

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** April 24, 2013

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Ryan Bragg  
Walter Francl  
Joseph Fry  
Veronica Gillies (Arrived after the second item)  
David Grigg  
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #1)  
Joseph Hruda (Arrived after the first item)  
Phil Mondor  
Goran Ostojic (Arrived after the second item)  
Norm Shearing (Chair)  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:**  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Daryl Condon

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	933 East Hastings Street
2.	508 Helmcken Street
3.	1121 Seymour Street
4.	1628 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
5.	170 West 49 <sup>th</sup> Avenue

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Shearing called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 933 East Hastings Street  
DE: 416627  
Description: To construct a 12-storey mixed-use building with four levels of underground parking.  
Zoning: CD-1 pending  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: GBL Architects  
Owner: 900 H.S. Holdings (Bruno Wall)  
Review: Second (First as Development Permit)  
Delegation: Stu Lyon, GBL Architects  
Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects  
Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects  
Staff: Anita Molaro

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following a rezoning. The site is along East Hasting Street at the corner of Raymur Avenue. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the manufacturing zone to the north. The site was rezoned in 2012 and increased the density from 5 to 6.5 FSR and the height. The project consists of both market and non-market residential in three towers and a podium expression. On the ground there are two levels facing the lane and one level facing the street with a new use called PDR (Production Distribution and Repair). This builds on the manufacturing and smaller business type format to encourage those kinds of uses. There is also a limited amount of office and retail uses that are permitted to allow of a variety of uses on the ground floor. Ms. Molaro noted that the sustainability requirement is that it has to meet LEED™ Silver. As well she mentioned that there are some changes to the building design since the rezoning review including a ten meter setback and dedication along the rail corridor and road connection.

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

Does the Panel support the detailed urban design response developed for this site:

- Response to the rezoning conditions:
  - Improve and enhance the DPR plaza and its pedestrian connection to the lower level PDR uses and lane;
  - Refinement of the architectural details of the façade to fully demonstrate the design intent of its robust industrial character references and materials.
- Detailed open space and landscape treatments.
- LEED™ Silver strategies (based on time of rezoning application).
- Redistribution of building massing and resolution of northwest corner in response to the rail corridor/street alignment dedication.
- Public realm interface of the various facades: Hastings Street, Raymur Avenue and the lane.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, made some general comments to the project noting there will be three primary users groups. This includes market housing, non-market housing and PDR spaces. He said they wanted to fully integrate the 70 non-market units into the project and as well they combined one of the residential towers with the non-market units which will make for a seamless approach between the market and non-market units. He explained that on the PDR side there is an opportunity on the lane to introduce this light industrial use. They wanted to engage these units as much as possible with the public realm. All the street facing spaces have big fold up doors and also through the center of the project is an open public passage way.

Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, described the changes to the project since the rezoning. The current configuration reflects the new realignment with Raymur Avenue along the rail corridor. They relocated the density that resulted in a portion of the building being cut away into the tower on the west in the form of one additional storey and an increase to the residential floor plates. They also lowered the podium by one storey allowing for more daylighting into the plaza. Mr. Eisenberg explained Council's recommendation to integrate different uses. As a result they have created a common lobby and opened the outdoor amenity space on the north side to both market and non-market residents. He noted that from a sustainable point of view they have limited the size of the openings and the amount of exposed slab edges. The balconies on the south façade provide shading during summer and they have incorporated insulated spandrel glass panel. The east and west walls are punched windows within a metal clad window assembly.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the East Hastings Street entry plaza that has been kept unobstructed since the freight elevators will be used to move pieces in and out of the building. He said he wanted to pick up on the light industrial character. The mixed courtyard space will have urban agriculture, a play area, seating areas and overhead trellis. It is a place for residents to mix. As well there is a common area space for the market housing units on level seven that will provide urban agriculture, play areas and seating areas. Mr. Hemstock added that there are also green roofs.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider more landscaping elements in the plaza space;
  - Consider adding a public art piece to the project;
  - Consider adding solar panels to improve the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an improvement since the rezoning submission.

