

# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 5 – February 23, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of January 26th Minutes of Meeting
- 9:05 am Highway #7 & Wigwoss Drive**  
Application for Site Plan, 2nd Review  
2190647 Ontario Inc.  
*Presentations:*  
Eugene Fera, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design  
A.J. Tregebov Architect
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:25 am Rose Garden City / Hwy 7 & Centre Street**  
Application for Site Development  
Liberty Development Corporation  
*Presentations:*  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Kirkor Architects Incorporated
- 11:40 am Break**
- 11:45 am Bathurst & Beverley Glen**  
Application for Site Development  
BAIF Developments Limited  
*Presentations:*  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Kirkor Architects Incorporated
- 12:55 pm Lunch**  
**1:00 pm Adjournment**

# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 4 – January 26, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of December 15, 2011 Minutes of Meeting
- 9:10 am Discussion by Design Review Panel Members**  
Procedures and Protocol of Design Review Panel  
(Revised as a result of comments received from December 15, 2011 meeting)
- 9:20 am Status of Projects Previously Reviewed by Panel**  
Manager of Urban Design
- 9:40 am Break**
- 9:50 am Highway #7 & Jane Street Development (Vaughan Metropolitan Centre)  
Mixed-Use High Rise**  
Site Development Application, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
ZZEN Group of Companies & Midvale Estates Ltd.  
*Presentations:*  
Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design  
Gc Architects & The MBTW Group
- 11:00 am Break**
- 11:10 am Centre Street & New Westminster Drive Development  
High Rise Residential**  
Site Development Application, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Cityzen Development Group  
*Presentations:*  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
- 12:20 pm Lunch**
- 1:00 pm Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 6 – March 29, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of December 15, 2011 Minutes of Meeting
- 9:05 am Discussion by Design Review Panel Members**  
6 Month Review of Design Review Panel (Self Assessment )  
Review of Procedures and Protocol of Design Review Panel  
Elect a Chair and Vice Chair for next year
- 9:40 Break**
- 9:50 am Highway #7 & Maplecrete Development (Vaughan Metropolitan Centre)  
Mixed-Use High Rise**  
Site Development Application, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Liberty Developments  
*Presentations:*  
Christina Napoli, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Kirkor Architects
- 11:00 am Break**
- 11:10 am Weston Road & Retreat Boulevard Development  
High Rise Residential**  
Site Development Application, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Ozner Corporation (South), Lormel Homes  
*Presentations:*  
Mark Johnson, Development Planning; Rob Bayley, Urban Design  
Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
- 12:20 pm Lunch**
- 1:00 pm Adjournment**

## **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 7 – April 26, 2012**

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

**9:00 am Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of March 29, 2012 Minutes of Meeting

**9:10 am 3600 Rutherford Road**

High Rise Residential & Townhouses  
Site Development Application, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
West Rutherford Properties Ltd. (Lormel Homes)  
*Presentations:*  
Mark Johnson, Development Planning; Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design  
Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

**10:20 am Break**

**10:30 am Bathurst & Beverley Glen Development**

High Rise Mixed-Use Development  
Application for Site Plan, 2<sup>nd</sup> Review  
Liberty Development Corporation  
*Presentations:*  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Kirkor Architects Incorporated

**11:40 am Lunch**

**12:30 pm Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 8 – May 31, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of April 26, 2012 Minutes of Meeting
- 9:10 am Status Update on Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**  
Design Review Panel Discussion  
*Presentations:*  
*Moira Wilson, Urban Design*
- 10:20 am Break**
- 10:30 am Highway #7 & Interchange Way Development Proposal**  
Pre-Application for Site Plan, 2nd Review  
Easton Development (VMC)  
*Presentations:*  
Erika Ivanic, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design  
Robin Clark Architect / Paradigm Architecture and Design
- 11:40 am Lunch**
- 12:30 pm Adjournment**

# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 9 – June 28, 2012**

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

**9:00 am Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of May 31, 2012 Minutes of Meeting

**9:10 am 4603 & 4611 Highway 7 Development Proposal**

Application for OP and Zoning, 1st Review  
2058258 Ontario Ltd.

*Presentations:*

Erika Ivanic, Development Planning; Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
Burka Architects Inc

**10:30 am Adjournment**



# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 10 – July 26, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am**      **Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of June 28, 2012 Minutes of Meeting
- 9:10 am**      **Major Mackenzie Drive & Keele Street Mixed Use Development Proposal  
Maple Heritage Conservation District**  
Application for Site Plan, Official Plan and Zoning, 1st Review  
Goldpark Group  
*Presentations:*  
Mary Caputo, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design, Cecilia Nin  
Hernandez, Cultural Services  
Kohn Architects Inc.
- 10:30 am**      **Break**
- 10:40am**      **Discussion by Design Review Panel Members**  
Discussion on Mississauga's revised Terms of Reference, and role of the Design  
Review Panel in influencing policy and land-use decisions.  
*Presentations:*  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design
- 11:45am**      **Lunch**
- 12:15pm**      **Adjournment**

# **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

## **AGENDA: MEETING 11 – August 30, 2012**

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

**9:00 am Call to Order**

Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of July 26, 2012 Minutes of Meeting

**9:10 am** Presentation and Roundtable Discussion with City Staff and Urban Strategies Inc., authors of the VMC Secondary Plan and Appendix C - Built Form Guidelines. To determine if the policies and/or guidelines need to be modified/strengthened to better address design issues.

**11:00am Adjournment**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 12 – SEPTEMBER 27, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am**      **Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of July 26, 2012 Minutes of Meeting
- 9:10 am**      **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre 16 Storey Office Building and Public Square**  
Application for OP, Zoning and Plan of Subdivision, 1st Review  
Calloway REIT (Sevenbridge) Inc.  
*Presentations:*  
Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
Staff Planning and Urban Design context overview and questions for the panel
- 9:30 am**      Diamond and Schmitt Architects / Claude Cormier + Associates Inc.  
Project presentation for DRP deliberation
- 11:30 am**      **Lunch**
- 12:00 pm**      **Adjournment**

# CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

## AGENDA: MEETING 13 – OCTOBER 25, 2012

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

- 9:00 am**      **Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of September 27th Meeting
- 9:05 am**      **Carrville District Centre Block 11**  
Application for Site Development 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Nine-Ten West Ltd.  
*Presentations:*  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design  
The Planning Partnership
- 10:15 am**      **Break**
- 10:25 am**      **7476 Kipling Avenue**  
Application for Site Development 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Portside Development Corporation  
*Presentations:*  
Eugene Fera, Development Planning; Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
architecture unfolded Ltd.
- 11:40 am**      **Break**
- 11:45 am**      **Kleinburg Village Condominium**  
Application for Site Development 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Beaverbrook Homes Development Corporation  
*Presentations:*  
Mark Johnson, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design  
IBI Architects
- 12:55 pm**      **Lunch**
- 1:00 pm**      **Adjournment**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 14 – NOVEMBER 29, 2012**

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**  
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda  
Disclosure of Interest  
Confirmation of Minutes of September 27th Meeting
- 9:05 am Rutherford Market Place**  
Application for Site Development 2<sup>nd</sup> Review  
FCHT Holdings Inc.  
*Presentations:*  
Mary Caputo, Development Planning; Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design  
Pellow + Associates Architects Inc.
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:25 am Capo Di Monte 9909 & 9939 Pine Valley Drive**  
Application for Site Development 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
1668872 Ontario Inc. c/o Royal Pine Homes Inc.  
*Presentations:*  
Judy Jeffers, Development Planning; Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design  
Allen & Sherriff Architects Inc.
- 11:40 am Break**
- 11:45 am Kleinburg Heritage Square 10423 & 10429 Islington Ave.**  
Application for Site Development Mixed Use 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Heritage Hill Developments Corporation  
*Presentations:*  
Judy Jeffers, Development Planning; Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Services;  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design  
Bernatt Architect Ltd.
- 12:55 pm Lunch (Catered by Panera Bread Delicatessen)**
- 1:00 pm Adjournment**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 4 – January 26, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 26, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)  
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting  
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design  
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity  
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.  
Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.  
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects  
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects (Project #1)  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects  
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

##### **Absent**

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

##### **STAFF**

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel  
Maira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning Department  
Stephen Lue, Development Planning Department  
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

**The meeting was called to order at 9:10a.m., with Antonio Gomez-Palacio in the Chair**

#### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

The Agenda was MOVED by Janis Fedorowick and SECONDED by Brad Golden.

## **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Mansoor Kazerouni declared a conflict of interest with reviewing the Centre Street & New Westminster Drive Development application.

## **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, December 15 be adopted with revisions proposed by Sony Rai.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

Farhad Jalili requested that the member submit his amendments to meeting minutes in writing to Rob Bayley, Development Planning Department.

## **4. ADOPTION OF “DESIGN REVIEW PANEL SCHEDULE AND PROCEDURES”**

The panel discussed the following “Design Review Panel Schedule and Procedures”:

A panel member requested receipt of draft meeting minutes within one week of the meeting. Rob Bayley responded that staff will endeavour to meet this request, however the timing of issue of meeting minutes is dependant upon available staff resources. The Chair added that several days is also required by the Chair to conduct a review of the first draft.

## **5. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **a. Vaughan Official Plan Amendment**

File No:	Site Development Application Review
Applicant:	Cityzen Development Group
Location:	New Westminster Drive and Centre Street, Vaughan
Architect:	Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
Landscape Architect:	Terraplan Landscape Architects
Review:	First Review

### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined the Thornhill Town Centre area context, vivaNext rapidway plans and draft Centre Street Urban Design Guidelines, and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Does the site organization and architecture respond and contribute positively to its surrounding context, and how could it be improved to address both the stable low density residential community as well as contributing to the vision for the Thornhill Town Centre (designated a Primary Centre in the Official Plan) ?

2. Does the proposal meet the intent of, and vision illustrated in the draft Centre Street Urban Design Guidelines for the Town Centre area, with special consideration

given to the promotion of pedestrians and alternate forms of mobility?

### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Overall, the panel emphasized the important potential contribution that this development could make to create vibrant, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes in the Thornhill Town Centre. Panel commended the intent for an urban rather than a suburban approach to the development as expressed in the Urban Design Panel Submission, however felt that, overall, this intent was not captured in the site organization. Panel members agreed that the relationship of the proposed built form and landscape spaces should be re-arranged and improved to better and more actively engage the adjacent streetscapes.

The following design recommendations were proposed:

#### Emerging Context

Panel proposed that the buildings and open spaces should more strongly frame and engage the streetscapes, including Centre Street, New Westminster, the new east-west public road, and the future new north-south public road. It was felt that the proposed site plan contains many smaller "fractured" open spaces that front the streets with the effect of creating a more suburban rather than urban pedestrian streetscape experience.

Elevations or massing would be required to better understand the relationship of the 8 storey building with building A, however, with the information provided, it was agreed that active frontages arranged with less loose space and more consistent street wall and setbacks in line with the Urban Design Guidelines should be pursued to create a more welcoming pedestrian realm.

The inclusion on the plans of fencing along the streetscape was noted, and it was recommended to remove this element from the design for the site plan submission.

#### Surface Parking

Panel acknowledged the financial parking challenge for this site in that the project is trying to create an urban experience with intensified development and green spaces, yet the proposal means that almost one-third of the site would be covered by surface parking. Panel encouraged the proponent to seek out an alternative to this proposed surface parking design, ideally underground.

It was highlighted that the proposed retirement residence surface parking area (a proposed addition to the current surface parking area fronting Centre Street), will detract from the future north-south and east-west public street frontages. The opportunity to extend the landscaped courtyard out to meet the north-south road, in order to create more landscaped space for the retirement program or a community amenity, was highlighted.

