URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: December 5, 2012
TIME: 4.00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Daryl Condon
Vincent Dumoulin (left meeting after 4th Item)
Alan Endall
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #1 & #2)
Arno Matis (Excused Item #1)
Norm Shearing
Peter Wreglesworth (Excused Item #5)

REGRETS:
Geoff McDonell
Veronica Gillies

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 755-795 West 41st Avenue
2. 800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena)
3. 1729-1735 East 33rd Avenue
4. 3002-3036 West Broadway
5. 650 West 41st Avenue (Oakridge Centre)
BUSINESS MEETING
The business meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on December 3, 2012 where 3100 River Walk Avenue was presented to the Board. 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: 755-795 West 41st Avenue
   DE: N/A
   Description: The proposal is for a 6-storey residential building, at a total height not exceeding 18.6 meters with 100 units and a total FSR of 2.72 (including 0.25 FSR for market rental)
   Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
   Application Status: Rezoning
   Review: First
   Owner: Buffalo Investments
   Architect: Arno Matis Architecture
   Delegation: Arno Matis, Arno Matis Architecture
              Chris Phillips, PFS Landscape Architects
              Mark Lu, Buffalo Investments
              Jubin Jalili, Cobalt Engineering
   Staff: Ian Cooper and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning of five lots on West 41st Avenue between Willow and Baillie Streets. The rezoning is from RS-1 (single family) to CD-1 (comprehensive development) to add multiple unit residential use, increase the density from 0.6 to 2.72 and increase the maximum height from two storeys to six.

  The project is for two 6-storey apartment buildings along West 41st Avenue and 2-storey townhouses on the lane. Approximately 20% of the units will be rental with more than 50% being two bedrooms or greater. There is a planned courtyard between the main building and the townhouses. Mr. Cooper noted that LEED™ Gold is required under the green rezoning policy. He added that the site will potentially be heated by a district energy system. The site falls under the Cambie Corridor Plan and generally meets the requirements in the plan.

  Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and the context for the area with single-family homes to the north with the Oakridge Shopping Mall to the southeast. Mr. Black noted that there is 26 feet between the two main buildings and each building is about 119 feet in length. He described the architecture and mentioned the undercut form that is created by the overhanging second storey, the setbacks around the buildings as well as the distinctive exterior with expressed fins and edges. As well he described the policy for the site, the Cambie Corridor Plan, noting that townhouses are recommended on the lane for deeper lots.

  Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
  - Handling of courtyard and open spaces in terms of liveability and amenity for future residents;
  - Spacing between buildings in the streetscape;
Handling of the public realm interface around the edges of the site, noting distinct site conditions of rear lane, bicycle upgrades, arterial traffic, and secondary local streets.

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

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Arno Matis, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they meet or exceed all of the Cambie Corridor Plan courtyard spacing requirements. The townhouses on the lane have a single stand-alone unit on each corner with two duplex units in between. The parking entrance is mid-block and all of the loading and garbage is handled below grade. On the West 41st Avenue side the two large massing blocks vary a little bit in elevation with the stepping down of the grade. As well each building has its own separate core at grade. There is a social amenity space on each side of the south facing courtyard with an interior space and a social space in the courtyard. The project consists of rental units and the corner units are multi storey garden units. There are also a number of two bedroom units to meet the requirement for family housing. Mr. Matis noted that the shadowing to the north is decreased due to the shaping of the buildings. There are two outdoor social spaces on the roofs and then there are also some private decks in the corners of both buildings.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that they tried to take advantage of private ground floor spaces and every roof top. Every ground floor unit has some outdoor space while the courtyard has bamboo screening to give some privacy between the units. At the front the units will have access from West 41st Avenue. Also along West 41st Avenue is a planned bicycle route with a tree lined boulevard. There are three social spaces planned. One is at the ground plane between the two buildings and the two amenity spaces in each building flank that outdoor space. A dual level reflecting pool is planned for over the parking garage entry. It is proposed to have a centre swale of cobble and scored concrete in the lane. As well there is some greening on the lane edges. Willow Street will have a station for bicyclists with bike racks and a drinking fountain.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider adding access through the courtyard from West 41st Avenue to the lane;
- Consider moving the townhouse entries to the side rather than facing the lane.

**Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well-designed project.

The Panel supported the height, use, form and density and as well they appreciated the quality of the architecture. One Panel member noted that the applicant had a fundamental understanding of the urban context and the regulatory guidelines and was working with them in a clear way. The Panel agreed that the building form was original and would set a precedent in the neighbourhood.

Several Panel members suggested moving the townhouse entries to each side rather than having them front the lane.

Several Panel members thought there might be some privacy issues with the balconies and suggested using the guards and dividing elements to further the privacy.

Most of the Panel would like to see greater penetration through the courtyard rather than having the circulation stopped at the water feature. One Panel would like to see a semi-
public walkway through the site. They also noted that the narrow buildings were a good solution for adding more sunlight into the units.

The Panel liked the way the courtyard was handled but thought the bamboo meeting the trees might not be appropriate. Although they thought 26 feet was narrow for the courtyard, they agreed that it should be well detailed to make it work.

One Panel member suggested mimicking the modular expression of the building in the use of the materials for the bike racks.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Matis thanked the Panel for their comments. He said he liked the ideas of having the entrances to the townhouses from the courtyard rather than directly off the lane. As well he said he appreciated the comments regarding the flow through the courtyard and the pedestrian access.
2. Address: 800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena)  
DE: 416258  
Description: Interior and exterior alterations to change the west office tower users on the 13th through 24th floors to residential units.  
Zoning: CD-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Review: Third  
Owner: Aquilini Developments  
Architect: B + H Architects  
Delegation: Jim Vasto, B + H Architects  
Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architects  
Riaan de Beer, Aquilini Developments  
Staff: Anita Molaro  

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-8)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, explained that in 1993 the project went through a rezoning and the building was conceived in this location as an office building. It went through another rezoning this past year which included a change of use to the upper floors to residential from office use. It was brought back to the Panel at this time for comments on the change from all office to office/residential. She noted that one particular unique attribute of the building is the acoustical management of the noise impact associated with the Roger’s Arena. In addition to enclosed balconies there is a notion of having exposed balconies that can be closed with folding screens to achieve an acoustical buffer. At the time of the rezoning there were a number of items that were included, such as the enhancement to the upper floors.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
- Overall architectural expression, including the articulated resolution of the upper portion of the building;
- Proposed materials;
- Sustainability attributes (LEED™ Silver equivalency);
- Architectural resolution of the “exposed balconies” to address the additional acoustic performance requirements; and
- Detailed landscape treatments.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Jim Vasto, Architect, further described the proposal. Originally the development permit application was for a twenty-three floor office building and the proposal is now for a twenty-five storey tower with the top twelve floors being residential. The first twelve floors are unchanged with two exceptions: gate 8 has been enhanced, and the entry to the office portion changed. Mr. Vasto described the architecture noting the major changes to the top two floors. He pointed out that they had created a structure that won’t obstruct the views. On the east side of the tower they have an acoustics challenge. They worked with an acoustical engineer and as a result have reduced the amount of glass, and have added enclosed balconies combined with open balconies that can be closed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.
Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to improve the transition between the office and residential portions of the tower;
- Design development to improve the relationship of the top of the tower to the rest of the building;
- Design development to improve the expression of Gate 8;
- Design development to enhance the residential entry;
- Consider improving the residential unit layouts especially to the corner units;
- Consider strengthening the sustainability strategy.

