

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** February 22, 2017

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Helen Avini Besharat  
Amela Brudar (excused for item #4)  
James Cheng (excused for item #4)  
David Jerke  
Veronica Gillies  
Karen Spoelstra (excused for item #3)  
Yijin Wen  
Muneesh Sharma  
Kim Smith  
Neal LaMontagne (excused for item #3 & 4)

**REGRETS:** Renee Van Halm  
Nell Gasiewicz  
Meredith Anderson

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	5812-5844 Cambie Street
2.	399 E 1st Avenue (Great Northern Way – Lot P)
3.	320 Granville Street
4.	3198 Riverwalk Avenue (EFL Parcel 10)

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Smith 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: 5812-5844 Cambie Street  
Permit No. RZ-2016-00035  
Description: The proposal is for a ten and eight-storey mixed-use development, including a total of 117 residential units (including eight live/work units at the lane), six commercial units at grade and 2,012 m<sup>2</sup> of office space on the second floor, a maximum building height of 35.0 m (116 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 5.22, over three levels of underground parking (including 215 vehicle spaces and 183 bicycle spaces). This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.  
Zoning: C-2 to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning Application  
Review: First  
Architect: IBI Group (Clement Pun & Martin Bruckner)  
Owner: New Oakridge Ltd.  
Delegation: Martin Bruckner, IBI Group  
Clement Pun, IBI Group  
Eddy Eckford, ETA  
Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting  
Staff: Graham Winterbottom & Ann McLean

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-1)**

- **Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project by noting that this is a rezoning proposal for a mixed-use development. It consists of ten and eight-storey residential towers with a five-storey podium which has commercial uses at grade and office space on the second level. This is a full block assembly of sites from 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue which are currently zoned C-2 and consists of a variety of one-storey commercial uses. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Phase II plan in the Oakridge Town Centre Neighbourhood which recommends a density range of 2.25 - 4.5 FSR subject to urban design performance.

Existing commercial zoning aims for a 'walkable mixed-use urban centre with a diverse mix of job space and housing types'. Policy specific to this block extends from 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue to 45<sup>th</sup> Avenue and envisions a 'vibrant street life and dynamic public realm' with 'opportunities for high-quality engaging architecture to accompany public plazas, active streets and at-grade shops and services'. Unlike other areas of the plan, the Oakridge Town Centre area recommends zero lot lines for a continuous street wall of commercial uses at grade. Job space is encouraged to support the designation of the area as a Municipal Town Centre in the Metro Regional Growth Strategy, and approximately 20,000 sq. ft. of second floor office space is incorporated into the proposal.

The plan recommends that lanes throughout these blocks be enhanced and active in order to act as 'connectors' that supplement movement networks in the area. Applicants are encouraged to explore ideas that maintain the functionality of the lanes for loading and parking, but also edge uses which create unique places and encourage people to use the lanes. As part of the proposal eight townhouses front the lane at the rear. As part of the public realm strategy for Phase II, a mid-size public plaza is recommended for this block which is activated through retail uses at the edges.

Building heights in the plan are recommended to taper down from 12 storeys at 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Cambie. However, provision is made to consider greater heights through planning work done in Cambie Corridor Phase III. Emerging directions through Cambie Phase III have indicated a consideration of heights between 16 and 20 stories on the four corners at 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Cambie Street. Note that these are draft policies still to be refined and considered by Council towards the end of 2017. Residential areas to the east of the site across the lane are also being considered as part of Phase III for heights of up to six stories.

The site is the only active application on these blocks between 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue and 45<sup>th</sup> Avenue. To the northeast and fronting onto W 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue is a six-storey rental building which is constructed and occupied. To the east of that is another proposal at Alberta Street for a six-storey market residential building. To the west of the site across Cambie Street is the Oakridge mall site which has a rezoning approved by Council in 2014.

Ann McLean, Development Planner, continued by noting that the proposal is for 10 storeys at the north end of the site and eight storeys at the south end, with a five-storey mid-section and townhouses at lane. The Plan in this area asks for a 5-storey streetwall. The proposed density is 5.22 FSR.

Policy asked for a “mid-size” plaza at 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and a “large” plaza at 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It has been agreed that relocating those plazas so that they flank 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is a better proposal. A plaza of about 950 sq. ft. is proposed, with a maximum dimension of 25 ft., which is comparable in size to open space at Vine Street and Broadway.

Otherwise, the setbacks are minimal at the street edges. A modest setback of 3ft is provided at the lane edge, as suggested by the Plan. A 30ft setback is provided above the second storey at the lane, which is comparable to what would be achieved under base zoning, and is satisfactory to Planning.

