

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 11, 2022

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Natalie Telewiak (Chair)
Reza Mousakhani (excused from item 1)
Margot Long
Clinton Cuddington
Amina Yasin (excused from item 2)
Alan Boniface
Peeraj Thakre
Meeta Lele (excused from item 2)

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 2 E Broadway2. 650 W 41st Av (Oakridge DP3)

BUSINESS MEETING Chair, MS. TELEWIAK, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

- Address:** 2 E Broadway
Permit No.: DP-2022-00184
Description: To develop a 12-storey mixed-use building with Retail uses and Office lobby at grade, and General Office above on floors 2 through 12, including 3 levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the rear lane.

Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: First
Architect: Mussen Cattell Mackey Partnership
Delegation: Mark Whitehead
Peter Odegaard MCM Architects
Byron Chard
David Stein

Staff: Hiroko Kobayashi

EVALUATION: E 2nd Broadway – Support with recommendations (7/0)

Planner's Introduction: Hiroko Kobayashi

Development planner, Hiroko Kobayashi, began by noting this is the proposed DP application at 2 East Broadway located in the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood on the southeast corner of East Broadway and Ontario Street. There are a range of buildings and uses that surround the subject site by a mix of retail and at-grade office space. The stretch of Broadway is characterized by low-rise buildings of up to four storeys.

Introduction of the final draft of Broadway plan, this map provides the overall draft concept for Mount Pleasant area.

The subject site is identified as a shoulder area between the main station areas. and right behind of the subject site is considered as residential apartment areas and expecting some high rise buildings.

This development permit generally complies with a CD-1 by-law, FSR 7.5 and the maximum building height is 45.10 m, 12 storey commercial office building with ground-floor retail with 3 levels of underground parking and public bike share is proposed on Ontario St.

This proposal was reviewed at UDP during the RZ application stage, was support with recommendations. Here are some of the recommendations from previous UDP.

- Design development to the corner café space to consider a more positive relationship to Broadway and address accessibility concerns;
- Review any potential conflict with the ramp exiting at the lane and safety to Ontario street bikeway and adjacent public bike share;

Ms. Kobayashi then presented the proposed building expressions and massing articulations and highlighted the design progression from Rezoning to this DP application.

RZ application proposed series of intersecting masses, expressed as stacked cubes at the West, the lower of the two cantilevering over the setback at the corner. The eastern mass is expressed with horizontal banding and defines a six storey street wall.

The current DP application proposed building's massing is broken into three differentiated volumes.

The ground floor retail and main building entry are set back from the above massing to differentiate and provide weather protection. The office massing is set back from the adjacent property, street and lane in response to the existing and future neighbouring building to the south and east.

The site slopes up from Broadway by approx. 4.5m (15'), with the highest point at the laneway to the rear of the site. Underground parking and loading are accessed from the rear lane.

The proposal includes a series of semi-public outdoor amenity spaces, for the use of the office workers: a rooftop patio at the east and south sides of level 7, a large rooftop patio atop level 9, and a proposed intensive green roof at the uppermost roof level.

Proposed materiality is changed to bricks to reflect the buildings more closely to the character of the adjacent heritage neighborhood of Mount Pleasant.

This stretch of Mount Pleasant along 10th and 11th Avenues have been recognized significant older buildings that form a unique cluster of character and heritage homes. Some example buildings are at left.

As per previous UDP recommendations, at grade interface is one of the key public realm conditions.

Previous proposal offers a retail unit at north west corner of this interface, current proposal shares this corner space with the building main entrance and retail café space. Also the accessibility at this northwest corner, some steps are proposed at the time of the rezoning application, and this DP application accessible interface was proposed at the corner of the site, and main entrance was also moved toward this corner, instead, grade difference was taken in account at the separate retail entry.

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

Overall Design Development and Materiality:

- a) Please comment on the overall evolution of the proposed building design, architectural expression, articulation of massing, from rezoning to this development permit;
- b) Please comment on the material palette with regard to its response to the existing context of Mount Pleasant;

Public Realm Conditions:

- a) Please comment on the overall evolution of the main building entry space at northwest corner and public realm interface and relationship to Broadway as identified for improvement by the UDP at the time of rezoning.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant presented on how the site fits with the neighbouring context. The site is 5 and 10 minutes walking radius to future rapid transit and Main St.

