

Peer Review Letter/

February 16, 2022

To: Mark Bryan
Senior Planner
Town of Collingwood
P.O. Box 157
Collingwood, Ontario
L9Y 3Z5

Re: **Site Plan Control Application (SPA) Submission – 31 Huron, Collingwood Ontario**

Dear Mr. Bryan,

Brook McIlroy is pleased to provide this Peer Review letter for the SPA re-submission to permit a proposed 6-storey mixed-use building (the “Proposed Development”) located at 31 Huron Street (the “Subject Site”) in the Town of Collingwood. On January 26, 2021, Brook McIlroy provided urban design comments on the SPA submission (dated July 31, 2020). The applicant has addressed these comments in the SPA re-submission.

Brook McIlroy has examined the updated Architectural Package prepared by CEBRA (dated August 26, 2021), the Landscape Plan prepared by the MBTW group (dated August 2021), and the Urban Design Review prepared by the MBTW group (dated August 19, 2021). The Peer Review letter provides a brief analysis of relevant policy and guidelines and a summary of the design changes. The letter finds that many of the issues raised in previous reviews have been resolved.

Analysis of Relevant Policy and Guidelines:

Town of Collingwood Official Plan (Consolidated January 2019)

The Subject Site is located within *The Shipyards – Special Policy Area* of the Town of Collingwood Official Plan. Official Plan Policy 4.4.4.9 applies to the Subject Site and the surrounding area outlined on Schedule A of the Official Plan.

OP Policy 4.4.4.9(1.9.3) provides direction on the urban design of the Shipyards Special Policy Area, and outlines how to ensure that the Shipyards are integrated with the downtown and waterfront areas:

- a. *provide views to the waterfront and the Town through “The Shipyards -Special Policy Area”,*
- b. *extend the existing and abutting municipal road allowances into the site,*
- c. *provide for a street grid pattern,*
- d. *connect the existing trail network with a continuous linked trail system,*
- e. *provide a public waterfront corridor including trails,*
- f. *provide for a bike trail, provide a water’s edge public plaza at the terminus of Hurontario Street along the water’s edge at the Launch Basin,*
- g. *provide a public waterfront edge,*
- h. *site and design buildings to address the waterfront,*
- i. *provide a variety of publicly accessible open space elements that include both public and private lands, and,*

j. locate buildings to front, face, and feature public open spaces including streets.

Development of the site shall be designed in compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines prepared by the MBTW Group entitled “The Shipyards Community Master Plan Urban Design Guidelines” as endorsed by Council with particular reference to the “The Shipyards – Special Policy Area Architectural Design Guidelines. (4.4.4.9(1.9.3))

The Official Plan policy correctly speaks to the high-level elements of urban design that begin to define a relationship between proposed developments and their surrounding and planned context. From an urban design perspective, the Proposed Development satisfies the policies provided within the Official Plan to sufficiently integrate with the downtown and waterfront areas.

The Shipyards Community Master Plan Urban Design Guidelines (2004)

The Official Plan empowers the Shipyards Community Master Plan Urban Design Guidelines and the Architectural Design Guidelines to guide the relationship between new development and existing uses, streets, blocks, public spaces, and buildings.

The Urban Design Guidelines include the following Principles of Built Form:

- *Built form can embody Collingwood’s ideal of “respecting the past while looking forward to the future”*
- *Create an interesting streetscape or edge to the public realm that is both coherent and diverse*
- *Support a well-defined, well-observed, intimate and pedestrian-scale public realm with built form*
- *Provide memorable elements or buildings at the end of view corridors or at gateways in order to create landmarks and points of orientation and wayfinding*
- *Locate and orient buildings or individual units to take advantage of views to the waterfront. public spaces, the Town or the surrounding landscape*
- *Site buildings at corners to define both edges; wrap fenestration around corners*
- *Wrap elements of the elevation treatment of the primary building facade around the side, exterior flankage or rear elevations that are visible from public streets and spaces*
- *Provide uses and functions at grade that promote activity. interaction and safety*
- *Encourage active interior spaces such as kitchens or common rooms to locate at ground level adjacent to either private open spaces or public spaces*
- *Design public buildings to be fully accessible inside and out*
- *Minimize the impact of service areas on the public realm*

The Proposed Development provides a built form that is inspired by the area’s shipbuilding heritage while remaining contemporary in design and materiality. The Proposed Development’s architectural approach provides a positive relationship with an enhanced pedestrian realm. Through the Peer Review process, Brook McIlroy and the Town of Collingwood have worked with the Applicant to ensure that the intent of the Urban Design Guidelines are met.

