



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday March 9, 2023** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*
Dayna Edwards
Jennifer Mallard

Eldon Theodore
Ted Watson
Jennifer Sisson

Staff Present:

Ken Coit, Director of Heritage and Urban Design
Jana Kelemen, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design
Michael Vortuba, SPM Heritage and Design

Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design
Rino Del Bello, Senior Planner, Development Planning

Others Present

Presentation #1 Zoning By-law & Official Plan Amendment 1866 Rymal Rd East	Ashley Paton , Bousfields Inc. David Falletta , Bousfields Inc. Aphrodite Liaghat , aArchitects
--	--

Regrets:

Joey Giaimo

Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	Development Planner
2:45pm	Mixed Use Development 392 Main St W	Site Plan Approval / Minor Variances	Owner: Main Margaret Inc. Agent and Presentation: Bousfields Inc.	Rino Dal Bello

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.

392 Main St. West

Development Proposal Overview

To construct a new nine storey mixed-use building containing 171 residential dwelling units and 446 square metres of ground floor commercial with a total of 105 parking spaces located within three levels of underground parking.

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- Does the proposal complement surroundings through building design and placement and the provision of pedestrian amenities?
- Does the proposal adequately transition the building mass and height towards the residential properties to the west?
- Does the proposal fit within the context of adjacent residential properties and the context of the street wall & massing along Main Street West and set an appropriate standard for future developments?
- Would revisions required by angular planes measure from 80% of street ROW improve the massing?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

The panel commended the design of the proposed 9-storey building, noting the clear and ambitious design cues were appropriate to the context of Main Street West as a major arterial road and commercial streetscape that is in flux at the moment.

b) Built Form and Character

The panel had equal praise and challenge of the design – noting the rows of glazing and slender fins were very seductive but had technical challenges during detailed design. The panel encouraged the architect to retain this design expression as much as possible – recommending if balconies are desired, Juliet balconies would least interrupt the lines of the concrete fins.

The panel responded to the question of stepping / angular plane on Margaret Street with panelists suggesting applying an angular plane on the Margaret Street ROW would not improve the massing or streetscape, possibly only creating a wedding-cake effect. Another panelist remarked the wedge designed end facing Margaret was a compelling design cue.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

The Panel was generally aligned on the concern over the west property line condition with a zero-lot line proposed noting concerns of overlook and shadow as an interim condition, and a concern or desire for breathing room between the future building.

A small landscape space at the rear of the property was noted as non-functional, and a recommendation for exterior amenity space at the roof or terrace level was put forward by the panel.

There was some concern by panel members for the circulation space at grade around the building given the desire shown to promote an active and vibrant sidewalk. The panel encouraged the architect to work with the available space to maximize impact / benefit on the sidewalk along Main and wrapping the corner to Margaret.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

Notwithstanding the limited space, the panel recommended additional tree planting, site furniture and plantings to ground the building, and careful landscape design coordination to balance circulation across and through the site while still allowing space to be in the landscape.

e) Sustainability

The panel offered encouragement to the architect to develop the technical details of the design in such a manner to retain the visual clarity of the design – noting there would be challenges as well as opportunities for improvements.

Summary

The panel had general agreement the clear design should be retained in detail design, and that the 6-storey finned-podium be kept free of obstructions for maximum impact.

The panel also agreed that some work needed to be done to address the west property set-back into the design, noting a benefit not only for the immediate neighbours, but also to improve both the proposed building and future development to the west with a gap in the street wall providing more opportunity than detracting.

Lastly it was noted the active streetscape and retail at grade were essential to a successful building and should be carefully planned and supported with landscaping and site furniture to activate the pedestrian realm on this major arterial road.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.