

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** August 1, 2012

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Robert Barnes (left after Item #3)  
Helen Besharat  
Gregory Borowski (Chair)  
Daryl Condon  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Alan Endall  
Veronica Gillies  
David Grigg  
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #3) (Present for Item #4 only)  
Geoff McDonell  
Norm Shearing  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:** Arno Matis

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	4949-5109 Cambie Street
2.	5675 Mason Street, 665-685 West 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue, 5688 Heather Street
3.	5501 Boundary Road
4.	2118 West 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (previously 3113 Arbutus Street)

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

The business meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on July 30th where 1155 Hornby Street was presented to the Board and approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 4949-5109 Cambie Street  
 DE: N/A  
 Description: The proposal is for three buildings with a total of 161 units. Heights of 6-storeys, and proposed FSR to 2.39.  
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Formwerks  
 Delegation: Jim Bussey, Formwerks  
 Kim Barnsley, Formwerks  
 Daryl Tyacke, Eckford Tyacke and Associates  
 Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group  
 Staff: Dwayne Drobot and Sailen Black

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-2)**

- **Introduction:** Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for ten single family lots along Cambie Street just south of McGuigan Avenue. The site is bounded by single family RS-1 lots to the west and south, with the Cambie Historic Boulevard and single family homes to the east of the site, and a church to the north of the site. West 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a bicycle route.

Mr. Drobot noted that the proposal is for three buildings of six storeys each. He provided excerpts of the Cambie Corridor Plan to assist the Panel with their commentary. Section 4.3.3 of the Cambie Corridor Plan provides the specific policy for the site, stating that in this area, residential buildings will be allowed up to six storeys. The density range for the site is 1.75 to 2.25 FSR. It is an estimated range and not a limit, based on intended urban design performance with respect to site size, form, typology, height, and scale. The policy also encourages exploring opportunities to develop unique and notable buildings that respond to reinforce view lines and perspectives created by the unique alignment of Cambie Street. The Cambie Corridor plan also identified a connection through this site to connect West 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue (and Queen Elizabeth Park) to the RCMP site. This connection is a mid-block pedestrian link to break down the scale of the block and creates a finer-grained series of connections to existing open space.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting there will be three building with a total of 185 units. Mr. Black mentioned that the Cambie Corridor Plan is a policy document and not a district schedule and it does not specify side yards or separation between the main buildings on the same site. The Plan supports up to six storeys and recommends 10 to 15 foot setbacks from Cambie Street with 24 feet between the courtyard and the main building. He added that if the Plan were applied literally to the site, the resulting development would have 120 foot rectangular buildings with a 50 foot gap between buildings. Instead a more varied combination is proposed with three 6-storey buildings, with a stepped plan arranged along the curve of Cambie Street which in turn has

varying boulevards. Mr. Black added that the project will be built under the Rezoning Policy for Greener Buildings.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the architectural and landscape design in general, and in particular:

- Does the proposed siting, building and landscape design taken together respond to the goals of the Cambie Corridor Plan for this area, noting the recommended limit on building frontage of 120 feet?
- Are the spaces and dimensions between new buildings on the site, especially between the interior faces of each six-storey building, sufficiently developed to ensure the livability of new residences and reflect the intended openness of this area?
- Does the massing of the rear elevations, especially the central block, create a sensitive response to the neighbourhood context?

Mr. Drobot and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Kim Barnsley, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the buildings were mirrored and have a formal composition. There is a 12 foot setback along Cambie Street with 10 feet on the sides. As well, there is a slight slope across the site. The basic form of the building steps back with a strong streetwall and it is broken up with vertical elements. The back of the site is stepped down at the third level to the 2-storey townhouse expression. She noted that they have tried to mitigate shadow impacts to the residential neighbours and to expand views to Queen Elizabeth Park. The units are oriented towards Cambie Street with planting and raised terraces for a clear pedestrian entry point. The courtyards are 24 feet apart and the space between the buildings will be about 42 feet. There are some private patios in the courtyards with some semi-public outdoor spaces. The 2-storey townhouses have private yards with entries off the lane. Parking access for the project is between buildings two and three which is closer to mid-block. Ms. Barnsley described the architecture noting that it is a grand promenade style with a family oriented estate-like feel using high quality materials. Materials include cultured stone at the base with brick elements at the entries. She added that they are proposing private occupied roof decks. Ms. Barnsley described the sustainability strategy noting that the project will be certified and registered as LEED™ Gold. For mechanical systems they are looking at using a radiant system that will be adaptable to the planned future district energy system.

Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the proposal noting the ground floor units are accessed through a raised terrace off Cambie Street and are screened from the street. The breaks between the buildings will have lower arbors at the entry and simple sitting areas with water features. The lane will have some urban agriculture. A sense of park has been pulled into the site. The higher roof tops will not be programmed but the lower roofs will have some landscaping.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Reduce relentlessness that results from all three buildings using the guidelines the same way;
  - Use colour and materials to enrich the buildings further;
  - Strongly needs an indoor-outdoor larger gathering area above grade;
  - Reconsider the symmetry;
  - Respond to the church and different Cambie Street axial context at the north end;
  - Design development to the middle building to create a distinct expression;

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it has met the guidelines. They also supported the use and form of development.

The Panel thought the proposal was responding to the guidelines along the Cambie Corridor in general. They supported the stepped profile on the north and south elevations and also they supported the lane interface. They felt the project was successful in modeling the massing down to the single family residential across the lane. They also supported the space between the buildings as a strong move. A number of Panel members had some concerns with the size of the courtyards and as well they were concerned with the repetitiveness of the three buildings and suggested the middle building have a different expression. Several Panel members thought there could be a loosening up of the expression and that it was a missed opportunity to not add a sense of fun in the architecture. They also thought the corners on the two outer buildings should be more prominent.

A couple of Panel members thought that the use of different colours and materials could help to achieve a variety that seemed to be missing in the project. One Panel member noted that the window wall expression seemed extremely horizontal relative to the rest of the design.

Most of the Panel thought the courtyards needed more room with one Panel member suggesting one of the townhouses could be deleted and as well to change the massing on the lane. Also, perhaps the lane could be developed as a mews. Another Panel member thought the lane interface needed more landscaping to soften it and that it should be year-round plant materials. Several Panel members thought there could be some common roof top amenity space, as they were concerned with the lack of amenity space in the project. As well, some Panel members thought the entrance to the parking should be moved north.

Although the Panel supported the landscape plans some members thought it could be improved with larger scale trees to add richness and character to the project.

One Panel member thought there could be some form of public art expressed on the corner of Cambie Street and McGuigan Avenue.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy and energy aspects of the project but thought there could be some solar shading on the south and west facades.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bussey thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed that they could bring more joy to the project.

2. Address:	5675 Manson Street, 665-685 West 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue, 5688 Heather Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The application proposes to rezone the site to permit a 6-storey residential development over 1 ½ levels of underground parking. The proposed density is 3.1 FSR, with a gross floor area of 10,741 meters (115,617 square feet) and a height of 17.7 meters (58 feet).
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	Second
Architect:	Formwerks
Delegation:	Jim Bussey, Formwerks Kim Barnsley, Formwerks Daryl Tyacke, Eckford Tyacke and Associates Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group
Staff:	Dwayne Drobot and Sailen Black

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-1)

- Introduction:** Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for five single family lots between Heather and Manson Streets along West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue. The site is bounded by Single Family RS-1 lots to the north and west of the site. East of the site is a 6-storey building developed before the Cambie Corridor Plan was approved by Council. South of the site is Oakridge Centre which went through a Policy Planning Program in 2007 and is going through further study prior to a rezoning application. Mr. Drobot noted that this is the second review by the Panel of this proposal. A previous design was reviewed and not supported by the Panel in March 2012.

The proposal is for two buildings of six storeys each. Mr. Drobot provided excerpts of the Cambie Corridor Plan to assist the Panel with their discussion. Section 4.4.3 of the Cambie Corridor Plan provides the specific policy for the site. He stated that in this area residential buildings can be allowed up to six storeys. The suggested density range for the site is 2.0 to 2.5 FSR. It is an estimated range and not a limit, based on intended urban design performance with respect to site size, form, typology, height, and scale.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal. The site is located two blocks west of the 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue Canada Line Station. The proposal is for a full block development comprised of five single family lots. Mr. Black noted that the Cambie Corridor Plan allows residential buildings up to 6-storeys. The buildings will provide front doors onto the street and will seek to enhance the lane by providing unit entries there. He also noted that the intent of the Corridor Plan is that residential-only buildings reflect existing patterns of apartments in area, as a series of discrete frontages created by distinct and separate buildings with open, permeable landscaped space between buildings. Since the proposal is a rezoning, it must also meet the Green Building Policy for Rezoning. The applicant will register under LEED™ and apply to certify.

