

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 22, 2015

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli (Excused Item #3)
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood
Neal Lamontagne
Ken Larsson (Absent for Item #1)
Jennifer Marshall (Chair)
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #1)

REGRETS: Irfan Ali
Roger Hughes
Arno Matis
Matthew Soules

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 1335 Howe Street |
| 2. | 2-26 East 1 st Avenue |
| 3. | 1837-1847 Main Street and 180 East 2 nd Avenue |
| 4. | 2328 Galt Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address: | 1335 Howe Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To connect a 40-storey residential building at 11.2 FSR. The proposal is for a total of 389 dwelling units and a 37-space childcare facility. |
| Zoning: | DD to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | IBI Group Architects |
| Owner: | Townline Homes |
| Delegation: | Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Architects
Gwyn Vose, IBI Group Architects
Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Landscape Architects
Steve Jedreicich, Townline Homes |
| Staff: | John Grottenberg and Sailen Black |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- Introduction:** John Grottenberg, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application in Downtown South for a mid-block site on the west side of Howe Street, between Drake and Pacific Streets, adjacent to the Howe Street on-ramp to the Granville Bridge. The site currently includes the former Quality Inn Hotel, which is being leased to the City for use as transitional housing for two years. The proposal is to rezone the site from DD (Downtown District) to CD-1 (comprehensive Development) to increase the density and height beyond that permitted under the current zoning. The intent is to build a 40-storey building with a 7-storey podium. The tower and podium will contain 389 strata residential units and a 37-space childcare facility will be on the eight floor with outdoor play area on the podium roof. Mr. Grottenberg described the policy that applies to the site noting that the zoning is regulated by the Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP). The site is in Area N of the DODP or the Hornby Slopes sub-area of Downtown South. The policy in this area endorses high density residential development with limited commercial uses. In 2008, as part of the Downtown Benefit Capacity Study, Council endorsed the consideration of rezoning applications in Downtown South seeking additional density height up to the underside of approved view corridors. The intent of this policy was to support public objectives such as provision of affordable housing, heritage restoration and the development of cultural, recreational or other community facilities. All zonings are subject to the Green Building Policy for Rezoning which requires the proposal to achieve LEED™ Gold, with a specific emphasis on optimized energy performance. Registration and application for certification of the project are also required.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that there is an unusual at-grade context as the public realm interface on Howe Street, especially moving south, is challenged by the bridge on-ramp. He described the Downtown South Guidelines which includes a minimum six foot front yard on Howe Street, preservation of existing neighbours access to daylight and sun and provision of lanes as a relatively green and open space with substantial setbacks and landscaping at ground floor. The site is limited to a geodetic elevation of 462 feet as the Queen Elizabeth Park view

cone crosses the site. The proposal will contain 389 market dwelling units, an amenity room at grade and a childcare facility on the eighth level.

Comments were sought on the overall landscape and architectural design of the rezoning application, and in particular:

- Is there support for the proposed form of development, including the height (378 feet), setbacks and density (11.2 FSR) shown?
- Is there support for the streetscape and public realm interface proposed along Howe Street, considering the uses, setback, and range of forms shown?
- Comments on the proposed design and extent of the balconies.
- Preliminary advice on the liveability of the lower residential units.

Mr. Grottenberg and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal noting that there is no limit to the number of towers allowed on the block face and the tower meets the 80 foot separation to the neighbouring building. He mentioned that the townhouses are only on the north end portion of the podium and are not impeded by the bridge onramp.

