

Minutes of the Design Review Panel Meeting 9 – September 16, 2014

The Design Review Panel met on Tuesday September 16, 2014, in Committee Room 2, Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, Toronto, at 12:00pm.

Members of the Design Review Panel

Members Present

Gordon Stratford (Chair): Architect, Senior Vice President, Design Director – HOK Canada	✓
Michael Leckman (Vice Chair): Architect, Principal – Diamond and Schmitt	
Carl Blanchaer: Architect, Principal – WZMH Architects	✓
Calvin Brook: Planner, Architect, Principal – Brook McIlroy	✓
Dima Cook: Heritage Specialist, Senior Architect & Senior Associate – FGMDA	✓
Ralph Giannone: Architect, Principal – Giannone Associates	✓
Meg Graham: Architect, Principal – superkül	✓
Brian Hollingworth: Transportation Engineer, Director – IBI Group	✓
Joe Lobko: Architect, Principal – DTAH	✓
Jenny McMinn: Green Building & Energy Services Manager – Halsall Associates	✓
Jim Melvin: Landscape Architect, Principal – PMA Landscape Architects Ltd.	
Adam Nicklin: Landscape Architect, Principal – PUBLIC WORK office for urban design	
David Sisam: Architect, Principal – Montgomery Sisam Architects	✓
Sibylle von Knobloch: Landscape Architect, Principle – NAK Design	

Confirmation of Minutes

The Panel confirmed minutes of their previous meeting which was held on July 30, 2014.

DRP Coordinator

Hamish Goodwin: Urban Design, City Planning Division

Meeting 9 Index

- i. "Elements" mixed-use development at Milliken GO Station, 4665 Steeles Avenue East
- ii. Albion Library, 1515 Albion Road
- iii. Kipling Mobility Hub, Etobicoke Centre
- iv. 93-95 Berkeley Street, King-Parliament Neighbourhood

4665 Steeles Av East	
Design Team	Torti Gallas and Partners
Review	1 st Review, Preliminary Discussion
Application	Rezoning Application
City Staff	Renrick Ashby, Community Planning Janet Lee, Urban Design
Conflict of Interest	none
Participating Members	CB, DC, JL, BH, GS, JMM, DS, MG, CBrook, RG
Vote	No vote - preliminary discussion



Introduction

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought advice on the following:

1. The recent land use re-designation from Employment to Regeneration may set the stage for a new context to emerge in this area. Please comment on how well the proposal establishes this emerging context in relation to massing, street wall, pedestrian realm, and design quality. In addressing this question, please consider that the Toronto and Markham area context (outside the study area) will remain as lowrise Employment lands and that the tallest building currently approved within 400-metres of the proposal is 24 storey's in Markham.
2. How well does the proposal respond to the existing context and potential future redevelopment of its neighbours to the west, east, north and south?
3. The application is part of the Steeles-Redlea Study which is in early stages of exploration. The extent of acceptable residential land use opportunities will be tested and is not currently known. Please provide if possible given the uncertainties, general comments on potential opportunities or issues for the Study Area.

The consultant described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.

Chairs Summary of Key Points

Panel would like to thank the proponent team and City staff for bringing this project forward at such an early stage. This project's size and location provides the potential for successful TOD-focused urban transformation. However, further development is needed in order to achieve this potential, including: creating an area-wide comprehensive design vision and strategy of the highest quality; providing true work/live/shop mixed use and setting an urban fabric block/street pattern.

Related Commentary

Panel acknowledged the site has many possibilities, and were appreciative of the applicant bringing the proposal forward for design review at an early stage. However, Members felt there were a number of issues that should have been studied and analyzed to inform site program, layout, design and response to context, but were not. Therefore, while supportive of the notion of transit-oriented suburban intensification, Members were largely unsupportive of the proposal. A summary of suggestions and comments for consideration in its refinement are below.

Please comment on how well the proposal establishes the emerging context in relation to massing, street wall, pedestrian realm, and design quality.