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

- 1. South massing:** As an urban design response to this context, and considering the proposed combination of shoulder lines, building separation and other massing elements, does the overall form of development provide the openness between buildings intended in the Cambie Plan?

2. **Space between buildings:** Considering the two courtyard widths between the buildings, and the height of the elevations, does the proposal provide enough space for the livability and amenity of future residents?
3. **Public realm interface:** Looking at the proposed ground plane and first storey, including grading, landscape, patios, townhouses, entrances and parkade ramps, does the proposed design create a successful pedestrian-oriented environment from the street to the buildings?

Mr. Drobot and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Kim Barnsley, Architect, further described the proposal noting the changes since the last review. The FSR and massing has been decreased substantially which also decreased the unit counts. There is still a 20% component for rental units. Originally they had proposed one building with a glass element in the middle. The building is now broken into two with a 24 foot courtyard at the front with all the main living spaces facing the street. The stepping at the lane has been revised and they have created a three storey expression at the lane whereas the previous application had a more of a two storey expression. They have maintained the two storey townhouse expression with bay windows and entries onto the lane. The stepping at the front has also been revised and they have simplified the expression. They also have a better relationship to grade as it is a steep slope. The sideyard setbacks have been decreased from 15 feet to 12 feet but they are still maintaining 15 feet along West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue. There are two entry lobbies off West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue that are articulated with different materials and a vertical element. There is a landscape courtyard with water feature at the front entry. Ms. Barnsley described the material palette. She described some of the sustainability strategy noting that they have reduced the window wall ratio to about 42% and they have introduced some passive techniques including sun shading. She noted that the parking access is close to Heather Street on the lane. As well, the stair wells on the courtyard have been opened up using natural light and ventilation.

Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, described the plans noting that they tried to stay to the original scheme of raised terraces, concrete, perforated metal and a more urban hard edge design. With the change in the design now for two buildings, they have proposed a water feature in the space between the buildings. Most communal activities will take place up on the roof with community gardens, arbours with tables and potting sheds. There will be both an extensive and intensive green roof. Landscaping is proposed for some of the lower level corners.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Develop more of an architectural idea for the development;
  - Consider access from the side streets to help with the central courtyard;
  - Design development to improve dark and narrow space between buildings;
  - Consider how to make the open spaces into amenity areas for people;
  - Consider a more contemporary expression in keeping with the context for the area;
  - Design development to provide more privacy between the units;
  - Consider an amenity space opening into the courtyard.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design had improved a lot since the previous review.

The Panel agreed that the project was improved and that the lane side had more stepping and better related to the residential to the north. As well, they noted that the south frontage had been simplified. They also thought the project had benefited from the reduction in the density as it gave more breathing space around the site. Some Panel members thought the massing needed some improvement and there could be a lightening up of the colour palette.

Several Panel members would like to see a more progressive contemporary expression like the midcentury modern buildings in the area. A couple of Panel members suggested maximizing the openings with one Panel member suggesting the exit stairs could be glazed.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding the livability of the rental units as they are long and could be dark. Also, a couple of Panel members would like to see an amenity space open to the courtyard as they thought it should be used for more than just a thoroughfare.

One Panel member thought there was too much urban agriculture and not enough patio space on the roof.

One Panel member thought the breezeway wasn't in the right location and suggested flipping the plan on the east building to allow for more light into the space. A couple of Panel members were concerned with the livability in the suites as they didn't seem to have much privacy. One Panel member suggested staggering the windows or another sensitive approach to provide more privacy.

Most of the Panel thought the sustainability aspects had been improved but still had some concerns with the glass to solid wall ratio and would like to see that reduced to help with the energy performance in the building.

