

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 20, 2016

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Meghan Cree-Smith (excused for item #3 & 4)
Ken Larsson
Neal LaMontagne
Jim Huffman
Derek Neale (excused for item #3)
David Jerke
Muneesh Sharma

REGRETS: Stuart Hood
Roger Hughes

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | 371 W 2 nd Avenue |
| 2. | 512 W King Edward Avenue |
| 3. | 305 W 41 st Avenue |
| 4. | 151-157 W 41 st Avenue |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair LaMontagne called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no business the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 371 W 2nd Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: To develop a 12-storey residential building (10 storeys and two penthouse levels) and a six-storey residential podium (five storeys and one penthouse level) with a total of 132 units of housing and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 4.11. The application is being considered under the Southeast False Creek Official Development Plan (ODP).
 Zoning: M-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Review: First
 Architect: DYS Architecture (Dane Jansen)
 Owner: Tidball Projects
 Delegation: Dane Jansen, DYS Architecture
 Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk
 Michael Kordyback, Tidball Projects
 Staff: Rachel Harrison and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the application as a site on the northeast corner of 2nd Avenue and Wylie Street at the western edge of the South-East False Creek Official Development Plan (SEFC ODP) area. The area on the other side of Wylie and 2nd is outside the ODP area. This area is zoned C-3A.

To the west are mixed-use buildings on 2nd Avenue. These include a four storey heritage building (“Maynard’s”) and a nine-storey mixed-use building (“Montreux”). There is also a nine-storey residential building at 1st Avenue and Wylie Street. The sites within this block are all zoned CD-1.

To the north is a four-storey residential heritage building (“the Exchange”) and a new six-storey addition next to it. The “Exchange” building sits right on its rear property line. To the northeast is a 13-storey residential building, to the east is a 10-storey residential building (“Pinnacle”) with a six-storey podium, and to the south are two to three-storey commercial and industrial buildings.

This rezoning is coming in under the Southeast False Creek Official Development Plan, which was approved by Council in 2005, and the Southeast False Creek Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys, which was later approved in 2010. The SEFC ODP sets a maximum density at 3.5 FSR not including the penthouse floors. The applicant is coming in at 3.49 FSR.

The SEFC ODP also identifies this site as having optional retail, service, office or light industrial uses at grade. The applicant has chosen residential uses on the ground floor.

The SEFC ODP restricts height with both a maximum height and an optimal height. The ODP sets the maximum height at 38.1 metres or 125 ft. for this area. There is also an Optimal Height Map which identifies a nine-storey tower next to a five-storey podium on this site.

The proposal is 10 ft. below the maximum height and one storey above the Optimal Height for the tower piece. The distinction between maximum and optimal height is that maximum is absolute height limit whereas optimum is a guide. This provides variation in building heights to achieve the urban design principles in the ODP. The intended pattern in SEFC is for high density in mid-rise buildings, with towers located at the corners and podiums spanning mid-block. This means that there is not always 80 ft. tower separation between buildings, and parts of SEFC have a tighter lane and street network.

There is also a separate Penthouse policy that allows for consideration of two additional penthouse storeys on a tower, and one penthouse storey on a podium.

The proposal is to rezone the site to allow for a 12-storey residential building and a six-storey residential podium with a total height of 40 m. (130 ft.) to the top of parapet. Not including the penthouse floors, this proposal has a height of 35 m. (115 ft.) and a base density of 3.49 FSR. The total density is 4.11 FSR. The proposal is for 132 strata housing units, of which 37% of the units will be two or three-bedroom units.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, continued by mentioning that the Site has 198 ft. of frontage and a lot depth of 122 ft. There is a 5 ft. dedication along W 2nd Avenue for road widening.

The application is below the maximum vertical height, and one storey above the optimum storey height of nine storeys at the 'shoulder' of the tower. The penthouse design must earn its density by meeting the performance criteria set out in the policy, such as showing how negative impacts like shadowing have been minimized.

Unlike the sites to the north, 2nd Avenue presents a heavily arterial interface with a complex traffic situation as angled streets intersect. The application includes a better than expected setback from 2nd Avenue to ease up the tough residential interface. The proposed tower form is somewhat broader in its proportions than some SEFC examples.

