



PLANNING A GREAT CITY TOGETHER

CITY OF TORONTO DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES: MEETING 2 – February 22, 2018

The Design Review Panel met on Thursday February 22, 2018, in Committee Room 2, Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, Toronto, at 12:30pm.

Members of the Design Review Panel

Members Present

Gordon Stratford (Chair): Architect, Senior Vice President, Design Director – HOK	✓	
Michael Leckman (Vice Chair): Architect, Principal – Diamond Schmitt Architects	✓	
Carl Blanchaer: Architect, Principal – WZMH Architects	✓	
Dima Cook: Heritage Specialist, Architect, Senior Associate –EVOQ Architecture	✓	
George Dark: Landscape Architect, Urban Designer, Principal – Urban Strategies		
Ralph Giannone: Architect, Principal – Giannone Associates		
Meg Graham : Architect, Principal – superkül	✓	**
Brian Hollingworth: Transportation Engineer, Director – IBI Group	✓	
Jessica Hutcheon: Landscape Architect, Principal – Janet Rosenberg & Studio	✓	
Viktors Jaunkalns: Architect, Principal – MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects		
Joe Lobko: Architect, Urban Designer, Principal – DTAH	✓	
Jenny McMinn: Sustainability Specialist, Managing Director – Urban Equation		
Jim Melvin: Landscape Architect, Principal – PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.	✓	#
Adam Nicklin: Landscape Architect, Principal – PUBLIC WORK		
Heather Rolleston: Architect, Design Director – Quadrangle Architects	✓	
David Sisam: Architect, Principal – Montgomery Sisam Architects	✓	
Sibylle von Knobloch: Landscape Architect, Principle – NAK Design Group	✓	*

* absent for first item

#in conflict first item

**absent for last two items

Design Review Panel Coordinator

Meredith Vaga: Urban Design, City Planning Division

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Panel confirmed minutes of their previous meeting which was held on January 25, 2018 by email.

MEETING 2 INDEX

- i. High Park Apartment Neighbourhood Area Character Study (1st Review)
- ii. 1779-1791 St Clair Avenue West (2nd Review)
- iii. Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study (1st Review)
- iv. Portland Commons – 517 Wellington Street West (1st Review)



HIGH PARK APARTMENT NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA CHARACTER STUDY

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION City Study

PRESENTATIONS:

CITY STAFF Elisabeth Silva Stewart,
Community Planning; Allison
Reid, Urban Design



VOTE No Vote

Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

The purpose of the review is to introduce the Study to the Panel and receive comments on the study direction and draft character defining elements.

Chair's Summary of Key Points

The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for bringing their study forward for review. The study's context offers a unique opportunity to set a character benchmark exemplar; with further work needed in the following areas:

- Look beyond the study boundaries to ensure a character strategy that anticipates broader City issues (e.g.: TOD intensification, rental vs condo residential, public amenity and green space needs, parking reduction, net zero sustainability, etc.).
- To achieve this, move beyond inventory of context to research that leads to a proactive vision.
- Reimagine "towers in park" heritage in a tighter, more intensively developed ground plane; including how to ensure character and quality of green/open space flow between buildings.
- Integrate water management into holistic sustainability as part of defining character.

Panel Comments

The Panel complimented the study team on their work. They commented that the document was really an inventory of the area rather than an analysis. Several members were very happy to see the study, noting that it was really valuable for the community as well as for thinking about the "ever intensifying city".

The Panel thought the study was a remarkable opportunity to address the "Tower in the Park" typology and develop a framework for it regarding development pressures moving forward. They thought the study could have wide reaching implications beyond the study area.

Several members commented that the study was located in a very interesting neighbourhood with distinct characteristics as well as a strong example of the "Tower in the Park" ideal.

Mapping & Study Boundaries

Establish Framework & Develop Neighbourhood as a Typology

The Panel appreciated the mapping that had been brought forward as a part of the study thus far. They encouraged further development of different mapping layers including man-made natural features, classification of different tree species and public vs. private elements. Although they were appreciative of both the qualitative and quantitative analyses proposed, several Panel members advised the study team to be rigorous when analysing these factors.

Assuming that the study would be providing a vision and framework for the area going forward, the Panel encouraged the study team to look at developing the "Tower in the Park" neighbourhood as a typology. A member additionally wondered if the study team could come up with a "prototypical response" for "Towers in the Park"; something they noted had originally been designed to be a prototype itself.

One member suggested creating a Nolli plan of the whole area to further understand the figure ground and neighbourhood context. The 1974 study by the office of George Baird, "On building downtown" was recommended as a good precedent for the study team to look at, particularly the "extremely perceptive" diagrams.

Extend the Study Boundary

The Panel strongly advised that the study boundaries should be extended south to include the High Park frontage. At the very least, they felt that the context from the Bloor West Village Study as well as the broader area should be included in this study. While they appreciated the study boundaries, the Panel thought this was an important overlay and critical to understanding how the site sits in the larger context.

Several members additionally noted that these adjacent pieces influenced the existing study area. They noted that both High Park and Lithuania Park were very influential to the organization and perception of open space in the study area. As well, many members pointed out that extending the boundary would also impact the understanding of the proximity to retail, entertainment and public transit.

Utilize Mapping Technologies

The Panel encouraged the use of mapping technologies such as BIM and ArcGIS to understand both the existing conditions as well as any impact various scenarios or interventions might have on the broader area.

Several members suggested that the technology could be used to map and understand the existing transit, transportation capacity and various neighbourhood statistics (schools, parks, etc.). Many members also wondered if virtual modelling could also be used to analyse the existing towers, including such elements as separation distances, footprints and tower density.

A few members noted that these technologies could additionally be used to capture the difference and transition between the "Tower in the Park" typology and the introduction of a potential streetwall element.

Future Development & Neighbourhood Capacity

Noting that the study would also be looking at how to add density to these "Tower in the Park" sites, a couple members suggested the study could also include an investigation into "community capacity" and what that means for intensification.

One member recommended developing capacity benchmarks from other "Tower in the Park" typologies to understand how this area compares to other precedents of similar typologies, even if only anecdotally. A member suggested this comparison could include number of units, square footage per area etc.

Many members thought there should be an analysis into how point towers would work with the existing slab buildings, noting that it would be a difficult facing condition and different from what typically occurs in Toronto. A few members noted that this was not a site for large podia, and one member indicated that separation distances greater than 25m would be required due to the juxtaposition of the two different building typologies.

