

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 18, 2016

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Stefan Aepli  
Meghan Cree-Smith (excused for item #2, 3 & 4)  
James Cheng (excused for item #2, 3 & 4)  
Roger Hughes  
David Jerke  
Veronica Gillies  
Karen Spoelstra

**REGRETS:** Russell Acton  
Ken Larsson  
Neal LaMontagne  
Muneesh Sharma  
Kim Smith

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                               |
|----|-------------------------------|
| 1. | 2894 E Broadway               |
| 2. | 155 E 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue |
| 3. | 7638-7662 Cambie Street       |
| 4. | 1335 Howe Street              |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address:	2894 E Broadway
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a four-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade, 37 secured market rental units above, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.65. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Program.
Zoning:	C-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Gair Williamson Architects Inc. (Chris Knight)
Owner:	Decorus Development
Delegation:	Gair Williamson, Gair Williamson Architects Inc. Chris Knight, Gair Williamson Architects Inc. Mayur Kothary, Decorus Development Manjit Bhatti, Decorus Development
Staff:	Rachel Harrison & Allan Moorey

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)**

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, and Allan Moorey, Development Planner, declined to give a presentation but took questions from the panel.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team declined to give a presentation but took questions from the panel.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The concept should have a stronger relationship to the context and demonstrate livability and sustainability of design on main arterials
  - The massing concept needs development to achieve clarity
  - The penthouses should have a stronger expression even if it means small intrusions into the height envelope
  - Common amenity on the roof should be considered with elevator access (accepting the over-height elevator run)
  - Exploration of massing alternatives (single block, double block) to respond to the corner site of the existing context
  - Development of the materiality and tectonics of the building to suit residential/mixed use on a corner site on an arterial
  - Development of the retail and residential entry with a stronger, more inviting street presence
  - Development of the service area, parking entry and common amenity areas off the lane to mitigate the impact on the adjacent single family houses
  - More extensive use of brick to soften the corner mass, lane elevation, and bunker image at the north west corner at grade
- **Related Commentary:** The panel declined to give commentary beyond what was given at the Urban Design Panel meeting on May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team declined to give a response.

2. Address:	155 East 37th Avenue (Little Mountain)
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is to develop the 15-acre site into a mixed-use development based on the Council-approved Little Mountain Policy Statement to include a variety of buildings between 3 and 12 storeys (mainly residential uses with some commercial and civic use), approximately 1500 residential units, a total of 234 units of replacement social housing (53 of which have already been built under current zoning), a City-owned building containing a new Little Mountain Neighbourhood House, a 69-space childcare, 48 additional units of City-owned affordable housing, a new community plaza and public park, a new City street and an extension of East 35th Avenue.
Zoning:	RM-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	Fourth (Second at Rezoning Application)
Architect:	IBI Group (Gavin Blackstock)
Owner:	Holborn
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Phil Scott, Holborn Veronica Owens, Lighthouse Stuart Jones, IBI Group
Staff:	Graham Winterbottom, Timothy Potter, & Patricia St. Michel

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a unique 15 acre site located at the corner of 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Main Street, immediately adjacent to Queen Elizabeth Park and Hillcrest Park and Community Centre. It is flanked by two major greenways, Ontario Street and the 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue Ridgeway, and is just over 1 km from both Canada Line stations at 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue and King Edward Avenue.

The site is a former social housing site. Constructed in 1954, it was Vancouver's first large scale social housing site and was owned by CMHC. In 2007 the Federal Government transferred ownership of the site to the Province under BC Housing, who selected Holborn Properties as their development partner for the site in 2008. As part of the redevelopment there is a commitment by the Province to replace all the social housing units on site, and to reinvest proceeds of the sale of the site into social housing projects within Vancouver.

