

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 3, 2019

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jim Huffman
Amela Brudar
Helen Avini Besharat
Colette Parsons
Jennifer Stamp
Derek Neale
Yinjin Wen
Karenn Krangle
Muneesh Sharma

Excused item 1
Excused items 2-4

REGRETS:

Grant Newfield
Matt Younger
Susan Ockwell

RECORDING

SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|------------------------|
| 1. | 3600 E Hastings Street |
| 2. | 3680 Hastings Street |
| 3. | 3235-3261 Clive Avenue |
| 4. | 1636 Clark Drive |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Jim Huffman called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 3600 E Hastings Street
Permit No. RZ-2019-00057
Description: To develop a 14-storey mixed-use building consisting of 75 secured market rental residential units and 19 moderate income rental units; all over three levels of underground parking with 41 vehicle stalls and 125 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 7,068 sq. m (76,083 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 7.10 and the building height is 48.2 m (158.2 ft). This application is being considered under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP).
Zoning: C-2C to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: BHA
Owner: Jared Stern, PCL Developments
Delegation: Peter Huggins, BHA Architecture
Duff Marrs, Architect, BHA Architecture
Staff: Marcel Gelein & Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations 8/8

**Please refer to minutes of item 2.*

2. Address:	3680 Hastings Street
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00057
Description:	To develop a 14-storey mixed-use building consisting of 75 secured market rental residential units and 19 moderate income rental units; all over three levels of underground parking with 41 vehicle stalls and 125 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 7,068 sq. m (76,083 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 7.10 and the building height is 48.2 m (158.2 ft.). This application is being considered under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP).
Zoning:	C-2C to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	BHA
Owner:	Jared Stern, PCI Developments
Delegation:	Peter Huggins, BHA Architecture Duff Marrs, Architect, BHA Architecture
Staff:	Marcel Gelein & Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations 8/8

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Marcel Gelein, began by noting the two buildings located at 3600 and 3680 E. Hastings are proposed by the same applicant team under two separate rezoning applications. They are coming in under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP) rezoning policy.

The subject block is on the south side of E Hastings between Boundary and Kootenay St. The two subject sites are located at the corners flanked by the two streets. The existing zoning for both sites is C2C as are the areas to the north and west along Hastings. Within two blocks to the west, there is one recently completed 6 storey building and two approved rezoning applications under rental 100. Across the lane to the south is a low-scale residential area zoned RS-1. The Kootenay bus loop is on the NW corner of Kootenay intersection. Across Boundary Rd to the east is Burnaby including the Boundary View towers which are 13 and 16 storeys.

The Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program seeks to create the right housing supply with deeper affordability. It enables up to 20 rezoning projects to provide 100% secured rental housing with a minimum of 20% of the residential floor area secured for moderate income households that meet certain project criteria. The two sites were selected as 2 of 20 projects being considered under MIRHPP as it proposes to deliver a significant number of new moderate income and market rental units in a location that is well-served by rapid transit, amenities and services, and would not displace any existing rental units or tenants. According to the policy, for C2C sites up to 14 storeys may be considered at arterial intersections subject to urban design review.

The proposal at the Boundary corner site is for a 14 storey mixed use development with 6.9 FSR. It proposes 118 rental units with a total floor area of 96,000 s.f. The Kootenay corner site also proposes a 14 storey mixed use building and 7.1 FSR with a total of 94 rental units and floor area of 76,000 s.f.. Between both developments a total of 43 MIRHPP units are proposed.

Development planner, Grace Jiang, began by noting the two sites are on one same block. The block is relative shallow with a depth of 102 ft. The east site has a frontage of 137 ft. along Hastings, and the west site has a frontage of 105 ft. Both sites have significant cross fall from north east to south west with site slope of 24 ft. and 13 ft. respectively.

The existing zoning of both sites is C2C, which allows a 4 storey mixed use development up to 3 FSR. Under MIRHPP policy, up to 14 storeys may be considered subject to the location and urban design performance.