The Panel thought the proposal was an adventuresome piece of architecture and thought the pedestrian connection through the site had been improved. As well they noted that the applicant had gone a long way to address the Panel's previous comments. The Panel liked the refinements to the massing and thought it gave emphasis to the modulated heights of the towers. A couple of Panel members would like to see more development to the chamfered elements. One Panel member thought there could be more playfulness in the design at the corners. As well, one Panel member suggested cantilevering over the podium.

The Panel agreed that the amenity spaces were well defined. Although the Panel said they understood the desire to keep a clean industrial look to the design they felt the plaza

needed some landscaping. As well they thought there needed to be more effort and greenery in the landscaping. One Panel member suggested adding one or two trees in the plaza to give some shade and shadow to the space.

It was suggested that public art should be incorporated into the project with one Panel suggesting placing it in the plaza to make an interesting place for people to want to explore.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, it was suggested that solar panels could be used for preheating water.

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

2. Address:	508 Helmcken Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a 36-storey residential tower with school use at grade. A maximum density of 17.02 FSR and a maximum height of 320 feet is proposed.
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Brenhill
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Julian Pattison, Considered Design Landscape Architects Max Kerr, Brenhill
Staff:	Karen Hoese and Sailen Black

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-3)

- Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, described the proposal for a rezoning on a site at Helmcken and Richards Street at the north end of Emery Barnes Park. It is currently the site of Jubilee House, a social housing site. The rezoning application proposes to increase the density and height beyond that permitted under the current zoning. The intent is to build a 36-storey tower including 428 residential units of which 73 are proposed as market rental and a private pre-school and commercial retail unit at grade. Ms. Hoese noted that in 2008, as part of the Benefit Capacity report, Council endorsed consideration for addition height and density in the DTS, up to the underside of the approved view corridors through rezoning to achieve public benefits. As part of this application the applicant is proposing to provide social housing at 1099 Richards Street including replacement housing for Jubilee House residents currently located on the site. The provision of new and replacement social housing as well as the provision of market rental housing is consistent with Council policy and the City's housing objective. Ms. Hoese mentioned that all rezoning are subject to the Green Building Policy which requires that rezonings achieve LEED™ Gold with specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting the new bikeway coming to the north side of Helmcken Street. As well there is a view corridor extending from Choklit Park to Grouse Mountain that limits the maximum height over most of the site to approximately 324 feet. There is another view corridor from Laurel Landbridge to Crown that limits a portion at the corner to approximately 266 feet. Mr. Black explained that the Downtown South guidelines for the New Yaletown area recommends a form of development that is intended to provide for relatively high density living while preserving access to light, view and air for residents. To this end, the guidelines recommend a tower plate of no more than 6,500 square feet in area, but allow a wider podium base to form a well-defined street wall set back twelve feet from the property line to accommodate a double row of street trees and a transition area from the public to private realm. Setbacks on the other sides are recommended at 40 feet from interior property lines for building portions over 70 feet tall, and 30 feet of rear yard for building portions over 35 feet tall, which help provide at least 80 feet of separation between towers.

Advice from the Panel was sought on the following questions:

- Taking into consideration current zoning and guidelines,
  - does the Panel support the proposed height (320 ft.), and density (17.1 FSR); and

- does the Panel support the proposed setbacks (0/20/30 feet), tower width (125 feet), and plate size (10,130 sq. ft.), within this neighbourhood context?
- Given the surrounding context and its location on Emery Barnes Park, is the revised form of development for the base of the tower (including open space and setbacks) a good fit for this part of Yaletown?
- Does the Panel have any advice on the overall design with regard to:
  - Neighbourliness including shadow and view impacts
  - Open space and landscape treatments
  - Preliminary comments on the exterior composition or expression in response to this unique site and context?

