



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday September 12th, 2024**, via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

Jennifer Mallard, *Acting Chair*
Eldon Theodore
Dayna Edwards
Joey Giaimo
Ted Watson

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

Others Present

Presentation #2	Mike Crough , Arcadis Marco VanderMaas , Arcadis Tim O'Brien , Arcadis Kathleen Freeman , CT Reit Andrew Pruss , ERA Architects Inc.	
------------------------	---	--

Regrets:

David Clusiau, **Jennifer Sisson**

Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
2:45 pm	Multiple Residence Development 304-314 Main St E & 17 West Ave S	Zoning By-law Amendment	Owner: Canadian Tire Corporation Ltd. Agent and Presentation: Arcadis	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.

304-314 Main St E & 17 West Ave S

Development Proposal Overview

The proposed development includes two towers (25 & 23-storeys) with an 8-storey podium which extends over a retained existing alleyway. 355 dwelling units are proposed with 1,256 square metres of outdoor amenity space. 17 West Ave is proposed to be re-developed as a 5-storey residential building with 24 residential units. 170 parking spaces are proposed, along with 464 bicycle parking space provide above and below grade.

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?*
- *What is the relationship of the proposal with the height, massing and scale of nearby residential buildings?*
- *Does the proposal respect and maintain or enhance the streetscape patterns including block lengths, setbacks and building separations?*
- *Does the proposal conserve and respect the existing built heritage features of the area?*
- *Does the proposal create, reinforce, and emphasize important public vistas and view corridors?*
- *How could flexibility be built into the ground floor layout to provide options for other uses if residential is not the best use at grade?*

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

- The panel was generally complimentary in the ambitious nature of the proposal and noted the appreciation for the depth of works demonstrating the research into materials used and the response to the pedestrian realm and the different conditions on the three different streets and the internal alley way.

b) Built Form and Character

- The panel appreciated the composition of building massing on the site – working to include the existing laneway and response to the lower density context along West Ave South with the 5 storey podium.
- The panel did have a concern about the east tower and the resulting setback to the adjacent property to the south which should be reviewed for impact to future developments.
- The panel appreciated the brick cladding proposed for the building base and the balcony detailing which gave a textural feature to the streetscape.
- The panel noted the obvious heritage component in the swooping canopy over the existing gas bar and appreciated the nod to the canopy with a similar swooping element over the existing alleyway which provides vehicular access from West Ave South.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

- The panel appreciated the efforts to be respectful in design adjacent to the existing church building on the opposite side of West Ave.
- A panel member noted how the arrangement of the building components on the property appeared to fit within the neighbourhood context along Main Street and Victoria Street when viewed in the renderings showing varying vantage points.
- The panel appreciated the use of the laneway and engagement of the space for everyday life for residents and community members alike.
- The panel posed the question of flexibility of the ground floor units (currently proposed as residential), noting the

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

- A panel member noted the desire for an improved or greater presence of the main lobby on the façade as part of design development to be in-line with the high-quality elevation being proposed.
- The panel noted how the proposal employed the existing alleyway(s) to become a place for people was beneficial to the overall plan and recommended further support with landscaping features site/furniture and plantings.
- The panel noted there was some concern with the proposal's wind study which noted a few areas of concern which need mitigation prior to site plan approvals. It was noted by the applicant team that this analysis and design work has been planned and the consultant team is planning on addressing these concerns in the next round of design development.

Summary

The panel was unanimous with their commendation of the ambitious nature of the development – and noted the site's physical location and the existing community use of the site illustrates the importance of the location, and thereby making it an appropriate location for a major development. In this regard, the panel found the proposed height of the development was supported – notwithstanding a desire to reduce one specific area of impact from the eastern tower locally.

The panel was complimentary of the proposed selection of materials and the design cues that added texture to the building's base levels – making visual and physical connections to the adjacent heritage church building and nearby brick dwellings. The panel encouraged the applicant's design team to retain these important features and build upon them in future development details.

Lastly, the panel found that the proposal would promote pedestrian activity along the street and was supported by landscaping and a well-designed building base.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.