Both rezoning applications are for a mixed use development with 14 storey tower on 6-storey podium. The lane is approximately one storey lower than Hastings, therefore the towers and podiums read as 15 storeys and 7 storeys respectively from lane.

The east site is located at the intersection of two arterial roads - Boundary and Hastings, which is eligible under the MIRHPP Policy for 14 storeys. The west site is at the intersection of an arterial (Hastings) and a local street (Kootenay), which is eligible for some additional height and density between 6 to 14 storeys subject to other considerations. Staff note that Kootenay St has a 100 ft. ROW which is the same width as the arterial road. Kootenay currently has two lanes of traffic - which allows for the remainder of the ROW to be developed with a wider sidewalk and public realm with landscaped boulevards on both sides.

Both sites are on the south side of Hastings. While the towers shadow the sidewalk and mixed use buildings across Hastings, the majority of shadowing falls on the roadway, particularly the shadows generated by podiums do not extend to the north sidewalk on the equinox between 10am to 4pm.

One of urban design considerations is to create a compatible streetscape with existing and future developments on the Hastings. The proposed podium height is 6 storeys. The upper storeys are stepped back to emphasize a 4-storey street wall which is in line with the anticipated developments along Hastings. 5-storey expression is created to emphasize the two corner conditions and extends along the flanking streets.

Commercial use is provided at ground floor fronting Hastings and wrapped onto the flanking streets. The commercial units are stepped along the slope to achieve at-grade entrance.

Both buildings provide setbacks from streets for enhanced sidewalk and public amenity, including 18 ft. on Hastings and 15 ft. on Boundary for the east site and 25 ft. on Hastings and 31 ft. on Kootenay for the west site. The wider public realm in front of the west building is to accommodate B-line bus stop and the corner on Kootenay could be potential patio space.

Policy also requires transition to surrounding areas and homes. Both projects provide transition heights and setbacks at rear including 12 ft. setback for the podium at the corner and along the lane, 17 ft. for the primary massing, and 24 feet at the shoulder. Along the lane, there are residential unit's landscapes, services, parking access, and loading.

The two towers are setback 8 ft. from the podium facing streets, and flush with the podium on the rear. The east tower provides 39 ft. setback from the interior side property line and the west tower provides 21 ft. The resultant floor plates are 5,500 sf (89 ft. x 67 ft.) and 4,700 sf (76 ft. x 67 ft.) respectively.

Both buildings propose amenity room on the 7th floor with co-located outdoor amenity space on the roof deck. Residential entrances are located on the flanking streets.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Does the panel support the proposed height and density (14-storey tower and 6-storey podium)?
2. Under the MIRHPP Policy, projects must consider and respect transitions to surrounding areas and homes.

Noting the location at the high point, does the project provide a suitable transition to the lower density areas to the rear, including:

- setbacks of podium and tower;
- podium heights; and
- lane treatment at-grade, including residential units, landscaping, garbage, loading and parking.

3. Please provide preliminary comment on the architectural expression and materiality to inform the development application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

An opportunity to the site is the proximity to two major transit corridors and Kootney loop. There are excellent views all around.

The challenge is compressing site coverage and massing into a tight envelope while managing the program. There is little wiggle room for the project and design.

Challenges with both sites are they are only 100 feet deep; there is inefficient parking, the massing and articulation. The slopes create challenge with mixed use buildings with loading.

The curb takes a bit of a bend; the intent is to create a continuous line for the East buildings.

The principle setback and height constraints of 14 storeys, transition from level 7-14.

In regards to tower widths entered negotiations with planning, asked for an increase of 74 percent on the West side and an increase of 60 percent to the East side.

Both corner sites are on a gateway block, goal is to emphasize the corner.

Corner retail units programmed for restaurant use.

There is glass on the corner to liven the area.

The corner transitions into a lighter canopy.

A brick element goes up to the parapet on level 6.

There is a break in the base and steps down to a 4 storey element.

Tower design is two eyes in the sky with small landscaping elements.

Top peeled back on level 14 in the east tower.

There is a penthouse expression on the west tower.

