

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** Wednesday June 1, 2016

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Russell Acton  
Stefan Aepli  
Roger Hughes  
Ken Larsson  
David Jerke  
Neal Lamontagne  
James Cheng  
Muneesh Sharma  
Veronica Gillies  
Karen Spoelstra  
Meghan Cree-Smith

**REGRETS:** Kim Smith

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	105 Keefer Street and 544 Columbia Street
2	1837 Main Street
3.	885 Cambie Street
4.	26 E 1st Avenue

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Roger Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 105 Keefer Street and 544 Columbia Street  
 DE: N/A  
 Description: The revised proposal is for a 13-storey mixed-use building that includes 119 market residential units, 25 seniors social housing units on the second floor, which will be operated by a non-profit housing provider, commercial space on the ground floor, floor space ratio (FSR) of 7.06, two levels of underground parking, and a height of 36.6 m (120 ft.)  
 Zoning: HA-1A to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning (Higher Building)  
 Review: Second  
 Architect: Merrick Architecture (Greg Borowski)  
 Owner: Beedie Living  
 Delegation: Greg Borowski, Merrick Architecture  
 Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership  
 Houtan Rafii, Beedie Living  
 Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting  
 Staff: Yan Zeng & Paul Cheng

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (4-6)**

- **Introduction:** The Rezoning Planner Yan Zeng introduced the application as a revised rezoning application at 105 Keefer. The project site is situated at the northeast corner of Keefer and Columbia Streets. There is a 150 foot frontage along Keefer, and a 122 foot frontage along Columbia Street. The site faces the Chinatown Memorial Plaza to the south, and adjacent to the site is a 50 foot wide site with a surface parking lot. Directly across on Columbia Street is the Chinese Cultural Centre building and the entrance to Sun Yat-Sun Gardens. Directly across Keefer Street is Chinatown Plaza Mall, which has a parking structure. The site is currently zoned HA-1A, and the maximum height is up to 27.4 meters or 90 feet, with no set maximum limit to conditional density. Furthermore, under the Chinatown South Rezoning Policy, building heights of up to 36.6 meters or 120 feet may be considered for this site. Density will be granted depending on the approval of the proposed form of development. The proposed uses include commercial uses at grade facing Keefer as well as Columbia Street. One of the CRUs facing Columbia Street is a Chinese Senior's Cultural Space. From Level 2 to Level 13 are residential units, on Level 2 there are 25 senior's social housing units, which would be operated by a non-profit housing operator. Level 3 and up are 119 market residential strata units.

The Development Planner Paul Cheng introduced the proposal by stating that the rezoning application is the second visit to the Panel. Mr. Cheng emphasized that since this is a rezoning the Panel should focus on the high level aspects of the proposal such as the proposed use, density, form and massing, and not on the finer details of the design, which could be reviewed during the development permit process.

The current site has a surface parking lot and previously held a gas station and automobile repair shop, but has been empty for some time. The zoning context is HA-1A, which is different than the other Chinatown zone known as HA-1, which applies only to the blocks along Pender Street. The HA-1 zone only allows much lower building heights than HA-1A.

Under the HA-1A zoning, a 90 foot building is allowed, but the 70 foot datum line is emphasized in order to reconcile a proposed 120 ft. building height within this zoning context of 70-90 ft. The proposal uses a streetwall podium to respond to the lower historical context, while setting back the tower element in order to be visually subservient when viewed from the public sidewalks. Mr. Cheng asked the Panel to consider the Urban Design Provisions under the Rezoning Policy as follows:

- Vary building facades in order to convey incremental development.
- Varied sawtooth building profiles
- Distinct incremental frontages in vertically-oriented bays.
- Setbacks of at least 25 feet for any building elements above 90 feet in height: for primary street-facing facades.

On Keefer Street the setback for elements over 90 feet is 25 feet, but there is a larger 52 foot setback on Columbia Street. Mr. Cheng stated that in the last iteration there were some elements above 90 feet that did not set back at least 25 feet.

