



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday January 11th, 2024** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*

Dayna Edwards

Jennifer Sisson

Jennifer Mallard

Staff Present:

Jana Kelemen, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design

Michael Vortuba, SPM Heritage and Design

Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design

Mark Michniak, Senior Planner

Tim Vrooman, Area Planning Manager

Others Present

Presentation #3	Liam Murphy , Bousfields David Falletta , Bousfeilds D. Papetti , OfficeArchitecture	
-----------------	---	--

Regrets:

Joey Giaimo, Eldon Theodore, Ted Watson

Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY – NONE

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
1:30 pm	Mixed-Use Multi-Residential Building 365 Hwy 8	Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendment	Owner: Mario Nesci. Agent and Presentation: Bousfields	Mark Michniak

Summary of Comments:

Note: The Design Review Panel is strictly an advisory body and makes recommendations to Planning Division staff. These comments should be reviewed in conjunction with all comments received by commenting agencies and should be discussed with Planning Division staff prior to resubmission.

365 Hwy 8

Development Proposal Overview

The applicant proposes to develop a 9-storey mixed used multiple dwelling containing 176 dwellings units, ±290 square metres of commercial space and 182 parking spaces (147 underground spaces over two levels and 35 surface parking spaces).

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character?
- Does the proposal promote intensification that makes appropriate and innovative use of buildings and sites and is compatible in form and function to the character of existing communities and neighbourhoods?
- Highway 8, which is designated as an Secondary Corridor, is anticipated to evolve over time to become a vibrant pedestrian and transit oriented place. Does the proposal exemplify this evolution? Does the proposal organize space in a logical manner through the design, placement, and construction of new buildings, streets, structures, and landscaping?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

The panel appreciated the inclusion of the commercial unit fronting Hwy 8 as part of the development – and pending the commercial needs assessment that flexible units might be wise to provide options for use until commercial demand exists – notes that the needs may change over time as the area is updated.

b) Built Form and Character

The panel thought the massing was generally successful with an established podium and agreed the angular planes were generally adhered to throughout the site with the proposed building including step-backs at upper floors. However, there was concern from panel members that the overall density on the site was excessive. Particularly, the panel felt the design proposal could not be used verbatim with the amount of surface paving and lack of at-grade amenity space.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

Then panel appreciated the planned trees both interior to the site and along Hwy 8 relating to the commercial unit.

The panel did have some concern about the layout of vehicular circulation through the site, noting a high amount of surface paving, as well as some awkward parallel parking spaces serving the commercial unit. The panel suggested that relocating the parking ramp closer to the entrance off the street might give the possibility to revise surface parking serving the commercial unit.

The panel saw that there was little negative impact from the sun / shadow study, and that generally good results were seen with the wind report.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

The panel noted a lack of at grade amenity space and saw potential to revise the surface parking (and location of parking garage ramp) as an option to improve this feature.

The panel appreciated the landscaping proposed at the commercial unit and noted the importance of setting a precedent for including good streetscape design for the area with such development proposals.

The panel appreciated the bicycle parking and suggested including bike parking closer to serve the commercial units as well as the residential entrance.

Summary

The panel appreciated the development proposal including a commercial unit with good relationship with the street frontage – noting including an active and welcoming pedestrian space with the commercial unit would set a good precedent and guide future development in the immediate area.

The panel saw opportunity to reduce the amount of area at grade to paving and vehicular circulation by relocating the underground garage entrance ramp closer to the street – which may also provide an opportunity to improve the parking area serving the commercial unit and give back at-grade space for resident amenity space (as well as breathing room and transition space to adjacent properties).

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.