Context

- It is difficult to understand the greater context
 - This is a super-scale project without context
 - The relationships to key surroundings are notional and under-developed
 - The proposal is depicted as jarring relative to its context; it is very insular
 - Both need to work together
- The precedent images of King St and TIFF building do not translate to the Steeles Avenue context

Massing

- The towers are too close together in this context; greater separation is required
- The cumulative shadow impact is too big
- The impact on sky-view is too much; the closeness of towers makes it like a single mass
- Height is difficult to comment on, but the proposal seem quite tall
- The placement of towers should be improved
 - the current configuration suggests that a fourth tower on the site might be contemplated by the applicant in the future
- suggests that a fourth tower on the site might be contemplated by the applicant in the future
- Guiding the physical form of transformation in the suburban context requires further thought
 - The 25-metre tower separation guideline is a bare minimum response to urban conditions
 - As you move out of core, more thought on how to introduce towers into the suburban context is needed

Street Wall / Steeles Ave

- The proposed 66-metre distance from building face to building face across Steeles Avenue is equivalent to a significant portion of a football field
 - With lots of traffic in between, this will be a road not a street/place
 - This is not an urban condition
- Don't give up on Steeles Avenue as a pedestrian environment
 - people will walk along here, therefore it needs to be nice

Pedestrian Realm

- The public realm needs lot of attention

- With such a large site, is essential to carve out meaningful spaces; places where you can imagine people inhabiting
 - Some outdoor amenity spaces are located upstairs (i.e. not at-grade)
 - It is difficult to believe that these are spaces where people would want to be
 - Occupation of the ground plane would be preferred; currently there is a lack of spaces at-grade
- Connectivity – more pedestrian connections are needed in the east-west direction; don't just focus on north-south movement
- There is an underlying assumption that there will be significant pedestrian flow in the north-south direction; more analysis is needed
 - Don't hang your hat on all-day GO service as being a major activity generator
 - Look at other stations with all-day GO service; many of them aren't bustling areas (e.g. Danforth station and Mimico are not bustling transit hubs)
 - And even if there are large volumes of pedestrians, the north-south flow dead-ends at Steeles, whereas the desire will likely be to continue to Pacific Mall across the street

Design Quality / Galleria

- The plans are unconvincing that the Galleria will be an amazing and spectacular place
 - Spatially, it seems as though it needs to be bigger/wider
 - The images presented don't indicate what the galleria will be in terms of experience
 - There will be cars driving and parking over the top of it
 - Overall, it is difficult to understand in terms of quality
- A well-scaled and animated street might be preferable to the galleria concept

Design Quality / Parking

- Above-ground parking is not acceptable
- It seems obvious to put parking underground, especially if it would be precedent-setting
- Above-ground parking has only been disguised/screened on the front elevation

Site Access

- Vehicular access and the relationship between vehicles and pedestrians is difficult to understand and requires further work
 - The whole front area will be dominated by vehicles, and will be entirely shaded
 - Calling this a public/pedestrian space is a stretch

Sustainable Design

- There is no clear stated sustainability vision other than reference to the TGS
- Want to see these aspirations in the diagrams
 - Tower placement, massing and orientation should relate to sustainability objectives
 - Careful consideration of cladding treatments and angling of towers would help to create a dialogue with the surrounding community

Mixed-use Program

- Employment Lands are necessary but don't make good streets/places
- The intent to increase the mix of land uses is honorable
 - Embrace the hotel concept and the employment that it brings; the hotel at present looks like a condo
- Ensure there is a successful retail environment; this needs full exploration

- The existence of transit presents an opportunity to provide a more diverse employment program
 - Office uses should be looked at here
 - A greater mix of employment opportunities will help reduce congestion
 - This argument/rationale is lacking in the proposal
 - Currently, it is more focused on people living here and commuting downtown

How well does the proposal respond to the existing context and potential future redevelopment of its neighbours to the west, east, north and south?

South

- Screening of the above-ground parking structure seems to have been completely ignored
 - If development occurred to south, it would be facing an unanimated parking structure
 - This is a missed opportunity

East / Splendid China

- This site will be sterilized by a combination of the Steeles Avenue grade-separation project and by this proposal

West

- It is not sensitive to have parking on a zero lot line to the west
- The site to the west been fundamentally sterilized because of this
 - This is unacceptable

Please provide if possible given the uncertainties, general comments on potential opportunities or issues for the Study Area.

- A precinct plan encompassing both sides of Steeles is needed
- It is critical that all lands are thought of comprehensively (subject lands, and adjacent lands) to address issues of transit, access to sunlight, transition etc.
- A precinct plan is necessary to understand...
 - How people will get to this project and the GO station
 - Where the best places are for parks and open space
 - the location of parks and open spaces needs to be informed by an analysis of sunlight and shadow, and other factors influencing pedestrian comfort such as wind.

