

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** July 4, 2012

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Robert Barnes  
Helen Besharat (Chair Item #2)  
Gregory Borowski (Chair) [excused Item #2]  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Alan Endall  
David Grigg  
Bruce Hemstock  
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #3)  
Norm Shearing  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:**  
Daryl Condon  
Veronica Gillies  
Arno Matis

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	3450 Commercial Street
2.	6110-6170 Oak Street & 975 West 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
3.	2610 Victoria Drive
4.	4320 Slocan Drive
5.	2528 Collingwood Street

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

The business meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on July 3, 2012 where 1545 West 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue was presented to the Board and approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 3450 Commercial Street  
DE: 415548  
Description: To construct a 4-storey building with commercial on the first storey and residential from the first to fourth storeys.  
Zoning: MC-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Review: Second  
Owner: Cressey Homes  
Architect: Rafii Architecture  
Delegation: Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Inc.  
Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects  
Hani Lammam, Cressey Homes  
Staff: Ann McLean

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, noted that the Panel had reviewed the proposal on May 9<sup>th</sup> and received non-support. The proposal is located just south of Trout Lake, where Commercial Drive diverts into Victoria Drive, and adjacent to the Expo Line guideway. The proposal is comprised of a 4-storey building oriented around a triangular courtyard. The north-eastern wing at Victoria Diversion has four levels of residential with the ground level being rental units. The southeasterly portion of the building has three levels of market residential over one level of commercial/retail space. Parking is on one level underground. Ms. McLean described the Panel's comments regarding items that needed to be improved from the last review.

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

Has the revised proposal addressed the areas of key concern noted in the previous review in particular:

- The treatment of the proposed elevation at Porter Street given its high visibility;
- The courtyard treatment and its relationship to the residential units; and
- The architectural treatment of all elevations with regard to the area guidelines and character.

Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Foad Rafii, Architect, described the changes made to the project since the last review. He noted that because of the shape of the building the residential lobby could not be located elsewhere. They have changed the elevation and as well the blank wall behind the commercial. They have added a window and a stepped planter at the lower portion of the courtyard. They talked to BC Hydro regarding the transformer and they will use concrete to cantilever over the transformer to improve the Porter Street elevation. The colours have been reduced from three to two and the

canopies are changed to a mix of glass and canvas. The second bedroom windows that were open to the corridors have been pushed back and the den windows are higher up on the wall to allow for more privacy. Mr. Rafii noted that the balcony on the corner has been moved and is now over the main entry of the residential.

Dylan Chernoff, Landscape Architect, described the changes to the landscape plans. He noted that the main criticism from the previous review was that the courtyard was chopped up. They changed the layout of the courtyard to a more rectilinear space which makes it a bit longer. Now it can either be divided or used as one space. There is an opportunity for seating and weather protection and they also introduced a private garden room that was the result of moving the stairs.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider a more distinctive canopy to mark the residential entry;
  - Design development to further improve the loading bay.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel agreed that there had been improvements since the last review. They thought the courtyard treatment had been improved and looked more inviting for the residents. One Panel member noted that the access to the secret garden looked a little awkward although the majority of the Panel thought it was a supportable addition. The Panel also agreed that the general treatment of the elevations had been simplified as well as the colours and the balcony expression. They also had no concerns with the lobby or the locations of the elevator and that the residential entry was clearly identified. A couple of Panel members thought it could be further identified by using a different and more distinctive canopy treatment.

Some Panel members thought more improvement could be done with the loading bay with one Panel member suggesting the angled wall that is cantilevered over the loading bay could have the geometry adjusted slightly to sit more squarely over the parking.

One Panel member thought the light well adjacent to the elevator lobby was too enclosed and suggested adjusting the walkway connection for more of a break to add more light into the elevator lobby.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Rafii said he had heard some good comments from the Panel and would try to improve the project further.

