

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 9, 2016

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Stuart Hood
Roger Hughes
Jim Huffman
David Jerke
Derek Neale
Muneesh Sharma

REGRETS: Meghan Cree-Smith
Ken Larsson
James Cheng
Julien Fagnan
Neal Lamontagne

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. | 5688 Ash Street (Oakridge Lutheran Church) |
| 2. | 870 E 8th Avenue |
| 3. | 1661 Davie Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 5688 Ash Street (Oakridge Lutheran Church)
 DE: 419928
 Description: Concurrent rezoning and development permit application to construct a six-storey mixed-use building with retail on the first floor, church, office and community space on the second floor and a total of 46 affordable housing units above. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Concurrent Rezoning and Complete Development Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Francl Architecture (Walter Francl)
 Owner: Catalyst Community Development Society
 Delegation: Walter Francl, Francl Architecture
 Daryl Tyada, ETA
 Robert Brown, Catalyst
 Staff: Michelle McGuire (for Cynthia Lau) and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Timothy Potter, Development Planner, introduced the project. It is a concurrent Rezoning and Development Application pursuant to the *Cambie Corridor Plan* (CCP) in the Oakridge Town Centre plan area. The proposal includes commercial space, a church, and secured social housing units. The development is on 41st Avenue at Ash Street at the existing Oakridge Lutheran Church site. The site is approximately 120 x 132 ft.

Section 4.4.3 of the CCP (41st Avenue Willow to Columbia) has an estimated density range of 2.0 to 2.5 FSR and building heights up to eight storeys. The proposal is 3.44 FSR and approximately 60 ft. and six storeys.

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

1. The CCP and its design principles seek to provide:
 - a. a consistent streetwall for mixed-use buildings (5 storey with setback above); and
 - b. A transition in scale to adjacent residential development (2 storeys at the lane).

In view of these principles, is the proposed massing supportable and is the transition in scale to adjacent neighbouring sites successful? Please also comment on the scale of the building immediately at the lane.

2. Is the presence and expression of the church use on the site successful? Does the panel have any other comments on the overall architectural expression of the building?
3. Please provide comments on the success of the Landscape design as it relates to:
 - a. 41st Avenue and Ash Street treatments;
 - b. Rooftop and amenity areas for residents and church members; and
 - c. Incorporation of areas suitable for children to play;
4. Please comment and provide advice on the success of the proposed sustainability measures.

The existing church is not on the Vancouver Heritage Registry (VHR) however a statement of significance and evaluation found that it would be a “B”-listed building if added to the VHR. There will be a loss of trees on the site. The engineering department is seeking statutory right of way to achieve more space to accommodate the B-line stop and a possible bikeway enhancement. The setback from the lane is 4 ft.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicants are full development partners with the church. Affordable housing and replacement of the church are key components of the project. The Oakridge Lutheran church has been on the site since 1956. They have been contemplating redevelopment for the past 8-10 years. Their objective is to maintain the church presence on the site and create a community gathering space and housing. They want the residents of the building and church members to share amenity spaces (indoor and outdoor).

The church has long-term objectives to provide affordable housing and community space. Catalyst is a non-profit developer and co-owner whose objective is to build social housing on-site. They have been working with the city on various other social housing projects. The unit mix is 30% social housing and the balance of units at market rental rates with the objective over time to drive rents down and provide more affordable units. The retail at grade is a benefit to the neighbourhood.

The church proposal will be represented and remembered in a recast format to honour the history of the site. The applicant worked with the church to preserve certain key heritage features. There were a lot of interior wood features that will be re-used in the new church space. Existing features such as doors, seating and paneling will be brought into the new building. Existing stone elements on the exterior will be incorporated into landscape, seating, and paving on site.

The applicant took cues from the site immediately west of the subject site and the future development that will occur at Oakridge. The Oakridge re-development anticipates tall towers that will also shadow the neighbouring buildings to the north. The proposed massing is stepped to improve the shadow performance to neighbouring sites to the north. Adjacent sites to the north are likely to have more intensive land use and massing than the existing single family zoning at present. As requested by the church congregation, the existing exterior glazing pattern of the church will be re-created in the proposed church space. After gathering feedback at open houses, the applicant has decided to allow residents of the housing component to have access to the church and amenity spaces.

