

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: August 27, 2014
TIME: 4.00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall
PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Walter Francl (Missed Item #1)
David Grigg
Joseph Hruda
Arno Matis (Present for Item #1 & #2)
Phil Mondor
Maurice Pez (Present for Item #1 & #2)

REGRETS:
Greg Bellerby
Joseph Fry
Jennifer Marshall
Chris Mramor
Goran Ostojic
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---------------------------------|
| 1. | 308 West Hastings Street |
| 2. | 311 East 6 th Avenue |
| 3. | 1529 Comox Street |
| 4. | 1546 Nelson Street |
| 5. | 1071 Cardero Street |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 308 West Hastings Street
 DE: 418102
 Description: To construct a new 6-storey mixed-use building containing commercial uses on the ground floor, institutional uses on the second floor, and residential rental units on the third to sixth floors. This application is being considered under the Rental 100 Program.
 Zoning: DD
 Application Status: Development Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Raymond Letkeman Architect Inc.
 Owner: MGC Properties
 Delegation: Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architect Inc.
 Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates Landscape Architects
 Robert Brown, MGC Properties
 Matthew Carter, MGC Properties
 Daniel Shapiro, SFU
 Staff: Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site found in the Downtown ODP Sub Area C2 which is located between West Hastings Street and Hamilton Street. The existing former CIBC bank building is currently on the site. The site overlooks the prominent Victory Square and is kitty corner to the Dominion Building. The site has a substantial north/south slope from the lane (high side) to West Hastings Street (low side). The proposal is for 52 self-contained furnished units of secured rental housing for the purposes of SFU students. It is to have a street level café and office/work/gathering spaces for the students.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

In addition to any comment on the overall architecture and expression proposed for this development application, the Panel's advice is sought on the following questions:

- How well has the proposal responded to the site, topography, and the greater context of the Victory Square precinct?
- How successful is the architectural expression and use of materials;
- Comments on the success of the West Hastings elevation and in particular the composition of the at-grade elevational treatments and their effect on supporting active street uses.
- Comments on the overall landscape (hardscape) design and the design of the public realm areas along West Hastings and Hamilton Street.

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Carter, Developer, mentioned that the project comprises of three elements: the ground level café, second floor innovation space and the top four floors of 52 rental units for students of SFU. He said that they believe the

design for the site is consistent with the zoning and recent policy documents. The site has historical significance and they were conscious of their design responding to that and as a result worked with SFU to come up with a strong design rationale. They wanted to be responsive to the significant heritage of the area while introducing a vibrant, contemporary design. As well they want the building to integrate well into the neighbourhood.

Raymond Letkeman, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they wanted to have a contemporary building that reflected the historic past. They wanted to make the base more transparent to allow for street interaction. Due to the slope on the site, the main address will be West Hastings Street and is defined by the red SFU form at the entry. The café will also front West Hastings Street and as well there is a third entrance on Hamilton Street which gives direct access to the innovation space. There will be some parking on the lane as well as the service entrance. The mid-section is more traditional in form and as well the windows are grouped with a black frame. The top of the building is very simple using a powder coated steel profile for the cap and change in the window pattern. Mr. Letkeman noted that the building won't have any shadow impacts on Victory Square. He added that they had a discussion regarding adding an amenity on the roof for the students but it was decided that it wouldn't be appropriate since the area would be unsupervised.

Rob Barnes, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted that this was the corner that the original surveyor for Vancouver started laying out the downtown grid. There is an existing plaque on the building with his name. He said they felt it was an opportunity to not only have recognition on the building but translate that down to the ground to represent that first survey spike. It is a quiet and simple streetscape that already exists. They will be adding some trees on Hamilton Street and they might be able to add one on Hastings Street.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the building's base and relationship to grade;
 - Design development to strengthen the corner at Hamilton Street;
 - Design development to strengthen the entrance;
 - Consider another material choice other than Swiss Pearl;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal as well as the uses for the building. The Panel thought the form and massing was appropriate and reinforced the street. They also thought it was connected to its context. The Panel noted that this was an important corner as it is highly visible and would create a strong corner.