Gwyn Vose, Architect, mentioned that the design of the bottom of the tower is challenging. To address the challenge they have set back the townhomes on the first floor from the street to create more of an open space and on the upper portion of the podium the large balconies have a sliding screen to create more privacy and bit of a buffer from the traffic noise. Every unit in the building has a substantial balcony. He noted that the owner is looking for a unified expression on the building and that would involve architecturally keeping a parti of half-light/half-dark to create a vertical expression. As well they are looking at having this theme carry over to street furniture and outdoor deck furnishings. As well lighting is a feature that is proposed for the balconies. The daycare has a screen and the upper two floors of the tower are 2-storey units. He added that there will be a bike share facility on the site. Mr. Vose described the material palette noting the two tones of metal panel, two tones of spandrel glass as well as a frit for the balcony glass.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the whole Howe Street configuration is really challenged for pedestrians since there is a very narrow sidewalk presently. This project is responding by setting up a much better public realm and pedestrian connection. They are planning to animate the ground floor to make it interesting to pedestrians. The lane will be a well-considered front door and drop off for the building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve livability to the townhouses at the lowest levels;
 - Consider adding outdoor amenity space;
 - Design development to improve the security and privacy of the townhouse units.
 - Design development of the thermal envelope on return to Panel
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant for the clarity of their submission booklet.

The Panel thought it was a well-considered presentation and supported the overall form of development, including height, density and setbacks.

Most of the Panel thought the public realm interface needed further development and that the lower residential units were challenged for livability. A couple of Panel members suggested adding retail as this would be a better use of the space although they weren't sure it would be viable in this area. Some Panel members were concerned with the townhouse expression noting that there aren't any barriers between them and the street. As well they thought they were challenged for light and security. It was suggested that there could be a vehicle drop off by pushing the bike share further to the amenity room or move it to the lane. A couple of Panel members thought there was a lack of outdoor amenity space although they noted that the size of the indoor amenity space might compensate for this lack. They liked the light installation and thought it would be an interesting piece, although one member questioned the glowing colour. A bench in the entry court would support pedestrian activity.

The Panel agreed that the design for the tower balconies was successful. They liked the staggering 2-storey balcony expression and thought they would shade the façade well. The Panel supported the material and colour palette and liked the contrast of light and dark on the tower. However they noted that the whiteness of the tower ends abruptly and the podium to tower relationship could be clarified. The Panel felt the enclosure around the daycare was visually anomalous and could be improved.

Regarding the water feature on Howe Street, some Panel members thought that from a sustainability point of view, that it was expensive to pump water from the cistern to the feature. One Panel member suggested the applicant finds ways to limit the amount of evaporation.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner thanked the Panel for their encouragement and for being supportive of the open balconies. He said that would consider a way to address the lack of common outdoor space.

2. Address:	2-26 East 1 st Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct an 18-storey residential building. The proposal is for 137 dwelling units at 6.98 FSR.
Zoning:	CD-1 Text Amendment
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	Third (first for current design)
Architect:	Bingham Hill Architects
Owner:	Pinnacle International
Delegation:	Doug Nelson, Bingham Hill Architects Alain Lamontagne, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Vito DeCotis, Pinnacle International
Staff:	Yardley McNeil and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Yardley McNeill, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that is a Text Amendment to a rezoning approved in 2006. The CD-1 bylaw contains three sub-areas and the Text Amendment related to Sub-Area 3, which is the last of the Sub-Areas to develop. The 2006 rezoning permitted additional density for Sub-Area 3 beyond the 3.5 FSR prescribed under the Southeast False Creek (SEFC) ODP in order to both accommodate density to shift amongst the three Sub-Areas, and to assist with the preservation of the historic sites in SEFC. She mentioned that Staff analyzed the impact of the increased density and determined it could be supported given the location of the site, the surrounding context and an urban design objective to create a terminating element as viewed from the future public park to the north. The existing CD-1 Bylaw lists the allowable floor area for Sub-Area 3. Ms. McNeill explained that at the time, both the Opsal Steel and the Best Building sites were identified as historic resources and eligible to generate heritage density for transfer. The 2006 rezoning assumed Sub-Area 3 would be purchasing heritage density from one of these two sites. She also mentioned that conditions were applied to the density, namely that the Development Permit Board approve the form of development and that Council approve the redevelopment of the donating heritage site which would include the density for transfer.

Ms. McNeill noted that a development application was submitted in 2008 and reviewed by the Urban Design Panel. The Panel did not support the application due to its architectural expression and noted the landmark status of the site. The current text amendment application is a new project wholly unrelated to the earlier development permit application. Since the 2006 rezoning, the heritage sites in SEFC have either sold their density or used it on their own sites. As such, there is no heritage density for purchase and transfer in SEFC. Staff will seek the direction of the City Manager as to how best to accommodate the density through other means such as a Community Amenity Contribution towards a recognized SEFC or Citywide public benefit.

