

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 6, 2015

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Irfan Ali
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood (Left after 2nd Item)
Roger Hughes (Left after 3rd Item)
Ken Larsson
Jennifer Marshall (Chair)
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #2)

REGRETS:

Arno Matis
Matthew Soules

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1427 Haro Street
2. 375 West 59th Avenue
3. 3699 Marine Way (East Fraser Lands Parcel 43)
4. 95 East 1st Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address:	1427 Haro Street
DE:	418712
Description:	to construct a new 4-storey residential infill building while altering and expanding the existing heritage building. This proposal is for a total of 11 rental dwelling units.
Zoning:	RM-5
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Hearth Architectural Inc.
Owner:	Plan A Real Estate
Delegation:	Carman Kwan, Hearth Architectural Inc.
Staff:	Anoop Majithia, Plan A Real Estate
	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development application for a site located in the RM-5 zone on Haro Street. The RM-5 zoning allows for a variety of residential development. Ms. Linehan mentioned that recent changes to the zoning in response to the West End Community Plan allow for the provision of infill multiple dwellings for secured market rental housing with at least 50% of the dwelling units containing two or more bedrooms to provide units suitable for families. The zoning also notes that existing buildings which are listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register or may have heritage value must be conserved.

In describing the site, Ms. Linehan noted that the existing building on the site is a Heritage B Edwardian-era home built in 1903. The house next door is a character building of the same vintage, and designed by the same architect. Other adjacent lots to the west are single family houses, some of which have been converted to multiple rental units; one lot to the west also has an infill building built in the 1990s under the older RM-5 zoning. On the east side is an older character apartment building built in 1927 which occupies the full lot depth. Across the lane is the Robson Street commercial zoning, specifically the Empire Landmark Hotel at this block.

Ms. Linehan described the proposal noting it is to retain, restore and designate the existing Heritage B building, and to provide six rental units and to construct a new 4-storey infill building with five units at the rear of the site, for a total of eleven units. The infill height and setbacks fit generally within the expectations of the West End Community Plan Laneway 2.0 Guidelines. A common courtyard of twenty-two feet width is provided between the buildings. The minimum courtyard width as per the Plan is twenty feet and upper level setbacks are recommended. One co-op car share vehicle and space is provided which meets the reduced parking requirement for secured rental projects of this type.

Ms. Linehan explained that one of the expectations of the Guidelines is to provide a residential presence on the lane with units and entries oriented to the lane. Eventually as part of the West End Community Plan Public Realm Plan improvements a six foot landscape strip will be provided to narrow the lane and act a buffer and threshold space to infill

development. Addressing will be available from the lane. This lane is an active commercial lane serving the hotel site. There is a commercial podium for the hotel that runs the full block width with parking entry at grade. The main entry to the infill is oriented to face Haro Street with an entry path along the east side yard. Laneway activation and overlook is provided with residential balconies at the upper levels.

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

1. Treatment of the lane elevation and uses at the ground floor in terms of laneway activation.
2. Quality of the common courtyard amenity space.
3. Design of the units in terms of size and livability.
4. The relationship of the new building to the overall context, including the existing Heritage B building.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Carman Kwan, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the existing house is in disrepair and has been vacant for at least five years. Some of the features are important in terms of heritage value. They are retaining the existing massing on the heritage building that fronts the street. They will be repairing all the details and removing a lot of the old additions on the back that is not in keeping with the design of the building. They will introduce a new dormer on the east facing side to create more livable head height on the second floor. Ms. Kwan mentioned that they decided on a contemporary design for the infill so it wouldn't compete with the heritage. The tower behind the site is 40-storey and has a blank wall with one parkade entrance.

Ms. Kwan took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider simplifying the colour palette;
 - Design development to improve the livability of the lower units in the heritage building;
 - Consider a softer treatment of the ground plane in the lane;
 - Design development to improve the quality of the courtyard;
 - Consider moving the new units over to make a wider sidewalk to the lane;
 - Consider reducing the amount of paving.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting infill project.

