URBAN DESIGN PEER REVIEW PANEL MINUTES
2015-04-15

PRESENT:

**UDPRP Members**
- Steve Ries – Fanshawe College, Professor, Architect
- Andrew Wilson – Fanshawe College, Professor, Landscape Architect
- David Yuhasz – Zedd Architecture, Architect

**City of London Staff**
- Eric Conway, Landscape Planner
- Eric Lalande, Planner II
- Britt O’Hagan, Urban Designer
- Lauren Sooley, Urban Design Technician
- Jerzy Smolarek, Urban Designer

REGRETS:
- Julie Bogdanowicz – City of Toronto, Architect
- Blair Scorgie – Brook McIlroy Inc., Planner and Urban Designer

Panel Review Application # 1
**Time:** 1:25
**Address:** 1212 Coronation Drive
**Conflict of Interest:** John Nicholson

**Planner/ Site Plan Approval Officer:** Eric Conway
**Application presentation by Applicant/ Agent:** Alison Hannay, Cornerstone Architecture

**Clarification:**
- The Maple Grove Park is to the east of the property
- The path will connect from Maple Grove Park to the south boundary of the school property
• A portion of the school site will be fenced in order to restrict access on and off the site
• The woodlot to the south is designated OS5
• There will be changes to the existing municipal structure, as the lay-by parking will be shortened to allow for an entrance
• Different materials will be used for the Kindergarten and day care playgrounds than on the hard surface playground
  o Still working to determine exact materials – likely a mix of hard and soft surface material for kindergarten and daycare areas
• There will be a sidewalk from the Kindergarten coatroom on the west elevation, to the entrance to the play area on north elevation
• The canopy at the main entrance of the school extends out to the first window of the learning commons
• Fencing along the property line between the school and the park will occur at the front of property
• When the park is developed, it will be landscaped, therefore landscaping along the property line adjacent to the park was not included in the design
• Trees were planted on the south property boundary because the bylaw recommends it
• Covered bike racks were not discussed in the design process, as there may be safety concerns with them
• Building materials were chosen because they seemed to be the right fit for the use
• Black chain link fencing will be used only around play areas, other fencing to be regular chain link.

Panel Review:
• Concerns with the interface of the school with Maple Grove Park
• There is no need for trees on the south property line
• Consider the use of covered bike racks
• Use building materials to delineate different uses in the school such as the Learning Commons
• Consider planting trees along the west property line
Chair ends meeting at: 2:00

Panel Review Application # 2
Time: 2:00
Address: 1635 Richmond Street
Conflict of Interest: None

Planner/ Site Plan Approval Officer: Eric Conway
Application presentation by Applicant/ Agent: Nicola Casciato, WZMH Architects and Chris Pidgeon, GSP Group

Clarification:

- The applicant’s presentation presented a one-building design
- A perspective will be created to show the interior of the walkway through the building and how the building will be clad/designed in that space.
- The total length of the building is 140 – 150m.
- The concept of one building instead of two, allowed for one elevator, one main entrance, a consolidated amenity space and consolidated garbage pick up
- The location of servicing and amenity spaces needs to be clarified between the one-building plan and the two-building plan
- There were more units in the one building design than in the two-building design.
  - There were 10 units added in the area of the mid-block connection
  - 5 or 6 additional units in the area where amenity space was located in the two-building design
- The applicant had not discussed with their client whether there was a possibility of adding an amenity space on the roof of the one-storey portion on the one-building design.
- There was consideration for opening up the pedestrian connection through the building to allow for more light into the space
- The ground-floor bedroom in the townhouses is out front, with the living area in the back
  - The layout could be reversed
- The roof styles of the townhouses are different on the perspective than in the section
- There is currently no development application submitted for the property to the south
  - The property has similar zoning – less density and same height
- Students living in the building use one main entrance rather than multiple entrances
  - Stairway entrances will be accessible to students, but it is not a preferred entrance
- The driveway under the building is for two-way traffic
- The Richmond Street – Old Masonville Guidelines define a streetwall as having a building frontage of no less than 75% of the eastern property line
• Bus stops on Richmond Street are located in front of the TD Canada Trust and south of Jacksway Crescent
• The outdoor amenity space is currently not programmed
• Townhouses could cater to a wider market of students