Some Panel members thought the base was the weakest element noting that the concrete blade that separates the ground floor from the second storey wasn't working in making a strong expression of the base. While some members liked the idea of the base being light and vibrant as a nice twist on what would normally be a heavier base, others thought it needed to be more substantial.

Some Panel members also thought the corner seemed somewhat weak at Hamilton Street. As well they wanted to see the lobby entrance improved as it is located at the darkest corner of the building. Many suggested an investigation of how the building relates to the public realm and potentially working with the City to reduce the width of Hamilton Street.

The Panel supported the colour palette while several members thought the materials could be simplified and suggested changing the Swiss pearl for another material choice. As well they supported the landscaping plans. Some Panel members wanted to see a tree on the corner. Several Panel members suggested further development of the roof.

Regarding sustainability, some Panel members thought the applicant should strive for LEED™ Gold and noted that they were not doing well in terms of energy points. One Panel member suggested using the roof for solar panels for domestic heat and hot water. Another Panel member though the applicant should add shading to the south/east side of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Letkeman thanked the Panel and said he agreed with the Panel regarding the 2-storey base and would take another look.

2. Address:	311 East 6 th Avenue
DE:	417971
Description:	To construct a new 6-storey building containing 57 residential units and 53 artist studios. The proposal includes 14 non-market Vancouver Resource Society units for artists with disabilities.
Zoning:	IC-3
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	IBI/HB Group
Owner:	Jameson Developments
Delegation:	Peter C. Lang, IBI/HB Group Jeffrey Mok, IBI/HB Group Cameron Owen, IBI/HB Group Tom Pappajohn, Jameson Developments
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-2)

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, mentioned that it was the second review for the application from the Panel. He described the background for the project noting that it is a three parcel site on the east corner of Scotia Street and East 6th Avenue. The site is characterized by light industrial uses and the surrounding context is comprised of two and three storey low rise building punctuated by five and nine storey primarily in the southwest. The site the slopes eight feet to the north and an additional three feet to the low point in the northeast. The applicant is seeking a bonus density under the IC-3 Schedule which allows a density bonus for providing a social amenity satisfying a core need which will be the secured residential with artist studios for artists with disabilities. There are 58 market residential units, 52 Class A residential with associated artist studio units and 14 social amenity spaces. On levels 1 through 3 the artist residential units having a clear ceiling height of 9 feet and levels 4 through 6 have a clear ceiling height of 8 feet for the market residential. The building presents 6-storeys along East 6th Avenue and 7-storeys at the lane because of the slope of the height. The proposal seeks a height relaxation of 8 feet along the northern parapet. The plan is configured around a common access courtyard, shared loading with direct access to amenity and workshop space and the parking entrance is in the northeast corner of the site. The upper units have roof top access by a spiral staircase.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Comment on the response and resolution of the previous comments made by the Panel:

- Consider a lighter colour palette for the building;
- Design development to reduce the bulkiness of the building;
- Design development to improve the materials used on the building;
- Design development to improve privacy for the ground floor units;
- Design development to improve the courtyard space.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Jeffrey Mok, Architect, further described the changes to the proposal. He mentioned that they have lightened up the colour palette with the use of white brick. They are maintaining the red brick which is a signature striped pattern as well as variations of white and grey. They are using a proper rain screen wall to achieve a high R value and the vision glass has been restricted to 38% as a way to mitigate energy loss. Mr. Mok said they have taken steps to break down the parts of the building.

From the top level they have set back the floor on the north side and pinched in the sides to make the building less bulky. They have also taken the centre portion of the building and set it back from the street four feet and have reduced the length of the courtyard. At grade level they have pulled the ground floor back three feet from Scotia Street and gave it more articulation with some cantilevered balconies and as well they have introduced little portal elements on East 6th Avenue.