Ms. McNeill mentioned that in 2010, Council adopted the SEFC Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys. This policy provides for the consideration of an additional two (partial) floors to a maximum of 6.25 meters of additional height with a commensurate amount of additional density. The owner is requesting the additional two storeys which is the basis of this Text Amendment.

Ms. McNeill explained that the proposal is for a density of 6.98 FSR and 53.25 meters in height, massed as an 18-storey tower with a 5-storey podium containing 137 market residential units with 167 underground parking spaces on five levels.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that two sites to the west have been approved. The site is located on the southeast corner of Ontario Street and East 1st Avenue. He noted that there are bikeways on Ontario Street and as well on East 1st Avenue. He explained that the Text Amendment will consider the Southeast False Creek ODP, the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning, SEFC Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys and the High Density Living for Families and Children Guidelines. The Text Amendment is to increase the permitted height and density from the existing CD-1. The Text Amendment is to increase the permitted height and density that was available in 20016 plus increased density associated with the penthouse storeys. He added that the proposed density is 6.98 FSR and the proposed height increases from 47 meters (154 feet) to 53.25 meters (175 feet). As well a range of indoor and outdoor amenity spaces is being offered on different levels and locations around the proposal. Mr. Black explained that the intent of the landscape at grade on the lane is for passive space (lawn). As well the design incorporates elements from the "Railyard" theme established for this part of SEFC. The space intended for children's play on top of the podium will use unstructured materials. There is also an indoor gym on a different level from the outdoor spaces.

Comments were sought on the overall landscape and architectural design of this rezoning application, and in particular:

1. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development, including the height (53.25 m), setbacks and density (6.98 FSR) shown?
2. Considering the proposed form of the penthouse element, including its effects on private views, shadowing of the park, and the position of the site, does the Panel support its additional height and density?
3. Can the Panel offer preliminary comments on the design and location of indoor and amenity spaces?

Ms. McNeill and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Doug Nelson, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the view from the park is a focal terminus. He noted that at the previous review the Panel thought the building should be slightly higher. With this proposal the penthouse additional storeys program allows that to happen. They pulled that form flush with the front façade in order to gain the north façade height. They have shaped the tower floor plate in order to get the front façade as vertical and slender as possible. Mr. Nelson noted that they have tried to pick up on the podium heights that exist in adjacent building forms. There are a number of outdoor spaces including a lounge/outdoor space on the corner. Some of the outdoor spaces are connected to indoor amenity spaces. There are some small private terraces proposed for the top of the building.

Alain Lamontagne, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that some of the elements reflect the rail yard past. From the ground floor perspective, the public realm follows the SEFC guidelines with the enhanced treatments of granite sets on boulevards. The townhouse expression has some semi-private space between the sidewalk and the townhouse. There is a common space on the ground floor which is more of a passive space with full sun exposure. On the laneway there are trees proposed and a large green space will be lawn. The level six podium has another outdoor space with urban agriculture and unstructured children's play. For adults and families on the corner there is a lounge area with barbeque and gathering space.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider a stronger expression at the roof top;
 - Consider stepping the form to allow for more sunlight into the courtyard;
 - Design development to include both indoor and outdoor amenity space on the south;
 - Consider further activation for the outdoor terrace on the north;
 - Consider mitigating the blank wall in the courtyard;
 - Consider connecting/locating the indoor amenity spaces to exterior amenity spaces.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the proposed form of development, height, setbacks and density in general, although some Panel members thought the proposal was a little tight to the lane side. As well they supported the shape and massing of the tower. Some Panel members thought there could be more of an expression at the roof top. As well there was some concern regarding the fifth townhouse and thought it would be better as a tower apartment. One member advised reconsidering the design of the enclosed balconies facing south toward the Bastion project. It was noted that the south façade could be improved with stepping to help get more afternoon sun into the courtyard. Several members advised refining the north side design to be stronger, with a less tentative expression.