The applicant will reclaim stone for site furnishings. The lane elevation will be treated with clinging vines to soften this edge. On the 2nd floor, re-using some elements of the existing church, a screen is proposed with stain glass panels that will be enhanced by back-lighting. The planter walls at either end will be faced with the stone from the existing building. The project is targeting LEED Gold. Many points will be earned from energy performance. The landscape materials, indoor air quality, and proximity to major transit routes position the site to earn several site design points. The owners of the building, motivated to reduce operating costs through low energy consumption, are providing a high performance building envelope. For example, triple glazed windows are proposed to drive down energy use.

With respect to access to amenity spaces, the residents will have elevator access to the 2nd floor shared spaces. A children’s play area may need to be re-examined to ensure it can also be accessed by residents. The rooftop at level six does not have an outdoor area for the residents.

The structure is a two-storey concrete frame with four storeys of wood on top. The applicant is trying to avoid intensive use on the wood frame roof area to avoid the possibility of future envelope failures.

- **Panel's consensus needing improvement:**
 - Improve the transition to sites to the north
 - The scale of the lane elevation
 - Consider the future expression and legibility of the church as well as future signage
 - There should be room on the roof deck on level two for trees to mature
 - Paving patterns need to be developed
 - The durability of materials at the base of the retail space needs to be addressed
 - The child's play area and its viability as a shared space needs to be worked out
- **Related Commentary:** The panel supported the massing and transition to adjacent sites, as well as the simple shape. The massing will offer good variety that is not overly articulated. The Social sustainability is very strong on the project. A panel member noticed this is a smaller and different site than the larger ones along 41st. The panel wondered if the building could be eight storeys since framing should not preclude an eight storey height. It might transition better to other sites as a taller building. Currently the expression is a bit bulky on the north side. The expression is successful and the simple, box style of the massing is successful without the upper storey setback. The church expression is modern, which is pleasing. The panel felt the proposal is a handsome, modern way of incorporating a church with other uses.

Some panel members thought the relationship with the church is well handled but other panel members thought there should be more of a public face to the church. Churches are usually vertically expressed, particularly the current building at the site. It might be beneficial to incorporate the verticality of the entrance and at the front of the building bringing more verticality to the street. One panel member thought this might improve the public presence of the church. The plan to have a small cross in a corner seems out of scale and too understated. One panel member thought the setback at the shoulder is notable and acceptable. The retail at grade and the church above works well for the uses. Another panel member thought the expression of the church is commendable and the modesty and expression of it is reflective of the changing times of the institution. A few panel members thought that the biggest challenge of the proposal on the north. The form could be maintained if the glass guard rail is raised so that the glass band around it enhances privacy for neighbours. There are a lot of people looking north, so some panelists recommended 42 inch high guards to improve privacy to the north. There were mixed opinions about the sharing of the public spaces of the church with residents. There was some concern that the church may in the future, change the access to the common spaces for the residents. One panel member thought the location of the office near washrooms seems undesirable.

Overall the massing is well supported especially close to a major transit mode. The stepping down is good especially close to the corner. Triple glazing works with sound proofing. The panel encouraged triple glazing. The landscape treatment is standard, and has a good relationship with solids and voids and seems sustainable. The panel would like to see more design development of the paving patterns. The children's play area is not as welcoming or as usable as it could be. The joy of the building should continue on to the ground. It is good to have access for the residents and churchgoers for the children play space.

- **Applicant's Response:** Gladly received and appreciated the panel's advice.

2. Address:	870 E 8th Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a seven-storey building over one level of underground parking and includes 51 affordable rental units.
Zoning:	RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DYS Architecture (Dane Jansen and Glenn Gardner)
Owner:	Red Door Housing Society
Delegation:	Dane Jansen, DYS Architecture Glenn Gardner, DYS Architecture Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd.
Staff:	Joyce Uyesugi and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Joyce Uyesugi and Sailen Black introduced the rezoning application for 870 E 8th Avenue. The site is located on the southwest corner of E 8th Avenue and St. Catherine's Street, two blocks east of Fraser Street. Across the lane is a four-storey building on East Broadway. There are character houses located to the north on E 8th Avenue, and the ANAVETS building on the 900-block of 8th Avenue is six storeys. China Creek Park North is located beyond the site, along Great Northern Way. The existing building on the site was built in 1985 and is in need of capital repairs.

The site is 138 feet in width and 122 feet in depth. It is a sloped site, and the lane is about one level higher than 8th Avenue. The proposal is for a 7-storey building - approximately 65 feet tall at the corner with 51 units and 2.86 FSR. There is underground parking access off the lane at rear.

