

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 25, 2022

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Webex

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Brian Wakelin (Chair)  
Adrien Rahbar (excused from item 1)  
Margot Long (excused from item 1)  
Alyssa Koehn  
Brittany Coughlin  
Jennifer Stamp (excused from item 2)  
Jesse Gregson  
Kelly Lee (excused from item 1)  
Scott Romses  
Peeraj Thakre

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** M.Sem

---

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING   |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 427-449 W 39th Ave</li><li>2. 123 E 6th Ave</li></ol> |

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

1. **Address:** 427-449 W 39th Ave  
**Permit No.:** RZ-2022-00017  
**Description:** To develop an 18-storey residential building, with 176 secured market rental units (including 34 below market rental units); all over two levels of underground parking, including 69 vehicle parking spaces and 337 bicycle parking spaces. The floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.1, the floor area is 10,655 sq. m (114,685 sq. ft.), and the building height is 60.7 m (199 ft.). This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.  
  
**Zoning:** RS-1 to CD-1  
**Application Status:** Rezoning Application  
**Review:** First  
**Architect:** Mussen Cattell Mackey Partnership  
**Delegation:** Rene Solivar, MCM  
 Jeffrey Staates  
 Adrien Rahbar  
  
**Staff:** Robert White and Ryan Dinh

**EVALUATION: 427-449 W 39th Ave – Support with recommendations (6/1)**

Rezoning Planner, Robert White, began by noting this site is located in Oakridge on the north side of West 39th Avenue between Cambie and Alberta Streets. It's in close proximity to the Oakridge-41st Canada Line Station and the R4 Rapid Bus route along 41st Avenue, as well as the Midtown/Ridgeway Greenway along 37th Avenue and the Ontario Street Greenway. Queen Elizabeth Park is located a couple blocks to the north and Oakridge Park is under construction nearby on the southwest corner of Cambie Street and 41st Avenue. The three-parcel site is currently zoned RS-1 and is developed with three single detached houses built in the 1940s. Properties along Cambie Street to the west are generally zoned RT-2, C-1 and C-2, with CD-1 zones further north, and a number of properties south along 41st Avenue are zoned CD-1 for 6-storey forms and higher. Presently, the area is predominantly single detached dwellings with taller forms along Cambie Street and along 41st Avenue.

**Cambie Corridor Plan**

Consideration of this rezoning application is enabled by the Cambie Corridor Plan which envisions this Oakridge Municipal Town Centre neighbourhood becoming a vibrant and dense walkable hub with housing off the arterials, and a highly walkable neighbourhood with a diversity of built form. At this location, the Plan allows consideration of rezoning applications for buildings up to 18 storeys on sites with a minimum 45.7 m or 150 ft. frontage, in a tower in open space form, when proposing 100% rental with 20% below market rental units, or proposing 30% social housing. Surrounding this block to the north, east and west, the Plan anticipates building forms up to 6 storeys, and to the south, buildings up to 18 storeys. To increase permeability of the neighbourhood, the Plan seeks active pedestrian links connecting streets to lanes throughout the area.

**Proposal**

This application proposes to rezone 427-449 West 39th Avenue for an 18-storey rental residential building, and includes 176 rental units including 20% of units at below-market rates, a height of 53.3 m or 175 ft. to the top of the roof, and a density of 6.1 FSR.

## Form of Development

Development Planner Ryan Dinh presented the recommended built form guidelines and noted that the Cambie Plan offers two high-rise typologies, which are 15-st tower on a 4-st podium and 18-st tower in open space, to provide form diversity. Towers in open space should provide substantial usable shared space for residents, while creating an active street edge and provides visual amenity for the street. For site frontage greater than 150ft, a secondary active link will be required at one of the inside property lines. Other requirements include maximum building width, public realm improvement, yard setbacks, and tower floor plate. It is noted that a 15% increase in floor plate size may be considered for the first 4 storeys of the tower to accommodate services, loading, parking access, and at-grade amenities and to create a consistent relationship to adjacent podium forms. Upper levels of a tower should provide a visual terminus from street level and when viewing the tower from a distance. The proposed development stays within the required setbacks and provides half of the active link as required, with 3 ground oriented units facing West 39<sup>th</sup> Ave. Indoor and outdoor amenity are provided on the ground floor, noting that additional outdoor space is also provided on the roof top.

