

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 15 – JANUARY 31, 2013

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 November 29, 2012 Meeting
- 9:05 am** **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape & Open Space Plan**
Design Concept, 1st Review
City of Vaughan
Presentations:
Moira Wilson, Urban Design; Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.
- 10:15 am** **Break**
- 10:30 am** **VIVA NEXT, H2 VMC Highway 7 Transit Improvements**
VMC Rapid Transit Station Design, 1st Review
York Region Rapid Transit Corporation
Presentations:
John Dyk, Aecom; David Clark, YRRTC
- 11:40 am** **Lunch**
- 12:00 pm** **Adjournment**



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 16 – FEBRUARY 28, 2013

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 January 31, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am** **Rose Garden City / Hwy 7 & Centre Street**
Application for Site Development Design Concept, 2nd Review
Liberty Development Corporation
Presentations:
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
Kirkor Architects Incorporated
- 10:15 am** **Break**
- 10:25 am** **Lansdowne & Hwy 7 / 10 Storey Multi-Unit Residential Development**
Application for OP and Zoning, 1st Review
Marquee Condominiums
Presentations:
Eugene Fera, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
FFA Architects + Planners Inc.
- 11:40 am** **Lunch**
- 12:00 pm** **Adjournment**



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 17 – MARCH 28, 2013

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 February 28, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am Maple GO Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Development**
Application for Secondary Plan, OP and Draft Plan of Subdivision 1st Review
York Major Holdings Inc.
Presentations:
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
Quadrangle Architects Limited
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:20 am Highway #7 & Interchange Way High-Rise Development VMC**
Pre-Application for Site Plan, 2nd Review
Eastons Group Limited
Presentations:
Mary Caputo, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design
Robin Clark Architect / Paradigm Architecture and Design
- 11:30 am Break**
- 11:35 am 9869 & 9891 Keele Street Mixed-Use Townhouse Development Village of Maple Heritage District**
Application for Site Plan and Zoning 1st Review
Presentations:
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
Kohn Partnership Architects Inc.
- 12:45 pm Adjournment**



CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 18 – APRIL 25, 2013

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 February 28th & March 28th, 2013 Meetings
- 9:05 am** **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre 16 Storey Office Building and Public Square**
Site Development Application, 2nd Review
Calloway REIT (Sevenbridge) Inc.
Presentations:
Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design
Diamond and Schmitt Architects / Claude Cormier + Associates Inc.
Project presentation for DRP deliberation
- 10:15 am** **Break**
- 10:30 am** **3600 Rutherford Road**
Mid-Rise Residential & Townhouses
Site Development Application, 2nd Review
West Rutherford Properties Ltd. (Lormel Homes)
Presentations:
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning; Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design
Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
- 11:45 am** **Lunch**

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

AGENDA: MEETING 19 – MAY 30, 2013

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 April 25th, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am** **Centre Street & New Westminster Drive Development**
High Rise Residential
Site Development Application, 2nd Review
Cityzen Development Group
Presentations:
Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design
Rafael + Bigauskas Architects
- 10:15 am** **Break**
- 10:30 am** **4908 & 4902 Highway Mid-Rise Development**
Mid-Rise Mixed Use
Site Development Application, 1st Review
Bremont Homes Corporation
Presentations:
Daniel Woolfson, Development Planning; Farhad Jalilli, Urban Design
E.I. Richmond Architects Ltd.
- 11:45 am** **Lunch**

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 20 – JUNE 27, 2013

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 30th, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am Liberty Maplecrete Development in Vaughan Metropolitan Centre
Mixed-Use Development**
Site Development Application, 2nd Review
Liberty Development Group
Presentations:
Stephen Lue, Development Planning; *Moira Wilson*, Urban Design
Kirkor Architects & Planners Inc.
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:30 am Market Lane Holdings Development (Woodbridge Avenue)
Mid-Rise Residential Development**
Site Development Application OP & Zoning, 1st Review
Market Lane Holdings Inc.
Presentations:
Eugene Fera, Development Planning; *Farhad Jalilli*, Urban Design
Nino Rico Architect Ltd.
- 11:45 am Lunch**
- 12:00 pm Adjournment**

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 21 – SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

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 June 27, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am Vaughan Civic Centre Resource Library**
City Capital Project Site Development, 1st Review
City of Vaughan Library Board / Buildings and Facilities Department
Presentations:
Margie Singleton, Chief Executive Officer, City of Vaughan Library Board
ZAS Architects + Interiors
- 10:15 am Break**
- 10:30 am Islamic Shia, Ithna – Asheri, Jamaat of Toronto
Mid-Rise, Townhouse Residential Development**
Site Development Application OP & Zoning, 1st Review
Presentations:
Mark Antoine, Development Planning; Sandra Cappuccitti, Urban Design
Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
- 11:45 am Lunch**
- 12:00 pm Adjournment**

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 22 – OCTOBER 31, 2013

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 26, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am** **7895 Jane Street, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre High-Rise Mixed Use
Development**
Berkeley Developments (Jane) Ltd.
Development Application OP & Zoning Functional Design Concept / 1st Review
Presentations:
Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Sandra Cappuccitti, Urban Design
Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
- 10:15 am** **Break**
- 10:30 am** **13019 Jane and Rutherford, High-Rise Mixed Use Development**
Rutherford Land Corporation
Development Application OP & Zoning Functional Design Concept / 1st Review
Presentations:
Melissa Rossi Policy Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
- 11:45 am** **Lunch**
- 12:00 pm** **Adjournment**

CITY OF VAUGHAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL AGENDA: MEETING 23 – NOVEMBER 28, 2013

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

- 9:00 am Call to Order**
Chair's Review of Meeting Agenda
Disclosure of Interest
Confirmation of Minutes of October 30, 2013 Meeting
- 9:05 am Jane Street south of Rutherford, High-Rise Mixed Use Development
Greenpark Group, Casertano Development Corporation OP.07.001/Z.09.038
Sandra Mammone OP.09.006 / Z.09.037**
Development Application OP & Zoning Functional Design Concepts / 1st Review
Separate Applications
Presentations:
Melissa Rossi Policy Planning; Sandra Cappuccitti, Urban Design
Kirkor Architects & Planners Ltd. (Greenpark Group, Casertano OP.07.001 /
Z.09.038)
SRN Architects Inc. (Sandra Mammone OP 09.006 / Z.09.037)
- 10:40 am Break**
- 10:45 am 8334 Islington Avenue, Mid-Rise Residential
Lanada Investments Inc.**
Development Application OP & Zoning Functional Design Concept / 1st Review
Presentations:
Eugene Fera Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design
SRN Architects Inc.
- 12:00 pm Lunch**
- 12:30 pm Adjournment**





CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting – DRAFT

Meeting 15 – January 31, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, January 31, 2013 in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gomez-Palacio, DIALOG

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Sony Rai, SMV Architects

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Absent

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Paul Jankowski, Commissioner of Engineering

Andrew Pearce, Development Transportation Engineering

Diana Birchall, Policy Planning Department

Armine Hassakourians, Policy Planning Department

Audrey Farias, Development Planning Department

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Stephen Lue, Development Planning Department

COUNCIL

Sandra Yeung Racco, Ward 4 Councillor

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m., with Antonio Gomez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Bruce Cudmore, Michael Rietta and Brad Golden declared a conflict of interest for Item #1, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape and Open Space Plan.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Adaption of the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, November 29, 2012.

4. Presentation

a. Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape + Open Space Plan: Design Concept

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Location: | Vaughan Metropolitan Centre |
| Landscape Architect: | EDA Collaborative Inc. |
| Review: | First Review |

Introduction:

City staff presented the draft design concept for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Streetscape + Open Space Plan, and invited comments from Design Review Panel Members.

Panel's Comments:

- The landscape concept is based on a strong concept of connectivity. The connection between different developments will be important, given the scenario of separate pockets of development over separate phases.
- The design concept is beginning to establish an interesting hierarchy with a thoughtful integration of storm water management. The opportunity for community gardens and other fine grain landscape typologies could be added to further develop and enrich the landscape system/ hierarchy.
- Vaughan's local food network could also inform the Plan with an overlay onto the proposed Landscape Character Typologies.

- Finer grain urban systems, such as parking and green roofs, could be included in the provided landscape framework for storm water management.
- Larger scale, regional systems should be included in the Plan, to understand and communicate how they connect with and influence the site.
- Panel encouraged further development of the sense of identity for the green-blue streets, including how they look and function in winter conditions. The context of development on one side of the street and parkland on the other allows for creative storm water management, including the relationship between built form and water.
- The success in realizing the vision for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre will depend on partnerships and collaboration. In order for the public realm/ open space system to be realized, private partners need to be consulted, understand, and buy into the vision. Therefore, this Plan should elaborate on the role that private development must play to make a successful place, including adding frontage, land use, and how development interface (including buildings, rooftops, parking) can contribute to the success of the public realm system.
- Panel members encouraged the project to articulate the interfaces between the public and private realms, outlining potential connections and landscape systems between them, to aggregate and capitalize upon opportunities at the outset of development.
- Panel raised a general concern that beyond the VMC Secondary Plan, there is no detailed plan that guides developers as to where loading should be located, what local streets should focus on retail, etc. The project documents for the revitalization of Regent Park were raised as a good precedent.
- Panel felt that a level of detail is missing in the Plan that relates the architecture to streetscapes and how they interface with each other. This is especially important for retail streets.
- Panel members flagged a concern about the success of retail along the length of very wide arterials, such as Highway 7 and Millway Avenue. The width of these streets creates an essentially one-sided retail condition in which is extremely difficult to create a vibrant, active pedestrian activity.
- Panel members advised that the downtown would be better served by focusing retail in areas that can function at a pedestrian scale.
- Panel advised the City on the importance of engaging stakeholders and a wide variety of retail and leasing experts in the development of the retail strategy for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

- An overlay of the cycling and pedestrian network is required to elucidate the functions of parks and open spaces, and how bicycle use will be integrated into the transportation system.
- The proposed pedestrian bridge or land bridge is an important element to create strong pedestrian connectivity across Jane Street.
- The graphic for the “Black Creek” Landscape Typology does not address the special condition at the corners of Highway 7 and Jane Street and how this area should be treated in the future.
- The graphic of the “Black Creek” Landscape Typology looks like a single entity rather than how it could potentially relate to what is around it. More pedestrian crossings should be shown on the plan to increase connectivity. The Plan should emphasize not only north-south connectivity but also east to west connectivity.
- The landscape function(s) of “Neighbourhood Parks” should be further developed and integrated into the larger landscape system of the new downtown.
- The idea of a Design Competitions for landscape and public art was raised to promote design excellence within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

5. Application for Consideration

a. **Application for Development Application Approval**

| | |
|------------|--|
| File No: | VMC Rapid Transit Station Design |
| Applicant: | VIVA NEXT, H2 VMC Highway 7 Transit Improvements |
| Location: | Highway 7 at Millway Avenue |
| Architect: | John Dyk, Aecom |
| Review: | First Review |

Introduction:

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

Given the overall goal of creating a well-defined, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use mobility hub at the centre of the new downtown, what improvements could be made to the proposed rapid transit station architecture and massing in order to contribute to and create positive relationships at grade with the planned subway station and public realm?

Comments:

1. Panel noted the important influence that the rapid transit station design, as part of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre mobility hub, will exert on the public realm and surrounding development.