The Panel acknowledged that the proposal was a good way to get more density into the West End and that it follows the West End Plan. They noted that the site has a tough neighbour with the tower across the lane. Some Panel members thought the west elevation was a little bland and that the green colour was a little aggressive and suggested the applicant revisit the shade of green. The Panel suggested using something more muted to compliment the heritage building.

Regarding the design of the units in terms of size and livability, the Panel thought it was generally an intelligent strategy to have compact units on the ground floor with the larger units on the upper floors. The Panel noted that the lower floor had some livability issues especially with respect to the lack of light and privacy. It was suggested that the house

could be raised to mitigate this issue. The landscape design should also be adjusted to deal with these issues.

The Panel thought the proposal was an interesting addition to the lane but thought it could use a bit softer treatment of the ground plane that could help activate this difficult stretch of commercial lane. The panel thought the courtyard was somewhat unfriendly with the amount of hard landscape. Some Panel members didn't mind the hardscape in the courtyard but suggested that perhaps the stairs could be reduced and the design of the ramp revisited. A couple of Panel members liked the large tree in the courtyard while other members were concerned with the size of it.

The Panel thought the relationship of the new building to the overall context, including the existing Heritage B building, worked well together. They were also supportive of having contemporary architecture next to a heritage building. Some Panel members did question the width of the sidewalks and thought the new townhouses could be moved over to make more space on one side. They noted that this would make a better opportunity to get light into the living spaces on the lower floors.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Kwan said she appreciated the Panel's comments. She mentioned that it is a difficult site with a 40-storey tower adjacent. She said they looked at many options on how to address the lane. At one point they did have an entrance off the lane but they also didn't have any parking there. Staff asked them to add parking so the entrance needed to be removed. She said they were committed to making the proposal work to better address the context.

2. Address:	375 West 59 th Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop two 6-storey residential buildings and one 5-storey residential building that includes a total of 154 residential units.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ramsay Worden Architects Ltd.
Owner:	Intracorp
Delegation:	Kurt McLaren, Ramsay Worden Architects Ltd. Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects Ltd. Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Landscape Architects David Jacobson, Intracorp
Staff:	Michelle McGuire and Ann McLean

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for the first rezoning application under the new Marpole Community Plan which was adopted in 2014. The Plan provides specific guidance for sites where land use changes are contemplated. For this area 6-storey residential buildings are anticipated. The site is one large parcel at West 59th Avenue and Alberta Street and is directly south of the Langara Golf Course and north of Winona Park. Ms. McGuire described the context for the area noting that directly east is a 3-storey townhouse development that is not anticipated to change under the Marpole Plan. To the west across Alberta Street are single family properties that are anticipated to be rezoned to 6-storey residential under the same policies as the subject site. Further to the west are properties along Cambie Street covered under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan and the Pearson Dogwood lands at West 59th Avenue and Cambie Street. The rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow a residential development with one 5-storey building and two 6-storey buildings all over one and half levels of underground parking. The proposal includes 154 units and parking for 229 vehicles and 302 Class A bicycle parking and 6 Class B.

Ann McLean, Development Planner, further described the proposal for 5-storey and 6-storey residential buildings with two levels of underground parking accessed from Alberta Street. Ms. McLean described the Marpole Community Plan noting that the form that was envisioned was for 6-storey buildings at the street and 2-storey townhouses at the lane. She added that for this site, that form was not considered optimal. She also described the Plan Guidelines noting the expected setbacks, building widths and landscaping elements. Ms. McLean mentioned that the site is part of a Habitat Connection Corridor which intends to provide trees and landscaping to allow wildlife and birds movement between parks and the Fraser River. There are many mature trees on the site and an arborist report has been provided. City staff have reviewed the trees and note that several are possible to retain, in particular the two pine trees located at the southwest corner of the site.