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

---

3. Address:	5501 Boundary Road
DE:	415742
Description:	Application to construct three residential towers, mid-rise and two podiums of community amenities and commercial spaces.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Third
Owner:	Wall Financial Corporation
Architect:	GBL Architects
Delegation:	Stuart Lyon, GBL Architects Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
Staff:	Anita Molaro

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)**

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that the Panel had reviewed the project previously. She stated that the applicant would describe the changes since the last review. She did note one significant change with regards to the reconfiguration of one of the towers. As well she noted that there has been a change from one of the design development conditions of the rezoning that called for two towers to have the same floor plate and one tower to have a larger floor plate in keeping with the Collingwood Neighbourhood larger floor plate of a certain scale.

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

- does the panel support the detailed urban design response developed for this mixed use development including:
  - revision to the massing strategy for podium that now links the two Boundary Street towers
  - the general massing strategy to reduce the apparent scale of the tower and podium elements
  - architectural expression that enhances the towers individual identity while still maintain a strong relationship to each other
  - to provide variety and interest to the architectural expression of the buildings
  - massing response as a singular massing form of the lower mid-rise building (along Ormidale) as a transitional form between the higher density tower and the low-rise (single-family) residential context across the street
  - the proposed materials as high-quality, durable materials that contribute to the character and quality of the area
  - integration of the building(s) public realm interface(s) given the varying slopes of the site and site edges
  - detailed design response to the site circulation, open space and landscape treatments, including
    - integration with circulation/open space patterns of neighbourhood including public connections through site to Boundary/Vanness corner
    - legibility and treatment of pedestrian connection up through site from Foster Street through to Boundary Road
    - detailed design treatment of pedestrian/vehicle mews
    - overall landscape treatments including roof treatments
  - sustainability attributes (LEED™ Gold)

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.



- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, described the changes to the project since the last review. He stated that they have done a tremendous amount of redesign on the site although it is still three towers with a height limit that is fixed in the zoning along with the amount of density. The three towers have been completely redesigned. The Ormidale Street building is the same building however the landscaping has been redesigned to accommodate a revised foot print on Tower 3 which is the park tower. Tower 3 is now part of the ensemble rather than different from the other towers on the site. The major move was to twist the tower back onto the same grid as the other two towers. That gave some livability improvements in the tower as the views from the suite bypass the immediate towers. They changed the base as well with a strong edge along Vanness Avenue. It has been curved in response to a comment from the Panel. The corners have been bent to give them a flatiron look that will provide some nice suites on those edges. The entrance on Vanness Avenue and Boundary Road has been redesigned to give a more welcoming gesture with the community space in the base opening into the plaza. As well, brick has been added to the material palette for the podium of Tower 3. Regarding the other two towers, Mr. Lyon noted that they shifted density out of Tower 2 into Tower 1 considering it is closer to Kingsway. The towers have been reconfigured so they are less rigorous in their expression. The materials are still Swiss Pearl and window wall but they have been rearranged. Previously the towers had a symmetrical, vertical format of materials arranged on them and now the towers are not identical. They are composed of two parts using different materials. The Swiss Pearl will be on the west and south sides which gives them an opportunity to reduce the size of the windows in order to respond to the solar conditions. The percentage of glazing remains at 50% or slightly below. On the previous submission there was a podium which has now been removed on Tower 2, and the bridge element is thinner with a more modest profile.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the changes to the landscape plans. He reminded the Panel that there is a gas pipeline running through the site and does not allow walls, ramps, stairs or trees in the right-of-way. The connections through the site have been improved as well as the plaza space. The water feature has been reduced and a lawn area has been added next to the play area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider opportunities for public art;
  - Review the solar exposure strategy and consider adding solar shading.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the Panel's previous comments had been taken into consideration by the applicant in the current design.

The Panel agreed that there had been significant improvement in the proposal since the Panel's last review. They thought that scale, interest and fun had been introduced into the project. They felt that the bridge element had been fully resolved however a couple of Panel members thought the third building should be better connected to the other two towers.

The Panel supported the landscape design and thought it had gone further since the last review. One Panel member suggesting adding a significant piece of public art in the large public realm space or adding several pieces throughout the site.

The Panel had some concerns regarding solar issues as they thought the sustainability strategy should be improved to meet the City's energy codes. As well, they thought the

orientation of the buildings had been ignored when it came to the issue of sun exposure and heat gain into the units. One Panel member suggested adding canopies on the Ormidale Avenue tower over the top balconies for weather protection and reduction of solar gain.