---

2. Address:	6110-6170 Oak Street & 975 West 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To permit the development of 33 townhomes in six buildings, having a total floor area of 42,144 square feet, a FSR of 1.0 and a maximum height of three storeys (35 feet).
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Owner:	Listraor
Architect:	Merrick Architecture
Delegation:	Greg Borowski, Merrick Architecture Gina Lyons, Merrick Architecture Gerry Eckford, ETA Landscape Architects Craig Rowland, Listraor
Staff:	Ian Cooper and Ann McLean

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for the rezoning from Single Family (RS-1) Zoning to Comprehensive Development (CD-1) in order to increase the density and increase the maximum height. The project will contain 33 townhouse units in six buildings at the northeast corner of Oak Street and West 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There is an interior courtyard space with thirty-one 3-bedroom units and two 2-bedroom units. The project will be built using BC Built Green Gold sustainable design standards. Mr. Cooper described the applicable policy for the site (Oakridge Langara Policy Statement) which provides for multi-family residential including stacked townhouses and ground-oriented low-rise buildings. Also, the High-Density Housing for Families and Children Guidelines applies to the site. The key issues include building and unit design which relates to residential livability for families with children. As well the children's area need to be designed with units overlooking the area for easy supervision of the children and there are also need to be appropriate open space to meet the on-site needs of children and adults. Mr. Cooper stated that the project will be built using the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning and requires LEED™ Gold registration and to be eligible to be certified. He added that buildings that are either not eligible or extremely ill-suited to participate in the LEED program for new construction due to form of development shall achieve a minimum of BuiltGreen™ BC Gold or LEED™ for Homes Gold and minimum score of Energuide 82.

Ann McLean, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that it is comprised of six townhouse buildings with 6 units in each of the north and south buildings; 5 units in the buildings on Oak Street; 5 and 6 units in the buildings on the lane for a total of 33 units. There is also one level of underground parking providing two stalls per unit. Most of the units will have direct access to the parking level. Ms. McLean explained that this part of Oak Street as a potential high-volume pedestrian area should have high quality pedestrian amenity such as landscaping and benches and views through the site as required in the Oakridge Langara Policy Statement. She added that the policy statement asked for a maximum height of 30 feet although similar rezonings in the area have achieved 35 feet. The proposed buildings will have flat roofs and the applicant notes the height of 35 feet at the highest point and 30 feet elsewhere on the site. The setbacks at the upper level in this form appear to perform in a similar manner to a pitched roof with regard to shadow and visual impact. There are no upper level decks proposed. There are setbacks from Oak Street and the lane and a retaining wall and planter transition on the lane. Ms. Mclean stated that the buildings will be separated by landscaped courtyards with a central entry

breezeway. Most of the units are 3-bedrooms with the exception of the two 2-storey units over the parking access, which have one bedroom and a den.

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

- On the overall proposal and urban design relative to the Oakridge Langara Policy statement;
- The relationship of the proposed buildings to each of the four site edges;
- Amount and design of open space on the site; and
- The character of the buildings with regard to the Oakridge Langara Policy Statement and the emerging character of the area.

Mr. Cooper and Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Greg Borowski, Architect, described the architecture noting although the height is higher than what is recommended in the guidelines the massing will be stepped to mitigate the height. Mr. Borowski said they designed the townhouses with a more contemporary expression based on other buildings in the neighbourhood. In terms of expression of the townhouse units they wanted to orient the decks to the side so they are away from busy Oak Street. Mr. Borowski described the proposed materials which include brick and zinc on the roof. He added that there will be a chimney element on the roof which may not be used for the fireplace but could be used as part of the sustainable strategy and used for ventilation exchange. The townhouses will have a fairly small ratio of window to wall with a lot of vegetation on the site. For solar exposure there are sun shades proposed on the units that face south and on the west side trees will help to shade the units. The project will be built under BC Built Green Gold.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that because of the width of Oak Street and the amount of traffic that it was appropriate to have smaller trees in the boulevard and the larger trees on the inside boulevard on private property. There are some existing trees that can't be saved but will be replaced with some significant trees at the four corners of the site. Some fruit trees will be added along the inside courtyard.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider individualizing the expression to the townhouse blocks; and
  - Consider tree choices on Oak Street;
  - Consider increasing the size of the children's play area;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it achieved the goals for the rezoning.

