Community Planning Department
Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD)

MINUTES

April 21, 2022, 3:05 pm
Virtual (Online) Meeting

Members of BUD

	present	absent / regrets
Matt Reid (Acting Chair)	✓	
Mike Flint	✓	
Jessica Hawes		regrets
LeAnn Seely	✓	
Nigel Tai	✓	
Alexandru Taranu		regrets
Jackie VanderVelde	✓	

Item #2: 1396 Guelph Line

Design Review: First Review

Application: Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning

Presentations:

City Staff: Thomas Douglas, Community Planning

Design Team: David Falletta, Bousfields Inc.
David Yuhasz, Zedd Architecture Inc.



Disclosure of conflict-of-interest

None.

City Staff Overview

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

1. **Response to Context**
   Please comment on the design of the building, does the proposed building fit well into its surrounding neighbourhood context in terms of scale and massing?

2. **Site/Streetscape Design**
   Please comment on the proposed site/streetscape design, does the development adequately integrate with the adjacent street and hydro corridor in a manner that supports active transportation and transit use, and establishes appropriate interfaces?

3. **Amenity Space**
   Please comment on the design of amenity space for use by residents of the development.

Design Team

The project planning consultant stated that they were commissioned to do a planning rationale for the site. They stated that the site is well supported by commercial and recreation amenities, daycares, trails and parks, that Guelph Line has a wide right-of-way and is adjacent to a wide hydro corridor, that Guelph Line is a great transit corridor, and it is well connected in terms of walking paths. They opined that the site could accommodate a maximum mid-rise building height at what is a unique location that can accommodate height and density; more so than any other site in the vicinity along the corridor.

The project's planning consultant also noted that they were not successful in discussions with the landowner to the south to share access.

The project architect provided a brief overview of the site take note of its irregular shape and resulting building envelope. It was also noted that the driveway entrance for cars is pushed away from the existing townhouses to the south. The proposal incorporates two-storey townhouses at the base of a mid-rise building facing the existing two-storey townhouses to the south as well as a two-storey glazing expression for the portion of the building facing Guelph Line. It was noted that there is a strong step back at the seventh floor, another step back at tenth floor, facing Guelph Line and the existing townhouses.

In terms of materials, the proposal is going from dark to light as the building rises and the form is gearing toward a flat iron type-built form.

Panel Questions:

The Panel asked the Design Team the following questions of clarification:

- In one drawing there appears to be a large separation between the ramp to the underground parking and the neighbouring townhouses?
    - The driveway is closer, you are seeing a rendering issue.
- The townhouse courtyard is not shown on the landscape concept, is there pedestrian circulation throughout the site?
    - Again, the renderings are different, the intent is to provide access from the sidewalk to small forecourts in front of the townhouse units – this could potentially be widened to give more breathing space and move the sidewalk to the west.

Panel Advice:

Question #1: Response to Context *– Please comment on the design of the building, does the proposed building fit well into its surrounding neighbourhood context in terms of scale and massing?*

The Panel generally agreed that the building fits within the surrounding neighbourhood context, however, the building massing should be modified to fit with the townhouses.

One Panel member commented from an architect's standpoint, that the lower level floor plans for floors 2-6 show very narrow and deep units (which look to be 12-15 metres deep units), which is not ideal, and will require the interior layout to put a bedroom inbound from the exterior window. It was noted that this is not the Burlington norm, and it should be improved. Generally, narrow deep units are not desirable from a pure design standpoint. Furthermore, it was commented that the 4.5-metre-wide townhouse units are difficult to layout in a functional manner as well. To have a bedroom and living room facing outside would be challenging

The Panel agreed that there should be a focus on articulating and animating the street to be more active.

The Panel recommended that the design reduce the number of size of columns that meet the ground plane, which effectively create a wall and closed off feel facing the hydro corrido. This together with the building massing due to its length makes the proposal read as overwhelming. It was suggested that more articulation be used to break the building massing up visually, particularly the back side should be stepped back to acknowledge the existing adjacent townhouses. The ground level design should also be looked at to mitigate the column impacts to access to light and views.

Question #2: Site/Streetscape Design – *Please comment on the proposed site/streetscape design, does the development adequately integrate with the adjacent street and hydro corridor in a manner that supports active transportation and transit use, and establishes appropriate interfaces?*

Proposed townhouses

The Panel agreed that the outdoor private amenity space for the proposed townhouse units at grade must be of an adequate area to provide for functional use.

Guelph Line streetscape

The Panel commented that with a bus shelter located near the site and street that it would make sense to locate the main entrance closer to the south and separate the pedestrian movements from car traffic. The Panel also recommended an increase width of the sidewalk to match the intended pedestrian capacity of the development.

Hydro Corridor

Given the context and location adjacent to the hydro corridor it feels like missed opportunity to create a connection to the hydro corridor from the lobby through an amenity area to the north open space and engaging frontage facing corridor with a

sidewalk spill out use tied to the amenity space together with high quality unit paving to suggest a pedestrian zone.

It was commented that the cantilevered portion of the building facing the hydro corridor feels dark along the hydro corridor and is undermining the relationship to the corridor.

Question #3: Amenity Space – *Please comment on the design of amenity space for use by residents of the development.*

The Panel commented that it is difficult to comment on the amenity space without the program. It comes down to program and execution of the design and program.

Generally, the Panel commented that 400 square metre of amenity space is not enough indoor amenity space. The Panel encourages the proponent to focus on the opportunity to use the rooftop as a shared outdoor amenity space and green roof.

The Panel was concerned by the lack of at grade amenity space and what they characterised as an informal connection to the hydro corridor.

The Panel also questioned where the 1,800 square metre of outdoor common amenity space is it coming from.

The Panel also encouraged the proponent and design team to consider the potential to realign the main access drive aisle.

End...Item #2

Meeting Adjourned