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

1. Does the Panel support the form and massing of the building, in relation to the Cambie Corridor Plan?
2. Comment on the quality of public realm, pedestrian amenity including the active link, the open space and the relationship to the street.
3. Additional advice that could further inform the design through the Development Permit process.

### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The objectives for the policy was to make family units hitting all of the target and complied with policy

The focus was primarily on the social aspect, ground planes in terms of amenities and the transition from neighboring area.

Presented the amenities of the project.

Presented the streetscape and the 3 three series of panoramas.

Massing studies:

The next series is about applying the policy of the Cambie Corridor tower in open space,

The next series applied is the tower positioning,

The next series is talking about "use".

Noted the creation of new setbacks

This building represented the notion of healing and wellness. Ideas of landscape, indoor planting and west coast elements.

In terms of sustainability, will be taking the low emission path.

In terms of rendering, the study between the south and east western elevation and trying to make them differentiated with the simple form.

The entry canopy will be a sitting area, opportunity to transition from the street.

There will be a series of outdoor rooms that extend the amenity spaces out to active the lane.

Presented the landscape. There will be some dense green edges which is a good contextual fit with the neighbourhood. The urban tree canopy consideration to accommodate larger soil volumes to create additional layers of trees.

**Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**

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

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. KOEHN** and seconded by **MR. ROMSES** 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) Design development of the interior to exterior relationship of lobby, gym, and rooftop amenity areas.
- 2) Design development of exterior materiality including balconies, soffits, guards and cladding.

**Panel Commentary**

Panel in general supports the massing and form.

Panel in general supports the way the building aligns with the objectives of the Cambie Corridor Plan and its close coordination with the massing.

Panel in general supports how well the public realm has been handled. They are happy with the way it lands on the site and the treatment of the landscape.

Panel in general encouraged the functionality of amenity spaces at the roof level and activating amenity space at the ground plane, to benefit more people.

A Panelist noted the mid-block crossing and the placement of amenity spaces is strong given what is known about the future neighbourhood character.

Some Panelists noted there is great human scale at the podium; appreciate the use of colour on the first floor and the materiality and how it differentiates from the rest of the building.

A Panelist noted the amenity spaces are well placed on the mid-block crossing and how they are well differentiated between public and private spaces.

A Panelist noted the active link is serving its purpose, there is good balance of public versus private outdoor spaces on the site.

A Panelist noted appreciation for how the townhouses are not fully separated but feel integrated into the frontage so it gives it a real identifiable character.

A Panelist noted the amenity space functionality could be strengthened as there is not a lot of indoor amenity space. Panelist suggested further study of outdoor amenity spaces that could be usable in the rain i.e. more overhang and built-in coverage

A Panelist noted the balcony screens feels enclosed and suggest more perforation could be achieved without it feeling too enclosed on the small decks.

A Panelist noted the simple geometry is good for energy performance and cost efficiency.

A Panelist noted it is great to see cooling throughout the building.

A Panelist noted appreciation for the low greenhouse gas emissions with an electric building.

A Panelist noted thermally broken is good from a coverage standpoint especially with some of the units that are thinner and smaller.

A Panelist recommended adding exterior shadings for the windows that do not have the balcony overhangs to further improve comfort as well as resilience.

A Panelist noted the massing is oversimplified, with lot of reliance on window and balcony placements.

A Panelist noted there are issues with the form, width, size and scale of the podium. The long linear balconies on the south side of the podium is also contributing to the mass.

Some Panelists suggested getting more use of the tower roof such as having trellises on the rooftop for heating and shading, planters and vines.

Encourage exploration and maximization of the roof plane as a social space as an urban agricultural space. It's is also a way to reinforce the health and wellness if there is urban agriculture to enable residents to connect to nature and all is benefits.