Panel also raised that this project opens the opportunity to redesign the Centre Street frontage, to replace the existing surface parking lot with built form by bringing

the second (proposed) retirement building down to front Centre Street.

#### East-West Mid Block Road

The Panel acknowledged the awkward geometry created by the fixed end points of the mid block road. However, it was highlighted that this geometry also creates a design challenge that, by necessity, requires a more creative approach for the built form.

To achieve the kind of urban streetscape depicted in the proposed perspective for the east west mid block road, it was suggested that a more continuous and active built form frontage for the east-west mid block road could be created by: moving the ramp to the north service area, adding residential units at grade, and moving the building closer towards the street.

An approach to addressing the design challenges posed by the east-west mid block road configuration could include making a civic gesture with the land on the corner of New Westminster and the new road.

#### New Westminster Drive

The street frontage of New Westminster Drive was a key issue that needs to be addressed. The panel recommended that the built form and ground floor uses are designed to maximize the framing and engagement with New Westminster streetscape with the pedestrian experience in mind. On the north side of the east-west mid-block road, residential units with entrances at grade were recommended. It was explained to Panel members that the managed care program for the retirement residence precludes suites with direct individual access to the street.

Pedestrian access (permeability) through the site from New Westminster should be increased where the managed care outdoor recreation circuit on the retirement portion of the site does not preclude it.

#### Current Driveway Access from Centre Street

It was noted that when the north-south street becomes public, the existing private access off Centre Street will be eliminated and a new access of the north-south public street will be built.

#### Retirement Residence Programme

In consideration of the public interface of the project and the nature of the seniors residence programme, adding a children's daycare could be a useful strategy.

### **b. Vaughan Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments**

File Numbers:	OP.11.014, Z.11.046, OP.11.105 and Z.11.047
Applicant:	ZZEN Group of Companies & Midvale Estates Ltd.
Location:	2938, 2966 and 2986 Highway 7, City of Vaughan
Architect:	Gc Architects & The MBTW Group

Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff and TRCA outlined the area's context, environmental significance and policy priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How well does the proposal's site orientation and built form address the surrounding context, including the Black Creek SWM pond and channel, the public realm along Highway 7 and Jane Street, and the adjacent private property?
2. Does the proposed building facades and podium design contribute to a high quality streetscape and does it encourage pedestrian movement along Highway 7 and Jane Street?

**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The proposed sites for development are located in a highly attractive place within an area, which is being transformed rapidly to a different future. Panel appreciates the fact that the land owners worked together to develop a design which corresponds with the envisioned urbanity for the future of Highway 7. The sites are also located between the future subway station and Expo City proposed development which will generate a considerable amount of pedestrian traffic through the sites. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a high level pedestrian permeability and create an uninterrupted network and high quality environment for pedestrians within the sites.

Panel acknowledges that the result of the Black Creek Stormwater Optimization Study, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Mater Plan Report (EA Study) will establish the final configuration for the storm management pond and stream, which could easily change the proposed design configuration on the west side of the site. The timing of the project has raised a concern that the proposal has been brought forward before the EA Study is completed. Since the outcome of EA Report will play a major role in programming of the site, Panel encourages the applicant to be an active participant and contribute positively to the future look and feel of Black Creek in the area.

Site Context

Adjacent to the site, the Back Creek Strom Management pond and stream are considered by the City as the Vaughan's waterfront and should be protected and become more accessible to the public.

Considering the fact that the storm pond and stream are parts of a regional amenity, it is a key design factor to view them as important parts of a larger public entity and makeup.

The proposed site for development is four fronted and requires equal consideration on all sides as public frontages.



It is imperative to value the courtyard and its frontage onto the pond and possibly future public park, which makes it critical in terms of addressing the north side of the properties.

A naturalized landscape design approach should be considered to conserve natural systems and enhance the pond and the water stream features. The transition from a naturalized to the urbanized environment of the intersection is a key factor to the success of the project.

The proposed design should incorporate the actual open stream into the design rather than burying it.

### Site Organization

The courtyard should be taken beyond being a servicing rear yard to become an amenity for the site, as well as a real frontage and a positive addition to the Black Creek open space and park system. Panel's encourages the applicant to consider a more naturalized approach to the courtyard and the site's west frontage design to integrate to and celebrate the Creek's natural features.

To create a better opportunity to enhance landscaping and pedestrian condition within the rear yard, vehicular movements and parking on the surface should be limited, ramps to the parking garage should be consolidated and integrated with the built form, and all loading areas should be moved to the underground.

To enhance the connection between the courtyard and Highway 7 sidewalks, the north-south mid-block road should be dedicated to pedestrian access.

On the west, a greater building setback could bring the opportunity for better urban environment by creating an opportunity for introducing outdoor cafes, seating areas, and restaurants.

The panel considered that ground related retail uses should be designed to respond to the different conditions, fronting Highway 7, the park, the courtyard and adjacent EXPO-City buildings. Moving the ground floor entry for residential on the east side of the project to the rear might help to activate the courtyard.

### Building Interface

The corner of highway 7 and Jane Street could be articulated and perhaps the building height should be reduced to 4 to 6 storeys to create a more human scale related urban space.

Panel requests more information to develop a nuance to understand how the frontage along Highway 7 and around the courtyard will be experienced by pedestrians.

The proposed podium seems to create a 120-meter street wall with a little differentiation. The podium length should be broken up by including different

architectural elements, materials, and articulation. Particularly, an emphasis on the gateway condition should be acknowledged at ground and the podium levels of the buildings.

A greater definition should be given to the north-south mid-block road connection to shape a gateway to the courtyard.

There is an opportunity for the buildings to acknowledge and celebrate the Creek as the waterfront as a natural feature, and take advantage of its presence.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 5 – February 23, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, February 23, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc. (Projects #1 and 3)

Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects (Project #1)

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc. (Projects #1 and #2)

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

##### **Absent**

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

##### **STAFF**

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Laura Janotta, Development Planning Department

Eugene Fera, Development Planning Department

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

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

#### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

The Agenda was MOVED by Richard Witt and SECONDED by Mansoor Kazerouni.

## **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Mansoor Kazerouni and Paul Nodwell declared a conflict of interest for project #2.

## **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, January 26 be adopted with revisions proposed by Lisa Harmeey.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

## **4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **a. Vaughan Zoning By-Law Amendment / Site Development Application**

File No: Z.11. 026 & DA.11.073  
Applicant: 2190647 Ontario Inc.  
Location: Northwest corner of Regional Road 7 and Wigwoss Drive, municipally known as 4800 Regional Road 7.  
Architect: AJ Tregobov Architect  
Review: Second Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

- Has the revised design concept adequately reflected the Panel's comments in terms of neighbourhood integration and character, site programming, transition in scale, and street frontage?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

In principle, Panel confirmed the revised design has shown great improvements in terms of site programming, massing and distribution of at-grade residential and retail uses through the site. However, due to lack of required information and low quality of provided drawings, Panel has difficulties to assess the merits of the proposed design and provide a comprehensive feedback to the designer. The applicant is encouraged to consider the following observations to increase the quality of the design and its presentation for the next review:

#### **Submission requirements:**

Panel requested the applicant provide the following information for the next DPR review:

- Landscape Plans: To evaluate the quality of the proposed landscaping within the site and streetscape along the surrounding public streets, Panel requires a landscape master plan that includes all necessary and detailed information regarding planting type, hard surface patterns and furniture.
- Rendered Elevations and Perspectives: Rendered elevations and perspectives should present realistic views of the proposed building, featuring all finishing material texture and colour, shades, and shadows. Specifically, perspectives from human eye level are to be provided to clearly show the quality of the proposed streetscapes along Benjamin Drive, Wigwoss Drive and Highway 7.
- Shadow Impact Study.
- Completely dimensioned and tagged site plans and elevations.
- Building Finishes and Cladding Materials: A complete and descriptive presentation of the proposed building skin's cladding components.
- And, additional information as per submission requirements.

#### Building Types, Elevations and Neighbourhood Character:

The term of "point tower" commonly refers to Vancouver's slender and tall tower model which limits the building envelope to 600 square feet. However, the proposed towers are considerably shorter and their envelopes seem to be 1000 square feet which make them substantially different from the referred type. Panel suggests a more compatible building type to be considered to achieve a higher quality building design by studying more successful and richer examples of the building type. A mid-rise building seems to be a more appropriate building type for this site, scaling down to meet the lower forms of adjacent properties.

The proposed materials are considerably different from the existing buildings within the community. Masonry should be considered as major material in the finishing make up of the building.

To achieve a higher level of sustainability, the towers' finishing materials should include well insulated panels.

The idea of the skewing and offsetting the towers to create a better condition for corner units is not proven to deliver the desired effect, and results in a broken street wall at the ground level, with untended spaces.

The character and detailing of the proposed at-grade residential townhouses should be designed in harmony with neighbouring residential buildings differently from the proposed design for the commercial frontage along Highway 7.

### Street Frontages:

The street frontage along highway 7 has been improved; however, the location of the proposed skew plan towers has resulted in a jagged frontage on the ground level. At its best, the jugged frontage provides some seating areas only in few warmer months of the year. A more continuous and articulated frontage could be actively and positively occupied year round.

The residential interface along Benjamin Drive has been interrupted by a relatively large drop-off area. This design issue can be resolved by:

- pushing the residential podium towards the north and minimizing the land dedicated to the drop-off;
- landscaping the courtyard space as a usable outdoor amenity space; or
- allowing more residential along Benjamin Drive by minimizing the drop-off area frontage.

The impact of the proposed lay-by parking along Benjamin Drive on the existing street trees should be evaluated in more detail, which may diminish the opportunity for proposing further planting along the street. The proposed plan should consider the existing planting and increase the quality of the streetscape by providing landscaping enhancements.

Entry driveway on Benjamin Drive should be better designed and the drop-off should be hidden from the public view.

### Site Programming and Layout:

The Panel concerned by the need to provide a proper transition from a potentially active and vibrant Regional Road 7 frontage through the site and to the residential character of Benjamin Drive. The design is yet to offer a creative solution to resolve the conflict between a potentially active and vibrant Regional Road 7 frontage and the neighbouring community's sub-urban character. The overall transitions to the neighbourhoods need to be readdressed both from west to east and south to north.

The relationship of the project to the west side should be revisited to minimize the impact on the neighbouring houses and to resolve the impact of the retail loading and residential parking access.

The separation between the laneway and the neighbouring houses to the west seems not enough to effectively reduce the truck traffic noise transfer.

The disproportionately large drop-off area has caused a missed opportunity to provide the future occupants with a high-quality landscaped courtyard. The drop-off should be minimized to only serve its function and create room for a more pedestrian-friendly, animated landscaped area.

The towers should be pushed forward toward Highway 7 and Benjamin drive corner to further reduce their impacts on the neighbouring residential areas and to increase their presence along Highway 7.

The separation distance between the towers is an important design factor to secure a minimum level of privacy for the future occupants.

#### **b. Application for Site Development**

File Numbers: No application submitted  
Applicant: Liberty Development Corporation  
Location: 1890 Highway 7, City of Vaughan  
Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners, Schollen & Company Inc.  
Review: First Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined that area context, including Region of York transit plans and City of Vaughan Urban Design and Policy Planning studies currently underway in the Concord West area, and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Could the proposed development's connection and interface with the West Don River be improved, and if so, how?
2. Are the public open spaces in the Site Plan organized and designed to maximize the potential for meaningful, social hubs and to build a community with a vibrant pedestrian realm?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The design team was commended for its integrated design process, particularly the discussion of watershed and related environmental matters, and the idea of an adaptive reuse of the Power Plant as a community facility. It also recognized the high quality presentation materials submitted to the Design Review Panel.