2. Coordination between VIVA and TTC designs is required to help shape a pedestrian-oriented, high quality public realm for the mobility hub.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

MAKING AN URBAN PLACE WHERE PEDESTRIANS ARE FIRST

- Panel expressed concern that engineering standards are driving the design and recommended that more importance is placed on urban design quality – including prioritizing the pedestrian experience – to make this mobility hub a successful urban place.
- Generally, Panel members expressed a concern that the station has been designed within the limits of a vehicle-dominated suburban typology, i.e. “an entrance on one side of a barrier”. Panel advised that an “urban” approach to the station design – integrating rather than separating it from the streetscape – will be instrumental to create the desired pedestrian-first mobility hub at this intersection. Panel advised that an urban approach will create a safer and more comfortable environment for pedestrians.
- The primary function of the station is to provide an interface between two modes of transit: subway and light rapid transit. In this context, the pedestrian is the mode that is the correlation between everything else. Panel believes that the pedestrian circulation system in the proposed design is not sufficiently surface-oriented. In summary, too much emphasis has been placed on under-ground connections, with the above grade pedestrian infrastructure and connections compromised.
- The interim condition of Highway 7 (with no built edge along the streetscape) should also be considered; temporary landscape architecture and architecture design measures could be provided to encourage pedestrian activity at grade.
- If the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre mobility hub and the associated Millway Park north and south of Highway 7, becomes a successful pedestrian place, the proposed three metre wide crosswalk size (and station ramp connection) at Millway Avenue and Highway 7 could potentially become too narrow to accommodate a large volume of pedestrians at this intersection. It was further noted that the expression of the paving - with dark colours for pedestrian surface and red for vehicle surface - relegates the movement of pedestrians to second place in the hierarchy.
- Panel members expressed concern that the VIVA station does not relate or interact enough with the future urban context: In particular, there is little integration between transit infrastructure and the Highway 7 streetscape. Various ideas were discussed to make the design more pedestrian-oriented and more easily accessible to all people and abilities, including the elderly who may take longer to cross the street.

- Clear views between the station and its surroundings should be a priority. At 0.9m to 1.4 m high, the proposed concrete barrier wall that extends the length of the station will block views and sightlines - in direct conflict with the urban vision for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and with CPTED principles. It was suggested the required traffic barrier could be conceived and better designed as part of the station architecture. Of particular concern to panel members was the visual barrier created by the station, as viewed across the width of the street. The crash barriers, as designed create an undue visual barrier and significantly diminish the quality of the streetscape. Solutions that are visually transparent should be developed. Furthermore, the location and design of the coupled service stations, creates an additional visual barrier.
- Panel felt that the quality of the pedestrian experience diminishes at the west side of the station; a condition which will become further apparent when the longer LRT vehicles replace buses in the future.
- Panel highlighted the opportunity to better integrate the bikeway with the transit system.

STATION ARCHITECTURE: FORM AND OPERATIONS

- The form of the station canopy does not respond to a linear system. Ideally the form would create a full enclosure of the platform, including when the longer light rapid transit vehicles are introduced in the future.
- Embrace the limitations of the operation, and develop and deploy a grammar to deal with the structure's condition in the middle of a street.
- Underneath the canopy appears to be a disjointed collection of objects (i.e. service buildings, windscreens, furniture, entrance to subway etc.) unrelated to the form above. Greater effort should be made to make a more efficient space that reads more elegantly.

ANCILLARY SERVICE BUILDINGS

- Panel recommended that a better solution should be sought to avoid having two above-ground service buildings on a terminus platform. All Panel members agreed that the placement and design of the proposed service buildings are an important issue in terms of their major negative visual impact on the station design and on the surrounding streetscapes.

SUSTAINABILITY

- Panel members framed the sustainability design challenge in the context of investigating how to incorporate design features to address sustainability in a holistic way.

LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE DESIGN DETAILS

- One Panel member positively appreciated the simple and elegant design idea of the station and suggested that effort should go into the detailing of it, to become a beautiful and sophisticated station. In summary, create the interior as cleanly as possible to make it a dignified space.
- It was generally agreed by Panel members that at this point in the process, effort should be paid to achieve visual clarity, high design quality, a distinct urban character, and durability, as well as prioritizing pedestrian movement, with the station as part of a complete street. The design should be based on an understanding the experience of the pedestrian who is moving along and across the street, from building face to building face.
 - The size of the pedestrian waiting area seems too small and cluttered. All the architectural elements below the canopy should be harmonized to create maximum space on the platforms and to enhance the pedestrian experience.
 - Panel members felt the light poles were an inelegant solution that create more physical and visual barriers and detract from the visual quality of the platform. Hanging lights, integrated with signage, were suggested as a solution to maximize platform space and clear sightlines.
- A finer level of detail and design resolution should be provided for the landscape architecture of the station platform. For example, the viability of plant health and their effectiveness within the ramp area was raised as an issue, with the suggestion that greater investment and detailing of a hard landscape solution could be more effective to elevate the pedestrian experience.
- The multiple layers of glass could create cleaning/ maintenance issues.
- A Panel member advised that the 14” diameter tubes of the station architecture will not look in reality as light as they do on the rendering.

PUBLIC ART, WAYFINDING AND IDENTITY

- Panel articulated a need to illustrate how this station relates to the viva Next system identity as a whole, and how the users will understand this destination (Vaughan Metropolitan Centre) as they are moving along the regional system.
- Need a greater identity for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre at this station as an important destination along the line. Signage seems deficient and inadequate. The station lacks a feeling of celebration of place.

- Art is part of a sustainability strategy, as part of the enhancement of the public realm and transit, to create a space that will promote and enhance ridership. This station at the heart of a new downtown presents the perfect opportunity to recognize the role of public art in the meaningful creation of a public space.
- Public art should be incorporated into this signature environment in order to capitalize on art-integration opportunities from the outset and to capture cost efficiencies. In addition to the windscreen, additional ways for artists to engage glass are the continuous skylight or the transparent panels on the sides of the station.



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 16 – February 28, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, February 28, 2013, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

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

Sony Rai, SMV Architects

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

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

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

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

STAFF

Farhad Jalili, 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 9:15a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Paul Nodwell and Drew Sinclair declared conflict of interest with reviewing the Liberty Development Corporation application.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Adaption of the Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, January 31, 2013 be deferred to the next meeting.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Site Development

File: Application for OP and Zoning Amendment
Applicant: Liberty Development Corporation
Location: 1890 Highway 7, City of Vaughan
Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners, Schollen & Company Inc.
Review: Second Review

Presentations:

Laura Janotta, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design

Introduction:

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

Panel reviewed the first design proposal on February 23, 2012 and recommended that the applicant to improve the design concept in terms of site orientation, natural heritage conservation strategy, stormwater management strategy and adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Has the new design proposal positively responded to the Panel's previous comments?

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

The Panel commended the quality and clarity of the submission. Panel also acknowledged the effort to illustrate discussion highlights from the last Design Review Panel meeting and the attempt to clearly demonstrate updated design objectives.

Panel members recognized and commended the goal to create a true mixed use development, and the provision of a public street along the West Don River lands.

However, the demolition of the Power Plant as a heritage structure was described as regretful. The proposed design has completely removed the heritage structure and no sign of its existence remains. Panel strongly encouraged the applicant to now

find another way to properly celebrate and recognize the history of the Power Plant building and railway in the area.

Site Context

The subject site is surrounded by the railway, industrial district and protected natural heritage lands of the West Don River which creates the potential for the project to become an isolated development that is internally oriented. This site condition requires more emphasis on the integration of the development with its context: historic, natural and urban.

Integration with the surroundings can be improved by moving the development closer to the Regional Road 7 frontage and introducing more active uses along the street. Also, the quality of urban space at the proposed development's entry points has a major role in connecting the development to its context. The quality of urban space at the entry points could be enhanced by the introduction of more prominent gateway features, moving some residential density closer to these areas, and by enhancing the pedestrian experience along the frontage.

Recognition of the potential GO stop (north or south of Highway 7) requires special and deliberate attention and setting up an environment that enhances opportunities for multi-modal connections.

To elevate the proposed central spine to a higher and more visible profile and function, the street connection to the north should be through the main spine, not by way of the eastern road.

The proposed one-sided ring road should be re-arranged to respond adequately to different situations. The ground related uses and continuity of frontages along this road are critical to the quality of the pedestrian experience. The nature of the ring road varies along the tracks and the valley lands and thus, the design should respond differently to different locations. On the west between the tracks and the commercial area there is a need for better transition.

Design Orientation

The main justification for density in the area is the upcoming planned transit infrastructure. The potential for access to the rapid and long range transit is a major factor to attract people to this development. Therefore, the possibility of integration in the development, attention to the transit connections, and ease of access to the stations/stops should be one of the main priorities of the site plan.

More attention should be given to the south-west corner of the site. There may be potential for retail on this corner of the site where most pedestrian traffic will happen through the arrival of the proposed transit station.

Greater consideration should be given to the urban environment of the proposed east-west streets which connect the future transit station and the valley lands to the community. The number of east-west streets could be increased to encourage pedestrian movement and to create more vibrant urban space along them.

Locating the proposed surface parking in the centre of the development, downgrades the central area and the proposed public square's urban environment. A parking garage with ground floor retail should be considered. Retail and ground related uses should front directly onto the street, and not be encumbered by surface parking between the building and the street.

Design Integration

The addition of a major east-west open space, which connects the West Don River natural features to the development, was applauded by Panel Members. However, the open space is excessively wide, which has resulted in a fragmented main street. Also, proposing too many open spaces and jagged frontages create unusable and forgotten spaces, which reduces the synergy and concentration of retail activities along the street and around the open space. To create vibrant and active urban space in the area, the plan should establish a strong continuity of frontages that strongly relate to the street and to the central open space.

Open spaces should be framed by built form and streets. To create an urban space for the proposed urban square, the surrounding buildings should wrap around the open space more continuously and be located closer to the square's edge.

Providing a more continuous pedestrian-oriented retail experience at ground level will be imperative to the success of the main street. On the west side of the square, the inclusion of kiosks and restaurants along the main street could help to provide a continuous pedestrian oriented retail street.

The proposed surface parking amplifies the discontinuity of the urban space along the main street.

The size of the proposed urban blocks, and buildings within the blocks, should be reduced to create higher pedestrian movements and a livelier urban environment.

Natural Heritage and the Environmental Protection

Maximize the stormwater absorption within the site through consideration of water infiltration, capture and reuse techniques including permeable pavers and green roofs where applicable.

The proposed open space & Valley Road should be more integrated with the West Don River natural heritage system.

The location of the required parking is a major concern. If needed parking is planned to be located underground, the environmental ramification with regards to storm water management will be significant. Alternative parking types including parking garage structures in the center of blocks should be contemplated, specifically on the west, where the major retail store is proposed.

5. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

b. Application for Site Development

File: Application for OP and Zoning Amendment
Applicant: Marquee Condominiums
Location: 11, 15, 23 and 27 Lansdowne Avenue
Architect: FFA Architects + Planners Inc.
Review: First Review

Presentations:

Eugene Fera, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the proposed orientation and building massing protect privacy for the neighbouring community and transition to adjacent lands?
2. To what extent does the overall design strategy and site organization encourage pedestrian activity in the nearby public realm and support transit use?

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Panel criticized the quality of the provided design package and found a considerable amount of detail, critical information and design analysis lacking, which made it difficult to assess the proposed development.

Given that the proposed development represents a significant departure from its surrounding context and from the City's Official Plan, the application should provide a rationale that supports such an approach. A rationale and analysis should demonstrate an understanding of the policy context and built form and open space characters. Also, the proposed development should respond to the analysis by providing proper transitions and mitigating negative impacts. No such analysis was presented with the application.

Site Orientation and Context:

The site borders Regional Road 7 which is a planned Regional rapid transit route. The location of the site requires a clear emphasis on pedestrian access from the building to nearby transit stops.

Sun/ Shadow studies should demonstrate a high quality and comfortable urban space within the site and its adjacencies.

The proposed site arrangement and the location of the 10-storey building would permanently cast shadow on the proposed courtyard. The site should be redesigned with the consideration of a shadow study for the proposed amenity areas and adjacent community.

The site is at the edge of the neighbourhood where mixed-use is preferable. Moving the development's main entrance to the southwest corner of the site would create more active frontage at the intersection.

Lansdowne Avenue, stretching from Regional Road 7 to Burwick Avenue, is a local one-block country road which requires a greater building setback than that of Kipling Avenue.

The tower could be moved away from the Lansdowne Avenue frontage behind a row of townhouses to reduce the building impact on the public right-of-way. Also, a greater setback from Lansdowne Avenue frontage should be provided to accommodate sufficient room for lay-by parking and landscape buffering.

More consideration should be given to waste management and parking design strategies. A truck maneuvering plan should be provided to ensure the proposed loading area is accessible to trucks and service vehicles.

Building Massing and Elevations:

Reduction of the proposed density and the consideration of alternative building typologies, such as "townhouse" or "townhouse frontage with a tower component", could lead to a better fit for the site.

Fitting the proposed density is a challenge. However, with sensitive massing there is an opportunity to create a high quality jewel-like building or a simplified and pure-looking monument, which would elevate the status of the community.