Through 2010-2012 City staff led a collaborative planning process with the local community, former residents of the site, and Holborn. During its development the Policy was presented to the Panel through two non-voting workshops in 2010 and 2011. In 2012 Council approved the Little Mountain Policy Statement which outlines the goals and objectives for the site in terms of land use, built form and height, transportation and connections, sustainability, and public benefits

Patricia St. Michel, Development Planner, continued the introduction by stating that the policy statement is focused on drawing from the place and memory of Little Mountain, and the local context of Queen Elizabeth Park.

The site is organized around the existing trees of Little Mountain and the alignment of the former buildings that occupied the site. There is an oblique angle in the southern areas which is unrelated to the surrounding grid and was typical of housing developments of the time. The key public places and streets are organized around this placement, with retained trees being celebrated as their focal points.

Wedge Park is the central open space on the alignment of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It focuses on the two significant trees at the Ontario edge and provides an important connection to Queen Elizabeth Park from the adjacent area to the east.

The Community Plaza in the southern portion of the site is organized around several retained trees. It will also be the social focus of the community, with an adjacent neighbourhood house and surrounding local retail.

Protecting adjacent bike routes was an important organizing principle. As such a Central Spine street will serve the site with connections to 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Main Street, and no vehicular access from Ontario Street or 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Permeability and connections to Queen Elizabeth Park for pedestrians is also a fundamental organizing principle. The policies direct the creation of multiple east/west pedestrian connections through the site and the larger development blocks.

Height and massing were of critical concern in developing the policies for Little Mountain. Higher buildings are accommodated centrally within the site. Buildings at the south and north edges are more limited in height and the policy outlines that they are to transition in scale to the surrounding neighbourhood.

There is an important view to Mount Baker from the summit of Queen Elizabeth Park about 145 ft. above the general topography of the site. The highest building heights at 12 storeys, or 120 ft., sit below the horizon. In the view alignment to Mount Baker across the south-west portion of the site, building heights are 10 storeys or less to sit well below the horizon and provide a generous frame to the view.

Sunlight on public spaces is an important principle and generator of building form. In particular, buildings south of the Wedge Park and Community Plaza are to be sculpted to optimize sunlight access. Buildings along Ontario Street are to ensure a pattern of intermittent sunlight and shadow along the bikeway and Queen Elizabeth Park edge.

The policies further address building variety, with blocks to be composed of distinctive buildings that are varied in scale and limited in length. Key ideas are to create a rich and varied interface within the context through varied setbacks, edge conditions, and areas of tree retention.

The Little Mountain Policy statement supports a gross range over the entire 15 acre site of 2.3 to 2.5 FSR. This proposal is for 2.5 FSR gross. This translates to a gross FSR on the development parcels of about 3.1, which in turn would be about 2.8 to 2.85 FSR average net after typical exclusions.

As a major site rezoning LEED Gold and connect-ability to District Energy are required. The rezoning policy for sustainable large developments also applies.

**Previous Panel Commentary**

This project was reviewed by panel in December 2015, and did not receive support. Comments from the panel's on key aspects needing improvement included:

- A larger, open space plaza is needed, and it requires a stronger sense of place. Add some drama to space. Consider relocating density to allow this to happen.
- Concern about the quality of space, with the big building shadowing. Consider moving density to accommodate the larger vision and have the driver be daylight activation
- Concern the massing is too monotonous. The massing needs to support elegance and refinement of the public realm.
- Going into the detailed design phase the project needs to be making a stronger commitment to reducing carbon creation and consumption, improving the envelope, and considering alternatives to the district energy system.

To address these comments the Community Plaza has been expanded and extended westward for a more direct connection with the Central Spine street. Buildings to the west of the plaza have been set further back and shaped to allow late afternoon and evening sun to access the space. There is now more room for the retained trees, and for additional trees to be retained in the sequence of spaces along 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Active retail use has also been introduced to the base of the market building that fronts the western edge of the plaza.

The southern edge along 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue has been reshaped with greater variety and more visual access deeper into the site. The building south of Wedge Park has also been reconfigured and reduced in overall height to improve sense of scale in this space.