Applicant presented the neighbourhood character addressing materiality and detailing in many buildings in Mount Pleasant.

Applicant commented on the massing, site duality, south of the site being more residential and north of site more industrial and how the relationship and scale of building relates and responds to the neighbourhood. The overall approach was to break down the mass into forms that were smaller.

Applicant presented the programming. The primary office above grade, amenity space on roof and second floor, active uses along Broadway, lobby and retail and the bike share on Ontario St as it meets the lane.

Applicant commented on the shadow studies for this site. The northwest corner gets sunshine between 11am to noon and the rest of the day the intersection is in sunshine.

Applicant presented the façade articulation.
Further breaking down the building and expressing verticality language is done by a different language than the previous proposal.
The solid clad elements, relieving that in some areas with more pure curtain wall glazing, producing a more vertical expression, further differentiate that with texture.
Introducing weather protection elements at grade.
Referencing historical architecture awnings.

Applicant presented the streetscape elevations, noting the major element on the corner that is broken down, 2 secondary elements, entrance to the building and public bike share.

On sustainability, applicant noted the project will comply with the green building policy and looking at more passive enclosure principles.

Applicant presented the landscape plan for project:
Will adhere to the Mount Pleasant guidelines.
Community Bikeshare and class b bike parking
Amenity level 7 and 9 are flexible deck spaces that can be programmed by tenant. There are bio retention planters
Roof level amenity spaces for tenant use.
Bird friendly design
Upper green roofs address storm water management

The materials used are primarily brick in reference to heritage buildings in neighbourhood.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. LELE** and seconded by **MS. LONG** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Review the potential to enhance the connection to the greenway and further the greening of the public realm on along Ontario, to reinforce the importance of the Ontario as a major city greenway.
- 2) Enhancement of public realm along the lane including additional trees and greenery within the lane.
- 3) Consider evolution of brick façade detailing to express the mass of the material.

Panel Commentary

Panel in general were pleased with the new evolution and expression from rezoning to DP. It has responded well to the massing and materiality to the context of the site.

A Panelist noted the fundamental massing is breaking down to differentiate the two buildings and commended applicant for finding a clever solution to manage the duality of the context.

Some Panelists noted appreciation for how the alley makes it look like two buildings when it is really one.

A Panelist noted concerns for the level of tension that has been put towards the breakdown of the material and massing and feels the façade can handle greater massing and weight.

A Panelist encouraged further evolution of design, to allow the façade to enhance shading by further depth or other means.

Panel in general were please with the evolution of proportion and expression from previous submission.

A Panelist noted there were positive architectural expressions in the previous submission which could have been expanded upon. Some Panelists noted the current materiality of the design responds well with the scale and materiality of the neighbourhood.

A Panelist recommended further evolution of the solid void. noted the brick being the shading element to envelope, there is a fine line between making solid and void and it is not solid enough. On Broadway and Ontario the planar elements are not very planar and it is difficult to use brick in the air in thin conditions. Panelist encouraged applicant to thicken or alter the elements to reinforce the brick element on the proposed articuration. Panel recommended adding more horizontal elements to enhance the brick materiality.

General support from Panel on the material shift and expression of that material.

General support from Panel on the material palette.

Panel noted there is opportunity to further celebrate the massiveness of the brick material, how it is detailed and enhance the quality of that expression. The expression has improved from rezoning.

A Panelist noted the tone of the material palette relates to the surrounding neighbourhood and the use of brick is commended.

Some Panelists noted the use of brick is very effective in responding to the context, history of the site and surrounding neighbourhood for both residential and industrial. A Panelist noted the high quality material inherently provides texture and variation but for it to work well it needs certain dimensions. Panelist encouraged applicant to think about the amount of brick and vertical elements that need to be there to actually make that brick read well.

A Panelist encouraged applicant to study the brick shading the envelope and the amount of shading it can provide.

A Panelist noted the brick is treated like a concrete and casting element instead of masonry. Panelist suggested it needs more work.

Some Panelists noted concerns with the breakdown of the upper level massing of the building, creating a contextual net that's incredibly successful only to undermine the public realm at the base podium level.

Panel noted the evolution of the entry at the corner is a positive change.

Panel noted opportunity to add more greenery along Ontario to connect and to further activate and animate the lane through design and the addition of trees. Another Panelist also noted more greenery and shading to mitigate the urban heat island and to fit with the idea of the bicycle corridor.