Neighbourhood Character

Established Community

The Panel pointed out that the study was examining an established residential neighbourhood with a mix of densities as well as open spaces. Several members suggested adding a layer to the study to look at the existing neighbourhood demographics and building typologies.

Many members felt that this was a desirable area with a mature, enjoyable and appreciated landscape. They encouraged the study team to look into the other existing amenities for the residents of the area. One member commented that the view from the existing buildings was a big question and an important consideration.

Several members thought any future development should be examined for how it would fit within the neighbourhood, how it would alter the landscape, and how it would impact the existing systems such as schools and transit capacity.

"Tower in the Park" Typology

Many Panel members encouraged the study team to consider the compositional strategy of this "Tower in the Park" typology. A member commented that the strategy was "Mondrianesque" and "Miesian". A few members suggested looking into the compositional mindset in the 1960s when the design strategy was implemented, with one member pointing out that it was the "young idealistic architects" who were proposing this design.

One member noted that the compositional strategy for the High Park neighbourhood crosses an immense area.

Several members mentioned that the typology was not a streetwall environment, but was about having towers and slabs in a green space where the streets were secondary. A member felt the study should recognize what was erased from the streets just outside the site, namely those implied transition zones between the streets along with the very important landscape spaces between the buildings.

The Panel felt that there was an interesting opportunity to use the study on similar typologies in Toronto, such as St. James Town, to extrapolate the findings and to begin to understand what works

in one neighbourhood/what doesn't work in another neighbourhood. Many members commented that the "indeterminacy of the space" is what didn't seem to succeed in the original typological experiments, as well as a lack of layering of public/semi-public/semi-private/private spaces between the streets and buildings.

Several members felt that the High Park neighbourhood had been established as a very distinct area, and that the "Tower in the Park" typology was a unique condition that should be celebrated. They felt that the distinct character of the area should be reinforced and maintained.

Cultural & Heritage Considerations

Many members felt that the composition and collection of the buildings in the neighbourhood was what needed to be considered for cultural and heritage value. These members thought it was important that Heritage Preservation Services would be taking part in the study.

A few members commented that the totality of the study area was a designed and planned landscape, where everything within the area had been placed in that orientation for a certain reason. Another member noted that in the site's fulfilled form, the "entire neighbourhood would recognize that it is sitting on one of the greatest resources of park space possibly in the city of Toronto".

Other members suggested that the cultural value should be understood in the context of the compositional strategies, underlying spatial ideals (including the ideal of shared and continuous landscapes), and the idealism of the 1960s.

One member further felt that the study was an opportunity to reflect back culturally as to what the aspirations and objectives of the era were, along with what worked and what did not work, and why.

Landscape & Public Realm

While the Panel acknowledged that the study had to cover a "lot of ground", they thought the public realm was a very important element for the neighbourhood. One member noted that the study was an opportunity to develop a new precedent for dealing with open space on these types of sites.

Open Space

The Panel encouraged the study team to investigate the different open space characteristics. Several members wanted to see more analysis into open spaces that were perceived as public versus those that were seen as private.

One member pointed out that open space is different depending on whether it is looked at as positive open space or residual open space.

A few members suggested looking at the different routes established by the residents along with the existing mid-block connections. One member suggested looking at how the connections functioned with the grade changes, safety concerns and questions of ownership.

A member felt that the public realm seemed underused and residual. They wondered if this was caused by berming as well as by the landscape being regarded as only a "crust over a parking structure".

Streetscape

The Panel was pleased to see the "early thinking" on the streets in the study area, saying that it was "really important and interesting".

Commenting on the narrow existing sidewalks, one member suggested that any new developments should be required to enhance the public realm and sidewalks.

One member pointed out that although they were great spaces, the streets were not designed to modern standards and consequently there may be trade-offs between sidewalks, bicycle lanes, parking, trees etc. when looking at improving the streetscape. They advised incorporating these considerations as early in the process as possible rather than developing "generic cross sections".

A member advised the study team that there needed to be a balance between "desires" and maintaining the existing character of "pretty cool and unique streets".

Some members noted that some of the existing roads were quite wide, and wondered if the study could develop an alternative with less emphasis on the car. One member suggested looking at flex streets whereby portions of the space function as sidewalks during peak periods and parking lanes during off peak times.

Another member pointed out that the original conception of the site was "absolutely not about streets", but rather was about a singular landscape urbanism that in its most realised form "the landscape paths would cross the streets" and not be blocked by "difficult ownership".

Given that the area had not been conceived as a streetwall environment, this member felt that there was an opportunity to create and reinforce the original conceptual, landscape and spatial strategies to develop and refine the existing landscape urbanism.

A different member pointed out the interesting condition of the public and private realm with regards to the "layers of entries" for both vehicles and pedestrians to the towers. They wondered if there was a hierarchy to these spaces or how they would be acknowledged moving forward.

Landscape Typology

Several Panel members felt there should be an examination of the different open space typologies, including what/where existing and future planting would occur. A member noted that the study could include an analysis just of the trees in the area, including placement, paving etc.

Another member pointed out that the reason Austrian Pines had been used throughout the neighbourhood despite not being native species was because due to their shallow roots they could be successfully planted over the parking garages.

A different member was very interested in the separation by the study of natural features and public realm, and wondered if there could be a third hybrid category that included imported "natural" features such as the planted trees.

One member commented that the idea of the original project was a series of towers existing in a unitary landscape. This member felt that the study team should imagine the area as an unfulfilled single landscape that in its fulfilled form would have no fences, obstructing berms or security issues.

Hydrological Impacts

Some members commented that they were pleased that the hydrological study that had been initiated with the Bloor West Village study was going to be expanded to include the High Park Apartment Neighbourhood study area.

One member mentioned that while the hydrology could be an "unseen characteristic" it was a really important piece of the landscape. This member was very interested to see what the influences of the study would have on the wider natural systems.

Shadow Impact

A few members noted that the existing towers already have significant shadow impacts. They felt that the cumulative shading was an important analysis for the study. One member pointed out that the neighbourhood was primarily made up of slab blocks, which are not what the *Tall Buildings Guidelines* point to regarding shadow impacts.

