

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 29, 2014

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Walter Francl (Excused Item #1, #2 & #5)
Joseph Fry
David Grigg
Phil Mondor
Joseph Hruda (Excused Item #1 - Left after item #4)
Jennifer Marshall
Arno Matis (Excused Item #1 & #4)
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #4)
Maurice Pez (Chair)
Matthew Soules (Excused Item #4)

REGRETS:
Ryan Bragg
Goran Ostojic

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 1755 West 14 th Avenue |
| 2. | 1166 West 14 th Avenue (L'Ecole Billingue) |
| 3. | 4500 Oaks Street (Children's & Women's Health Centre) |
| 4. | 799 West 41 st Avenue |
| 5. | 55 Expo Boulevard (International Village Elementary School) |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Pez called the business meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. The new Panel members were introduced and a chair was elected for the remainder of the year (Ryan Bragg). Mr. Pez then noted the presence of a quorum and the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1755 West 14th Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: To construct one 12-storey multiple dwelling building and one 3-storey townhouse building, allowing for the retention of the existing 13-storey, market rental building. This development proposes a total of 122 new market rental units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.
 Zoning: RM-3 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Review: First
 Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Delegation: Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Peter Odegaard, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Peter Kruek, Durante Kruek Landscape Architects
 Staff: Janet Digby and Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Janet Digby, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal and gave an overview of the policy background for the proposal. The intent of the Rental 100 policy is to encourage private sector development of market rental housing and to ensure that they remain rental units for the long term. Since development of market rental housing has been seen to be economically challenging in recent years, the policy provides a variety of incentives to improve the financial picture for developers. Specifically these include an increase in density and height, reduction in parking, relaxation of unit sizes, DCL waiver and concurrent processing. As well many applications are not accessed with a CAC and that is based on a pro forma review of the project finances. Ms. Digby noted that this proposal is an infill project in that there are large site areas available for further development of rental housing. In addition to the policy there are some guidelines. Relevant to this proposal are two provisions: one is that additional floor area can be granted based on projects being subject to urban design review and the City's livability standards. Also, there are some general guidelines that relate to multi-family developments. These are that tenants are not to be displaced and for applications in RM-3 zoning, the rezoning proposal must adhere to the existing height limits with is 120 feet.

Colin King, Development Planner, further described the proposal to add a second tower and townhouse development to the existing rental complex. He described the context noting there are a number of four and twelve storey residential buildings in the area as well as some low scale residential. Currently the site has a 12-storey building with 135 units, gardens and a pool at ground level as well as two levels of parking for 177 stalls. The proposal comprises of the addition of two rental buildings. These include a six unit 3-storey stacked townhouse form as well as a 12-storey tower with 116 units and new parking levels and the relocation of the pool to an area between the towers. Mr. King described the zoning for the proposal and mentioned that the RM-3 zoning is essentially an outright zone for medium density residential. This means that there are no design guidelines but instead

an objective to achieve a higher quality of parking, open space and daylight access through floor area density bonuses. As well he described the access as per current arrangements for the parkade as well as what has been proposed with the new development. As well he noted that significant trees around the perimeter of the site will be retained.

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

General commentary was sought from the Panel on the overall success of architectural and landscape design proposals and with particular advice on the following:

- The contextual fit of the new tower as it relates to massing and expression.
- The townhome component of new development as it relates to the provision of open space across the site and the creation of a transitional massing element within the streetscape.
- The quality of the open space provided between the towers as it relates to the interface with both new and proposed rental buildings and with West 14th Avenue.

Ms. Digby and Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Whitehead, Architect, further described the proposal and noted the neighbourhood plan that identifies rental towers in the area. All those buildings were built in the 1970's. He said that the proposal will set a precedent for this type of development. In terms of the parkade, it needs to be maintained, which determined how buildings were added to the site. They wanted to put as many units as possible per floor and ended up with 10 units per floor. Four are two bedrooms and the rest are studios and one bedrooms. Mr. Whitehead described the architectural plans for the proposal noting that in terms of massing the, they tried to take some cues from the existing building. The townhouses are wood frame structures and slab on grade. He described the colour and material palette noting that they will be lighter in colour than the existing building. In term of LEED™, the slab extensions provide sun shading on the southwest and east and are carried over on the north for continuity. He added that they will be pursuing LEED™ Gold and using water based heating systems and insulation of the slab extensions.