The application is being considered under the Housing and Homelessness Strategy. This policy aims to increase the supply of affordable housing and to support partners to enhance housing stability. The site is also located within the Mount Pleasant Community Plan (approved in 2010) area. The Plan includes policy direction for affordable and social housing; however, there is no rezoning policy for the RM-4 district.

The site and the surrounding area are currently zoned RM-4. The surrounding area is a mix of 3-storey rental buildings as well as some lower scale market development such as on St. Catherine's Street. Zoning permits heights of up to 10.7 m (35.1 feet) with secondary angle, and density up to 1.45 FSR. The front yard depth requirement is a minimum of 6.1 m (20 feet) The side yard allows a minimum width of 2.1 m (6.9 feet), plus a 135 degree angle containing angle under the policy guidelines.

The intent of the RM-4 district schedule is to permit medium-density residential development, including a variety of multiple dwelling types, to encourage the retention of existing buildings and good design, and to achieve a number of community and social objectives through permitted increases in floor area.

Guidelines for the Mount Pleasant RM-4 area include goals to achieve high quality development, residential livability, and enhance the character and identity of each neighbourhood. It may not always be possible to achieve all the objectives in this document. The Guidelines also note that on each site, tradeoffs will be considered to achieve the major design objectives. It is noted that the Northeast Mount Pleasant apartment area contains a mix of housing types of varying ages.

The predominant building type is the three to four storey wood frame apartment building. Some remaining houses are also located in this area. The development planner reviewed a number of recommendations from the guidelines for the form of development in new buildings.

High-density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines applies to the site, as well as the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning, so LEED Gold or equal standard must be met.

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

1. Does the panel support the proposed form of development, including the seven-storey height with the setbacks shown at a proposed density of 2.86 FSR?
 2. Does the proposed form strike the right balance between the goals of the zoning and design guidelines; the neighbouring sites; and the potential of this corner site?
 3. Does the panel have any preliminary advice on the exterior expression shown?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the project is entirely funded by non-profit owners who own the land and are developing it. The demographics of tenants have changed over the years. As such, they are proposing replacement of the existing 22 units with one- and two-bedroom units. The affordable housing policy allows for densification, and there is a balance of densification for affordability and the desires of the community.

The applicant was concerned about setbacks. They intended to fit a volume that would achieve the revenue goals. They were concerned about the shadowing resulting from the form of the building, and they wanted to restrict the shadows of their building onto neighbouring properties. Parking is challenging because there is a steep slope for the ramp. There is an amenity space adjacent the parking ramp. There are corner balconies to soften the edges. The building is LEED Gold, and it is concrete for long term durability. There is interior insulation and the majority is light weight metal cladding, which was used to create a residential scale. The cladding also used to create durability for energy performance.

There is a raised podium around the edges with picket style fencing, and there is a setback to allow for large tree planters. There are generous patios. There is a kid's play area with amenity space that is accessible around the back sunny side of building. There are community garden plots in four areas. The planting at the site will be edible, which will be layered. They do not to have a guard rail at the site for a soft corner and privacy. The only way to get to the garbage is through the front door on site. The residential wraps on the ground floor, and the lower level is office and amenity space. The façade is metal panel and sheet metal material.

As far as urban design intent, the applicant was concerned for affordability in order to achieve requirements while pursuing density. The broader context is that the area is evolving for densification with generally up to six storeys on Broadway. They sought variety in building height for the site. There are 40% window openings. They are using building materials for sustainability. The winter solstice shadowing does extend out to the neighbouring properties on the opposite side of the street.

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

- The six storey corner of the massing could be softened;
- The design has direct access to garbage through the front exit, but the back exit might be more appropriate even with at the expense of losing habitable space;
- The panel recommends less metal cladding for the exterior expression;
- The northeast corner plinth should have a better connection to the rest of the site;
- The entry way could be improved and celebrated more, and perhaps the canopy in the play area could be handled differently;
- Maybe this should be designed as a family building;
- More outdoor amenity on the rooftop could be added.

- **Related Commentary:** Overall the project adds variety to the neighbourhood. The density and height is supported. There is support for FSR to 2.86 and massing and height in general. The massing and background building are well done. There is a good social sustainability component to the project. The panel commended the project for the three different amenity rooms, which are doing three different things in three different spaces. The proposal adds quality and good design to the neighbourhood, and is not out of character.