Adjacent Park System

Several members wondered whether there was an opportunity to establish a connecting landscape piece to the large existing adjacent parks, specifically High Park to the south of the study area and Lithuania Park to the north of the study area.

Parking Garage Network

Many members felt that developing a study layer for the existing parking garage network was very "potent", but cautioned the study team that they needed to account for constraints inherent to parking garages.

Several Panel members wondered if the parking garages could become a subset of the landscape in the area. One member suggested that they could also be used to develop new below grade pathway connections.

A member felt the number of parking spaces being provided in the garages should be re-examined, noting that the proximity to transit along with modern car usage could potentially reduce the number of required spaces.

Sustainability

A few members noted that there should be a study direction that specifically looks at energy and climate change. One member suggested the study area could become a case study for the City to look at Net Zero.

Another member recommended that the study team look into offsets on the embodied energy inherent to buildings, such as through tree plantings etc., in the event some of the existing buildings are redeveloped.

A member wondered if the underground parking network could be redeveloped to incorporate electric vehicle parking.

It was also suggested that the streets could be used for stormwater infiltration.

1779-1791 ST CLAIR AVENUE WEST

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW Second Review

APPLICATION Site Plan Approval

PRESENTATIONS:

CITY STAFF Sean Rooney, Community Planning; Allison Reid, Urban Design

DESIGN TEAM SMV Architects

VOTE Support – 10
Non-Support – 1



Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

1. **Public Realm:** The proposed interface between building setback and streetscape with particular focus on the proposed triangular forecourt which is to be designed to accommodate a future road widening along St. Clair.
2. **Open Space:** The design and programming of the proposed at-grade amenity area and pedestrian connections.
3. **Built Form:** The overall composition of the built form with particular focus on the proposed articulation, material expression and response to the building's prominence and view termini.

Chair's Summary of Key Points

The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for the design improvements made since the 1st Review. Further work is needed in the following areas:

- Adjust site plan and landscape strategy along north and south side of building (e.g.: simplified amenity programme, south entry sequence, pie-shaped landscape elements along St. Clair frontage).
- Further develop design to simplify and clarify built form and materiality.
- Provide a higher performing sustainability strategy.

Panel Comments

The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation and drawing package. Several members commented that the material was very detailed and thorough; however, another member felt that the drawing package was lacking information.

The Panel felt the proposal had improved from the last time they saw the project. Some members particularly felt the massing of the building had been improved, but suggested more development was still needed in the landscaping and public realm.

Many members indicated that they were interested to see how the design would continue to evolve moving forward.

Public Realm

Streetscaping of Ford Street & Osler Street

Many members appreciated the idea to continue the front yard character found along Ford St and Osler St; however, they wondered whether there was an opportunity for more occupation of those spaces by the residents of the proposed units fronting the streets to create a porch condition as well as "eyes on the street".

A few members noted that on the west side of the streets the sidewalks were not reaching the 2.1m City standard. They suggested the trees on Ford St. would need to be rethought.

Some members felt the typical streetscape seemed fine with respect to the placement of trees etc. and one member agreed that the long term plan for the streetscape seemed "straightforward and made sense".

Landscaping in the Proposed Triangular Forecourt

Several Panel members pointed out that when the curb along St. Clair Ave W was redone it will necessitate the removal/redoing of the four trees. Reflecting this, one member suggested as an interim solution to keep the island and plant it with trees, noting that the lighting and utilities will impact the removing of the trees as well.

The Panel agreed that the proposed triangular planters located in front of the retail along St. Clair should be removed or located elsewhere. The Panel felt these planters were not "robust enough", were "too busy" and were negatively affecting the retail. One member pointed out that the planters would impede any animation or spill out from the storefronts.

However, another member thought the general idea to introduce separation through landscaping to mitigate the effects of the street was a good one.

The Panel suggested the design team needed to rethink the proposal for the forecourt. One member questioned the purpose of the "kit of parts" being presented for the forecourt area.

A member thought the design team should develop a simpler pedestrian gathering space and nice forecourt to the building. A different member thought redeveloping the area as a gathering space could also support some of the retail, and suggested diversifying the proposed landscaping to include seating.

One member wondered if the planters could be eliminated entirely and the forecourt filled with a bosque of trees, similar to the landscaping at the bend at Spadina Rd and Bloor St. Another member pointed out that it was a "rare occasion" to have that amount of public space available in the corner.

Many members also wanted to see more dimensions for the forecourt as well as the public realm spaces in general.

Ground Floor Amenities

One member noted they appreciated the attention to detail with regards to exploring "optimal locations" for the bicycle parking along with the idea of a bicycle repair shop.

A few members thought the diversity of uses on the ground floor and particularly in the rear was very interesting. One member felt that making spaces that were inboard as well as off the laneway was appropriate for the building.

However, several other members thought there were too many different programmatic elements proposed for the rear space, with one member saying it was too "piecemeal" and divided up.

Many members questioned how the different amenities would ultimately be used. They felt the amenities should be controlled differently to permit a stronger east-west pedestrian connection through the laneway as well as any further connections.

The Panel wanted to see more drawings, including axonometric views, demonstrating how both the rear amenities spaces and the interior spaces would work together as well as how the screening elements would function.

One member questioned the size and use of the open lawn space, and wondered whether there could be more spill out from the indoor amenity into this space. Another member suggested the open lawn and dining area could become something that ran north-south holding the proposed garden plots with a pathway running down the middle. A different member suggested that the garden plots could be moved to the roof.

Proposed Dog Run

While the Panel recognized the importance of providing dog relief areas, they were "doubtful" about the proposal for the dog run. If required, they felt that the dog run was not located in the right place. One member commented that it was a little far from the main door and another member wondered how much the existing neighbours to the south would appreciate the proposed location.

Servicing & Loading

A few members commented on the positive improvements to the servicing and loading from the last iteration they reviewed. One member noted that taking the service space off the lane and inboard was "very appropriate zoning".

Open Space

Laneway Connection

The Panel strongly felt that the laneway system should allow people to exit to Osler St in the east. They noted that the proposal was turning a space with no visual obstructions into a dead-end at the building. A few members also pointed out there should be a connection to the school and Wadsworth Park at Osler St. Many members recommended developing additional ways to "vent people out of the lane".

