Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) Comments
Date: 12/2/2020

Item #	Question	Response
Panel Questions		
1	How close is the proposed development to the nearest park and was that park designed/planned to accommodate this level of density? Are there parks within walking distance from this location? • The lands immediately to the north were planned to be a park and open space area as part of Station West Phase 1. Hidden Valley Park is nearby, exact distance unknown. • The project team also clarified that a decision has not yet been made about making the proposed open space on the northeast corner of Option 1 a privately-owned public space; it is currently considered a private amenity space.	The nearest park is the proposed park immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property, at the end of Cooke Boulevard. Hidden Valley Park approximately 500 metres to the southwest of the subject property. Grove Park and Aldershot Park are approximately 630 and 800 metres respectively to the northeast. Lasalle Park is approximately 730 metres to the southeast. With the exception of the adjacent proposed park, the other parks all exist and were conceived of prior to the redevelopment of the lands of which the subject property is a part. The proposed open space on the subject property is conceived of as a private amenity space. It has been designed as an open and inviting space with a variety different landscape features, including a large lawn and a stepped seating area facing Cooke Boulevard.
2	Are there any long-term plans for Waterdown Road, such as widenings?	Any plans to upgrade Waterdown Road are outside the purview of the proposed development and are not triggered by the proposal.
3	Who developed the lands to the east?	Lands to the east were also developed by Adi as Phase 1 of the StationWest development.
4	What is the rationale behind the two options? O • The project architect acknowledged that there is a lot of shadow on the ground level open space. He explained that Option 2 was developed first, and then the team looked at what it would be like to free up a corner. The project architect felt that the difference between 30 and 40 storeys is not noticeable, but a parkette is noticeable.	A preferred option was chosen. It consists of 3 buildings on two podiums. It includes the private amenity space adjacent to the proposed public park north of the subject site.
5	There seems to be an assumed density for the site; where does that come from?	No change to this response. The tall building form is anticipated in the area near the GO station. The density is a result of the

Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) Comments
Date: 12/2/2020

Item #	Question	Response
	• The project team explained that the proposed density is based on the client's desire for higher densities and proximity to the GO station, not the City. The site was always intended to have higher densities than Phase 1.	appropriate built form in proximity to higher-order transit and based on the surrounding land use context which includes sufficient separation from lower density residential areas to mitigate shadowing impacts.
6	Since this area is close to transit, a mix of uses and a more active uses at grade would be desirable. Were café or offices ever considered? • The project team explained that no commercial is contemplated at grade at this time, and that this development is within walking distance of Plains Road.	Commercial uses are now included in the proposed development. A 231 square metre retail/commercial space, and an associated outdoor space are proposed at the corner of Masonry Court and Cooke Boulevard. Parking for the retail space is provided on site in the ground floor parking area. This ground-level space may also accommodate other permitted non-residential uses in the MXC zone such as office and service commercial uses.
7	What types of unit sizes are contemplated? Larger sized units are generally encouraged. • The project manager explained that the majority of units will not be studio units. The focus will be on two-bedroom and one-bedroom-plus-den units.	No change to this response. 74.6% one-bedroom and one-bedroom plus den, 25.4% two-bedroom and two-bedroom plus den.
Panel Advice		
1	Public Realm - What design strategies could be used to encourage active transportation by residents of this development, and ensure a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented public realm along Masonry Court, Cooke Boulevard and Waterdown Road, in light of the grade changes along Masonry and Waterdown and the planned future pedestrian connection to the GO station at the north terminus of Cooke Boulevard? How should site and podium design relate to the Waterdown/Masonry and Cooke/Masonry intersections?	Option 1, with the open space facing Cooke Boulevard adjacent to the proposed public park was selected as the preferred alternative. The podium elements have been designed with both street facing and courtyard facing lobby entrances. As noted above, a retail/commercial space and an associated outdoor space adjacent to the intersection of Masonry Court and Cooke Boulevard have been provided. No residential units are proposed at grade facing the Masonry Court or Cook Boulevard frontages, as recommended. Detailed streetscape plans have been developed for all street frontages and indicate the presence of generous sidewalks and street tree planting. Residential units are proposed at the second

Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) Comments
Date: 12/2/2020

Item #	Question	Response
	All Panel members felt that although Option 1 is generally more supportive of active transportation and a vibrant streetscape than Option 2, the inward-focused configuration of both options currently does not provide the opportunity to create a positive interface with the street. The Panel recommended that the podiums be turned outwards to address the streets, with atgrade entrances, lobbies, and retail space facing the streets. Amenity space facing the street would also assist with enlivening the streets. The Panel felt that since transit users will likely move along Masonry Court and Cooke Boulevard, at-grade treatment of these streets is most important, and residential uses along these streets may not be appropriate. Building shadows on Cooke should also be minimized. The Panel suggested that a fulsome consideration of the surrounding context, including the future conditions of Waterdown Road, would be beneficial for informing how the building should address the streets. The Panel suggested providing active recreational uses in the proposed open space area to complement the future, likely passive, public park (e.g. children's play area and/or dog parks). The Panel felt that having residential uses face the public stormwater pond and park is desirable for eyes on the street. To address the grade changes, the Panel recommended using architecture and landscape rather than having one elevation for the entire development. In particular, the podium could be articulated so that it rises with the elevation (i.e. taller height at Waterdown and lower at Cooke). Doing so could help reduce	floor level facing the stormwater pond. The ground floor of the frontage on the stormwater pond is occupied by proposed indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. Street facing and courtyard lobby entrances are provided for all three buildings. Building shadows have been minimized. The shadow study which accompanies the submission indicates the proposed development satisfies the City's Shadow Impact Criteria with the exception of the proposed park adjacent of the subject property to the north - which tested at slightly less than the required 0.5 SAF. Generally, the additional shadow in this area is minimal and will not affect the useability of this park resource. As recommended, the podium elements now vary in height with the taller podium being located facing Waterdown Road. Bicycle parking is provided along the Masonry Court frontage as in previous iterations. Access to these spaces will be from the courtyard at its grade level.

Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) Comments
Date: 12/2/2020

Item #	Question	Response
	shadowing on the proposed open space, redistribute density to where it may be most appropriate (e.g. closer to Waterdown Road), and relate the building to the site topography. The Panel also felt that the internal space in both options read as primarily for vehicle movements and questioned the usability of the internal courtyard space in Option 2. Paving / surface treatment could be used to convey that this space is primarily a public space. Tucking the loading space away from Cooke Boulevard, as in Option 1, is desirable. Some Panel members also felt that bicycle parking at both corners is a good idea but questioned how accessible it will be from the street due to the site's grading.	
2	Ground Level Outdoor Amenity & Site Design - Please comment on the advantages and disadvantages of each option with respect to the provision of ground level outdoor open space. What other opportunities could be explored to ensure the incorporation of high-quality, ground-level open space on this site? The Panel agreed that it makes sense to locate the open space at the northeast corner of the site, adjacent to the future public park in Option 1, but was very concerned that the park will be in shadow most of the time and asked that it be addressed in the future development application. The Panel suggested that the shadowing could be improved through podium articulation, tower sculpting and reduction in overall tower heights and mass. The Panel suggested that the applicant consider how the park will be used in the future and possibly consider relocating the park elsewhere on site with a path to connect to the public park instead.	Option 1 is the preferred option and served as the basis for the current application. We have reviewed the shadows on the proposed park and as discussed above it tested at slightly less than 0.5 SAF, an amount we consider to be a minor difference which will not affect the useability of the park. Connections betwen the proposed park and the proposed private outdoor amenity space of the proposed development have been detailed in the Landscape Plans which are part of the development application.

Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) Comments
Date: 12/2/2020

Item #	Question	Response
3	Built Form, Massing & Materiality - Please comment on the overall form, massing and materiality of the towers and podiums in contributing to an interesting skyline and achieving a human-scaled environment at the street level. The Panel appreciated that two options were submitted and that the design process was explained. However, all Panel members were concerned that both options are overdeveloped for the site and area and noted that overbuilding is the underlying issue to the concerns raised in the Panel's responses to earlier questions. Specifically, the Panel advised that: • Transitions to adjacent properties and between the buildings within the site, in terms of scale, mass and height, are missing. The City's Tall Building Guidelines exemplify a very clear, gradual transition in height (e.g. 24 storeys to 16, 8 and finally 3 storeys), which is not currently reflected in the proposals. • Providing ground-level, outdoor amenity space on site is essential given the level of density proposed, but the shadow conditions in Option 1 are not desirable. • With respect to skyline, the podiums appear disproportionately small in relation to the towers and the 6-storey buildings to the east, and the towers appear as one large mass rather than individual buildings, despite appearing to meet the City's tower separation guidelines. Since the towers will be seen from all angles and visible from a distance, more differentiation between the towers, and between the tower and podium shapes is needed.	As noted above, Option 1 was the preferred alternative and forms the basis of the development application. In developing the current plan, Tower A was rotated 90 degrees to provide additional spacing and sky views and to reduce shadows onto the park - in response to the panel's comments regarding separation distances and the appearance of being "one building". The transition between the tall buildings and the nearby townhouse and mid-rise development is effected by the presence of the three storey podium which will provide the primary street defining element on both Cooke Boulevard and Masonry Court. The towers above these podiums are stepped back substantially from the podium, by amounts that are greater than those recommended in the City's Tall Building Guidelines. With regard to building height, the part of the precinct in which subject property is located is identified in the available planning background materials as the appropriate location for the tallest buildings. Within the proposal itself, the tallest buildings are located along the Waterdown Road frontage away from the lower scale buildings on the opposite side of Cooke Boulevard.