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

- 1) Whether the Panel supports the proposed built form at each of the four sides, including height, setback and open space, as creating a well-resolved design with the:
 - a) Heritage Best Building and its new open space to the north;
 - b) Residential podium to the east, including the step back from 2nd Avenue;
 - c) Wylie Street interface, including the amenity room at grade; and
 - d) Relationship with West 2nd Avenue, at grade and within the wider context?
 - 2) Does the Panel support the proposed form of development including the:
 - a) Height (12 storey tower at 36.1 m; 6 storey podium at 20.1 m),
 - b) Setbacks (2.6 m south, 3.1 m west, 2.1 m north before dedication),
 - c) Density of 4.1 FSR and area of 99,006 sq. ft., and
 - d) Penthouse levels?
- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project and noted that the decision to go residential was made due to the lack of retail continuity.

While some retail does exist in the area, residential units are a much better fit overall. A 12 ft. setback and planting provides relief for this.

The line of the podium is being adhered to as the podium is critical to creating a continuous street wall.

There are a significant amount of shading devices, including very pronounced glass and framing. The windows have also been used to create verticality with dark glass. This verticality comes up into the penthouse level.

There is a seating area at the back, and the intention is to evolve it and make it much lush during the development application process. A theme of lushness and blue elements exists throughout the site to reference the surrounding area.

Up in the amenity courtyard there is a kid's play area. This area is sheltered from the elements and includes seating for parents. There is a smaller amenity further up, with room for urban agriculture and a reasonable sized gathering. This provides a second layer and upper level of amenity

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

- There are concerns about the vertical expression as too many 'moves' are being done
- There is some concern about the relationship with the Best building; especially in light of the loading and garbage location
- Design development is needed to strengthen the corner and tie the spaces together better; consider creating commercial in this area
- The courtyard needs to be better; there needs to be a shade program strategy
- There needs to be more sensitivity to the lane
- The units off 2nd Avenue should be more livable, and the landscaping should have more integrity
- There is an opportunity to strengthen the podium
- There is uncertainty about the penthouse and whether it belongs

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel was divided on whether the massing, height and density worked. While some members thought that the overall massing and density was a good fit for the site, others thought that the amount of density being proposed creates massing issues.

The build form is a bit more awkward than elegant. There are too many moves in this building with the materials, glass, projections and other statements. These statements are not being expressed meaningfully, and provide more interpretation than expression. Additionally, on the rear side there are north-facing two-bedroom units which jut into the courtyard and add shade to the area.

While the penthouses do add to the overall building, they seem to be blocking the views from across the street and are not selling themselves. The building would be fine if they were removed and the overall height was a bit lower. The trellis on the roof of the podium is also not helpful, and adds too much to the height in this area.

The panel was split on the relationship to the Best Building, with some members thinking that it was fine, while others thought that it was awkward and insensitive. It was agreed that the loading and garbage access do not work with the paving and bollard expression in the lane, and that they are not neighbourly. Overall the space and materials at the lane are a problem and should be handled differently. There is a lack of consideration in its current form.

Retaining the townhouse form on such a mean street will be a struggle as it will create barrier and activation challenges. To make a viable space, there will need to be barriers to make them look livable.

There is a bit of concern with the visual appearance of the residential podium to the east. This is a big façade, which is nicely broken up, but the upper framing only sticks out a meter. Pushing it out another half meter would do much to enhance the definition on this side. Putting more glass elements at grade near the amenity would also add continuity and visual appeal.

There needs to be very strong definition between the units and the street at grade along west 2nd Avenue. Currently 2nd Avenue has a lot of commercial space with limited residential use. The setback is good as there is a lot of traffic in this area; however, consider adding a bit more acoustic privacy to block the sound coming off of 2nd Avenue.

The amenity space at the north seems a bit cut-off from the rest of the building. The location of it on the corner is fine, but the open space on the north could be a bit more accessible. As well, the upper amenity could have more space.

The corner with the bike share would be a great location for a coffee shop, and could act as the entrance to the false creek area. This corner also seems to be very weak and needs to be stronger.

The landscaping in the setbacks off 2nd Avenue needs to be carefully considered as it will be the only landscaping of its kind in this area. Consideration should be given to providing more screening in general throughout the site, and the grade may need to be raised in order to raise the planters off Wylie Street and keep people out of the planting. The Panel also highly recommends courtyard options which would support an intelligent shady program. Currently the courtyard is in the shade at all times of the day.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and will be coming back with an evolved application for the development permit. This means that the landscape will be better, as will the area off of 2nd Avenue. They will also address the comments about the corner with the applicant.