Several Panel members felt that a pattern of rear laneways would start occurring in the neighbourhood. They pointed out that having no pedestrian access in one block was not a good precedent to set, and instead the proposal should include a walkway for public use to contribute to a future broader network of laneways.

One member commented that the view corridor of the existing laneway was really interesting. They wondered if a visual amenity could be developed for the community through a feature such as screening for the approach from the north-south portion of the laneway.

A member advised that the lane should be a concrete finish to accommodate truck turnings from the loading area.

Develop Linkage North-South to St. Clair

The Panel felt the design team should further develop the north-south connection through the building lobby. One member thought this connection could reinforce the linkage between Osler St and St Clair Ave W and another member thought that the presence of the school off Osler St would mean that route would be well utilized.

On the other hand, a different member felt that while it could be an interesting community amenity, they questioned how much the route would actually be used. Another member thought a north-south link was a very positive aspect, but thought that ideally it should be located further east to line up with the existing laneway.

Some members wondered whether more interior-exterior connections could be made, especially to the indoor amenity elements. One member thought the linkages through the middle of the block should be reconceived and opened up to be "more urbane and humane".

A few members advised that if the connections could not be expanded there should still be a better terminus to the existing north-south laneway.

Road Widening & Creation of Landmarks

One member questioned the viability of widening the road, pointing out that it would involve extensive work to redo an entire underpass used by both streetcars and cars, as well as a very expensive intervention.

It was also noted that approaching from the west, everything past the Stock Yards is industrial land until the site of this building. A member pointed out that the proposal would then mark the beginning of the residential neighbourhood.

Built Form

Building & Site Context

Many members suggested looking more at both the physical context as well as the specific cultural context that the proposal would be operating in. Physically, a member suggested investigating "what makes this building a good neighbour to the surroundings and an appropriate development for the block". A few other members noted the proposal was lacking context for the broader site.

Culturally, a member recommended investing in "the poetic character of materials" as well as developing the parti or narrative of the building beyond massing and articulation.

Building Articulation & Massing

Several Panel members, while noting that it was still a work in progress, complimented the design team on a huge improvement in the architectural language. One member felt there was a "robustness" to the architecture. Another member was pleased to see the entrance had been relocated. A different member appreciated that the building fit into the sectional angular planes.

However, despite the improvements made to the massing and articulation, several members still found the building to be too big and bulky. One member thought the design team should further develop the building to be less "brooding" and move towards a "lighter" architecture.

Another member noted that while the building was more articulated the design team should find more substantial ways to "break up" the masses on such a substantial development in a low rise neighbourhood. The member also felt that breaking up the masses would help clarify and develop the ground floor amenities and laneway connections, areas that are critical to a sense of entry and building porosity.

Looking at the slot windows shown on the cover image in the drawing package, one member felt that architecturally they were an outlier to the vocabulary established throughout the rest of the building. This member suggested employing a consistent architectural language by designing either a solid wall or corner windows at that location.

Rationalize the Plan

A few members pointed out that when looking at the floor plans, particularly at the north-west corner of the 7th floor and up, there would be "some very difficult areas" to plan with respect to suite layouts. A member additionally noted that as designed the interior corner units had very little exterior wall for a quite large area.

To resolve this, some members wondered why the south line of the building didn't follow the angle on the north more closely. One member pointed out that without an angled wall there wouldn't be as many "difficult areas" to plan and instead there would be more freedom with respect to gross floor area.

A member felt that if the plan was rationalized in a more equally double loaded way the design team would be able to better sculpt the top of the building; introduce more terracing in the rear; cover the loading near the base; and alleviate the "quite dark" elbow balconies.

Ground Floor Plan & Main Entrance

Many members appreciated the thinness of the ground floor plan, particularly at the lobby, noting that at the main entrance there is the ability to see right into the garden. However, the Panel advised that the substantial overhang located at the entrance should be removed to create a grander and more transparent urban entrance as well as connecting piece to the laneway beyond.

Break up the Building Massing at the Entrance

While the Panel was glad to see the use of a midrise typology, they thought there needed to be a more noticeable break in the two massings at the entrance to counter the resulting very long building façade along St. Clair. Several members further felt that a colouration difference at the entrance would also help to break up the building massing.

Develop a Rhythm

One member advised the design team to develop a rhythm to help with the massing and building composition. This member noted that a rhythm is established after five repetitions, and after five there is the ability to make an exception.

Looking at the rendering shown on pg. 7 of the drawing packages, the member pointed out the building only has four bays and 4 incremental setbacks along the St. Clair facade, and that none of them were the same size. By developing a rhythm, the entrance could become a "great" exception and the corner piece could be seen in the context of an established pattern.

The member thought this would additionally help to break up the mass of the building as the regularity of a pattern would create a cadence, drawing the eye to "see the monument, not the pieces".

Anchor the Building to the Ground

Many members felt that the building had lost its connection to the ground due to the cantilevered elements. Several members mentioned that in this iteration the building was functioning as a very heavy brick mass sitting on a very light retail base.

The members wondered if there were other opportunities to better anchor the building to the ground. One member suggested bringing the brick down in strategic places the way had been done at the entrance.

Another member thought there needed to be more information and development regarding how the building would work at grade through the inclusion of detailed elevations etc.

Materiality

Several members appreciated the use of masonry throughout the building, commenting that the materiality choices had "promise". A member thought masonry gave a "whole new way of exploring the building's architecture and formal type". Another member suggested a play of materials would help bring together the different pieces of the project.

One member wondered if the design team could use the masonry to build up a textural story. The member noted that in the rendering on pg. 7 of the drawing package there were a number of elements in the upper portion of the building that began to suggest an articulation of the materiality that was indicating a texture rather than a cladding. They specifically pointed to the "extra deep fins" across much of the top of the façade, as well as the ribbed bricks in the opposing corner and the cantilevered element on the east side.

This member felt that these textures should be used to develop a stronger compositional idea through a greater intensity of material exploration. They thought that pushing the materiality choices would distinguish the project as a "material exploration in the midrise building type" and could inform the articulation of the massing.

One member thought there could be a colour difference in the two massings on either side of the entrance bay. Another member was concerned about the design team's intention to choose bricks to reflect a mosaic of the existing neighbourhood. While this member thought having a range of brick was appropriate, they cautioned the design team about generating a "catalogue of bricks".