The proposed building elevations and its randomly arranged components suggest no rationale for the ultimate shape of the building. Simplifying the building massing and appearance may help to establish a character for the building.

A thoughtful choice of finishing materials to make the development more compatible with the neighbourhood, and the articulation of the townhomes facades could transform the generic look of the proposed building to more community-related built form.

Landscaping:

Privacy is a major design factor that could be addressed through landscape buffering and by strategically locating balconies to control viewing directions from the proposed apartment units where overlook is a problem.

The proposed landscape buffering on the north has been interrupted by the underground parking vent and surface parking which have reduced its effectiveness adjacent to the existing neighbouring low-density residential building. The depth of

the proposed landscape buffer should be consistent to effectively protect the neighbouring community.

A better transition to the adjacent school is needed, and a wider landscape buffer and more robust screening planting should be provided.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 17 – March 28, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, March 28, 2013, 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
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

Absent

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Sony Rai, SMV Architects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Diana Birchall, Director of Policy Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Urban Design, Development Planning, Recording Personnel
Moirá Wilson, Urban Design, Development Planning, Recording Personnel
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning
Mary Caputo, Development Planning
Armine Hassakourians, Policy Planning
Rende Daniel, Recreation and Culture

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Richard Witt declared a conflict of interest with reviewing Quadrangle Architects Limited project.

Mansoor Kazerouni declared a conflict of interest with reviewing the Easton's Group Limited project.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for Thursday, January 31, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments

File: OP.12.018 and Z.12.046

Applicant: McNaughton Community - Maple GO Development

Architect: Quadrangle Architects Limited

Location: South side of McNaughton Road East, west of Troon Avenue, north of Hill Street, and east of the existing Maple GO Station

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

To what extent does the proposed site organization and built form relate and react to the neighboring urban context on different frontages, specifically to the Maple Go Station, CN Rail lands, McNaughton Road, and Troon Avenue?

How well does the proposed site plan create a high-quality pedestrian environment within the site, and provide pedestrian connectivity to the site's adjacencies?

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Panel acknowledged the applicant is facing a sizable challenge to create a harmonious co-existence between a medium density residential development and a major transit hub at this location. The potential for traffic congestion during pick up and drop off hours could negatively impact living conditions in the proposed new

community. Furthermore, the projected future growth of transit use and associated parking demands may require the future addition of a structured parking garage at the GO Station which will significantly impact the proposed development plan. Therefore, the development plan should consider more comprehensive design strategies to resolve potential conflicts and issues such as parking, bus and car traffic, and pedestrian access and movement.

Site Plan, Layout and Orientation:

It is exigent to address the site's surrounding streets and uses. The proposed design responds to the existing context rather than to the potential future development of the perimeter, and as such, is internally oriented. In terms of integration and connectivity with the surrounding areas, the proposed plan could be improved if the potential for the area's future was taken into consideration.

The presented design for the corner of McNaughton Road and Troon Avenue is a concern. The proposed building flankage condition and laneway would create an unattractive environment at this location. The design could be improved through developing a design typology for the public edges and corners.

An improvement could be made by moving the density closer to the Troon Avenue frontage and introducing mixed-use mid-rise buildings along the street. This site layout could create a better relation to the neighbouring commercial site and expand the site plan concept into a two-spine layout. This site orientation would also resolve the flankage condition and could create a stronger north-south pedestrian connection to Major Mackenzie Drive.

As another alternative design concept, there is an opportunity to increase the presence of the development if considered along an east-west site orientation. By moving the density closer to Hill Street, this alternative concept would enhance the quality of the development by capitalizing on the cemetery's natural features.

The streets behind both rows of proposed mid-rise buildings seem to be compromised by the inclusion of entrances to underground parking garages, refuse enclosures, and townhouse flankages. These streets play an important role in connecting the low-rise product to the mid-rise buildings. Through better positioning of these streets as a part of an enhanced transition, they would significantly contribute to the creation of a more cohesive urban development.

The attempt to propose a pedestrian-oriented neighbourhood is commendable. Nevertheless, the hierarchy of the network could be further enhanced through better connections of the development's components to internal sidewalks and to the surrounding context.

Panel expressed concern that the size of the proposed traffic cul-de-sac may not be sufficient to absorb the expected volume of bus and vehicle traffic in the future. The applicant also should investigate if the high volume of bus traffic at peak hours will negatively impact the pedestrian-retail experience along the main street and the buildings that front the main street.

The proposed access to the underground parking, loading and garbage storage areas will negatively impact the surrounding public spaces. More attention should be given to avoid creating unpleasant areas.

Panel was not certain if locating a median in the middle of a modest main street for a small community could be successful. It was suggested that pedestrian safety, movement and comfort would be improved if the proposed median was removed and sidewalks widths increased instead.

Building Type, Use and Facade

The shadowing and other microclimatic impacts of the proposed continuous, linear mid-rise buildings on the south side of Eaglerock Way will considerably hinder future retail and pedestrian activities. Also, the extended length of each building along the main street creates the potential for a monotony of urban form and experience along the street. This building type makes it challenging to introduce enough variety to the built form to create a vibrant environment along the sidewalk. Also, the length of the building may limit the ability to deal with the grading issue at the west end of the block, where the land elevation is lower and could expose the underground parking garage walls to the surrounding public realm.

A greater mix of heights could provide better transitioning opportunities between the proposed 12- and 2-storey building types. This may also bring an opportunity to resolve shadowing impacts on Eaglerock Way.

Panel expressed a concern with respect to the substantial amount of retail proposed along Eaglerock Way and its viability if the main street is active only during transit pick up and drop off hours. The introduction of office use would increase the amount of pedestrian traffic during the day to provide more support for the proposed retail.

One of the proposed townhouse types has been developed with a driveway access through the front. This building type has imposed constraints on the design at a broader scale, such as the articulation of the building facades and the pedestrian condition on adjacent sidewalks. Panel encouraged the applicant to revisit the actual product and refine the design. A rear-lane design concept (or the use of underground parking) for the proposed townhouses could enhance the building facades by moving the parking garage door to the rear side. Also, this building type creates a safer pedestrian environment by reducing pedestrian and vehicular traffic conflict points along sidewalks.

Converting the proposed free-hold townhouses to condominium blocks may help to achieve the rear-lane or underground-parking townhouse typology.

Outdoor Space and Public Art

Public art should not be located at the end of a cul-de-sac, but rather has the potential to participate in the public space network. Public art could enhance the east-west pedestrian-open space axis, which could in turn include an open breezeway concept through the buildings.

The proposed internal parks do not have active edges, but rather face either the rear side of the mid-rise buildings or townhouse flankages. Buildings should address the parks. Furthermore, these parks seem too small to appropriately meet the needs of the future community and to create an animated public space. The quality and size of the proposed parks should be increased to appropriately serve this emerging community.

b. Vaughan Pre-Application Consultation

File No: PAC.13.034
Applicant: Eastons Group 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: Third Review

Introduction:

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

Does the design proposal support the urban design vision and policies articulated by the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan?

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Overall, a lack of information limited the ability of Panel Members to evaluate the proposal. As a result, few comments were provided. No architectural design for the podium or tower was presented; instead only a notional idea of massing which is not sufficient. The limits of the proposed underground parking need to be indicated on the site plan. Landscape sections are also required to understand the site's relationship to Highway 7.

- The new tower needs to be more cleverly integrated with the existing hotel and considered within the context of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan, and/or proposed as "Phase 1" within a long term plan for the re-development of the entire site.
- Panel underlined the importance of planning within a long term vision for the site. The proposed additional building has the potential to sterilize the long term redevelopment of the site if it is not considered within this bigger, long term context. For example, the north end of the site will be constrained by underground parking, adding to the constraints at the south and east sides of the site. The proposed driveway off Highway 7 defeats the bigger picture of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan's street network - in

particular, the north-south local street on the east edge of the site.

- Property owners will need to cooperate with each other to establish the fine grain street network in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.
- Panel expressed concern about the short separation distance between the proposed tower and the existing hotel.

b. Application for Zoning By-Law Amendment

File: Z.12.042
Applicant: Empire Pace (Maple) Ltd.
Location: 9869 and 9891 Keele Street
Architect: Kohn Partnership Architects Inc.
Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the proposed development fit within the existing urban context of the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District, specifically along Keele Street?
2. To what extent does the overall design strategy and site organization facilitate pedestrian permeability and provide a high quality pedestrian environment though the site, as well as along Keele Street?
3. How well do the proposed residential units provide quality living space for the future residents?

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Panel advised the applicant to highly regard the significance of being a part of a heritage district. A broader understanding of being a part of the district requires every structure to be a reflection of its own time. The manifestation of our time is about being respectful of the district's character by carefully contemplating the scale, land use, proportion, rhythm, and quality of finishing materials and details. It is the exploration of how to develop a building character that enhances and forms a relevant dialogue with the artefacts inherited from the past.

Heritage Preservation:

There is a need for a more thoughtful transition and relationship with the existing heritage building. The transition cannot be complete only by setting back from of the

building, but by respecting it and considering it as major part and catalytic object to shape the development.

Studying and responding to the heritage features include two major interrelated design factors, the built form and outdoor areas. The proposed courtyard should be considered and incorporated as part of the conservation strategy by understanding the conservation district in terms of its open space character.

While acknowledging that the proposed design treats the heritage building better than the development to the north, Panel described the overall approach to preservation of the heritage house as forced and insensitive. The new development seems to turn its back to the heritage house by surrounding it with blank walls, parking and loading areas. A meaningful and respectful design approach should be developed to treat the existing heritage house as an artifact and providing it with an appropriate context.

As an important part of the overall heritage landscape, ensure that the existing mature trees and hedgerows alongside of the perimeters of the site are preserved.

Site and Landscape Plans:

The proposed courtyard is entirely dedicated to vehicular traffic and parking, which lowers the appeal and quality of the proposed development.

Also, the proposal does not provide any outdoor living space for residents or any safe outdoor play space for their children. The courtyard should be designed as a high-quality outdoor amenity space for residents.

The view to the courtyard from the street should be considered and treated as a part of the public realm. The proposed one-car garage units would greatly impact the pedestrian condition within the proposed courtyard and create an unpleasant view from the street. Considering one-car garages most likely would result in the space being used as storage areas, it would be practical to move all parking to the proposed underground garage.

More dignified and prominent access to the proposed courtyard should be given to pedestrians. As presented, pedestrian access into the site are reduced to 1.50 meters of pavement located against the blank walls, and cross loading areas and parking spaces.

The proposed loading area is located close the existing heritage house and on a prominent visual and physical access point into the site. Also, the loading area does not seem to be conveniently accessible to trucks. Effort should be made to find a better location for the loading area, away from entry point to the courtyard and heritage house.

Fronting onto the cemetery should be one the defining elements of the site orientation and building character for the proposed development as it would be highly visible from Keele Street.

Explore ground related residential units fronting the cemetery to maximize exposure to this open space frontage.

Access to the underground parking should be less visually prominent. The surface could be paved with the same material as the sidewalks to become a shared space.

Consideration of how bicycles access underground long term parking spaces should also inform the design.

Townhouses should be more ground related with more landscaping incorporated with the building frontage. This can be achieved by moving townhouse parking underground and by reducing the units' front stairs.

Building Massing and Elevations:

The overall building design is generally a respectful contemporary response to the heritage context.

The design of the townhouse building is successful in terms of, massing and proportion; however, the proposed three different finishing materials for the three-storey townhouses seem to be excessive and should be simplified.

The end townhouse units should be designed as corner unit to face the existing heritage building, and likewise for the larger building.

As presented, the storefront frontages are neglected and undermined by proposing a consistent precast concrete across the elevation. It is important to include some variation and rhythm across the retail frontage. A more celebrative and joyful street frontage could be achieved along the street by including commercial elements such as canopies, trellises, banners and signage.

The proposed retail and their windows could be more pronounced, with their design including more historic shop features.

The proposed rooftop mechanical penthouse is disproportionate to the building scale and is highly visible. Efforts should be made to reduce the penthouse mass by moving some of mechanical equipments to the underground.

Sustainability:

Panel commended the proposed approach to sustainability which includes high quality building envelopes and efficient environmental control systems.