The Panel encouraged the design team to continue to pursue an integrated design strategy to take advantage of the major assets that are unique to this site: the natural heritage of the river valley and cultural heritage of the Power Plant building.

The Panel recognized and accepted that this highly dense development will have its own identity as a community, given the surrounding conditions. However, it was felt that, for all intents and purposes, the proposed development is designed as an inward-looking campus, relatively unconnected to its surroundings, rather than as a community connected to the larger urban and natural context. With this in mind, the Panel recommended that the design team continue to explore creative ways to respond to the opportunities afforded by the natural heritage of the river valley, the cultural heritage of the power plant building, and the larger urban condition.

North-South Vehicle Connection:

The importance of obtaining a street connection through site to the north was emphasized by Panel Members.

East (West Don River) Edge:

Panel expressed that the master plan should provide substantially greater public access and views to the river valley to capitalize on the natural asset of the West Don River and bring the river “into” the community, rather than blocking it off with high rise buildings.

To achieve this, it was generally felt that a public street and associated open space fronting the river valley would provide a continuous and more direct and open access to the West Don River along its entire edge.

An additional east-west street(s) was also recommended to increase connectivity of the community with the river and the Bartley Smith Greenway.

It was expressed by several members that the street network may be more successful if it has a main axis running perpendicular to the river.

Several Panel Members suggested the incorporation of low rise units near the eastern edge to increase porosity, views, and a sense of the human scale near the river. It was pointed out that towers do not need to be near the river valley edge in order to have views of the river.

Pedestrian Bridge:

It was agreed that a signature pedestrian walkway bridging the river valley would play an important role to connect this community with the larger context.

West (CN Rail) Edge:

It was also felt that, regardless of the 30m CN rail setback, the western edge of the site could be improved and intensified.

Panel highlighted that the design gives up a building frontage along the north-south road at the western side of the site. It was recommended to replace the proposed surface parking lots (for visitor parking) with built form. If a street is kept along this edge, active uses at grade should front the east side of this street. Panel recommended the surface parking lots are eliminated or substantially reduced and incorporated into streetscapes.

Additionally, it was recommended that the trajectory of the east-west streets is re-evaluated in order to improve the condition of the western edge of the south commercial building (a flatiron).

Highway 7 Frontage:

The Panel advised that the development should incorporate the Region’s and City’s vision for the future of Highway 7, as a more pedestrian and transit-oriented, compact, and accessible road.

Panel advised that at least one more substantial pedestrian connection, ideally on



the south east side of the site, connecting Highway 7 to the open space system, should be added to increase the porosity of the development. This pedestrian connection could also connect back into the Bartley Smith Greenway.

#### Power Plant:

Design Review Panel encouraged the proposed plans for adaptive reuse of the decommissioned Power Plant as a community facility, suggesting that a broad range of community elements would be appropriate. The Power House Recreational Centre, in the Kipling and Lakeshore area, was discussed as a precedent, including the skating trail and warming hut. It was recognized that with extra creativity in planning and programming, the Power Plant has the potential to be an incredible asset for both the development and broader community.

It was felt that the proposed configuration of the Power Plant community centre with respect to the Don River was awkward and underdeveloped, and that a landscape strategy should be developed to fortify the connection. Panel agreed that the design of the open space and circulation network should be reviewed to improve the connection between the two.

#### Open Space:

Panel highlighted that the density this development is proposing necessitates the creation and consolidation of a prominent open space system; and natural heritage conservation strategy. The Panel encouraged the design team to pursue alternate building typologies that would create greater public access to, and synergies with outdoor spaces including within the buildings themselves (courtyards, squares etc.).

Panel agreed that the master plan should consider incorporating a public plaza or a series of programmable, occupiable public spaces rather than the “traffic circle” type focal points that are primarily designed for vehicle movement. It was agreed that traffic circle nodes are not pedestrian-friendly spaces that foster social gathering or pedestrian activity. In particular, the massive traffic circle at the north end of the development was questioned in that it adds no appreciable value as a component of the network of open spaces nor does it add value to the social life of the community.

#### Sustainability:

In addition to “green buildings”, Panel unanimously recommended a greater use and connection to the natural heritage systems as structuring forces to lend authenticity to the idea of a forward-looking sustainable development. Water, topography and the river valley system were highlighted as key opportunities to integrate into the design.

#### Stormwater Management:

The Panel urged that stormwater is treated as an asset and as part of the site’s ecological system. The potential of treating and conveying stormwater through a water feature was also recommended. Sherbourne Commons was provided as a precedent. A Panel Member suggested the western edge of the site (lands located within the railway buffer zone) could be occupied by a series of long linear streams or designed pools to highlight a more sustainable approach to stormwater management.

Site Organization:

Overall, the key issues raised with the master plan related to: the composition of streets and blocks; the disposition and integration of open spaces; the building typologies used; and, the resulting kind of urbanity this creates. Panel encouraged the exploration of alternative street patterns and building typologies to better relate to the site context. Panel recommended the design team explore how to create multi-modal (not car dominated) streets, laneways and other building and open space typologies.

Diversity:

Given the contextual premise that this development would function as a community in itself, all Panel Members agreed that a critical factor to Rose Garden City's success as both a place and as a community, will be diversity: Both a diversity of uses, beyond just retail and commercial, and a diversity of people who can live there. A mix of housing unit sizes and types, including housing for families, was emphasized as important. It was also recommended that grade-related townhouses could be incorporated into the development to increase the unit mix. Panel asked if a school site would be incorporated into the development.

Public Art Strategy:

A Panel Member highlighted that the public art strategy has positive attributes on a number of counts: 1) It addresses highly visible, mostly highly accessible locations that have value in terms of the figure of the overall development, and, 2) it appears to consider a public art strategy that is precinct wide rather than individual property ownership/property line specific. The Member encouraged the public art strategy to consider "lines" as well as "points", "systems" rather than "monuments". The recognition of the natural river valley space to the east of the development, and the designed space to the west of the development were highlighted as prime opportunities for public art expression.

**c. Application for Site Development**

File Numbers:	No application submitted
Applicant:	Liberty Development Corporation
Location:	Bathurst & Beverley Glen (north west corner), City of Vaughan
Architect:	Kirkor Architects & Planners
Review:	First Review

**Introduction:**

City staff outlined that area context, including Region of York transit plans and City of Vaughan Urban Design studies currently underway in the Thornhill District Centre area, and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Which, if any, proposed massing option is most appropriate to the site?

2. If one option is recommended above the others, how could it be improved with respect to its relationship with the surrounding context?

### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

#### Shadow Studies:

The Panel expressed concern about the cumulative shadow impacts on the low density housing to the east of the site. The scale of the podium was questioned as it would shadow the back yards of houses on the east side of Bathurst Street for all of the evening hours (4pm onwards) for all of the active season.

#### Amenity Space:

Panel felt that the proposed amenity space at the south west corner of the site seemed programmatically redundant considering the large park space directly across the street. Also, the proposed amenity space has no active frontage to create the basic condition for a well-used and successful urban space.

Panel suggested that the Applicant revisit how the amenity space will function within the overall development scheme, designed as integral to site. Suggestions included exploring the idea of a linear open space linkage, connecting the plaza to the north to Beverley Glen through the site, or a central courtyard-type amenity space.

#### Central Drop Off/ Courtyard Area:

It was noted that the proposed central courtyard/ drop off area will be almost permanently in shadows of the proposed buildings, and is an underutilization of a prominent open space

#### Transition in Scale from West to East:

Panel proposed that in place of open space, built form (transitional in scale) would act as a visual foil to better moderate the substantial proposed change in scale between the low density residential to the west, and the larger elements towards the east on the site. Given a vivaNext transit stop is planned at the corner of Beverley Glen and Bathurst, it was noted that a significant amount of pedestrian activity along the Beverley Glen edge should be anticipated.

Panel highlighted the opportunity to explore a community service use in the recommended transitional building fronting Beverley Glen.

#### Retail and Bathurst Street:

Panel recommended that the Applicant re-consider the retail strategy for the site given the future intent for Bathurst Street and the planned bus rapid transit stop at Beverley Glen and Bathurst. Continuous ground floor retail along Bathurst Street was viewed as the appropriate move to make a publicly engaging, active frontage along this intensification corridor.

#### North Elevation:

Panel recommended more breaks in between building massing to create a sense of transition. It was suggested that the Applicant review the conditions created for the townhouses proposed for the northwest corner of the site.

Building Typology:

A midrise courtyard building type was suggested as an alternative to pursue density. The built form could be higher at the north and drop down towards the south and west.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.**



**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Meeting 6 – March 28, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 28, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

**PANEL MEMBERS**

**Present**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (*Absent for Projects #1 and #2*)

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair) (*Absent for Project #2*)

**Absent**

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

**STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Christina Napoli, Development Planning Department

Mark Johnson, Development Planning Department

**The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair**

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

The Agenda was MOVED by Richard Witt and SECONDED by Brad Golden.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest declared.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, February 23, 2012 be adopted.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**4. SIX (6) MONTH REVIEW OF DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (SELF ASSESSMENT)**

Panel members agreed to schedule time in the next Meeting Agenda to discuss the totality of what the Design Review Panel has seen in the last six months, and what this means for the future urban fabric in the City of Vaughan.

It was agreed that a stronger critique on the merits of the architecture itself was needed as a practical step to push the improvement of the quality of architecture within the City of Vaughan further and faster.

It would be helpful to receive from staff a cumulative context map issued with each Agenda to show all applications reviewed by the Design Review Panel to date. Staff agreed to take this into consideration for future meetings.

Panel members expressed concern about the inconsistent quality of Design Review Panel submissions from Applicants, with information on the submission materials checklist often missing or incomplete. Staff confirmed that they are reviewing submissions and requesting missing information on the checklist, however agreed with Panel on the inconsistent quality of submissions in some cases. The Panel confirmed that they are willing to receive additional missing material at the Design Review Panel presentation.

Attendance of Panel members was agreed to be important to maintain a robust and diverse discussion of projects.

**5. REVIEW OF PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOL OF DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

All present member of the Panel unanimously agreed to the following two revisions to the Procedures and Protocol document:

### Appointment of Panel Chair

**Revise:** “The Design Review Panel members will nominate a Chair and Vice-Chair for a period of 6 months.” **To:** “The Design Review Panel members will nominate a Chair and Vice-Chair for a period of one (1) year.”

### Meeting Protocol

**DELETE:** “4 minutes per Panel member” in (b) Question & Answer Period through the Chair.

## **6. ELECT A CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR NEXT YEAR**

All members of the Panel present unanimously elected Antonio Gomez-Palacio as the Chair and Richard Witt as the Vice Chair for a term of one year.

## **7. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **a. Vaughan Zoning By-Law Amendment / Site Development Application**

File No: Development Concept Only  
Applicant: Liberty Development Corporation  
Location: The south west corner of Highway 7 and Maplecrete Road  
Architect: Kirkor Architects  
Review: First Review

#### **Presentations:**

Christina Napoli, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design

#### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined the area context and area policy priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

Does the development achieve the vision, objectives and policies in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan?

### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

In general, given the relatively large scale of land development increments in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, and the density of development planned in a short period of time, attention to architectural detail, materials and architectural variety will be especially important to create an interesting urban place.