In the northwest area of the site, buildings have been reoriented east/west. This aims to provide more generously scaled courtyards that are organized around clear and welcoming pedestrian paths which provide visual and physical access to Queen Elizabeth Park. Buildings on the east side of the new central street have been redesigned to provide a more direct pedestrian connection between these paths and the future pedestrian routes between developments in the Little Mountain Adjacent Area.

To create a stronger sense of place within Little Mountain a hierarchy of buildings has been established to help guide future design development of the buildings. The hierarchy identifies Primary and Secondary Landmark buildings, and Primary and Secondary Streetwall buildings. It also provides design guidance specific to the role that the buildings play within the larger setting of the Little Mountain development.

With respect to carbon reduction and building envelope performance the guidelines seek to reduce the window to wall area ratios, incorporate passive design strategies, and enhance the energy performance of various building elements. This is in addition to LEED Gold certification, site-wide sustainability strategies, and being district energy ready. Parking garages along the central spine are also being pulled back to enable ground-water infiltration and greater permeability along the rainwater feature.

The Planning Department would like advice and comment on the response to the previous 'Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement':

- A larger, open space plaza is needed, and it requires a stronger sense of place. Add some drama to space. Consider relocating density to allow this to happen.
- Concern about the quality of space, with the big building shadowing. Consider moving density to accommodate the larger vision and have the driver be daylight activation.

- Concern the massing is too monotonous. The massing needs to support elegance and refinement of the public realm.
- Going into the detailed design phase the project needs to be making a stronger commitment to reducing carbon creation and consumption, improving the envelope, and considering alternatives to the district energy system.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team presented a PowerPoint slide show which highlighted the changes that they have made. The applicants summarized the previous panel commentary as follows:
  - Transitional edges work well
  - Central spine and permeability are strong
  - Tree retention is good
  - Establish "Big Idea"
  - Sameness of built form contributes to lack of sense of place
  - Solar performance should drive public realm, particularly: NW corner and community, plaza
  - Plaza needs to be larger, better connected to spine, more activated, sunnier in late afternoon
  - Consider a grocery store
  - More commitment to sustainability of building envelope
  - Consider alternatives to district energy

In response to these comments the applicants made changes to the south-east quadrant to enlarge the plaza and increase the plaza sunlight performance, particularly in late afternoon. They also added active use to building AA, turned Building AA into a landmark for views from Main and Quebec Streets, then stepped Buildings AA and EC for better edge transition to the adjacent area. Building BA has also been reoriented to activate the plaza edge and create a sunny courtyard.

In the south-west quadrant there is now a continuous pathway connection from the plaza to Queen Elizabeth Park. The heights and massings are now varied, particularly on the Ontario Street edge. Building CC-2 has been pulled north to preserve trees and improve plaza solar performance. Additional trees are also retained, and there is now a large, contiguous, south-facing courtyard.

In the north-west quadrant there is continuous east-west path which connects to the north-east quadrant path and creates generous view corridors from the Central Spine to Queen Elizabeth Park. Tall buildings are offset to create varied street edges and minimize overlooks. Additionally courtyards are generously scaled for daylight and privacy, and the Ontario Street sunlight performance has been improved. Generous setbacks of 18 ft. also now exist on the west side of the Central Spine to accommodate a stormwater feature.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - There is concern about the relationship of the boulevard to the nature of the space
  - Building A infringes too much into the public space
  - Change the massing on building CA-1 to be a stronger 'landmark'

- Some unique character needs to be developed on this site; somewhere in this project is something unique which can be tapped to give the site a stronger identity that relates to the character of Main Street
  - Reduce the FSR on the site to give some more space to improve shadows
  - Sustainability requirements are changing and over the time frame of this project are going to impact the design of buildings, so consider the future carefully with regards to changing building technologies
  - Showcase the bike culture and urban agriculture better
  - Building CA's parking entrance needs to change to not align with the public realm and connections from 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel noted that the configurations and reallocations of geometries have had a positive impact, and that the larger open plaza looks quite successful.

Building AA is too far south and restricts the plaza a bit, so consider pulling back the building line in order to open up the space. It also has a curvature which struggles with the plaza, so pulling it back or straightening it out would help with the massing.