Materials required for Next Review

For a site with such challenging conditions, the package leaps to a design solution without providing cues to how you arrived there. Requested information for the next Panel review includes:

- diagrams showing the evolution of preferred massing
- materials which convey the essential characteristics of place
- building sections
- more drawings showing analytical relationships
- greater context analysis
- a larger vision and how this proposal fits

Albion Library	
Planning Area	
Design Team	Perkins + Will; DTAH
Application Type	Site Plan Application
Review	First / Preliminary
City Staff	Carly Bowman, Community Planning Julie Bogdanowicz, Urban Design
Participating Members	C. Blanchaer, D. Cook, B. Hollingworth, G .Stratford, J. McMinn, D. Sisam, M. Graham, C. Brook, R. Giannone
Conflict of Interest	J. Lobko, DTAH
Vote	<u>Refine – 8</u> ; Redesign – 0



Introduction

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought advice on the following:

1. Do the proposed building design and siting contribute positively to the urban objectives of the City and does the building prioritize pedestrian, cyclist and transit movement while improving the public realm?
2. Is the proposed development located and organized to fit within its existing and planned context? Does this public building accomplish its civic duty?
3. Are there additional architectural and landscape elements that the panel would suggest could contribute to the design approach, particularly in terms of facilitating pedestrian movement and marking the entry sequence?

The consultant described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.

Chairs Summary of Key Points

Panel commends the proponent team, including the TPL, and City staff for a design that is of the highest quality, and a significant contribution to both the neighbourhood, and the broader City. Further develop the “pavilion in a park” strategy throughout the site, including eliminating all traces of traditional curbed/paved driveway format current shown on the site plan.

Related Commentary

To the question "Does the proposal accomplish its civic duty?", Panel provided a resounding "yes", suggesting that it was a great example of the way that a building should behave and act in the city. A selection of supporting comments provided by various

Members follows. Suggestions for improvement, summarized further below, focused on ways that the design could move from good to great.

- This is a beautifully executed project
- The Toronto Public Library has done exceedingly well in moving and adapting with time
- I think this will be a great library
- This is one of the best projects we've seen
- This project fulfills a need and creates a desire
- It will be the living space of an entire community
- There is a bright spirit and cadence to the building
- The use of colour as a moment of celebration makes a bold statement: "I am here; come and visit me!"
- The knowledge garden metaphor represents spectacular vision for a library

Are there additional architectural and landscape elements that could contribute to the design approach, particularly in terms of facilitating pedestrian movement and marking the entry sequence?

Building Cladding

Members were supportive of the proposed cladding system, indicating it was an integral element of the project that should not be value-engineered out. Additional comments included:

- Try to use all glazed pieces (rather than some being non-glazed)
- A pattern of glazed colours could help demarcate the entrance
- The use of colour could be applied to the columns
- Pursue more rigor with thermal performance
 - o Heavily glazed areas will present thermal challenges
 - o Ensure the system and design provides user-comfort
 - o Consider if more opaque materials would help with this (i.e. ones that are more easier to control thermally)

Bus Stop Location

Normally it would be desirable to locate the bus stop closer to the main entrance of the building, but given fewer people arrive to the library by bus, and balancing safety issues, the proposed location is probably OK.

Entry and Entry Sequence

- Examine the potential of making the east side entry piece and the new pedestrian route into another garden; increasing relationship to landscape
 - This might mean making the parking area more compact
 - It would result in an improved sequence of entry through a garden, improved connectivity to the pedestrian pathway through to the neighbourhood to the south, and additional programming opportunities
- Examine ways to make the entrance more obvious, such as through articulation or the use of colour
 - Ensure the entrance is obvious at all times of the day
 - Think about the first-time user who is unfamiliar with the building on arrival
- Examine ways of increasing the relationship between the entry and the market space

Vehicular Realm

- Examine ways of reducing potential for conflict with vehicles and pedestrians
- There looks to be a lot of space dedicated to parking and vehicle circulation
 - It looks out of scale
 - Determine if Fire Services would accept a more compact dead-end configuration rather than the large Y-shape configuration
- Determine if the parking area can be curb-less, so it is more like a plaza
 - Parks and people should rule

Courtyards and "Sanctuary"

- Explore ways of extending the notion of "sanctuary" further across the site
- Push the garden idea a little further
- The plan feels like a very contained building within a landscape that has a perimeter condition
- It would be great to have a place where people could sit outside, where school groups could have a discussion
- The notion of outdoor rooms and an indoor landscape falls a bit short
- The courtyards are all very similar in size
 - Consider reducing the size of some

Seating

- Provide seating outside the building to encourage and support the occupation of exterior spaces on outside

Community Garden

- Determine if the community garden can be arranged in a linear fashion so that it is more visible, and interacts more the courtyard spaces.