The panel appreciates the existing residents focus on the economic challenges. There was not much to consider for urban form because it responds to the guidelines. It is handsome and reaches the goals of the project and is a cut above the norm. The panel found no problem with the materials. It is fake metal but it gives variation and boldness. At the entry there should be more improvement. A few panel members thought the exterior expression had too much metal cladding, which made it too busy. Perhaps more masonry could be put on base of the building. The entry sequence of the front door is convoluted. The panel felt that the urban design context is varied and is not cohesive enough to determine a single response.

The current plan for density is appropriate considering the Skytrain development and surrounding developments, such as the six-storey height on the Broadway corridor. The slope of the land gives an opportunity to go up to seven storeys, which would be more difficult if the slight was flat. The shadow performance is good and not a major issue for winter. There are condominiums close by, and the shadow is not a concern for the neighbours. The top floor is successfully setback. The response to the site might resemble "coffin buildings", as they used to be called.

There was a concern about access to garbage going through the front door or down through the ramp. There should be a direct route to the garbage. But there is a question to whether removal of space is worth the convenience of back exit access to the garbage. There is an issue with the street scape, which looks like a wall and unattractive. The parking structure is flat, and should be sloped slightly to work with the street grades. A panel member thought the building is not welcoming at grade. There could be more of a connection to the streets for a 'friendly street'. The panel approved the semi plinth for the parking.

The play area with the wood form could be celebrated more. The wood form could be made as a canopy piece and shield. It would be a lattice at the play area. The play area could be a special feature for the project, and design development to improve the expression was encouraged. The outdoor amenity space is too small. The families in the area might need more space such as on the rooftop which is made from concrete and could accommodate play areas there.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the panel. All the comments are issues the applicant worked on as well. It was very helpful for the next stage.

3. Address: 1661 Davie Street
 DE: DE419982
 Description: To develop this site with a commercial/residential building consisting of a three storey podium with three (3) retail units on the lower & upper ground level, retail grocery store on the upper ground & mezzanine level, two residential towers containing a total of 319 dwelling units (market rental) with a common amenity on the 3rd level over three levels common underground parking, accessed off of Davie St and the lane.
- Zoning: C-5A
 Application Status: Complete Development Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects (Gregory Henriquez and Dallas Hong)
 Owner: Westbank
 Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Dallas Hong, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Ian Gillespie, Westbank
 Staff: Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the project as a complete development permit application. The site currently hosts a one-storey Safeway, liquor store, and parking lot facing Davie Street. The Safeway entrance is adjacent to the corner of Cardero and Davie Streets. To the north of the site is Pendrell Place (two high rise apartments), with Lord Roberts Elementary situated beyond. The existing development along the north side of Davie is generally low scale. They offer water views from viewpoints up the hill to the east. On the other side of Davie is a one-storey commercial with 18 storey residential tower (Regency Park) facing Cardero Street.

Next door is the recently approved design at 1188 Bidwell, also under the C-5A, that features a 2-storey podium with a residential tower above that is set back 40 ft. from the interior property line. There is a children's outdoor play space with units for families located on the lower levels.

Relevant policy for this site includes the West End Plan and the C-5A zoning district schedule. The new West End Plan, adopted in 2013, established the potential for up to 7.0 FSR for new buildings providing secured market rental units. The aim is to increase the amount of basic rental stock in the West End as sites are redeveloped.

The site is located in a "corridor" area of the West End Plan, which generally aims to provide job space and meet the housing needs of the community. The intent for the Lower Davie corridor allows increasing density while maintaining existing height limits.

Built form policy for the area includes:

- To maximize views and sunlight on sidewalks, residential floor plates should be set back above a two storey podium level and should not exceed 511 sq. m (5,500 sq. ft.) plate towers, to preserve sunlight and views.

- Building materials should include a variety of materials, rather than consist primarily of glass façade, and reflect the architectural character of surrounding buildings. This is particularly important for the lower floors.
- New development should be responsive to adjacent and nearby private views by shaping built form to optimize performance.

The intent of the C-5A zoning is to provide for retail and service uses, forms of development compatible with the primarily residential character of the West End, and to provide for dwelling units that are compatible with commercial uses. The schedule encourages external building design that is oriented towards pedestrians in scale and function. The C-5A also provides density bonuses for social housing or secured market rental housing.