Most of the Panel supported the penthouse expression and thought they would help to make it more of a landmark building. However a couple of Panel members thought the penthouse element felt modest and could have more of a setback. As well they agreed that there was no issue with shadowing on the park given the shape and configuration of the park.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but thought there should be an amenity space opening up onto the lawn as this would be a nice space for families. As well they noted that the amenity seemed shut off from that space. Although the Panel liked the amount of amenity space being provided there was real concern that they were disconnected from exterior spaces. Some members thought it would be beneficial to have one of the amenity spaces relocated next to the garden space on the south. As well they thought the outdoor terrace on the north could be better activated to improve its performance. The courtyard needs a little more development as well with respect to the blank wall on the west side. The Panel agreed that the roof top amenity space was well programmed with both private and communal spaces.

Although the Panel liked the “Railyard” theme, they noted it seemed gratuitous as employed. They wanted to see the theme applied more meaningfully in the next design.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding the corner on East 1st Avenue. They noted that it is a semi private space in a public location.

The Panel supported the material palette but thought the applicant should consider another colour other than red since there is already a large amount of red in the precinct and it dilutes the significance of the Salt building as a public space.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that the balconies will need to be insulated or thermally broken.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Nelson thanked the Panel for all their commentary and criticisms which he said they would take under consideration.

3. Address:	1837-1847 Main Street and 180 East 2 nd Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a 12-storey mixed-use building. The proposal is for a total of 256 dwelling units including 30 secured non-market rental units with artist production space and commercial uses at grade.
Zoning:	IC-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Francl Architecture
Owner:	Aquilini Development
Delegation:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Alain Lamontagne, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Mark Mazzone, Aquilini Development Veronica Owens, Light House (LEED™ Consultant)
Staff:	Yardley McNeil and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Yardley McNeil, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application to rezone the lands from IC-2 to CD-1 in accordance with the provision of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan (MPCP) and the Mount Pleasant Implementation Plan (MPIP). The MPIP envisions this site and the one to the east across Main Street as 'gateway' sites leading up into Mt. Pleasant. The MPIP suggests the height of these two sites should be compatible, with the eastern site limited by the Main Street view cone to 100-116 feet.

The subject site is not impacted by the Main Street view cone. The rezoning proposes a height of 12-storeys which given the slightly lower ground level, will be compatible with the eastern site and produce the 'book-ended' massing the MPIP is seeking for these two corners. The MPCP prescribes a density of 5.0 FSR and notes this site as a location for a public plaza. Ms. McNeil described the proposal noting that it is for a mixed-use building containing 226 market residential units, retail at grade, an open public plaza off the lane, 30 social housing units targeted to low-income artists and a 4,000 square foot artist production space. The application proposes a density of 5.5 FSR with .50 FSR of the density attributed towards the social housing units, artist production space and their associated amenities.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal and noted that it is located on the east side of Main Street and is a mixed-use building that will include several on site public benefits including secured non-market rental housing, culture production space and plaza space.

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

In addition to any comment on the overall form of development proposed for this rezoning application, advice was sought on the following:

- Is the proposed massing, density, and height supportable?
- Comments on the design of the passages from Main Street to the plaza with respect to the following:
 - Vertical dimension as it relates to the perception of the space;
 - Livability of the units in this area;
 - CPTED concerns and visibility of the plaza.
- Comments on the preliminary design of the CRU spaces as they relate to creating successful retail activity and maintaining visibility to the plaza.

- Comments on the overall success of the landscape design of the plaza, street and lane edges, roof top terraces, and garden spaces.