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

Comments on the proposed form, height, density and use with particular regard to:

1. The proposed siting of the buildings as they relate to the context and future context;
2. The setbacks and building form relationship with the different edge conditions, particularly at the east adjacent to the neighbours;
3. The response to Urban Forestry and Habitat Corridor requirements of the Marpole Community Plan;
4. The proposed building width at the north property line;

5. The relationship to grade at public edges.

Ms. McGuire and Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bob Worden, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that from a massing point of view and taking into account the Marpole Plan, the proposal responds to the surrounding neighbourhood context and site conditions. The building has a 102 foot frontage and is stepped-back at the top floor. He noted that they created a series of discreet rectangular forms fitting within the frontage with a family of materials in a palette of greys and black. He described the architecture and mentioned and described the material palette noting that the stone material on the corner carries into the landscape. He explained that the proposal has a significant slope across the site and that the courtyard opens out to both West 59th Avenue and Alberta Street to create a connection through to the Langara pathway. The roof is designed as green and functional with outdoor living spaces. He added that they have a public art budget for the project. Mr. Worden noted that they are using wood frame construction with concrete slabs.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and noted that the organization of the courtyard is important for livability. The courtyard is south facing and has been opened up for the townhouses to enjoy some yard space. He noted that they have been talking to the City to enhance the pedestrian path with new trees and other plantings that runs east/west from the Golf Course.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to ensure an neighbourly interface and good livability at the northeast corner alongside the neighbouring development;
 - Design refinement to the north elevation to ensure it is a good backdrop to the public golf course
 - Consider adding windows in the lower level amenity space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought they had successfully addressed a lot of challenges.

The Panel supported the siting of the buildings as they related to the future context. Although the Panel supported the setbacks and building form in relationship with the different edge conditions, they had some concern with the northeast corner alongside the neighbouring development. They noted that the building is about five feet below grade and encouraged the applicant to consider raising these units higher as that could affect livability.

Some Panel members thought the proposal needed some work at grade especially the courtyard and suggested it could be more pedestrian friendly. As well some Panel members thought the applicant should reconsider planting trees over the parking garage.

Although the Panel supported the material and colour palette, it was suggested that at DE stage the applicant reconsider the black edge at the top of building as it would get lost at night.

Some Panel members thought the amenity space on the upper level worked well but the lower level one could use some windows.

The Panel had few comments regarding the Urban Forestry and Habitat Corridor noting that the City policy didn't present a clear rationale but agreed that the approach to create a habitat was supportable.

The applicant was encouraged to refine the streetscape to support the habitat corridor. The Panel felt that the City should consider the entire street in the evolution of a habitat corridor.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Worden thanked the Panel and said he appreciated all the comments.

3. Address:	3699 Marine Way (East Fraser Lands Parcel 43)
DE:	418252
Description:	To develop two 6-storey residential buildings and one amenity building. This proposal is for a total of 280 rental housing units.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Owner:	EFL Properties LP
Delegation:	Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Staff:	Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-7)

- **Introduction:** Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development application for Parcel 43 of the River District, or East Fraser Lands. It was the second review by the Panel as the proposal was seen in December of 2014 and did not receive support.

Ms. St. Michel gave a brief background of the River District and its context. The River District is located in the southeast corner of Vancouver between Kerr Street and Boundary Road, Marine Way and the Fraser River. North of the River District and Marine Way, the topography slopes upward to several existing townhouse developments, Champlain Heights and Everett Crowley Park. The River District was formerly industrial lands, the primary use of which was the White Pines Saw Mill that operated continuously from 1923 until it was shut down in 1999. There are over 130 acres of land and one mile of riverfront associated with the River District as well as over 25 acres of park and includes residential developments, retail, a community centre, school and several childcare centres. River District will be home to approximately 13,000 residents when it is built out.

Ms. St. Michel described the East Fraser Lands Guidelines noting that the East Fraserlands Design Guidelines was approved by Council at the time of rezoning. She mentioned that the Guidelines provide direction for the public realm, sustainability strategies as well as massing and allocation of densities and architectural expression. The proposal is required to achieve LEED™ Gold equivalency or Built Green Gold with Energuide score of 80.

Ms. St. Michel acknowledged that Parcel 43 is different in location and type from other recent River District projects. It is on the north side of Marine Way at the foot of a slope up to Champlain Heights, adjacent to Boundary Road. It is a roughly triangular area with a future park at the west end. There is about 20 feet of grade change between the corner of Marine Way and Boundary Road and the level of the buildings and the slope continues up to the north to existing townhouse developments on the rise above. She noted the park is part of the future Avalon Park Corridor and provides a visual and physical extension of green from the river to the uplands of Champlain Heights. An existing pedestrian connection to the uplands will connect this Avalon Park corridor. An extension of Saw Mill Crescent, the east/west street that runs through the Town Square, forms the northern edge of the promontory park and the parcel, and terminates in a cul-de-sac.