Related Commentary: The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel supported the form and the addition of two storeys. The Panel had concerns regarding the transition between the office portion of the tower and the residential uses particularly on the east façade. A couple of Panel members noted that the two uses could be better integrated into the architectural expression. One Panel member stated that the building needed to be vertically integrated from the top to the bottom in its expression. They also thought the top of the tower could have some further resolution, although they did support the horizontal truss expression. Several Panel members noted that the continuous balconies were broken at the top and they felt they should harmonize with the rest of the tower.

The Panel felt that there could be some further design development to the Gate 8 expression. They also thought connectivity to Roger’s Arena needed to be strengthened or be distinguished more clearly.

The Panel thought the residential entry and adjoining canopies were too discreet and could be further distinguished to help people find that entry. They also suggested adding more greenery to the plaza area or providing more outdoor amenity space.

The Panel supported the acoustical response and thought the exposed balconies with the ability to close them was an interesting idea.

The Panel noted that there were some issues with the residential unit layouts with some Panel members commenting that some units were too deep with a lot of awkward planning, although they recognized the challenge of changing the use from office to residential. One Panel member thought some of the corner units might have acoustic issues.

Regarding the public art, it was suggested to use a local artist that could work with an international artist.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, the Panel though the LEED™ approaches to sun shading was perhaps not strong enough. One panel member noted that the extended mullions on the lower floors were not going to do anything for solar shading.

Applicant’s Response: Mr. de Beer noted that having more greenery on the plaza could be a problem considering the significant flow of people going through that space from the arena. As well, Engineering staff suggested that there be less landscaping on the plaza so the flow wouldn’t be restricted. He added that they calmed down the residential entry since people looking for the entry would be residents, although he thought they might have calmed it down too much.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>1729 - 1735 East 33rd Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Cedar Cottage Cohousing Company has applied to the City of Vancouver to rezone 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue from RS-1 (Single Family) District to a CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is for a three-storey multi-family residential development that will operate as a cohousing community. The project will consist of 27 strata-titled units and a common amenity space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>RS-1 to CD-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Status:</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect:</td>
<td>McCamant &amp; Durrett Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td>Farhad Mawani and Ann McLean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION:** DEFERRED
4. Address: 3002-3036 West Broadway
DE: N/A
Description: The development of a 5-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 83 secured market rental residential units above. Total height not to exceed 18.52 meters.
Zoning: C-2C to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning
Review: First
Owner: Orr Development Corp.
Architect: Yamamoto Architecture Inc.
Delegation: Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc.
David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects
Timm Orr, Orr Development Corp.
Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting
Staff: Grant Miller and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-2)

• Introduction: Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a C-2C site at the corner of West Broadway and Carnarvon Street to allow the development of a 5-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and secured market rental housing units above.

Mr. Miller noted that the proposal is being considered under the Rental 100 Policy adopted by Council in May of 2012. This new policy follows from the city’s experiences with the Short-term Incentives for Rental Housing Program. Rental 100 supports rezoning for additional height and density to be considered in the commercial zones when, as in this case, 100 percent of the residential units will be secured for as market rental for the life of the building. More specifically, the Rental 100 Guidelines support consideration of height increases up to six-storeys and commensurate achievable density on C-2C sites throughout the City.

Rental 100 also includes a Housing for Families Policy, which targets 25% of units to have two or more bedrooms and be designed to meet the City’s High Density Housing for Families with Children guidelines. The application proposes 83 residential units, of which 23 (28%) have two or more bedrooms.

Mr. Miller noted that Rental 100 applications that are rezonings follow the city’s Green Buildings Policy with a goal of LEED™ Gold with a minimum of 63 points including 6 energy points, 1 water efficiency point, 1 stormwater point, and application for certification.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal for noting that the proposal is for the rezoning of four lots on the south side of West Broadway. He described the context for the area noting the detached housing south of the lane and the 4-storey mixed-use buildings at the corners of Bayswater and Balaclava Streets nearby. The proposal is for a drug store and another retail space on the ground floor, with 83 residential units above.

