



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday November 11, 2021** via Webex.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*

Ted Watson

Hoda Kameli

Joey Giaimo

Jana Kelemen

Jennifer Mallard

Jennifer Sisson

Eldon Theodore

Staff Present:

Rino Dal Bello, Senior Planner, Rural Team

Charlie Toman, Senior Project Manager, Rural Team

Joe Buordolone, Planning Technician, Urban Team

Others Present

Presentation #3 Residential Development 134-136 Upper Mt Albion Road	David Falletta , Bousfields Inc Tom Beraldo , Owner Ashley Paton , Bousfields Inc.
--	---

Declaration of Interest: N/A

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
4:00 p.m.	Residential Development 134-136 Upper Mt Albion Road	Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment	Owner: Taha of Companies c/o Lorraine Kelso. Agent and Presentation: David Falletta, Bousfields Inc.	Rino Dal Bello, 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.

134-136 Upper Mt Albion Road

Development Proposal Overview

The applicant is proposing to develop a standalone 5 storey residential building that would contain 154 units, and one level of underground parking with a total of 160 parking spaces. The development is proposing an outside amenity area that is located to the rear of the building. The application is to add a Site-specific Policy for the subject lands to permit standalone residential where commercial uses are to be included on the first floor.

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

1. How will the applicant address the massing along Upper Mt Albion Road? (B.3.3.3.3)
2. Does the proposal represent compatible integration with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character? (B.2.4.1.4. d)
3. How will the building address the adjacent residential townhouses, where they are 1-2 storeys in height?
4. Does the proposal complement and animate existing surroundings through building design and placement as well as through placement of pedestrian amenities? (B.3.3.2.6 a)

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

- Overall, the Panel is comfortable with the proposed additional height and scale as it is located across the street from lands that have commercial land uses.
- Responds well to the site and good precedent for midrise development in the area and the Architecture response is calm and appealing.
- The panel has a concern with the location of the garbage and how that can be considered with land use compatibility.
- The ground floor terraces could be setback to give a more of a landscape strip for more amenity space.
- The outdoor/indoor amenity being connected is nice but should flush out the programming some more in terms of on-site private amenity space.
- The Panel noted that the proposed development is pleased with the walkability.

b) Built Form and Character

- The Panel indicated that West elevation could be considered quite long. At the upper level, could remove units at the upper level or set them back in order to break up the massing of the building.
- On the north side, the units make sense on their own, but they may need more of a buffer because of the Jiffy Lube.
- West elevation could be considered quite long. At the upper level, could remove units at the upper level or set them back in order to break up the massing of the building.
- East façade could have more that stepping that we see on the other facades.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

- The outdoor/indoor amenity being connected is nice but should flush out the programming some more in terms of on-site private amenity space.
- Relies a lot on the public street to provide amenity. The ground floor terranes could be setback to give a more of a landscape strip for more amenity space.
- Approach with the parking/bicycling parking makes sense but share concern about the blank wall.
- The trail could be connected to the Jiffy Lube site, past that semi private courtyard space.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

- More landscaping on the west side of the building on Upper Mt. Albion.
- Relating the trail of the courtyard. Connected to the trail as well with the existing greenspace.
- Relies a lot on the public street to provide amenity. The ground floor terranes could be setback to give a more of a landscape strip for more amenity space.
- About a 3rd of the frontage on Mount Albion is parking. Would benefit more landscaping in that area instead of a blank wall.
- Making a strong residential statement will improve the street scape.

Summary

- The Panel thanked the applicant and design team for the presentation. The proposal represents a good exciting opportunity for transitional change for a site located at a future LRT station. Encouraged to increase the amount of landscaping being provided on the west side of the building on Upper Mt. Recommended on the north side, the units make sense on their own, but they may need more of a buffer because of the Jiffy Lube. The five units that face onto Albion are on a raised level, in the future this may change to have some commercial. If those were lowered to at grade, it would solve some of the issues with the accessibility.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.