

Department of City Building

Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD)



MINUTES

July 17, 2018, 3:55pm
414 Locust Street, 2nd floor boardroom.

Members of BUD

	present	absent / regrets
Ken Coit (Chair)	✓	
Jana Kelemen (Vice Chair)	✓	
Naama Blonder	✓	
Wai Ying Di Giorgio	✓	
Jessica Hawes	✓	
Matt Reid	✓	
Nigel Tai	✓	
Alexandru Taranu	✓	

Item #3: 1161-1167 North Shore Boulevard

Design Review:	First Review
Application:	Official Plan Amendment & Rezoning
Presentations:	
City Staff:	Jamie Tellier
Applicant:	AMICA



Disclosure of conflict-of-interest

None

City Staff Overview

City staff outlined the project details, site context and planning framework.

Staff are seeking the Panel's advice on the following:

1. **Built Form:** Please comment on the overall built form including: building dimensions and depth, tower floor plate, step backs, sun/shadow impact on amenity space to the east, etc. Does the variation in building heights and outdoor courtyard offset the overall volume of building floor area on site or is the cumulative effect too heavy?

2. **Architectural Expression:** Please comment on the architectural expression of the proposed development. The building will be highly visible and requires a high impact design. Does the building including the tower and top have enough definition?
3. **Site Layout:** Please comment on the building interface with adjacent low density residential area to the north. Are the rear yard setbacks, terracing, and angular plane appropriate and effective to manage design compatibility? Similarly, does the proposed building have an appropriate relationship with the street?

Applicant / Design Consultant Presentation

The applicant and design team provided the Panel with an overview of the company and then walked through the proposal's details including background information regarding the site and its context, the teams' analysis, design principles and evolving changes to the design.

Panel Questions:

The panel asked questions of clarification on the following topics:

- Dimensional questions regarding the horizontal distance between the proposed residential townhouse units and rear property line, setback from North Shore Blvd.
- Overhang conditions.
- Informal discussions with residents to the north.
- How the programmed uses influence the design and OBC restrictions.
- If the community will have access to the site.
- Population at capacity.
- Amenity spaces and safety.

Panel Advice:

Question #1: Built Form: Please comment on the overall built form including: building dimensions and depth, tower floor plate, step backs, sun/shadow impact on amenity space to the east, etc. Does the variation in building heights and outdoor courtyard offset the overall volume of building floor area on site or is the cumulative effect too heavy?

The Panel commended the applicant on making refinements to articulate the tall building. They did note that the massing of mid rise buildings on west side of site is more successful and well proportioned than the tall building on the east side.

The Panel suggested that the applicant explore reducing the height and increasing the articulation of the podium so that it does not read as a solid wall. Defining the podium with smaller more delicate elements will help. The revised design is going in the right direction. However, the Panel would ideally like to see the development divided into multiple buildings to break up the massing. It was suggested that a mid-block connection be used to separate the townhouse units and create a cut through for the community to the courtyard.

The Panel commented that the design around location of the courtyard is logical given the solar rotation, however, being adjacent to the highway makes for a challenging

condition. The Panel cautioned that improved landscape may not be enough to mitigate against highway noise impacts.

The building should be placed into the gateway imagery photos of the urban design brief to make sure the building works as a gateway in relation to the context.

Question #2: Architectural Expression: Please comment on the architectural expression of the proposed development. The building will be highly visible and requires a high impact design. Does the building including the tower and top have enough definition?

The Panel commented that the challenge for this type of development is to make it more residential in character through materials and smaller scale residential-like elements rather than campus qualities. The Panel would like to see the building podium broken-down further to make it less chunky.

The panel agreed that the soft look using the precedent image with the brick facades on the protected interior edges is a desirable feature.

Revising the tall building to look different and making it a visible landmark is important for this site. Reconsider the corner cut balcony design to assist with making the tall building feel less massive.

Question #3: Site Layout: Please comment on the building interface with adjacent low density residential area to the north. Are the rear yard setbacks, terracing, and angular plane appropriate and effective to manage design compatibility? Similarly, does the proposed building have an appropriate relationship with the street?

The Panel commented that the proposal appears to be sensitive to the existing development to the north by applying the 45-degree angular plane; however, the building seems very large as it fills the site. The Panel also observed that the existing apartment towers to the east have larger rear yard conditions and that the proposal needs to be more sensitive to this by making the building less visually intrusive. The Panel suggested increasing the rear yard setback to improve the interface with low density residential to the north. More room at the rear will lessen the perceived impacts from the additional bulk. The Panel suggested that the increased setback would allow for a larger landscape area around the site, which could allow for a trail or walkway and better circulation. It was also suggested that the building edges and landscape geometry be softened to rationalize pedestrian circulation around the site and create sense of place.

The Panel also mentioned the importance of ensuring there is enough space adjacent to the front property line to allow for mature tree canopy and to ensure a proper pedestrian environment with connections to the hospital.

End...Item #3