Panel encourage exploration and maximization of the roof plane as a social and urban agriculture space to further reinforce the health and wellness, to enable residents to connect to nature and all its benefit.

A Panelist suggested looking into a social sustainability strategy and suggested strengthening the lobby area by enlarging the canopies and having more seating in the sitting area outside the lobby.

A Panelist suggested consideration for CLT. Panelist noted the benefits from the health and wellness of the warmth of the wood and expressing that in parts of the interior which will solve some energy challenges in working with a concrete building.

Some Panelists encouraged design development to explore alternative materials or more inviting colours, in particular the soffits at the balcony, the balusters and development of the balcony railings. Also, opaque panels create a playful pattern, adding a bit of looseness to which the project needs. Panelists noted current materiality and colours are bit subdued, understated, flatness, and lack of luminosity.

A Panelist suggested further enhancing parking and loading entries with multiple functions.

Some Panelists suggest having more amenity shared spaces for gathering.

A Panelist suggested providing washroom and gardening sink at roof level amenities space.

A Panelist suggest further exploring multiple programming at the lane (what other activities can it do when it is not in use?)

A Panelist noted townhouses adjacent to the vehicle entry and dog run are challenging, there are some bedrooms that are overlooking the vehicle access and in close proximity to a dog run, this will cause livability issues for residents of the units.

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>2. Address:</b>         | <b>123 E 6th Ave</b>   |
| <b>Permit No.:</b>         | <b>DP-2021-00983</b>   |
| <b>Description:</b>        | <b>To develop a 12-storey, mixed-use building with Wholesale and Office uses; all over three levels of underground parking, having vehicular access from the lane. The total FSR is 6.6, the total floor area is 196,369 sq.ft. (18,243 m<sup>2</sup>), and the height is 150 ft. (45.75 m).</b> |
| <b>Zoning:</b>             | <b>I-1B</b>  |
| <b>Application Status:</b> | <b>Complete Development Application</b>  |
| <b>Review:</b>             | <b>First</b>   |
| <b>Architect:</b>          | <b>DLR Group Architecture Inc.</b>   |
| <b>Delegation:</b>         | <b>Steve Cavanaugh<br/>Hugh Cochlin<br/>Charlie McDanile<br/>Dylan Chernoff<br/>Spencer Purdy<br/>Ershad Chagani<br/>Brent Sawchyn</b>   |
| <b>Staff:</b>              | <b>Carl Stanford</b>   |

#### **EVALUATION: 123 E 6th Ave – Support with recommendations (8/1)**

##### **Planner's Introduction:**

Development Planner, Carl Stanford began by noting that the development permit seeks to develop the site under existing I-1B zoning with a proposed new 12 storey office & industrial building located at 123 East 6th Avenue with an existing heritage building on site all over four levels of underground parking, having vehicular access from the lane. The project also consists of the relocation, designation and conservation of an existing two-storey (10,632 sf) heritage building onsite (SFU Annex built in 1929) for the purpose of delivering to the City to operate as an arts centre. It will include the change of use of the existing two-storey Heritage building from School to Artist Studio Class A & B. The proposal is located in the Mount Pleasant Industrial Area between Main Street and Quebec. The Mount Pleasant Industrial Area is a centrally located dynamic area. It was initially developed as a single-family neighborhood in the 1890s and then transformed slowly to industrial use beginning in the 1940s. It is centrally-located, close to transit, has a mix of land uses, and is close to housing and amenities like cafes, parks, and shops. These factors are attracting an increasing number of digital and creative businesses, making Mount Pleasant a major cluster within Vancouver's growing innovation economy.