Panel noted a general sameness of the architectural design language within the development itself and as compared to other developments in Vaughan, and encouraged the Applicant to use alternate design expressions and typologies as a marketing 'value added' to distinguish this Liberty development in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

Panel commended the comprehensive nature and quality of presentation materials submitted to the Design Review Panel. The inclusion of both office and residential uses in the development proposal was also noted as a positive contribution to the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. The Panel hopes their below comments will provide the Applicant with the encouragement to have further conversation with the adjacent landowners.

#### Development Concept

- Panel recommended that the streets and block structure should be the predominant starting point rather than built form footprints driving the design of the development.

#### Street Network

- Proposed alterations to the VMC Secondary Plan street network and block pattern should be presented as improving or adjusting the block structure of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (not only the development site itself) and with due consideration given to adjacent landowners and the VMC urban fabric.
- The proposed street network must either link up to the planned contextual street network ('Schedule C' in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan), or the Applicant should come to an agreement with adjacent property owners to illustrate how the streets will link in the future in a way that contributes in a positive way to the VMC urban fabric.
- Street configurations that are aligned at intersections are preferable to T intersections.
- The west link one block south of Highway 7 needs to be provided to ensure vehicle access to the adjacent site and pedestrian access to the Black Creek open space system. A proposed building will block this connection to the west, effectively 'land locking' the adjacent westerly site (since full access off Highway 7 for the adjacent westerly site will likely not be feasible).
- The east link (one block south of Highway 7) needs to align with the future



east-west street (one block south of Highway 7 to the east of Maplecrete Road) outside the site boundaries. It was suggested that the built form in the southern block should respond to the resulting site configuration created by the resulting curve in the street required to align with the intersection at Maplecrete Road.

- The south link needs to be considered as part of the overall development plan from the outset, even if it is built in a later phase, as the road will change the architecture along it. The proposed ramp access to underground parking could not be located in the proposed location given the future south link.
- There is an important opportunity to create a mid-block pedestrian or vehicle connection from Highway 7 to increase block permeability, as the block length along Highway 7 was recognized by the Panel as a long block. This additional north-south connection could include a “pocket park” and mid-rise podium with grade related residential units or retail uses.

#### Black Creek Riparian and Open Space System

- Panel encouraged that the site organization and architecture respond, front, and contribute to the future planned Black Creek open space system which has the potential to be the most important public open space in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

#### Built Form

- Overall, Panel felt that the built form needs further investigation and expressed a concern that all five buildings look too similar. It was recommended that each building should be designed to feel like it is built at a different point in time.
- Panel requested more variety in architectural expression and recommended that other forms such as mid-rise be explored for the site to create diversity.
- With respect to materiality, it was suggested to employ a kit of materials that can be rearranged to allow the architecture to achieve a sense of unity without the same feeling of monotony. It was recommended that the architecture should address orientation of north versus south, west versus east conditions rather than using glass on all four sides in the same way. Panel recommended further exploration of materials beyond the usual palette of glass and precast.
- Given this is one of the first high development proposals in the area, Panel suggested that the architecture should respond to the edges that exist and that can be anticipated. For example if the road is curved, how could built form respond to this condition? The architecture should also take its cues from the environment as its design context with respect to sun, wind, topography, Black Creek, etc.

- Panel agreed that the podium fronting Highway 7 should be higher to: i) be in scale with Highway 7, ii) create a street wall consistent with future buildings fronting Highway 7, and, iii) create a sense of street enclosure to mitigate likely microclimate and wind effects. Commercial use was suggested for the podium above ground floor.
- Panel recommended breaking the base of the building north-south to differentiate the character of the office use from residential use.
- The proposed balconies are not integrated and recessed as per the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Plan. The glazed balcony expression dominates the residential towers.
- If tower 1B is oversized, could reduce height and put more density into the podium fronting Highway 7.
- The towers appear short and squat; there is a significant opportunity to improve them.
- The tower on the west side of the site is too close to the boundary and will sterilize the adjacent site for re-development.
- The current building layout misses the opportunity to address the corner condition at Maplecrete and Highway 7. A lobby would flow to the vivaNext bus rapid transit stop at this intersection.
- The office entrance should be on Highway 7. More animation of Highway 7 should be created through lobbies and common spaces connected to the streetscape, in addition to retail.

#### Amenity Space and Street Network

- Overall, Panel felt that the current proposed outdoor space feels like a left over space rather than part of a meaningful open space framework that includes addressing a connection to Black Creek. The opportunity to design something bold, active and connected to the context was emphasized as an important feature that would contribute to a vibrant and successful development. The social life of the outdoor amenity space needs to be considered for its successful siting and design.
- Panel agreed that an outdoor amenity space in the form of a north-south 'pocket park' off of Highway 7, utilized as part of the retail frontage and streetscape of Highway 7 would be a stronger alternative than the proposed car park type of courtyard. Buildings fronting onto the courtyard should offer ground related uses and animation.
- Alternately, a connection to Black Creek open space system through a future coordinated or shared space with the west land holding, would also be a more valuable and useable form for the amenity space.

- Given the nearby presence of Black Creek, and the Applicant's proposed use of the area below the amenity space to help meet storm water quality and quantity control requirements, Panel suggested that the amenity space could make visible the storm water treatment as a design feature.
- Although the purpose of a Woonerf was well understood, in its proposed configuration Panel felt that it would not be a pedestrian-first shared space. Panel encouraged that servicing, loading and parking are removed from any Woonerf spaces. It was suggested that the City and Applicant collaborate to set a precedent with both the north-south and east-west streets within the development.

## **8. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **a. Vaughan Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Development Application**

File No: OP.11.011, Z.11.042 & DA. 11.113

Applicant: Ozner Corporation (South), Lormel Homes

Location: The Southeast corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard

Architect: Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

Review: First Review

#### **Presentations:**

Mark Johnson, Development Planning; Rob Bayley, Urban Design

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Concerning the urban context and the proposed development impacts on the surrounding low-density urban environment, the Panel found the proposed design conveys a suburban feel and does not respond to the conditions surrounding the site. Its enclave and car-oriented configuration offers a less hospitable pedestrian environment within the site and the surrounding public realm. To achieve a higher quality and more active urban environment in the area, the design approach should be shifted from the proposed interior focused type of development to a public realm oriented concept. In addition, the uses generated from the built form should interact with the street and generate social interaction.

The DRP also encourages the applicant to consider the City's vision for the future of the area and provide a design concept that is in conformity with the new Official Plan designation for the area.

### Architectural Presentation Quality

The optimism from the 3-D perspective and the written submission was lost during the translation to the 2-D drawings. A higher quality presentation of architectural vocabulary and landscaping materiality could tremendously help to understand the project intentions and merits.

### Architectural Guidelines

There is gap and discrepancy between the content of the provided design guidelines and design concept. The applicant should go back to the guidelines and revise the design concept in conformity with them.

### Transitioning

A proper transitioning from the Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard to the neighbourhood is a key factor in the success of the project. This may be accomplished though a better distribution of height and density by considering the following design factors:

- Move the density to corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard.
- Step down the building form from west to east.
- Move away from the Smart Centre development and allocate an increased setback from the southern edge.

### Mixed-Use Opportunities

Considering the type of retail that is available in the immediate area, alternative commercial uses, including professional offices, can be located at grade to animate and urbanize the area. The proposal can react to the car-oriented Smart Centre development in a positive manner by offering commercial space which is within a 5 minute walking distance from the community.

### Building Frontages and Life on Street

The proposed site for development is located at the southeast corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard. Its function as a gateway to the surrounding community should be addressed during the revision of the design concept. Bringing the buildings closer to the street and orienting grade level access to face the neighbourhood will help to create a more active urban environment and inviting streetscape along the external perimeter of the site. As proposed, the distance and landscape buffering along the street reduces 'eyes on street' opportunity and security in the neighbourhood. To bring "urbanity of the street" and generate social interaction in the area the following should be considered:

- Remove the proposed landscape buffer and fencing to establish a direct connection between the proposed at-grade building uses and the street and public sidewalk.

- Increase the interaction between the building uses and the public realm by reducing 7.5 metre building setback.
- Alignment of building should be parallel to the street edge and should not be skewed.
- At-grade retail and/or public uses should be considered to encourage pedestrian movement on the surrounding public sidewalk, specifically at the corner location.
- All at-grade building uses and units should interact with the street.
- If at-grade retail and/or public uses are not feasible, all residential units should face the street and have direct points of access to the adjacent sidewalks.

### Courtyard

As presented, the courtyard has been laid out with priority given to the vehicular and service access. This site plan orientation is less sympathetic to the pedestrian condition, safety and comfort. To increase the quality of the courtyard environment for the residents the following design strategies should be considered:

- Relocation of the proposed access ramp to the underground parking away from the centre of the courtyard and integrate it with architecture of the building.
- Redesign the court and provide a single drop off point and service access.
- The excessive amount of hardscape should be reduced to allow for more planting and amenity.
- Increase the area of the courtyard by pushing the proposed building closer to the street.
- Provide more pedestrian direct connection and permeability from the surrounding streets to the courtyard.

### Other Comments

- Emergency exits should face interior of site not the street.
- The site is the first of three corners of the intersection which is being developed; therefore, it should set a valuable precedent to shape the future of the area.

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



**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Meeting 7 – April 26, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 26, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

**PANEL MEMBERS**

**Present**

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (*Absent for Projects #1 and #2*)

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

**Absent**

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

**STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department

Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Laura Janotta, Development Planning Department

Mark Johnson, Development Planning Department

Carmela Marrelli, Development Planning Department

Moira Wilson, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

**The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair**

a. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Paul Nodwell declared a conflict of interest for the Liberty Development project at Bathurst and Beverley Glen.

b. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, March 29, 2012 be adopted at the next Review Panel meeting on May 31, 2012.

c. **APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

a. **Vaughan Official Plan, Zoning Amendment and Site Plan Applications**

File No: OP.11.012, Z.11.043, and DA.11.114

Applicant: West Rutherford Properties Ltd.

Location: North side of Rutherford Road, south side of Hawkview Boulevard, and east of Weston Road, known municipally as 3660 Rutherford Road, City of Vaughan

Architect: Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

Review: First Review

**Presentations:**

Mark Johnson, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design

**Introduction:**

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Does the proposed building façades contribute to a high-quality urban environment and inviting streetscape along Rutherford Road, Hawkview Boulevard and the proposed internal driveway (Future Public Road)?
2. Does the overall design concept of the proposed development appropriately relate to its immediate urban context?

**Panel's Comments:**

Panel acknowledged the fact that the lack of a concrete and detailed vision for the future of this part of the city, in respect to policy and design guidelines, makes it difficult for designers to provide a design which properly responds to both current and future conditions of the area. Considering the existing general policies and the direction of the new Official Plan, as well as the context of the

site, however, can lead to an exemplary development which would set a strong precedent to lead the future developments within the neighbourhood. A development which acknowledges a transitional site and tries to pursue a mixed use, lively streets and pedestrian oriented type of environment would create a positive impact on future developments within the larger context. The following design considerations are suggested to guide the applicant to propose a higher quality design:

#### Street Network, Urban Block Size

To encourage pedestrian movement in the area, reduce the size of the existing block by reinstating the proposed north-south road, Plover Heights extension, and considering a mid-block east-west driveway with the following considerations:

- North-south road could remain private if it carries its public obligations, be publically accessible and properly aligned with the existing street network.
- A future potential mid-block east-west street connection through the site and aligned to the south end of the stormwater management pond should be protected for.
- Create appropriate active facades by orienting all the adjacent buildings onto the driveways/roads.
- Appropriate right-of-way should be allocated for both north-south and east-west roads to allow for a high quality street design by including comfortable pedestrian environment and lay-by parking.
- More attention should be given to the site and neighbouring lands grading to eliminate the need for retaining walls along the proposed driveways and roads.
- Any site layout and configuration which leads to duplication of circulation routes should be avoided.