Panelists encouraged more greenery along Broadway. A Panelist noted the evolution of the neighbourhood and densification, there needs to be more landscape and trees to make it more pedestrian friendly.

A Panelist encouraged more rain gardens on Ontario St.

There were mixed comments from Panel on the canopy.

Some Panelists suggested further exploration of canopy to the public realm.

A Panelist noted there is opportunity for canopy on the less busy side of Ontario St that is part of the uncovered lobby. Another Panelist noted concerns with the weight and heaviness of the canopies.

A Panelist noted it is not necessary why the canopies are carrying through the two buildings.

There was general support from Panel for the location and the mews.

A Panelist noted the main lobby has a more clear relationship to the street.

A Panelist suggested programming of level 2 amenity area which would be better situated to activate Ontario St and create more engagement on the ground plane.

A Panelist is encouraged City staff to work with applicant to rejuvenate and activate the alley and save that critical precinct of Ontario as a place where people can reside.

A Panelist commends the applicant for its ability to take a stance on how to rejuvenate and bring alive the alleys and energize so many different edges.

A Panelist was pleased to see the lobby is being shared with retail which leads to activation of the street and pedestrian use.

A Panelist noted the sidewalks feels too narrow.

A Panelist commended the applicant for managing to squeeze in an end of space facility which will help with septic issues.

Some Panelists noted concern this project is laying down precedent for the ongoing evolution of the Broadway Plan meeting Mount Pleasant plan.

A Panelist noted this submission is a good reflection of Mount Pleasant public route plan guidelines and the design guidelines.

Some Panelists noted support of the two building character, reflecting the scale of what is happening in Mount Pleasant.

A Panelist noted appreciation for the evolution of the bike share station on the south west corner in order to mitigate the blank wall. A Panelist suggested signage to indicate location of public bike share.

A Panelist noted slight concern with gaps in between for weather protection.

A Panelist did not share applicant's opinion that arcades don't work in Vancouver.

A Panelist noted Mount Pleasant spent years on design guidelines and public realm plans and input from the community was strong. Due to engineering requirements a lot of things get taken out of the quality and improvement of the public realm. It is disconcerting as it goes through the process and coming up with the design guidelines and in the end it gets watered down. The guidelines are there to reinforce what the public wants to keep and value. Many things were noted in the public realm plan and it is unfortunate when the departments get crossed over, reinforcing the livability gets taken away.

2. Address:	650 W 41st Av (Oakridge DP3)
Permit No.:	DP-2022-00220
Description:	A new 11-storey office building (located at NE corner of the site) including a new mall entry corridor with retail uses, a transit plaza, and a below grade connection to the station/ retail concourse all in CD-1 zoning.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects Ltd
Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez Chris Philips Rui Nunes Kevin Welsh
Staff:	Carl Stanford

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (6/0)**Planner's Introduction:** Carl Stanford

Development planner, Carl Stanford began their presentation by noting the application proposes a 2-storey retail Mall Entry, an 11-storey Office Building including one level of retail below-grade and two levels of retail above-grade at the base. The Transit Plaza and canopy are also a part of the scope however, the transit connection down to the TransLink station is excluded pending review and approval by TransLink. It is shown here for intent and context. There is an existing medical dental building within the scope of the permit. Renovations to the Medical Dental Building are limited to the west and north-facing building envelope and access to the existing office and retail at grade. The upper three levels of the building are a separate residential air parcel referred to as The Terraces which is not a part of this development permit application.

The format of this presentation is divided into two parts. The first part provides a site-wide context for the redevelopment. The second part is specific to the Development Permit 3 (DP-3) and the Transit Plaza, Main Mall Entry and new Northeast Office as stated. This DP is a portion of a larger site wide development. This DP is the third of nine (or more) development permits for phase one of a multi phase, multi-building large development at the Oakridge Mall site at 650 West 41st Avenue.