The site measuring 74m (244') by 37m (122') is located in I-1B zoning on a rectangular site at the Southwest corner of Quebec Street and Sixth Avenue with a rear lane to its northern edge and a side lane to its eastern. It has an approximate site area of 2,764m<sup>2</sup> /29,753 ft<sup>2</sup>. It is comprised of one legal parcel and is essentially rectangular in shape. The Frontages are approximately 37.06 meters (122 feet) on Quebec Street along the western edge of the site and approximately 74.31 meters (244 feet) on E. 6th Avenue along the southern edge. The site measures approximately 71.36 meters (234 feet) along its northern edge and 34.11 meters (112 feet) along its eastern edge. The Property slopes moderately rising from east to west. The built context of the area is changing from low rise light industrial to midrise and higher density development that is mainly commercial in character. To the south east of the proposal is an 8 storey multiple dwelling building and to the east of the lane on an I-C2 zoned site is a two storey motel functioning as an artists lodge known as the '*City Centre Motor Lodge*'. This site has no private rezoning policy and has an absolute height maximum of 38m/125ft., for IC-2 with a setback at grade of ~ 3.1m/ 10ft required off the lane. To the south are 2 and 3 storey residential/ light industrial structure while directly to the north is a surface car park.

The site is presently occupied by the Simon Fraser Elementary School Annex classification group B heritage building. The heritage building is a two-storey Arts and Crafts style schoolhouse located along East 6th Avenue and constructed in 1929. It is characterized by its prominent roofline with paired gabled wall dormers and central entryway set significantly above grade. It was designed by the Vancouver School Board architect Harry Walter Postle. The Annex is to be converted to Artist Studio use with the studios generally aligning with the original classroom and restored in its new location. The conservation strategy includes maintaining the institutional form, scale and massing of the two-storey structure as well as restoring the exterior Arts and Crafts style design features. The application proposes to relocate the building to the east end of the site. In order to accommodate the new building the Annex is to be rotated 90 degrees and located on new foundations, with the main entrance facing the lane as opposed to its current frontage facing East 6th Avenue. The Vancouver Heritage Commission reviewed this project on May 09<sup>th</sup> 2022. It supported the Simon Fraser Elementary buildings addition to the Vancouver Heritage Register as a category 'B' heritage building and the 90 degree rotation of the Annex building with relocation to the east side of the site. The Commission FURTHER recommended design development

The principle governing policy for the site includes:

- *The I-1B District Schedule;*
- *The Mount Pleasant Community Plan; and,*
- *The View Protection Guidelines (2011).*
  - *View cones 3*

The I-1B designation allows an outright density of 3.0 FSR but allows for higher densities under an amenity share cost schedule, as per Schedule F of the Zoning and Development By-law, potentially allowing for a total FSR of 6.0 (1.0 FSR for industrial uses; 2.0 FSR for general office uses; and, 3.0 FSR for digital entertainment and information technology uses). The I-1B designation also allows for the consideration of additional density, beyond this up to a maximum of 10%. The total floor area proposed here in this application is 18,236m<sup>2</sup>/196,292 sq.ft or 6.6FSR the absolute maximum density allowed. I-1B is a relatively new zoning. In 2016 Council approved policies to support and grow the economy in light of the importance of the innovation economy, and particularly the digital and technology sector. The primary intent of the I-1B District Schedule created in 2017 is to permit light industrial uses, including complementary commercial uses, such as office and retail, with a particular focus on digital entertainment and information communication technology use. This replaced the I-1 Zoning with I-1A (33.5m/110ft.) and I-1B, and the rezoning of four blocks east of Quebec Street to these new industrial zones to allow larger and taller buildings in order to retain, support and grow the innovation economy.

Under the zoning the setback of a building at grade must be 1.50m/ 4.9ft from Quebec and 0.65m/ 2.1ft from 6<sup>th</sup>. Above 18.3m of height it requires from Quebec 6.10m/20 ft. and 4.50m/14.8 ft from 6<sup>th</sup> avenue respectively. The proposal states that it meets these requirements which will be subject to verification via a technical review. The I-1B zoning allows for the consideration of additional height above the 38m/125ft. limit up to approximately 48m/160ft or the underside of the view cone whichever is lesser. This is subject to the designation of the Simon Fraser Annex Heritage-B building, and the proposals overall urban design performance. The proposal includes a Section 10.21A mass timber by law variance. This additional 5.77m allows an increased maximum of 39.98m from (the 38m zoning limit) due to the buildings use of mass timber in its construction. The proposed Site is under View cone 3. The sites maximum height is not impacted by the view cone which has an absolute maximum height limit of 73.2m/240ft geodetic height at its lowest point. The building proposes a height of 45.75m/150ft. (geodetic height 69.47m/228ft.) as its uppermost limit which is approximately 3.6m/12ft. under the view cone. This height will be subject to a technical review for verification purposes.