#### Urban Context, Building Orientation and Facades

- To provide a site plan which responds better to the current and future conditions of the area, study the urban fabric of the neighbourhood and suggest a larger picture scenario for the future of the area.
- Push the density further toward Rutherford Road and provide a better transitioning from the street to the community.
- Take an advantage of the existing stormwater management pond on the west site of the site and maximize the viewing opportunities by facing the development toward the pond.
- Consider at-grade retail along Rutherford Road frontage to animate the street and better fit within the area.



- The proposed development should include a considerable podium to maintain a sense of human scale along all public roads and private driveways.
- Provide a more active look for the proposed towers by significantly increasing the ratio of the vision glazing.

Landscape Design and Sustainability

- Prepare a comprehensive and integrated landscape plan to demonstrate creative ideas for the overall site and its relation to adjacent uses such as the community to the north, Rutherford Road's right-of-way and the stormwater management to the west.
- Landscape plan should consider sustainability objectives with respect to stormwater management, infiltration and reuse strategies by including sustainable design elements, such as green roofs, eco-pavers, as well as native and adaptive plant species.

Graphic and Presentation

- Present a complete demonstration of design process to describe the design ideas and approach to satisfy the existing City policies.
- Provide an adequate number of cross sections to describe the relationship between the proposed development and its context.
- All provided illustrations and drawings should present a consistent and clear picture for the proposed development, specifically for the proposed towers.

**b. Application for Site Plan**

File No: O.P. 11.007 and Z. 11.032

Applicant: 154677 Ontario Limited (Liberty Developments Inc.)

Location: SW corner of Bathurst Street and Beverley Glen Boulevard, at 7890 Bathurst Street

Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners

Review: Second Review

**Presentations:**

Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design

**Panel's Comments:**

The Panel was mixed in their review of the project's site organization and building massing, specifically with respect to the public park, Bathurst Street and North Park frontages.

Public Park Frontage (west edge):

- Some Panel Members felt that the proposed amenity space in the south half of the site provides an improved and satisfactory connection and edge to the public park. Recommendations include:
  - The proposed deck/green roof above the parking at the north end of the site is an interesting idea that needs further consideration given to its architectural treatment, such as adjusting the heights, perhaps a special pre-cast pattern that relates to the park edge.
  - Alternately, given the generous amount of private amenity space proposed, the green roof over the parking has the potential to be developed as building with the resulting increase in floor space used to reduce the height of the towers.
  - The design of the at grade amenity space connected to the park could be improved to feel more public and to be a more useable space.
- Other Panel Members felt that the proposed site plan and building massing leaves the edge of the park drifting and unsupported, with no significant public benefits provided for park users in compensation for the projected shadowing effects of the proposed towers.
  - Standing in the park, the view of the 4.5m high proposed green roof (north end of site) would not contribute in a positive way to the visual experience within the public park.
  - The proposed amenity space is a decorative landscape element in a valuable location that would be better used for circulation.
  - The idea of putting a parking and loading dedicated area next to the park when there is an alternative option of selling units facing a park is a surprising decision.

These Panel Members highlighted the potential of the site with four frontages, good depth, and park adjacency. These members felt that the site plan does not optimize the site and does not provide an adequate contribution to the public realm.

Recommendations include:

- Design a north-south driveway along the development site's western edge to look like a beautifully designed street that will provide for: 1) a continuous public park frontage on the west side of the drive and 2) an active building frontage along the east edge of the driveway, effectively fronting the parkland.

- Grade-related units along the public park frontage are an important opportunity for the developer to create more value for the development site, and for the City to create an active east edge for the park.
- Design architectural frontages to ensure positive visual interest at the pedestrian level from the public realm along all four sides of the development including the park.
- The suggestion was made to explore orienting the buildings east-west to fill in the site with more density in order to reduce the height of the towers. Could also explore three lower towers in place of two to reduce the proposed height.
- Move the taller building to the wider (south) end of the site to push it back from the residential area on the east side of Bathurst.

Bathurst Street frontage (east edge):

- Some Panel Members like the way the building masses are articulated a little differently along the Bathurst Street edge (with the south building pulled back slightly) and advocated for the idea of the resulting pedestrian square you can walk across *with the caveat that parking should not be in this space*. A challenge will be to refine the location of the southern building podium and the extents of separation from the public streets.
- Other Panel Members advocated that the podium at the south end should be pulled forward closer to Bathurst Street and North Park in order to create a stronger street wall and resulting better frontage for the public streets. It was highlighted that this move would increase the amount of retail floor space for the development as well. Building layouts would need to be organized to accommodate fire truck access. These Panelists asserted that changing the surface material of the internal circulation route fronting North Park and Bathurst, as proposed, does not adequately mitigate the negative impact on the public realm.
- All Panel Members agreed that the Applicant and City should pursue layby parking along Bathurst Street to service retail uses.

North Park Road frontage (south edge):

- Given the proximity of a planned synagogue across the street on North Park and Bathurst, a Panel Member highlighted the opportunity for grade-related units fronting North Park Road rather than the proposed parking aisle.

**Panel's Consensus:**

- The following improvements to the previous submission were noted with further recommendations also provided:
  - Site and Landscape Plan better addresses the corner of Beverley Glen and Bathurst Street where the bus rapid transit stop is planned. Some Panel Members recommended softening the paved/stepped area with increased

planting, and using permeable paving where there is no parking structure below.

- Improved architectural design including the proportions and variation of buildings.
  - Improved architectural sustainability was also noted, specifically thermal breaks on balcony slabs, the use of overhangs and canopies for shading and green roofs.
  - The mid-block breezeway was agreed to be a positive and important move to connect the park to Bathurst Street and break up the length of the block fronting Bathurst Street. Recommendations to improve the design of the mid-block connection include: designing it as a more pedestrian-oriented connection rather than primarily vehicle-oriented, reducing its dimensions (width), improving its treatment through detailing, and considering a curb cut to Bathurst Street (with Regional approval).
- The Panel expressed the need for better performance of the site with respect to shadows with concern for the duration of shadowing on the adjacent residential community. A Panel member framed the design question, “How do you get enough density to animate the planned community centre with developments that are embraced by the community?”

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 8 – May 30, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday May 30, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (*Absent for Project # a*)

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

##### **Absent**

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

##### **STAFF**

Erika Ivanic, Development Planning Department

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department

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

#### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

#### **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

Mansoor, Kazerouni, declared conflict of interest with reviewing the Eastons Development application.

### **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, March 28, 2012 and Thursday, April 26, 2012 be adopted as circulated.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

### **4. The VMC Status Report**

Urban Design staff presented an update on the status of current projects and studies within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

### **5. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **a. Vaughan Pre-Application Consultation**

File No: PAC.11.101  
Applicant: Easton Development Limited  
Location: Southwest corner of Regional Road 7 and Interchange Way, municipally known as 3201 Regional Road 7, existing Hilton Garden Inn Hotel  
Architect: Paradigm architecture + design and Robin Clark Architect  
Landscape Architect: Quinn Design Associates Inc.  
Review: Second Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre area context, history and area policy priorities sought the Panel's advice on the following:

Panel reviewed the first design proposal on November 24, 2011 and recommended the applicant to improve the design concept to respond better to the existing and future conditions of the site. Has the new design proposal positively responded to the Panel's given design directions?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel appreciated the applicant's effort to respond to some of the previously made recommendations, including providing improved conditions for the existing hotel rooms. However, the entire site is being utilized by the current use which makes it extremely difficult to propose a new development which meets the City's vision for the future of the VMC.

Panel was also concerned about setting a precedent to encourage other landowners within the vicinity to propose similar developments while keeping their existing and non-corresponding uses. The applicant is encouraged to reassess the project's short-term priorities to ensure the long-term vision for a vibrant downtown is not hindered.

The design process for the site should start with creating a clear vision, formulated through a masterplan. The masterplan should be utilized to determine short-term objectives as different design stages to achieve the long-term goal.

### Design Excellence

The role of the Panel is to ensure the design excellence is provided. The proposed project's financial concern, however, has taken a central role and driven the project away from providing a quality design. Design factors, such as keeping the existing building which sterilized the site, usage of inexpensive finishing materials, and proposing a parking structure instead of an underground parking have taken away an opportunity to achieve design merit.

### Long-Term Programming

The absence of a presentation for a long-term vision has raised a major concern. The key factor to the success of the plan is providing a solid vision and long-term design strategy that clearly show the site context and content for the future to ensure a harmonized plan with the intention of the VMC Secondary Plan will be achieved.

The proposed design for the site should consider the City's role in distributing the urban uses within pedestrian reach for future residents. The site plan priorities should be given to the pedestrian accessibility and quality of urban environment.

A long-term vision and design strategies to achieve the vision should be presented by a comprehensive masterplan that not only clearly shows the final product, but also illustrates every step of the project's completion progress.

Future roads on the south and east of the site should not be treated as service roads.

### Short-Term Design Approach

The provided short-term plan is awkward with its surroundings. The relationship between the sidewalk and the development should be enhanced to make the adjacent sidewalks more comfortable.

On the north and west sides, the condition of the sidewalks can be enhanced by moving some of the existing hotel life closer to the street. This can be achieved by introducing some amenity areas in form of court yards and restaurants along the street connecting the sidewalk to the existing hotel.

The efforts in keeping the convention centre has placed a significant constrain on the site, which forced the proposed parking structure fly over the centre. An alternative design approach could be taken to preserve the existing hotel building's form and function and remove or replace the convention centre to clear space for the new development.

### Parking Structure

As presented, the conditions are set to make it less likely to animate the adjacent future roads envisioned by the Secondary Plan. Fronting a large parking structure directly

along the future east-west mid-block road, raises a concern that the area's quality of the urban environment will be compromised.

An alternative parking structure design approach should be considered by setting priority to its interface with the public realm and how it contributes to street life.

As proposed, the parking structure is an intergraded part of the building which makes it permanent and its impact on the context would be irreversible.

#### Sustainability Approach

Sustainability of development has to be considered as a primary factor to develop a masterplan design concept, not an afterthought. Decisions on the sustainable design strategies, such as storm water management, microclimate control, alternative energy usage, and alternative transportation modes should be made at the beginning of the project and carried on through the design process.

**The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.**





## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 9 – June 28, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday June 28, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)  
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)  
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting  
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.  
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects  
Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

##### **Regrets**

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.  
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects  
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity  
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

#### **INVITED EXTERNAL AGENCY MEMBERS**

June Little, Toronto Region Conservation Authority

#### **STAFF**

John MacKenzie, Commissioner of Planning  
Rob Bayley, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department  
Carmela Marrelli, Development Planning Department  
Erika Ivanic, Development Planning Department  
Moirra Wilson, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department  
Audrey Farias, Urban Design Section, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

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

**1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest declared.

**3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, May 31, 2012 be adopted as circulated.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

**4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**a. Vaughan Official Plan and Zoning Amendment**

File No: OP.12.004 and Z.12.010  
Applicant: 2058258 Ontario Limited  
Location: 4603 & 4611 Regional Road 7(Southwest of Regional Road 7 and Pine Valley Drive). City of Vaughan  
Architect: Burka Architects Inc.  
Landscape Architect: Strybos Barron King Ltd.  
Review: First Review

**Presentations:**

Erika Ivanic, Development Planning; Audrey Farias, Urban Design

**Introduction:**

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. Does the proposed high density development represent an appropriate massing with regards to impact on the surrounding low density residential development?
2. Does the proposed design concept encourage pedestrian movements and connections to the open space system?