The Shipyards Community Master Plan Architectural Design Guidelines (2004)

The Official Plan policy examined above also empowers the Architectural Design Guidelines, which note that the Shipyards should provide seamless continuity with the existing townscape of Collingwood. The Guidelines are clear in stating that “seamless continuity does not necessarily imply absolute replication. [...] The key in every instance, Victorian or contemporary, is that the design be properly and creatively accomplished.”

The Guidelines also recognize the importance of periodically reviewing and updating the document:

The Guidelines are not intended to be absolute and immutable. The evolution of the Town of Collingwood is an ongoing occurrence. Ideas and expectations shift and develop over time. New

insights or tastes lead to reconsideration of prior policies and directions. To that end, it is absolutely essential that the Architectural Design Guidelines be periodically reviewed, critically appraised, and amended accordingly (albeit with prudence) so that they may accurately reflect changing conditions.

While the Guidelines have not been updated since their adoption 18 years ago, they are forward-thinking in noting that they “shall be read in conjunction with all landscape designs, which shall be considered as integrated into any building proposal” (Section 1).

Brook McIlroy finds that a contemporary building that references the industrial heritage of the Shipyards, expressed architecturally as well as through public art installation and heritage interpretation, complies with the intent of the Guidelines.

The Town of Collingwood Urban Design Manual (2010)

While the Shipyards Urban Design Guidelines and Architectural Design Guidelines provide a more detailed vision for the Subject Site, the Urban Design Manual should be considered holistically, and the Manual applies to all development proposals subject to review.

Section 7 of the Manual provides guidance on Buildings. The stated goal of the Manual is to ensure “high-quality design that has evolved from the local context and culture to create livable, functional, safe, and attractive environments.” The Proposed Development generally satisfies the guidelines within Section 7 of the Manual.

The Proposed Development is a corner site. The Proposed Development complies with guideline 7C(2) to provide a canopy and decorative architectural feature at the southwest corner of the building. The southeast corner of the building is enhanced by landscape features and interpretive signage. The landscaped element at the northeast portion of the Subject Site is a prominent gateway feature.

The Manual’s guidance on Height and Massing (7F) a 45 degree angular plane taken from the street centre line. The Proposed Development is under a 45 degree angular plane taken from Huron Street, and it incorporates an enhanced public realm along the frontage. Portions of the north and east elevations project into a 45 degree angular plane taken from Side Launch Way and Heritage Drive. However, each elevation occupies less than 50% of the frontage and are complemented by open space, which mitigates the visual impact of the height and massing in these areas.

The Manual provides guidance on roofs in Section (7N). The roof of the Proposed Development is not considered a false form, per guideline 7N(2.a). Guideline 7N(3) provides guidance for roofs extending 20m or more horizontally. The Proposed Development roofline is approximately 25.7 metres in width at the east and 27.05 metres in width at the north. Brook McIlroy finds that the windows at the mezzanine level provide sufficient visual interest within the roof form at the north and east elevations. The inset balconies throughout the roofline provide visual interest and amenity space for residents, and do not add additional bulk to the roof line or penetrate the 45 degree angular plane.

SPA-Resubmission Comments

The following comments were provided by Brook McIlroy on January 26, 2021 and the SPA-resubmission package has addressed the comments as follows:

1.1. Clarify this cladding material as wood depiction is likely not realistic - especially sloping window sills

The provided Architectural Renderings and Elevation Drawings indicate a window wall with black frames and sills, with wood cladding framing the southwest corner element. This issue has been resolved.

1.2. Signage controls should be in place on the plaza side - controlling size, face lit (not rear lit), encourage perpendicular blade signs and channel metal letters signs

The provided renderings show channel metal letter signage. However, Brook McIlroy recommends that signage controls be put in place by the Town to ensure that tenant signage is appropriate in size, illumination, and materiality.

1.3. Multiple retail entrances should be located on the west side (not shown on plans) - this would be positive for plaza animation, spill out café uses, etc.

The provided floor plans show four retail entrances located on the west side of the ground floor. This is a positive addition, and this issue has been resolved.

1.4. Canopy here? For snow/rain protection - note sloping surfaces above

A canopy has been provided at the southwest corner and it projects to, but does not overhang, the south property line. This issue has been resolved.

1.5. Retail entry should also be on the plaza side to encourage patio use and outdoor retail display

See comment 1.3. This issue has been resolved.

1.6. Backup from this parking space may be in conflict with ramp exit movements

Applicant has removed one parking space at grade to limit potential conflict with the underground parking ramp. This issue has been resolved.

1.7. Barrier-free spaces conflict with truck back-up at loading area

Applicant has shifted barrier-free parking spaces to the east portion of the surface parking area. Three proposed parking spaces conflict with the Type G Loading area. This issue has been resolved.