Ms. St. Michel mentioned that Parcel 43 is all residential. Beyond the buildings, there will be two 4-storey buildings intended for affordable housing on the north side of the cul-de-sac. She also mentioned that originally in the guidelines, an 18-storey tower, with a low-

rise base was envisioned. The proposal now has been changed to a 6-storey wood-frame building making the units more affordable.

The proposal is for two rental buildings although the tenure is not being secured by the City. A separately expressed amenity building is proposed at the juncture between the two buildings and stepping down a level with the slope. Ms. St. Michel indicated that the proposal is generally consistent with the guideline version with respect to being set quite far back from Marine Way and raised above it in elevation. There will be reconfiguring at grade around the site to transition to this level and the proposal is for a natural wooded frontage with trees planted at a substantial scale. Also, the park site will be re-graded as well to raise it above the level of Marine Drive.

Ms. St. Michel noted that at the previous review, The Panel thought that in principle the 6-storey wood frame buildings were a supportable change from the Guidelines tower form, but that the massing as presented at the time was unrelenting and lacked interest. As well they thought the general landscape approach and common floor elevation was supportable with further consideration given to responding to the slope in other ways. The Panel also commented that the proposal should not seek to express the industrial past and working river aspects of the Guidelines, but rather could speak more to west coast contemporary architecture and perhaps Champlain Heights. She also described other aspects needing improvement that were mentioned by the Panel.

Advice from the Panel on the response to Key Aspects Needing Improvement as outlined in the previous Urban Design Panel minutes included:

- Design development to address the unrelenting and homogenous massing and expression of the buildings.
- Design development to better respond to this gateway site and to reflect the varied orientations of the buildings, improving sustainability and passive design response.
- Design Development to improve the colour and material palette.
- Design development to improve the livability of the proposal including the length of the internal corridors.
- Design development to improve the expression, visibility and circulation to the amenity building.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Ray Letkeman, Architect, further described the proposal noting that it is more closely associated with Champlain Heights than the River District but they wanted to introduce some of the sawmill characteristics of East Fraser Lands. The amenity building breaks up the landscape and becomes an important feature. They changed the amount of glazing on the amenity building and added a sloped roof. The building has been set back on Boundary Road to give more of a landscape foreground to the building. Mr. Letkeman said they worked hard at breaking down the massing on the buildings. They defined the massing with the use of colour and materials and as well they have recessed the windows to allow relief in the façade. Mr. Letkeman mentioned that the connection to the common areas comes from each of the buildings. He also mentioned that they have tried to emphasize the entries and have canted the corners. He described the material and colour palette noting that they wanted to try and get some variations on the facades. Regarding sustainability, they have increased the balcony projections on the southern facades to reduce solar gain. Mr. Letkeman noted that a sidewalk has been added along Boundary Road.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they are planning a rain garden to run down the slope with a pond on the corner. He noted

that there is no public art planned for the site. They have added more pathways from the lower terrace of the amenity building that will tie into the trail system. Urban agriculture, children's play and open space and an outdoor gathering space are on the south facing terrace.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to ground the building's relationship to the site.
- Design development to further address the overbearing and homogenous massing and expression;
- Design development to break the massing into four components by introducing a glazed connection in Building B, similar to that in Building A;
- Design development to introduce bolder, more lively materials and colours as in the rest of the River District Town Square;
- Design development to bring more life and joy to the park face of the development, recognizing that this is a front, not a back of the development.
- Design development to the southeast corner at the southwest park corner.
- Design development to improve the materiality of the buildings as in the precedent examples.
- Design development to expand the ground floor patios
- Design development to ground the building's relationship to the site.
- Design development to improve the expression of the amenity building.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought there were a number of aspects that needed to be improved.

The Panel thought there was a fundamental difference in the site planning strategy in this application from all those across Marine Way which have continuous townhouses flanking the street. This proposal does not support the streetscape context which is a main flaw in its approach.

