

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 13, 2016

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Stefan Aepli (excused for item #4)
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood (excused for item #2)
Ken Larsson
Muneesh Sharma
Neil LaMontagne
Derek Neale
David Jerke
Jim Huffman (excused for item #1)
James Cheng

REGRETS: Roger Hughes (Chair)
Julien Fagnan
Russell Acton

GUESTS: Jennifer Marshall

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	101 E 2nd Avenue
2.	1750 Pendrell Street
3.	2235 Kitchener Street (Lord Nelson Elementary School)
4.	377 E Broadway

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting in which Roger Hughes was elected as the new chair in absentia, and Neil LaMontagne was elected as the new vice-chair. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 101 E 2nd Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: To construct a three-storey retail and office building for Mountain Equipment Co-op (MEC). The proposal includes two storeys of retail space at grade with one storey of office above.
 Zoning: M-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Proscenium Architecture + Interiors Inc. (Ron Clay)
 Owner: Mountain Equipment Coop
 Beedie Group
 Delegation: Hugh Cochlin, Proscenium Architecture + Interiors Inc.
 Ron Clay, Proscenium Architecture + Interiors Inc.
 Rob Fiorvento, Beedie
 Sandy Treagus, Mountain Equipment Coop
 Staff: Rachel Harrison and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as an application to rezone the site on the northeast corner of East 2nd Avenue and Quebec Street. The proposal is for a three-storey building for Mountain Equipment Co-op which includes both retail and office uses. The applicant is applying to rezone the site to have more retail and office floor area than what is permitted under its current M-2 zoning.

The rezoning policy that applies to this site is the Southeast False Creek Official Development Plan (SEFC ODP). The policy identifies this site for optional retail, service, or office use at grade. The Meccanica building to the north is an example of a building built-out under the SEFC ODP.

Staff are supportive of a commercial-only building at this site. Since the ODP was adopted in 2007 a lot of residential development has been built. So it is okay that this proposal does not include residential.

The site is in a high traffic-use area at the intersection of two main arterials and two bike ways. It is also 500 metres from the Main Street/Science World Skytrain Station

Sailen Black, Development Planner, continued the introduction by stating that the site contains a one-storey commercial and warehouse building. The site area is 244.23 ft. x 122 ft. (29,796 sf.). Required setbacks include 38 ft. off Quebec Street for road widening, 5 ft. off the lane for landscaping and lighting, and 5 ft. along West 2nd Avenue as road dedication to be used for road widening.

The preliminary design for Quebec Street north of 2nd Avenue adjacent to the MEC site includes:

- Two thru motor vehicle lanes northbound
- One left, one thru and one right lane southbound
- protected bike lanes in each direction on opposite sides of Quebec Street
- 2.4 metre sidewalks on each side of Quebec Street

There are also boulevard strips between the bike lanes and vehicle lanes, and between the sidewalks and bike lanes, where utility poles, street lights, trees etc. would be placed.

The surrounding SEFC sites have been rezoned from M-2 to CD-1, with the exception of Mario's Gelato at 88 East 1st Avenue and the Shell Gas Station at 1785 Main Street. South of 2nd Avenue and east of Main Street is zoned I-1 and IC-2. There is a mix of older commercial buildings with the exception of the proposed twelve-storey rezoning at the south-west corner of Main and 2nd Avenue in Mount Pleasant.

Adjacent developments include Opsal Steel at 24 storeys, Mario's Gelato at four storeys, Meccanica at 12 storeys (with a 6-storey podium), and a Shell Gas Station.

The present Zone for the site is M-2, which calls for a maximum floor area of 10,764 sf. for retail and 2,529 sf. of office space. This site also falls under the South-East False Creek Official Development Plan. The ODP notes the following as the preferred form of development:

- Significant setbacks from the lane to reduce shadowing to the north, provide a landscaped area, and activate the lane; and,
- Active storefronts to animate the street

The site is subject to the South East False Creek Public Realm Plan and the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning.

The proposal is for a three-storey retail/office building consisting of two levels of retail and one level of office for one tenant: Mountain Equipment CO-OP (MEC). There is a proposed 2.0 FSR (60,676 sf.) comprised of 45,510 sf. for retail use and 15,166 sf. for office use, and including three levels of underground parking accessed off the lane. There is also an exercise studio on the ground floor adjacent to the lane to provide activation, and a roof scape with outdoor seating areas and active space.