Look at ways to engage the tower to the base.

There are thread window elements to the base, helps vertical expression, and the break in the base, helps give store front variety.

The podium form is a 4 storey strategy with balconies on the lane and street.

On the lane side, try to peel away brick base and insert some residential.

Peeling away of base and raised terrace with landscape buffer helps transition base across to the residential

There are outdoor amenity spaces, on level 7 there is a terrace with perimeter planting.

There is an amenity on both buildings at the front corner that is adjacent to an outdoor amenity.

There is also residential units that spills out onto each terrace with lots of landscaping for privacy

Regarding landscape, with greater setbacks there is opportunity for street trees.

Along Kootney there is a greater right away plan for much heavier landscaping.

Along lane insert landscape buffer at residential units

There is bicycle parking.

A main consideration is a strong focus on window to wall ratio.

There is 25 percent of the envelope on both buildings.
Limiting balcony runs, every unit even studios have full balconies, they are constricted not continuous.
There is continuous insulation.
The buildings have mechanically high efficiencies RVs.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Parsons and seconded by Ms. Besharat-Avini and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT of the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design Development to develop the character of the two buildings;
- Design Development of the residential entry on Boundary;
- Design Development of the amenity of the west tower;
- Design Development of landscape and streetscape landscape.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was strong support from the panel.

The project was in line with the corresponding policy.

This was a MIRHPP project presented to the panel.

It is a unique site with slopes, major streets, height of buildings, and the retail at grade is strong.

It is a gateway site.

The treatment at grade is nice.

The podium heights are nice can see how future developments have been considered.

The setbacks, podium and tower are not entirely ideal on the lane side however with the slope and southern exposure the single family homes have mitigated this a bit.

The residential entry is nicely defined.

The corner elevations on Boundary and Kootenay are strong; the three elevations are nicely treated.

In general the material choices were accepted.

The loading and garbage appear to work with the lane treatment.

The sister character of the buildings is nice but buildings could also have differences.

Consider a change in color or massing elements. The east building could be higher and the west lower.

A panelist suggested these are background buildings and that is okay background buildings have a place in City of Vancouver, make materiality and architecture reflect this.

A panelist suggested taking simple materials and carrying it on.

The Residential entry on the east tower off boundary, the walkway is fairly tight and sunken, design development needed to this area.

The transitioning into the surrounding neighborhood from the lane treatment does appear tight.

Review the units close to the garbage enclosure at the lane to ensure this is not their view.

At the DP stage greater thought and creativity around the ground plain is needed.

Given the amount of units and people living in them providing a nice amenity space is very important.

The panel supported the concept of a rooftop amenity at least at one of the sites with amenities like a washroom and elevator.

The amenity on the west tower suggest making it bigger or moving it to the roof or to the other side.

The common areas appear cramped for most programs.

3680 building, south of the lobby there is a blank wall suggest adding windows.

The site is close to Adanac bike route with an opportunity to make convenient access for biking.

On level 7 the trees are very narrow, confirm they will survive.

Along Boundary at the 3680 Building there are no street trees showing, consider connecting with Engineering in regards to this.

Overall landscape treatment would benefit from further design development.
The amount of parking is a concern as it is already a congested area.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

3.	Address:	3235-3261 Clive Avenue
	Permit No.	RZ-2018-00047
	Description:	To develop the site with a 6-storey residential building and five ground-oriented townhouses for a total of 68 strata units; all over two levels of underground parking with 68 vehicle stalls and 138 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 4,689 sq. m (50,479 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.25 and the building height is 21 m (69 ft.). This application is being considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan.
	Zoning:	CD-1 (219) to CD-1 (new)
	Application Status:	Rezoning Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	DYS
	Delegation:	Norm Chin, Architect, DYS Architecture Marina Rommel, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape Architect Dan Laflamme, Next Properties
	Staff:	Tiffany Rougeau & Miguel Castillo-Urena

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8/0)

• **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Tiffany Rougeau, began by noting, the rezoning application at 3235-3261 Clive Ave is a 5 lot assembly midblock on Clive and Vanness Avenues, between Spencer and McHardy Streets.