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

---

4. Address:	2118 West 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (previously 3113 Arbutus Street)
DE:	415745
Description:	To develop this site with a mixed-use building containing commercial units on the ground floor with residential units above all over three levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second
Owner:	Cressey Development Group
Architect:	IBI Group
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Group Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects David Evans, Cressey Development Group
Staff:	Anita Molaro for Paul Cheng

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-1)**

- Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, gave an overview of the zoning and guidelines for the site. The site is zoned C-2 which allows for a development of mixed-use commercial and residential buildings. The site has been zoned C-2 since 1956. The C-2 District Schedule and C-2 Guidelines were amended by Council in 2003 following a comprehensive review including public consultation. At that time, some of the key changes to the District Schedule included a reduction in the allowable FSR from 3.0 to 2.5 FSR, an increase in the base height to 45 feet from 40 feet, and increased setback provisions to address neighbourliness with adjacent low-density residential contexts. Ms. Molaro noted that the guidelines address the opportunity for staff to consider increasing the height from 45 feet to 55 feet for larger sites provided that the impacts of the height relaxation on overshadowing, overlook, or views of neighbouring residential development are not unduly worse than with a development that conforms to the height limit and setbacks prescribed within the basic building envelope. She also noted that site services, parking and loading, are to be served from the lane. The existing condition within the Arbutus Street right-of-way is a parking area that has access from southbound Arbutus Street and egress onto westbound West 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Under this application, this parking area will be removed and replaced with a plaza/green space. The proposal is for a five-storey mixed-use building with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above. Loading and vehicular access is proposed from the existing rear lane.

Ms. Molaro said she needed to clarify a statement made by staff in the previous presentation to the Urban Design Panel. One in which that staff stated that the 5<sup>th</sup> storey of residential is in exchange for converting the City owned land from a parking lot to a public park. Two aspects about this statement need clarification.

- The additional height increase requested from 45 feet to 55 feet is a permitted discretionary increase that the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board can consider under the C-2 district schedule and is not tied to the closure and landscape improvement contemplated for the Arbutus Street right of way.
- While staff referred to the greening of the street as a park, technically it is not a formal park but falls under Engineering purview as open green space.

Ms. Molaro added that there is a large Metro Vancouver water line as well as a City-owned pump station currently existing within this street right of way.

The applicant proposes a building mass, particularly along the rear elevation where this site interfaces with a lane and low-density residential zones beyond, that increases the rear setbacks at all levels of the building to better address matters of liveability (e.g.

overlook, shadowing) and neighbourliness. Ms. Molaro asked the Panel to carefully consider the shadow analysis the applicant provided illustrating the shadowing of a typical 45 foot building/and setbacks versus the proposal's shadowing/increase setbacks along with the measures to improve overlook and neighbourliness, and asked that they comment on the additional height being considered.

Ms. Molaro noted that at the previous Design Panel, the members raised a number of concerns around the treatment of the loading bays which the applicant now proposes to provide an enclosure for; projecting corners of the living rooms in the west facing residential units have been removed and setbacks increase at the upper floors to reduce overlook. The planting at level 2 has been lowered to reduce the height of the wall along the lane with additional landscaping to cover the wall. Continuous planting along the edge of the level 4 terrace and the clerestory design at level 5 has been redesigned to be more integrated. The main commercial entrance has been relocated at the base of the vertical massing feature.

The application proposes to remove the existing parking area and develop this portion of the street right-of-way with an expanded pedestrian-oriented public realm including enhanced hard and soft landscape features. This is in keeping with the City's "Street-to-Park" initiative (Greenest City Action Plan - Access to Nature) which looks for opportunities to make better use of surplus street space with an enhanced public realm. This newly created open space will remain part of the street right-of-way. While the Parks Board will maintain the landscaping it is not formally park but rather green open space under the jurisdiction of Engineering. The landscape treatment being proposed is a row of legacy trees, low planting, and a south plaza for pedestrian and commercial activities.