Furthermore, the Panel is also to consider the major concerns from the previous Urban Design Panel review, which included:

- The project appears out-of-scale with its context (Sun Yat-Sen gardens, Memorial Plaza and nearby buildings).
- Consider bringing down the building height at the Southwest corner, and responding more sensitively to Memorial Plaza.
- The architecture lacks clarity and has too many design elements, due to its detailed response to design guidelines. A calmer, more legible design response is recommended.

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

- 1) Does the revised Rezoning proposal successfully respond to the Urban Design Provisions of the Chinatown HA-1A Rezoning Policy, with respect to overall massing, density, height, form and proposed uses?
  - 2) Does the revised proposal successfully address the concerns previously voiced by the Urban Design Panel, with respect to its scale, contextual fit with neighbouring properties and Memorial Plaza, and architectural legibility?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as a more simplified version of the previous design. The applicant stated that their intention was that the scale of the building fit in with the scale of the surrounding historic neighbourhood. There was a lightbox concept used for the massing of tower element, which is over the 90 foot shoulder height of the building, giving a separate 'identity' to the tower component. The applicant used cantilevered floor planes for balconies on the tower.

The applicant layered the guard rails so they are visible as people enter Chinatown. There was a neon sign added to introduce the public into Chinatown. The vertical piers are used facing the parkade to create of a smaller individual building scale. The senior's cultural space is intended to 'enliven' the ground floor and open up towards the street. The senior's amenity space on the south side has glass doors that open and provide an outlook to Memorial Plaza. The access to the building will be through the main entrance off Keefer on the south east corner of the site. The seniors cultural and recreation centre would be at the northwest corner to honour the historical location of that use and animate the lane.

The applicant used landscape to contribute to breaking down the building massing. At the ground plane, the applicant designed sidewalk mosaics in front of the small retail spaces of street names or glass prisms in order to express the symbolism of Chinatown. The applicant intended to respect the Memorial Plaza space, by allowing 'spill out' from the corner retail spaces without encroachment on the plaza. There are bamboo screens on the patios as an added historic design element. The sustainability rating is LEED Gold. There are movable screens intended for the west façade. There are measures being considered to prevent thermal bridging for the patio decks.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Overall the building form is too tall and does not align with the scale of Chinatown's distinct silhouette;
  - The massing concept and architectural language, should reflect or be informed by the dominant north south grain of the built form of Chinatown.
  - The south west corner of the building at the end of the Quebec Street axis should make a stronger architectural statement;
  - The balconies on the tower lantern create too much mass, bulk, and conflict with the vertical façade elements;
  - The tower element, the floors of the building above 90 feet, needs invention and incorporate a reinterpretation of Chinatown elements;
  - The 'spirit' of Chinatown and the contemporary reinterpretation of history were not evident in the design.
- **Related Commentary:** The Chair Mr. Roger Hughes prefaced the discussion by stating the Panel comments should relate to the relationship of urban design to the policy guidelines. In particular, in order to achieve 120 foot in the rezoning, the Policy states it "should consider innovative heritage, cultural and affordable housing projects in Chinatown". The Panel supported the social housing, cultural facility and small retail uses. However most of the Panel did not think the form earned extra density or height. The design seemed too 'literal' or borrowed from a very direct or obvious interpretation of Chinatown. A few Panel members advised the use of a more contemporary language of design. Some Panel members mentioned that aspects of the form were too 'bulky' in the presentation, and needed a finer grain. The design is too tight at grade and needs more breathing room. For example, the lane could indent at grade. Overall, the form should achieve a strong sense of place in order to warrant increased density.

Some of the Panel thought the architectural legibility had improved. There was some Panel support for screens and rooftop gardens, but there was concern for their longevity. Some Panel members regretted the loss of the Keefer Street side saw tooth design of the previous scheme, but there was support for the saw tooth in the north south orientation by one Panel member. Some Panel members thought the bamboo screens may not work due to a future conflict with views and reliable maintenance, although one Panel member appreciated the screens. The laneway elevation was the most successful aspect of the presentation according to some Panel members. One Panel member thought the Columbia Street façade looked like a glass façade with stuck-on vertical brick elements. Another Panel member suggested relocating the senior's amenity room to mitigate possible noise problems. One Panel member mentioned that the scale and parcel pattern of the Chinatown buildings oriented north-south is not reflected in this scheme, which has 'equal directional reading' on both main streets.