The flat roof, or part of it, could be used as an amenity space. A low-load green roof could also be utilized to cover at least a portion of the large flat roof area.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 18 – April 25, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, April 25, 2013, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-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.
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Grant Uyeyama, Director of Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Margaret Holyday, Development Planning
Stephen Lue, Development Planning

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

Meeting Minutes for February 28, 2013 and March 28, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments

File: OP.12.014 and Z 12.034

Applicant: Calloway REIT (Sevenbridge) Inc.

Architect: Diamond and Schmitt Architects

Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associates Inc.

Location: Southwest corner of Millway Avenue and Apple Mill Road,
Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Review: Second Review

Introduction:

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

Has the proposal responded to the “key aspects of the plan needing improvement” identified in the September 27, 2012 Design Review?

Presentations:

Stephen Lue, Development Planning; Moira Wilson, Urban Design

Overview:

Panel commended the architectural and landscape architectural design teams on the high quality presentation and attention to details. The project goal to achieve LEED Gold was also appreciated. It was noted that a genuine relationship is starting to develop between the park and the buildings, and that the configuration of the buildings on the site is moving in a positive direction.

In this light, Panel members highlighted the following opportunities for future-proofing and to improve the at-grade experience:

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

1. Panel members appreciated the “iridescent mosaic” treatment of the tower façade, and encouraged the design team to articulate the tower with lighting in a bold way so that it becomes an architectural beacon at the centre of the new downtown.
2. The proposed configuration of the park, buildings, transit square and subway creates an important east-west axial line through the centre of the site. The pedestrian passageway between the two buildings should be treated and animated like a pedestrian street and as a grand gesture, rather than as a minor passage, to capitalize on this axis.
 - Wind flow, dimensions, treatment of vertical and horizontal surfaces, and active faces will be very important to the quality and experience of the pedestrian connection.
 - The blank walls on the south side of the pedestrian connection should be addressed to provide animation on both sides of the “street”.
 - A short portion of the pedestrian passage could be enclosed with glass to create an indoor connection between the buildings at grade. If treated as a very tall, transparent element, it would punctuate the beautiful iridescent quality of the office building's façade.

RETAIL BUILDING

3. Panel underlined the importance of creating an active building frontage on Apple Mill Road, or at least to design the building in a flexible way that does not preclude retail fronting at least a portion of Apple Mill in the future. To accommodate the future scenario of double fronted retail on both Apple Mill Road and Transit Square, Panel recommended that the interior space is configured to allow for a centrally located service corridor that would service retail units on both sides.
4. A key missed opportunity identified by Panel members is to wrap retail units around the west side of the retail building to front the park. These additional retail units could be created by shifting the loading area one bay eastwards. It was noted that even if the floor plate of this retail space is comparatively shallow and wide, the opportunity to create café and retail space fronting a park should be capitalized upon. JOEY at Yorkdale Mall is an example of a narrow, two storey footprint that animates the edge.

5. The second floor of the retail podium has the opportunity to wrap around in front of the office tower, creating a space with amazing potential uses that overlook the park. This move would create a definitive architectural terminus that expands the width of the park.
6. Panel appreciated the high quality design of the office tower and suggested the treatment of the two storey retail building (with precast trim) seems more conventional in comparison. Panel encouraged the design team to explore the volume of the second floor; the way that the skin relates to the structure.
7. Panel was encouraged by the idea of a community facility in the second floor of the retail building and strongly encouraged to City to pursue this important opportunity. This use would allow the integrity of the design intent to remain - the alternate scenario of a retail tenant on the second floor may result in portions of the façade being blocked out to accommodate retail displays.
8. Panel recommended that the low retail building could be constructed with a footing to allow for a taller building at this key central downtown location in the future.
9. The design team was encouraged to further consider the long term implications of the building envelope from an energy perspective.
10. The roof of the low retail building is an opportunity to create a revenue-generating destination (restaurant/ bar) that creates a vantage point for the park and square.

PARKING

11. In the context that the proposed underground parking provided meets municipal parking requirements for the development, Panel cautioned that the proposed temporary surface parking should not be a tenant requirement or agreement that will preclude the relocation of this surface parking in the future.

PARK

12. Panel members appreciated the well-considered and flexible design of the park, and noted the tremendous opportunities the design creates.
13. Panel projected that the west (park-side) of the buildings will become the most important and well used public frontage, in both the interim and full build out. The following comments were provided concerning how the development meets the park at the western edge:

- It was noted that the park could provide more in the way of a sequence of experiences (or opportunities for event, program or public art) as you travel through to the park from the plaza at the west edge.
 - The hardscape plaza should extend further into the park to create a less shallow edge.
 - The pedestrian desire lines that trace routes from one point to another across the park are neglected at the western edge of the building. The dimension of the hardscape area at its western edge should be increased so there's a stronger connection between the pedestrian infrastructure to the north and south of the site and the plaza.
14. The built form edge of the park should contain a restaurant, retail or something that will animate this important edge. It was noted that the solid wall of the loading area will not animate the park.
 15. To phase the park, Panel suggested that the size of the temporary surface parking area is scaled back to allow for partial construction of the park plan and hardscape area to create a social space along the western edge of the buildings. This would be a move to cultivate the long term intent for this space.
 16. It was recommended that the landscape design for the interim parking lot is "lifted" to indicate the future intent / vision for this place. For example, a strong planting of trees to emphasize the central pedestrian axis and/or upgrading surface treatments in strategic locations.

TRANSIT SQUARE

17. The scale of the transit square feels right. Transit square should be designed as an everyday place, while the larger softscape park provides more room and a suitable surface for larger events and festivals.
18. The surrounding ground floor uses will be critical to the animation of the square.
19. In future phasing, the at-grade retail along the north edge of the square should be extended eastwards to enclose and create a continuous and activated edge for the square, and to improve summer and winter microclimates.
20. Temporary retail and other social uses within transit square site would help activate the square in its early development as a destination. Panel expressed confidence that the full park design will create a local and regional draw when it is built – the

challenge in the interim is how to get people to come shop here during the week and on weekends.

21. Panel recommended further consideration be given to phasing, and how phased development will impact the square.
22. Panel expressed a hope that the integrity of the landscape design, its thoughtful details, and intent can be maintained through the TTC's technical review process.
23. Public or private ownership of the square was flagged as an important issue to the success of the square.
24. Finally, Panel expressed a strong caution about the residential use proposed for the future tower fronting the north side of the square. While it was agreed that mixing uses is encouraged in the mobility hub, members highlighted recent experiences with condominium projects directly fronting a private or public square, and the resulting conflicts between condominium boards and the functions of a square – complaints about outdoor restaurant tables, noise etc.

b. 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: Second Review

Presentations:

Margaret Holyday, Development Planning; Farhad Jalili, Urban Design

Introduction:

The Design Review Panel reviewed the first design proposal on April 26, 2012, and recommended the applicant to improve the design concept in terms of site orientation, policy and site contexts, and building massing. Has the new design proposal positively responded to the Panel's previous comments?

Panel's Comments:

Panel acknowledged the applicant's efforts to capture the previously made comments and enhance the proposed development in terms of site orientation, massing, transitioning and building elevations. Panel consented that the revised design concept is a positive start in the right direction.

Nevertheless, the provided package lacked a considerable amount of detail and critical information including ground floor plans, cross sections, landscape plans, shadow impact study and elevations. Insufficient information made it difficult for the Panel to comprehensively assess the proposed development.

Panel also encouraged the applicant to consider sustainable development measures, specifically solar gain and heat transfer performance for the proposed building envelopes.

Site Plan Layout and Landscaping

Considering the community opposition to reinstate the north-south street, which is regrettable, it is crucial to facilitate pedestrian connectivity and access through the subject site where possible.

Panel acknowledged the design challenge to propose a high-quality residential development for the site which, to a large extent, is surrounded by suburban and car-oriented commercial sites. The site context requires an adequate amount of buffering in form of landscaping which is strategically located, designed and planted.

The pedestrian connection to the commercial plaza to the east is an important factor to encourage future residents to walk for their daily shopping needs. More effort should be made to provide a direct pedestrian link to the plaza.

The success of the provided amenity areas will depend on their programming and relationship to the residential and commercial units.

Facing the proposed townhouses to the rear side of the neighbouring retail building on the east and the proposed six-storey building on the south is a concern.

The reduction of the proposed six-storey building footprint and integration of the two small amenity areas and would effectively enhance the special relationship within the site.

Due to close proximity to the existing gas station, designing a proper frontage for the south-east corner of the proposed building podium is challenging. An alternative design scenario could enhance the site plan by moving the front driveway to the east and by creating a vehicular court between the building and the gas station. This concept allows for an overall improved north-south pedestrian environment by segregating it from the vehicular and service traffic. Also, by aligning the proposed north and south vehicular accesses, this design option may facilitate a more efficient vehicular circulation on the proposed underground parking garage.

To improve the pedestrian environment and access, the number and size of drop-off and loading areas should be minimized.

Building Massing and Elevations

The scale of the provided podium is understated. Providing a more prominent commercial podium would create a more effective commercial presence on the street.

Panel encouraged the applicant to explore a more innovative approach in selecting finishing materials and designing building elements for the proposed towers. A considered use of materials and composition of building elements would not only enhance the character of the buildings, but also increase the building energy efficiency and their environmental control performance.

The concept of the proposed vertical expression on the front façade is a positive and should be taken advantage of to further enhance the building elevations.

There is an imbalanced proportion between the brick and the glass on the proposed building exterior finish. Introduce more articulation to the building facades by including brick panels in addition to the proposed masonry pillars.

The proposed back to back townhouse design is an appropriate type for the site; however, their contemporary design should be modified to better tone in with the neighboring community's urban character.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 19 – May 30, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, May 30, 2013, 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
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

Absent

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Diana Birchall, Director of Policy Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Moirra Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Daniel Woolfson, Development Planning
Carol Birch, Development Planning

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for April 25, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments

File: Z.08. 032 and DA.13.014

Applicant: Cityzen Development Group / Blue Water Ranch Investments

Architect: Rafael + Bigauskas Architects

Location: East side of New Westminster Drive, north of Centre Street

Review: Second Review

Introduction:

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

1. In the first submission on January 26, 2012, Design Review Panel emphasized the important potential contribution of this development to create vibrant, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes in the Thornhill Town Centre, and commented on the relationship between built form, landscape, and the public realm. Has the Applicant addressed Panel comments in this submission with respect to Buildings "A" and "B"?
2. Please provide comments on the architectural elevations and how they could be improved.

Presentation:

Moira Wilson, Urban Design, Development Planning

Overview:

Panel commended the architectural team on an improved submission of a more urbane building and an improved and more contemporary landscape. Panel also recognized the presentation's clear and direct responses to previous Design Review Panel comments.

For a more fulsome design review, the submission should include more information, including a plan and location of the underground parking to understand the placement and orientation of the units.

Notwithstanding recognition of the design challenges created by the geometry of the site, Panel provided the following comments to further improve the site plan and architecture:

Building Massing

- The cumulative visual impact of the proposed massing (with long tower forms and sheer walls) will create the effect of a much larger massing.
- The long dimensions of the towers eliminate the urban design benefits of their relatively small floor plates.
- Panel advised that an 18m separation distance between towers is not enough because the cumulative visual effect of the proposed massing. If the buildings must be in an elongated form, greater separation and/or the rotation of a tower could help mitigate this effect. In this context, Building 'A' could be moved and rotated slightly to address New Westminster Drive and the new east-west street. Scaling down buildings 'A' and 'B' will allow for an equal separation distance between towers, better massing and less shadowing.
- The sheer walls will likely have a negative impact on the experience of the pedestrian at grade. Increasing the step backs to 4.0 meters minimum and increasing to 3 stories (versus 2 stories) will mitigate wind impacts. A podium would also mitigate wind, shadow, and visual impacts.
- There is not an adequate visual transition to adjacent low density residential across the street.
- Overall, further exploration of the massing is needed to create a development that does not create a visual barrier within the skyline, to provide for a better transition to the low density residential, and to create a more positive experience at grade.

Architectural Elevations

- Consider in detail the type and scale of glazing, use of transparencies, and opacity. Recommendation to avoid the use of dark glazing which will increase the perception of a bulky, monolithic form.

Ground Level Elevations

- Further design work is needed for the ground floor level; this exercise will then start to inform and benefit the orientation, architectural elevations, and physically and visually break down some of the massing. Eye level interest and human scale at the street level should be pursued.