The Panel thought the relationship with the neighbours was nicely softened with attention paid to reducing the overlook. They also thought it would fit nicely into the neighbourhood as a result of the way the roofs are articulated. A couple of Panel members wanted to see a change to the expression as it seemed unrelenting and there was an opportunity to adjust these blocks to have individual expressions. Also it was suggested that a variety of colour or materials could be used to also individualize the expression.

One Panel member had some reservations regarding the central courtyard and how it would work as a community gathering place within the complex and suggested adding seating areas. Also, it didn't look like it was wheelchair friendly. Another Panel member suggested

adding a glazed element in the courtyard so the area could be used in inclement weather. While another Panel member suggested more lawn area on the West 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue private courtyards and that also the tree strategy on the boulevard needed rethinking.

A couple of Panel members had concerns regarding the addition of a children's play area noting that the area is only 35 feet wide. The site needs to be able to have that amenity and not rely on parents taking their children to the park down the street. There was also some concern regarding the street tree strategy noting that Oak Street would benefit from having significant sized trees.

The Panel commended the applicant for the sustainability strategy especially having the roofs be solar ready for future panels.

The Panel felt it was not necessary to have the proposal come back to them at the development permit stage but leave it up to the Director of Planning for decision.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Borowski thanked the Panel for their comments. Mr. Eckford said that they would continue working with Engineering Services regarding the street trees on Oak Street as they don't want to see them on that street.

---

3. Address:	2610 Victoria Drive
DE:	415800
Description:	Concurrent rezoning and development to construct a mixed-use building with four and six storey wings with office, classroom, clinic and 28 short term residential units all over one level of underground parking. The building will be for the Immigrant Services Society.
Zoning:	RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning/Complete
Review:	First
Owner:	ISS of BC
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects
Delegation:	Richard Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Farhad Mawani and Paul Cheng

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Farhad Mawani, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a concurrent application for a rezoning and development permit for a "Welcome House Centre" for the Immigrant Services Society (ISS) of BC. The project is to allow for an integrated regional services hub and transitional housing facility for recently arrived government assisted refugees. As well it will be a place for multiple organizations, public institutions and programs geared towards the needs of recently arrived refugees entering BC under one roof. These programs include refugee trauma support, settlement support, government outreach, a law clinic, food bank, primary health care clinic, community kitchen, a teaching facility, immigrant refugee youth drop-in, child minding and ISS of BC corporate offices. The project will contain 28 units (98 bedrooms) of short-term (up to two weeks) and transitional (up to one year) housing for newly arrived government assisted refugees. The project is located at the corner of East 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Victoria Drive. It is a City owned site that will be leased to the society for a 60 year period. Mr. Mawani noted that a rezoning is required to permit the use, height and density on this site. The application meets multiple policy objectives for the City, including Strategic Direction #2 of the Housing and Homelessness Strategy (2011) that identifies the need to encourage a housing mix across all neighbourhoods that enhances quality of life, with specific focus on low barrier shelter, supportive housing and social housing for target populations. Mr. Mawani also noted that public feedback that has been received to-date has been supportive of the programming on-site, and the overall design of the building. However, concerns have been raised with regards to the height of the building, and the associated impact on views from surrounding private residences. He added that the Green Building Policy for Rezonings would apply.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal. He noted that it is a triangular site with a lane on the southern edge. He described the context for the area noting that 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a dedicated bike route. Mr. Cheng explained that the RM-4 zoning is an old apartment zone and was originally made with the intent for 3-storey apartment buildings. The maximum height is 35 feet in the zone while the proposal is 63 feet. This zone also has sideyard regulations that insure there is a certain amount of neighbourliness between buildings. There isn't a shared property line on this site because of the lane between the property and the church property. In terms of shadows, everything is being cast onto the Grandview cut so none of the residential to the north will be affected.