The site is located at the crossing of West 41st Avenue / Cambie Street and is situated in the Oakridge neighbourhood. The surrounding neighbourhood zoning has been updated in the Cambie Corridor Plan, which increases the density at this major transit node. A number of strata multi-residential units are located on both the west and south perimeters. It is 11.4 ha (28.3 acres) in area and currently has approximately 57,500 m² (619,000 ft²) of retail, service, and office use. The existing structure is surrounded by uncovered parking. The main entrance to Oakridge Centre shares the northeast corner with the Canada Line Station which connects the downtown core to the airport. It is flanked by two towers that accommodate office and residential units. There is an approximately 15 to 18 storeys development projected for future built context surrounding the Oakridge site. The Oakridge project seeks to re-establishes links to the surrounding areas and establish

programming comprising mixed use, with affordable / rental housing, and office space. There is a planned reinvigoration of the transit plaza to announce the main entrance and lead to the park. A new proposed 24 hour high street is intended to be a re-birth of the open air mall of the 1960s with retail along its edges. The park is intended to be a raised draped park linking to below. The scope of the DP is to be considered in the context of DP-1, DP-2, DP-4, DP-5 and DP-6, which comprise the first phase of construction for the Oakridge development. Parking, loading and bike storage are provided in the scope of DP-1 and DP-5.

The project went through the rezoning process in 2014, and after further design development, changes to the overall form of development was reviewed by the panel, and approved by the DPB through PDP (Pre-DP) process. In 2020, a new rezoning application was made in response to a changing context. This current design represents a natural evolution of the design approved resulting in stronger urban connections and more vibrant active public spaces. Governing policy for the site includes the CD-1 (1) By-law (Oakridge), Oakridge Design Guidelines, Conditions of the Preliminary Development Permit, Cambie Corridor Plan (2011), and Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Public Realm Plan. The project is broadly in lines with the requirements of all the above with no major issues related to height, density or guideline variance subject of course to a more detailed review during the development permit process. Oakridge is designated as a Municipal Town Centre in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy and the Cambie Corridor Plan. It is the only one located within Vancouver outside of downtown core. Municipal Town Centres are intended to be among the region's primary focal points in terms of concentration of residential density, job space, civic/cultural facilities, and transit service. The Governing policy for the site includes the CD-1 (1) By-law (Oakridge), Oakridge Design Guidelines, Conditions of the Preliminary Development Permit, Cambie Corridor Plan (2011), and Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Public Realm Plan. The City of Vancouver has also prepared Oakridge Design Guidelines for the streetscape treatments of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street (& Choy Yuan Crescent). These guidelines include the delineation of pedestrian /bicycle circulation, paving materials treatments, the location of street trees and general guidance on public realm. Oakridge features a nine-acre city park that is primarily located above the mall. This multilevel public park blankets the site, covering the roof of the mall and spilling down to grade surrounding the site. The park will provide spaces for sport, play, performance, and urban agriculture and will be activated by the surrounding civic, retail, office, food, and residential uses surrounding it. The park will connect to the rest of the site with a pedestrian pathway network and feature the characteristics of Pacific Northwest landscape.

Coming back to the application, and to explain the sequencing there was a previous application on the scope included in this DP in 2019 which has subsequently been canceled and a new one submitted this year taking into account the rezoning changes. This proposal marks the primary entry into the project from the Transit Plaza at the corner of Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue. The DP consists of 5 main program components; The transit Plaza, the Northeast Office, the Main Mall Entry, the Medical Dental Building offices / retail refurbishments, and the Park Connection. The Transit Plaza and Main Mall Entry connect visitors to multiple levels of the project including the Canada Line. They also provide legible access to the various parts of the site and to multiple modes of transportation. The park connector is accessed off west 41st avenue with a grand staircase. Elevator are provided at the mall entrance. The Office building projection over the park walkway stair provides weather protection and marks the path up to the park on the building facade. The path is on

the east facade of the building and sunlight is able to penetrate to light the majority of the walkway at both the equinoxes and summer solstice due to the low angle of the morning sun.

The existing seven stories Northeast Office building will be replaced with a new 12 storey building with additional floor area. It will consist of three levels of retail including storefronts on the Transit Concourse level and 7 levels of Office use above. A shared amenity meeting room is located on the roof for tenants. The Northeast Office building continues the glazed 'skin' of the adjacent Building 4 podium, wrapping the building above. The architecture incorporates a capless, curtain-wall skin that wraps around the two primary façade. The skin projects out over the sidewalk and provides weather protection for the retail storefronts, and the staircase leading up to the park. At the rooftop parapet, the glazing extends past the building edges to form a guardrail for the rooftop deck. The Northeast Office Tower footprint is constrained by the proximity to the residential units in Building 4. Building 4 is composed of two retail levels at grade, 4 office levels over this, and residential above. The top three floors of the Northeast Office building face projects up opposite the residential levels and has been set back in order to maintain the Horizontal Angle of Daylight for rooms within the units. The review at this stage will include the design development (of the buildings approved height, density and massing established at rezoning stage) on the neighborliness/ detailing of the building as it relates to resolving adverse micro climatic conditions (whether acoustic or wind or other) generated with the adjoining buildings as well as privacy and daylight.

