



# Memo

**To:**           **Proponents**

- Steve Pinhal, Applicant
- Luis Claro, Friend

**City of London Personnel**

- Britt O’Hagan, Urban Designer
- Michelle Knieriem, Planner II

**From:**       **Urban Design Peer Review Panel (UDPRP)**

- Adrian Dyer, Architect, Chair
- Jason McIntyre, Architect
- John Nicholson, Architect
- Sung Ae Sim, Landscape Architect (absent)
- Jordan Kemp, Urban Planner
- Janine Oosterveld, Urban Planner (absent)

**RE:   Zoning By-law Amendment : 644 – 646 Huron Street – Residential Development Presentation & Review, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

Note – The panel has identified that the applicant was not respectful of the Panel, it’s members, and its procedures. The applicant and their representatives were dismissive of the Panel.

- There is an established character in the immediate area that includes extensive soft landscaping, wide front yard setbacks, and passive green space. The proposal does not reflect or reinforce this character.
- No compelling argument presented as to why the front yard setback is being challenged by placing building closer to the street. The general approach to the siting and organization of buildings on the site does not appear to follow any clear rationale.
- Consider consolidating the two new buildings into one building.
- The general intent of intensification on an existing apartment building site should be to ensure that the proposal reflects an improvement for existing residents. It is not clear how the proposal represents an improvement over existing site conditions.
- There is a substantial proportion of hard surfaces and parking areas. Consider replacing hard surfaces with soft landscaping to enhance the *visual* appearance of the proposal and to reduce potential stormwater impacts. (*Consider a flat roofed scheme to better blend with neighbours and to retain water*)
- Internal pedestrian connections through the subject site should be setback from any new buildings by soft landscaping to minimize direct views into the *building*

- The provision of soft landscaping in a large, consolidated area may be considered a benefit for use by existing and future residents as an outdoor amenity area.
- Very wide drive aisles. Consider reducing these to 6.0 metres to recover some soft landscaping areas.
- The proposal as presented is unresolved. It is recommended that a revised proposal be presented to the UDPRP prior to a rezoning application for the site advancing to Council for consideration.
- Strongly consider investigating the crossing storm pipe to see if still in use.
- Garbage should be kept AWAY from amenity areas.
- The design is a hodge-podge of materials and colours. Bedrooms are undifferentiated from living spaces, entries are unprotected. Roof a poor match for the design. Very poor relationship of building interior uses and exterior uses ( eg parking in front of windows)
- Recommend leveraging adjacent transit, shopping and personal services available to pedestrians within 800m of proposed development. This could equate to a reduction in the number of parking spaces provided, in turn allowing for more outdoor amenity space.

This UDPRP review is based on City planning and urban design policy, the submitted brief, and noted presentation. It is intended to inform the ongoing planning and design process. The panel would like to request that this proposal is brought before the UDPRP again once the appropriate revisions are made.

Sincerely on behalf of the UDPRP,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Adrian Dyer', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Adrian Dyer, BArch, ARB (reg), DATD, Chair, City of London Urban Design Peer Review Panel