Ms. McNeil and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the project started about three years ago under the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal is in response to a number of neighbourhood meetings and is a massing response to that commentary. The site is at a busy intersection with a lot of traffic on both East 2nd Avenue and Main Street and is a fairly hostile environment for pedestrians. The building has opportunities both front and back, to ameliorate those conditions. Mr. Francl described the architecture noting the block at the taller end of the project and then a 6-storey block at the south end which would continue the massing that is anticipated up Main Street. On the lane side in the Community Plan there has been a notion of animating the lanes up and down and both sides. They have anchored the north end of the site against East 2nd Avenue with a courtyard off the lane to anchor pedestrian movement. The retail space will be a product of who will be renting the space. There is an artist production space off the courtyard with covered outdoor space. The massing is stepped to maximize the amount of daylight that the courtyard will receive. All of the roof tops are either amenity spaces for the residents with urban agriculture or private amenity spaced for both the non-market and market housing in several locations. Mr. Francl described the sustainability strategy noting the use of moveable screens and horizontal and vertical elements to provide solar control on the north/south façade.

Alain Lamontagne, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that there are a series of planters in the public realm to address the grade changes and entries into the CRUs. They have also taken the opportunity to add cantilevered benches. They have tried to make the courtyard as open as possible and have included some seating. There is a water feature under the breezeway along with a light installation since planting material won't do well in this area. There are a series of common amenity spaces that are adjacent to indoor amenity space. There is also a market residential fitness room on level 8 with an outdoor space. For the non-market residents there is small space with urban agriculture and unstructured play for children. As well there are outdoor amenity spaces on the 12th floor that takes advantage of the North Shore Mountains with outdoor dining and separated with planters that can be shared by both user groups and adjacent to that there is another children's play. The top roof has urban agriculture.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the breezeways;
 - Design development to improve the water feature in the plaza;
 - Consider adding vertical landscaping in the plaza;
 - Consider having some of the amenity space available to both non-market and market residents.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting and well thought out building. The applicant was commended for the quality of their submission.

The Panel supported the proposed massing, density, and height. They thought the applicant had done a good job of breaking up the long frontage. As well they noted that passages from Main Street were critical to making the courtyard work. There was concern

regarding the height of the breezeway and the Panel thought it could be higher at Main Street. As well some Panel member thought there only needed to be one breezeway.

The Panel thought the unit layouts were supportable but had some concerns regarding the CRUs facing the courtyard. They thought the CRUs might work better as one larger space rather than two smaller units. Several Panel members had concerns regarding CPTED issues in the courtyard.

For the most part the Panel supported the landscape plans and mentioned that as the area fills in there should be more activation of the laneway. One Panel member thought the site could be terraced more to the south to help out the courtyard experience and provide more light. Panel members thought the water feature needed work. As well they noted that artful lighting and more development of the plaza level was required. A couple of Panel members suggested to adding some vertical landscaping in the courtyard, something that would create an event and compliment what is going on with the artist spaces.

Some Panel members thought there could be an amenity space off the lobby at the plaza level as a way to engage the plaza. Panel members were concerned with the segregation between the non-market and market amenity spaces. They were especially concerned with how some of the separate amenity spaces overlooked one another and thought there should be some spaces that encouraged mingling between the tenants.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, it was suggested that the applicant add solar panels to the roof. There could be a covered outdoor space on the roof with the solar panels added to the top of it.