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

1. Panel comment on the overall approach to urban design is invited in general for this rezoning application, and specifically:
 - a. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development, including the setbacks, height and density shown?
 - b. Does each of the three outer edges (north, west and south) create appropriate spaces in response to the three different contexts?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that there have been numerous meetings with City staff on the project. In these meetings planning requested ground level transparency to provide more connection to the lane.

Activation of the lane is required through an 8 ft. dedication. There will be a public bike-share station going into the area, so not a lot of other programming is needed.

It should be noted that the property is highly visible from the gas station, and a fifth elevation exists at the rooftop due to the surrounding towers. The massing needs to respect MEC's need to be 35,000 - 40,000 sq. ft. of retail space over two levels. Ideally there would also be a 12 ft. clear wall around the building to allow for merchandising. The parking proposal is for 174 spaces.

The podium has been brought down to grade so that the entry underneath the covered canopy would allow the pedestrian access to activate both the corner of the building, and the corner of 2nd Avenue and Quebec Street. MEC would like to utilize this space to organize running groups and other activities.

The glazing line has been brought onto the lane-side to allow for physical transparency through the building. A screening element has been added to prevent light pollution in light of this.

The roof-plane is being intentionally set back to create a community space, and to set the mass back and reduce shadowing on the neighbours. Activation of the roof is done through the creation of an active park setting and a green roof. A water feature will also move down the expression of the building through a series of swales.

Glass has been introduced on the upper level, but actual materiality will be discussed at the development permit level. There will also be heavy timber construction to make the building easy to remove at the end of its 25 year contract.

LEED Gold is being targeted. The concept of tying into a geothermal system has been explored, but will probably not happen as the building will need to connect to the district energy utility.

In order to respect traffic flow and facilitate garbage movement, all loading has been moved underground.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Move the main entry onto or towards Quebec Street and make more use of the corner
 - There needs to be more space on the Quebec Street frontage for people to gather as the current space seems tight
 - The lane edge needs more activation; this could be done by showing the inside materials on the outside, or by adding a second entry and moving the bike parking
 - Refine the awkward relationship with the gas station site
 - More softscape refinement is needed off the lane
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that this was a good project for this site, and a welcome relief on height and use. The colour scheme is good and the forms of the building seem striking and very appropriate for the precinct. However, some more vertical elements could be added into the building to suggest climbing, or other activities related to MEC.

The outer edge seems supportable, especially in the absence of what the future may bring. However, the 2nd Avenue setback seems quite tight. Especially when taking bike traffic into account.

The relationship to the gas station seems awkward. Something should be built which fills the space between the two sites and provides separation somehow. Making the area facing the gas station into a climbing wall might be a good use of a blank wall.

The Quebec Street frontage is of concern as it is the main area and there appears to be a conflict between pedestrian traffic and the bike racks. Quebec Street is set to become one of the more important streets to the Olympic village, and will attract quite a bit of pedestrian traffic north-south. Thus the corner should be reconsidered with regards to this traffic. The corner could do more to announce MEC's presence. Making this corner a jewel would announce MEC as a 'place'. Additionally, there should be more coverage and weather protection on Quebec Street to provide meeting spaces.

In terms of landscape, the roof-scape is good but could use more irrigation. The water feature off of Quebec Street also seems well done. On the North-side in the area with the overhang it seems like a very tight landscaped area. Attention should be paid as to how this is treated.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant stated that the points put forward are good, and will be addressed through talks with the Vancouver Engineering Department and the adjacent Shell Station.

2. Address:	1750 Pendrell Street
DE:	DE419775
Description:	To develop a 21-storey residential building containing 173 dwelling units, and a one-storey amenity building.
Zoning:	RM-5A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Third (First as Rezoning)
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects (Peter Wood)
Owner:	Westbank
Delegation:	Peter Wood, HPA Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative Farouk Babul, Westbank
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the site as being on the south side of Pendrell Street between Denman Street and Bidwell Street. The development is an RM-5A district of the West End that generally permits multiple dwelling. The two nearest towers are the Sundowner at 13 storeys and Stratford Place at 19 storeys. There is also C-5 zoned commercial shopping along Denman Street, and Morton Park to south-west on the other side of Denman Street.

The application follows approval in principle by Council of a rezoning application which included an estimated height, density and overall form of development. The approval was for a greater amount of density than the architectural drawings showed, which was intended to accommodate more family sized units.

This project will be reviewed under the site's CD-1 By-Law, as well as the West End design guidelines and other policies.