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

1. *The base zoning of this property and the properties located to the south permits a maximum building height of 35 feet while this rezoning application is proposing a maximum building height of approximately 63 feet.*

With respect to the overlook, shadowing and privacy, does the proposal negatively affect the surrounding public realm and private properties to an undue manner?

2. *The northeast-facing elevation is prominently viewable from major aspects of the public realm including the bridge spanning across the Grandview cut on Victoria Drive and the Central Valley Greenway.*

Does the proposal provide sufficient visual interest for the Northeast elevation?

3. Does the proposal provide clear visual wayfinding to the building's main entrance from Victoria Drive?
4. *The proposal includes extensive soft landscaping elements that integrate with the building and the site.*

What advice can the Panel provide to ensure the viability of these landscaping elements?

Mr. Mawani and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Henriquez, Architect, described the proposal noting the immigrants will arrive from the airport in a taxi and so they designed a *porte-cochère*/canopy as weather protection. Mr. Henriquez described the architecture noting that there are two types of spaces in the building. There are suites which are expressed with punched windows and vertical panels and office space which is expressed as basically glass with structural setback. He added that there will be about 200 people in the building and they have created a lot of open space for both the residents and staff.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the project. There is a driveway with benches and widened sidewalk that extends out to Victoria Drive to open up the entry. The ground floor is about entry to the building. On the 2<sup>nd</sup> level there is a roof top deck with a good portion of it covered. It is a flexible space for child minding with play equipment and it also allows for small to larger gatherings. It has hard-space with moveable benches. On level five is urban agriculture. There is also a small children's play area adjacent to lawn with lots of south facing benches, fruit trees and some edible landscaping. On the top of the roof is the office function with an extensive green roof. There are a number of vine walls at the ground plane and as well they are using robust plantings.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider moving the entry closer to the street;
  - Consider adding fruit bearing plants for the urban agriculture; and
  - Consider adding irrigation for the roof top gardens;



- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it would be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood.

The Panel supported the massing as well as the additional height. They also thought the issues of privacy and shadowing have been well addressed. The Panel agreed that it was a unique site with a unique design response and they also thought the plan was simple and logical. The Panel thought it was logical to have the 6-storey expression on the cut. Most of the Panel members also thought the wayfinding to the main entrance was well done however one Panel member thought it was too far back from the street. Another Panel member thought it could have a more residential expression.

The Panel thought there wasn't any problem with the overlook on the northeast elevation as it is filtered through trees. The calmness of the northeast elevation reinforces the strength of the composition of the building. One Panel member thought the north side of the building had a more institutional expression and suggested the application could soften the expression with landscaping.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought they were very well done. A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding the viability of the urban agriculture considering the residents will mostly be short term stays and therefore might not be there long enough to look after the gardens. It was suggested that fruit bearing plants might work better for urban agriculture. A couple of Panel members were concerned as to whether the existing trees would survive during construction. One Panel member suggested using landscape plantings that would not require a lot of care and watering and that irrigation should be added to the roof top landscaping. Also there was some concern regarding who would take care of the green walls and if that was a viable solution.

The Panel supported the art on the side of the building with one Panel member suggested that below the renderings was an ideal place for moveable panels to allow families or children to produce their own art to give them a sense of home during their stay.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for their comments.