The Mount Pleasant Community Plan was adopted by Council in 2010 and sets land use policy for this area. The geographic scope of the Community Plan includes a strip of the Mount Pleasant Industrial Area from the lane west of Main Street to Quebec Street. Two of the eleven principles of the plan are

pertinent to this proposal. Section 3.6 of the plan requires development to *'Encourage laneways in suitable locations as a prized feature of Mount Pleasant, activating commercial lanes to make them places to walk, live, and work, while still serving commercial loading/unloading and waste management routes.'* It further suggests *'animating lanes by encouraging commercial activity on the lane – e.g., presentation/ studio space for artists, and by creating small courtyard/ mini-plazas'*, and to provide a *'second face' of Mount Pleasant with expanded opportunities to position architecturally innovative new development along these routes, strengthening the vitality of Mount Pleasant as a business district by promoting dual-entrance options, laneway-facing studios or other small businesses, temporary art installations, and other "back route" enhancements'*. Section 3.8 requires development to *'Recognize and preserve all heritage buildings'*. The proposals designation and restoration of the heritage building address this item.

Level one of the proposed commercial building includes (wholesale) industrial use with a corner entry off Quebec and sixth. The parkade entry and loading access is off the rear north lane. A central vertical circulation core connects all floor. The main building entry is located adjacent to the corner of East 6<sup>th</sup> avenue and the east lane at Level 2 due to a change in grade. A small vestibule adjacent to the heritage building provides access to the office building via its vertical circulation core. The artist studios are accessed off the east lane. A mix of wholesale and digital information use is provided to the west. Additional studios are provided at the upper floor of the heritage building. On Level 3 of the main building there is a fitness studio and social workplace with digital information use on the western side. Office use predominates from the next floor up with small terraces and setbacks providing relief to the homogenous facade. The floor layout is typological of most office buildings with a central core and surrounding circumference office space and the success of the architectural expression rests on the execution of high quality detailing and sympathetic contextual transition. The building form is articulated incrementally and provides a sense of neighborhood scale through a series of step-backs and set-backs required by the I-1B District Schedule. A series of active outdoor terraces are created, and entry points punctuated at the base. At level 06 we see one of the roof terraces created at a corner cut to provide relief from the volume of massing provided. Terraces and corner cut outs occur at level 06 at the NW corner, level 07 at the SW corner, level 08 along the southern edge and finally at level 11 along the south western corner. Office space with a small terrace occupy the penultimate floor surrounded by the glazed perimeter. Mechanical space and a small terrace occupy the roof with an office mezzanine floor facing south. The mechanical plant is pushed northwards and is flush with the offices below. Finally on shadows. Looking at the east west section we see how the heritage building sits tight up against the eastern edge of the new building with an abrupt shift in scale down to the lane. The existing stair case has been removed from the heritage building for access and grade reasons. Just coming back to the public realm the primary area of façade activation is at the junction of the heritage building and the new commercial building at the plaza and lane junction but the applicant has provided a corner entry point for ground level use at the junction of Quebec and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave which provides some activity. Shadows studies were conducted on the Equinox and solstices and demonstrate minimal impact on the surrounding context with no significant impact on parks, amenities, or public spaces.