Ms. Hoesse and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal and said he wanted to focus on the comments from the last review. He acknowledged the Panel's comment regarding improving the relationship between the tower and the park and stated that they have moved the whole building back twelve feet. He also noted that they wanted to place the building in the park and let the park go around the tower which was in part to keep the tower profile continuous all the way to grade. Since they didn't receive support for this expression they have created an orthogonal base that relates more strongly to the urban context. This gives more definition for the school and articulation to its entrance. Mr. Lyon noted that the building wasn't relating to Brookland Court (the building next door) and they have now taken that into account by reorienting the Helmcken Street frontage to follow the alignment of Brookland Court. He mentioned that there were comments about the top of the building being too flat so they have created a bevel and recessed balconies with chamfers on the corners of the building. As well they have narrowed the width of the slot. Mr. Lyon mentioned that they have improved the maneuverability for vehicles in the lane. He also explained that there is a need for a certain density on the site in order to support the non-market housing project across the street but they have reduced it a bit and made the floor plates a little smaller. He described the material and color palette proposed for the project.

Julian Pattison, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping for the project and noted they have changed the paving pattern and will transfer some of the ideas from the park. They have created a landscape buffer that anchors the corner of the school. Along Richards Street there is a line of street trees with a series of raised terraces to separate private and public spaces in front of the townhouse units.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve how the tower meets the base;
  - Design development to improve the entry sequence;
  - Design development to improve the termination of the tower;
  - Design development to the landscaping for a greener edge to the park;
  - Consider other ways to activate the ground floor.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the response at grade and how the park was relating to the tower had been improved.

The Panel appreciated the applicant's response to their comments from the last review however while the panel supported the height and density they still had a number of concerns regarding the proposal. They thought that one of the biggest issues was how the tower meets both the podium and the park. The design development of the tower from the original submission has improved but the Panel felt it needs additional refinement. There was a great deal of discussion on the tower and a number of recommendations were made such as allowing a portion of the tower to be expressed at the base. In addition the Panel suggested the entry lobby be made smaller and more area be given over to retail, and the water feature at the corner be reduced or eliminated altogether. A number of Panel members felt that the park was still fighting the building and seemed to have a back edge to the park. One Panel member suggested letting the park end on the south to make it stronger and to explore the idea of having a green edge.

The Panel supported the south elevation of the tower as this will be the facade of the building that will be most experienced by the general public from the park however they felt that further design development needed to occur on the other free elevations. The Panel also expressed concerns over the design of the top of the tower.

Most of the Panel felt the lane way had too much hard surface area and suggested the applicant explore softening the expression and making it a stronger multi-purpose link to the park. One Panel member wondered why the lane was being continued around the building and suggested it could end at the loading bay.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon said he appreciated the Panel's comments. He agreed that the project had some significant challenges in landing density but hopefully the Panel would see that they are willing to respond to the commentary. He said he wanted to assure the Panel that their comments would find their way into the design.

---

3. Address:	1121 Seymour Street
DE:	416617
Description:	To construct an 8-storey thirty-nine dwelling unit multiple dwelling building and a 2-storey one dwelling unit building on this site.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Endall Elliot Associates
Owner:	Wall Financial
Review:	First
Delegation:	Alan Endall, Endall Elliot Associates Architect Doran Fishman, Eckford Tyacke & Associates Landscape Architect
Staff:	Paul Cheng

---

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

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site between Helmcken and Davie Streets. The proposal is for a 72 foot tall building which staff considered was in keeping with the parameters of the ODP. Mr. Cheng noted that in working out the siting of the project, staff were open to a courtyard concept that allowed an open view through the site but were concerned with the amount of unadorned blank sidewall of the neighbouring development. In response the applicant has proposed to locate a 2-storey townhouse against that sidewall, which staff accept as a good design move.