Renovations to the Terraces Building are limited to the west and north-facing building envelope and access to the existing office and retail. The two office levels of the Medical Dental Building will remain in operation while their access points are reconfigured. The Medical Dental Building will require renovation in the areas where the building's existing atrium has been removed. The façade facing the Main Mall Entry will be clad in a capless glass skin that is similar to the Northeast Office skin. The Medical Dental Building is also proposed to have a digital screen facing the plaza for events and advertising. The architectural language of recessed structural glass storefronts continues throughout DP-3, wrapping along both edges of the Main Mall Entry passage and into the entry itself. The Transit Plaza acts as the gateway to the project as well as being a major public space as designated in the Cambie Corridor Public Realm plan. It is at the intersection of multiple modes of transit including, the Canada Line, bus lines, and bicycle routes. The project team is currently in discussion with TransLink regarding the Transit Station and head house design proposal. The proposed design and integration with the rest of the project is subject to TransLink approval. The Cambie Corridor Plan identifies this corner as a major future plaza. The plan's principles for plaza use and design are flexible open space for community events, informal enjoyment and large public gatherings. The plaza is to have visual and physical openness to Cambie Street, the ability to accommodate a performance stage, minimized shadow from adjacent buildings, informal seating arrangements, trees and plants, public art and integrated bicycle access. The Transit Canopy is conceived as a continuous ribbon that covers and connects the Transit Station, bus stop, Mall Entry storefronts and the Northeast Office building. The perimeter edges of the ribbon are extended with glass canopies that provide cover and natural light below. The canopy extends out towards the West 41st Avenue bus stop and also extends to mark the Northeast office building entry.

The UDP for the previous 2019 permit (now cancelled) included 3 recommendations. These were 'Design development to the park connector, the interface with the adjoining building and connective point to the park', 'Design development to the at-grade interface and landscape treatment at the edge of the park connector', and 'Design development to improve rain

protection cover with particular regard to the mall entrance and refinement to the Northeast Office projection over the park connector’.

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

Please comment on the success of the public realm with consideration for:

- a) Does the proposed phased feature canopy demonstrate an effective, welcoming, light filled public space, and does it make sufficient allowance for effective integration and interaction with the public spaces?
- b) Does the proposal achieve a satisfactory transition of spaces to the mall entry particularly at changes of grade with sufficient provision for the less abled, ambulant disabled and older demographics ease of use?

Please comment on the architectural expression, and material treatment of the proposal with particular consideration for:

- a) Does the new office building demonstrate sufficient articulation, and neighborliness, as exhibited through a considered use of scale, massing, materiality and design of elements?
- b) Does the proposal adequately demonstrate a strong cohesive design concept with high quality aesthetics, materiality, and functionality appropriate to its location?

The Panel is requested to provide its comments on this new development, particularly for commentary on the public realm spaces, the success of the architectural expression and the interface between the building and its adjacencies.

Applicant’s Introductory Comments:

Applicant presented briefly about the evolution of the existing two buildings left over from the 1980s.

Applicant noted working with translink to integrate the transit station with the larger sculptural canopy.

Applicant discussed the multifunctional nature of the plaza and the programming.

Applicant noted the perimeter edged was defined by the canopy. The canopy also provided enclosure to the space,

Applicant noted the sidewalk along W 41st Ave slopes up, the grades rises whereas at the corner of the transit station it’s flush with the plaza.

Widen the pathway up to the park significantly from what it was before.

Applicant presented the benefits of the social amenity space and garden for tenants of the office.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. CUDDINGTON** and seconded by **MR. BONIFACE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Further exploration of the landscape continuity to the park from the corner of W 41st & Cambie with enhanced landscape at grade and/or enhanced direct visibility to the park.