Peter Kruek, Landscape Architects, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there is a mature landscape already on the site. The townhomes have entrances off West 14th Avenue and also an entrance at the back. The ground floor units have patio areas with a garden. He said they aren't planning on adding any landscaping around the existing tower as it was upgraded recently. The common amenity has access from the towers and with the grade change the pool deck has a set of stairs with the change rooms within the new tower. There are trees along Burrard Street that will be retained. As well there is urban agriculture planned in the slot between the buildings.

The application team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve solar response;
 - Design development to improve the termination of the tower;
 - Consider removing the townhouse block and leaving the pool in its current location;
 - Consider moving the garden plots to the roofs of the new towers;
 - Consider improving the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a good contextual fit.

The Panel acknowledged that the proposal is going to be a significant intervention on the neighbourhood however they did support the project as it is providing additional rental units. As well they liked that there is a number of units for family housing being offered.

The Panel thought the proposal had been well-handled given the size and massing of the development. As far as the expression was concerned the Panel thought the applicant had taken the context of the existing building into consideration by providing horizontal and vertical lines that are picked up in the new buildings. Some Panel members thought there was an opportunity to break away from that somewhat and create something a little more distinctive that responds more to passive solar response and the different orientations and scale of the street.

Several Panel members thought the termination of the tower could be use some design development to make it more interesting.

The Panel thought the townhouse block was a good transitional piece but there was some concern around whether or not it was an appropriate addition to the site. They noted that the townhouse block puts pressure on the neighbourhood amenity of the open space and the landscape concept. Some of the Panel members thought the pool was moved out of a program need to add townhomes rather than have it in a sunny location that was integrated with other functions like the children's play area.

Some Panel members thought the garden plots on the lane didn't work and thought that they could be added to the roof along with an outdoor amenity space.

It was noted that since there may be a number of children moving onto the site and would be attending local schools, that perhaps there was a need to add a traffic light on Burrard Street.

Some Panel members thought the applicant could improve the sustainability strategy such as adding solar panels for domestic hot water. As well they thought the entire energy performance of the project could be improved by looking at the potential for double glazing in the existing tower.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Whitehead said he appreciated the comments. He agreed that the issue of the pool keeps coming up. They did a shadow study regarding the location and have met with the residents with that in mind. Mr. Whitehead said he would be happy to revisit the issue.

2. Address:	1166 West 14 th Avenue
DE:	417413
Description:	To construct a new elementary school on this site.
Zoning:	RT-2
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Colborne Architecture Group
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Delegation:	Al Hepburn, Colborne Architecture Group Margot Long, PWL Landscape Architects Jay Hiscox, Vancouver School Board
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-3)

- **Introduction:** Mr. King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal to construct a replacement school as part of the Vancouver School Board (VSB) seismic upgrade program. The school occupies a city block bounded by West 14th Avenue to the north, West 15th Avenue to the South, Spruce Street to the East and Alder Street to the West. The site is surrounding by RM-3 zoning which includes towers and apartment blocks as well as two and half storey residential. The new school consolidates the existing portables, additions and the original school block into one centrally located building broadly following the siting of the original school. This allows the school to maximize the continuity and extent of the outdoor play spaces along both West 14th Avenue and West 15th Avenue. The school sits on a small site by VSB standards relative to the capacity (485 students) but the school is broadly within expectations of the zone as it relates to heights and setbacks. The existing staff surface parking for 21 spaces will be retained at the corner of Alder Street and West 14th Avenue and access from West 14th Avenue. As well bike stalls are adjacent to the parking. The main pedestrian entrance will be located off West 14th Avenue as well. Mr. King explained that the LEED™ Gold certification is required by the VSB. He described the material and colour palette noting the use of painted cementitious paneling and accent colours to elements such as canopies and frames around the entrances.