Cameron Owen, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the courtyard has been simplified. They have introduced built-in seating with tables as well as large roll up doors to connect the indoor amenity space to the outside. Garden beds provide some separation from the residential units that are facing the courtyard and a gated access and trees to separate the lane. They have also introduced along the Scotia Street edge some plantings. There is a tree planted in relation to each unit along East 6th Avenue. On the first storey around the courtyard they are introducing a cable that vines will grow on to green up the area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve privacy issues with the ground floor units;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the building;
 - Design development to improve the uses in the courtyard;
 - Design development to improve unit livability.
 - Consider adding a common amenity space on the roof;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the changes since the last review had improved the building.

The Panel thought the change in the material and colour palette had broken down the mass and improved the building. They were concerned however with the privacy for the ground floor units. They noted that there are very close to the street and suggested not using glass rails since there was a privacy concern. As well some Panel members thought the building looked a little too residential for its use.

The Panel wanted to see design development to improve the courtyard space. They mentioned that this was more of a challenge due to the fact that it is an artist studio building and requires both work and living spaces. As well some Panel members thought the 7-storey walls could benefit from some manipulations at higher levels to make those walls not so overbearing.

A couple of Panel members thought that while the step at the upper levels was an improvement it doesn't go far enough on the north end.

Some Panel members wanted to see other areas for amenity spaces since they thought the courtyard wasn't really serving as amenity. One Panel member suggested having an amenity space on the roof in the middle space as there would still be room for private patios.

Some Panel members thought the units in the corners of the courtyard that face north were challenged for livability. One Panel member recommended getting rid of the solid walls and using window wall instead. A couple of Panel members thought the balconies on the front of the building were more appropriate for a marine holiday environment than an industrial environment and did not match the context for the area.

There was some concern from the Panel regarding livability with the units at the front of the building that are long and narrow.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Mok thanked the Panel for their comments.

3. Address:	1529 Comox Street
DE:	418115
Description:	To construct a new 4-storey multiple dwelling infill building at the rear of the property consisting of six one-bedroom units and one three-bedroom unit with surface parking space at the rear. This application includes relocating the existing multiple dwelling building towards the front property line with an addition.
Zoning:	RM-5
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Carrera Management Corporation
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Daniel Martins, Ankenman Marchand Architects
Staff:	Colin King and Holly Sovdi

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-5)

- **Introduction:** Holly Sovdi, Planner, introduced the proposal for an infill building. He described the context for the area noting that there are a number of apartments that are five or more storeys. The area has the fourth highest density of children in the city. There are lots of green, leafy streetscapes and many of the buildings maintain a large landscaped front yard. The off-street parking in the area is under-utilized. Mr. Sovdi mentioned that there is a distinct neighbourhood character with a desire to see more rental housing for families with children. As well there is a strong community support for the Laneway 2.0 Strategy. Mr. Sovdi described the Laneway 2.0 Strategy which seeks to respect and cherish the green leafy streetscapes; protect the remaining character houses and important heritage assets; diversify the housing stock; increase the available rental stock; soften and green the lanes, establish front doors onto the lane and an incremental approach to growth that will strengthen the West End's distinct and cherished neighbourhood character.

Colin King, Development Planner, further described the proposal for the relocation and addition to the existing multiple dwelling and construction of a new 4-storey infill multiple dwelling building on the lane. He described the context noting that across the lane is a 3-storey, 40 unit strata building with decks to the lane. Adjacent to the site is a 3-storey walk-up and 2.5 storey character home. As well Mr. King described the Guidelines and mentioned that it looks for upper level setbacks to the lane and that the infill development should preserve the existing character to the street.

The proposal includes relocating the 1907 dwelling forward on the lot and that the ground floor along the street frontage will accommodate bicycle room and storage. The new location of the existing dwelling is proud of the adjacent development and results in the removal of eight mature trees in the front yard and five in the side yard. Mr. King mentioned that the relocation of the house reduces the front yard and the scale of the infill means the twenty foot courtyard is the only open space on the site.