The proposal is for a multiple dwelling tower at 58 m in height. The recommended tower separation in guidelines is being met. Other zoning measures, such as setbacks, are generally being met or exceeded. The project has a total area 10,527 m², and a range of open spaces is provided around the buildings. The increased area is generally located at the rear of the building to avoid creating any further impact to private views from the two nearest towers.

The design shown at the rezoning stage incorporated a number of elements intended to refer to the established West End character. This development application proposes a new exterior design including expressed 'frames' on the west elevation, and removal of some of the previous features, such as the scalloped balcony forms. Staff have some concerns about the new expression, especially on the east elevation, and would appreciate the Panel's input.

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

1. Whether the previous comments of the Urban Design Panel have been addressed successfully, including the relationship of the landscape and architectural elements with the public realm at the front and lane sides
2. Whether the design of the new massing is appropriately designed and detailed

3. Whether the new exterior expression of the other areas is supported

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team gave a brief PowerPoint presentation where they noted that they have spent a few years working on this. Although the form of development has been consistent all along, the design itself has changed dramatically in response to previous Urban Design Panel (UDP) commentary.

The biggest issue from the previous appearance at the UDP was the harshness of the lane, and the courtyard between the pavilion and the tower needing activation. There were also comments on how the building could be simplified and made more contemporary.

The idea with the current design was to split up the large floor plate into two bars consisting of a larger east bar, and a smaller west bar. The east bar was around 4000 sq. ft. which seemed appropriate to the West-End context. Since then the west bar has been shifted south to maintain the view cones. The two massive blocks have been treated in different ways, and steel frame and wood screen is being used to unify the form. The intent of larger bar was to be shaped as a historical form, while the smaller bar is meant to be much more modern.

Too many architectural characteristics were previously used, so these have been vastly reduced. As this is a rental building a lot of money has been spent on the 'public face' of the building to make it fit into the West End context from the Denman Street elevation.

A lot of work has been done on the landscape treatment, and on integrating it with the lane. The podium has been dropped, the landscaped feathered, and furniture added in an attempt to try and activate it more. A terrace has also been created in between the two semi-private uses of the building, which a yoga studio spills out onto.

A palette of steel, concrete and glass is being used. Wood privacy screens are being used to add some warmth to the project.

Views are being maintained where they could be, with more attention being paid to overlook and privacy. The building has been moved as far east as possible to mitigate impact on private views and to limit sightlines up from the building. Balconies have also been removed to preserve privacy.

According to the shadow analysis there should be minimal impact to the surroundings during the summer solstice.

The aesthetics of the landscape are meant to suggest something gentle and Zen-like. A stone artisan is being consulted to develop a language of sculptural pieces. There will be a small parkette which will sit in front of the screen and will include public art. There is urban agriculture on the roof and a space for recreation though not necessarily for children.

To activate the lane there is proposed rose planting cascading over the edges of the walls to hide and mitigate them. This is in addition to the tree canopy which will exist in the area. There is no lane activation other than planting.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to tie together the buildings and architectural elements
 - The east side is too relentless and not articulated enough; something needs to happen here

- The radiating fins are a problem
 - The laneway treatment is not good as it is screened rather than engaged, and mitigated rather than activated; this site needs to give something back to the community
 - The eastern mechanical piece seems larger than it was originally; more architectural articulation is needed in order to fix this
 - Design the façade better to provide privacy, respond to the context and reduce overlook
 - The Japanese garden is delicate and needs to be more robust, and brought around the building more
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thanked the applicants for their presentation and noted that the use, density and form of development are supportable. This design is more resolved and rational than the previous curved whimsical design presented at the rezoning. However, the south and east elevations feel relentless in their expression. They are bulkier and bigger and there is too much solar gain. There are also slab-edge projections on all four sides with no interruptions, and this is not desirable. Take some of them away.

This building lacks the subtle West End vertical feeling, so the design strategy does not seem to be a benefit to the project. While the building looks more contemporary from the original design it has also lost a lot of character, and feels like it could be from anywhere. There should be a different strategy to the neighborhood and the West-End context; a layered and finer grade one. Real modulation should be apparent in the building. Additionally the somberness of the east and strength of the west are very different, and they need to be brought together more.

The roof deck space has been programmed and detailed, but there is a perception that the mechanical equipment is bigger because of the loss of canopy. Bring it down in appearance. A canopy should also be added to the outside of the amenity entrance to provide weather protection from those seeking to use it.

The way the balconies on the lattice-side have been offset going up the building is nice. However, the radiating fins are a problem. Wrapping the balconies might help with this.