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

General commentary was sought from the Panel on the overall success of architectural and landscape design proposals and particular advice as it relates to:

- The expression of the larger blank volume of the gym within the east elevation.
- The extent of hard surface play space proposed.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Al Hepburn, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the intent was to replace the school largely in the location it is now with the exception of the gym which they have removed and replaced. He said they would like to get a better setback around the building with different activities on the sides. They are keeping the large playfield intact and also keeping the parking in its current location. He said they are locating all the classrooms in clusters, at two storeys, with a small learning community model. Mr. Hepburn further described the programming for the school. As well he described the architecture noting that the building is frame construction. He described the material palette noting the use of ground face concrete block veneer largely on the lower levels and some of the larger volumes around the gym. As well they are using cementitious panels on an upper band and are planning to express some variety in colour on the panels. Mr. Hepburn noted that they are proposing sunshades on

the south side that descends and turns into a bench next to the door into the classrooms. He described the sustainability strategy and mentioned that they are targeting LEED™ Gold and have a consultant on the project.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and mentioned that they worked closely with staff and the parent's group. They are keeping the existing trees on the perimeter and will be adding some additional ones to fill in the gaps in the landscaping. They are also keeping some of the existing granite stairs and slabs by incorporating them into the new landscaping. They have utilized a lot of the existing site features such as the grades and walls. A lot of staff and children ride their bicycles to the school so there is a large staging area for them to park their bicycles. Ms. Long mentioned that they are providing a rain garden near the parking lot to clean some of the water. As well there are a number of other rain gardens as well as a native garden. There is a large gardening program already on the site with an orchard and urban agriculture.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider a different colour palette;
- Design development to improve the access to the site;
- Design development to improve the east stairs;
- Design development to improve the landscaping in the parking lot;
- Design development to improve the pit in the southwest corner of the site;
- Design development to move the air handling units;
- Design development for access to the roof.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the architectural design as well as the proposed materials. They had no concerns regarding the volume for the gym or the amount of hard surface on the site. A couple of Panel members noted that it will be important how those surfaces are treated. As well some Panel members thought the overhangs could be increased considering the amount of rain that happens in the city. A couple of Panel members thought the colour palette was depressing for a school and thought the colours should be more playful.

A couple of Panel members thought the access to the site could be improved. Although they appreciated the existing conditions they were concerned as there are only two areas where disabled people can get access to the building. They thought there needed to be access from all four corners of the site. As well one Panel member noted that the only ramp to the front entrance is through the parking lot.

A couple of Panel members thought the east stair off the multi-purpose room could be developed further and that some playfulness could be added into the landscaping design. One Panel member thought the curves could inform the stair feature. Since the parking can't go underground, one Panel member suggested adding more greenery in the parking lot and perhaps adding some trees that will screen the cars. Another Panel member suggested adding a grass running track around the space.

Regarding the landscaping, the Panel thought there were some nice moves on the site in relationship to the building edges and they liked the seating area off the music room although one Panel member thought it could be further developed. As well a number of Panel members thought the stepped edges needed some refinement. One Panel member suggested using the grade for some additional play value. As well the Panel had some

concerns regarding the pit in the southwest corner of the site. They felt it did not have a friendly relationship to the street. A couple of Panel members wondered if the air handling units could be placed elsewhere on the site as they are facing the courtyard at the library.

Regarding sustainability, the Panel appreciated the efforts but thought that some future proofing of the building along with access to the roof would be beneficial. As well the Panel thought that access to the roof was important.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hepburn thanked the Panel for their comments. He said they had lots of different ideas for the arrangement of the site but after consultation with the users they decided to have the larger play areas.

Mr. Hiscox said the design was the product of a very engaged school community.

3. Address:	4500 Oak Street (Children's & Women's Health Centre)
DE:	417576
Description:	To develop a new 8-storey Acute Care Centre of about 53,035m ² over one level of underground parking. This includes inpatient units, an emergency department, medical imaging and procedural suites, hematology/oncology, pediatric intensive care, high risk labour and delivery suite, and neo natal intensive care unit for BC Children's Hospital.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Third (first as Development Application)
Architect:	ZGF Architects
Owner:	Provincial Health Services Authority (PHSA)
Delegation:	Allyn Stellmacher, ZGF Architects Dan Simpson, ZGF Architects Vikram Sami, ZGF Architects Ken Larsson, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Inc. Eleanor Lee, PHSA
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-9)

- Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site bounded by West 32nd Avenue, Oak and Heather Streets as well as West 28th Avenue. It is a 46 acre site sloped from the southeast corner down to the northeast corner. He described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the west, east and south of the site. Mr. Black gave a brief history of the site noting that the Panel had seen the rezoning proposal in November 2010. In May 2012 the Panel reviewed the overall Master Plan. The CD-1 By-law was amended in November 2012 along with the associated Master Plan guidelines and design standards were approved in principle by Council. The By-law extended permitted height in the centre of the site to 148 feet with limited exclusions such as an elevator overrun. Mr. Black mentioned that the main Conditions of Approval recommended for the development permit of the building were tree replacement, limiting shadowing and providing open spaces for respite and repose.

Mr. Black explained that the proposal is for an 8-storey Acute Care building which includes an Emergency Department, Radiology, inpatient beds, Oncology, Pediatrics, high risk labour and neo natal care.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the proposed landscape and architectural design of this complete development permit application in general, and in particular:

- Has the application addressed the Panel's concerns on key aspects of the design needing improvement noted in 2012?
 - Are the entryways and paths clear and inviting for the range of needs from everyday visitors to urgent care?
 - Is the materials palette, composition, colour and detailing well resolved and appropriate to the range of users and this context?
 - Does the exterior design strike the right balance between a variety of expressions and break up of scale, and overall cohesion of design?
 - Are the open spaces beside and on the building successful for their intended uses?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Allyn Stellmacher, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that relative to the master plan there is a desire for a state of the art building that will service the community. The goal has to be efficiency, reducing the foot print on site and to increase the density of the centre campus with the objective of creating more open space. It is a high intensity use program for the building with every component designed for a wide diversity of needs within the building.

Dan Simpson, Architect, explained that Oak Street is the primary point of access into the site as well as West 28th Avenue. Given the site location one of the goals was to provide density and consolidate the critical clinical component within the centre of the campus. The existing emergency access needs to be open during construction. A cover has been added over the entrance which has been extended for drop offs. There are 125 parking spaces at grade and a ramp to a below grade parkade for another 180 cars. A dedicated ambulance lane is provided and connected to the emergency department. In the centre of the campus is the loading dock. Pedestrian linkage and across the campus was something that was important. There is a Wellness Walk that is being developed around the perimeter. He mentioned that there will be a series of indoor and outdoor public spaces and they are trying to keep them green as much as possible.

Ken Larsson, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the respite and repose is reflected in developing urban streetscape around the building which is connected to the Wellness Walk. There is a large glazed promenade at the front of the building. They have tried to pull the landscape up into the building with internal courtyards that are based around key program areas that provide visibility and views to nature. They also wanted to provide a large amount of sunlight to public spaces.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the wayfinding around the site;
 - Design development to clearly mark the entrance;
 - Consider a lighter colour palette;
 - Design development to improve the quality of the courtyard and open spaces.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel agreed that the program for this proposal was complex and was the driver for a lot of the building form. They felt that the massing worked and was an improvement from the last review.

The Panel had some concerns regarding wayfinding and thought it had not been addressed in the submission. They were concerned that people under emotional stress would find it very difficult to find the front entrance. It was suggested that a simple planning diagrammatic panels that show how the circulation worked would be helpful.

The Panel agreed that the entryways and paths were not clear and inviting for the range of needs. The main road is fairly well defined but the wayfinding and entry is still confusing. The elements of the building that are meant to give location and signage are not as clear as they could be and still require work to be legible.

The Panel thought the massing was successful in that it had good composition and complexity. As far as the massing goes there is a lot of clarity of elements, although the materials could unify it more.

Most of the Panel supported the colour and material palette while some Panel members thought the materials went too far and made the building overly complex. There wasn't a lot of support for the dark brown. They wanted to see something more subtle. The other issue with the dark colour was that the courtyards in the north or northwest wouldn't get a lot of sunlight and the dark colour would contribute to making them difficult spaces.

The Panel thought the open spaces needed a lot more attention. The main road spine and the building itself are strong and create a lot of outdoor spaces but they feel like leftover spaces.