A member advised against breaking up the brick with a thin piece of metal cladding coming down at the entrance. They felt the design team should reinforce language of stepping back the brick base

with something lighter on top. This member thought the brick screen covering up the mechanical at the north-west corner also didn't fit with the material language and recommended covering it up.

Sustainability

A few members questioned why the project was only aiming for Tier 1 for the Toronto Green Standards. One member felt that was "too low" to be a benchmark for these buildings.

GOLDEN MILE SECONDARY PLAN STUDY

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW First Review

APPLICATION City Study

PRESENTATIONS:

CITY STAFF Russell Crooks and Emily Caldwell, Community Planning; Sasha Terry, Urban Design

DESIGN TEAM SvN Architects + Planners

VOTE No Vote



Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

1. **Placemaking:** What physical features and economic functions of the Golden Mile are important in defining and strengthening placemaking in this area?
2. **Alternative Organizing Approaches:** Three "Organizing Approaches" have been presented: The Gateway; The Central Hub and Clusters. What approach or combination of approaches could best achieve a new complete community based upon the draft vision and guiding principles?
3. **Victoria Park/Eglinton Triangle (Parkette):** Do you have any recommendations with respect to the parkette on the southeast corner of Eglinton and Victoria Park and how the node should be contemplated given the location of a future Eglinton Crosstown LRT station at the intersection and prominence of the intersection as an entry point into the Golden Mile?

Chair's Summary of Key Points

The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for sharing their work to date; and appreciates the complexity and challenges presented by the study's context and parameters. There is significant potential to reinvent the concept of a vibrant TOD mixed use community with this study, but to realise this possibility work is needed in the following areas:

- Shift from tactical to strategic thinking, with a big-picture vision focus on:
 - Establishing a high-level place-making story... "what will set the Golden Mile apart from other places?"
 - Create weave of streets, blocks and open/green spaces as the urban stage for place-making story.
 - Confirm the right mix of uses to support the story; thinking outside the box and proactively considering emerging and future trends related to all uses (e.g.: workplace of future, right degree of civic/green amenity, net zero sustainability, etc.).

- To help achieve the above re-set the study boundaries to encompass all the ingredients for future success; including strong higher education contribution.

Panel Comments

The Panel thanked the study team for their presentation and several members noted familiarity with the study area. The Panel commented that the scale of the study was very large and "a huge undertaking". Many members indicated that they found the project very challenging to review.

A few members pointed out that the study was of a very significant site that will be completely reimaged over the coming decades, and that the future of the area needed to be carefully thought about. One member complimented the "complete, connected, prosperous" terminology proposed by the study team and felt it was a good starting point; however, other members noted that the drawing package was missing standard urban design development drawings.

One member recommended that City staff and consultant teams across city studies should have consistent methodologies and analytic tools to collectively build up understanding between the areas of the city.

Placemaking

Need to Develop an Overarching Vision for the Area

Several members advised developing an overarching vision or idea for the Golden Mile as the first step. They elaborated that once there was a strong initial image for the area it will be easier to establish specific placemaking elements. One member noted that the study vision presented in the drawing package was "a little dry" and "could be speaking about anywhere in Toronto".

A few members felt that the goals outlined in the drawing package to develop the area as "immediately identifiable as a distinct place" and "both a community and a destination" would be the biggest challenge in redeveloping the Golden Mile. One member recommended starting by looking at the key uses of the area and where they were headed in the future. Another member suggested looking at the "key catalytic sites".

One member commented that the neighbourhood needed a stronger "heart". They noted that the area was a major node for Toronto that had the potential to transform into a major east-end hub like the Danforth. A member agreed that the neighbourhood should be welcoming to "a variety of people" and be less car-oriented. Another member suggested looking at precedents of mixed-use shopping centres where people live, work, and play in the same spaces.

Intensify and Give Character to Eglinton Ave. E.

Many members pointed out that redevelopment traditionally begins on the arterial road. These members felt that developing the core character of Eglinton Ave. and looking at the future distribution of density along that street was a logical first objective for the future for the area.

Gateways & Potential Placemaking Moments

Some Panel members felt that the gateway idea was "okay" but did not feel there was enough there to constitute creating "place" exclusively through gateways.

Several members suggested various potential placemaking moments. One member thought if the mall and public realm space in the west end was substantially redeveloped it could become the Golden Mile gateway.

A few members suggested the study team look at the possibilities for the future of the site given the cultural shift in how people work, shop and use cars, with one member suggesting the future of the area could be receptive to "the radical change that it seems ... is coming".

Use Street and Blocks in Placemaking

Several members felt that street and block patterns lay "at the heart of placemaking". One member pointed out that the way the streets/blocks are established can begin to define completely new places over long periods of time.

A member wondered if the Golden Mile could use topography to better define the area. This member suggested introducing another layer in the study to analyze the topography in the Golden Mile. They felt the topography could be used to develop the block network.

Alternative Organizing Approaches

Develop a Street and Block Pattern

Many members were concerned that the alternative organizing approaches were "false options" and noted that they were having difficulty providing feedback to the study team. A few members pointed out that the conceptual diagrams shown were too diagrammatic relative to the scale of the study area and too abstract to develop a useful response.

Some members strongly advised the study team to establish a street and block pattern noting that it was "the biggest challenge" and "the biggest issue" for the Golden Mile. One member pointed out that without a "reasonable" pattern there wouldn't be a way to break down the "currently giant sites" into incremental developments to be built up over time.

A few members further suggested developing a secondary road network parallel to Eglinton Ave.

Use Future Transit Nodes

Many members thought that the future LRT stations along Eglinton Ave were "degree zero" and the most obvious way to begin to organize the study area through the development of transit nodes. One member pointed out that there were five LRT stops proposed in a mile of very low density along with a lot of surface parking that could be converted to something else.

A member suggested that first increasing density at the transit nodes could transform the use of the street, similar to how the relatively minor intervention of the King St. Pilot Project transformed King St. downtown.

One member wondered if people could be attracted to the Golden Mile by developing a new "character defining feature" for the neighbourhood focused on bicycles. This member posited that Eglinton Ave. could have considerable amounts of land dedicated to safe cycling, bike paths, great trees and shopping bicycles similar to the ones used on the Toronto Islands.

Density Locations are Premature

Some members felt that delineating density locations across the Golden Mile was premature. A member pointed out that there were a number of larger landowners in the study area who would all want to be treated equally with respect to future development. The member further pointed out that the landowners should also be incentivized to encourage the area's transformation.