Most Panel members appreciated the lane treatment and one suggested the lane should have varying setbacks at grade. Most of the Panel agreed that there should be a strong architectural piece on the corner so as not to 'disappear'. A few Panel members thought there should be a stronger roofline, and a stronger distinctive tower lantern form. Additional plaza space was welcomed by one Panel member. Overall, the Panel agreed that the design needs authenticity in spirit, and not rely on mimicry of detail.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant felt the mass concerns would be reviewed, and thanked the Panel for their comments. The expression on the lane garnered interesting comments.

2.	Address:	1837 Main Street
	DE:	DE420183
	Description:	To construct a 12-storey mixed-use building comprised of 256 dwelling units, including 30 social housing units, a secured cultural amenity space (4,000 sq. ft.), and retail at grade, all over three levels of underground parking.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	Second (First at DE)
	Architect:	Francl Architecture (Walter Francl)
	Owner:	0839879 BC Ltd.
	Delegation:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Alain Prince, Francl Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Mar Mazzone, Aquilini Veronica Owens, Light House
	Staff:	Tim Potter

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter introduced the project, a development application subsequent to a rezoning, by identifying the site as a full-block development on Main Street between Second and Third Avenues. The site is 242 feet wide (along Main Street) and 132 feet deep with a slope of 13 feet between Second and Third Avenues. The proposed height is 117 feet (12 storeys) and a density of 5.49 FSR. Mr. Potter also located the following key elements of the project: the artist production space, the internal plaza, the passage space, and the secured social housing.

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

1. Please comment on the following aspects of the building design:
    - a. The success of the architectural materials and overall expression;
    - b. The interface of the building to public areas such as along Main Street and the passage to the internal plaza;
  2. Please comment on the success of the following aspects of the Landscape design:
    - a. the plaza;
    - b. street and lane edges; and
    - c. roof terraces and garden spaces.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project by hi-lighting the key features and revisions to the project which include a passage from Main Street to an internal plaza, an artist production space, and a social housing component. The internal plaza can be seen from Main Street if viewed through the passage. The plaza will be an interesting space for artists, residents and retailers alike. It will be an active place for presentations, making art, events, and terrace space for the retailers. There will be an opportunity for public art in the plaza that will be seen from Main Street.

The material palette of the building is comprised of glass and a cementitious panel system. A depth and liveliness of the elevations will be achieved by using three variations of each of the colours (red and green) that have been selected for the panels.

The general approach to the landscape design is a simple layering of landscape treatments. The design begins at the top of the building with the roof deck(s). The uppermost roof is a green roof with a large area dedicated to urban agriculture. The terraced roofs that step down to 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue are a mix of green roofs and private patios. The social housing component has its urban agriculture at the south side of the project. The plaza space is a large open space with that will support adjacent retail spaces. There is an area of the plaza that can serve as a stage. A public bike share is located at the edge of the plaza along the lane. There are a number of sustainability measures for the project, some of which include: building overhangs; storm water management; insulated slab edges; and double glazed windows.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The passage needs to be improved by giving it a stronger architectural expression;
  - Related to the above, public art could contribute to the enhancement of the passage;
  - The artist production space should have a more unique identity.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that the building is a well-articulated mid-rise form. The terraced green roof expression was well supported. The architectural expression and use of materials is also successful. However, one member suggested that the façade designs could be better related to their solar exposure. A few members had concerns about the solar bridging of the slab edges and the energy performance of the windows. A number of panel members thought that the artist studio space lacks a unique identity and needs to be more dynamic.

A few members thought the passage is not developed enough and should be further refined. Aspects of it such as benches, walls, soffits, and the garage exhaust grill should be explored to enrich the design of the passage. Some aspects of the project such as the garage exhaust, the artist studio exhaust, and the vista switch, need to be well coordinated and, in some cases, re-designed to be better integrated to mitigate their effect on adjacent outside spaces.