The maximum frontage for each occupancy on a floor within 6 ft. of the street grade is limited to no more than 25.3 ft. wide. However, the Development Permit Board may relax the maximum frontage regulation in the case of an existing grocery store provided that:

- they consider the intent of the zoning,
- that are satisfied that the scale of development at the street property line will relate to pedestrians;
- The site has a frontage over 150 ft.
- no more than a total of 50 % of the frontage of the site is occupied by grocery or drug store use and its departments, except when this total amount shall be interspersed with other retail or service uses
- windows at the street property line are clear-glazed and unobstructed so that the interior of the premises are at all times visible from the sidewalk

The proposal includes two residential towers at 210 ft. tall, with 319 dwelling units, over a three storey podium. A new grocery store is located above the three CRU's at a lower level along Davie Street. The proposed parkade access goes from Davie Street over the sidewalk, and from the lane. Levels four to seven are in the range of (600 to 949 sq. m) 6,458 sq. ft. to 10,215. The floor space ratio is 6.43. The service docks and large loading bays are in the lane. Floor plates above level seven are 5,500 sq. ft. Outdoor common spaces for residents are at level four. The project has staggered balconies in a distinctive pattern, and there are different architectural approaches to the inner and out faces of the towers.

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

1. How well does the proposed design respond to policy and guidelines for the area, including:
 - a. The tower and podium scale recommended in the West End Community Plan
 - b. External design regulation in the C-5A zoning
2. Looking at each of the four edges of the podium, can the Panel comment on the quality of the urban design interface along the:
 - a. Lane
 - b. Adjacent site
 - c. Cardero
 - d. Davie
3. How well is the built form sculpted to maximize views from nearby residences?

4. Does the detailing of the building reflect the architectural character of surrounding buildings?
 5. Does the Panel have any advice on the approach to sustainable design?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the zoning is prescriptive with the West End Plan. The design is an anomaly because it is an anchor food store in the neighbourhood. The design constraints have to do with the intentions of the West End Plan tower size and placement, relationship to streetscapes and podiums, and the desires and requirements of a large food store that require very different things. The entire site is purpose built.

The design exercise is twofold: one that Safeway retains its identity as Safeway, and the other is the rhythm of the streetscape of the façade is broken down with the design intent of the guidelines of the West End Plan zoning. The intention was a holistic identity for the block but also a design broken into smaller elements while penetrated by towers that pierce through the podium.

The towers are broken up into three elements of street wall located further back than the 7 to 12 ft., or up to 25 at entrances, required for setback. The rhythm of streetscape is broken up into sections of residential and retail uses at grade. There is a 15 ft. drop on the Davie street side so the Safeway entrance at the east and liquor store on the west are at grade, and second level Safeway is at ground level on its east side entrance only. The tower floor plates are 5,500 square ft. in accordance with the West End Plan, and they are designed so that there are no direct views into other suites in adjacent buildings. The podium is 25 ft. to 40 ft. in height with a mezzanine for Safeway, and reads as three storeys, but is actually within code at two-storeys as the mezzanine is not counted as a storey. There are elements on both sides referencing the nautical nature of the site.

The food store is transparent and translucent, so that the entrances are very open and there are solids and voids. The front is completely transparent. There are LED lights built in to create a finer grain retail experience. The intent is for a modern reinterpretation for the scale of the streetscape to satisfy guidelines and zoning, as well as provide a holistic experience that includes the liquor store and gardens. The other big feature is 33% of the units are family housing.

One of the advantages of Safeway on the 2nd floor is the opening up the sliding doors so there is the ability to open and connect to the outside. If Safeway was at grade, it would not be opened and connected to the outside. There are terraces and a family play area and rec centre in the middle to fill in extra density, and the area is terraced. The 7.0 FSR has not been entirely used. There is the aim to not affect views on towers, and the podium to be within zoning. The West End identity has been noted with balconies that are more modern, and nautical in style and related to the ocean. Balcony design and location has been driven by the suites, with outdoor living space and it is unique because a lot of the West End does not have very big balconies. The units can be smaller with outdoor spaces.

There is a loading bay in the lane due to truck traffic. There is planting and glass along the back that frames the loading bay, and a dog park above connects to terraces. There is an effort to make the lane a green experience. Terraces go down into the lane. Safeway is a major grocery store in the West End, so the signage has been moved down for a more intimate scale, behind the entrance in line with the geometry and shape, rather than up high and bold.

Landscape elements include urban agriculture on the roof. The streetscape pedestrian experience has stone cladding, featured lighting, featured boulders, and mass planting. An Asian inspired entry feature plays off the forms of the building. There is a water feature and screening. There are planters that propose vertical landscaping and horizontal greenspace. The bamboo planters are there to draw the eye up. On the 3rd floor the views are framed to capture the English Bay landscape.