All lots are currently zoned CD-1 (219) and are each developed with a single-family houses. The proposal is being considered under the Joyce Collingwood Precinct Plan which anticipates residential buildings up to six storeys (and 70 ft. in height) with a maximum density of 2.25 FSR.

For context, the Joyce Collingwood Station is located 2 blocks to the east - approximately a 5 minute walk - with the skytrain line directly to the north over Vanness Ave.

East, west, and north of the site, are single family homes, designated in the Plan as sub-areas V1 & V2 - same as the subject site - and anticipates future mid-rise buildings with some mixed income affordable and social housing sites.

This includes one in-stream rezoning application on the other side of the Skytrain tracks, for 102 social housing units.

Directly east of the site is a 4 storey social housing project built in 1998 - noting that the Plan anticipates that this site is unlikely to redevelop.

South of Clive is single family homes, which are designated in Joyce Collingwood Plan as a townhouse zone up to 3-storeys.

This proposal consists of a 6-storey residential building and 5 ground-oriented townhouses fronting Clive Ave. A total of 68 strata units are proposed over 2 levels of underground parking. An FSR of 2.25 is proposed

Development planner, Miguel Castillo-Urena, began by noting that the site slopes 5m diagonally and approximately 2m along Vaness Ave and 4m along Clive Ave.

The form and development consists of a 6-storey apartment building fronting Vaness Ave, two 4-storey buildings containing 5 townhouses facing Clive Ave. The arrangement of both the apartment building and townhouses creates a 24-foot wide courtyard, which has access from Clive Avenue and Vaness

Avenue. The parking entry is off Clive Ave. The indoor amenity is located on the ground level facing the courtyard and the outdoor amenity space is the on top of the apartment building.

The proposal generally meets the expectation in terms of setbacks per the Joyce Collingwood plan; however a relaxation in frontage is sought.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

Density and Form of Development

- Have the proposed density and height been incorporated into an overall form of development that is well integrated into the surrounding (and future) context?
- Will the proposed form and massing create positive streetscapes and “courtyard scapes”? Do the four-storey buildings on Clive Avenue provide compatible “fit” with the immediate existing and evolving context?
- Has the increased building frontage (140 ft.) been “earned” through an appropriate form of development?
- Please comment on livability:
Please consider: Skytrain line, ground level units, amenity space.

Public Realm

- Overall public realm, particularly proposed courtyard and building edge interfaces. Will there be an adequate ground floor relationship with the public realm?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

• Applicant’s Introductory Comments:

The challenge with this site is the slope and drop from high point to low point.

This is a 5 lot assembly right in middle of the block, took into consideration what that means for future developments.

The proposal is for a 6 storey midrise condominium structure with townhouse units. The 6 storey volume followed what planning prescribed with setbacks. There is 17 ft. in the front, struggling with the 120 ft. wide building face. We looked at what is the right fit to get suitable amount of density for this site with restricted height and depth. The setback consists of two wing components; this still gives a frontal face of 120 ft. We have reduced the visible mass facing the lanes. On the north to south slope the buildings have been stepped to visually increase the scale.

The architectural pattern consists of vertical expression along Clive Avenue. The vertical expression has a modern architecture character.

The upper units have private outdoor spaces. There is an additional common outdoor space on the roof, in addition to the indoor amenity space at the ground level. There are conventional stairs with landing to provide safe access to the roof.

There is accessibility through the site via the sides and center. On Clive Ave there is a midblock entry. In between the two building forms there is a 24 ft. wide courtyard space and children play area in the corner. The townhouses have a break in the middle providing additional penetration to the courtyard.

Landscape included planting to identify entrances. There are nice pods of outdoor space and seating nooks for residential to sit. Patios provide eyes on the street.

Along Vanness due to the sky train, there is not a lot of present landscaping, looking to have large canopy trees stepping down to the patios.