4. Address:	4320 Slocan Street
DE:	425814
Description:	Concurrent rezoning and development to construct a 4-storey mixed use building containing two commercial units on the ground floor and 41 dwelling units (STIR) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> floors over one level of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning/Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Allan Diamond Architects
Delegation:	Allan Diamond, Allan Diamond Architects Jarrod McAleese, Samara Landscape Design Orianne Johnson, Sustainable Building Centre
Staff:	Farhad Mawani and Tim Potter

#### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-7)

- Introduction:** Farhad Mawani, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a concurrent rezoning and development permit application for a market rental building under the City's STIR program. STIR provides incentives to encourage development of new purpose-built market rental housing with the intent of making these project more economically viable. Incentives include reduced parking, DCL waiver for residential units, concurrent processing of the rezoning and development permit and bonus density. Mr. Mawani noted that for C-1 sites, STIR guidelines suggest that density and form comparable to what is permitted under the City's C-2 guidelines would be appropriate. The proposal is for a site located on the corner of Slocan Street and East 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Mawani described the context for the area noting the Expo Line SkyTrain guideway is located to the immediate south with single family homes across the lane to the east. Rezoning the site to CD-1 will allow for the provision of secured rental housing as well as additional height and density on site, outside of what is currently allowed, but in keeping with C-2 guidelines. The development will include 41 units of rental housing and two commercial retail units. Parking is provided according to the parking by-law, with relaxations being granted for proximity to transit as well as provision of a car-share space on site.

Mr. Mawani noted that at a community open house, concerns were heard from single family home owners to the south and to the east with regards to the height of the buildings, and the associated impacts on views, shadowing and privacy. The site falls within the Renfrew Collingwood Community Vision Area which enables social or affordable housing projects, including projects with a legal agreement that guarantee units as rental, to be considered for rezoning without additional area planning. He also noted that the application is also consistent with Strategic Direction #1 of the City's Housing and Homelessness strategy that seeks to increase the supply of affordable housing in the City, with a particular focus on rental housing.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal for the site just south of East 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue opposite the SkyTrain cut near the 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue Station. Mr. Potter described the context for the area noting that the C-1 zoning allows for a mix of commercial and residential. The proposal is to rezone from C-1 to CD-1 to vary restrictions on height and density and to enter into a Housing Agreement under the STIR program. The height of the building is proposed to be 46 feet and four storeys, 11.32 feet higher than is currently achievable under the current zoning.

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

- Is the level of buildings articulation, materiality and detailing responsive to the context having regard for solar/daylight access (south side), relationship to neighbouring sites (north side) and general street presence (Slocan Street)?
- Given the importance of common garden space amenity, has its access and connection to units been successfully resolved.
- Will shadowing have an influence on the design development of this amenity?

Mr. Mawani and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Allan Diamond, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that one of the key aspects of building on the site was to not excavate and to negotiate with Engineering Services to have access for the parking from Slocan Street. He said most of the site is vacant and so what they chose to do is maintain the street line to orient the building north/south to allow more breathing space between the existing residential and the new building to the west. Mr. Diamond gave a bit of history of the site and the area. Mr. Diamond said that they wanted to come up with a building that was sustainable and maintainable. He described the material palette noting that they have a masonry façade front and back and will be using Hardy plank materials on the sides to add some colour to the building. It will be a LEED™ Gold rental building.

Jarrod McAleese, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He stated that the majority of the plantings will keep their leaves year around to maintain a full landscape presence. The space along the Hydro right-of-way will be lawn. There will also be community gardens available for the residents.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the articulation on the facades;
  - Design development to improve the residential entry;
  - Design development to simplify the material palette;
  - Design development to make the retail units more accessible;
  - Consider removing the urban agriculture and replacing with an outdoor amenity space;
  - Design development to improve CPTED issues;
  - Consider adding an irrigation system for the landscaping.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel thought there weren't any negative impacts regarding views and density on the surrounding neighbours. Several Panel members encouraged the applicant to improve the façade design especially on the north and south façades as they could use some openings. A number of Panel members thought there was a problem with the front entry and that it needed some enhancement to make it less hidden. The Panel felt there were too many proposed materials and suggested the applicant simplify the building parti by reducing the number of materials. Also they thought the having the bike racks at the entry didn't work.