There is outdoor seating to blur indoor and outdoor space, with featured plantings, and lounge areas and table tennis. The outdoor patios are terraced with grazed planters proposed, which reference the step façade along Davie Street. There is a proposed outdoor lounge area. In the centre there is a gymnasium out of a central children's outdoor play area with an extension of rubber surfacing and some form of matting. The green space has been terraced outside of the building with the private patios. The urban agriculture space at the top of the towers has planting, plotting harvest tables, storage areas for participants, and some other bench seating to make the most of the views.

Parking access has been lowered because Safeway would not have street access to parking at the site. The entrance on the street is the only access to Safeway. Safeway requires access on the site for cars. There is continual retail down the site. The target is LEED Gold. The major feature is the hot water hydronic system which ties creative energy to Davie Street towards the Bidlow site. It could be link and a meaningful way to have more sustainable heating supply.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The corner canopy of Safeway is too massive relative to the tower entry
 - The expression of the balconies could be differentiated with two different sides
 - The laneway is a canvas of opportunity, and lighting and safety should be considered
 - The panel recommended the entry way of Safeway should have a lit canopy
 - The vehicle entry should be further celebrated to slow cars down for safety
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel agreed the design is very strong. There was strong support for the tower placement and scale of the podium. The detailing is a good evolution of the West End architectural language with a modern beach aesthetic. There is good massing and it preserves views for neighbours because of the sculpting of the building. The upper decks are well done providing generous outdoor space. The regulations for C-5A are well addressed. The panels on Davie break up the scale of the anchor store. There is an attempt to create a unifying idea by balancing opposite ends of the building massing.

The panel supported the scale in the West End plan as expressive and innovative, since the west end needs to continue to densify. The challenge of the changing grade on Davie, and the podium scale is appropriate, and the four edges of the podium are well considered. The Safeway sign should be tucked under the canopy. The curb cut is supported, and it is a relief on a large site. The scale as well as tower and podium are unique due to size of Safeway. The podium, which is a terrace and podium hybrid, was well received by the panel. The site is broken up very well with existing zoning. The outside space on Davie is very well done, but more space is needed to make it a smaller scale on the street, and more articulation of the rhythm to make it more pedestrian friendly. Also, the Safeway canopy some panel members felt was a bit too massive relative to the pedestrian scale and rhythm of the street. One Panel member felt that it is not necessary to have retail continuity and there can be bigger and smaller chunks along Davie Street.

The panel agreed the C-5A zoning issues have been addressed. The extensive frontage is not monotonous. The streetscape animation is good. There is a lot of pedestrian engagement. The sculpting and views are very convincing. The siting of the towers was well received by the panel, but one panel member questioned the regulation of the towers. The panel agreed the towers work well in shape and sightlines. The panels on the street break the site up sufficiently, and the base of the building and Safeway store is well broken up with panels. Detailing of the building is captured with a modern 'beachy' feel. The handrails and the raised cornice are well done. The Safeway bench is inviting. The tower floor plates work for the neighbours views and separation distances. The overall form is dynamic.

The blank space in the lane could be utilized, since the lane is used more like a street. In the lane, the panel recommended adding artistic expression. They also recommended incorporating lighting for safety, for example, the laneway upper wall might be changed for more light to Safeway. There was concern from the panel about the street side lack of continuity with retail shops, some are recessed down from adjacent grade and some are blank as well as the entry to parking interrupts the continuity, so there is a fair chunk of site that does not have retail interest at the ground level. There should be more retail attraction according to a few panel members.

A panel member had concerns about balcony privacy. There is a view over 2-3 balconies, so maybe it could be a stacked group. The balcony is a calm expression on the inside but maybe too busy from the outside. The entrance to the west tower is a bit underwhelming sitting next to the parkade according to one Panel member. The driveway needs a lot of quality design elements and materials, and designed so that drivers are not speeding in and out of the driveway.

The panel felt the sustainability of the development is a bench mark for the West End for future developments. But there is too much glass on both towers. The colouration of the towers is too similar according to one panel member, and suggested the use of other materials to differentiate them in order to reduce energy consumption. Sustainability wise, balconies were encouraged. The Panel mentioned the landscape looks to be lush with considerable variety. Also, there is a strong case for social sustainability in the project according to one panel member.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the Panel regarding details for fine tuning. The balcony privacy issue is addressed with staggered balconies that allow for more natural lighting. Staggered balconies create dialogue and intimacy. There are negatives to loss of privacy, but the intention was a sense of community.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.