



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday, November 12th, 2020** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

Colin Berman, Brook McIlroy

Vincent Colizza, Vincent Colizza Architects, *Chair*

Ute Maya-Giambattista, Fotenn Planning + Design

Tim Smith, Urban Strategies Inc.

Jackie VanderVelde, Land Art Design Landscape Architects Inc.

Yasin Visram, Perkins + Will Canada

James Webb, Webb Planning Inc.

Staff Present:

Anita Fabac, Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design

Shannon McKie, Senior Project Manager, Urban Team

E. Tim Vrooman, Senior Planner, Suburban Team

Others Present

<p>Presentation #2 Winona Point Mixed Use Development 1290 South Service Road and 5 & 23 Vince Mazza Way</p>	<p>Gabe DeSantis, Homes by DeSantis Fernando Puga, Homes by DeSantis Serina Carbone, Homes by DeSantis Adam Cairns, Melrose Investments Inc. Aaron Collina, Melrose Investments Inc. Przemyslaw (Shem) Myszkowski, KNYMH Gord Alexiuk, KNYMH Marc Begin, KNYMH Wayne Harrison, KNYMH John Ariens, IBI Group Jared Marcus, IBI Group Stephen Francovich, S. Llewellyn & Associates Limited</p>
--	---

Regrets:

Robert Freedman, Freedman Urban Solutions (Panel member)

Declaration of Interest:

Mario Patitucci, Adesso Design Inc. (Panel member)

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
3:30 p.m.	Winona Point Mixed Use Development 1290 South Service Road and 5 & 23 Vince Mazza Way	Pre-consultation Former File FC-20-069	Owner: Winona Point Joint Venture Inc. Agent and Presentation: KNYMH Architecture Solutions	Tim Vrooman, Senior Planner

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.

2. 1290 South Service Road and 5 & 23 Vince Mazza Way

Development Proposal Overview

The proposal includes a three phase mixed use development with surface and underground parking. Phase 1 includes a one storey commercial building with 598 m² GFA (Bldg. 1E) in the southeast corner, seven (7) three storey mixed use buildings with 2,085 m² GFA and 54 stacked residential units above fronting Vince Mazza Way (Bldgs. 1A-1D & 1E-1H), eight (8) four storey stacked townhouse dwellings with 212 units interior and to the southeast of the site, and a woonerf / 4,250 m² parkette interior to the site. Phase 2 includes four (4) four storey stacked townhouse dwellings with 92 dwelling units in the northwest corner (Bldgs. 2A-2D) and phase 2 includes a 28 storey multiple dwelling containing 266 dwelling units with at grade parking on level 1 in the northeast corner (Bldg. 3A).

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- What is the relationship of the proposal to the existing neighbourhood character? Does it maintain, and where possible, enhance and build upon desirable established patterns, built form and landscapes?
- Does the proposal respect prominent sites, views and vistas in the City?
- Does the proposal create comfortable pedestrian environments by:
 - Locating principal facades and primary building entrances parallel to and as close to the street as possible;

- Including ample glazing on ground floors to create visibility to and from the public sidewalk;
- Including a quality landscape edge along frontages where buildings are set back from the street; and,
- Using design techniques, such as building step-backs, to maximize sunlight to pedestrian areas.

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context (Questions 1, 2, 3)

- The panel felt that this review is premature and that a larger master planning or secondary planning exercise should be undertaken to establish what the future node will evolve into as it is currently a big box store and employment area. The panel stated that the site is effectively an island that does not connect to other residential lands or amenities. A review of the neighbourhood level commercial and supportive uses, and open spaces, should be completed.
- The panel questioned if this is the right place for a landmark tower and if a suburban node is an appropriate location for this type of height and density. The panel stated that if a tower is permitted, it must be a very appealing tower. The panel does not feel that the proposed design works as a landmark tower.
- The panel appreciates that mixed use buildings with ground floor commercial units are a major part of the plan, but questions if the commercial units will achieve full occupancy. The existing District Commercial designation/zoning is a challenging framework for mixed use development.

b) Built Form and Character (Questions 1, 2, 3)

- The panel noted that the development is treating Vincent Mazza Way as a buffer, building walls and cutting off the development from the surrounding uses which creates a fortress effect.
- The panel has concerns with the proposed 28 storey tower and the lack of transition to the surrounding three and four storey buildings, resulting in the structure feeling like an island within the island. Mid-rise structures are recommended to provide a more balanced development.
- The panel acknowledges that the proposal has incorporated some good urban design principles by positively addressing the surrounding streets and creating pedestrian oriented spaces; however, the development is nevertheless highly internalized and there is no sense of how it will relate to its surroundings.

c) Site Layout and Circulation (Questions 1, 2, 3)

- The panel recommends relocating the main open space to a more centralized area, shifting away from the fortress feel to a more open concept. The tower should have a positive relationship to the open space.
- Rather than the commercial uses buffering the site, consider an internal focused pedestrian retail street.
- The surface parking along the east edge of the site should be relocated along the south side to flank the stacked townhouses while still serving the commercial uses and doubling as visitor parking.
- The panel questioned the plaza location at the southeast corner of the site as it faces a busy intersection and may be underutilized. It would be better to enhance the open spaces throughout the site.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy (Questions 1, 2, 3)

- The open space and streetscape network feature several positive design elements; however, the panel is concerned that it will not function as intended. The woonerf, intended only for emergency vehicles, unnecessarily breaks up the central open space. It will reduce the space's functionality and attractiveness. The playground, for example, is pushed too close to the townhomes, which will create conflicts.
- The panel suggests introducing a series of linear open spaces leading to a central green space which would address the issue above while also limiting the number of road crossings to get to the central green space.

Summary

The panel thanks the applicant for their presentation and appreciates the effort to incorporate good urban design principles at this early stage. The panel recognizes the site challenges due to the location and surrounding big box retail, district commercial uses and employment lands. The panel recommends that the proponent work with Planning staff on a land use and urban design plan for the larger commercial area to determine how residential uses can be integrated with the established communities to the north and south. The panel suggests a more balanced development, with a centralized open space and greater built form variety, including mid-rise buildings. The appropriateness of the tower should be assessed. Once an area plan has been developed, a revised proposal should be submitted to the Design Review Panel for review.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.