TRCA member highlighted that the proposed development was within the extent of the TRCA regulated area and was an area of concern. TRCA was advised to have discussions with the applicant after reviewing the Tree Inventory Plan submitted by the applicant.

### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel appreciated the applicant's understanding of the site and caring attitude to the site and its surrounding.

However, it was felt that more sensitivity should be used to respond to the adjacent river corridor, as a prominent natural feature and amenity. The panel noted that it was a remarkable site and that it is expecting a remarkable design and building that responds to, and integrates with, the river valley as a prominent feature of the public realm. The applicant is encouraged to meet with the TRCA to identify the areas and spaces that need to be conserved.

### **Site Organization and Orientation**

It was generally felt that the proposed building sitting turns its back on the river valley (i.e. it has no public frontage or circulation). Panel recommended considering to orient the buildings such that the amenity areas face the existing open space system. It was also suggested to consider flipping the buildings such that the access road is moved to the west side of the buildings adjacent to the open space system to create a better edge along the open space.

It was also suggested to consider reorganizing the vehicle drop-off by situating it in the middle between the building and the open space, and by reducing the footprint.

Another suggestion was to incorporate a break between the buildings, which could potentially act as an amenity area, integrating the TRCA regulated areas and concerns of ground water collection and drainage to the open space system. In this way, it would serve as a dual function by creating an amenity space for the residents and retaining some of the existing trees, if worth keeping.

Panel felt that the frontage along Highway 7 required further enhancement to create a more pedestrian oriented environment, in keeping with the City's vision for Highway 7. Opportunities for commercial and other public amenities should be considered to animate Highway 7. Furthermore, it was suggested to consider enhancing access to Highway 7 from the site and the river valley by creating open spaces such as courtyards and walkways.

### **Building Massing, Form and Elevations**

Panel recommended higher massing along Highway 7 with a significant transition by dropping down the building mass toward the south of the site. It was also suggested to consider reducing the height of buildings on the south side to avoid asking for a minimal increase in height.

Overall, the panel felt that a greater relationship should be articulated between the buildings and the open spaces, through the design, layout, and materiality of both.

It was recommended to reconsider the proposed material palette to allow the development to relate with the conservation area and the low density residential. Panel encouraged the use of contemporary masonry instead of the proposed precast to respond to the existing masonry language of the Woodbridge area. It was also felt that the design of elevations should be influenced by the building orientation, reflecting the character of the space within.

#### Landscape and Sustainability

Panel requested the applicants to explore the potential of providing a greater relationship with the existing open space and responding to the winding nature of Jersey Creek. The applicants were asked to explore various energy and natural area conservation objectives and methods for site remediation.

It was further suggested that the drip line and conservation of trees be considered to create this urban scale project. Additional details showing how drainage is being handled on site and what treatment is given to the existing drain outlets were requested from the applicants.

#### Pedestrian Connections, Permeability and Open Space Character

Panel encouraged the applicants to provide pedestrian connections to the open space system, by looking at ways of creating a walkway between and alongside the proposed buildings and the top of bank on the west side, for people to walk along and enjoy the natural heritage. Panel agreed that the elimination of the two proposed decorative fences on each side of the site would increase permeability through the site. The Panel, however, understands the political complexities that are related to connecting Sydel Crescent to the site.

Panel expressed that the proposed plans did not show doors at the ground level. It was recommended that ground floor uses have doors to ensure that people can enter/exit their units at the ground level.

It was felt that the provision of the terrace on the 5<sup>th</sup> storey was a great idea but is preferred to be expanded or flipped such that it faces the open space on the west instead of the residential area on the south.

**The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 10 – July 26, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday July 26, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)  
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting  
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.  
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design  
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.  
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.  
Sony Rai, Diamond and Schmitt Architect Inc.

##### **Absent**

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects  
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects  
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

##### **STAFF**

Audrey Farias, Development Planning Department  
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel  
Stephan Lue, Development Planning Department  
Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Recreation and Culture Department

**The meeting was called to order at 9: 03 a.m., with Antonio Gomez-Palacio in the Chair**

#### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

## **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest declared.

## **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, June 28, 2012 be adopted as circulated.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

## **4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **a. Vaughan Pre-Application Consultation**

File No: OP.12.007, Z.12.016 and DA.12.038

Applicant: Gold Park (Woodbridge) Inc.

Location: The subject lands are bound by Major Mackenzie Drive to the north, Keele Street to the east, Church Street to the south, and Jackson Street to the west

Architect: Kohn Partnership Architects Inc

Review: First Review

#### **Introduction:**

City staff outlined the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, the area planning policy, urban design priorities and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

1. How well does the proposed development relate to its urban contexts, specifically along Church Street, Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive?
2. To what extent does the overall design strategy and site organization of the proposed development encourage the pedestrian presence and activities by introducing a meaningful mixed-used development, vibrant public realm and amenity space?
3. How well does the proposed development fit within the existing urban context of the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District as described in the Heritage District Plan and Guidelines, specifically along Church Street, Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel encouraged the design team to seriously consider the purpose and policies of the Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan. A central purpose of the District Plan has to do with managing change within the Village of Maple, while conserving its character and special role within the city. This requires asking "what is it that we are conserving?" As such, the premise of an HCD is that there is heritage

significance beyond the individual structures, to include the district as a collection of structures and landscapes that tell a story of how the settlement began in the 19th century and how it has grown to its current shape.

The proposed design and the extent of demolition, however, are far from demonstrating sensitivity to the heritage significance of the site and of the district. In fact, it reads as a development which could be placed anywhere else.

Panel encouraged the applicant to include conserving the district's Village character as well as the existing structures and to demonstrate how the design realizes the District Plan's vision.

Panel also encouraged the applicant to consider that new structures should reflect their own time, not replicate past eras. New architecture should offer a powerful version of contemporary continuation. Yet, there is a story to be told within the context. In order to provide a more relevant and sympathetic design to the urban form and the heritage character of the area, the DRP recommends the following design considerations be addressed:

#### Design Process and Approach

It seems the Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan policies have not been incorporated in the design process. A comprehensive analysis of the District Plan's related policies and assessment of each existing structure should be completed to allow for better conservation plan.

Being sympathetic to the work of the City in terms of the conservation of heritage public assets and to the developer's financial concerns, the Panel recommend the two sides work with each other to find a design solution through a design charrette.

#### Heritage Conservation

The whole creation of the HCD Plan responds to the recognition of this as a special place within Vaughan, whose character needs to be conserved.

Although existing heritage buildings within the site are neglected and deteriorating, they individually and/or collectively hold unique historical significance which makes them worthy of conservation.

The applicant should be more hesitant of removing the existing structures and landscape. The urban character of the village should be conserved by incorporating some of existing buildings and landscaping into the proposed design.

Panel asked the applicant to respect the integrity of the heritage buildings and landscapes and put more effort to their conservation, incorporating them into the design.

#### Building Architecture & Development Character

The heritage character of the area suffers from the interpretation of "what

vernacular architecture is?” and “what is needed to be done to distinguish the local architecture from other places?”

The proposed warehouse architecture type is perceived as a standard design, which can be located anywhere else in Ontario, specifically downtown Toronto. The challenge for the architect is to review and understand the Maple Heritage Conservation District and propose a design that belongs to the Maple community and responds to the HCD Plan’s intentions for new developments in the area.

Furthermore, the proposal should respond to the unique character of each frontage. The proposed built form and architecture should relate to its many different contexts, it is doubtful that one building can fit into the site’s different frontages.

As proposed, the four-storey building looks the same on all of its four frontages. The building footprint should be broken into smaller components to address each frontage more appropriately in terms of architecture, scale, streetscape and setbacks.

#### Landscape

Not only are the heritage buildings worthy of conservation, but also the landscapes, which support the character of the HCD. As such, they should also be conserved and incorporated into the overall design.

Removal of tree canopy is not an insignificant matter and plays an important role in the character of the village. However, the greenness and the ample vegetation within the site and along the edges have been proposed to be removed and dedicated to the vehicular access and parking. The possibility of on-street parking on Major MacKenzie was discussed as an alternative, which might be further discussed with staff (benefitting retail in particular).

Very little area is dedicated to pedestrian connection to the surrounding streets which hinders the future residents and visitors of the site from walking in the area.

#### Streetscape

To make a positive contribution to Maple community, all available design characteristics of the existing built form such as setbacks, heights, landscape, finishing materials and other built form characteristics, which form the streets, should be captured and incorporated into the design.

The rhythm of the existing buildings and built form, as well as the character of landscaping should be articulated to achieve a more harmonic design to the existing context and streetscape on all surrounding streets.

Efforts should be taken to positively contribute to the adjacent streets by enhancing the pedestrian environment within and around the site.

### **5. Mississauga Urban Design Advisory Panel Overview**



Urban Design staff presented the revisions recently made to the Mississauga Urban Design Advisory Panel.

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



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 12 – September 27, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday September 27, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)  
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)  
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting  
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design  
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.  
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects  
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.  
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.  
Sony Rai, SMV Architects  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects  
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

##### **Absent**

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Development Planning Department  
Diana Birchall, Policy Planning Department  
Audrey Farias, Development Planning Department  
Paul Jankowski, Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works  
Shirley Kam, Economic Development Department  
Stephan Lue, Development Planning Department  
John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning  
Andrew Pearce, Development/ Transportation Engineering Department  
Anna Sicilia, Policy Planning Department  
Grant Uyeyama, Development Planning Department  
Moirra Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

## MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

Sandra Yeung Racco, Ward 4 Councillor

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

### 1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

### 2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

### 3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

That the Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, July 26, 2012 be adopted as circulated with a revision.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

### 4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

#### a. **Application for OP, Zoning and Plan of Subdivision**

File No:	OP.12.014, Z.12.034, 19T-12V007, and DA.12.085
Applicant:	Calloway REIT (Sevenbridge) Inc.
Location:	Southwest corner of Millway Avenue and Apple Mill Road, between Edgeley Boulevard and Millway Avenue, City of Vaughan
Architect:	Diamond and Schmitt Architects/ Claude Cormier + Associates Inc.
Review:	First Review

#### **Introduction:**

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

1. How does the overall proposal fit within the urban structure of the VMC Secondary Plan?
2. Does the overall proposal create a high quality pedestrian environment?
3. How do the building's massing, podium design, programming, and relationship to the public realm set the stage as a first move to achieve a successful, vibrant, mixed-use mobility hub?
4. Please comment on the site plan with respect to the configuration and potential activation of transit square, the location of 'back of house' functions, and the response to its various frontages. Also consider if the dimensions of the proposed setbacks and volume of the space being created are sufficient to achieve an appropriate transit square.

### Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

The panel appreciated the carefully considered and comprehensive approach of the project and the high quality drawings submitted. The following is panel's consensus on key aspects of the project needing improvement:

1. By virtue of this building's highly visible location at the visual terminus of a grand scale linear park and next to the subway station, this will be a **landmark building**. As such, panel wished the building was more imaginatively expressed with more robust, significant architecture to better frame the public realm.
2. Although the **podium design** shown in the presentation was further developed from the material circulated to Design Review Panel members, the panel felt that it still requires further development to become more cohesive and robust, and to address some problems at the transition point between tower and podium. Overall, the podium needs improvement with respect to its scale, massing, and the definition of a clear visual order – all critical to establish the success of the surrounding public realm and retail environment. It was noted that the **micro-climactic conditions** on all four sides of the building should be carefully considered to create a pedestrian place.
3. The panel expressed concern about the negative impact that the proposed **loading, underground parking access and skylight** will have on Apple Mill Road and the park. It was recommended the applicant consider alternate strategies for loading, and to consolidate parking and loading - to one entrance if possible.
4. **Energy optimization of the building** could be improved by adjusting the façades to respond to their aspect (north, south, east, west), such as changing the percentage of ceramic frit on the glass to improve solar control performance. The Pharmaceutical building in Waterloo was provided as an example of a graphic architectural language which also serves a second function to moderate energy.
5. The **master plan** beyond the limits of the site plan application was raised as an important consideration to evaluate the site, especially with respect to the surrounding blocks street walls, the north-south connections, and how the pedestrian network shown in the master plan interconnects to what is shown on the site plan.
6. Panel members emphasized that the street network will play an important role in defining the pedestrian nature of the station precinct. The panel invited the design team to **reexamine the overall street network proposed to create a stronger relationship between the streets, park, transit square and built form**. It was suggested that the north-south streets deleted from the original plan do not need to negate the relationship between the park and the building, and that these streets may be a useful device to animate the western entrance of the office building during the winter season.
7. The **streets** that traverse the park in a north-south direction could be treated differently (more pedestrian friendly through material change and perhaps eliminating the curbs and have them flush with the park) to make sure that they are understood as a pedestrian dominant space and a continuation of the park.

8. Create a **stronger pedestrian connectivity between the park and transit square**. It was suggested that the “wall” (building) that separates the park and plaza should be considered as framing both spaces rather than as a barrier between them. The idea of a **tall mid-block galleria**, such as at BCE Place, to enhance the axial relationship between the park and transit square was discussed.
9. **Transit square** should have very strong, clearly defined edges to anchor it as a place for people to be comfortable in, and for the success of its retail and restaurants. Panel members expressed mixed opinions on the proposed size for transit square. Some members believed the scale as shown is generally appropriate as an urban square, and advocated for architectural enclosure of the square to define the edges of the space. Other members expressed concern that the size of the square is inadequate to meet the functions of a civic square. It was agreed that the function and programming of the square, unarticulated at this meeting, will inform its size and configuration.
10. Panel expressed concern about the **uncertainty of the “future building”** dotted onto the site plan and how this building would address the square, and relate to the proposed building. The addition of this building has the potential to create a positive contribution to the Apple Mill street edge and to enclose and anchor transit square. However, more definition of this building (including servicing, frontage, built form articulation, parking, and use) is required to review it and to evaluate the resulting size and configuration of the square. The building footprint should be revisited with consideration of the impact on transit square and visual/ pedestrian connections.
11. The development proposal should consider the **mobility hub’s access points and pedestrian circulation routes** and how they could be made to relate to each other and the surrounding public realm, including the transit square.
12. The **landscape plan for the park** was positively received as very engaging and expressive design. Panel commended the strong gesture and narration of the pedestrian experience within the park as well as the integration of public art into the design.
13. To improve the landscape plan, the **park and square programme** should be further considered to support diverse activities in the park as the community develops, and to generate both daytime and evening activity in the square. Space could be provided in the square to allow for kiosks or other temporary installations that would contribute to the activation of the mobility hub.
14. With respect to the park, it was noted that the **pedestrian circulation routes** should recognize future desire lines, that relate to destinations within and adjacent to the park. Harvard Yard was mentioned as a precedent.
15. With respect to **transit square**, the panel recommended that further consideration should be given to the **tactile quality of the surface**. Given the harsh, open, windswept condition of the site, the design needs to create an inviting place for people to stay in.
16. **Public Art**: The idea of a linear procession from the transit square, through the building, through the park to the west was offered as the vision of the pedestrian experience. As well as the linear, sequential placement of artworks at regular points

along the central axis of the park, it was suggested that artists be encouraged to engage the park spatially.

The landscape as an art program could incorporate the North West storm water pond to create a relationship with the park if water was further developed as an element in the design. There currently exists a circular water element at the west end of the park.

The opportunity exists for artists to work collaboratively on other elements, such as the pedestrian bridge, underground access points and park structures.

17. The design and location of the **park underground parking ramps and exit stairs** need to be more carefully considered with respect to the impact on the public realm (all the park edges and adjacent streets). Overall, it was agreed that more detailed drawings are needed to allow for a design review of the underground access points.

Panel members offered various suggestions:

Vaughan Street was questioned as an appropriate place for the location of a parking entrance ramp.

Rather than the minimalist Judd-like boxes, potentially explore a series of glazed pavilions that would bring light to the below grade parking. These access points, if extended vertically, could provide an opportunity for public art as iconic elements and as an opportunity for public art that was in a non-heated environment but protected from the elements. These pavilions may have a relationship to the public space of the office tower as a method of "pulling" the public space of the tower into the landscape and vice versa. The pairing of these pavilions might also provide an alternate or complimentary ordering system to the placement of artworks along the central path.

Panel agreed that if a **pedestrian bridge** is provided, its design must be extraordinary. It was suggested that perhaps only one of the streets has a pedestrian bridge. The proposed pedestrian bridge could be an opportunity to integrate the parking access ramps, perhaps tucking it under the proposed pedestrian bridge.

18. **Existing context should be represented in one set of drawings** (in addition to the built out urban condition) in order to evaluate the interim condition of the development. Panel suggested that the Applicant investigate precedents for large phased developments on brownfields/ greenfields to research how interim conditions were dealt with. The success of this first phase is crucial to the success of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, and although is easier to visualize the end goal, it will be important for the citizens of Vaughan to be excited about the first phase.
19. **Sun Shadow Studies** should include the full build out of the surrounding urban context to allow for a review of the impact of the towers on the square and park.

5. **ADDITIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POLICIES FOR THE VAUGHAN METROPOLITAN CENTRE**

Policy Planning staff provided a draft list of additional guidelines and/or policies to guide development in the VMC and invited Design Review Panel members to comment.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 13 – October 25, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday October 25, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd. (Present for agenda items 2 and 3)

Sony Rai, SMV Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Development Planning Department

Diana Birchall, Policy Planning Department

Audrey Farias, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Farhad Jalilli, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Laura Janotta, Development Planning Department

Christina Napoli, Development Planning Department

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel (Item 1)



## **MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**

Sandra Yeung Racco, Ward 4 Councillor (Item 1)

**The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair**

### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

### **2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest declared.

### **3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, September 27, 2012 be adopted.

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

### **4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **a. Application for OP, Zoning and Plan of Subdivision**

File No:	OP.12.015, Z.12.035, 19T-12V009
Applicant:	Nine-Ten West Limited
Location:	Carrville District Centre
Architect:	The Planning Partnership
Review:	First Review

#### **Introduction:**

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

1. Does the proposed development concept meet the urban design vision and objectives established by OPA 651 and re-stated in the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan study?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The panel commended the overall quality of the package submitted, the intent of the plan, feel that that the plan as it has developed generally maintains the strengths of the original.

1. Panel positively recognized the stated intent of the plan to protect and take advantage of the topography for dramatic effect but raised the caveat that a more complete review would be only possible with more knowledge of form and densities, as well as more detail on the topography itself.

2. Panel suggested more refinement of the plan to take advantage of the topography and to create interesting relationships between the open space system, urban blocks, circulation network and architecture. Cross sections are necessary to better understand this site and the relationships.
3. Given the large amount of open space, the plan needs to continue to explore design opportunities between the open spaces and the urban areas to create a robust urban place that attracts people to it, as well as for the safety of pedestrians moving through the open spaces. Suggested refinements to the street network are:
4. Replace the curved form of Street A and resulting block shape with a Street A that approaches Marc Santi Blvd at a 90 degree angle. This sharper corner would create a more regular, efficient block shape for Block 19 likely resulting in a better quality building, slow down traffic, and increase the prominence of pedestrian connection across the urban park of Block 13. It would also create a closeness between Streets A and B, and an interesting design opportunity for the pedestrian connection across the urban park of Block 13.
5. It was noted that if there is no street between Blocks 19 and 20, it becomes a large block. Panel recommended that if no street is included, then a very strong, activated pedestrian connection through the centre of the block should be explored.
6. Panel agreed that if Street C (the segment between Block 1 and 2) is shifted northwards, this will create a more traditional block size that will accommodate a greater variety of built form.
7. Panel expressed concern about the quality of place that will create at the intersection of Street B and Street C with three corners townhouses and the remaining corner an urban park. Noted that Blocks 1,2,3, and 4 need to be more robust in terms of urban form to create an urban place and to transition from low density residential to the east to high density. Is there an appropriate mid-rise that would create a more gradual transition.
8. Given the existing topography, the viability of constructing the proposed high rise towers in Block 6 was questioned, and how these towers would relate to the topography.
9. Creating connectivity across the center of the plan was emphasized with the following recommendations:
  - o The importance of achieving a full intersection at Street A and Dufferin to connect the pedestrian greenway and street network with the western quadrant.

- The plan should anticipate a more substantial pedestrian R.O.W. across the urban park block 13 with consideration of materiality, planting and finishes. It was felt that the landscape plan diminishes the importance of the east west connection across the park which is a critical consideration.
10. Would like to see more effort to connect to this neighbourhood to the east across Crimson Forest Drive, and inclusion of eastern adjacency on drawings.
  11. Plan should include a public art strategy to show how public art would be integrated with the public realm.
  12. Panel raised the opportunity to go beyond the usual sustainable design checklist for this particular site given the topography and natural features.
  13. The plan should show how the plan integrates public transportation into the urban fabric and how people are visualized moving around the site with no car.
  14. The proposed park shift from Block 2 to Block 12 was generally deemed a positive move to create contiguous open space and likely for park operations. One member noted the park in Block 2 offered a better permeability in terms of adjacent development.

**b. Vaughan Pre-Application Consultation**

Applicant: Portside Developments  
 Location: 7476 Kipling Avenue  
 Architect: Architecture Unfolded  
 Landscape Architect: NAK Design Group  
 Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

1. Does the built form and its architecture respond to the character of the natural setting?
2. Does the proposal adequately address the relationship and connections between the built form and the open space?

**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The panel was concerned about the viability of the proposal and felt that it was lacking in a strong planning justification and questioned the criteria for intensification in this area of Woodbridge. The applicant was advised to come back with a more responsive proposal.

1. Panel advised the applicant to think about a planning justification that would strongly support the development's proposed scale and height. The applicant was encouraged to revisit the density for the proposed development to be respectful of the rural setting.
2. It was felt that the choice of precedents for the architecture should be carefully considered. It was felt that the selected precedents were only skin-deep and did not reflect any features of the proposed development.
3. Panel suggested reconfiguration and refinement of the plan to relocate drop-off to the west and away from the street, to move garbage collection away from the public face, and to consider the relationship of the building to the street.
4. It was felt that the proposed height was too much for this rural site and it was recommended to consider different built forms and arrive at a building design that is precedent setting. The applicant was also advised to rethink about the materiality of the building. The idea of a glass box next to a natural setting would pose problems with birds flying into the building.
5. The proposal should consider its existing context – the low density residential and open space, and its potential context –the future context that it will be developed into. It also needs to consider the landscape context and its relation to the public realm. The applicant was further asked to establish a network of paths to the open space system.
6. The building orientation on the site was a concern and did not seem to be a viable option. If other sites developed in the context, the angular orientation would throw off the other developments and would not create a consistent street wall.

**c. Vaughan Pre-Application Consultation**

File No: PAC.12.117  
 Applicant: Beaverbrook Homes  
 Location: 10360 and 10384 Islington Avenue, City of Vaughan  
 Architect: IBI Group Architects  
 Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

1. To what extent does the proposed design relate to the Village of Kleinburg urban environment in terms of architecture, site orientation and landscaping?
2. How well does the proposed development fit within the existing landscape and built context of the village of Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation

District, specifically along Islington Avenue, and in particular as an intervention within and immediately adjacent to the Martin Smith property, which is designated Part IV under the Ontario Heritage Act?