One panel member was disappointed that the rainwater collection terminates in a cistern in the basement. It was suggested that perhaps the collected rainwater could be re-used to supply the irrigation system. It was also observed that the play space related to the social housing amenity area should be bigger.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments.

---

3. Address:	885 Cambie Street (formerly 225 Smithe Street)
DE:	DE420157
Description:	To construct a mixed-use building containing one level of retail, three levels of office and 23 levels of residential use over six levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First at DE)
Architect:	GBL Architects (Andrew Emmerson)
Owner:	Boffo Developments
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Andrew Emmerson, GBL Architects Gerry Eckford, ETA Landscape Architecture John Jalil, Integral Group
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

---

### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-7)

- **Introduction:** The Development Planner Patrick O'Sullivan introduced the project as a development application after a rezoning (CD-1). The site is located at the corner of Cambie and Smithe Streets and the dimensions are 120 feet wide and 125 in length with a 12 foot cross fall from north to south. Mr. O'Sullivan described the context for the area noting the Rosedale Gardens residential building at 26 storeys high across the lane, the Rosedale Hotel at 20 storeys high further north, a 21 storey residential building at the north end of the same block-face and an 11 storey office adjacent to the immediate east. There is a 28 storey residential building to the south; and across Cambie Street there are 2-6 storey forms classified as Heritage "C". There is also a three-storey commercial building to the Southwest of the site.

The applicant proposes one level of retail, three levels of office (levels 2 through 4), 23 levels of residential, totaling 27 storeys at 275 feet in height and six levels of underground parking. The density is 11.39 FSR with a floorplate of 9400 square feet for office component and approximately 6600 square feet for the residential tower portion. The tower is set back 32 feet from the east property line. The required 80 foot separation from Rosedale residences is provided. Building materials proposed include curtain wall, window wall, spandrel glass, painted concrete and metal panel.

Mr. O'Sullivan described the changes to the building expression since the previous UDP appearance at rezoning, which includes the following: the podium has dropped by about 20 feet from the rezoning scheme; the verticality of the expression of the rezoning scheme has been changed to a simpler, more horizontal articulation; the stepping undercut of the rezoning design has been changed to more clear simple undercut with slender columns introduced; and the blunt "flat top" of the rezoning design has undergone additional shaping at the top of the tower. The public realm includes an office entry located along Smithe Street with a setback area of alternating panels of concrete unit pavers, and a custom timber bench, as well as a cast-in-place planter at the lane. Residential entry is located along Cambie Street with a setback area and alternating panels of concrete unit pavers. The landscaping includes: an outdoor amenity area for office on Level 3 at the lane; IPE decking; timber benches; hydra pressed slab; and a variety of planting. There is a landscaped outdoor deck for office use on Level 4 on the lane side. Amenities are located on Level 6 for an office with outdoor space along the Smithe Street side of the site. The private residential decks on Level 9 are landscaped and the roof level is inaccessible with an extensive green roof, and an accessible area with IPE decking and urban aggregate.

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

1. Has the applicant addressed the Consensus items from the rezoning UDP appearance?
  2. How is the architectural expression, composition of forms, elements, materials and tower shaping (including the modified undercut above the office uses) handled?
  3. How is the overall approach to the landscape design, including the public realm (street trees, seating area, setbacks at grade and weather protection) and landscaped decks, outdoor amenity spaces, and green roof?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project stating the step in the shoulder piece was much higher before in order to cover up a blank firewall. The shoulder height has been dropped by several floors. In the carved out portion of the building the applicant wanted to capture more outdoor space. The building is more layered in this presentation. The applicant intended a simpler, structurally direct approach. The top of the building was addressed with more articulation at the top than the previous scheme at the rezoning stage.