Articulation and the "Veil"

- The sense of veil is a very strong conceptual idea, that doesn't need to happen at every corner... this almost reduces the impact of the main one.

Pavers

- Ensure quality pavers are installed, and that the design of the shared space/parking is well thought out
 - Ensure it is not simply a mix of concrete and asphalt

Sustainable Design

- TGS compliance is appreciated, but as a civic duty, pursue ways of taking this further than the bare minimum requirements
 - City-owned buildings have higher standards

Roofscape

- Consider the placement of PV cells; ideally they will face south
- With the roof setup as proposed, water collection from the green roof will be minimal; think about this analytically
- As a demonstration project, sight lines and visibility of the roofscape is encouraged
- Provide more of an overhang for weather protection and protection for bikes at the main opening

Kipling Mobility Hub	
Planning Area	Etobicoke Centre
Design Team	planningAlliance
Application Type	Feasibility Study
Review	4 th Review
City Staff	Julie Bogdanowicz, Urban Design Luisa Galli, Community Planning
Participating Members	R. Giannone, G. Stratford, M. Graham, B. Hollingworth, C. Blanchaer, D. Cook, D. Sisam
Conflict of Interest	Jenny McMinn, Halsall Associates
Vote	Refine* - 6; Redesign – 0



* Panel voted for refinement on condition that the architecture and pedestrian infrastructure is further improved to become as exceptional as the functional aspects of the proposal, creating a sense of celebration and landscape continuity.

Introduction

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought advice on the following:

1. The goal of Mobility Hubs is to create a seamless integration of various modes of transportation, including pedestrians and cyclists, and to promote a sense of place while providing uses and amenities that support transit users and the local area. Does the proposal meet Metrolinx's Guidelines and the City's goals and objectives related to the convenient, accessible and attractive integration of comprehensive multi modal development within the Etobicoke Centre?
2. Given the site constraints and the change in grade, does the plan appropriately address and the street frontage along Dundas Street West with a prominent design? Is the proposed design resulting in a series of quality spaces that supports the Etobicoke Centre? Or will the site be used as a passage rather than a destination?
3. Do the various elements within the plan come together as an integrated design? Does the design present an adequate architectural statement that considers views from above? Considering the constraints, is the design greater than the sum of its parts and is the design resulting in a cohesive campus-like hub?

The consultant described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.

Chairs Summary of Key Points

Panel is very appreciative of Metrolinx's long term commitment to engaging the Panel in the design process for this project. The site is a challenging one but also has the potential to be a significant transit gateway; both functionally and as a prominent civic amenity. With further development and creative ambition, the design presented can achieve a high-quality civic node. Extend the sculptural quality shown in the existing and new buildings throughout the site including: creating the landscape as a sculpted meadow landform, shaping the topography and planting to visually screen parking levels, and integrating vehicular and pedestrian routes as patterns into the landscape.

Related Commentary

The Kipling Station Mobility Hub was one of the first projects reviewed by the Design Review Panel, in July 2007. At that time the proposal included a bus terminal closer to the subway station, beneath the hydro corridor. The project underwent several iterations since that time, the most recent one reflecting a new policy change from Toronto Hydro that restricts development beneath such corridors. The bus terminal, which is the current scope of the project, has subsequently been shifted westwards on the site.

Members expressed frustration with so many site constraints, but identified some potential for celebration on the site by raising the architectural expression of the bus terminal, underground entrances, and the landscape quality. These observations, and other comments, are summarized below.

Does the proposal meet Metrolinx's Guidelines and the City's goals and objectives related to the convenient, accessible and attractive integration of comprehensive multi modal development within the Etobicoke Centre?

