

**200 Codd's Road (Block 21) | Informal Pre-Consultation Review | T Bonhomme Architect, Wateridge Lifestyles Ltd. |**

**Panel Members in Attendance:** James Parakh | Heather Rolleston | Emmanuelle van Ruten | Colin Berman | Nigel Tai | Philip Evans |



**Key Recommendations**

- The Panel expresses interest in the project’s original conceptual sketch, particularly the idea of clear connections through the site and a generous, landscaped interior block condition.
- The Panel expresses concern that a significant portion of the interior of the site is being consumed by servicing, loading, and vehicle circulation.
- The Panel encourages continued exploration of built form adjustments, including pinching or reorienting portions of the building mass, particularly toward the north end to open up a larger and more meaningful courtyard space between Phase 1 and Phase 2.
- The Panel supports the overall material direction and encourages caution against the use of less durable materials such as EIFS, due to long-term performance and maintenance concerns.

**Site design & public realm**

- The Panel appreciates the effort to reinforce Codd’s Road and Tawadina Road as clear site corridors and encourages further exploration to create a more pedestrian-focused site, as it currently feels dominated by vehicles and servicing.

- The Panel encourages further exploration of the massing on the site, including tower placement, ramp locations, and ground-level organization, to better align with the original master plan intent of permeability and access through the site.
- The Panel suggests Phase 1 ramp can be relocated or configured differently, potentially toward the east, or whether a more direct entry into the building could be achieved, while maintaining visibility and safety for ground-floor residential units.
- The Panel notes that in Phase 1 the pedestrian pathway connection across the site is difficult to read and appears to be lost, and emphasizes the importance of establishing a clear, legible path through the site.
- The Panel notes that vestibules, parking ramps, and service elements are acting as physical and visual blockers where through-block porosity could be achieved, representing a lost opportunity to strengthen connections to the park.
- The Panel recommends shaping the buildings more deliberately around this space to create a cohesive, usable, and holistic outdoor environment, rather than a negative leftover condition.
  - Suggestions include flipping or reorienting building legs to open up a larger, more successfully shared amenity area.
- The Panel expresses concern regarding the generator, loading, and transformer area, which currently forms a prominent edge.
- The Panel encourages further study of relocating bike parking and the small terrace to better consolidate or conceal these elements through enclosure, reduce congestion and allow greater flexibility in resolving service.

## **Sustainability**

- The Panel suggests emphasizing long-term durability, resilience, and operational performance as key sustainability considerations.
- The Panel encourages careful consideration of snow storage, drainage, and maintenance operations to ensure that primary pedestrian routes from parking areas to entrances remain safe, comfortable, and legible throughout the year.

## **Built form & Architecture**

- The Panel expresses support for the use of rusticated stone at the base and encourages further refinement of proportions and detailing at the canopies. The current configuration leaves a very thin band of rusticated stone above the

canopy that feels visually awkward. Revisiting canopy depth, placement, and proportion could help strengthen the base expression.

- The Panel expresses concern about the proposed use of EIFS, citing issues of longevity and material performance.
- The Panel strongly encourages pursuing more durable, noble materials across the base, middle, and top of the building, even if this requires efficiencies or simplifications elsewhere in the building form.
- The Panel suggests further refinement in the floor plate size and configuration, including the potential for smaller floor plates or mirrored U-shaped buildings to better support the courtyard condition and improve amenity space.
- The Panel encourages the proponent team to look at successful Garden Court precedents and to find efficiencies in building form.