Along Clive Avenue, a residential street, the townhomes elevate with patios and trees.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Besharat and seconded by Mr. Neale and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design Development of the parking entry and PMT location to enhance livability and reinforce the texture on Clive Ave;
- Design Development of the courtyard to enhance its livability and functionality;
- Design Development of the amenity to make indoor and outdoor connection stronger by co-locating them;
- Design Development of the landscape to take advantage of the topography.
- Design development of reconfigure location of patios to enhance livability.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support for the project and form of development.

The panel appreciated the contemporary expression.

The architectural expression of townhouses and streetscape is supportable.

Overall the massing as it relates to its surroundings and setbacks generally work.

The punch windows and symmetries are good.

The applicant has earned density, height and frontage.

This is a challenging site from a grade perspective. The grading drives many elements and is not allowing a successful outcome.

The location of the parking ramp needs design development; look at alternate locations to get onto the other street to reinforce texture on Clive. Overall review of the parking access and PMT is needed. A suggestion was to place the PMT where the bike parking is. It was noted to City engineering that it is unfortunate they are requiring the parking ramp and PMT to be placed on Clive as its taking up a large area of the street face and its better suited on the skytrain side.

There is a lot of courtyard shade; units at the lower levels on the big buildings suffer the most.

The courtyard space is lacking narrative of what it wants to be, requires programming development.

The narrowness of courtyard appears more of a passageway. Consider widening it and reduce setback at the front on Clive Ave. The townhouses have three patios; the patio on the north side which does not receive a lot of sun is not needed.

This space is better suited being reallocated to the courtyard. By reviewing the parking, there is some room to drop the grade of townhouses; this will help on the courtyard side with wall heights.

The indoor and outdoor amenities are disjointed. Consider co-locating indoor and outdoor amenity space or having a small kitchenette up at the roof terrace, this will make the space stronger. Consider aligning the entry to the courtyard between the two townhouse buildings with the indoor amenity. The children's play area is stingy.

Overall there is not a lot of landscape buffer. Sound mitigation along Vanness will be critical. Planting in front of blank wall is needed.

The Townhouses facing south will not get a lot of light and windows appear small.

Consider having the townhouse stairs on the other side this would mitigate shadowing of the upper deck and would help stepping of the building. Consider flipping the living rooms of the townhouses or

the landscape so the patio part is in front of the window and the soft landscape in front of the blank wall. Reconsider the raised planter on top of the high wall.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.

4. Address:	1636 Clark Drive
Permit No.	DP-2019-00287
Description:	To develop a 10-storey mixed-use building consisting of 97 social housing units, a social enterprise space and a withdrawal management centre, including up to 20 short term transitional beds.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	HDR
Delegation:	Jim Alders, Architect, HDR Architecture Marine Rommel, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape Architect
Staff:	Omar Aljebouri for Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION RECOMMENDED (8 /0)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Omar Aljebouri, began by noting, this is a Development Permit Application following rezoning, which was approved by Council on February 21, 2019 for the use, height, density and general form of development. Omar described generally the allocation of program within the floors of the building. He then discussed the major recommendations by the Urban Design Panel and staff conditions from rezoning, and how the Applicant has responded to these comments and conditions with the revised design. Omar concluded by asking the Panel a set of questions with regards to 4 areas of the design: architectural expression; quality of open space and landscape; wayfinding and identification of residential entrances; and any advice to the incorporation of First Nations cultural elements.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

- 1) Please comment on the architectural expression's response to the Grandview Woodlands Plan's intent for a fine grain fabric:
 - a) Is the development's base adequately articulated?
 - b) Are the two residential blocks reading as "residential"?
 - c) Does the sky-garden sufficiently break the overall massing?
- 2) Please comment on the quality of open space and landscape:
 - a) Does the landscape soften the base and enhance the public realm?
 - b) Does the sky-garden offer adequate access to outdoor common amenity?
- 3) Does the project sufficiently provide wayfinding measures distinguishing of entrances and their reading as "residential"?
- 4) Does the Panel Member have any advice for the incorporation of elements that speak to the presence of First Nations such as the proposed wall art?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The challenge with this site is this is an introvert building, rooms are not open to the outside, there is no function fully opened to the outside.