- Mobility Hub Guidelines
 - Many objectives are being met
 - From movement perspective, it seems to work functionally
 - This is a transportation intensive site, therefore it has a lot of surface parking
 - Notwithstanding this, the extent of parking detracts from the ability to provide more "green"
 - The sheer number of people using this hub will make it animated and hopefully exciting
- Pedestrian and Cycling Access
 - It could be a potentially frustrating experience for those arriving on foot or by bike
 - The separation of accesses will distribute loads, and possibly make it safer for pedestrians
 - Consider how a cyclist would access the site
 - The shared route on Acorn seems like a good compromise
 - A dedicated route would be challenging for safety
- Taxi stands and Accessible Parking
 - Ensure a sufficient supply is provided

- Passenger Pick-up and Drop-off
 - There will be a lot of activity here, so ensure it functions safely
 - Ensure it has a clear identity as a drop-off but also that it feels like a civic space
 - Pick up and drop off happens in a parking lot, which is a problem
 - The parking lot wins; there is no celebration
 - The sidewalks need to be wider; cars should not dominate
 - Think about pedestrian patterns particularly in bad weather
 - They will stay in the shelter
 - Is there enough capacity for this?

Does the plan appropriately address the street frontage along Dundas Street West with a prominent design? Is the proposed design resulting in a series of quality spaces that supports the Etobicoke Centre? Or will the site be used as a passage rather than a destination?

- Wayfinding and Safety
 - Wayfinding signage for pedestrians and drivers will be essential
 - This needs to be balanced with quality of space
 - Ensure the public realm is not dominated by signage
 - It will be necessary to ensure pedestrians don't cut across roadways
 - Ensure the public realm is not dominated by chain link fencing
 - Structures need to be designed as beacons, encouraging people to use them
- Quality of Spaces
 - The lack of furniture and lighting will be a challenge
 - The pedestrian spine has clear graphic quality to it
 - There is too much hardscape in the region from the PPUDO to the bus terminal
 - re-examine extent of pavement, and soften if possible
- Pedestrian Flow
 - The pinch-point at the south of 5353 Dundas St, along the east-west link, could benefit from further study
 - It needs to be considered 3-dimensionally
 - think about materials as well
 - The pedestrian crosswalk across Subway Crescent is clear
 - A similar intervention will be required to the east, on Auckland Rd.
- Proposed Design
 - At least one Member felt the alternative option, with the curvy road, would result in a better design overall
 - They felt it was more logical and elegant
 - They felt too much of the current site would be taken up with parking
 - They also felt it would allow for a better response to the Dundas frontage, including by constructing a "shelf" for pedestrians at this level (with a civic function), and locating car parking beneath.

Do the various elements within the plan come together as an integrated design? Does the design present an adequate architectural statement that considers views from above? Considering the constraints, is the design greater than the sum of its parts and is the design resulting in a cohesive campus-like hub?

Given the site and project challenges, there was a general sentiment that making a coherent campus would be extremely difficult. Opportunities for design excellence and civic gestures were identified in the bus terminal itself, the underground tunnel entrances, and the landscape design. Overall, there was a sentiment that the design was currently lacking a strong announcement of arrival.

- Bus Terminal
 - The terminal has potential to be attractive but is not there yet
 - The terminal has to be really exciting, really iconic
 - The terminal needs to be "pumped up" more
 - Develop a dialogue with the existing roof structure of the PPUDO and TTC Station
 - They are classic modernist pieces
 - The wood soffit is questionable; it looks pedestrian and there could be issues with long-term maintenance
 - You need something really exciting as a soffit that provides users with a heightened experience
 - Consider it as a potential public art location
 - The "oasis" in bus shelter is welcome
 - push this further
- Tunnel Entrances
 - The quality of entrances is under-developed
 - Given expanse of space, marking entrances will be important to help with wayfinding
 - They need to be something really amazing/special that you see coming up from underground or as you approach from across the site
 - Consider how natural light will be treated
 - Consider integrating the architecture of tunnel entrances and terminal
- Landscape Design
 - The formation of a quality open space along Dundas Street could form a nice counter-point to the other parks and open spaces that are coming within the Etobicoke Centre
 - Aspiring to the quality shown within these images could set the standard as a place without trees
 - Long grasses and low landscapes can be really eloquent
 - the precedent images have not been translated into the proposal
 - Push the envelope at this scale
 - Use the Hydro permissions to full advantage
 - This needs to be seen as an opportunity
 - Place desire lines where people want to go, and make the quality of planting and design along there as great as possible

93-95 Berkeley Street	
Planning Area	King-Parliament Neighbourhood
Design Team	Giannone Petricone Associates
Application Type	Rezoning Application
Review	First review
City Staff	Ragini Dayal, Heritage Preservation Henry Tang, Community Planning
Participating Members	D. Cook, B. Hollingworth, D. Sisam, G. Stratford, M. Graham, J. McMinn
Conflict of Interest	None
Vote	<u>Refine – 5</u> ; Redesign - 0



Introduction

City staff outlined the area context, history and area policy priorities and sought advice on the following:

1. Does the proposed massing of the base building along the Parliament Street edge provide a built form that respects the existing streetscape established by the heritage buildings south of the site? What improvements are needed for this section of Parliament Street to continue the characteristics of this "Special Street"?
2. Does the Panel have suggestions, such as architectural articulation, for the tower along Parliament Street that will continue the characteristics of this "Special Street"?
3. Does the proposed building setbacks along Berkeley Street, and building projection onto the private pedestrian mews achieve a compatible relationship with the Christie, Brown & Co. heritage building? What other improvements, such as roof line and profile, and architectural articulation are needed?