The applicant introduced the building programming by stating the small site was challenging. There is a significant slope for parking access. The frontage is intended to be as open as possible for the public realm by having setbacks. There are separate entrances for office and residential-uses. At Level 6 there is an indoor amenity space adjacent to the outdoor amenity space in the lane. The tower is pushed out to create a shelf like projection, and there is a ribbon fascia to integrate the different components of the retail and residential space. The residential tower is intended to be clean visually with less articulation than before.

At the ribbon fascia, there is a metal panel soffit with LED strip lights, which will be a combination of a metal panel and painted concrete. The sustainability rating is LEED. There is a hydronic mechanical system proposed. The proposed landscape has a stormwater treatment system. The trees are intended to be a canopy around the edge of the building. The private terraces should have enough landscape to provide over look protection from below. On Level 6 there is an arbor element and glazed screens with children's play and dining areas. The urban agriculture consists of a planter edge along the children's area. The amenity is a series of landscape rooms to animate the space with chandeliered lighting. The urban agriculture on the roof is only accessed by the penthouse.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The folded band fascia is not working and needs design development;
  - A stronger public realm statement is needed;
  - The residential amenity space is too broken up by columns;
  - The stacking massing concept either needs further development or should not be used;
  - The double row of street trees is not supported;
  - The sustainability strategies should be further developed.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel was more supportive of the previous (rezoning) scheme than that of the current presentation. Panel members thought the verticality of the first scheme worked better because of the finer grain of expression and that it connected to the tower to grade well. Alternatively if the layered stacked massing concept is to be used further design development is required to strengthen its clarity and resolution of the relationship of the stacked pieces.

The Panel supported dropping of the podium at the party wall. Furthermore, the stepped soffit over the outdoor amenity area for the first scheme was preferred over the current simpler shaping. A Panel member thought the amenity for the office space on Level 4 was too small. The expression at the top of the tower needs development according to a few Panel members. The lighting on the soffits was appreciated by one Panel member.

Most of the Panel appreciated the diversity of outdoor spaces and streets with wider setbacks. Although one Panel member thought there should be more public space overall. The urban agriculture area could be improved more as well as the green roof, which although supported, most Panel members felt it should be a shared amenity. The Panel felt the planters were not sufficient to qualify as amenity space. One Panel member appreciated the seating area outside, but mentioned there should be weather protection for it.

One Panel member mentioned the sustainability was not exemplary, rather more of a mainstream approach. Another Panel member suggested the building envelope be improved rather than rely on a geothermal system. Finally, the percentage of glazing appears high and the design relies on vision glass. Therefore, meeting the energy code will be challenging.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant enjoys the challenge and felt they had an exemplary presentation.

---

4. Address:	26 E 1st Avenue
DE:	DE420164
Description:	To construct an 18-storey residential building containing 137 dwelling units over five levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Fourth (First at DE for current design)
Architect:	Bingham + Hill Architects (Doug Nelson)
Owner:	Mondiale Development
Delegation:	Doug Nelson, HBH Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Richard Tam, Pinnacle
Staff:	Sailen Black

---

#### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (4-6)

- Introduction:** Development Planner Sailen Black introduced the project, a complete development application, by identifying the proposal as a new residential 18 storey high rise containing 137 dwelling units with open and enclosed private balconies over five levels of underground parking. Common access amenity spaces, both indoors and outdoors, are proposed at different levels and locations around the building. The amenities include a space for a children's play area on top of the podium. The site is located on the southeast corner of Ontario Street and East 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue with bikeways on Ontario Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, and is currently zoned CD-1 with a height of up to 175 feet and density of up to 6.98 FSR.

At the development permit stage the Green Buildings Policy is being considered. Also, the High Density Living for Families with Children Guidelines will apply to any large project where there are a number of two and three bedroom units that house children and families. In the Southeast False Creek (SEFC) Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys, there are a number of prescriptive tests that should be met when considering an additional upper two storeys on a tower in southeast false creek. The previous penthouse has changed since the last presentation, and one change is a condition of rezoning to reduce the mass of the north tip of the project because of its potential effect on East Park. The achievement of a high quality architectural design for the penthouse levels is another test from the SEFC, as well as its contribution to an interesting and engaging roofscape, reinforce the originally-intended scale of the building in the Official Development Plan; minimize negative impacts on- and off-site, including neighbouring buildings, view obstructions, privacy and shadowing, and integrate well with the overall massing and expression of the rest of the building.