There was a lot of commentary which can be taken forward. It has been a challenge to sort out the density on the site throughout the project, and City staff have been very helpful in coming up with solutions.

2. Address:	512 W King Edward Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a six-storey residential building that includes 50 rental residential units and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.0. The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture (Arno Matis)
Owner:	S. Benjamin Holdings
Delegation:	Arno Matis, AMA Architecture Paul Kibayashi, AMA Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Zak Bennett and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Zak Bennett, Rezoning Planner, introduced the site for this rezoning application as being made up of a single parcel at the southwest corner of Cambie Street and King Edward Avenue. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan which contemplates six-storey residential buildings in this area. The site is approximately 11,066 sq. ft.

Currently there are 13 rezoning applications approved or underway in the area. The surrounding areas are predominantly single-family, RS-1 and RS-5 zones around Douglas Park. There are also C-2 and RM-3A zones north along Cambie Street from King Edward Avenue. There is the potential for future change to some of these areas as part of Cambie Phase 3.

This rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow development of a six-storey building over two levels of underground parking accessed by a shared ramp and which includes 37 residential stalls. The proposal also includes 50 secured market rental units, and has a proposed site FSR of 3.0. The Cambie Corridor Plan anticipates residential six-storey buildings in this area with an estimated FSR range of 2.0-2.5.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, continued by noting that to the west is a rezoning for a four to six-storey building. This was recently approved in principle and seen by the Urban Design Panel. To the north there is a Canada Line station and two other rezonings. To the south is a rezoned site with a development permit for a six-storey apartment.

The proposal is for a highly detailed exterior and dynamic form conveyed by the extensive use of exterior slabs, treated glass, and expressed beams around the exterior. There is a 340 sq. ft. amenity room at the south grade, and a proposed floor area of 32,189 sq. ft. overall.

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

- 1) Whether the Panel supports the proposal as being successful in terms of:
 - a) Meeting the rising grades and proximity to the adjacent neighbour;
 - b) Strength of the curved forms as a response to this context;

- c) Quality of the public realm interface around the north and east sides;
 - d) Design of the main residential entry; and
 - e) Usefulness and livability of the indoor and outdoor common amenity spaces
- 2) Does the Panel support the proposed form of development including the:
- a) Heights (6 storeys and 68 ft.),
 - b) Setbacks (12 ft. from the streets, 10 ft. from lane, 8 ft. to the neighbour), and
 - c) Density of 3.0 FSR with an area of 32,189 sq. ft.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project as a small but important site as it marks the intersection and boulevard leading up to Queen Elizabeth Park. Cambie Street is at a bit of an angle here, and widens out to create the boulevard. The podium responds to this through a bit of a shift.

There is an existing stone-rubble wall currently extending 6 ft. onto City property. This will be removed, but elements of it are to be retained. There is also an existing shared ramp which determined the parking response. A bit of a stair and pedestrian access will be added off of Cambie Street.

There is a gateway appeal to this site, which uses a curve to suggest the massing of the Cambie Corridor turning the corner. The typical unit ceiling height is 9 ft., and the ground unit ceiling height is 10 ft. It is important to note that this is an all-rental building.

There is a small ground-floor indoor amenity space off of the courtyard. There is also a very large roof deck amenity. The parking garage has created some constraint, and work has been done to provide oversight.

A lot of playful forms are being used going up the building. On the roof there is urban agriculture and outdoor seating, as well as a kid's play area.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - At the ground plane there is an opportunity to reflect the architecture in the landscape in a stronger fashion
 - Think about thermal performance and bridging
 - Consider a stronger expression of the stone wall, or incorporate it onto the roof
 - There is some concern about the interior amenity being dark and narrow
 - The indoor amenity could be made more useful to the building if it was something else
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel thought that the overall design is very elegant, and that it sets a high standard for design. The proximity to the adjacent neighbour is permissible, and the public realm interface is very appropriate for this location.

The setbacks, density and height are all fine. The curved form is dynamic, expressive and rationale. However, the strength of the building is in its form, and it would benefit the building to have the entrance on the building's southern side so that nothing penetrates the plinth.

There is a bit of a challenge with grades along the north side, which has been well handled. The entry along the north might be a bit dark at times, and the north-facing decks are a bit small, but these aspects are not worrying.