It was also noted that the area needed to have viable block and street patterns before density locations could be determined.

Study Boundary Should Reflect the Physical Realities of the Area

The Panel advised that the study boundary should reflect the physical realities of the area rather than "an abstract planning construct on employment areas". A few members further pointed out that while it was important to be aware of zoning, the physical ownership configurations should override the planning distinction.

Several members recommended that the study area extend south to Comstock Rd and encompass both sides of Ashtonbee Rd. including the institutional uses to the north. One member pointed out that the current boundaries may also be orphaning some employment uses between the hydro R.O.W. and the study limits.

Distinguish Between North & South Sides of Eglinton Avenue East

The Panel was pleased that the study bridged both sides of Eglinton Ave. as opposed to terminating in the middle of a street. However, many members noted that this study was unusual due to the differentiation of uses north of Eglinton Ave. versus south of Eglinton Ave. It was felt that the study needed to better recognize these different conditions within the area.

Several members felt that realistically it was only feasible to connect north-south across Eglinton Ave. at certain locations such as at Eglinton Square along the western edge of the study area. These members thought that the study needed to recognize that for the bulk of the Golden Mile, Eglinton Ave. would function as a boundary between communities on either side of it, which should then be developed accordingly.

Conceptual Vision for Eglinton Avenue East

Several Panel members suggested that the study team needed to develop a "much richer conceptual idea" for the Golden Mile area along with a better defined future urban experience for Eglinton Ave. A few members questioned whether Eglinton Ave. was envisioned to have a streetwall condition or a built form experience more about setbacks and large green/open spaces in front of the buildings.

One member pointed out that it was very important to look at the different stages of development over time when developing the conceptual vision. Another member thought that the vision for Eglinton Ave. needed more distinction between the north and south side of the street.

A few members felt that the study team needed to develop a clearer overarching organization for the buildings along Eglinton Ave. along with stronger public realm connections. Many members wondered if there was an opportunity to reinforce pedestrian and cycling networks on Eglinton Ave.

North-South Connections across Eglinton Avenue East

Several members felt that the study needed to figure out how to improve the north-south connections across Eglinton Ave. A few members pointed out that after the LRT is established safe connections will become even more critical.

Greenway & Open Space Connections

The Panel felt there should be a large amount of open space connections established in the Golden Mile. Several members advised that the connections should extend to the north and south boundaries of the area as the employment lands will be intensifying over time.

A few members wondered if instead of having the greenway connection link to Victoria Park in the west it could connect into the existing green space on the east side to have a "constant greenway".

A member advised the study team to establish the optimal locations of the future parks early in the process and secure the land now.

Commercial View Corridors

A member cautioned the study team that preserving the existing commercial view corridors could become an issue for the effective development of the area. They pointed out that 20 year leases mean that this could be an issue for a "very long time" and result in difficulty developing Eglinton Ave. unless the leases are "completely renegotiated".

To avoid this, the member advised the study team to develop as the first step "the biggest possible vision" for the Golden Mile to anchor all the other decisions as well as become the first move for everything else to be organized around. They noted that a big intervention would present something for the existing landowners to be able to get behind as well as reconceive the possibilities of the site.

Some examples of large site-changing interventions included the kilometer long park at Vaughan Metropolitan Centre or Rail Deck Park in downtown Toronto.

Alternative C: Cluster

Looking exclusively at the three development options, many Panel members felt that Alternative C, the "Cluster" option was the most successful. One member noted that a gateway or cluster typology was the most realistic because the study area was too big for a central hub condition. Another member pointed out that the study boundary was "somewhat artificial" and so there would not be a natural central hub.

A few members appreciated the "potentially strong idea about landscape" presented in the cluster option which they thought had the potential to tie the area together. One member did not think the LRT alone was enough to unite the Golden Mile.

Another member thought that the tall and midrise density proposed between Victoria Park Ave. and Pharmacy Ave. could become a potential location for a "built form threshold" on either side of Eglinton Ave. A different member suggested the height distribution throughout Regent Park could be a good precedent for this study.

One member was concerned that the cluster option was putting too much focus on an area off of the main arterial and wanted to see more development to the street and block network to better understand the proposed combination of road network and open space.

A different member advised the study team to develop a series of Nolli plans depicting the figure ground phased through the proposed transformations over years. This member suggested the maps could become a roadmap to understanding the typologies and framework proposed for the area.

Location of Buildings along the Landscape Connection

Some members liked the placement of the taller and midrise buildings predominantly in the north of the study area along the east-west landscape connection. One member noted that this placement would allow the buildings facing the landscaping to be mainly in sunshine with shadow falling to the north.

Surface Parking

Several members noted that the large amount of existing surface parking was a large issue that will need to be addressed and substantially reduced for the area to be able to be transformed.

Density in the Study Area

A few members felt the density diagrams should be simplified to illustrate a "finer grain concept" as opposed to the "big ideas" presented in the drawing package. They felt a "fabric of ideas" would better support an area of such a significant size.

Victoria Park / Eglinton Triangle (Parkette)

Reconfigure the Road Network at Victoria Park Avenue & O'Connor Drive

Several Panel members thought there was a lot of merit in reworking the roadway at the Eglinton Triangle to improve both the road network as well as the public realm spaces. With respect to the parkette, the Panel agreed that it would be difficult to have a successful park space under the existing conditions with streets bounding three sides.

While the Panel felt that the parkette would function better by reworking the street system and removing at least one of the road edges to allow the area "to be a part of the proposed fabric", a few members pointed out that as the study was so vast, the parkette was only a small element within a very large area.

One member thought the idea of connecting O'Connor Dr. deserved more exploration, but cautioned the study team that if the roadway became "too big and oversized" it would detract from the "great street that Eglinton will be in the future".

Another member thought that from a land use perspective "Alternative B" was a good solution. They felt that if O'Connor Dr. was stopped at Victoria Park Ave. some of the road traffic and density could be diverted to the south. However, a member cautioned the study team that traffic from O'Connor Dr. should not be dumped into the residential area in the south.

Integrate Parkette with Planned LRT Stop

A few members wondered if the parkette space could be incorporated into the future LRT stop located at the triangle. One member suggested the parkette could become part of the station's forecourt. Another member thought that "it would be wonderful if the LRT stop was in the middle of a park". A member thought the park space could be "very Parisian".