The Panel supported the retail space but one Panel member thought there could be more than two CRUs. Several Panel members were concerned that the retail might not be viable considering it is at the end of the street and there isn't an anchor tenant. As well they thought the landscape plans might be hindering access to the retail space.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but was concerned about the viability of the urban agriculture plots on the east side. They thought that access to it was challenging and

it wouldn't receive a lot of sunlight during the day. One Panel member suggested making it a gathering node instead or making it more useable. As well a couple of Panel member were concerned with potential CPTED issues and thought there were privacy issues around the bedroom windows as they were too close to the walkway. One Panel member was disappointed that there wasn't a plant list included in the landscaping materials. Another Panel member thought there could be more landscaping on the lane for screening between the building and the housing opposite.

The Panel supported the applicant pursuing LEED™ Gold with one Panel member noting that there wasn't an indication of visible green building elements on the facades especially on the west where shading devices would help to mitigate solar gain. A couple of Panel members encouraged the applicant to add an irrigation system and to use a cistern to collect rain water to use in the landscaping. One Panel member suggested adding light wells on the top floor to give more light into the deep units and as well light could be introduced into the stairs on the south.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Diamond thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that there isn't a context for the area and so what they are trying to accomplish with this building is to have it pull away from the fabric of the community. They also thought it was best to attempt to be neighbourly and not shade the existing residential homes. He said they were prepared to keep working to improve the project.

---

5. Address:	2528 Collingwood Street
DE:	415763
Description:	To construct a commercial residential 4-storey building with one level of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2C1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Owner:	Alexis Holdings Ltd.
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Delegation:	Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture Andres Vargas, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Sailen Black

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)**

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for 24-unit building on Collingwood Street. The site is 66 x 105 feet with a height envelope on the north property line at 7.3 meters and 30 degrees to address solar access and the streetwall.

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

1. How well does the massing and height of the proposal transition to the single family residential scale of buildings across the lane?
2. Is the design of the light well and its dimension, material and tone successful with respect to providing daylight to the units? (Horizontal angle of Daylight requirements of 24 meters relaxable to 3.7 meters).
3. How well does the exterior detailing create visual interest, depth, articulation and relief as an overall contributor to the streetscape?
4. Does the corner CRU warrant any special design consideration?

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Andres Vargas, Architect, further described the proposal for a 4-storey building with a concrete base. He described the relaxation at the front which is based on the height of the buildings across the street and to help reduce the shadow impacts across Broadway. He also described the material and colour palette. Scott Kennedy, Architect, noted that the important thing about the building is that it's at the beginning of the commercial area. He described the concept behind the design and noted that the detailing is some modern elements mixed with some traditional elements. The light well is an idea to get relief in the middle of the building which creates light into bedrooms and cross ventilation.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
    - Consider making the residential entry bolder;
    - Design development in the loading and garbage area;
    - Consider a lighter colour palette in the light well; and
    - Consider opening up the lobby area.
  - **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting and handsome building.
-

The Panel noted that the massing didn't address the single family residential across the lane but thought it would be a completely different building and wouldn't be as successful. Some of the Panel thought the CRU should respond to the corner with a bolder expression. A couple of Panel members were concerned with the viability of the CRUs and thought that good signage could make them more noticeable. As well they thought the residential entry could be bolder. One Panel member suggested changing the canopy type to reflect the entry. Another Panel member had some concerns regarding the blank wall on the laneway and thought the concrete wall should be designed to mitigate graffiti.

The Panel thought some design development was needed on the loading area and garbage enclosure with one Panel member suggested they be separated. The Panel liked the light well with one Panel member suggesting the metal siding should be a lighter colour to help reflect daylight. Some Panel member found the residential entry a little hidden and was a bit of a tunnel to get to the elevator. They suggested opening up the area to improve the lobby experience.

Although the Panel supported the landscape plans one Panel member thought there should be more greening on the lane. Also it was suggested to discontinue the weather protection over the planting beds or to take the storm water off the roof and water that area.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Kennedy thanked the Panel and thought their comments were fair and very helpful. He added that they wanted to respect the neighbours across the lane so the idea was to bring the materials around the corner. He said he agreed there is still some work to be done that could improve the building.

### Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.