Panel Commentary

The Panel has requested the project come back to UDP if there are design changes which significantly impact or alter the design of the feature canopy and Transit plaza as a response to the ongoing discussion with Translink related to the currently excluded Transit Station component of the scope.

General support from panel for the public realm being an effective, positive, inviting and welcoming space, supporting the variety of programs that is proposed for the plaza.

A Panelist noted it was a well-presented and complex project but perhaps in not reusing elements of the old office building there was a missed opportunity for sustainable reuse.

Some Panelists noted concern over the extent of continuous glass in the office building and that it would require bird safety mitigation strategies. The continuous glazing may also result in overheating and applicant should consider this from a sustainability point of view in the amount of cooling required.

A Panelist noted concerns with the double height retail maintaining the animation of a two storey glass wall. Panelist encouraged further design consideration of detail.

A Panelist noted concern on accessibility from 41st Avenue. A ramp down from that direction would make sense for people with strollers or the mobility challenged. Panelist suggested having a ramp so people with strollers coming off 41st Ave could come down on the ramp and then onto the canopy.

A Panelist noted concerns with accessibility of the stairs behind the amphitheater.

A Panelist noted concern with the double height retail with double storey glass wall with a canopy very high up that does not offer a lot of low level rain protection and there is no indentation at the door.

Some Panelists noted the bold connection of the feature canopy on the corner of the site as a gatehead. A Panelist noted it provides generous rain protection right to the front door, potentially right from the transit station and addresses the corner in a strong way. It's kind of playful and yet bold corner treatment which will work extremely well. Another Panelist noted the success of the canopy really marks that corner and framing of the edges of the plaza

defines that as a public space. Also, the transition from exterior to interior retail is well resolved. Another Panelist noted it is an opportunity to think of the rooftop of the building as a way to re-introduce some of those early sculptural moves that allow the lines that connect the forms and begin to bring this together as a larger sculptural massing proposition.

A Panelist noted concern over the function of the feature canopy. It is a cover for circulation but the desire lines bisect straight through potential amphitheater/ stage programming. They further noted that an expansion of the canopy over the stage should be considered or a redesign of the stage to mitigate the issue.

A Panelist noted concern that the plaza will be a contested space with potential conflicts of management of the space. It has the feel of the under storey of an elevated rail system with issues we are trying to solve elsewhere. They stressed a need to prevent the underbelly from becoming orphaned hostile space.

Some Panelists noted the importance of the detailing in the feature canopy particularly on the circular light well at the corner. The dripping and control of rainwater run off needs to be addressed as well as enhancing the integration and design of foliage around the circular hole.

A Panelist encouraged applicant to think about ways in which the underbelly of that canopy might become the scaffolding for a more significant planting strategy that could utilize the extensive planting opportunities of the rooftop looking down.

Some Panelists noted the canopy sloping down at the base of the transit station head house isn't working and could present life safety issues with awkward design solutions such as Plexiglas barricades to prevent kids climbing up. They noted the detailing really needs further study as it evolves with translink and the way it comes out from the ground.

A Panelist noted that the canopy must maintain lightness as typically elements become heavier and thicker as detail design progresses beyond the DP stage.

Some Panelists noted the high canopy along the office building does not offer sufficient rain protection or indentation at the entrance doors.

The Panelists had mixed views over the secondary or muted nature of the entrance to the park via the park connector. one Panelist noted the hierarchy of connections to the park and the main park entry at the community centre is the right location for the primary entrance.

Some Panelists encouraged further landscaping and enhanced greenery to symbolize and create an indirect connection to the park.

Most Panelists noted that not being able to have a visual connection to the park from the street edge is a deficit. The proposal could have pulled the office building back to see the park as the view is currently obstructed with a lot of built elements.

Panelists noted major improvements with the park pathway from the previous application. A Panelist noted it feels like a transition to a private space. There is a concierge stand at the top of the stairs, the average passerby would have to pass by that in order to go by the retail and the find the park. The concierge stand feels defensive to the public. It might not be

obvious to the average person that there is a park up there. Panelist suggested bringing the landscape down.

There was general support from panel that the materiality is an appropriate response on the articulation, reflective of the context, considering the site's history, materiality is cohesive and in line with the site.

Most Panel member agreed that in spite of concerns that would be recorded in the minutes for the applicants consideration that the overall intent of the proposal was of strong and cohesive design quality.