The exterior expression and materials seem very innovative. However, consider introducing a feature re-using the stone wall or an interpretation piece based on the quarry as it would better set the plinth in place and really make it work.

The building seems well placed, and the Panel liked the idea of thermally broken slabs. These slabs also create a lot of cut-outs which could be played with.

It will be exciting to see how the rooftop amenity develops, and the indoor amenity is appropriate for the size of the development. The ground-floor amenity might be better off turned into a funky lounge for residents, or with another vibrant use which is different from a gym. It could also be turned into bike storage or a martini bar to better serve the needs of the residents.

At the ground plane it would be good to reflect the architecture in the landscape. Turning the landscape around towards Cambie would create a stronger push towards it. Additionally, putting the stone wall near the play area would add some history to the space.

It was recommended to planning staff that the project did not need to come back to the panel at the development permit stage.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the helpful comments and noted that they will be integrated going forward. They also asked that, if the panel is supportive of the project, it could vote on recommending that it not come back to the panel at the application stage. It is noted that the application stage review by the panel is ultimately a staff decision.

3. Address: 305 W 41st Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: To construct a six-storey mixed-use building that includes 49 residential units, a replacement church space, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.91. The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Review: Second
 Architect: ZGF Cotter Architects Inc. (Michelle Lee-Hunt, Daniel Wilson)
 Owner: Townline
 Delegation: Patrick Cotter, ZGF Cotter Architects Inc.
 Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architecture
 Steve Jedreicich, Townline
 Terry Harrison, United Church
 Staff: Cynthia Lau and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-2)

- **Introduction:** Cynthia Lau introduced the rezoning application located on W 41st Avenue, a block and a half east of Cambie Street. The proposal is being reviewed under the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP) which can consider residential buildings in this area up to six storeys with an estimated density range of 2.0 to 2.5 FSR.

The site is a single parcel located in close proximity to Oakridge Mall and the Oakridge-41st Avenue Canada Line Station. Along 41st Avenue are single-family properties that can be rezoned under Phase 2 of the CCP. To the north of the site are single-family properties that will be included in Phase 3 of Cambie Corridor.

This application seeks to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow the development of a six-storey mixed-use building with church use at grade, over two levels of underground parking. The previous proposal reviewed by the Panel (in Nov 2015) was comprised of 58 dwelling units and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.33. The revised proposal is comprised of 49 dwelling units, an FSR of 2.91, and a maximum building height of 67 ft.

Timothy Potter continued with the presentation by noting that the site currently is home to the Oakridge United Church, and that the site is in the *Oakridge Town Centre* area of the CCP. The site is irregularly shaped and is 158 ft. wide and 120 ft. deep.

The proposal is a replacement facility for the church combined with a market residential component. Parking is located below grade. The proposed density has been reduced from 3.3 FSR to 2.91 FSR. The building depth was also reduced from when the project was last reviewed in November.

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

1. Have the panel's comments been satisfactorily addressed?
2. Please comment on the success of expression of the building in term of the expression of the Church use and its architecture;
3. Is the proposed form of development, massing and density on this site supportable?

Previous panel Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The contextual fit, transition and design are not supportable
 - The floor plate is too deep
 - The shadow performance is problematic
 - Design development to better express the church as distinct from the residential portion of the building
 - Using the loading bay as a public open space is not supportable
 - Separate amenities are needed for the church and residential portions, and quieter spaces should not be located on 41st Avenue
 - There is not enough outdoor space
 - The stepped-down aspect of the townhouses is not supportable
 - The overall form of development is too big, deep, and high; therefore, the proposed density is not supportable
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by stating that the building depth has been reduced to approximately 74 ft. bringing the floorplates within a more conventional range. The residential units are now a more reasonable depth and have full access to daylight. The previous massing followed the prescribed setbacks at level five and six; however, a series of three setbacks in the massing have been introduced to improve the relationship to neighbouring sites to the north and provide greater sunlight exposure at the lane. The outside of the sanctuary space, on the south-east corner, was modified to expand and provide more open space around the sanctuary.

The church aspires to become a more local, walkable, facility that is opened to the community. Along these lines, the concept of an inner sanctum has been used to provide a transparent enclosure of the sanctuary that is screened yet still visible to the public. Coloured glass is being used to wrap around the sanctuary space so that it reads as a place of worship. Support and administration spaces of the church are clearly separated from the residential spaces.