Ground Level Open Spaces

- Revisit the functions of the ground level open spaces in the landscape plan, to increase interior/exterior permeability and ground level animation.

New Westminster Drive Frontage

- Although Panel Members agreed the new east-west street is an important pedestrian frontage, it was also asserted that New Westminster should also be considered an urban street.
- Further design exploration is needed to more clearly define the New Westminster frontage. The proposal creates an amorphous space, or a “no-man’s land” that fails both as a private and as a public space.
- Use architectural landscape elements to create an urban edge and define the space.

Option A: If the built form needs to come forward to the street, need to explore how to accommodate built form into the complex geometry. The building could be angled and positioned to address New Westminster; lower units could be added to address issues of transition and massing.

Option B: If an open space is proposed, how can it be designed as a successful place that feels like part of the condominium and the city, a landscape that will be used by people, and with a more comfortable microclimate? Landscaping could be used to address ground floor privacy and microclimate issues. A pedestrian walkway (sidewalk) could be brought into the site. The current proposal of an open space / buffer condition with a monolithic building creates problems at grade and a non-urban condition.

- In summary, it was felt that the site plan is missing the opportunity to address New Westminster and the site plan articulates an “overly complicated” relationship between built form and landscape.

- Through refinement of the site plan to address New Westminster, the internal courtyard space could be improved.

Town House Units

- At the south west corner of the site, the side walls of town houses are facing New Westminster. Corner units should address both streets. Could also bring some units out closer to New Westminster.
- The commercial quality of units at grade could express live-work units; they do not have to speak a domestic language. Other panel members suggested the units should express their residential use with a finer grain articulation of the elevations.

Visitor Parking

- The proposed surface parking area was viewed as a missed opportunity because it takes up a key location for an amenity space. An amenity space in this location could be a good size, and designed to increase infiltration of storm water on site.

South West Corner Plaza

- The three trees proposed at the north edge of the plaza would cut this space off from the rest of the development.

New East-West Street

- The two driveway entrances and their large scale turning radii will interrupt the pedestrian experience along the street. These driveways should be addressed to create the pedestrian-friendly realm that the design is striving to achieve.

Servicing and Loading

- The internalization of servicing and loading is a positive improvement to the site plan.

Shadow Studies

- The shadow studies should be used as part of the design process to improve the shadow conditions through adjustments to architectural massing and site plan layout.

b. Vaughan Zoning By-Law Amendment Application

File No: Z.13.012
Applicant: Camelot on 7 Inc.
Location: 4902 & 4908 Regional Road 7, City of Vaughan
Architect: E.I. Richmond Architects Ltd.
Review: First Review

Presentations:

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

Panel's Comments:

- Panel advised the Applicant to take the quality of the submission more seriously. The discrepancy among the provided drawings and illustrations suggest hastiness in preparing the presentation. The Applicant is advised to provide a more complete and higher quality presentation for the next submission. Also, the presence of all professionals who participated in developing the proposed design concept at the meeting is recommended in order to respond more accurately to Panel's questions.
- Panel strongly encouraged the Applicant to assess the heritage value of the existing buildings and landscape and revisit the approach in choosing the type of the development and design.

Site Context

- The surrounding context is predominantly low-rise. The application's proposed density and building height (10 stories) should be justified through a comprehensive study of the area and the existing policies, and by an impartial demonstration of alternative design options to establish the merits

of the selected development option within its context.

- The Applicant needs to be explicit about the design rationale, which is missing in the provided presentation. Pushing the envelope to increase the development yield requires a strong justification.
- Panel recommended that the design team react to the site context with an approach that considers a proper setback and transition to the surrounding community, creates a better interface with the cemetery as a public frontage, and corresponds to the future planned Regional Road streetscape as a pedestrian and transit oriented environment.
- The proposed development is unprecedented in the area and would cause a concern among the existing established community. The impacts of the new development on the adjacent community should be considered and addressed.
- The proposed development does not seem to meet the 45° angular plane design criteria if drawn from the property line of neighbouring low-density residential unit on the north-east side of the site.

Public Frontage

- Considering the planned vision of Regional Road 7 as a transit and pedestrian-oriented corridor, the appropriateness of the proposed landscaping approach on the site frontage is questionable. The proposed deep and vegetated front setback would considerably reduce the commercial visibility and pedestrian movement in the area. It is important to respond better to the anticipated pedestrianized condition of the area by reducing the front setback and proposing a more urbanized landscape design along the street frontage.
- The proposed arcade along the front façade of Regional Road 7 further sets back the development's commercial frontage from the public realm.
- Considering the prominent public view to the building through the cemetery and Humber River valley lands, the west side of the site should be treated as an important public frontage to address.
- As a publically accessible open space, the existing cemetery should be capitalized upon to increase the quality of the proposed development. Panel recommended that the proposed driveway, parking garage door and loading area should be moved away from the cemetery frontage.

Site Layout

- Panel commended the efforts to protect the trees on the north-west corner of the site. However, efforts should be made to integrate the protected landscape with the site's pedestrian circulation system and to utilize it as a

part of the site's amenity space. A Panel Member suggested that if the existing trees on the north-west corner preclude a better site organization with the driveway along the east side of the site, perhaps the trees should be removed.

- The proposed car-traffic driven site layout should be converted to a more pedestrian- oriented plan by internalizing the driveway, access to the parking and loading area.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 20 – June 27, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, June 27, 2013, 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.
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Vice-Chair)

Absent

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for May 30, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments

File: DA.13.021 (Related Files #s OP.12.010 and Z.12.025)
Applicant: 1834371 Ontario Inc. (Liberty Development Corporation)
Architect: Kirkor Architects

Landscape Architect: Land Art Design Landscape Architects Inc.

Location: The south west corner of Highway 7 and Maplecrete Road

Review: Second Review

Introduction:

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

1. Does the development achieve the vision, objectives and policies in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan?
2. Has the design proposal adequately addressed comments provided in the March 28, 2012 Design Review Panel?

Presentation:

Stephen Lue and Moira Wilson, Development Planning, City of Vaughan

Overview:

- Panel thanked the Applicant for a high quality submission, a clear presentation, and for putting forward a believable long term vision of a mixed use development within high intensity streetscapes in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.
- Bringing a critical mass of mixed use fits perfectly with the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan.
- Panel struggled to understand how Phases 2 and 3 relate to the context. How built forms relate to their context cannot be left for the future.

Comments:

- The placement of towers, massing strategy, and open space systems is logical and a significant improvement from the previous submission. The architectural expression has also improved with respect to the integration of balconies, and increased podium height fronting Highway 7.
- Although the articulation of the massing and materiality has improved, it was suggested that:
 - The frames could relate more together between the office building and the residential building. The frame stops: perhaps it could continue, and also be used to signal entries.
 - There is room to improve and simplify the volumes of the buildings. It seems like there are too many moves and too much happening for a small building. For example, why does the office building need a stepback? The retail in the podium could be substantially improved from this exercise.
 - The same comment as above applies to the residential building. Difficult to unravel the discipline for why the stepping down occurs.
 - The materiality is still undisciplined in comparison with the interesting massing ideas. Panel members identified problems with materiality including a missed opportunity to express volumes.
 - The kit of parts is a great idea but it has been taken too far with too many parts in the kit. For example, does there need to be two kinds of frame? If the residential frame has two stories, it could traverse across to the office building. More attention is required for the treatment of the east face of the building, where the notion of the frames is diluted.
 - Colour has been introduced, but not enough of it to make any significant difference to the expression. Recommended that colour is used meaningfully or not at all.
- Panel noted that the separation distance between the office building and residential podium is small – if these are secondary rooms in the residential building, as clarified by the architect, does the balcony therefore need to wrap around? The wrap-around balcony suggests a more important space than a secondary room. If the balcony did not wrap around, it would increase the separation distance.
- Podium: The weight of the precast in proportion with the retail is not quite right – it looks a bit ominous in some views of the building. The giant tower over a single storey glazing at ground level is out of proportion.
- There is the opportunity to do something more exciting with the retail podium. It doesn't have to be a continuation of the extrusion of the tower above.
- The life of this place will be about the ground floor, and therefore Panel encouraged the Applicant to raise the height of the ground floor.

Additionally, from a servicing perspective, the proposed height of the ground floor may be an issue.

- Panel felt that the buildings at-grade relationships could be better coordinated with the significant improvements to the landscape plan.
- Ground Floor Plan: Some aspects of the plan are not convincing, such as the number of elevators proposed and the single ramp to underground parking for Phase 1 office and residential. As this design moves forward and these details are fleshed out, it may impact the design.
- The “condominiumization” of the office building plays against this vision as a high intensity urban streetscape because it creates small retail units. Need some larger retail units to bring in high quality retail, and to ensure that Highway 7 is not only lined with small unit retail such as convenience stores and drycleaners. The same recommendation is also provided for the office building: in the long term, the Applicant may want bigger users, such as financial company, that the smaller commercial office space units would preclude.
- The width of the office vestibule is too narrow, and is not connected to the courtyard (square) space.
- Recommended consolidating retail on Highway 7 and creating more of a lobby presence in the courtyard.
- Views between the buildings: A significant improvement has been made to the site plan by opening up visual connections through the site and connecting to the surrounding street network. Connecting Highway 7 with the square is a positive contribution to the site plan.
- Panel recommended further articulation of the Phase 3 terminus of this pedestrian connection through refinement of the podium or architectural expression. The tower in itself is not enough to create a terminus from a pedestrian point of view.
- Phase 3 podium interface with Highway 7 needs a lot of consideration. Recommend consideration of a zero lot line condition, in collaboration with adjacent land owner, to close the gaps in the Highway 7 street wall, creating a continuous building frontage that works with adjacent development.
- Resolving the N-S local street and access ramp for Phase 3 building should be considered at this stage, as the N-S local street is a public frontage and therefore the ramp should be moved away from it.
- Resolution of the corner between the N-S local Street and the E-W local Street needs to be explicit to ensure continuity of the N-S street to the south of the site. The Site Plan should extend the N-S Street south to show the intention to continue the street. This will also be part of the exercise that determines access location to underground parking for Phase 3.

- The landscape plan has significantly improved, with the creation of an important, smaller scale [private] square that will complement the public park and open space system.
- In the courtyard, the vertical frames of the office wrap around but then dissipates. The renderings show a tree-covered façade – further work could be done to refine how the base terminates.
- Ground Level: Further consideration should be given to the placement of access ramps for all phases, including 2 and 3. The positioning of these ramps will influence pedestrian access into the lobbies.
- The public will use the public N-S and E-W local streets as connections through the site – across properties to the west and south. Therefore, the broader vision for these streets in the VMC should be understood within the context of this plan.
- Recommended further articulation on how stormwater will be integrated into the open space system, as well as a description of other sustainability strategies.
- The future Black Creek Park has the rich potential to be a significant part of everyday life; however, it is not clear how this development proposal integrates with it as a natural corridor nor as a public open space.
- The level of detail for Phase 1 has not been put into Phase 2 and 3, and needs to be detailed for the whole plan.

b. Vaughan Zoning By-Law Amendment Application

File No: Z.06.079

Applicant: Market Lane Holdings Inc.

Location: 112, 116 Woodbridge Avenue, City of Vaughan

Architect: Nino Rico Architect

Review: First Review

Presentations:

Eugene Fera, Development Planning; Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Recreation and Culture; 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. How well does the proposed development fit into its urban context?

2. To what extent the proposed contemporary architecture respect the adjacent heritage building and Woodbridge Avenue urban environment?
3. How well does the built form and massing of the proposed development fit into the existing context of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District, especially along Woodbridge Avenue and with respect to adjacent heritage resources?

Panel's Comments:

Panel criticized the quality of the provided design package and found a considerable amount of detail, crucial information and design analysis was lacking. The absence of information including sun shadow study, landscaping plan and severance plan, made it difficult for the Panel to comprehensively assess the proposed development. Panel also required detailed analysis of the relation between the proposed design and Woodbridge Avenue's streetscape, adjacent open spaces and urban environment to be able to review the proposed design within a larger urban context.

Master Plan

In complex site conditions within urban core areas, the work and responsibility of an architect would expand beyond considering the existing condition of the site. Panel strongly encouraged the design team to analyze the proposed development in relation to the rest of the site in the existing and future conditions.

