicing access both at the interim and ultimate configuration.
2. Architectural expression of the various built form components, including the scale and massing of the podium, impact on the pedestrian realm, and design integration with the Highway 7 streetscape.

### **Staff Presentation:**

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Urban Design

### **Overview:**

Panel comments focused on the following key areas:

- Panel complimented the applicant on the aspirations for the project and hoped that the project would achieve the high architectural standards highlighted in the precedent imagery.
- Maintaining the existing hotel building is resulting in huge trade-offs for the project, and lost opportunity costs for the overall development.
- Panel encouraged the applicant to develop a stronger relationship to the surrounding context and planned vision for the neighbourhood, including future public street frontages, mid-block connections, , parks and open spaces. Streetscape elements and public realm components should be properly articulated and planned to inform the build out of the downtown.
- Panel urged the applicant to explore alternative options for relocating the hotel uses and providing built form frontage along the local roads as envisioned in the VMC Urban Design Guidelines and VMC Streetscape and Open Space Plan. The site organization in the south portion of the site is too suburban, internalized, and car-oriented in treatment. Reorientation of the site may provide for a stronger north-south spine, as well as an opportunity to create an east-west connection and provide more public realm/amenity space for residents.
- While the Highway 7 massing is attempting to create a grand sense of public space, the scale of the ground floor is overpowering. More human scale should be achieved through the design of the podium massing and streetscape treatment. Breaks in the mass should be explored to achieve more fine grain detailing.
- Site constraints are resulting in elongated tower footprints with long façades in the east-west orientation. Reconsider tower massing to minimize the slab presence.
- Rather than just accommodate area for future streets, the project should advocate for the planned street network to be built sooner to catalyze urbanity.

### **Comments:**

#### Site Plan / Landscape Plan

- Complexity of the program should be carefully considered. Maintaining the existing hotel structure is creating issues for the site organization and compromising the big moves of the project.
- Before the design moves further ahead, alternative land use schemes should be explored. Re-examining the ground plane of the site in a more economical manner would make room for greater landscape area and more meaningful pedestrian connections.

- Moving the hotel frontage to the corner of Interchange Way and Highway 7 would improve the ground floor program. The hotel and residential entrance could be combined in a more meaningful way, and the area of the drop off could be tightened. Reconsider inclusion of hotel rooms at grade.
- Panel expressed concerns about the large scale commercial on Highway 7 and proposed that to consider a finer grain of retail and/or bringing some of the hotel uses to the street.
- Within the overall site plan, too much of the southern area is dominated by drop off and servicing areas. Reorganizing the ground floor may allow for an east west pedestrian connection as well as reduction in the drop off area to make room for a pedestrian plaza where it is sunny.
- The urban approach to the west streetscape needs to be reflected on the south and east sides.
- Panel questioned how pedestrian friendly the scheme is. The north-south linkage is convoluted and should be strengthened by opening up clear sight lines and creating connection to the south.
- The north-east corner of the site will experience a lot of pedestrian traffic, the location of the lobby condo 2 and its presence on street needs to be reexamined.
- The courtyard looks interesting as a feature, but is a design challenge to make it a useable space as it will be in shade most of the time.
- Future pedestrian circulation patterns should be studied. The design and use of the central courtyard could be made stronger if projected desire lines are followed, punching connections through to the surrounding public streets.
- There does not appear to be enough outdoor amenity space for the proposed density.
- Re-examine the servicing / loading / drop-off strategy, as these areas of the plan have not yet been solved or are not yet properly placed. Could there be a satellite solution for loading and servicing underground? Driveways are permanent but could be looked at as temporary solutions.
- Clarify vehicular circulation below grade.

#### Architecture / Massing

- The Highway 7 frontage needs further exploration. The scale of the podium should be reviewed and increased height should be explored. Could the conference rooms be relocated above the retail podium?

- The institutional expression of the façade does not achieve the vision of a pedestrian scale environment. The inset podium and canopy creates a long expanse of shadow along Highway 7.
- Panel was “not convinced that the hotel suffers from being hidden behind the podium”.
- Entrances are treated too equally and require hierarchy and a stronger wayfinding typology.
- The sculptural form of the tower creates an exciting shape. However, the length of the towers creates a massive slab condition in the east-west orientation that needs to be reconsidered. The economics of the partially single loaded residential floor plates were questioned. Could the floor plates become squarer given the extra separation distance present in the plan?
- Panel was enthusiastic about the use of colour in the facades but suggested it be more focused in application on commercial frontage in places where pedestrians naturally move, at gateway points and/or to mark amenities in the tower tops.
- Lobbies are too tight and do not create a generous or pedestrian friendly experience. If the hotel use is relocated or rotated, the long lobby condition could be improved.
- Panel were concerned that an east elevation was not provided. More detailed contextual drawings are needed to review.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.**