Paving patterns are designed to reflect and reinforce the architecture. More colours and perennials have been added to the landscape planting to enhance variation. There is an existing commemorative garden that will be moved to the west end of the site where the new garden will have a memorial plaque and seating to provide a place to reflect and contemplate. The garden will be a buffer from the street with an evergreen canopy along the edge. The landscape has been pulled back to allow morning light into the sanctuary. The outdoor space at the lane allows for the pick-up and drop-off of passengers and also supports the delivery and receiving functions of the church.

There is a small residential amenity space on the south-east corner (near Elizabeth Street) that is a separate amenity space for the residents. The outdoor amenity space for the building residents has been set in from the street edge to provide protection to it and, and the children's play area. The townhouses along the laneway, the west of this outside amenity area have also been protected from the lane with landscape elements.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - There are concerns about overlapping of uses in the lane space, especially given the townhouses
 - Some members thought that the building is still too deep

- The amenities in the back are in the shade
 - If wood is being used then it should be expressed along the full length to make the building stand out on the street
 - The articulation of the upper floors of the development could be subdued
 - Some concerns about the overall form and massing remain
 - The public, outdoor spaces need to be connected and more distinct in their expression
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel noted that the commentary from the previous Panel seems to have mostly been addressed; however, the some members felt that the building remains unnecessarily deep and sprawling. This means that the building as proposed is just too big for the site. One panel member thought that the proposed density for the project is unsupportable.

The frame on the building has been used to break down the massing effectively, and the form seems supportable, but there is a lack of rigour in how the framing snakes up and down. The church, as a whole, also needs to be expressed within this frame but the administration and the fellowship hall currently appear to be unrelated to the sanctuary. In addition, the lower level of the church at the west has a blank wall that is uninspiring.

The informal and formal outdoor public spaces are in conflict with each other and have many barriers that prevent synergy between the spaces. These spaces need to be better integrated with each other.

Generally the Panel thought the wood articulation was rich and warm, but that if it is going to be used, then it should be expressed all the way along the 41st Avenue elevation. One panel member thought the wood makes the building seem more like a pub than a church. Some members thought there is too much articulation on the upper storeys of the building and that these areas should be calmed down.

There are also too many things occurring at the lane. This intense lane activity conflicts with the residential use. There needs to be more separation between the church functions at the lane and the residences to afford more privacy to the townhouses.

The residential amenity on the north-east corner is a small but workable; however, the amenity space in the back will be in deep shade. In addition, a roof deck amenity space is needed. The children's space could be perhaps removed to create this because the current play area is too small anyway.

The outdoor space with the loading bay has a lot of conflicting uses. The wall coming out from the loading bay will compete with the drop-off area and create traffic problems. There is a lot in this area which needs to be better resolved.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their commentary and noted that the comments were understood and appreciated. In particular, the comments about the wood expression and the articulation will be taken seriously. There will also be more clarity brought to the landscape, and to the programming of uses at the lane.

4. Address: 151-157 W 41st Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: The proposal is for a townhouse development that includes one four-storey building on West 41st Avenue and one 2.5-storey building on Woodstock Avenue with 15 residential units and a net floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.9. The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan and Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Review: First
 Architect: DYS Architecture (Norm Chin)
 Owner: Next Pacific
 Delegation: Norm Chin, DYS Architecture
 Dan Yan Haastrecht, Durante Kreuk
 Harrison Han, Next Pacific
- Staff: Graham Winterbottom and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom introduces the policy for the proposal that this is a rezoning application for a multi-family townhouse project at 151-157 W 41st Avenue. It is a mid-block site located on 41st Avenue between Columbia and Manitoba. The site assembly consists of two parcels currently zoned for one-family dwellings (RS-1), with a frontage of approximately 99 ft. and a depth of 112 ft. The site is unique because it is situated between two streets, or double fronting, with 41st Avenue at the front and Woodstock Avenue at the rear of the property.

The proposal is for a stacked townhouse form on W 41st Avenue, and 2.5-storey townhouses on Woodstock Avenue (15 units in total) served by a courtyard between. The proposed density is 1.9 FSR.

The proposal is being reviewed under the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP) in the Oakridge Town Centre neighbourhood. For this site the CCP anticipates proposals up to four storeys in an apartment form. Townhouses at the rear are not described in the CCP for this area; however, it does suggest active uses and front doors to activate Woodstock Avenue.