Panel Review:
• Reduce the building mass of the one-building design at the pedestrian walkway to allow for more light into the pedestrian corridor and to reduce the impact of the size of the building
• Concern with living spaces at back
• Incorporating balconies into the front of the building will help break up the massing
• Incorporating external access for ground floor units will help improve the pedestrian/streetscape experience
• The one-building mass design is not appropriate
  o A two-building or three-building design would be more favourable
• The panel would like to see the final design come back for a second review
• The drop-off and pick-up areas are not sufficient to accommodate the number of residents in the building
• Ground floor units facing Richmond should be screened with low landscaping walls to increase privacy
• More detailed plans of the amenity areas are required
• Reduce the height of the back half of the building to 4 storeys in order to provide a height transition to the townhouses
• Enliven courtyard/amenity spaces by facing windows of neighbouring units onto the spaces
• Consider the addition of new materials to help break up the building mass
• Use steps to access the townhouse units instead of a gradual sloping path
• Sloped roofs on townhouses not effective, might be stronger with flat roofs
• Further articulate the building face to help break up the building mass
• Use the canopy as a way to break up the building mass
  o Currently the canopy appears to add to hold the building mass together as it stretches across its entire length
• The treatment of the driveway across from Jacksway Crescent should be more pedestrian-friendly
• Consider using high-quality materials as presented to the panel in the meeting
• Could move the Jacksway Crescent entrance to the south to provide a future shared access for future redevelopment of the adjacent property

Chair ends meeting at: 3:20
Panel Review Application # 3
Time: 3:20
Address: 462-472 Springbank Drive
Conflict of Interest: None

Planner/ Site Plan Approval Officer: Eric Lalande
Application presentation by Applicant/ Agent: Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

Clarification:
- The OPA/ZBA request is to merge the four parcels that make up the site together
  - Current Official Plan zoning is high density which only allows for small-scale office use
  - New zoning to expand office designation from the south to allow for a larger office component
  - Current zoning is Arterial Commercial
- The parking will be controlled on-site
- There is no proposal to put gates on the site
- If the building owner chooses to use a gate, then there is room to have car stacking on-site
  - The first entrance to the parking would be closed by redesigning a longer parking island, to allow for this stacking

Panel Review:
- The west elevation is not doing a service to the residents next door
- This is a very traffic-driven design
- Street wall needs to be more defined by aligning the screening beds for the parking with the wall of the building
- Principle entrance of the building needs to be seen from the west
- Material use on the west elevation indicates that there may be an entrance on that side of the building, but there is not
- Building should be reconfigured along Springbank Drive to allow for a longer building edge to face the street
  - Parking can be hidden behind the building and screened from the street
- Use of building materials on building facade should be simplified
- More definition should be added to the entrance of the building

Chair ends meeting at: 4:00
Panel Review Application # 4
Time: 4:00
Address: 4425 Wellington Road
Conflict of Interest: None

Planner/ Site Plan Approval Officer: Eric Conway
Application presentation by Applicant/ Agent: Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

Clarification:
- Busy Bee is the owner/developer of the site
  - The design of the building is reflective of their other buildings
- There are not enough stacking spaces at the entrance of the site to allow for a straight connection from the front driveway
  - Shared access must be maintained

Panel Review:
- The stepping of glass at the front of the building is not working
- Parking at the front of the building is not preferred
- Step back the building at entrances
- Enhance the landscaping and walkway treatment
- Consider increasing walkway width to allow space for trees in order to reinforce the facade
- Relocating the entrance on unit #1 to the north elevation may resolve problems with the parking at the front
- Provide rain protection for people moving from unit to unit
- Incorporate banding for signage
- Consider entrances off of central parking area in order to animate the space
- Incorporate landscaping into central parking area
- Reinforce walkway along building with sloped asphalt
- Sign locations should be indicated on the building in the second phase, as the current north elevation suggests there are only two major tenants instead of four

Chair ends meeting at: 4:30