Continuation of Linear Park along North Side of Eglinton Avenue

One Panel member pointed out that along the north side of Eglinton Ave. at Yonge St. there was a proposal to introduce a linear park. They wondered if there was an opportunity for a linear park system to become a unifying element for Eglinton Ave.; a "green mile" and "a total contrast to the [existing] parking lots" along the Golden Mile.

PORTLAND COMMONS – 517 WELLINGTON STREET WEST

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW	First Review
APPLICATION	Rezoning
<i>PRESENTATIONS:</i>	
CITY STAFF	Nathaniel Baker, Community Planning; Nasim Adab, Urban Design
DESIGN TEAM	Sweeny&Co Architects
VOTE	Refine – 2 Redesign – 8



Introduction

City staff outlined the project history, existing and future context, and planning framework. Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following key issues:

- Articulation, massing and distribution of height on the site and within the immediate context
- The height of the proposed building within the King-Spadina West Precinct
- Relationship and transition to low-rise buildings along Portland and within Draper Street HCD
- Relationship of the lower levels of the proposal with the existing heritage building face along Portland
- Overall impact of the proposed building on the public realm, streets, sidewalks and Victoria memorial

Chair's Summary of Key Points

The Panel would like to thank the proponent team for their high-quality presentation, heritage preservation and ambitious new workplace strategy which has potential. However, more work is needed in the following areas to match ambition with a design that is fully sensitive to its future occupants and surrounding context:

- Reduce aggressive density, height and scale of development; especially relative to impact on context east of site, and shadowing on surroundings.
- Improve built form transition between south tower and building along Portland.
- Reconsider overhangs to improve access to natural light and sun for mid-block outdoor spaces.
- Consider shifting parking/loading access off Portland.
- Provide detailed information regarding landscape strategy, wind study and survivability of mid-block retail.

Panel Comments

The Panel thanked the design team for their presentation and commented that they thought the proposed programming of office space and retail would be "an excellent fit and welcome to the

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

neighbourhood". Many members expressed familiarity with the area and were very supportive of the ambition to bring more office space to the neighbourhood as well as the retention of the existing heritage buildings.

The Panel noted that while they appreciated seeing the project at an early stage, there was a lack of general information in the presentation and drawing package with regards to many of the proposed spaces and effect on the surrounding context. They felt that the proposal was "very much a work in progress" and were looking forward to seeing the project again as it continues to evolve.

Built Form

Building Articulation

While the Panel noted that it was good to see designs early in the process, several members felt that the architectural articulation for this proposal was "late to the process". A few members commented that the "straight on" elevations seemed to show the general intent and "bones" of the design, while the renderings were more of a rendition of what the project "could be".

Many members felt that instead of the proposed prismatic architectural expression, this project could be a great opportunity to use articulation and architectural expression to shape something interesting to help the heritage conservation district in which the proposal was located.

Articulation on the Front Street Elevation

Many members found the articulation on the elevation along Front St. very intriguing. One member thought it could turn into something "very unusual" and felt the articulation was representative of the kind of users the design team was proposing would use the site.

Another member thought it would be interesting to see some of the materials from the Portland St. elevation carried over to the Front St. façade. They suggested it would establish a connection and interaction between the two architecturally disparate faces.

Articulation on the Portland Street Elevation

Several members felt the proposed building articulation needed further design development to ensure it properly responded to its context and many members commented that the articulation on the Portland St. façade was out of scale with the surrounding buildings.

While not suggesting it as a design solution, a member noted that the generic elevations with "very little articulation" shown by the design team were "quieter" and more respectful of the heritage buildings when compared against the renderings of this elevation.

Programming

A few Panel members questioned what an architecture of "new employment" and "new economy" would be, but cautioned that it did not "automatically translate into a new articulation". One member, looking at the heritage component, suggested the design team look at the way lobbies, cafes and exterior spaces are currently being used by businesses, as well as how small companies expand and grow.

Several members questioned how the proposal worked on the ground floor. One member commented that while the inner mews/courtyard space was interesting, it was not clear how it related to the ground floor or why there was no direct access from the building into the main

courtyard space. A different member thought that the retail at grade also needed clarification between what was retail versus lobby spaces.

Another member noted that while the drawing package was showing retail uses, the retail was not subdivided. This member advised the design team that double sided retail is "problematic" and needed further thought as to how those spaces would be marketed. The member further noted that it would be detrimental to the success of the courtyard/mews space if those retail spaces failed.

Shadow Impact

While many members appreciated the intention to sculpt the building to minimize the net shadow on the Tier 1 Victoria Memorial Park, the Panel strongly felt that the proposal and material shown should include the full range of shadow studies. One member pointed out that the studies depicting shading on September 21 don't fully illustrate the full shadow impact as there will be deeper shadows and greater effects at other times of the year such as in the wintertime when sun penetration is especially important.

Several members also pointed out that the shadowing of the historical Draper St by the proposal is a big issue that is not currently being addressed or acknowledged by the design team. One member, looking at the very articulated south elevation suggested that façade could become a "generating origin" to control light access into Draper St.

Massing & Distribution of Height

While many Panel members thought the general massing intent was good in terms of its relationship to the surroundings, the Panel strongly felt that the proposal was overall too tall, located too close to the existing heritage buildings and architecturally too "oppressive" and "looming and daunting", particularly on Portland St.

Several members also pointed out that there are "precious few open spaces" in Toronto, and thought there should be no incremental shadow on those spaces due to height encroachment for even 10-20 minutes during the day.

One member was confused about the synthesis between the massing of the tower form and the midrise form, particularly noting that there were elements organized vertically and linearly in a north-south direction "colliding" with a tower oriented on the east-west axis. They additionally noted this was in contrast to the orientation of the nearby Well project.

Another member suggested a shown rendering that seemed to hint that the gap between the two buildings would occur over multiple storeys with a bridge-like structure above supporting it was a more appealing architecture and provided a stronger transition in the massing than the low entrance between the two buildings shown in other drawings.

Many members felt that lifting the proposed building above the existing heritage buildings, particularly along the east elevation seemed "overdone". A few members further noted that the courtyard spaces underneath seemed very tall and wondered whether the overhang elements could be lowered to reduce the overall height of the proposal. These members noted that it would be a tradeoff for the spaces underneath, but if reduced the new building could still hover over the heritage architecture while reducing the shadow impact on Draper St. and Victoria Memorial Park.