1.8. Relocate barrier free spaces here direct access to retail entrances and better sidewalk conditions

The Applicant has relocated barrier-free spaces as directed, resulting in a more direct route to retail at the southeast portion of the Subject Site. This issue has been resolved.

1.9. Recommend 2.1 m sidewalk width

The Applicant has proposed 2.1 m sidewalk widths at the indicated area, which is compliant with barrier-free sidewalk design approaches. This issue has been resolved.

1.10. This area should not be a parking space (back-up into the delivery lane) - recommend an outdoor space contiguous with the Amenity area

The Applicant has removed the indicated parking space and proposed 10 at-grade bicycle parking spaces. This is an acceptable approach, and this issue has been resolved.

1.11. *Building height, staggered façades and roof form are very successful in mitigating the building's massing, creating a built form that is positive and appropriate for this important site.*

Building height, roof form, and façade form remains appropriate and acceptable. This issue has been resolved.

1.12. *The use of brick/masonry cladding, metal roof and their respective colours are positive and appropriate*

Building materiality remains appropriate. This issue has been resolved.

1.13. *The use of a wood product as a feature cladding material at the entrance is a positive feature but requires further consideration given the depiction of sloping sills etc.*

See comment 1.1. This issue has been resolved.

1.14. *More architectural design and landscape design consideration should be given to the east side of the development adjacent to Heritage Drive to indicate this as an important gateway of historic significance.*

The Landscape Plan shows an improved gateway condition at the northeast corner of the Subject Site, with interpretive rail cart, in-ground historical plaques, and interpretive signage complemented by public seating and plantings to enhance the public realm and screen the surface parking. The Harbourland Park Information Interpretive Sign (D-1: Detail 1) at the southeast portion of the Subject Site is 2.1m – 1.5m in height, with only 0.26 m between cortan steel panels. The panels create a safety concern because they screen the pathway abutting the building from view. This warrants further review from the Applicant team.

1.15. *A detailed landscape plan for the green space at the north-east corner of the site should be provided. A well landscaped and treed area integrating seating and shade would provide a positive public-realm transformation of this important intersection at Side Launch Way and Heritage Drive. Opportunities to integrate heritage interpretative elements into the design should be considered.*

See comment 1.14. The Applicant has provided a Landscape Plan that provides a gateway at the northeast corner with public seating, heritage interpretation elements, and adequate shade and planting. This issue has been resolved.

1.16. *Appropriate building and commercial signage should be restricted in size using channel metal signs that are face-lit. Blade signs perpendicular to the façade, overhanging the sidewalk and patio areas, are also encouraged. Blade signs should be no larger than .38 sq metres in face dimension per side and may be face-lit or rear-lit.*

See comment 1.2. This issue has been resolved.

1.17. *Ground floor plans should include multiple entrances to the retail areas on the west side.*

See comment 1.3. This issue has been resolved.

1.18. *Opportunities for seasonal outdoor patio uses and outdoor retail are presently limited by the property boundary on the west side. An agreement with the Town is encouraged which would*

permit a wider zone for these uses through an easement into the public plaza area (similar to a sidewalk permit). These outdoor retail/patio uses will enjoy favourable south and west light making them a popular destination in the summer and shoulder seasons. These uses in turn will contribute to the vibrancy of the public plaza as an important public destination. Given the location of the plaza and these animated outdoor uses at an important gateway to the downtown, this site has the potential to be a high-profile, featured destination for visitors and residents.

See comment 1.3 with respect to retail uses. Further action from the Town is required.

1.19. Accessible parking stalls should not be located adjacent to the loading zone. Recommend they be moved to the east end of the parking lot adjacent to the sidewalk accessing retail entrances.

See comment 1.7 and 1.10. This issue has been resolved.

1.20. Parking spot in front of the parking ramp exit has the potential for conflict and should be removed.

See comment 1.6. This issue has been resolved.

1.21. The sidewalk flanking the north side of the east-west wing of the building should be widened to be a minimum of 2.1 metres in width.

See comment 1.9. This issue has been resolved.

Conclusion

This Peer Review letter confirms that the architectural updates to the Subject Site are generally satisfactory and result in a Proposed Development that fulfills the intent of the Official Plan for the Shipyards Special Policy Area, as well as the intent of the Shipyards Urban Design Guidelines and Architectural Guidelines. The Urban Design Guidelines and Architectural Design Guidelines are permissive of contemporary and well-designed buildings that reference the industrial history of the area and support an enhanced relationship with the public realm.

The comments previously provided by Brook McIlroy are resolved, with the exception of 1.14 with respect to the interpretive signage at the southeast portion of the Subject Site. Comments 1.2 and 1.8 require further discussion with and action from the Town.

Sincerely,



Calvin Brook, RPP, MCIP, FRAIC, OAA, MAA, SAA LEED AP

Principal

Brook McIlroy Inc.