The applicant altered the design approach in a number of ways from the rezoning. There are distinctive staggered windows in a dark 'frame' element on the north tower, replacing the previous red line and bays. The new proposal has smoothed and curved side elevations, replacing a saw tooth approach in previous floor plans. Furthermore, the balconies have less projection than before, and there is a revised design of amenity rooms on all levels.

The prior rezoning presentation was supported by the Panel with advice to implement a stronger expression on the rooftop. The Panel also advised stepping the form to allow for more sunlight into the courtyard, and recommended design development to include both indoor and outdoor amenity space on the south side of the building, further activation for the outdoor terrace on the north, mitigation of the blank wall in the courtyard, and connecting and locating the indoor amenity spaces to exterior amenity spaces.

The applicant team was asked to comment in more detail on the changes from rezoning including exterior materials, colours and expression; how they have addressed the UDP comments; landscape approach; and any specific sustainable design features.

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

- 1) Has the applicant addressed the consensus items for improvement raised by the Panel on April 22, 2015?
  - 2) Has the relationship between the tower and podium elements been resolved in this design?
  - 3) Considering the revised form of the penthouse element, including its effects on private views, shadowing of the park, and the position of the site, does the Panel support its additional height and density?
  - 4) Can the Panel comment on the revised design and location of indoor and amenity spaces?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as having the tower placed in the same location as the rezoning stage. The north to south dimension of the tower has shrunk. The tower was kept to the setback line. The applicant chose metallic materials to convey the motif of an industrial aesthetic in the design. Spandrel glass is proposed on the north facade.

On Level 6 there is a family lounge connected to the rooftop amenity space. The courtyard has a connection to the lane. There was a concern about view obstruction due to setbacks in this proposal. The streetscape has outdoor patio spaces. The ground floor is built on the concept of a railway module, by using benches, timber and other materials. There is a green roof and private patio space on the top of the building. There is public art planned in the plaza. The proposed sustainability rating is LEED Gold Certified.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The overall design became generic after the rezoning stage and lost its quality as a 'landmark' building;
  - The black metal panel frame on the front facing park needs to be more deliberate;
  - There should be more elaboration of the railyard theme currently incorporated only in one small area in this scheme;
  - The relationship between the tower and podium should be stronger;
  - The penthouse needs more of an element of 'delight' in the design development;
  - The grade connection at the lobby could improve.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the height and density of the penthouse, but preferred the rezoning stage design. For example, one Panel member mentioned the vertical elements gave the tower more presence in the previous iteration. Some of the strengths of the current scheme include a well done south elevation, a calmer approach to the east and west sides of the tower, the front and back work well, the relationship of the tower to the townhouse facades is improved, and there was a better lobby location in the scheme. Most Panel members supported the indoor amenity space.

The shadowing of the courtyard was resolved, but some Panel members felt the strength of the design was lost. A few Panel members suggested deleting the colour features and emphasizing black instead. One Panel member mentioned the townhouse forms were 'handsome'. One Panel member recommended the design of the penthouse should be different from the rest of the tower. One Panel member supported the roof top amenity room over the penthouse. But another Panel member did not support the roof amenity over the penthouse because the area has a seawall, parks, and a good-sized main outdoor amenity area on the podium. A few Panel members suggested raising the black frame to the penthouse, and have it touch grade and to consider the landmark location of the tower.

There was Panel support for combining the indoor and outdoor amenity space at the podium roof level. The grade connection at the lobby could improve. One Panel member suggested the main roof amenity space incorporate the railyard theme. Another Panel Member thought the windowless amenity rooms were not a good idea. One Panel member suggested a better building envelope, instead of solar shades. The benefit and durability of solar shades on the upper levels of the south façade should be re-considered according to a few Panel members. Overall, the Panel thought the design lost its uniqueness since the rezoning stage.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant appreciated the comments, especially related to the façade and the rail yard theme.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.