There was a lot of support from the Panel for the roof top spaces. They felt they had lots of light and were well integrated with the internal spaces.

Several Panel members suggested looking at the program to integrate more of the active lounge spaces with the outdoor space, particularly around the entry.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Lee thanked the Panel for their comments. She noted that it was a complex building and that parking was an issue and continues to be a challenge. She added that from a functional aspect they need the surface parking.

Mr. Stellmacher said he understood the comments regarding the wayfinding and was something to be still worked out. Mr. Simpson said he heard the comments and they will work on solutions for the challenges.

4. Address:	799 West 41 st Avenue
DE:	417427
Description:	To construct two multiple dwelling buildings and three townhouse buildings at the lane containing 78 dwelling units over two levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	CD-1 pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second (first as Development Application)
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture
Owner:	Buffalo Investments (Canada) Ltd.
Delegation:	Arno Matis, Arno Matis Architecture Chris Phillips, PFS Studio
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site between Willow and Baillie Streets. He described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the north and Oakridge Shopping Mall to the south. He mentioned that the proposal was reviewed by the Panel in December 2012 as a rezoning under the Cambie Corridor Plan. Mr. Black described the policy and said that it generally supports new 6-storey residential buildings with a number of urban design goals. When reviewed by the Panel in December 2012 they identified two items as key aspects needing improvement: access through the courtyard from West 41st to the lane and moving the townhouse entries to the side rather than facing the lane. The proposal is for two main buildings with an undercut form created by overhanging the second storey. There are setbacks around the building, a courtyard, and a distinctive exterior expression of angled fins and edges.

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

- Handling of courtyard and open spaces in terms of liveability and amenity for future residents.
- 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.
- Exterior design including the organization and hierarchy of the different elements, the effectiveness of the 4-storey shoulder line, and the implementation of exterior design ideas in detail.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Arno Matis, Architect, further described the proposal and noted some of the programmatic changes. He mentioned that originally the application had a 20% rental unit requirement that has been removed in lieu of a higher CAC. As a result there was a reorganization of some of the unit plans. They have increased the percentage of two and three bedrooms units. In the early scheme they had the ground floor amenity space facing West 41st Avenue. Those spaces are now on the north end of the building flanking the water feature but they do have access to the south court. They also created access on both sides of the water feature so there is a circulation from the lane through to West 41st Avenue on both sides. Originally there were two duplex units on the lane and that has been designed into two single units. This opened up the spaces between the buildings for more light in the courtyard. The originally proposal was to have entrances off the lane for the townhouses. They have now been turned end units so their entrances are on the side street and the interior units enter from the courtyard. As well these units

have been set back two feet from the property line for better landscaping. Mr. Matis described the material palette noting the dark spandrel panel with a wood veneer. The light coloured material is exposed concrete.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that West 41st Avenue is a bit of challenge because of the addition of the bikeway. Each ground floor unit has a small outdoor space. Willow Street is a greenway and they will provide public amenity of seat and bicycle pump system and street trees will be added on Baillie Street. There are three common areas including two roof decks that will have social and garden spaces. Between the buildings there is a courtyard with a bamboo garden to separate the space from the lower unit's patios to help provide privacy.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the courtyard and open spaces;
 - Design development to improve privacy and reduce noise for the ground floor units along West 41st Avenue;
 - Consider improving the size of the two small amenity spaces and their relationship to the outdoor space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a creative design.

The Panel agreed that the building had a bold expression and appreciated the way the applicant has handled the Cambie Guidelines which made for an interesting expression. As well they thought the quality of the architecture was very high and that the expression, articulation and materiality were also of a high quality. As well they thought there was a unique sense of vertical scale.

The Panel thought the courtyard and open spaces needed some work in terms of livability as the spaces were tight but felt that the applicant was working towards a solution.

The Panel had some concern regarding the ground floor units along West 41st Avenue and felt the privacy could be improved to make them more livable. As well the thought there needed to be noise abatement measures and that the public realm could be improved along that frontage as well.

The Panel thought the amenity spaces were undersized and the relationship to the outdoor space could be improved. They suggested making the water feature a little smaller and making the patio space larger to make the space more enjoyable for the residents.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that there was a lot of thermal bridging in the design but felt that the applicant would find a solution to meet LEED™ Gold.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Matis thanked the Panel for their comments. He said they were working on improving the water feature with the building interface. He also said that the West 41st Avenue ground floor exposure condition could be improved.