Mr. Cheng explained that in the assessment of the proposal, staff had two minor concerns about the general landscaping treatment facing the street and the lane. Facing the street, the entrance sequence involves a grade change that requires a ramp which is currently proposed in a slightly circuitous fashion, with an entrance gate that seems rather high as seen from the sidewalk. As well, at the rear lane interface, the projects in this zone are expected to provide a high quality lanescape through the provision of hard and soft landscaping and the avoidance of blank walls.

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

- 1) Does the proposed treatment of the front yard provide a high-quality and animating interface with the public realm?
- 2) Does the proposed treatment of the rear yard provide an aesthetically-pleasing appearance of the lane edge?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Alan Endall, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the guidelines for the area tend to recommend for infill sites more of a front to back organization. This would result in half of the units facing onto the lane that might have liveability issues so they thought the courtyard arrangement made for wide shallow units and they get a view to the park across the street. As well they get good sunlight exposure and they look onto the courtyard space. Mr. Endall noted that each suite has an enclosed balcony as well as an open balcony that face one another. The single townhouse unit was added at the advice of staff and he said it works well to frame the courtyard for added privacy. There is a small amenity space off the lobby that is available to the residents with two units at grade with private patios. He stated that they are at LEED™ Silver for the sustainability strategy.



Doran Fishman, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the two large street trees that will remain with an addition of a second row. He described the landscaping for the courtyard and mentioned that stepping up the parking garage ramp is a set of stairs with natural materials and some lighting. As well there is a water feature in the courtyard. The roof will have urban agriculture with built-in seating area and green roof that is not accessible.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider flipping the enclosed balconies;
  - Consider adding an element at the top of the stairs in the courtyard;
  - Design development to improve the solar response on the building.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a good example of an infill project.

The Panel thought the project was very well handled and had a great transition from the sidewalk into the private and public spaces. The Panel was mixed in support of the townhouse. While some thought it was a good addition others thought it didn't belong. One Panel member thought it wasn't necessary to conceal the neighbouring building and thought there were ways to landscape the area to soften the wall. Another Panel member felt there was an opportunity for an urban mansion but thought it cut off views to the park. As well one Panel member suggested having a coffee shop on the corner that could activate the courtyard.

A number of Panel members thought the enclosed balconies should be flipped in order to take advantage of the view to the park.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel member suggesting the front entry could be more open to understand better the location of the lobby. Also it was suggested that a little more space on the lane could be used for greening the blank wall. The Panel also liked the landscaping over the entry to the parking garage. However, several Panel members suggested having a destination at the top of the stairs such as a bench or small pool with bubbling water.

A couple of Panel members thought there could be some improvement on the sustainability side especially regarding the solar response on the facades. One Panel member thought the applicant might have some difficulty meeting the City's green policies and suggesting looking at alternative mechanical systems. Also it was suggested that the townhouse should have a green roof to improve the overlook.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Endall thanked the Panel for their comments. He said he liked the idea of flipping the enclosed balconies and they would look into that possibility. He noted that there are a lot of restrictions for enclosed balconies and wanted to set up a situation with the living space having the opportunity to see diagonally into the park.

---

4. Address:	1628 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
DE:	416161
Description:	To construct a mixed-use 4-storey building with commercial on the 1st storey and residential on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> storeys containing 50 dwelling units over three levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2B
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill Architects
Owner:	Radius Communities
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects Cameron Thorn, Ledingham McAllister Landscape Architects
Staff:	Agatha Malczyk

---

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

- **Introduction:** Agatha Malczyk, Development Planner, introduced the project to develop a 4-storey, mixed use building containing commercial at grade and three levels of residential with a total of 50 dwelling units. Ms. Malczyk described the context for the area noting the light industrial zoning to the north and south. She also mentioned that transportation and traffic are important influences for this site in the forks of the Granville Street Bridge off ramps and intersection to West 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Malczyk noted that the proposed height has been reduced from 5-storeys to 4-storeys. As well there have been several revisions including a revised massing, redesign of the outdoor space on the second floor and change in some of the materials. Proposed density is the same.