Mr. Black described the C-2C District Schedule noting that staff are encouraging provision of an 18 foot width from the curb to the building in the commercial areas to support pedestrian travel and street life.
Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the following:

- Handling of building massing in relation to detached houses across lane to the south;
- Appropriateness of a 5-storey street wall on this particular section of West Broadway;
- Design of the commercial level in terms of frontage scale and pedestrian widths;
- Exterior expression in relation to local area character.

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

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that Shopper’s Drug Mart has a lease across the street that is expiring and they will become the single tenant in this project. Mr. Yamamoto described the architectural plans noting that along West Broadway they have stepped back a portion of the upper story and have done a similar treatment along Carnarvon Street. There are two five storey elements that bookend the site as a way to vary the volume. The use of various materials, colours, brick and the storefront treatment allows for a varied expression to the building.

  Mr. Yamamoto said he worked with the Shopper’s architect to develop a scheme that would allow a transparent storefront. As a result of the drugstore requiring the whole main floor, the residential lobby and the parkade entrance has been pushed to one side. Also, as a result they have located the residential lobby back from the corner which will also help to activate the lane and transition to the single family homes across the lane. The rear of the building has a setback to provide some privacy and distance from the single family homes. They are planning to have some vines to cover the back of house of the commercial. As well there is a small common roof deck on the 2nd floor with a small child’s play area and attached indoor amenity room.

  They are trying to take advantage of the orientation of the building with solar shading on the south façade and using a light coloured roof membrane as part of their sustainability strategy.

  David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that on West Broadway there are some existing trees that will remain. On the lane they wanted to create a green edge and have stepped the planters. The amenity area will have some soft surfaces for children’s play.

  Daniel Roberts, sustainability consultant, remarked that there is a blank wall on the western façade and the north façade doesn’t have any overhangs to allow for as much natural light into the units as possible. The south façade has larger overhangs as well as external devices for shading. He added that they have yet to do their energy modeling for the building.

  The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

  - Design development to improve the livability of the residential units;
  - Consider breaking up the continuous cornice on the 5th floor;
  - Design development to improve the expression of the blank wall;
  - Further articulation on the residential entry;
  - Consider an irrigation system for the landscaping.
• **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal in general and thought it would fit well into the neighbourhood.

The Panel liked the way the façade was articulated along West Broadway and thought the wide sidewalks was a supportable move. As well they supported the 5-storey street wall. They also thought the scale relative to the single family dwellings across the lane was well handled.

A number of Panel members thought there might be too much density within the 5-storey format and as a result some of the unit’s livability was compromised. One Panel member thought the deep living rooms with a lot of circulation would make it difficult to place furniture. It was suggested that the density be peeled back and reclaimed on a sixth floor to give better unit layouts. Another Panel member felt that with the way the units were currently configured, the livability doesn’t meet family-friendly criteria.

Several Panel members thought the continuous cornice at the 5th floor maybe a bit too much and should be broken in a few places. One Panel member suggested making it more strongly a collection of three buildings as opposed to one building to break up the length of the building. A couple of Panel members noted that the blank wall on the west side was a little relentless and could be expressed in a different way with materials or colour or perhaps a mural.

Although the Panel supported the location of the residential lobby they thought it could be articulated better. One Panel member wondered if reorienting the elevators would allow more light into the rather long and relentless corridors. Most of the Panel thought the single retail tenant would have a negative impact on the street. They noted that there needed to be some articulation to make the retail spaces have a more human scale.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but didn’t support the landscaping on the slab without any irrigation. As well a couple of Panel members thought the south deck was in a good location and had a good relation to the indoor amenity space but thought it might be too small. As well the children’s play area needs to be programmed. One Panel member suggested adding a tree in the bump out at the Carnarvon Street corner.