5. Address:	55 Expo Boulevard (International Village Elementary School)
DE:	417537
Description:	To develop a 4-storey elementary school over existing below grade parking. A portion of the elementary school will be located within the existing Firenze building form at 688 Abbott Street.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Francl Architecture
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Delegation:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Alvin martin, Francl Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Kelly Isford-Saxon, Vancouver School Board
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and mentioned that the site was rezoned several years ago to allow for a complex development involving two condominium towers, a mixed-use podium of 5-storeys with retail at grade, a day care and a future school to be built on the site. The school was not originally built with the rest of the project because the estimation of enrollment at that time was much lower than the actual number of children now in the neighbourhood. As a result, the program for the school has grown which presents a challenge in terms of adjacency since there are dwelling units in the tower that would be looking out onto the taller and larger school. Staff have required a minimum 50 foot distance from the living rooms of those units. This in turn results in a massing of the school that is 5 meters over the property line over the park property. Mr. Cheng stated that all the legalities are being addressed. He added that there has been an ongoing discussion with respect to the resulting space underneath the cantilever next the park given location regarding potential CPTED issues and asked the Panel for suggestions on how to address this issue.

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there was also an anticipated (community centre) for this on the site. The entire ground floor including the gym and multi-purpose spaces will be available to the public off hours. He said that the City will be building some of the multi-purposes spaces that will be on the ground floor. There are only two facades to the building and they have tried to give that over as much as possible to the public. They have organized the ground plane so that it can be used by the rest of the community throughout the day. Mr. Francl described the program for the school and noted that the circulation is organized around the various classrooms as well as the private south facing learning pods. The building has been designed to achieve LEED™ Gold equivalent and will plug into the hot water utility that is currently operating in the towers. The roofscapes have been sculpted to step back from the residential tower and there are class screens for added privacy. The primary entrance is off the park and there will be doors in the multi-purpose rooms that open up onto the park as well. The atrium will eliminate the interior of the school up through 4-storeys. The strategy on the south side has been to modulate the light through a series of louvers and the little learning pods on the outside face of each of the classrooms to temper the light. All of the classrooms have natural light. Mr. Francl described the material and colour palette.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that play spaces are often challenging in the downtown. She mentioned that they have had discussions with the Park Board regarding using Andy Livingstone Park including the play structures and courts. There are going to be some upgrades to the park that will benefit the school. The play spaces on the roof are more passive learning environments for kindergarten and grade one aged children. They are trying to provide opportunities for outdoor learning and provide good connections between inside and out. There will be seat walls and science boxes as well as chalk boards. On the ground plane they have looked at running the flooring of the park walkway up to the face of the building. They have addressed the CPTED concerns with lighting and along Expo Boulevard they have added a double row of street trees. They are asking the City to have no parking in the morning and later in the day for drop off for the school and asked the Panel for suggestions on how to address this issue.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a wonderful infill project in an area that is in need of a new school.

The Panel liked the architecture and thought it was well handled and a sophisticated expression considering the challenges. They supported the choice of materials including the coloured glass and the raised reading nooks. One Panel member suggested applying them to the exterior spaces that face stair wells so they become seating edges. A couple of other Panel members thought the south façade was not as well handled as the east façade.

The Panel thought the applicant had done a good job with the setback from the adjacent tower and daycare as well as the view slots into the park. They also thought the cantilever was a strong and exciting part of the building with the park coming up to the edge of the building. One Panel member thought more could be done at the edge to strengthen the relationship to the park.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans however it was suggested that the five trees that are going to be removed could be replaced elsewhere on the site. As well it was suggested that where the plaza meets the street there was an opportunity to announce the plaza.

With respect to the park areas located under the cantilevered portions, one member suggested bright artificial lighting during night hours.

- **Applicant's Response:** Kelly Isford-Saxon thanked the Panel for their comments. She said that it has been a challenge to take on a community that has iconic views of what schools should look like but felt that there was renewed hope that they are going in the right direction.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.