Staff are considering the application because the stacked form on W 41st Avenue is an equivalent scale to a four-storey singular building and because there is a general desire by Council to achieve family-oriented housing types in the City.

Tim Potter continued the presentation by reminding the panel that this is a rezoning application that is subject to the form of development guidelines in the CCP.

The project is located on the north side of W 41st Avenue between Columbia Street and Manitoba Street. This is a double-fronting site with Woodstock Avenue to the rear. The estimated FSR range for this site is 1.25 to 1.75 FSR and a height of four-storeys.

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

1. Please comment on the form of development as it relates to neighbouring sites and in particular, the relationship of the courtyard (its proposed elevation) and how that relates to the existing grade of neighbouring sites;

2. Please comment position of the ramp location with respect to massing and the Woodstock Avenue streetscape;
 3. Please comment on the success of open space design and overall amenity for the project;
 4. Please provide any additional advice that could further inform the design process through the Development Permit process
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by noting that the site is not as deep as the sites across the street. A unique thing about this site is that it faces two streets rather than having a typical lane condition at the rear. Adjacent sites on Woodstock are single-family residences and on the south-side of Woodstock are detached garages. This condition was seen as an opportunity to depart slightly from the CCP prescribed form to activate Woodstock Avenue.

The site has a change in grade downwards from Woodstock to 41st Avenue of approximately 4 ft. The courtyard in the middle has been designed at its height to allow sufficient height for the parking. The parking ramp goes against the existing slope of the site which is why the courtyard above this area has been raised.

There was a desire from the applicant to focus this development on family units. The unit mix being proposed ranges from single-bedroom units to two-bedroom plus a den, and three-bedroom units all in a townhouse configuration.

The massing facing West 41st Avenue is a typical four-storey volume. There are stacked townhouses with the bottom units being accessed from W 41st Avenue. The upper units are accessed from the courtyard. The Woodstock Avenue units are directly accessed from the street.

The building materials will most likely include durable paneling with varying textures and colours to maintain a modern appearance.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The depth of the site and the tightness of the courtyard may be an issue
 - There was some concern about the height of the podium for the courtyard
 - There was concern about accessibility throughout the site
 - The parking ramp is too high, and consideration should be given to future sharing opportunities
 - Concerns were expressed about the width of the courtyard
 - The details of the project need to be more clear prior to the development permit stage
 - Use landscaping to provide a sense of openness and create breathing space
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that the layout of the site is clever and will create a nice streetscape. This form provides more relief than a double-loaded massing; splitting the building creates a lot more daylight for the through units.

The focus of this project should be on the relationship to Woodstock Avenue. Attention should be paid to having quality building and materials used toward the neighbouring sites to mitigate the massing. As well, the grade needs to be as flat as possible where everyone is walking. If the applicant could play with the grade a bit to reduce a few of the steps and bring down the podium of the courtyard, that would be better. Lowering the overall form would also increase accessibility to the units.

The Panel was split on whether the ramp location is okay. Some members thought that the ramp could be in a stronger location to one side. They also thought that it would be good to move the ramp to allow for a continuous sidewalk where kids can play between units without having to encounter with traffic.

Any extra room that might be gained for the courtyard would be, but this may require a conversation with the City about setbacks, a much more comfortable dimension for a courtyard. A dimension of 30 ft. was suggested. While that may not be achievable, pushing toward this as much as possible would be great. If there is any way to enlarge the courtyard and make the whole walkway feel like a place to gather, then it should be done.

The panel noted that there is a lot of consideration given to the details of the courtyard, towards mitigating its tight dimension; however, it still feels like it has a sea of stairs going through it in different directions. Some effort should be made towards eliminating some of them and expanding the kid's play space.

Careful attention should be paid to the side yard relationship to the neighbours. Going forward, look carefully at the detail edges. The wall treatments, railings, light wells and parkade wells need to be done crisply, not generically, to really make them work. There is also a 6 ft. fence sitting on top of the 4 ft. wall, and depending on what happens with the other developments this fence will require a lot of creativity as currently there is a lot of continuous opaqueness in this area.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their positive and constructive commentary. There are a lot of details which need to be sorted out, including the edge conditions. They will definitely keep in mind being friendly to the neighbours and the future condition of the area.

The driveway situation is tough. There are pros and cons no matter where it is placed, but the current location does provide opportunities to explore sharing with future sites.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.