The Panel thought the buildings still had an unrelenting, homogenous massing and expression although they thought overall it was improved. The expression of the buildings as being composed of four components should be strengthened. They noted that building A was the most successful in part because of the glazed link at the entry lobby. It was suggested by the Panel to add a break in the Building B similar to the break in Building A would assist with the expression of components as well as provide an opportunity for improved access to the courtyard. The Panel also thought that further consideration could be given to the courtyard landscape design on the eastern building, providing a linkage and relationship between the lobby entries, common courtyards and amenity building. They thought the canted expression at the southeast gateway corner was a successful element and should be repeated at the southwest corner of building B overlooking the park.

The panel thought greater depth should be introduced to the facades and that larger balconies should be introduced on the south and west facades to provide shade from the south and west sun, and to take advantage of the views the location offers.

The Panel thought that the least successful aspect was the elevation of the building on the park. More life and joy should be brought to this elevation, and it should be recognized that this is a front, not a back, as it is the prominent view for all arriving at the site.

Although the applicant had varied the colour palette and introduced greater contrast, the Panel thought the unrelenting amount of hardi panel was not working. The Panel thought the buildings would benefit from greater use of wood, and in particular, a smaller scale, more refined use of wood as in some of the precedent photos. Wood could be used in this way at the entries, amenities and at the corners of the buildings. As well they thought the colours could be bolder. The Panel agreed that the brown/grey tones in Building B lacked joy and suggested a different colour palette with enhanced contrast was needed. It was noted that there was little difference between some of the colour variations in the current palette. The Panel suggested looking to the bolder more lively colours of the River District Town Square buildings.

Several Panel members commented on the base of the buildings; that the buildings needed to be grounded in the site with a transition from site and landscape to building. Patios on the ground floor along the southern edge should be enlarged and variation along this edge could help with strengthening the expression of the base. One panel member expressed concern with the consistent roof datum, and suggested varying the elevation of the buildings as a means to help address this issue.

The Panel had no concerns regarding the long corridors and thought that daylighting at the ends and the middle had helped. They also thought the central lobby was well handled.

The Panel discussed the challenges of the site and of designing for its busy highway like location. Several members of the Panel thought the amenity building was in the wrong location given Marine Drive. They noted that there needed to be something to mitigate the traffic noise that would make the patio area more habitable. However, the chair noted that the amenity building was important in this location as a means to address the street and to remove all connection to Marine would not be good city building. It was suggested that pedestrian connections to Marine Drive from the amenity building should be enhanced. Several Panel members preferred the expression of the amenity building in the previous review.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and agreed that the park like character improved the proposal. They also thought the grading and terracing as well as the amenity outdoor space and landscape treatment was well handled.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Letkeman said he appreciated the comments. He said they would work with staff to improve the project. He mentioned that the amenity is a 2-storey space. The ground floor is a patio and the upper level has outdoor space on either side. At the moment there is no direct link to Marine Way but they could make a connection. He added that they had one originally. Mr. Letkeman said he agreed that the colour could be bolder but that they didn't want to make it a 2015 building as it would not age well.

4. Address:	95 East 1 st Avenue
DE:	418842
Description:	To construct a 15-storey residential building that includes a total of 135 dwelling units and a daycare.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Owner:	Concert Properties
Delegation:	Richard Stout, DYS Architecture Colin Shrubb, DYS Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Craig Watters, Concert Properties Ltd. Kate Sunderland Ratzlaff, Concert Properties Ltd. Jason Packer, Recollective
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a parcel in South East False Creek. Mr. Cheng gave an overview of the rezoning for the area and mentioned that there was going to be a subdivision with the Park Board having ownership of park land next to False Creek. The site has a large public realm component involving Railspur Mews which is a historic piece of railroad track. Also there is going to be two new streets: Switchman Street and Pullman Porter. There is also a pedestrian walk-through and a small public plaza. The proposal is going to be a City owned turnkey Social Housing building and operated by a non-profit society. Mr. Cheng noted that the flood plain elevations are a little higher so there is a change in elevation between the first floor and the street level. On the corner is planned for the future streetcar line that will be returning from Quebec Street to East 1st Avenue. As a result, City Staff did ask for more space to be considered at the corner and at the front of the building. He added that they will be looking for an industrial style with interlocking components and solar shading. Mr. Cheng provided some background regarding the increase in the height with penthouse storeys noting that the two extra penthouse floor can be considered when looking at issues such as shadowing and overlook. Mr. Cheng added that the 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units all have large open balconies but the studio and 2-bedroom don't have any private outdoor space. However, there are a number of common outdoor amenity spaces.