The 4-storey infill will have 15 units of which half are 2-bedroom units. The 2-bedroom units on the top floor have access to a deck while the 3-bedroom unit has no private open space. In terms of circulation, the upper levels are a double loaded corridor, rather than stacked townhouse forms and also the location of the garbage room will require use of the side yard and courtyard for access.

With respect to parking, the 1907 building predates the bylaw. Given the challenge posed by balancing the intent of the infill program to achieve a pedestrian-oriented laneway frontage with required parking provision, it is likely that in the future staff will have to assess the overall parking deficiencies created by smaller lot development on any given laneway. There might be a threshold of acceptable parking relaxations for smaller lots and loss of surface parking due to fire access arrangements after which staff cannot consider further relaxations regardless of lot size. Such work is ongoing and likely to be included in the forthcoming laneway toolkit.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Staff are seeking panel commentary on the success of architectural and landscape proposals as follows:

- The relocation of the existing dwelling and resulting tree removal as it relates to the preservation of the existing street character;
- The proposed form of the new addition as it relates to both the preservation of existing street character and compatibility with the existing dwellings in its massing and material expression;
- The quality of the shared courtyard space in terms of its function as the main amenity space for the 28 units proposed, as well as commentary around proposed upper level massing of each building.
- Livability of the 2 & 3 bedroom units as they relate to the provision of both private open spaces and common outdoor play spaces.
- Site planning as it relates to unit access and servicing;
- Massing and material expression to the lane, particularly as it relates to shadow impacts on adjacent development and upper level setbacks,

Mr. King Took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Daniel Martins, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that one of the voids on the east side is a parking stall. On the right side it is for a pad mounted transformer. These infill projects can either be strata or rental, and in this case the client has opted for rental. The project economics are somewhat marginal relative to what would be a typical Heritage Revitalization Agreement where the costs would be earned in density. Mr. Martins noted that originally they had the ground floor for parking and that went against the design guidelines which wanted to see 2-bedroom units with patios facing onto the lane. He added that they don't have any historical records of the existing house but have designed the proposal based on what that house once might have looked like. Mr. Martins described the material palette noting that they have an old postcard that shows the colour and materials of the existing house. They are using that information to choose materials and colour but using something that is newer and fresher on the infill.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to better integrate the two buildings on the site;
 - Design development to improve the courtyard space;
 - Design development to include an indoor amenity space;
 - Design development to improve the unit layouts;
 - Consider finding a solution to not removing the tree;
 - Consider adding windows in the bike storage room.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought it was a difficult project.

The Panel found the solution to be very unsatisfactory with one Panel member stating that the response to the heritage was completely disrespectful. They were disappointed in the relocation of the existing building and the resulting tree removal. They wanted to see a way to save the trees that would as a way to keep the original landscaping. One Panel member wondered why there wasn't an Arborist report in the presentation.

The Panel also thought the new addition related poorly to the house façade. One Panel member noted the entire frontage at the lower levels seemed to be blank walls. The original house would have had a simple gable, not four dormers as shown in the alternate elevations. They suggested that it should look to complete the original anticipated volume of the house and get back to roof forms that would have existed when it was built.

The Panel thought the quality of the shared courtyard space would benefit from a different roof line as well. One Panel member mentioned that there was no reason for any of the residents to use the space as it is only 20 feet wide. Another Panel member noted that the space could be the core of a mini community if handled well. As well they thought there should be an indoor amenity that is attached to the courtyard.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the livability of the bedrooms and the unit layouts. It was noted that 520 square foot 2-bedrooms units with a table and four chairs that sits in front of the fridge is totally unacceptable. A 45 square foot bedroom is more of a closet, even if targeted at children's use, its livability is questionable. The unit next to the pad mounted transformer, as well as the unit adjacent to the parking spot, is not acceptable at all. As well the original house doesn't have a prominent entry and the infill building should also have entries that are more visible.

The Panel was concerned with the lack of parking. They noted that there is a surplus of parking in the West End, but they are in dark and dirty parking garages that are not convenient for people to use as well as a concern for personal safety. The City needs to implement a parking plan for the area sooner rather than later.