Looking further at the separation between Draper St. and the building on site, some members thought the tall building proposed along Front St. would impact both the understanding of the historical Draper St. as well as the views along the street towards Front St.

A few Panel members agreed that the prominence of the future potential Rail Deck Park and resulting transformation of Front St. into a civic oriented "front street" fronting a major park warranted the proposed "scale of gesture" and "multiplicity of articulations" proposed in the design, but many members thought the massing and articulation along Front St. needed to be further developed to support these intentions.

The members felt that the streetscape should be better activated at grade. One member suggested pushing the massing back to the first column line, while other members suggested bringing the cafés and retail uses back to grade.

King-Spadina West Precinct Context

Many Panel members felt the design rationale with respect to the organizing parti of the three streets (the civic, community and heritage streets) made sense. One member complimented the design team on the "sidedness" of the proposal. However, some members indicated that they didn't find the current proposal successful in terms of urban design and recommended and the Panel agreed that the project needed further development.

One member pointed out that when travelling eastbound on Niagara St, there is "a rare instance of a t-intersection with a new building". This member felt the architecture should respond to that unique broader context and "façade circumstance".

Another member thought there was an opportunity for the project to contribute to the architectural language of the neighbourhood, saying the area could become similar to Michigan Avenue in Chicago.

Regarding the height of the proposal, although 16-17 storey buildings are fairly common in the neighbourhood, a member pointed out that refers to residential floors, and not the larger commercial floor-to-floor heights. This member felt the existing residential datum was a good one to try to sustain and maintain in the project block, including on the south façade.

Public Realm

Many members thought the organizing parti and design rationale of the three different streets (civic, community and heritage) made sense. One member appreciated the "spirit" of these design intentions, but wanted to see more detailed information on how it would actually work.

Proposed Courtyard & Mews

One member thought there could be an "interesting tension" between the existing heritage buildings and the new building in the proposed central courtyard. However, several members noted there was a lack of information regarding the character of the proposed spaces.

The Panel was concerned about the quality of the public realm spaces due to the proposed overhang from the building above, which a few members felt was "looming" over the spaces below. Other members wondered how much of the ground plane would be covered by the building above and several members were critical about the amount of sunlight that would be able to get into the proposed spaces.

Many members suggested that the overhang could be pulled back to allow for more light. One member stated that without the "extra piece of slab architecture overhanging the courtyard space the project would be much more successful". Regarding lowering the overhang to reduce the overall massing and building height, many members cautioned that such a move could have a negative impact on the quality of light in the spaces.

Some members wanted to see sun and wind studies to better understand the quality of the spaces and whether vegetation could grow there. Many members questioned whether the courtyard or mews would be comfortable spaces or successful from both the perspective of the landscape and public realm or of the heritage buildings facing the space. One member advised the design team to show precedents of successful spaces with similar light conditions.

Several members thought the landscaping and planting strategy should be rethought. One member pointed out that because the floors of the existing heritage building were not aligned with grade, the resulting grade difference in the central courtyard would be an issue. They felt the design team should develop an "innovative" design solution to deal with and incorporate the grade changes.

Another member felt that the courtyard could be an interesting space and didn't have to be a traditional landscape space. The Panel thought that the spaces needed more design development.

Transition of Building Typologies along Portland Street

Looking at the transition of building typologies, a few members wondered whether one level of articulation could be removed from the building along Portland St. to create a larger setback. By removing some of the articulation they thought the building could then be lowered by a floor to enhance light access to the street and Victoria Memorial Park.

Another member that the relationship between the design proposal and the existing low rise buildings seemed "relatively deftly handled" but found it hard to comment conclusively without full information around materiality, details etc.

Parking & Loading

One Panel member noted that the 350 parking spaces was a lower rate than they had initially thought, calling it "essential parking".

Some members thought the parking and loading access should be moved to Portland St. One member noted that while they could buy Portland St. as a pedestrian street, Front St. will be a major pedestrian street as well. Another member pointed out that with the access located on the major arterial of Front St., vehicles will use Draper St. as a shortcut.

A member felt that it would better serve the project to have green space where the ramp is currently located on Front St. Another member agreed that with the parking entrance on Portland St. the "two green spaces idea would seem more viable".

Landscape

A few members thought the landscape needed further design development. One member didn't think the proposed landscape spaces were successful commenting that there were too many grade differences and things happening in the spaces.

One member thought that the treatment along Wellington St. was promising and particularly liked the "great setback". This member felt there was an opportunity for public occupation in that space and suggested incorporating amenities such as seating, bicycle parking etc.

Another member wanted to see more development to the landscape along Portland St. This member noted that there was also a discrepancy between the plan and some of the renderings at Portland St. They encouraged clarification of the building massing and landscaping on the Portland St. façade.

Intersection Wellington Street / Portland Street

While many Panel members appreciated that the proposal was trying to make a connection to Victoria Memorial Park, one Panel member wondered if the whole intersection at Portland St. and Wellington St. could be explored as a larger connection for the project. The member noted that the area has a distinct character and "really great energy" with the park, active uses and heritage buildings.

Heritage Considerations

Several Panel members commended the design team on the full retention of the heritage buildings, calling it "an incredibly positive" move for the project as well as a huge step forward both for this site and for establishing a good precedent for other projects in the area.

One member didn't think the overhanging portion of the proposal respected the heritage of the existing building and if implemented thought the heritage building would become "a dark corner of the site". A member noted that the west elevation of the heritage building facing the proposed courtyard was very nice and thought it could be more exposed than currently proposed.

Draper Street HCD

Many members felt that the transition between the proposed building and the historical Draper St. needed further development and consideration.

One member noted that as shown there is a "harsh wall" proposed along the Draper St. façade spanning the entire height of the building. The member pointed out that when looking at the height elevation along Front St. the western tower of The Well "defer[s] down to Draper St." by stepping down several times. They thought this project either needed to make a similar gesture or be moved to the west.

Another member pointed out that the transition from the existing heritage building on the site to Draper St. was already significant. They then suggested the proposed height and massing would be adversely affecting the light circumstances on Draper St.

A different member wanted to see eye-level views from Draper St. to better understand "the backdrop and impact of the building proposal".