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

1. Commentary on the overall site planning of the proposal including the interface between the private and the public realm and the quality of the proposed public spaces.
2. Commentary on the proposed architectural character and its response to the general principles in the Design Guidelines.
3. Do the proposed penthouse storeys create a legible and architectural "finish" to the top of the building, while also minimizing impact with respect to shadowing and overall building mass?
4. Taking into consideration that semi-private outdoor amenity spaces are provided on the 6th and 14th storeys, is there nevertheless a need for a private outdoor space for each of the studio and one-bedroom dwelling units?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Richard Stout, Architect, further described the proposal noting that it has a tight site but will have its own parking and services. They have tried to fit the building on the site and follow the form of development guidelines. They are providing a plaza at the corners of the building and green space on the northeast corner. Mr. Stout described the architecture and mentioned that they wanted to deal with the mass of the building and articulate and slim down the building as much as possible. The face is oriented to Quebec Street and they created some low brick masses to bookend the building and then a high spine that focuses on the corner and rises in a slender tower. On the south side is an open elevation that is a clean and modern design. The east face contrasts with the low 5-storey mass which is of solid brick in a dark colour. The low form helps the building to step down to the public realm. He described the colour palette noting the greys and strong white and black colours. Mr. Stout mentioned that the family units primarily face south and have big balconies and solar shades. On the north on the 6th floor is outdoor space plus on the upper level there is urban gardens.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that the public realm is still evolving. He mentioned that they have been working on Pullman Porter and is closer to a typical street with a double row of trees on either side. They have kept landscaping close to the building to that it can change and involve. The idea is to have some outdoor seating in different areas and as well on the ground floor, there are two large outdoor patio spaces that are actually are family run daycare spaces. On Railspur Mews there will be railway tracks with a grassy area and granite sets. The double row of tress also carries through. The indoor amenity opens to outdoor space on the north with kids play and outdoor seating. There is a green roof planned for the top of the building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider improving the entrance expression;
 - Design development to positively connect the lobby to park space to the north;
 - Consider improving the expression of the north face of the building;
 - Consider strengthening the lobby connection to Railspur Mews;
 - Consider providing balconies or Juliette balconies for the small studio and 1-bedroom apartments;
 - Take advantage of north views and proximity to recreation.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and appreciated the level of care and attention that had gone into the project while continuing the legacy of providing affordable housing.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the overall site planning of the proposal. They thought all the pieces were there but it seemed that the entrances were understated and small. They wanted to see a better way to bridge how one gets to the public spaces from inside the building.

The Panel thought the proposed architectural character responded to the general principles in the Design Guidelines. They agreed that the colours were bold and the building was functional and well proportioned. The Panel thought the north façade needed some work noting that it was the weakest part of the building. The other sides have sun shades and balconies that help add details and refinement to the expression.

A couple of Panel members thought the proposed penthouse storeys should be set back further to improve the finish of the building.

With respect to the amenity spaces, some of the Panel thought there should be more community amenity space. Some Panel members thought it was a lost opportunity to not add benches on the verge of the sidewalk, a place where it is attached to the main use of the building. This would claim the public space as more semi-public. Also in the courtyard the front feels semi-public and it was suggested that even the office spaces could have patios to help provide useful outdoor space. They also thought that the connection from the lobby to Railspur Mews needed to be strengthened.

The Panel thought that although there was communal outdoor space for each of the studio and one-bedroom units, a small Juliette balcony could be provided that would capitalize on the livability of those units.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Stout thanked the Panel for their comments and said they had touched on the areas that they have been thinking about. He added that they have shifted the main entrance more than once to try and open it up but will revisit those elements. He agreed that there was work to do on the north face.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.