It was suggested that the bike storage should have windows onto the lane.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Martins said he agreed with the Panel's comments especially about with the lack of programming in the courtyard space and indoor amenity.

4. Address:	1546 Nelson Street
DE:	418104
Description:	To construct a new 3-storey multiple dwelling infill building (rental) at the rear of the property consisting of three two-bedroom units and one one-bedroom unit. No work is proposed for the existing building which will be retained on site.
Zoning:	RM-5
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Carrera Management Corporation
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Dimitar Bojadziev, Ankenman Marchand Architects
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 3-storey multiple dwelling infill to the lane at the rear of a 1907 dwelling under the Laneway Infill Program. He described the context for the area noting the 40 unit strata with decks to the side yard to the east. The existing dwelling on the site will not be relocated leaving the front yard on Nelson Street intact. As well the mature landscaping to the street will not be altered, however two trees to the rear will be removed as well as one on Cardero Street, fronting the property. Mr. King described the guidelines and mentioned that the Guidelines look for upper level setbacks to the lane and that the infill development should preserve the existing character to the street. As well apartment forms with single entry and common internal corridors as primary access will not be permitted. The existing building has 6 residential units and an existing sundeck that will be retained. The infill will have four units over 3-storeys with Juliet balconies on the upper levels. Private open space is not provided for the units but the upper level could be given private roof access. In terms of the Guidelines and massing, this is a modest proposal that is broadly in line with the expectations. Mr. King mentioned that regarding parking, the 1907 building predates the bylaw. The six existing dwelling units would require 3 parking spaces, the infill requires 2 for a total of 5 parking spaces. He added that it is the expectation of staff that they will consider a parking relaxation given the challenge posed by balancing the intent of the infill program to achieve a pedestrian-oriented laneway frontage with required parking provision.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Staff are seeking panel commentary on the success of architectural and landscape proposals as follows:

- The quality of the shared courtyard space in terms of its function as an amenity space for units proposed given the retention of the existing deck;
- Livability of the 2-bedroom units as they relate to the provision of both private open spaces and common outdoor play spaces.
- Massing and material expression to the lane, particularly as it relates to shadow impacts on adjacent development and visual interest to the side elevations.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tim Ankenman, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that because it is only 3-storeys they won't have to deal with

stairs and elevators. It is a humble approach and as well they are not proposing parking. All the doors are onto the lane. There was talk of a roof top garden but the client rejected the idea as he thought he wouldn't get a return and is the reason for the addition of balconies on the exterior. The courtyard will be a communal space for barbeques and gatherings. There are privacy issues with the interface between the neighbouring buildings and as a result the side walls are windowless.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the courtyard expression and function;
 - Consider adding glazing in the side walls and the vertical circulation;
 - Consider greening the courtyard space;
 - Consider greening of the lane;
 - Consider adding roof top access for the lane units.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was what was anticipated in the laneway housing program.

The Panel thought the massing was acceptable but thought the project would have better liveability if the house was moved forward making for a better courtyard space. They mentioned that the courtyard was probably going to be used by the residents in the existing building and very little by the residents in the new building. The new units don't have access to the space other than by their windows. The Panel mentioned that the proposed units had no livability issues with the exception of the blank walls which would benefit from either glass blocks or translucent glazing for more natural light into the units.

The Panel liked the material palette but wanted to see a more robust expression and also they wanted to see some translucent glass adjacent to the vertical circulation.

Some Panel members thought there could be some greening up of the courtyard space. The Panel felt that the deck in the courtyard should be removed as it was compromising the space.

Some Panel members wanted to see some greening on the lane as well. They also thought it wasn't acceptable that pedestrians could walk up to the unit windows on the lane and wanted to see a green barrier.

Some Panel members wanted to see the units in the new building have roof access for more outdoor space.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman said that they are designing the project with the full anticipation that the lane will be greened up. He added that staff had it removed because they haven't figured out what that would look like as yet.