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

**1. Previous Comments.**

1. Were the issues identified by the first UDP review, related to the massing and expression of the building, landscape treatment, residential amenity, retail frontage and setbacks, adequately resolved?
2. Does the Panel support the height relaxations proposed?
3. Does the Panel have any comments regarding the proposed colours, materials and details?
4. Does the proposed scheme address:
  - Building articulation in response to the site context and the proposed use?
  - Livability as it relates to the privacy and access to daylight by the individual units?

Ms. Malczyk took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Keith Hemphill, Architect, further described the proposal and reminded the Panel that when they had their last review the Panel was concerned about the character, fit and context. He said they focused on how to manage the character of the building and as a result of their discussions with staff, settled on the current scheme. He said the building now has a contemporary response and fits more into the ongoing development of the area. He added that they were encouraged to match the height of the building next door and they have tried to simplify the expression. There is a stronger and different character on the northeast corner with a strongly colored fin to keep the emphasis on the corner as this is an important intersection. As well they simplified the back of the building and internalized the west residential exist that now comes out to the street. The roof has been handled with access from all of the fourth floor units and there is

a common outdoor terrace with direct access from the elevator lobby on the fourth floor. Mr. Hemphill noted that they simplified the colour and material palette. He added that they have a slab depression that will allow for enough soil depth for the trees. As well they have introduced trellises and vines to green the various walls.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the residential entry
  - Design development to commercial and residential canopies along West 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  - Consider improving the canopies on the south side to allow for more daylight into the units;
  - Consider improving the liveability of the units on the south side;
  - Consider a lighter colour palette and integrate the colour of the fin with the rest of the building;
  - Consider improving the common outdoor amenity space;
  - Consider adding common outdoor space on the roof.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the height, massing and character were in keeping with the neighbourhood.

The Panel felt the applicant had made an attempt to simplify the highly complex massing and made it fit better into its context. Some of the Panel members thought the canopies on the south side were oversized and were obscuring too much of the daylight, especially into the recessed bedrooms which raised concerns of liveability. They did however, support the solid canopies on West 4th Avenue but thought there should be glazed elements over the residential entry and the corner retail space.

They also thought the residential entry required further design development and to re-evaluate the location of the elevator as its present location was severely compromising the entry lobby. One Panel member said that the residential entry needed to read as a key feature on the building face.

Although the Panel supported the use of the fin on the building and thought it created a point of interest visually on the corner, they felt that the colors needed to be tied into the rest of the building which has a fairly dark colour palette. The panel also suggested the applicant review the colour palette of the building.

The Panel had some concerns with regard to the usability of the residential amenity space as it didn't seem to be a very attractive space to spend time in. One Panel member noted that the amenity space was too heavily covered by the roof canopy. As well the Panel noted that there needed to be more development on the roof top uses and thought that a portion of the roof should be given over as a common amenity space.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but wanted to see more plantings on the private roof decks and thought the area could be better programmed. A couple of Panel members thought the paving at the ground plane needed some attention.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, one Panel member suggested using energy from the commercial space for heating the residential.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hemphill thanked the Panel for their comments. He said he agreed that the ground floor canopies could be more transparent and that the residential

entry could be enhanced. As well he thought there was room to simplify the paving patterns. Mr. Hemphill said that a common amenity is perceived as difficult in a wood frame building as acoustics become an issue. He did however agree that there were lots of room to improve the outdoor space on the fourth floor amenity.

---

5. Address:	170 West 49 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (Langara College)
DE:	416605
Description:	To construct a 5-storey, 12,600 sm Science & Student Services building at the main northeastern entrance to the existing college campus on 49 <sup>th</sup> Avenue.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Brook Pooni Associates & Teeple Architects
Owner:	Langara College
Review:	Second (First as Development Permit)
Delegation:	Steve Teeple, Teeple Architects Kavi Chan, Proceidum Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg Landscape Architects
Staff:	Colin King

---

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

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 5-storey Sciences and Student Services Building on the existing northwest entrance to the Langara College Campus at West 49<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The proposal is in line with the amendment to the Campus Masterplan that the Panel supported in May 2012. This reorganized the proposed location of future phases, notably relocating the Creative Arts building to the rear of the site and the Sciences/Student Services building to the front and reorganizing the main pedestrian spine along a new 'theatre axis' feeding into a quadrangle type movement around the campus. The 3-storey volume of the Sciences building will sit on a 2-storey glazed podium and cantilever over the vehicular entrance and drop-off space.