The east elevation at the lower levels is not successful. The adjacent building is only 5 m away, but the building does not respond to it at all. There needs to be more separation between the buildings and the building should definitely respond more to the context.

The lane does not appear to have enough thought put into it and is problematic. There doesn't seem sufficient attention to how the lane is articulated and it is not an animated west-end lane. Carrying the Japanese element into the lane might make it more west-end worthy. The front also needs to be brought into the back somehow in order to activate the laneway and connect it.

There is the potential for better activation of the street for the public.

Overall there is good use of wood and materials, but the introduction of the wood for the privacy screens may not be successful at the upper levels. The duality between the two sides of the building makes the east elevation seem tall and institutional. Consider introducing some lighter materials and brighter colours to tie the two side together better.

The urban agriculture on the roof is great, and the successful relationship of the landscape and architecture is evident. The staggering of the building works well in opening up the ground floor. In regards to the Japanese garden on the ground plane, this is a delicate

garden in an urban space and may be too close to the architecture. The theme also doesn't carry around the building at all. Overall the landscape could be cleaner and stronger and simplified.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the Panel for the comments and will take them back; it is true that the lane needs more work. The east façade will also be worked on. An attempt has been made to create a contextual building to the West End, with horizontal expression being done through the slab extensions.

3. Address:	2235 Kitchener Street (Lord Nelson Elementary School)
DE:	DE419841
Description:	To develop a three-storey institutional facility consisting of a replacement elementary school in the first two storeys (Lord Nelson School) and a City of Vancouver operated Child Care Facility on the third storey.
Zoning:	RS-7 and RT-4
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	McFarland Marceau Architects (Charles Britton)
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Delegation:	Marie-Odile Marceau, McFarland Marceau Architects Craig Duffield, McFarland Marceau Architects Richard Buccino, McFarland Marceau Architects
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the project as an application to construct a replacement school as part of the Vancouver School Board (VSB) seismic upgrade programme. The school occupies a full block site bounded by Charles Street to the north, Kitchener Street to the south, Garden Drive to east, and, atypically, a residential lane to the west. The existing school is addressed from Kitchener Street and located mid-block, with an existing play field bounding the lane. The new school will be located along Garden Drive frontage.

There are existing larger street trees, particularly on Kitchener Street and Charles Street, but the site is more or less free of mature planting constraints.

The main school building is from 1910, but has no Vancouver Heritage Registry listing and scored low on the heritage study of the school stock, so demolition is proposed.

The lot is split zoned, with single family RS-7 to the east and duplex RT-4 to the west in line with the interruption of Templeton Drive. There is a fairly typical school context of 2.5-storey mostly single-family residential. There are a series of relaxations, which this school seeks, to reconcile institutional school use within a residential area and which are not in themselves problematic. The most obvious is the three-storey height.

The proposal is for a three-storey institutional facility with school use on the first two floors and a childcare facility on the top. The school seeks a relaxation in height from 10.7 m to 12.46 m which the Director of Planning can give through a combination of Sections 3 & 11, and is essentially subject to neighbourliness. The upper level is set back to reduce apparent mass to the street, with a play area located within that setback. The new school also shifts location to the lower Garden Drive frontage. As a result of the site rising toward the lane, combined with the different form of development, this means that the new school is lower than the existing.

Yards are relaxed under the same provisions to provide 7.3 m side yards, which again is not problematic under school provisions (10% per zoning = 8 m). The site slopes to the west so in order to deliver grade access to play space from the main level of the school we have a ground floor partially elevated on a plinth to Garden Drive. The plinth absorbs a community terrace and access ramp and there is good integration with hard & soft landscape designs to give landing spaces at the corners, and terraced planting.

The school locates the larger flexible spaces to the front with classrooms to the interior, linked by the commons and main entry. The entrance gains legibility from the location and is further defined by the coloured metal canopy. It is flanked by multi-purpose rooms opening out onto the elevated terrace on the Charles Street side which steps back at grade, and the gym on the Kitchener Street side. The double height volume of the gym is animated by the polycarbonate cladding to break down the scale of the elevation. Moving around the school you notice the variation in the fenestration as it relates to the coloured metal trim.

Surface parking for staff is along the lane frontage. This is remote from the school but generally underground parking is not viable through the seismic programme, so it is what it is. Accessible parking is mid-site at the current school location, where there is also covered bike parking stalls in a steel-framed timber-roofed structure. Loading is at the corner of Kitchener Street.