5. Address:	1071 Cardero Street (1601 Comox Street)
DE:	418103
Description:	To construct a new 4-storey multiple dwelling infill building (rental) containing a total of 11 dwelling units, including six one-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units with surface parking space at the rear. This application includes interior alterations to the existing multiple dwelling (1601 Comox Street) on the basement level laundry and bike storage rooms.
Zoning:	RM-5A
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Carrera Management Corporation
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Afshin Banafsheh, Ankenman Marchand Architects
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (3-2)

- Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal under the Laneway Infill Program. This is a relatively unique scenario in terms of expected lot types in the West End. The corner flanking location requires a response to the street orientation as well as the aims of the laneway infill program. Mr. King described the Guidelines noting that a 3.5 to 4 storey ground oriented laneway infill dwelling, addressed from the lane is expected. As well the Guidelines are looking for upper level setbacks to the lane; three foot minimum side yards and the infill should preserve the existing character to the street. The proposal is for a 4-storey infill comprising of eleven units with three parking stalls along the lane. The dwelling will be addressed off Cardero Street to pull the entrance within the courtyard at the interior of the site. Regarding parking, Mr. King mentioned that the 1912 building predates the bylaw. He noted that it is the expectation of staff to consider parking relaxation for larger lot typologies (66+ feet). On smaller lots it will be considered on a case by case basis. He added that that it is the intent of the infill program to achieve a pedestrian-oriented laneway frontage with required parking provision. It is likely in the future that deficiencies created by smaller lot development on any given laneway will have to be addressed. Such work is ongoing and likely to be included in the forthcoming laneway toolkit.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Staff are seeking panel commentary on the success of architectural and landscape proposals as follows:

- The success of the building as it relates to the stated aims of the West End plan regarding the activation of laneway frontages.
- Legibility of the infill common entry and any potential concerns with use of the courtyard as amenity space given the entry circulation.
- Livability of unit 102 in as it relates to privacy amenity.
- Massing and material expression proposed.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tim Ankenman, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they had inquired as to why the house wasn't on the Heritage Registry. He said it was an amazing building inside, although not so much outside. They are going to try and do as much rehabilitation as possible inside. The building is a wood frame building

of 8-storeys built at the beginning of the last century. Mr. Ankenman mentioned that the existing building is a little plain so they want to have some fun with materials and colour for the infill. The existing building has very little outdoor space so they are proposing an outdoor amenity in the courtyard and are also looking at adding a roof top garden to the infill building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to simplify the architectural expression;
 - Design development to improve the livability of the units, especially Unit #102;
 - Design development to improve the landscaping in the courtyard.
 - Consider finding another area to park cars;
 - Consider adding an amenity space to the proposal;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and liked the look and feel of the building and the way it fits with its neighbours.

The Panel thought the success of the building related to the West End Plan and thought it would be a nice looking building and a great addition to the neighbourhood. However, there were some Panel members who were concerned that the proposal was not an example of laneway housing. As well there were Panel members who thought the overall architectural expression could be simplified. They mentioned the fake wood Hardi panel was going to look cheap over time and that for the small money, brick could be used. As well they also noted that the Cardero Street frontage was more interesting given its corner location.

On the laneway, it was suggested that the cars should not be sitting under the building. They were also concerned with the livability of unit 102. A couple of Panel members wanted to see some of the units regularized to be more livable. Some panel members questioned the location of the elevator and the resultant loss in efficiency and livability of the unit plans.

Most of the Panel thought there was lack of viable amenity space and wondered if perhaps the roof could be used for this purpose as it would make a better overlook for the neighbours. One Panel member noted that it was essential to have an elevator to the roof. As well they thought the courtyard looked more like an entry space and not a courtyard space. They supported the shared entry through the courtyard but thought the landscaping could be improved.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman said he had no further comments but hoped that they would be able to add a roof top patio. He said he agreed that the courtyard was a small space and would look forward to incorporating the Panel's comments into the proposal.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.