Community Planning Department
Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes:
July 24, 2025 (3:30pm - 4:30pm)
Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams

Item #2:
2076 Old Lakeshore Rd.

Design Review:
First Review at Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD)

Application Type:
Pre-consultation for Official Plan Amendment & Zoning Bylaw Amendment

		present	absent
Members of the Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel			
Matt Reid	BUD Member		✓
Jackie VanderVelde	Acting BUD Chair	✓	
David deGroot	BUD Member	✓	
Jessica Hawes	BUD Member	✓	
Mike Flint	BUD Member		✓
Nigel Tai	BUD Member	✓	
Alexandru Taranu	BUD Member		✓
Christopher Moise	BUD Member	✓	
Timmithea Chan	BUD Member	✓	
City Staff			
Alicia West	Planner, Development	✓	
Chloe Richer	Senior Planner, Heritage	✓	
Kyle Poole	Planner, Urban Design	✓	
Applicant & Design Team			
Cale Vanderveen	Bousfields Inc.	✓	
David Falletta	Bousfields Inc.	✓	
Tom Kasprzak	Bousfields Inc.	✓	
Lilia Koleva	NEUF Architects	✓	
Gabriel Garofalo	NEUF Architects	✓	
Kyle Nichols	NEUF Architects	✓	
Peter Horn	Ownership Group	✓	
Darko Vranich	Ownership Group	✓	

Disclosure of Conflict-of-Interest:
None.

City Staff Presentation Overview:

City Staff presented an overview of the development proposal, which was submitted through a pre-consultation for proposed amendments to the City's Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw. City Staff's presentation provided a brief overview of the proposed development along with the existing and upcoming context of the surrounding neighbourhood.

City Staff asked the BUD Panel members for design advice in the following three areas:

1. Context & Public Realm
   How does the proposal respond to the surrounding context and public realm, including adjacent waterfront and the broader neighbourhood? What improvements could assist in integrating the proposal into the surrounding urban fabric?

2. Built Form & Site Design
   Is the proposed site layout, circulation strategy, and massing appropriate given the site's context? How could the site design better assist in ensuring an activated and engaging public realm?

3. Open Space & Sustainability
   How effectively does the proposal integrate meaningful public open space into the site and surrounding neighbourhood context? How could the proposal better contribute to long-term sustainability objectives (e.g., climate resilience, floodplain considerations, tree canopy, access to green infrastructure, etc.)?

Applicant Presentation Overview:
The Applicant & Design Team presented the site and area context, including key planning framework considerations with a focus on the proposed development and its design. Key ideas expressed in the presentation included:

- the evolving context of the site and surrounding area, specifically noting the evolving high-density context of adjacent properties.
- the official plan designation of the site being Old Lakeshore Road Mixed Use Precinct – Area C, permitting buildings of up to ten stories in height or fifteen stories in height subject to several conditions.
- the current zoning of the site is Downtown Old Lakeshore Road – Area C (DL-C) as well as Community Park (PC).
- the irregular shape of the site and the need to provide a substantial setback on the lake side which results in the built form being pushed to the northern most portion of the site.
- that the Conservation Halton setback for access along the lakefront influenced the continuation of the Waterfront Trail along the south portion of the site. The trail continuation is proposed to be accomplished through a two-tiered approach and connect to the existing pedestrian connection along the west edge of the property.
- highlighting the proposed colonnade along the Old Lakeshore Road frontage and wrapping around the south-west corner of the building to create a sense of rhythm along the western facade.
- noting both the residential entrance and the hotel entrance are positioned off Old Lakeshore Road, with the residential lobby located central to the building and the hotel lobby located at the north-west corner.
- that the northern façade of the building is heavily influenced by the elevation of the building to the east, to which a heritage designation applies to a portion of the eastern property/building. The architectural lines extending from the eastern heritage building have been carried through to the podium of the new building.

- the architectural detailing intended for the proposed café at the north-west corner of the building, a modern take on the heritage aspect of the neighboring property and drawn from the Heritage Based Urban Design Guidelines for Downtown Burlington.
- the building finish was anticipated to be a tiered stone with bronze insets and lighting, reflecting the natural stone motif of the lake.
- that sustainability was a consideration for the development given that the development was both a hotel and private residential units. The ground floor is proposed to be transparent glass while the upper façade is a combination of punched windows and precast.

BUD Panel Contextual Questions:

BUD Panel members asked the Applicant's Design Team the following clarifying questions. Answers below were provided by the Applicant's Design Team.

Q1: How did the Design Team determine the appropriate building height for the development, and what factors determined this?

- The Design Team noted:
  - this initially began by examining the hotel component of the development, where one hundred and thirty hotel suites were necessary for project viability. This number was later increased to one hundred and fifty-four hotel suites. Underground parking was also a deciding design factor, whereby the depth of underground parking influenced how much density could be added to the site,
  - the building height, architectural expression and site layout was also influenced by the pattern of development in the surrounding area, noting the proposed building has a similar height to adjacent buildings in the immediate area,
  - the building is proposed with a very narrow and tight tower floorplate, and
  - that the enhanced public real and extension of the Waterfront Trail is a result of early discussions with Staff at the City of Burlington and Conservation Halton. Early iterations of the site design did not include these enhancements and public realm features.