The consultant described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.

Chairs Summary of Key Points

Panel appreciates that the proponent's concept is a strong starting point on what is a challenging site. However, with the character and history of the neighbourhood and site context in mind, further design is needed with the following areas of focus.

The proposed design is visually very active and needs to be calmed down, with an emphasis on simplicity and clarity. Shift density to create built form that is more in keeping with height and massing of context, and retain the original heritage building. In terms of materiality, reduce and focus the palette to more subtly complement and contrast the area

context. Ensure that the high quality pedestrian realm presented is realized including a safe/animated mews and increased setback along Parliament.

Related Commentary

Panel was supportive of the proposal, but suggested it would be improved by refinements to a variety of elements including the height and massing strategy, materials (type and simplicity), mews quality, and heritage retention strategy. Some comments in this regard are below. An expanded summary of the discussion follows.

- The spirit of project and response to different conditions is great
- There is so much happening, it almost takes away from overall response
 - Simplify some of the gestures
 - It feels like there are too many things happening
- The building is too big to fit with the emerging fabric
 - Bring it all down so it's a larger version of the neighbourhood character; OR
 - Pick a point which creates a good base condition, and make a really good slender portion above
- It feels as though there are too many materials

Parliament Street Base

- It responds to local conditions, which vary tremendously throughout
- The proportion of brick to glass feels a bit off
- The retail and lobby level could be simplified

Parliament Street Tower

- The massing is very heavy above the base
- The tower could be more slender
- There are too many materials, too many volumes
- The tower proportions are off
 - It is stubby; would be better if it was more slab-like
 - If the tower was taller, which no one probably wants, it might feel more appropriate because of the better proportion
 - The 10th-19th floor looks almost like a cube, which is awkward
 - I would like to see a less phonetic insertion into the community
- The Tall Building Guidelines don't always work/apply
 - It would be better off if the tower took an ell-shape and extended up to something like 14-storeys
 - This would help it fit in better, and cool it down a bit
- The proposal looks to shade Richmond Street throughout the day
 - Reducing this shadow impact would be commendable

Berkeley Street and Heritage Building

- The Berkeley St setback works well
- Precedent of New York, meat packing, works well

Pedestrian Mews

- The pedestrian mews has lots of potential if done right

- Not sure it should be covered; open to the sky is preferable
 - Concern that it will be dark
 - Continue to think this through
- As public space, it could be really popular
 - The area is deficient in public space, so it could be a big draw card
- Retail at the corner of Parliament will encourage people to use it
 - Push retail back a bit, so it becomes a wayfinding point
 - Ensure it is the kind of space that people know they can use
- Concern at night and whether there are enough eyes on the street
 - Is it somewhere people will go?
 - It could take on a different character
- Concern with access to light
 - Will trees grow, especially if the south site is redeveloped?
 - Consider how the potential build-out would affect quality
- Concern with issue of privacy for townhouses located on the mews
 - What becomes the character of that space once people have moved in?
 - Blinds will be down
 - How will the character of the units be affected once the public are using the mews?

Heritage building

- Encourage the heritage building to be retained in place, rather than taken down and rebuilt
 - When this is done, it appears as new
 - There is an inherent loss of the original patina and character
- Once the mews exists, the entire presence of the heritage building has to be felt
 - The side of the heritage building needs to be retained in addition to the front

Materials

- The intention to treat the setback mass differently is appreciated
- The corrugated metal seems like an industrial contrast to a building that has a more refined expression
 - Want something more detailed than this
 - An industrial pastiche might still work, but the material needs to translate better to the heritage character
- It feels as though fewer materials would be an improvement
- Use traditional materials in a modern contemporary way, without detracting from the neighbourhood
- The play of brick needs to be well executed
- The use of brick, and traditional brick colours, is encouraged

Sustainable Design

- Push further than minimum TGS requirements