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

- Is the additional height (55 feet) supportable given the design measures implemented to address neighbourliness (overlook, shadowing) with respect to the lower density residential neighbourhood to the west, in comparison to a typical C-2 height envelope? Are there further measures or alternatives that should be considered/employed?
- has the proposal addressed the previous concerns and commentary raised by the UDP including:
  - improve wayfinding to the commercial parking access
  - enclosure of the loading to mitigate impacts to the residential
  - simplify the W. 16<sup>th</sup> façade to reduce the blank expression simplify the façade on the lane portion and address overlook issues through terracing of the upper floors
  - better incorporation of the "Ridge" sign into the project
  - the use and programming of the open space to be better activated by the building's ground floor uses
  - ground floor retail designed so that smaller incremental retail uses could be accommodated.
- overall architectural quality including:
  - resolution of the commercial entry with the vertical massing
  - interface of the commercial frontage with the expanded public realm
  - integration of the building's public realm interfaces, given the varying slope of the site and site edges, in particular the building interface along W.16<sup>th</sup> avenue and bus stop
  - material treatments
- landscape treatments including:
  - the expanded public realm treatments
  - landscape treatments integrated within the west massing

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal noting the setbacks on the west side of the site. He said they simplified the massing and although it is still a terraced building but has a more orthogonal expression. He went on to describe the other changes they have made to the expression of the building. They have tried to reduce shadowing and overlook to the adjacent residential properties. He also noted that there is an opportunity for cross ventilation in the suites. Mr. Bruckner described the material palette, noting that it is more clearly organized since the previous review. The planting on the second floor has been pushed down to mitigate the height of the wall. He noted that they are breaking up the façade on Arbutus Street with some articulation separated with the Ridge sign. The open space has been reshaped with a more defined grade across the slope of the property. The bus shelter will be at the foot of the step in the boulevard. The ground floor commercial has been reorganized into even bays for future smaller CRUs should the food store not be realized.

Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He noted that there are two areas that have changed, which include the open space in the front and the landscaping in the lane. Starting with the plaza on the corner, planning had asked the applicant--in response to the busy West 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor—to make this an open space. They have provided a generous open space for a possible future outdoor café area and access into the building. A number of seating areas are being provided using a concrete base with a wooden top. Also, a landscape buffer will be added along Arbutus Street. He described the type of legacy trees that are planned for the site noting that they are intended to live 300-400 years so they will need a generous growing space for the roots. He said he felt the space was engaging for families as they have included a maze, and at one end there is a seating area for social interaction. The north side has an entrance plaza and on the lane they have lowered the planter to reduce the effect of the wall height.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to the roof popups;
  - Design development to improve the neighbourliness of the loading bay;
  - Design development to add more glazing to the ground floor commercial along Arbutus Street;
  - Consider reviewing possible light pollution to the residential across the lane;
  - Consider reviewing the roofscapes; and
  - Consider heritage tree species for the legacy trees.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and felt the applicant had responded to their comments from the last review.

The Panel agreed that there was a handsomeness to the building, that the increased setbacks had resolved the issue of the additional height and that the exterior elevation had been simplified. They also thought the commercial uses had been improved with the legibility of entries and the potential for breaking the area up into smaller units. As well they thought the servicing area had been improved and was much tidier. However some Panel members thought there might be some programming issues in order to provide better neighbourliness to the residential across the lane. A couple of Panel member questioned the use of white concrete noting that it often looks dirty with age. As well a number of the Panel members were concerned with the popups roofs and felt they needed to be reviewed as they could cause light intrusion at night to the neighbours.

Some Panel members thought there was an opportunity to have public art in the public realm on the Arbutus Street plaza.

Some of the Panel thought the roofscapes and the top floor was still somewhat busy and that the architectural expression could be improved at the roof line. One Panel member was concerned with the glass boxes on the top floor due to potential solar gain issues. Another Panel member suggested adding privacy screens on the top floor decks. Several Panel members thought there could be more glazing on the ground floor commercial to improve the expression. Some Panel members thought the colour palette could be toned down a bit.

The Panel felt the ground floor uses were more flexible and thought the whole Arbutus Street frontage had been cleaned up including an improvement in the landscape design. They liked that the programming could be adapted to the uses in the building. They also commended the applicant for restoration of the Ridge sign which gave a historical relevance to the building. The Panel felt the laneway landscape plans had been improved and have reduced the overlook to the neighbours. Regarding the legacy trees, some Panel members thought heritage species should be considered.

The Panel also supported the sustainability strategy including sharing heating and cooling from the commercial area with the rest of the building that could be augmented with solar panels. One Panel member suggested adding shading devices on the south and west facades and having operable windows and light wells on the top floor. A couple of Panel members thought a green roof on the roof above the loading could be considered.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner thanked the Panel for their input and said they were helpful.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.