The scale is broken down by layering different elements such as the bottom is a living wall, lights on top, and canopies for wayfinding.

There is a detox component in the upper floor.

There are two levels of transitional housing at the podium.

There is also a residential component.

There is an additional floor.

We widened the spacing between to bring more light to neighbors on the north.

Because of the level change the entrance to the housing is quite difficult, addressed this by introducing a secondary stair down for visual connection to the alley.

Main drop for the clinic is underneath the building to allow for privacy.

Main entrance for residential has a lot of ramps.

To address the wayfinding all canopies have a copper color, worked with landscaping on entrances to make them human in scale.

This site has opportunity for art.

We programmed for a lot of lighting.

We stepped back the building to create a plaza towards McLean Drive.

There are benches for seating and bicycle shed.

There is an amenity space that will open up to the garden.

There is seating, and kid's playground and opportunity for BBQ.

Units have outdoor patio spaces.

Interior amenity space opens up to exterior amenity space.

There is a sacred space for the health care, which will mainly be used by First Nations for healing.

For the detox they will have an at grade courtyard with a Zen garden.

Landscape will be important to soften up the edges of the building and the top.

There is some urban agriculture for residents and an outdoor kitchen with table.

Tenants are surrounded by a lot of nature through landscape design.

There are lush planters to address concerns of overlook.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Parsons and seconded by Ms. Stamp and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel RECOMMEND RESUBMISSION of the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design development to legibility to differentiate the entries and wayfinding;
- Design development to improve the drop off;
- Design development of the landscape along 1st Ave, along the lane, and increasing overlook landscape and ensure it is supportable by the building design;
- Significant design development to the public realm for both the buildings and landscaping on all four frontages.

- **Related Commentary:**

At a rezoning level the project is supportable however the DP level requires more attention and refinement of design development to bring it at a deserving level. Examples of areas needing improvement include bulk of massing area above the windows, detailed design guards, residential lobby, landscaping needs to be softened. The panel had many concerns around the street level.

This is a Grandview Woodland Plan and the project is a lot more than expected and this has to be earned. Some moving around of the density is needed. The concept is great but does not fit in the context.

The program for the people is not clear, architecture should be helping the people that will be staying or working there.

Study the orientation of buildings and units to help with unit livability and find a solution to get more natural light.

Design development is needed to mask rooftop units, and justify tapered elevations which add shadowing to the neighborhood.

Solid walls are not supportable at grade; there are a lot of long flats of blank wall.

The streets make it difficult to access the building

Struggling with entries, the drop off locations and how they are functioning.

Residential entrance of the alley needs further work.

Recess entry of the residential building to the west is unsuccessful and needs to be completed revisited.

All entrances should be separate; residents should feel a sense of pride when entering their homes.

Suggest looking at measures to improve the wayfinding, which should be an expression of the buildings.

Wayfinding of the residential and commercial should be different.

Consider having just one walkway along 1st, having additional landscape buffer along 1st Ave would help, could create pockets that are perpendicular to the curve, consider how people congregate.

Canopies entrance off of 1st should be barrier free.

The vehicular courtyard entrance is dark; the second entrance appears like a back entrance which is actually one of the prominent corners of the site.

Review expression of canopies, sides, glazing, find opportunities for increasing glazing at street level and amenity at the roof top.

Change the color of the canopy. The rooftop is a missed opportunity, there is access by elevator already, and would be a wonderful space for families.

The panel noted the applicants could be planting new trees on Clark now for positive results for future designs.

Better landscaping along the alley is needed, residents who live on the other side of alley will have a lot of noise and this will help soften.

Planters will need to be better articulated and designed.

A panelist noted there have been many studies for mental health that has concluded lots of greenspace is important and necessary. At the clinical level the space could be wrapped in green space.

The walls for mural require more research and public art, suggest development of a strong public art celebrating First Nations.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.