The proposal demonstrates fairly well-developed landscape plans. The existing grass field remains untouched, while the existing school location develops as paved and gravel play spaces. The bike pavilion and courtyard areas give some sheltered spaces. There are also exterior stairs and a slide feature. While the City of Vancouver does not generally support exterior exit stairs on schools, the building group has not yet said anything about the acceptability in this instance. There is also some concern with the safety guard. However, the application doesn't give any detail of this assembly so more detail is needed before Vancouver can take a position on it.

As a straight DE application LEED certification is not required by the City of Vancouver, though LEED Gold Certification is typically required by the Vancouver School Board. As a final comment on sustainability, the Urban Design Panel has previously noted that schools should be physically demonstrating their green features as a learning tool for children.

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

1. Is panel satisfied that new school, in its height and proposed siting to Garden Drive, demonstrates good contextual fit with the primarily single family neighbourhood?
 2. Does the panel have any comments on the proposed exterior expression or detailed material assembly, in general and specifically relating to the gym expression to Garden Drive?
 3. Can the panel offer commentary on the exterior stair/ slide both as a general design feature and in terms of the detailed assembly proposed?
 4. Does the panel have any advice as it relates to the sustainability strategy of the proposal?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by stating that the new school comes with strict guidelines for size and funding. The reason why it is sited the way it is, and goes up to the setback lines, is because it needs the space since the construction occurs in a single phase to meet the program and budget.

The approach to the building and site was rigorous. It is clear and simple in its design and has equitable space for the students and teachers. The massing is separated to create four quadrants to limit the impact and visibility of the scale from the street.

The play area was requested for the east side, which allows the third storey to be recessed. On contextual fit, the school itself is well below the envelope. The only thing punching through is maybe the third storey. The 'H' form harkens to the formality of the Edwardian school form, and will support the community well.

Materials are made to add colour which makes the building whimsical and playful. The stairways are made to provide covered areas for the children, and create spaces around the classrooms which have writing walls for students to use and play with. The stairs are metal and concrete.

This is not a LEED certified building, but it is following all the LEED guidelines. A full energy session was done on the proposal. Materials from the demolished building are being reused whenever possible. Water management practices are being featured in order to allow the children to see and understand them.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - There are issues of durability around the materials on the ground plane
 - Attention should be paid to what the orange poly-carbonate does to the environment inside the gym
 - The success of the stair in front of the windows is about porosity; the more places that there are to hang out outside the school the better. The ground floor common space is important to the inside/outside connection
 - Integrate education opportunities at every point possible into the sustainable design
 - There needs to be better access to childcare, and the stairs need to be a 'front door'
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thanked the applicants for a thorough presentation and noted that the siting of the building and height are supportable. However, the gym could use a bit more design development as it currently looks a bit odd and blocky. Maybe mimic something a bit more minimal on the gym side.

The exterior expression looks well handled, but the front entrance at the second level seems to have too much white space. Extending the window in this area might help with this.

A larger safety landing area is needed at the bottom of the tube slide to prevent falling.

The exterior stairs don't seem to relate well to the circulation of the building. If the elevator breaks down it seems like it would be clunky to access the daycare. If the exterior stairs are intended to be exit stairs, then the original exit stairs would be the access stairs and this may not satisfy the fire code.

In general having the daycare on the third floor is not great, and another stair is really needed to access the daycare. Consider if the public will need summer or after-hours access to the daycare through the school. More route options are needed other than the elevator.

The materiality seems to have a good selection, but may be a bit too uniform at the first two levels. Use a bit more modulation to add interest to the whiteness. There is also concern about the durability of the building on the west side. The playing kids may be rough in this area, and extra work should be done to protect against it falling apart.

Vegetation will be the key to mitigating the scale of the building on this site, so it is good that the bigger trees are not being taken down. The low maintenance lawn is also great.

While there seems to be good energy performance, it would be nice if the daycare was LEED gold certified. This could be cast as a teaching element and pitched as cost-saving. At least consider triple-glazing the windows to address the solar gain on the south side. As well, think about cross-ventilation in the classrooms to prevent overheating if the air system goes down. Make sure there are plenty of openings and an air intake from the north façade to create cross-drafts and cool things down.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and noted that it is overwhelming to have such support for the project. All of comments will be taken seriously.

4. Address:	377 E Broadway
DE:	DE419668
Description:	To construct a five-storey mixed-use building including a total of 29 residential units and retail at grade.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand (Dimitar Bojadziev)
Owner:	Eighth Avenue Development Group
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Dimitar Bojadziev, Ankenman Marchand Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ed Kolic, Eighth Avenue Development Group
Staff:	Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the project as an infill site between Brunswick Street and Prince Edward Street. The site is zoned C-3A, with RM zoning across the lane, and is approximately 99 ft. wide and 88 ft. deep with a lane at the rear.