The 'landmark' building is too tentative to be significant. Adding another level might help to make it stronger. The parking entrance also needs to be moved.

The commitment to carbon reduction is not sufficient at this point. The next phase in City policy is net zero, so there is a strong encouragement to have a high standard for energy compliance. Look at dynamic glazing, or other things which affect the energy performance. As well, consider green roofs as it would be a shame to see all the buildings covered with mechanical rooms.

The site doesn't seem to have anything distinct about it; it is just like all the communities which are already built. A great job has been done in integrating nature, but there is still a lot of opportunity to do something a bit more adventurous.

Main Street has a foodie culture, and this should be reflected somehow in this area. Maybe every roof should be usable green space to create more urban agriculture. The cycling culture could also be celebrated by putting bike racks in the front lobbies, or having space for them along the spine. Bike culture is a big part of Main Street and should be reflected here.

The Panel appreciated that the daylight activation concerns have been addressed since the last presentation. The rain garden feature is a great addition, but how it looks and appears over time will be important so maintenance will be critical. They also thought that the applicant could incorporate more of the water feature back into the design.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team welcomed the comments and noted that the parking entrance can move further south, but it needs to be on the spine street.

The water feature is based on rainwater and ground water runoff, so it is designed to be sustainable given the dry summers and that water cannot be transported across property lines. There will be urban agriculture and green space on the roofs of the buildings, with the opportunity to increase garden space in the future if interest in that space grows.

---

3. Address:	7638-7662 Cambie Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a 6-storey building that includes 34 residential units, a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.43, 71 vehicle parking spaces and 49 bicycle spaces.
Zoning:	RT-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects (Andrew Emmerson)
Owner:	Creekside Development
Delegation:	Andrew Emmerson, GBL Architects Julian Pattison, Considered Design Inc.
Staff:	Cynthia Lau & Patrick O'Sullivan

---

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (3-2)

- **Introduction:** Cynthia Lau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the site for this rezoning application as being made up of two parcels mid-block between 60<sup>th</sup> and 61<sup>st</sup> Avenue on the east side of Cambie Street. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan which contemplates six-storey residential buildings in this area.

The site is approximately 17,000 sq. ft. Sites on Cambie Street to the north and south are zoned RT-1, and can be considered up to six-storeys under Phase 2.

To the east behind the lane are sites zoned RM-9 as part of the recently approved Marpole Community Plan. RM-9 contemplates medium density dwellings, including townhouses and low-rise apartments. To the west across Cambie Street is a recently approved project for a six-storey mixed-use building, including a church and 129 secured market rental units.

This application proposes to rezone the site from RT-1 to CD-1 to allow development of one six-storey building over two levels of underground parking with an FSR of 2.43. The proposal includes 34 market residential units.

A mid-block pedestrian link, as noted in the Plan, is included at the northern edge of the site. The Cambie Corridor Plan anticipates residential six-storey buildings in this area with an estimated FSR range of 2.0 - 2.5.

Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, continued by noting that the proposed density is 2.43, but the massing represents a density of 2.5 if the 'open to below' space on the upper level were to be included. There is also "Oko" skin cladding, wood soffits, wood cladding in covered areas, and bypassing glass balustrades.

Residential front doors are proposed to face Cambie Street, but it is noted that on-grade uses facing the mid-block pedestrian link contain windows but not doors into this connection space. The landscape at the rear contains active uses including urban agriculture and an outdoor amenity space. The roof contains an extensive green roof and private roof deck for the upper two units. The front setback is 7 ft. to 10 ft. and a rear yard setback of 30 ft. as suggested by Planning. Sideyard setbacks comply with the form of development guidance of the Cambie Corridor Plan.

There are 71 parking spaces being provided, although only 37 are required. A 455 sq. ft. amenity area is proposed at grade.