• **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Yamamoto noted that there are lots of residential units similar to the ones planned for this building. He also noted that with only one commercial tenant they tried to modulate the expression. As well they worked with Shopper’s architect to make sure there aren’t any blank walls other than where the elevator core is located. He added that it is a challenge to make all the density work on the site.
EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

- **Introduction:** Dwayne Drohot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for the site at the corner of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street regarding the 28 acre Oakridge Shopping Centre. The centre was originally built in 1956 as an open air centre, and was enclosed in 1983. Mr. Drobot described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the north and east of the site as well as the multi-family dwelling to the south and the west, with heights of 6 and 11-storeys. Currently there is 650,000 square feet of retail with 1.4 million square feet proposed. There is also currently 120,000 square feet of office space with 425,000 proposed and 50,000 square feet of residential with 2.7 million square feet proposed. Heights are at 7-storeys currently with proposed heights to 45-storeys.

Mr. Drobot noted that in 2007, Council adopted the Oakridge Centre Policy Statement. The Policy Statement establishes principles and objectives to guide the redevelopment of Oakridge Centre over the next 10 to 20 years. Since 2007, there have been a number of other city wide and area policies adopted by Council including the Cambie Corridor Plan.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that in moving ahead with the redevelopment of Oakridge Centre, it becomes the most significant and comprehensive opportunity for change along the Cambie Corridor. In assessing the application, Ms. St. Michel stated that there is a potential to have Oakridge become a municipal town centre serving the broader community, be a transit-oriented development at a key crossroads, and a neighbourhood serving focal point for the existing and evolving community.

Ms. St. Michel described some of the key aspects of the 2007 Policy Statement including the following:

- Permeability and connectivity were two important principles in the policy plan. One of the key organizing elements was a new dedicated public high street that would become part of the city’s street network, a dedicated public shopping street (cars, pedestrians
and bicycles) with residential above and linked to West 41st Avenue and Cambie at Heather Streets and at West 44th Avenue.

- The policy recognized the continued presence of the mall, but sought to make it more permeable and accessible through a direct connection from the station plaza area through to the High Street. This connection would be open to the public throughout the operating hours of the Canada Line.
- Two other diagonal cross routes that lead to two dedicated public park spaces at grade.
- Retail: Mall expansion to a second level, with anchor spaces extending out towards the site edges. Site edges ‘wrapped’ in street-oriented retail on Cambie Street, supporting a local shopping street.
- Continuation of mall operations meant limited ability to alter the central portion of the site, carry a second level, and it could not support active uses on the roof. An extensive green roof was envisioned in the central portion.
- Opportunity for greatest change in areas of completely new construction including two clusters of towers of varied scales 12 – 24 storeys, transitioning downward in height from the corner towards the neighbourhood. Tower floor plates consistent with downtown south and new waterfront neighbourhoods of 6,500 square feet.
- Mid-rise street wall residential primarily along the southwest seam with the existing community.

Ms. St. Michel described the current proposal noting the High Street configuration with a proposed connection from Heather Street on West 41st Avenue. This space would be for pedestrians and not vehicles but accessible to bicycles, and access would be secured with a statutory right-of-way and not a dedicated public street. Major underground parking entries are proposed, along with two connections at grade through the mall. Also proposed is an upper level of retail with anchor spaces expanding out towards Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue. One of the biggest changes from the 2007 plan is the active publicly accessible and programmable open space on the roof. The roof will be activated with connections and linkages with community amenities, the community centre, auditorium, childcare and library. Ms. St. Michel added that there will be a higher intensity of residential, retail and office uses with more buildings and more variety of building types. Five types of residential buildings are described in the application, eleven towers of three types ranging in height from 18 to 45 storeys.

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

1. Density Height and Massing: What is an appropriate building form, height and density for a redeveloped Oakridge Centre?
   - the proposed intensity of development (residential and retail) as a transit-oriented development and a municipal town centre;
   - the proposed heights in the context of the evolving neighbourhood; and
   - scale and massing of the varied building types (gateway, terracing streetwall, point towers, earthwork towers).