Specifically, proposing a large scale development within the subject lands, which includes a heritage building and a future urban square, requires a deeper understanding of the existing condition and potentials for the future development. Adding a large building to the south-east corner of the site will hinder future possibilities for future redevelopment of the larger site and square.

To respond appropriately to the subject site's conditions, an overall master plan for the whole site is required. The master plan would help to understand the development potential for the site and to discover the future residential developments and retail opportunities. The envisioned concept should demonstrate the proposed building's functionality within the existing and future context and protect for future access points and building footprints.

The master plan should envision an ultimate concept for the future of the site. To implement the envisioned concept a phasing plan is needed. By laying a phasing plan, the placement of the proposed development can be justified as the first phase.

The proposed development is constrained due to its proximity to the existing retail buildings. The proposed site plan should not hinder the functionality of the existing retail and the future development which would replace the buildings.

The vehicular access from the proposed building to the surrounding streets is not clear. The master plan should also include a traffic circulation to clearly show access to parking garage and loading areas.

Site Layout

The proposal seems to be extremely large for the dedicated land for development and disregards all the site plan requirements including minimum setbacks and encroachment to the neighbouring properties. This is especially true in the absence of a Site Plan, and assuming the severance of this site for the creation of a condominium.

The design should consider issues, such as site circulation and access, related to future condominium corporation ownership after the land is severed.

The windows on the south east corner of the proposed building are two metres away from the property line. This may further reduce the quality of life in these units in future if the neighbouring site is developed.

The design should find a way to contribute to the Woodbridge Avenue's urban environment by including meaningful amenity areas and more active building frontage.

Staff has put considerable effort in interpreting the heritage requirements which will result in a more sympathetic building expression; however, the proposed massing and the floor plan approach seems inherently unsuitable for the site.

The proposed courtyard between the heritage and proposed buildings should be facilitated to celebrate the entry to the residential units. The urban environment of the proposed courtyard would be enhanced if it incorporated retail on both sides.

Although currently Woodbridge Avenue may not be considered as a successful retail street, the opportunity for future transformation of this heritage area into a vibrant retail and social destination should be considered. The proposed development's at-grade frontage should be designed to respond to the current condition and yet be flexible enough to be converted to retail in future.

The proposed plan should include a detailed truck maneuvering plan to ensure access to the refuse area is provided.

To gain access to the proposed underground parking, the site plan encroaches to the adjacent publicly owned lands. The applicant should ensure the needed access easement can be acquired before forwarding the design concept any further.

Building Elevations and Massing

The oversized scale of the proposed tower with numerous and disproportionate balconies will have an overwhelming impact on the site context. The size of the tower should be reduced, its geometry simplified, and the balconies should be integrated into the tower's geometry.

The relationship between the existing heritage building and the proposed development can be improved by following the proportion of the heritage building's exterior components.

The east elevation is highly visible from the Woodbridge Avenue's right-of-way and should be given the importance of a front façade.

More sympathetic design approach to the existing heritage building should be provided. This could only be achieved by analyzing the heritage structure's physical attributes, such as massing, materials, fenestration rhythm, character, alignments, and employing the same qualities to the proposed building.

The quality of the proposed brick imitating FIFS panels is concerning. The applicant should realize the finishing material plays an important role in the quality of the final product. The proposed panel system will cause highly visible and undesirable joints which negatively impact the quality of the building elevations and surrounding streetscape.

The balconies on the tower have taken over the massing of the tower. The balconies projections should be more consistent and their sized restrained.

The proposed glass baluster, shown on the top of the lower portion of the building, does not match to the building podium material and should be design to be more consistent with the adjacent heritage building, or pulled back to be hidden from the public view.

The quality of the provided renderings should be improved to present realistic views of the proposed building, featuring all finishing materials, textures, and colours.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 21 – September 26, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, September 26, 2013, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Absent

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

Grant Uyeyama, Director of Development Planning

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Sandra Cappuccitti, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

The meeting was called to order at 9:20 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members.

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Richard Witt declared a conflict of interest with reviewing Quadrangle Architects Limited project, the Jaffari Village at 9000 Bathurst Street.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for June 27, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. City Capital Project

Applicant: Vaughan Civic Centre Resource Library
Vaughan Public Libraries, City Building and Facilities Department

Architect: ZAS | Architects + Interiors - Toronto

Landscape Architect: Scott Torrance Landscape Architects Inc.

Location: Vaughan Civic Centre Campus, Major Mackenzie Drive

Review: First Review

Overview:

Panel complimented the applicant on the quality of the presentation and illustrations describing project's design ideas and aspirations. However, the panel requested more detailed cross sections to help visualize the quality of the building's interior and its connection to the surrounding context and landscape.

There was much debate regarding the design team's departure from the existing City Hall architecture in terms of form and materiality, which hopes to create a more dynamic environment within the Civic Centre Campus. Panel had many concerns and cautioned that the complex geometry could lead to budgetary issues and cautioned the design team to focus on balancing the desired architectural aspirations with the budget constraints.

Panel discussed the development approach for the Civic Centre Campus as a whole raised concerns of losing the integrity and vision for this important urban space with competing architectural styles and designs. To integrate the site and develop the campus, landscape architecture has the potential to play a major role in connecting the pieces together. The panel encourages the City to develop an overall landscape master plan to guide the future developments within the campus. But in the absence

of a landscape master plan, this application will set the tone for the future developments. Therefore, it is imperative to develop a design language for the site that can be carried on during the course of the campus's completion.

Comments:

Site Plan Circulation and Landscape:

- The building is proposed at a very important intersection, which could play a major role in transforming the existing suburban environment along Major Mackenzie Drive into a uniquely civic, active and vibrant urban space. Utilize this location to act as a gateway into the campus. Engage the open space, especially on the west side of the building, and consider the use of landscape elements, planting, and potential extensions of the building.
- The building's dramatic geometry creates an urban experience and highlights interesting views along Major Mackenzie Drive; however, the proposed landscaping responds to the suburban environment of the area. The proposed landscaping should be carefully planned and programmed to be more inviting and encourage pedestrian activities. As well, the building corners, specifically the pinch points between the building and sidewalk on Major Mackenzie Drive, need to be carefully designed and activated through the use of landscape. Explore circulation around the building as a whole.
- Generally, the proposed agricultural landscape theme is highly appropriate, but the panel advised against the pavilion in the park concept. With such a highly architectural building, work needs to be done to better integrate these two items. The juxtaposition between the landscape concept and architecture is intriguing, but needs to be explored more thoroughly. This provides an interesting role for the landscape on site.
- The pedestrian promenade from Keele Street to the Civic Centre should take a more central role in developing the design concept. To animate this important access route, a sufficient amount of pedestrian protection in the form of hard and soft landscaping should be provided. The current proposal makes the promenade look stale and uninviting, and does not emphasize its importance.
- The promenade could be converted to an important civic space by engaging vegetation and opening some of the proposed building functions, such as the proposed patio and courtyard to the pedestrian promenade (see San Francisco Museum of Modern Art as example). The promenade does not necessarily need to be a straight connection. Explore the potential of varying the edges, creating enclosures, defining spaces and utilizing landscaping elements such as planters, seating walls and tree planting.
- The building should be a site for public art and engagement of artists. Public art should not be located at the peripheral areas. The role of the library in contemporary society and culture could be the theme or content for artists to

address.

- The proposed north-south road, located on the east side of the site, pays little attention to the pedestrian condition. The panel encouraged the applicant to consider enhancing the design by giving priority to the pedestrian condition.
- Panel vocalized its confusion with the programming of the site as a whole. Focus on the quality of small spaces, while maintain the connectivity of the site as a whole.

Architecture:

- The panel debated whether the geometric architectural form was appropriate for the civic campus. While many members found the form to be fascinating, others felt the building competes with the existing architecture on campus and advised the applicant to be careful with this proposal. All members warned the applicant about budgetary issues that are associated with building of this nature.
- The panel asked many questions about the location and design of the entry to the building.
- The current proposal does not place an emphasis on any side of the building. Importance should be given to the south side of the building and its relationship to the proposed pedestrian connection. Use the buildings unique architecture to engage the pedestrian promenade to create urban environment that integrates both elements. At the same time, address the streetscape along Major Mackenzie Drive.
- Panel members all agreed that a courtyard feature was appropriate for the development and recommended that the idea be explored further. Consider enhancing the outdoor space by directly connecting the courtyard and promenade space, altering the shape of the building.
- The proposed configuration for the second floor and its relationship to the void above needs to be explored. The panel recommended that this space be designed in more detail.
- Minimize the attention placed on the proposed drop off and service area driveway on the east side of the building by appropriately utilizing landscape elements and architectural features.
- The building footprint is extremely large for the dedicated land. The building coverage should be reduced to create more space for landscape on the west, and to allow for better connections to the proposed pedestrian promenade.
- Reconsider the proposed opaque façade treatments on the building. As well,

explore the effects that glazing can have on the environment, including solar gain and glare, internally and externally.

Sustainability:

- Increase the building's sustainability profile and architectural values by including the following:
 1. Provide a green roof on the top of the building. Consider the slope of the roof and public visibility.
 2. Propose creative stormwater management strategies for the courtyard and other landscaped areas.
 3. Design the building's elevations based on the geographic directions to control solar gain.

b. Application for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment, and Site Plan Application

File: The Jaffarri Village

PAC.13.039

Applicant: Weston Consulting

Architect: Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Landscape Architect: Marton Smith Landscape Architects Inc.

Location: 9000 Bathurst Street South of Rutherford Road, on the west of Bathurst Street

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the orientation, building mass, and façade of the senior's residence and condominium building address Bathurst Street and contribute to a high quality public realm?
2. To what extent does the overall design strategy and site organization of the proposed development encourage, differentiate, and facilitate pedestrian and vehicular circulations?

Presentation:

Sandra Cappuccitti and Mark Antoine, Development Planning Department

Overview:

Panel thanked the applicant for a high quality submission and a clear presentation.

This proposal has large potential, but the Panel agreed that many opportunities were missed. Reconsider the proposed organization of the site as a whole, for both vehicles and pedestrians. Explore the existing site circulation and enhance the proposed connections. Reconsider movement, entrance and access, flow and views on site. Consider potentially relocating the proposed building and highlight the existing features and buildings on site. The landscape plans should respond to the proposal. Engage the existing valley and landscape, connecting to a larger pedestrian system.

Comments:**General Layout and Circulation:**

- The panel had many concerns with the limited access, parking, and the internal vehicular circulation of the proposed parking lots and private road system. Reconsider the organization of parking as it currently is not functional and separated. There is a lack of stitching on site and the proposed lots do not flow together, segregating the site. Centralize the open space; consider breaking up the general mass of parking and moving it further to side boundaries of the site. There is a lack of physical infrastructure necessary for this proposal to function.
- The general master plan is disconnected and needs to be revised. The current layout seems segregated and does not properly integrate the proposed elements of the master plan. Review the site circulation and orientation. Work needs to be done to connect all the pieces of this application. Specifically, explore the circulation and layout of Block 4.
- There are two separate public realms on site which do not interact with each other.
- The general placement and orientation of the place of worship is an asset, located in the centre of the site and should be highlighted; the current proposal makes the place of worship a constraint in the circulation of the site. Consider viewsheds.
- Reconsider the orientation of the primary driveway coming in from Bathurst Street. Explore the potential of having the road run parallel to the

northern property line, creating an overlooking condition into the valley. Currently, the edge of the northern property line is not well utilized.

- While the proposed placement of the townhouse on the south west corner of the site is an ideal location for those units, explore other locations for buildings on site and different ways to achieve density in alternative forms of development.
- Encourage permeability and pedestrian circulation through the site. There are many possibilities for pedestrian connections running east to west, and integration to the south.
- The future Mid-Rise building and High School are too far into the future and therefore it is too hard for the panel to provide comments.
- The panel had many questions in regards to phasing of the project.

The Heritage Building:

- It was recommended by several panel members that the heritage building remain in its existing location and become incorporated into the proposal. Review the proposed structure and consider reworking the front façade of the condominium building to include the Corrie Glen Heritage Building.

Cultural Campus:

- Without having much background on the organization that owns the property, it is hard to comment. It is always helpful to have the owner present at the Design Review Panel Meetings.
- The site is proposed as a cultural campus. Some panel members encouraged the applicant to explore the cultural influences that drove the design of the community centre and place of worship. Others felt that the campus feeling should not be emphasized. The current application does not highlight the existing campus feeling, creating a strong sense of place, nor does it disregard it. There are many lessons that can be taken from the development of faith based communities. This site has large potential.