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

4. Address:	2328 Galt Street
DE:	418823
Description:	to construct a new 4-storey residential building. The proposal is for a total of 28 rental dwelling units.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Concurrent Rezoning and Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Bruce Carscadden Architect
Owner:	Talib Diwani
Delegation:	Bruce Carscadden, Bruce Carscadden Architect Ian McDonald, Bruce Carscadden Architect
Staff:	Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Michael Naylor, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a concurrent rezoning and development permit application. The site is a three-lot assembly on Galt Street in the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre area. The application is being considered under the Norquay Village - Apartment Transition Area Rezoning Policy, as well as the Secured market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy. The apartment transition area is envisioned to provide a physical transition between the higher densities and 10 to 12-storey forms on Kingsway to the residential neighbourhood further away from Kingsway. This policy requires that new development be residential use, in the form of 3 to 4-storey low-rise apartments. Mr. Naylor explained the relevant development parameters under the rezoning policy. He noted that under the Rental 100 program, incentives can be granted, at the developer's choice, to help with the viability of providing market rental housing. For rezoning proposals in the areas with existing rezoning policies, the Rental Incentive Guidelines state that additional floor area may be considered but the proposal should be appropriate to the context and be subject to urban design review. The proposal generally conforms to the Apartment Transition Area Rezoning Policy. The incentives being requested under the Rental 100 policy include reduced parking requirements and DCL waiver. Also, an approximately 10% density increase has been supported by staff (the total proposed density is approximately 2.25 FSR). In addition there is a slight relaxation of the DUD requirement (28 units proposed versus 27 units maximum permitted under the policy). Of the 28 units proposed, there are 27 two-bedroom units and 1 three-bedroom units. All units will be secured as market rental for the life of the building or 60 years, whichever is longer. As well, LEED™ gold is required.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal and provided some background on the Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan that was passed by Council. There were four distinct parts of the Norquay Plan. The first one was for Kingsway which would allow 3.8 FSR that would involve 10 to 12-storey buildings. There is a transition apartment zone area that is everything on the other side of the service lane from the Kingsway properties. Outside this area, former RS-1 properties were rezoned to permit courtyard cottage and stacked townhouses at 2.5-storeys in height. The rezoning policy allows for 4-storey apartments at 45 feet in height which allows for larger scale apartments. The maximum number of dwelling units is capped to encourage larger, family-sized apartments. One of the other aspects of this particular topology is the alphabet plan type topology of buildings with a courtyard and where there are extra windows for better livability that also allows for some natural cross ventilation.

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

1. Do some of the window sizes and placements compromise livability of the dwelling units?
2. Do the balconies on the front elevation detract from the perception of the building's required 12 foot setback?
3. Is the architectural expression appropriate for the building's use as a residential apartment building, with respect to:
 - proposed building forms and articulation;
 - choice of materials and detailing and;
 - choice of colour?

Mr. Naylor and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bruce Carscadden, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the design was based on ideas of livability and creating a sense of community. There is a sense of entry at the front of the building and the corridors become places that have moments of rest.

Ian McDonald, Architect, mentioned that the building is structured around an open air corridor and entry. At the front entry there are planters with seating areas at either end. He described the building layout noting the three bedroom unit at the back of the building. There is a roof top terrace.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the privacy issues with the units in the courtyard;
 - Design development to improve the front expression of the building front and back;
 - Consider improving the material and colour palette;
 - Provide weather protection to the stair wells;
 - Consider an indoor amenity space on the roof;
 - Design development to improve the landscaping in the lane.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and agreed that the size and form of development was supportable.

The Panel thought the proposal was a good transitional use between the commercial frontage and the residential on either side of the lane. They liked how the building wrapped the courtyard but had some concerns regarding the window placement and size of the windows. One Panel member suggested using recessed windows or more windows on the corner to improve adjacency issues.

As well the Panel had a number of concerns regarding privacy issues with some of the suites in the courtyard where some suites have bedrooms looking into other bedrooms with people walking by these units.

Some Panel members thought the front elevation and the expression of balconies looked too severe and diminished the quality of the streetscape. They noted that there is the same issue on the lane and suggested some degree of stepping at the upper level. As well some Panel members thought the building lacked a residential character.

Regarding the material palette, the Panel thought the proposal looked heavy and a little industrial with predominately one colour that makes the expression problematic. They wanted to see some variation in the colour to express the volume.

Some Panel members thought the stairs should have some weather protection and as well they liked the courtyard but it is on the north side and a little too small and suggested it be moved to the south side of the property. They liked the tree in the courtyard but thought while other Panel members thought the tree was a bit overwhelming for the building and that there should be other plantings in the courtyard. They also wanted to see the lobby activated with an amenity space.

The Panel liked the amenity space on the roof but felt there should be an indoor amenity attached and a covered outdoor space. Also, the Panel thought the landscaping on the lane was a bit harsh and needed some vertical landscaping such as trees. They also wanted to see individual entrances on the lane what would improve the proposal over all.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, there was no mention of mechanical when it comes to heating which will require room for boilers, hot water tanks and ventilation.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Carscadden thanked the Panel for their comments and said they would take them under consideration.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.