The materiality of the building has subtle integration of a more textural quality with the rhythm and modulation of the building subdivided at the base with generous amounts of glass. Further, the buildings floor lines have been designed so that the building can have indoor-outdoor space at both the corner of Quebec Street and East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue as well as the public entry plaza to the heritage building. Materials used include wood at the entrance at grade, brick in the expression of the first a couple of stories and concrete, brick, metal panel and perforated metal across the façade treatment. Note the repeating modular expression of the façade which is a feature of massed timber buildings and how the expression of material treatments mirrors this style. With the exception of the timber frame which is exposed at the two primary entrance points, the project is monochromatic and materials in the pedestrian realm where the building meets the ground are understated with raw cold-rolled steel, board-formed concrete and masonry.



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

The topics we'll be reviewing today in our questions include the heritage relationship, the articulation or expression of the new building, and the quality of the public realm interface generated at grade.

1. Please comment on the Heritage Relationship considering; Does the relationship between the new building and the heritage building achieve a satisfactorily integrated/ sensitive relationship particularly at the points of transition from one form to another?
2. Please comment on the Massing & Articulation considering; Does the articulation of massing, setbacks, and architectural expression of the new building achieve an appropriately differentiated character (base, middle and top) with consequent orders of scale for effective contextual fit / sensitive transition to the surrounding neighborhood?
3. Please comment on the Public Realm Interface considering; Does the proposal succeed in effectively integrating with the ground plane, supporting its success as an activated façade and enhancing the quality of the pedestrian realm and streetscape?

In summary, the Panel is requested to consider the Heritage Relationship, the success of the Massing Articulation/ Expression and the Public Realm Interface.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The T3 Mount Pleasant project stands for timber, transit and technology. The design approach was centred around enhancing the neighborhood while remaining true to the origins of Mount Pleasant as the original industrial heartland of Vancouver.

The area features good transit connectivity and robust bicycle commuting, with some 20,000 bicycles a day coming down Ontario St a couple blocks away. The new Broadway extension will result in a transit stop two and a half blocks from the site.

The existing Simon Fraser Elementary School Annex building has fallen into disrepair, and there has been some very unsympathetic additions to the building. This includes the addition to the west and the replacement stairs at the front entry, and an accessibility ramp that has been added on to the east.

As part of the conservation strategy, the applicant is proposing removal of the addition to the west, removal of the ramp to the east, removal of the entry stairs, and the demolition of the lower basement level. It includes retention and harvesting of existing windows. Door elements on the lower level are to be reinstated.

This new building proposed is a fully exposed mass timber building. This is primarily motivated by carbon reduction and the commitment to build sustainably.

The applicant presented further on the design process, noting that the key to a successful integration into the neighborhood is an incremental reduction of scale. This included considering the outright zoning density and working in that urban scale. This was followed by creating a secondary much lower datum that brings the building into harmony with the neighborhood scale, inclusive of the heritage building and articulating the base of the building. This was completed by utilising form, materials, and permeability that relate to the human scale.

The applicant then presented details on the programs, plans and materials.

**Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**

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

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS.THAKRE** and seconded by **MR. ROMSES** 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) Design development to refine the interface between the office building and the heritage building to improve the relationship.
- 2) Consider architectural openings to better connect the heritage building to the lane and public realm.
- 3) Design development to refine the roof line of the building to be more consistent with the overall massing.
- 4) Design development to refine the public realm to reflect the Mount Pleasant character as envisioned in the community plan.
- 5) Design development to include landscaping on the roof deck.

**Panel Commentary****Massing & Articulation:**

In general the Panel supported the massing and the scale.

In general the Panel supported the materiality of the project.

The Panel commended the applicant for their effort and commitment to mass timber and heritage preservation. A Panelist noted it's impressive to see the T3 concept being deployed all over North America and Vancouver needs more of these buildings.

Some Panelists noted appreciation for the erosions and cut out aspects of the massing in the new building.

Some Panelists noted appreciation for the simple geometry with the right amount of articulation and stepping that works really well.

Some Panelists encouraged improving the articulation and expression of the roof top uppermost levels of the building to be more consistent with the overall design. The diagrams showed better design intent but the final result lacks these good gestures. It looks chaotic at present. They recommended a better identity for the roof to celebrate the building. It is not intentional in form or following a harmonious profile with the rest of the building.