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

1. Please comment on your level of support for the proposed form, height and density as it relates to the Cambie Corridor policy.
  2. Please comment on the overall general approach to landscape design
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by noting that the Cambie Guidelines are a bit of a challenge with the massing and transitions. The aim was to have a compact form with some dynamic elements. Thus the linear quality and dynamism of Cambie Street is being expressed in the building form through an interlocking built form.

A lot of the units are two-bedrooms.

The orientation of the building takes into account solar shading and sustainability, so there are more linear balconies on the Cambie Street side. On the east side there are more compact balconies with compact pockets in between the layers.

The idea was to add some solidity to the ends to make a sense of enclosure and prevent overlook which would compromise privacy. There is a very clear transition through the building, and a defined entry on the front. The building is symmetrical with a very simple layout and a clean form.

The landscape architect continued, noting two layers of street trees and a 4 ft. hedge at Cambie Street to provide a bit of privacy and activate the edge. On the east side there are benches and a small pocket park. Play is seen as an intrinsic part of the entire landscape and informs all of the geometries and conditions of the site. Planting exists around the edges to provide a sense of privacy and to prevent access to the site and vandalism.

A sustainable urban drainage system is being proposed along with urban agriculture.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Address privacy at the mid-block pedestrian link
  - Some concerns exist around the formal language being inconsistent with the solar shading on the east and west sides
  - The landscaping needs further development; the pocket park on the east side could be moved to provide a buffer between the building and the walkway, and that the lane side landscape design might be too busy
  - There are some issues about how the building responds to the changing grade on Cambie St. and the resulting interface between the public realm and the street level units which are too close to the street given the current design
- **Related Commentary:** The panel had no particular issues with the height, massing or density. They did note that it is a bit concerning that there is no amenity across from the pocket park and a greater separation between the units and Cambie Street is required. Perhaps the landscape could be flipped from the lane to the front in order to accomplish this.

More information is needed about the east side and how the grading will be affected by the walls and landscaping. On the east side the landscape is also too busy. The basalt bioswale feature might work, but there is an extensive amount of hardscape in this area which might make the area feel desolate. One panelist liked the “craziness” of the landscape on the east side as it is unconventional.

On the north there seems to be a space which could be improved upon to integrate the benches. Think about what it will mean if this area is abandoned. The south elevation seems neglected and will probably become a service walkway.

The panel felt that the building is too close to Cambie St and that the amount of glazing on the front elevation at grade will cause privacy impacts from passers-by on the sidewalk. The panel suggested that the building be located further to the east on the site.

Removing the glass on the north or south would be better to mitigate the solar gain. The panel suggested that the applicant consider reducing the window-to-wall ratios overall.

The pop-ups for the private decks on the roof are not in the interest of the Cambie corridor or the overall building given that they are only for two units.

The midblock pedestrian connection is an opportunity to do something different. Take the entry and move it adjacent to the pedestrian connection. This would address the privacy issues and better activate the area.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team noted that the balconies have been supplemented along Cambie Street with some vertical screens to protect against the sun. Some solar shading analysis has been done, but more consideration will be given to the shadow analysis and solar impact.

---

4. Address:	1335 Howe Street
DE:	DE420124
Description:	To construct a new 40-storey mixed used building with commercial at grade and residential above containing 363 dwelling units over six levels of underground parking
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First at DE)
Architect:	IBI Group (Martin Bruckner)
Owner:	Townline Ventures Howe St Ltd.
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Gwyn Vose, IBI Studio Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Lin Lin, PFS Studio
Staff:	Sailen Black

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-5)**

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the project as a mid-block 200 by 120 ft. site which exists opposite the Howe Street on-ramp to the Granville Bridge. There is an unusual at-grade context; the public realm interface on Howe Street, especially moving south, is challenged by the bridge on-ramp.

The site is subject to CD-1 policy and the Downtown South Guidelines. This means that there is a minimum 6 ft. front yard on Howe Street. The guidelines recommend consideration be given to the neighbours' access to daylight and sun, and to the provision of lanes as a relatively green and open space with substantial setbacks and landscaping at the ground floor. There is a protected view corridor from Queen Elizabeth Park that limits the height on this site to a 462 ft. geodetic maximum.