The application is for a new mixed-use market development seeking the following:

- a) Conditional Density from 1.0 FSR to 3.0 FSR;
- b) 10% additional heritage density transfer; and
- c) Conditional height from 9.2m to 18m

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

1. Please comment on the building's relationship to the public realm with respect to the following:
 - a) Setbacks from the property line to sidewalk along Broadway;
 - b) Projecting balconies at levels three and four;
 - c) Roofline expression.
 2. Please comment on the building composition on the north elevation, including the interface and scale of level one along the laneway frontage;
 3. Please comment on the success of the overall expression of the building, material palette and their execution;
 4. Please comment on the overall landscape plan and the treatment of the proposed enhancement of the boulevard area;
 5. Are the proposal's overall massing, bulk, density, and overall building design supportable?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team mentioned that the streetscape along Broadway is currently quite dismal. There is not a lot of colour. In the future the Kingsgate Mall can go eight to twelve stories, and this development aims to be consistent with that site once it gets developed.
-

The site is 100 ft. wide which has been broken into two parts with a central spine to break down the main façade and elevation. A battered fully-glazed wall has been introduced in between the two elements, which has elements and sparkle running through it.

City staff had concerns that the original cantilever design at the second storey had some overlook issues, and the structure was pulled in. However, the ideal would be to push out these elements again to add drama to the building.

There is continuous retail along the ground floor.

The parkette which currently exists is heavily used but is full of roots. So, in the applicant's view, the most that can be done in this parkette is to celebrate the bus stop; put in desire lines of travel for the pedestrians; and add ground cover to the area.

In the middle of the project there is a pulled out concrete box with a canopy which announces the project. As an expression from the street this will read mostly as a four-storey building. At the top there is really just storage space and cabanas with outdoor furniture.

The applicant team took questions from the and panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

- Design development to make the building exemplary;
- Design development to commit to a sustainability standard;
- Design development to activate the lane and provide an improved pedestrian scale;
- Design development to improve the enhanced boulevard and make it a *place* that might engage with the café;
- Delete the roof "pop-ups" and do something else on the roof of the building;
- The copper and brick colours are a bit too much; use palette of high quality material that is better suited to the neighbourhood;
- Create a private amenity space for the building;
- Design development to address concerns about privacy between the second level and the sidewalk.

- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the project is a very proud and strong building, but is not very special. While the density and height may seem appropriate for the area; the current design is not doing anything exemplary in terms of providing a public benefit to earn the extra height and density. The height of the building at the lane either needs to come down, or the building design needs to be improved to provide a better scale at the lane for pedestrians.

Pertaining to the lane, more work could be done as the doors all seem to be at different heights and could be more organized. Additionally, it needs to have something different than a 'back of house' design as it is not just a garage door and an alley at the back.

The sloping of the roofline seems a bit too abrupt, and the roofline expression is a bit overdone. The lightened metal at the top is also too weak, and a better way to top it is needed.

The building is kind of industrial and everything should reinforce this image. The materials should be durable to last, and simplified. For the colour palette the brick colour creates too much busyness. Replacing it with something grey would bring out the window colours and simplify the overall building expression.

The setbacks along Broadway make sense, but spill the coffee shop into the park more. Maybe with benches or something that is part of the landscape. The pocket park in the front is great. A bit more development is needed for seating and usability rather than travelling through the space. Pay a lot of attention to making the parkette successful and a benefit to the City. Additionally, celebrate the bus stop. Anything you can do to make the bus stop 'more' is good.

While the setbacks are agreeable, the balconies overtop seem a bit confusing. Design development is needed to resolve the balconies and the overhang better as there is currently not a lot of privacy between the second floor and the commercial usage of the street out front. Resolve the first and second level better to integrate them more into the public realm.

There is a lack of amenity, and this should be addressed. Maybe take out one of the private rooftop gardens and have the elevator go up into the space.

In terms of sustainability it is non-exemplary and needs to be. The project should commit to passive house design.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and mentioned that the Juliet balconies will be given more expression and articulation, but that the engagement with the sidewalk is a selling point. The floor-to-floor is high, but it is done for continuity with the Mount Pleasant Commercial guidelines in use across the street. A common courtyard can be created, and the roof elements will be changed.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.