Landscape:

- The landscape feels as if it was a secondary thought of this application. The proposed courtyard does not adequately connect or engage the senior's residence and the condominium tower. Enhance the proposed space to encourage connectivity through the site.
- The proposed landscape plan does not utilize existing site features and should connect to the valley, just north of the site. Develop a connection

to the valley as it is a large opportunity and can become a unique amenity space for the users of the site.

Architecture:

- At this conceptual stage, the building itself is appealing. The panel was concerned with the integration of the buildings on the site. The proposed towers do not respond to the surrounding context. In fact, it blocks out the surrounding context and does not respond to the cultural style that exists.
- Use the building to highlight the existing community centre and place of worship, emphasizing the proposed community mentality that drives this proposal. Integrate the campus elements further to avoid the feeling of the segregation that this proposal provides.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 22 – October 31, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, October 31, 2013, in Committee Room 243, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)
Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects
Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.
Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects
Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting
Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design
Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity
Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc. (Acting Chair)

Absent

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.
Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.
Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects
Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.
Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

Councillor Sandra Yeung Racco, Ward 4
John Mackenzie, Commissioner of Planning
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design
Grant Uyeyama, Director of Development Planning
Moirra Wilson, Development Planning Department
Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Sandra Cappuccitti, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel
Stephen Lue, Development Planning Department
Anna Sicilia, Policy Planning
Melissa Rossi, Policy Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Antonio Gómez-Palacio in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Antonio Gómez-Palacio declared a conflict of interest with reviewing 13019 Jane and Rutherford, High-Rise Mixed Use Development.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes for September 26, 2013 were adopted.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment, and Site Plan Application

Applicant: Berkeley Developments (Jane) Ltd., Plazacorp Investments Ltd.

Architect: Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Landscape Architect: Claude Cormier + Associates Inc.

Location: 7895 Jane Street, Vaughan Metropolitan Centre

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. Does the proposal create a high quality public realm and streetscape condition that encourages pedestrian circulation? How well does the development facilitate vehicular circulation on site?
2. Does the development proposal support the overall vision, objectives, and policies of the guiding plans for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, including the VMC Secondary Plan and the VMC Streetscape and Open Space Plan?

Presentation:

Sandra Cappuccitti and Stephen Lue, Development Planning Department

Overview:

- Panel thanked the applicant for a high quality submission and a clear presentation.
- This proposal has large potential, but the Panel agreed that many opportunities were missed, particularly regarding the integration with its context and its gateway function to the VMC. E.g. reconsider the way the southern elevation interacts with the Black Creek; engage the existing landscape with a landscape architecture scheme that appropriately connects the two sites; explore and redefine the circulation for both pedestrians and vehicles; maintain the proposed height of the building as it allows the development to act as a gateway to the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.

Comments:

General Layout and Circulation

- The site presents unique opportunities that should be captured in its development. Sandwiched between a substantial green space and prominent street, the development site has no real 'back side' - this presents a notable design challenge and opportunity.
- Concerns were raised regarding circulation on the ground floor level. The site plan feels crowded and recommendations were made to explore widening the mouth of the lobby. The panel responded well to the continuous granite paving from the driveway to the lobby, as it helps to link these spaces. The scheme could make better value of the space by exploring the east-west connection.
- The site's vehicular circulation layout needs to be further explored to better address vehicle and pedestrian connectivity and flows. It was suggested to explore the use of landscape, bollard, and architectural features to help define these spaces.
- The current parking layout is challenging. Panel members agreed that the structured parking in the south elevation is a lost opportunity because this portion of the building should capitalize upon south facing views. The 2nd and 3rd floors will offer the best views onto the green space. Above ground parking will effectively sterilize the first three floors of the development.

Architecture and Landmark/Gateway

- The site and architecture lend itself to become a gateway feature into the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre through its vertical orientation, design, and mix

between vertical and horizontal lines. The design proposal, with the vertical nature of the towers, creates an important viewport travelling south along Jane Street that can be seen from afar.

- The cumulative massing of the two towers dominates certain perspectives, both from a distance and at street level. The panel discussed the proposed massing and noted that the juxtaposition of the towers beside the open space will create a substantial contrast. Because of the surrounding context with low-rise industrial to the north, the height will be more noticeable and powerful. After discussion, the panel advised to maintain the proposed scale. However, it was suggested that the taller of the two towers should be located alone Jane Street. This will emphasize the verticality of the building to become a visual beacon for the VMC.
- Further articulation of the building façade should be considered. The southwest corner, which will also be highly visible, should be expressed in similar detail to the north facade. The massing of the balconies should be broken up and the necessary detail must be fully expressed. The panel is interested in these details for the next panel review.
- An architectural treatment of the parking garage at ground level facing Portage Parkway is an appropriate design solution.
- The Vaughan Metropolitan Centre is transforming into a regional urban centre. Proposal should further consider how to accommodate, contribute, and respond to this urban transformation. For example, the proposal must anticipate the development of Jane Street into a high order transit corridor.
- Panel members suggested that the proposed townhouses along Jane Street are not appropriate. Further architectural and landscape architectural exploration should be done to evolve and urbanize this space.

Landscape and Streetscape

- The majority of the landscape proposal along Portage Parkway is located within the right-of-way and would not be considered feasible to maintain by City of Vaughan. Specifically, questions were raised regarding snow plowing, loading, and salt build up. Consider the use of this space in the winter months. As well, questions were raised regarding the appropriateness of the landscape treatment along the Jane Street frontage. Panel recommended a more urban treatment, including consideration of the future potential rapidway station at Jane and Portage.

- Proposal should explore the south edge of the site, the building elevation, and its relationship to Black Creek and the storm water management green space. Currently, the building and landscape scheme do not adequately respond to, or connect with, the existing landscape context and capture its future potential. Given its location next to Black Creek, this building should be as sustainable as possible. The incorporation of water management techniques into the landscape was encouraged.
- Questions were asked about the potential to connect the development to the trail system that will run through the Black Creek green space. Pedestrian and cycling connectivity are important considerations. However, specific access and connection points have not yet been determined because the design concept for the storm water management pond and Black Creek has not yet been developed.
- Consider gradually increasing the amount of “green” in the development block, transitioning from urban hardscape to green space towards Black Creek.

b. Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment

Applicant: Cortel Group

Architect: Quadrangle Architects Limited

Location: Southeast Corner of Jane Street and Rutherford Road, City of Vaughan

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How successful is the proposed design in leveraging the parkland to increase the quality of the urban environment within the site and around the proposed institutional use?
2. How well does the proposed public square and main street design concept create a vibrant and active urban environment in and around the site?

Presentation:

Melissa Rossi, Policy Planning Department, Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department

Overview:

The design team is encouraged to study the chosen Barcelona-model block concept in context with the larger planned and existing block, street, and public space network of the Vaughan Mills area. Presenting a review of precedents with a similar urban block structure, public realm network, and built form, including examples from Toronto, will help inform the concept.

Comments:Site Plan Layout

- The activation of the Rutherford Road and Jane Street frontages, including the development's interface with the public realm, is an important issue that requires more attention.
- Generally, a more generous pedestrian space should be provided within the internal street rights-of-way.
- Pedestrian connectivity and flows between the proposed courtyards, adjacent parklands, and public sidewalks should be improved.

Built Form

- The panel was intrigued with the idea of altering the traditional perimeter block typology by overlaying it with high-rise towers, and with the idea of redistributing some of the public open space throughout the development. However, it was suggested that the altered block typology should be a more direct response to specific site conditions. Additionally, the towers will create shadow impacts on the courtyards and perimeter blocks that were not identified adequately. Sufficient sunlight in the courtyards, particularly during the winter time, must be considered when designing the proportions of the courtyards, surrounding podiums, and towers. The design becomes more complicated when access to the proposed parking is factored in.
- The proposed concept plan should include a sun/ shadow study to evaluate the amount of access to sunlight on all publically-accessible outdoor areas, parkland, and public sidewalks.
- The phasing plan plays a crucial role in the successes of the proposed development, particularly the vitality of the proposed at-grade retail. The phasing plan should create the critical mass to support the proposed retail during all phases of the project.

Parklands and Open Space

- The panel discussed the proposed distribution and approach to parkland within the development. The proposal does not include a larger-sized park at the south west of the site that would be connected to the larger natural valley system. This south west portion of the site also contains existing mature trees that could be preserved within the parkland dedication.
- The scale and proportion the Barcelona-inspired block model should be altered to respond to and provide access to the adjacent open space that is the site's most prominent and unique opportunity.
- The adjacent natural open space should be better connected to the development's access points, street network, and open space network.
- The panel suggested providing additional build form at the southeast corner to shape a larger civic square, and to address the noise generated by the neighbouring Magna manufacturing.
- The success of the proposed internal courtyards as public urban space will depend upon their public accessibility and visibility. The panel expressed concern about the low level of pedestrian permeability into the courtyards which starts to suggest the privatization of open space. Public access into the courtyards should be increased by reducing their elevation/ height relative to the surrounding streets and by providing more entry points to them from the street network.
- It was noted that elevated courtyards are generally less successful as public spaces. Additionally, public space must be designed to be easily accessible for all abilities.

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



CITY OF VAUGHAN

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of Meeting

Meeting 23 – November 28, 2013

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday, November 28, 2013, in Committee Room 244, City Hall, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, Ontario

PANEL MEMBERS

Present

Richard Witt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd. (Acting Chair)

Antonio Gómez-Palacio, DIALOG (Chair)

Janis Fedorowick, Wavefront Planning & Design

Sony Rai, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

Bruce Cudmore, EDA Collaborative Inc.

Brad Golden, Brad Golden & Co. Public Art Consulting

Harold Madi, The Planning Partnership Ltd.

Mansoor Kazerouni, Page & Steele/ IBI Group Architects

Paul Nodwell, Schollen & Co. Landscape Architects Inc.

Lisa Harmey, Architecture for Humanity

Absent

Michael Rietta, Giannone Petricone Associates Inc. Architects

Santiago Kunzle, Montgomery Sisam Architects Inc.

Sheldon Levitt, Quadrangle Architects Ltd.

Drew Sinclair, planningAlliance & regionalArchitects

STAFF

Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design

Grant Uyeyama, Director of Development Planning

Farhad Jalili, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Moira Wilson, Development Planning Department

Sandra Cappuccitti, Development Planning Department, Recording Personnel

Amy Roots, Development Planning Department

Stephen Lue, Development Planning Department

Melissa Rossi, Policy Planning

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m., with Richard Witt in the Chair

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

APPROVED unanimously by present members

2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Antonio Gómez-Palacio declared a conflict of interest with reviewing the first application, Casertano Development Corporation and Sandra Mammone – High Rise Mixed Use Development.

3. ADOPTION/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Meeting Minutes were not circulated and will be approved at the next meeting.

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

a. Application for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for Two Separate Applications

Applicant: Casertano Development Corporation and Greenpark Group (OP.07.001 and Z.09.038) and Sandra Mammone (OP.09.006 and Z.09.037)

Architect: Kirkor Architects & Planners (Casertano, Greenpark)
SRN Architects Inc. (Sandra Mammone)

Location: Within the Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan Area,
West side of Jane Street, South of Rutherford Road

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

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

Presentation:

Sandra Cappuccitti and Melissa Rossi, Development Planning Department

Overview:

- The panel was pleased that the applications were submitted together, hoping that this would lead to a coordinated design approach.

- Understanding that there are many constraints for both developments, the panel felt that the applicants were presented with a unique opportunity to define the urban condition for the entire area. In both cases, the panel felt that opportunities were missed because the conventional nature of the proposals did not respond to the surrounding context.

Comments for the Casertano and Green Park Application

General:

- The panel was impressed with the presentation and graphic quality for the proposed development. The logical design process and narrative outlined in the presentation aided the panel in understanding the rationale for the development and led to more apt questions and comments. That being said, the quality of realism in the renderings was seen as a disservice at this stage, as it led the panel to believe the design was further developed.
- Consider a more inclusive response to the surrounding conditions. While fronting onto Jane Street on the east side, the development must also consider its relationship to the Vaughan Mills Circle and the Vaughan Mills Mall extension. While there are many constraints, this location is an opportunity, allowing the designer to explore the site's potential to create a unique urban condition. The panel agreed that despite the opportunity for creativity and potential to develop a unique design solution, the result was a conventional proposal that does not respond to the context. The panel suggested that the design exploit the strange vibrancy, access to the future mobility hub, and public realms created by this condition.