A Panelist noted with the mass timber there is potential for a well-insulated building enclosure and appropriately managed solar heat gain at the windows for thermal comfort. They also encouraged further development of the energy performance and energy model.

A Panelist noted the roof decks needs further consideration and are not intentional in form.

The Panelists encouraged the roof decks to be accessible to everyone in the building and not just a particular tenant encouraging further activation and programming.

A Panelist noted the potential programmatic synergy between the new building and heritage building was lacking.

A Panelist noted that the lobby spaces should be stronger.

---

Some Panelists noted the importance to signal what's taking place inside the heritage building in the plaza or in the expression of the built elements especially given that it is being converted to artist studios. They suggested proposing a design with architectural openings that will create more of a connection with the heritage building especially the main entrance. Further work needs to be done to the plaza next to the heritage building to help celebrate the new and old building.

### **Heritage Relationship:**

Some Panelists noted the heritage preservation should be better and the relationship to the lane should be stronger.

Some Panelists recommended more programmed interaction, artwork, or interface opportunities to celebrate and provide a connection to the heritage building.

A Panelist suggest further study of what the heritage building can do for this project, currently it only gives a height bonus for the building adjacent to it.

Some Panelists noted that the proposal appears as two separate buildings with no relationship. The facade fronting onto the heritage needs to have a stronger response than the rational grid. The facade should be conceived as a backdrop and jewel. It could be small moves. When is it a grid or bay and how does it break down. A new material or texture to acknowledge the heritage building.

Most Panelists suggested further refinement of this new building and the heritage building interface, particularly at the interface of the old roof to the new elevation.

A Panelist noted that the heritage is treated as no more of a than a density transfer and feels programmatically divorced. It feels like a lost opportunity.

Some Panelists noted that the original heritage building side elevation was not designed to face onto a plaza and therefore needs to be designed to act as a front.

### **Public Realm Interface:**

The Panel noted that in terms of the public realm interface, the lane and the plaza are somewhat disconnected. The landscaping as designed is a barrier to the public realm and the same thing happens along Quebec and East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The Panelists noted there could also be a better relationship with the side lane and plaza space at East 6<sup>th</sup> Ave.

The Panel noted concerns with the access or barriers posed by stepping down and suggest further design development. They suggested more ramping and accessibility awareness in the design.

A Panelist noted the outdoor space in the plaza can be used to communicate key elements of the proposal and to celebrate the arts.

The Panel noted concerns with the entrance at Quebec and East 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. It feels small, tight, diminutive and uncomfortable and strongly recommended applicant to rethink the design on that corner.

Some Panelists also noted that the plaza and office building entrance should be more carefully considered. It should also be a gathering area in addition to the functional aspect of the entrance by using the space to better integrate the two buildings on site.

A Panelist noted the public realm does not have a sense of place that is reflective of the Mount Pleasant character. There is very little of the project that reflects that community plan or the vision of the neighbourhood.

Some Panelists noted the public realm is lacklustre and the lane has no quality to it. Some Panelists noted more activation on the laneway so the original front doesn't get lost along the lane.

A Panelist noted the project is missing some form of public art or homage to the culture of Mount Pleasant. They suggested something a little bit more bespoke to the area would be well warranted.

Some Panelists suggested more trees or landscaping on the lane.

A Panelist noted the semi public social spaces in the building need more consideration. There is a lack of social space in this building besides the plaza.

A Panelists noted it is unfortunate that the streetscape is so homogenous in the proposal as this area is quite varied, social with boutiques, small store fronts, and social spaces. They suggested pulling the grid back from exterior to explore opportunities to further activate the public realm complimenting the neighbourhood community.

A Panelist noted the Mount Pleasant public realm plan and the community plan talks about the lane as a potential activation event space. This project is not reflecting the uniqueness, edginess, quirkiness of Mount Pleasant.

Some panelists suggest reviewing the public realm guidelines for Mount Pleasant and try to reinforce that, adding more programming to the plaza and be reflective of the Mount Pleasant character.