The proposal is for 389 market dwelling units with an at-grade amenity room on the left. The permitted density is 11.2 FSR and the proposed height is 378 ft., which is about 2 ft. below the view cone. The maximum tower floor plate of 6,500 sq. ft. and a tower separation of 80 ft. have been provided. The site is also subject to the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning.

On the Howe Street side it is important to consider the pedestrian experience. The proposal includes setbacks of the two bottom levels which would create a hollowed out volume facing the street at grade containing building entries and a water feature.

The planner noted the previous comments offered by the Urban Design Panel.

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

1. Does the proposed design address the key aspects the Panel identified as needing improvement?
  2. Are any changes recommended to ensure a high degree of livability for the residences at the lowest podium levels?
  3. Does the proposed public realm interface create a safe and attractive area for pedestrians along Howe Street?
-

4. Does the Panel have any advice on the proposed materials, tower design, or the open space on top of the podium

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team continued the introduction by mentioning that there are market condos in the tower, and rentals are in the podium, with townhouses at one end of the lowest level. The middle portion of the building is purely lobbies. When it comes to livability for the townhouses, the living side is on the lane.

The planting is the screen for the Howe Street side. On the lane there is an at-grade area with planting to make it feel like a courtyard.

The daycare has been taken out, and the space is now an amenity. Proposed is an outdoor pool and hot tub on one side, and on the other side ~~are~~ a children's play area and a dog run. Screen walls and trellis partitions are being proposed for privacy.

White horizontal elements have been added throughout the base, along with a feature for an illuminated glass screen which shows the pool behind it. At the top of the building is a tree-top pattern trellis structure, that, when seen from Drake Street, becomes a feature which caps the building. There is less than 50% glazing, and the metal panels are white and charcoal grey.

There is a water feature to provide some acoustic buffering from the bridge. Stormwater will be incorporated into the design for sustainability purposes. On the roof there is urban agriculture, along with a tool shed and storage area. In the lane there is lots of landscape with a finer paving treatment, and an opportunity for pedestrian drop-off.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The urban agriculture is too much of a token gesture and the area should be used to reinforce the function of adjacent areas
  - The townhouses are problematic and are not suited for this location
  - There was a stronger expression of public space on the original scheme
  - Add planters at the podium to add interest if the water feature is dry
  - The strong horizontal elements are interrupting the tower mass at the ground and podium level; they should be reconsidered or removed
  - The amenity is popping out and interrupting the line of the tower going down
  - The top trellis seems unnecessary and gratuitous.
  - There is some concern about the white brick not relating well to the building
  - The tower lacks the clarity of the original scheme and needs design development to express the concept of the large staggered balconies juxtaposed against the interior spatial envelope of the tower
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the design mostly addresses the previous comments. However, there was a rigor and calmness to the geometry in the previous design which created a grid-like pattern on the tower that is lost in this iteration. The clarity present in the original design is not present in this one. The white bands on the podium should probably disappear to better integrate it with the tower. As well, the proposed white brick does not really relate to the other elements and materials.

While the trellis at the very top is unnecessary and doesn't relate to the building, the proposal for the lower podium levels is quite interesting. However, the townhouses are not supportable as a use on such a busy street/bridgehead. Either change them to commercial uses, or open this space up to the lane.

The pedestrian realm along Howe Street looks safe, but will depend on the water feature to be attractive. Integrate planters to provide some visually appealing aspect if the fountain is dry.

The outdoor amenity space on the podium is good in its separation of uses between the north and south. More agriculture is needed, but not at the north as it won't work. If the urban agriculture is not going to be large and serious, then consider removing it and having an open play space.

The thermal envelope is good in terms of its performance value, but the face of the grey wall looks like unfinished concrete. It is too harsh compared to the white corner.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that it is interesting how sometimes the first idea is the best one. An attempt was made to address the comments from the earlier panel, and they are confident that they can come up with something which addresses the current comments.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.