Site Layout and Circulation:

- The panel had mixed opinions on the placement of the outdoor amenity space proposed along Jane Street. The majority of panel members recommended that the amenity space be located in the centre of the block, as an internalized public space. Others felt there was merit in the proposed location, acting as an extension to Jane Street itself, inviting people into the public realm, engaging the transit connections, and aiding the definition of the street edge. Few agreed that the amenity area would be better suited along Vaughan Mills Circle. But it was questioned if the proximity to Vaughan Mills Mall and the busy Vaughan Mills Circle would create an undesirable condition. Explore all conditions.
- As a whole, the panel members had varying opinions on the proposed block allocation. Focus on development of accessible human scaled blocks. Consider the development of a north-south directional block to act as a spine running down the centre of the site, utilizing a linear park model, and defining an internal road system.

- The proposed layout focuses on the Jane Street frontage and does not respond to the Vaughan Mills Mall. Address all sides of the development, while still facilitating the loading area on one side. Explore alternative ways to create a relationship with the mall through aligning roads, creating views, developing connections/mews, and linking to entrances of the building.
- Put a greater focus on the proposed woonerf as public space to connect the site and potentially act as the central spine of the development.

Amenity Space and Public Realm:

- Create a comprehensive landscape approach to the development. Landscape plans were not included within this application.
- Explore the finer grain elements of the plan. Have more thought for pedestrian linkages and inter-massing of the podium to allow for improved space definition. Develop a series of east-west connections through the site. The site requires the development of a new urban condition. Focus on creating a united pedestrian network that speaks to the human scale and enhances walkability.
- Create a flow between the proposed open spaces, parks, and pedestrian realm. As well, an emphasis must be placed on the pedestrian connections to provide movement between the podiums. Each block should be a destination.
- Explore the principal entrances of each building, the conditions created on the public realm, and the pedestrian activity that would be encouraged by the definition of those spaces.

Public Park and Open Space:

- A strong emphasis should be placed on the public park between the Casertano and Mammone applications. This park can act as a gateway and should be highlighted in the application; rather it is treated as a secondary thought. Provide more information on the programming of all open spaces, including the public park.
- Develop an interface between the development and the park through a connected pedestrian system, architectural expression, and programming. The public park is cut off from the development by vehicular movement.

Architecture and Massing:

- Additional typologies, characters, and orientations of buildings should be explored. The podium-tower typology does not allow the site to reach its full potential. Consider using a mid-rise typology, which could create an interesting relationship with the point tower condition. This would allow the development to increase the proposed density, while adding necessary

architectural differentiation to the proposal. Reevaluate the height transition between the buildings.

- Commercial development should be highly encouraged on this site. Close proximity created by the Vaughan Mills Mall extension should be exploited. While Jane Street creates an urban and appealing condition, explore the inclusion of commercial development facing on to Vaughan Mills Circle. This will capitalize on the unique commercial condition created by the mall and utilize the available parking. This will also help to separate the Vaughan Mills Mall extension from the residential units. To optimize the livability on site, tap into the vibrancy created by the existing commercial development.
- Review the shape and form of the proposed towers to aid in improving the buildings exposure along Jane Street and breaking the massing of the buildings into smaller defined spaces. The architecture should incorporate a more organic response to the public park.
- Servicing is proposed along the Vaughan Mills Circle frontage, treating that unique condition as the backside of the building. Explore the opportunity to internalize servicing.
- Understanding that the details of the buildings have yet to be fully defined, the current proposal requires a variety of architectural expressions. Encourage differentiation of the chosen materials and styles, as well as the expression of the building as a whole. Consider further exploration of layering a variety of spaces to individualize each building.
- The built form should be creative and should include the development of portals in the massing. Create intimacy at a human scale within the podiums of the proposed buildings.

Phased Development and Timing:

- Timing of this development is highly dependent on the City of Vaughan's approval and the Ontario Municipal Board process.
- A phased development approach should be considered, starting with the north side to respond to adjacent office building, moving further south.

Comments for the Sandra Mammone Application

General:

- The comments from the previous presentation (Casertano Development) should be reviewed and the general principles that were emphasized should be applied to this application.
- As a whole, the panel was disappointed with the quality of the design and presentation, stating that it was challenging to provide comments. In the

future, it was recommended that the applicant provide a presentation showing the design rationale and general thought process that lead to the final design.

- The panel agreed that the proposal missed several opportunities in relationship to the surrounding context. This proposed design has no relationship to the existing site conditions and could essentially be located anywhere.
- As mentioned for the Casertano Development, the quality of realism in the renderings undermines the level of thought given to the application and sets high expectations for a design that has not been fully determined. As well, inconsistencies in the versions of graphics were confusing.

Site Layout and Circulation:

- The panel recommended that the applicant look at the site as a blank slate, focusing on a new proposal that responds to existing conditions and creates a seamless connected system of movement for the usability of the site. As previously mentioned, incorporate comments that were given to the Casertano Development.
- The built form of the proposal feels monotonous. The tower and podium design of this project represents an almost slavish idea of urbanism. The application was compared to a vertical subdivision, lacking richness and differentiation between proposed buildings. Further design development is required. Consider the ground floor relationships and work to create a pedestrian circulation system on site, which currently does not exist.
- Cultivate an interior street network that creates accessibility and allows for necessary circulation, speaking to the organization of the development. This system should act as more than just a driveway connecting the residential towers. Create through connections.
- Utilize the surrounding context; create accessible conditions to the surrounding environment, including the proposed public park, Vaughan Mills Circle, Vaughan Mills Mall and the future mobility hub.
- Panel members had questions about the functionality of commercial development on site. The current proposal is one sided, turning its back to Vaughan Mills Circle, Vaughan Mills Mall, when it should be addressed and connections should be enhanced. Explore this relationship.
- Develop a collection of public, private and semi-private spaces for the use of the residents on site. Create a variety of spaces and experiences, making the site a destination. The current organization and structure of the site will not be successful, challenging the residents on site and the surrounding community.

- Consider rotating the building orientation to better respond to the shape of the site. The proposed block system is too large, making the scale seem unviable. Break up the blocks create visibility. Divide the mass of the buildings to define a more integrated network for circulation. Explore the location of various uses, ensuring that residential units are not included on the ground floor.

Amenity Space and Public Realm:

- This application is missing a level of fine grain thought, specifically relating to general pedestrian and vehicular circulation. The current network is minimal and does not function well. Elements are placed with no relationship or connection to each other. Explore pedestrian links to join a variety of spaces and explore mid-block connections to create better circulation on the ground floor.
- Explore an integrated and internalized open space network that will connect necessary public spaces and pedestrian zones.

Public Park and Open Space:

- The relationship of both sites is important to the success of the park.
- Both developments share the responsibility for the development of the park space. Revise the architectural conditions abutting the park, as the current architecture has no relationship to the park space. Review building entrances, connections, architectural elements, and landscape architectural design principles to link the spaces.

Architecture and Massing:

- The proposed development requires architectural innovation. The general massing and material articulation should be varied to create a distinct differentiation between the podium and towers. The panel discouraged the use of colonnades in this setting. Explore alternative typologies from the podium-tower condition. Panel members felt that the height transition of the towers was well considered.
- Buildings are uncomfortably close.

b. Application for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment

Applicant: Lanada Investments Inc.

Architect: SRN Architects Inc.

Location: 8334 Islington Avenue

Review: First Review

Introduction:

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

1. How well does the proposed site layout and built form address the surrounding context and transition to the neighbouring community?
2. How well does the provided architectural style fit with its surrounding naturalized environment?

Presentation:

Farhad Jalili and Eugene Fera, Development Planning Department

Overview:

- Panel members had mixed opinions on the application. While many felt that the general principle of the application should be supported, others had a strong sense that the proposal is not appropriate for this site. Overall, the panel felt that this application still needs work to be a suitable development within the surrounding context. Many concerns were outlined with the current configuration and lack of respect for context. The odd shape of the lot calls for creativity in the development proposal, and the panel felt that the applicant missed unique opportunities provided by conditions on site. The panel encourages the applicant to do less.
- While the panel was disappointed with the submitted proposal, the applicant is encouraged to explain the proposal more through drawings. The panel indicated that they are looking forward to the second presentation.

Comments:

Surrounding Context:

- The panel questioned how successfully the development would fit into the neighbourhood. Looking at the adjacent properties, the surrounding development is primarily residential. Panel members specifically had concerns relating to the lots east of the property line. The applicant is

urged to review the relationship to the surrounding neighbourhood and respect the conditions created by the existing development.

- In exploring the surrounding conditions, it was made clear that the general nature of Islington Avenue is changing. Despite the fact that the streetscape frontage of the development is not changing and has a limited exposure onto Islington Avenue, the panel advised the applicant to explore the development's relationship to the street.

Building Design and Layout:

- The current site layout simply cannot sustain the density proposed and requires a different organization. The site feels overcrowded. The footprint of the building is too large and it is not appropriate based on the size of the site. This has led to an over developed and problematic proposal. Overall, the panel would like to see a better design, as this proposal creates many competing planning issues. Reorganize the site.
- The driveway and site organization anticipates a sense of arrival. The entrance to the building and the cramped courtyard space do not create this condition. This should be revisited.
- Reconsider the orientation of the building, views onto the north boundary, and the setback to eastern properties. Consider the economic feasibility of purchasing additional properties to the east of the site, directly along the Islington Avenue streetscape and expanding the size of the property.
- The organization of the underground and at-grade parking should be revisited. The proposed ramp location is inappropriate, leaving vehicular circulation patterns at the ground level congested and dysfunctional.
- The panel had questions relating to the architectural style and material choice. They wanted to be sure that aesthetically, both the style and materials respond to surrounding conditions and fit into the neighbourhood. The panel felt that there was not enough traditional materiality for a mid-rise building. The applicant advised that the materials have not been confirmed, as this application is still in a general design stage.
- The sun/shadow study highlighted that this application is not suitable for the site. Alternative typologies should be explored, as the shadows created by the building are concerning. It was recommended that the applicant consider stacked back-to-back townhomes or a simple bar building, as it would be more suitable.
- The City sees this site as a special condition and not a typical development condition or lot size within Vaughan. That being said, the

Panel is worried that this inappropriate response to the site would set a dangerous precedent within the area.

Access and Circulation:

- Vehicular circulation within the current proposal does not function. The driveway entrance off Islington Avenue is narrow and constricting, essentially making the building isolated. Fire and emergency vehicle access is a large concern.
- The ground floor development should be reconsidered, as both the functionality and flow are missing. The sequence of movement throughout the site is stunted. There is no sense of arrival, both pedestrian and vehicular circulation is cramped, and the loading and servicing areas are inappropriate. Reconsider the ramp location, visitor parking spots, and the ground floor circulation system as a whole.
- Pedestrian circulation is non-existent. Explore ways to connect pedestrians from the building to the streetscape in a safe and welcoming fashion. General opportunities for circulation are limited. Explore permeability throughout the site.
- The primary entrance to the building is through the vestibule, to the lobby. The current entrance to the building needs to be reviewed, as it is hidden when it should be a focal point. Consider additional access points. The panel questions how the units at-grade will be accessed, inquiring about the potential for external access.

Landscape, Open Space, and Amenity Space:

- Within this application, the landscape proposal feels like an afterthought. The panel encourages the applicant to make use of the unique space and explore opportunities. Create connections, permeability, and a comprehensive public realm.
- There is no real amenity space on site, aside from the rooftop patio. At-grade amenity space should be created and should be fully accessible. Develop a linked pedestrian system. The development of a public courtyard would create a connected urban space.
- The woodlot to the west of the property is a unique feature and a missed opportunity. Explore connections to this land, utilizing the area as amenity space lacking on the site plan. Explore both internal and external connections to the wooded area. With the current layout and building configuration, the woodlot is not accessible or usable.

- The panel had many questions about the topography on site. Ensure all trees and vegetation are preserved and the proposal respects all environmental parameters.

End of Minutes