Mr. King noted that the public realm works in this phase will include landscape upgrades along the boundary with West 49<sup>th</sup> Avenue to improve pedestrian and cycle permeability, provide covered bike parking as well as develop an entry court and a west court connecting the college to the park. Surface parking remains to the rear of the site in this phase with spaces lost made up in existing underground parking.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

- Can the Panel offer commentary regarding the quality of the space created at ground level beneath the cantilevered volume, specifically with regard to activation of the space and whether occupant access to the building from the drop off space is desirable?
- Can the panel offer some commentary regarding the exterior expression of the upper levels of the building, with specific regard to its responsiveness to solar orientation?
- Does the proposal satisfactorily address previous Panel concerns with respect to shadowing of both 49th Ave and the entry court in the afternoon?

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Steve Teeple, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the master plan for the campus was developed in early 2000 with the idea of transforming the area into a sequence of student spaces formed by the building and animate spaces with student activities. Mr. Teeple described the architecture noting the building picks up the key east/west axis on the master plan. He added that they wanted active student spaces on the first two floors and to bring activity to the west court they have developed a food services area that connects to the reflecting pool court through sliding patio doors. The labs will be in the upper levels of the building. Mr. Teeple added

that they will be looking for LEED™ Gold minimum and plan to use heat recovery and other energy efficiency systems. He added that they are also using a mix of transparent and translucent glazing on the base.

Kori Chan, Architect, mentioned that they tried to keep the building as transparent as possible and to be able to see up and through the building by using the circulation space that is lite through the use of an oculus (skylight). The floor space is open, interconnected floor space that is part of the air movement strategy which is part of the sustainability strategy.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that they will be increasing the ability to move through the site in between the trees. The southwest courtyard has lots of area for the students to occupy when using the food services space as there are with seating with tables. They are planning a small amphitheater using the existing berms and as well expanding the existing bioswale into a newer system as part of their stormwater strategy. There is also a lighting strategy using building lighting, ambient lighting and street level lighting.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to move the landscaping further into the campus;
  - Design development to increase lighting under the cantilevered portion of the building;
  - Consider other surface material for the outdoor spaces;
  - Design development to the mechanical penthouse;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a bold and adventurous design.

The Panel thought the project was exciting and well resolved. That said there were concerns regarding it being used as a gateway element into the campus when the remaining entry sequence has as yet not been resolved. There was considerable commentary on the surface treatment below the overhanging element with many members believing the landscaping needed to extend to the point of arrival to connect with the rest of the campus. The Panel felt that in order to minimize the shadowing of the entry and the neighbouring public realm that a great deal of care needed to be taken in the design of the ground plane particularly as it applies to the use of asphalt. It was suggested that public art could be involved as well as further design development to the lighting design.

While the glazing system of the building is compelling a number of panel members thought it needed further design development as it looked arbitrary when considering different exposures and interior uses. A couple of Panel members thought the mechanical penthouse needed further design development as it lacked the same degree of design resolution as the rest of the building. Further refinement of the "box" or something, completely different to counterpoint the building, were discussed.

Several Panel members mentioned that the design of the building relied on the resolution of the details and hoped that the same design rigger, as displayed in the submission, would be carried throughout the building.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, it was suggested eliminating the thermal bridging and that relying on negative pressure in the building would be challenging.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Teeple said he liked the Panel's comments and noted that the gold glass on the oculus (skylight) should be reflective on two sides. He said a lot of the space will be experienced as a vehicular gateway as well as a pedestrian space.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.