**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel recognize a high degree of thoughtfulness has been given to design the proposed buildings' massing and orientation, particularly the separation between the existing heritage house and the new development. The proposed new development, however, should celebrate the existing heritage house and not compete with it. Considering the design limitations imposed by the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District Study, the design team should search for an alternative design approach to suggest a design concept which appears traditional and yet respects the exiting historic artifact.

Architectural Design Approach

1. Panel concerned the design and construction of perceived heritage buildings bring the following challenges and consequences:
  - Heritage style buildings require a high level of talent in customized design and craftsmanship in construction which could increase the budget to a prohibitive level. There is a concern if cost controlling measures through the construction process eventually reduce the quality of the development to a low-quality imitation of the past.
  - In general, the perceived heritage style buildings could create distraction from the original heritage house. To reduce the impacts on the heritage artifact, the new buildings should be kept as far as possible from the existing heritage house and be designed out of the ordinary as much as the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District Study allows. One solution could be to design the new buildings to appear as if they are heritage buildings which are renovated and upgraded by including modern components which are precisely and delicately detailed.
2. The new development looks to be competing with the heritage house in terms of style and presence. This impact can be reduced by orienting a smaller building on the frontage and dropping its roofline to the heritage house level. Using different finishing materials and considering hip roof or heavy timber building styles instead of the gable could also reduce the new development's visual impact.
3. The other design strategy to reduce the new development's competing impact on the heritage house is to limit the number of the proposed building styles. The proposed design proposes too many architectural types which considerably reduce the visibility of the heritage house.
4. The building is located at the gateway to the village's core area. The

location of the site and its context require designing more sophisticated building and detailed elevations. The proposed primary frontage, however, looks plain as if it is the rear side of the development.

5. More careful approach to propose a mechanical system is required. The proposed “Magic Pack” will add visible grills on the building façades make unwanted noise and heat on the proposed balconies. A central heating and cooling system which includes internal air ducts seems to be more appropriate. The central mechanical system should direct the exhaust vertically to the roof and the proposed chimneys could be utilized to function as the end segment of the exhaust system.
6. The authenticity of the historic architecture styles rely on an accurate representation building components and construction methods in every detail. For example, it is crucial to correctly construct the window lintel as a traditional load bearing building element.

#### Site Plan and Landscaping

7. One point access to the site does not seem to be sufficient. Considering the location of the site and its proximity of the Village’s core area the pedestrian connection to the site should be increased in terms of quality and ease of access. To ease pedestrian access, minimum of two access points should be considered and all proposed and existing buildings should directly be connected to the street’s sidewalks by high-quality pathways.
8. The proposed design for the south part of the site suggests a traffic circle, parking garage door, loading area and visitor parking along a driveway. The site plan can be enhanced by removing the circle and designing the driveway as a street with more historic urban character and treatment.
9. The proposed linkages between the buildings should be opened to form colonnades to allow for more transparency at the grade level and around the new and historic buildings.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.**



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### **Minutes of Meeting**

#### **Meeting 14 – November 29, 2012**

---

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday November 29, 2012, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

#### **PANEL MEMBERS**

##### **Present**

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.  
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design  
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting  
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity  
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects  
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.  
Sony Rai, SMV Architects  
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

##### **Absent**

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG  
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.  
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.  
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.  
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

##### **STAFF**

Rob Bayley, Development Planning Department  
Diana Birchall, Policy Planning Department  
Audrey Farias, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel  
Farhad Jalilli, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel  
Laura Janotta, Development Planning Department  
Judy Jeffers, Development Planning Department  
Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Recreation and Culture Department  
Moiria Wilson, Development Planning Department

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. **CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA**

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. **ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Adaption of the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, October 25, 2012 be deferred to the next meeting.

4. **Application for Consideration**

a. **Application for OP, Zoning and Plan of Subdivision**

File No: OP.11.013, Z.11.044 & DA.12.079  
Applicant: Rutherford Market Place (FCHT Holdings)  
Location: 9350 Bathurst Street  
Architect: pillow + associate architects Inc.  
Review: Second Review

**Introduction:**

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

Panel reviewed the first design proposal on November 24, 2011 and recommended the applicant to improve the design concept to respond better to the site's urban context. Has the new design proposal positively responded to the Panel's provided professional design guidance?

**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel acknowledged the design team has responded very positively to the comments made on November 24, 2011, specifically in terms of massing, public interface and site orientation. However, in response to community input, all at-grade residential units have been internally oriented, facing their backyard toward the public realm. Panel encourages the applicant to meet the community with the support of the Planning staff to clearly explain the street oriented design layout advantages in achieving more pedestrian activity and a vibrant community in the area. To further enhance the proposed development quality, the Panel suggested the following design reconsiderations:

**Site Plan and Landscaping**

Regarding the landscape treatment along George Kirby Street, the Design Review Panel mentioned that there are many successful examples throughout



the GTA of creating an attractive delineation between the street edge and ground floor units that are lower in elevation, and the Design Review Panel supports this type of treatment. Public access to the ground floor units can be discouraged by a more effective landscape treatment than the continuous fence shown in the applicant's perspective drawing. A combination of ornamental picket-style fencing that allows visual penetration, raised planters, shrub beds and trees should be used to discourage pedestrian access, but still provide an attractive streetscape treatment.

The quality of public space is improved by moving the proposed "Building 3" loading area away from the street frontage. The loading area, however, has been screened from the public view by a blank wall. The wall should be delicately designed and detailed in relation to the adjacent landscaped areas to create a high-quality urban environment along the sidewalk. The other design option is to place residential units on the street front to separate George Kirby Street's residential environment from the existing commercial plaza.

The design configuration of the proposed plaza has been significantly improved. However, alternative design options should be explored to enhance the quality of the east-west connection to the plaza. The following design considerations will greatly improve the pedestrian environment within the plaza:

- reconfiguration of the proposed tower to minimize its shadow impact on the plaza
- breaking up the development in two segments to allow for outdoor access to the plaza from all directions
- broadening the pedestrian connection to Ilan Ramon Boulevard sidewalk to allow better transition from the sidewalk to the plaza
- removal of the propose staircase on the west side of the plaza. If remains on the same location, the staircase should be minimized in size and designed as a part of outdoor amenity and public art.
- engagement of public art to create high-quality urban space within the proposed plaza's and along all access to the plaza

The definition of the "Interior Courtyard" and private space is not clear. A gradual transition from the public to semi-public and private space is needed by controlling the transparency and screening levels. The desired balance between privacy and transparency can be achieved by utilization of landscaping tools such as planting and decorative fencing.

The proposed "Bin Storage" room should be moved away from the plaza and replaced by a more active use.

#### Massing and Elevations

Massing has been handled well; nevertheless, the proposed roof-top

mechanical penthouse seems to be disproportionately large. The mechanical penthouse should be designed as an integrated part of the structure and used to enhance the overall look of the building.

The efforts on the architectural expression of the building as a residential building by introducing the balconies, wood screening, and the use of well selected materials are very encouraging. To make the project more successful, further consideration should be given to enhance the quality of building components and architectural details.

The building podium is designed well; the tower, however, could be designed better to match the podium design level.

#### **b. Vaughan Site Plan Application**

Applicant: 1668872 Ontario Inc. c/o Royal Pine Homes  
Location: 9909 and 9939 Pine Valley Drive  
Architect: Allen & Sherriff Architects Inc.  
Landscape Architect: Cosburn Associates Ltd.  
Review: First Review

#### **Introduction:**

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

1. Do the built form, architectural quality and use of materials of the proposed development seem like a good fit within its surrounding context?
2. How well do the amenity spaces respond and connect to the existing open space system?

#### **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The panel was concerned that the proposal did not take advantage of the site's exceptional natural character. It was felt that there was a gap in the design process. A site analysis that focused on identifying opportunities and constraints would help the applicant in responding to the site. The applicant was advised to come back with a more responsive proposal.

1. Panel advised the applicant to strongly consider the relationship of the built form and the natural landscape. The building design appeared to be street oriented rather than site related. The position of the ramp to the underground level obstructs any linkage to the natural environment. It identified an opportunity to create terracing toward the natural features with courtyards facing the ravine.
2. Panel suggested that the applicant rethink the circulation both internally within the building and externally to improve the plan. It was recommended that the long driveway along Pine Valley Drive be reduced in length and more green and amenity space added along this frontage. It was further suggested to add more vertical connections to break the long internal corridor. In general, it was noted

that access and circulation for a building of this size was not developed, either internally or externally, for both able-bodied and less mobile uses. The unusual length seemed to be served by one main entrance and exit.

3. Panel noted that the proposed built form as presented was too long. The applicant was recognized for its efforts to break down the mass with the horizontal elevation treatment. However, it was suggested to break down the volume instead to create a better built form.
4. Panel stated that the location and scale of amenities was not successful and did not feel like a community. It was suggested to move the surface parking to the lower level and use the surface parking area for amenity spaces. The applicant was further advised to consider using some of the roof areas for amenity spaces.
5. The applicant was advised to consider the style being used as the current use of the traditional style was superficial. It acknowledged that the historical reference as an inspiration is great but if the traditional style was preferred, it should be authentic in its materiality, detail and form.
6. It was further noted that no detail was shown for the relationship of the ground floor units, at the front of the building, to the street. Further, the loading and garbage pickup areas were not clear.
7. Lastly, it was brought to the applicant's attention that the overall presentation material was lacking in important information. The applicant was strongly advised to provide more detailed information for the next review with fully labeled and dimensioned drawings that would better assist the panel in assessing the design. Also, the panel stated that a presentation file with all images would help rather than flipping through multiple files.

**c. Vaughan Official Plan and Zoning Amendment, and Site Plan Application**

Applicant: Heritage Hill Developments (II) Corporation  
Location: 10423 and 10429 Islington Avenue, City of Vaughan  
Architect: Bernatt Architect Ltd.  
Landscape Architect: Landscape Planning Limited  
Review: First Review

**Introduction:**

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

1. Does the site organization of the proposed mixed-use development encourage pedestrian activities and allow for adequate amenity space?

2. How well does the built form and massing of the proposed development fit into the existing context of the village of Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District, specifically along Islington Avenue?

**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Panel recognized that the applicants were well-versed about Kleinburg and commended them for their fine grain knowledge of the site. Preservation of the historic value of the site is not only dependent upon preservation of built form but of landscape character as well. The applicant was encouraged to preserve as many trees as possible. The panel encouraged the applicant to consider the implications of modifications to the site vis a vis historical preservation as well as potential reduction of economic valuation should the character of the site be overly compromised.

1. Panel noted that too much parking was provided on site and the proposed "public square" did not feel like a real public square. The applicant is advised to reduce the surface parking and use the space to provide the residents with some amenities. The provision of parking along Building B was also questioned. It was suggested to reduce the asphalt and possibly create connections to the street along this space.
2. The site is not big enough to accommodate all of the proposed ideas of density, and public square. It was recommended to reduce the density and create more space around the historic buildings. The applicant was encouraged to explore other options of site organization and to create more buffers along the edges.
3. With regard to Building C, it was recommended to observe the side and rear yard setbacks, and to consider pulling back the parking ramp giving an opportunity to add units at grade to the rear of the building. It was also suggested to use the space within the roof and any precedent identified should be more closely followed.
4. Lastly, the applicant was encouraged to preserve more trees on site. It was asked that the Landscape Plan show the existing trees and highlight the efforts taken by the applicant in the preservation of trees. The applicant was asked to come back with a more sensitive proposal.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.**