Q2: Can you please confirm what the floorplate size is including balconies?

- The proposed floorplate size is six hundred and fifty square metres. This is approximately thirty-six metres by eighteen metres. This floorplate is inclusive of balconies.

Q3: Can you give a brief summary of the tower analysis and how the team concluded there could not be a tower on the adjacent property to the east?

- When considering the lands to the east (2084 Old Lakeshore Rd.), if a twelve-and-a-half-metre setback is applied to both sides of the property the resulting tower floor plate is too small to have a viable project.
- This is further compounded when you factor in the engineering development setback from the lake, which restricts the southward limits of the building footprint.
- The lands further east at 2092 Old Lakeshore Rd. are currently owned by the same applicant, limiting the ability of the 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. property owner to merge lands to acquire a larger tower floorplate. The lands at 2076 and 2092 Old Lakeshore Rd. are currently owned by the same ownership group, eliminating the option of 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. acquiring either of the adjacent neighbouring properties.
- Due to the shoreline and engineering development setback narrowing from west to east, the developable area for a building footprint at 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. is limited.
- The heritage designation of a portion of 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. is also a contributing factor, complicating the opportunity for a tall building or tower development at 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd.

Q4: Has the Applicant engaged in discussions with the current owner of 2084 Old Lakeshore Road?

- There have been multiple discussions with the owner of 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. and an attempt to do an area master planning exercise for the area.
- There is a belief that the owner of 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. is also the owner of one or more properties across the street, to the north of Old Lakeshore Road.

Q5: From the proposed outdoor spaces to the lake, how does accessibility function?

- The central path within the private amenities provides accessibility to the pool and all outdoor amenity spaces. The accessible lift on the eastern edge provides accessibility access to the pool.
- For an individual with accessibility needs to access the Waterfront Trail from the private amenity area, they would be required to go around back through the building. There is not sufficient space within the current design layout to make the minimum ramp slope and avoid going around.

Summary of BUD Panel Advice:

BUD Panel members provided the following design comments for consideration with respect to the three guiding questions posed by City Staff. Answers below were provided by the BUD Panel members.

1. **CONTEXT & PUBLIC REALM**
   How does the proposal respond to the surrounding context and public realm, including adjacent waterfront and the broader neighbourhood? What improvements could assist in integrating the proposal into the surrounding urban fabric?

- The design choices of 2076 Old Lakeshore Rd. affect or impede the development potential for 2084 Old Lakeshore Rd. to redevelop. A Limiting Distance Agreement similar to the City of Ottawa may need to be negotiated as the sufficient side yard setback to provide for minimum tower separation should not be levied by the 2076 Old Lakeshore Rd. property.
- The south, north and west side of the development successfully address the context and public realm, however further analysis regarding the larger servicing and traffic capacity for Lakeshore Road and Old Lakeshore Road is recommended.
- The architectural expression of the project is recommended to be pushed further as the built form was though to be basic. Opportunities to make the architecture more memorable were suggested.
- Opportunities for the heritage attributes to percolate through the tower and focus on the verticality of the tower were suggested as being worthy of consideration. This was thought to potentially be beneficial as opposed to solely capturing the heritage expression at the corner, ground floor café.

2. **BUILT FORM & SITE DESIGN**
   Is the proposed site layout, circulation strategy, and massing appropriate given the site's context? How could the site design better assist in ensuring an activated and engaging public realm?

- BUD members recognize the limited opportunities to relocate or redesign elements given the tight nature of the site within its context.
- A form of secondary planning or tertiary planning was suggested as being necessary to justify the proposed tower setback and demonstrate how the three neighbouring properties south of Old Lakeshore Road redevelop cohesively.
- BUD members complimented the detailing of the podium and the warmth of character derived from the materiality.
- The thoughtful layout and placement of spaces within the ground floor of the building were thought to be positive attributes, specifically noting the strategic placement of the public hotel lobby and private residential lobby.
- Further delineation of the built form of the tower was suggested as it was unclear if the hotel portion of the building was to be expressed differently from the residential portion.

- Opportunities for public art or public engagement on the two less pronounced side elevations were suggested.
- To maximize the design of the interface with the adjacent property along the west property line, a high degree of detail was suggested as to provide the best integrated side yard relationship as possible.
- The introduction of a parking lift as opposed to a traditional parking ramp to access underground parking was appreciated. BUD members questioned what they viewed as a hybrid option encompassing both a valet with drive isles in addition to the parking lift technology, as a fully automated system was though to be more appropriate.

3. OPEN SPACE & SUSTAINABILITY

How effectively does the proposal integrate meaningful public open space into the site and surrounding neighbourhood context? How could the proposal better contribute to long-term sustainability objectives (e.g., climate resilience, floodplain considerations, tree canopy, access to green infrastructure, etc.)?

- Opportunities for native species planting were suggested, especially considering the proximity to the lake and the Waterfront Trail. Interpretative signage was suggested as an educational aspect to further promote awareness around landscape ecology and biodiversity.
- Provided the location adjacent the Waterfront Trail, opportunities to encourage bicycling and other forms of active transportation should be included.

End of Item #2.