2. Connectivity and Permeability: How well does the proposed development connect and integrate with its context?
   - directness and permeability of public routes through the site. Connections to transit; and
   - connections and integration with the surrounding neighbourhood - the city grid to the north and east; the off-grid alignments and lanes of the area to the south and west.

3. Public Place-making: How public are the public places on the site?
• accessibility and visibility of the roof-top open space. Transitions to grade;
• the design and nature of the High Street;
• animation of the Cambie Street frontage as a pedestrian and local shopping street; and
• edge conditions along 41st Avenue.

Mr. Drobot and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

• Applicant’s Introductory Comments: Gregory Henriquez and Thomas Lee, Architects, made a Power Point presentation that discussed the commercial and residential aspects of the project. Some of the high lights of the presentation included:

• the public realm with a rooftop commons spanning the entire footprint of the Oakridge Centre with numerous programmable spaces;
• major anchors include the Bay, Target, Safe and another major store to be named;
• office space includes three office components in locations chosen for proximity to transit and ease of pedestrian access;
• transportation and circulation with a new high street bisecting the site to increase permeability and accessibility and to reduce the presence of automobiles;
• retail that includes both neighbourhood-serving and destination retail;
• residential with a range of housing types and forms located strategically across the site;
• amenities include a new library, seniors centre, community centre and daycare.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that the internal streets will have no traffic and will be used be pedestrians and cyclists. There will be approximately eleven and a half acres on the roof top which will be publicly accessible.

There are a number of key elements in the public realm including children’s play areas, several different plazas along with gardens and seating areas. Public art is included in the site, including the structure at the corner of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

• Related Commentary:

Density Height and Massing:
• It’s an aggressive scheme but the density can be accommodated;
• Height and massing needs to be looked at in a broader context;
• At 42-storeys, it is getting into the realm of the tallest buildings in downtown Vancouver;
• With 23 acres along a transit line there is no better place to do this proposal than here;
• Tower floor plates are the correct square footage as anything over 6,500 square feet is exciting and anything less is not efficient;
• The site could benefit from increased density in the north east corner;
• A higher residential component on the north east corner would be an improvement by perhaps stepping down sharply to lessen the impact;
• There might be too much density on Cambie Street and seems too monolithic;
• Do there need to be three office buildings with the same vocabulary.

Connectivity and Permeability:
• There shouldn’t be any physical barriers so security needs to be thought about in a different way;
• The internal streets and external streets seem the same and perhaps it is working thinking about having some covered and uncovered streets;
- Feels like the design is internalized and not connecting in a strong way to the community;
- Find other ways to access the roof without using just stairs, escalators and elevators by bringing the landscaping down into the street;
- The park does need to come down to grade as a way to become part of the neighbourhood;
- The park needs to be visible from the street, at the transit plaza and the southeast and northwest corners of the site;
- People should be able to ride their bike or use a wheelchair from one side of the site to the other;
- Important to research how people will arrive to the site;
- Is there a possibility of a net zero community in one of the phases or a way to look into going beyond LEED™ Platinum;
- The image of the terraced rice paddy is the right one.

Public Place-making
- No discussion regarding the West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street edges;
- Could be an interesting relationship between the west and east sides of Cambie Street;
- Is a big box storefront the right kind of use on the street edge to match the smaller scale retail further north on Cambie Street;
- When do you stop making a street a retail integrated street; perhaps this portion of West 41st Avenue should just be an expression of what is happening in the internal spaces;
- Don’t think West 41st Avenue could support retail shops but it could still be a pedestrian street;
- Safeway would have street presence on Cambie Street;
- The Community Center might need to be a separate building and could be facing the public space while still adjoining the southeast side of the site;
- The buildings look randomized but the ordering of identify of the public buildings could give a sense of destination.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Gillespie said he appreciated the Panel’s comments. It is a very big project, and important project and they will take all the comments under consideration. He added that the team has had similar conversations regarding the project but some great new ideas had come out of the workshop.

---

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:53 p.m.