Policy asks for smaller scale residential buildings at the lane, where possible, in order to enliven the lane. The Plan also envisions the lanes near transit stations to act as secondary pedestrian routes. Lanes should have some flexible outdoor spaces, lighting and high quality material treatment on the buildings.

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

1. The overall proposal in terms of its form, height and density with regard to the policy and guidelines. (5.22; 8+10 storeys)
  2. Relationship to the public realm -
    - setbacks at the streets and lane and
    - the success of the proposed plaza size and configuration
  3. Massing of building with regard to the departure from the policy-recommended form having a 5-storey streetwall, with a stepback above, and its relationship to future buildings under the rezoning policy.
- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that there is a setback at the south side where it is sunny, and that activating the lane through live/work units was considered to be a good thing. The building presents as having an urban form but remains compliant with the Cambie Corridor plan.

At the back it is pulled back 30 ft. to create a reasonable setback for the building mass. There is rain protection along all commercial frontage, and prominent residential lobbies at the north and south side. The form is one of interesting bookends to create verticality, with more traditional residential architecture in between. Materials look like concrete but actually include cladding.

With regards to the landscape, the applicants have tried to maintain a certain amount of openness. There is a very simple landscape treatment and a pattern to the plaza which is repeated at the north end. On the central green rooftop there is space for a variety of uses and a children's play area.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

- Support proposed density, but do more to earn it;
- Design development to add more verticality to the massing of the towers;
- Design development to better activate the lane, and especially the blank walls;
- More variety and activation is needed along the block with commercial uses;
- Design development on the plaza to provide better connection and integration with the sidewalk;
- Re-consider seating in the plaza to make sure it is logical and sufficient;
- Consider the planting strip on the podium and whether it will be successful;
- More consideration should be given to bicycle circulation around the site;
- The units in this building need to be much more affordable;

- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that there should be more height and less bulk in the middle as the form of the building feels squat currently. The building massing strategy is wrong, and it would be better as a taller building or with more vertical elements. Either move the towers up or the podium down in order to add more verticality. As well, reconsider the symmetry of the book-ends to make them more contextual as currently the scheme seems a bit confused. Design development should also be done to better highlight the office aspects in the building, and the location of the office entry should be re-visited as it is too close to the residential entrance. Panel members suggested the entrance to the offices be located on Cambie Street.

At the retail level it looks too relentless and there needs to be something which attracts the eye, such as articulated canopies. Really consider how the building will interface with the streetscape the sidewalk outside the CRUs and how it will evolve. More could be done to activate the space and make it viable in the long term as the edge along Cambie Street is too flat and needs design development to create more interest. Consider reducing or alternating the monolithic-ness of the structure to lessen the flatness.

Pull the building back from the lane to provide the building with more breathing room. As well, play with the podium to make it more interesting and to better activate the lane.

The plaza stops a bit abruptly and will seem unfinished if the City is not brought onboard with its design. Currently it is less of a plaza and more of a CRU spill-out; so consider just going in this direction. The narrow strip of landscape above the podium level with the trees also does not seem successful. Either eliminate it or develop it further and better.

Consider coming up with a better way to celebrate the bicycle-oriented aspects. Think more about how bikes will use the elevators; maybe even consider a separate elevator for bikes. Much more also needs to be given on creating affordable housing in this building. Finally, something beyond the white cladding and glass should be considered in the material pallet.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their thought out comments and looks forward to incorporating the advice.

2. Address:	399 E 1st Avenue (Great Northern Way – Lot P)
Permit No.	DE420195
Description:	To develop four buildings (ranging in height from 7 to 15 storeys) including: two live/work buildings, one hotel and one office building, all with retail at grade that is connected by a public plaza over a common (five-level) underground parkade accessed from Thornton Street. A storage facility is also located on Level P5.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	IBI Group (Jeffrey Mok)
Owner:	Onni Group
Delegation:	Michael Bruckner, IBI Group Jeffrey Mok, IBI Group Eddy Eckford, ETA Chip Hall, Onni Group Tim Tewsley, Recollective
Staff:	Tim Potter

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-1)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the site as being located on E 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue at Thornton Street. There is a significant slope going from north to south across the site. The BNSF railway is located immediately to the north of the site, and the site is governed by CD-1 (402) which was recently updated in 2013.

The proposed development application is comprised of a hotel building, an office building, two live-work buildings and a public plaza, and a landscaped area on the Brewery Creek Statutory right-of-Way (SRW). The proposed maximum height of the buildings on the site is 150 ft.

#### Previous Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Overall, the site massing and layout does not fit together well based on past guidelines, and does not appear to be generated from the context of the site;
- The pixel/voxel articulation is a superficial applied expression and is not 3 dimensional enough, for example the unit planning and how it relates to the massing and expression of the building are not integrated;
- The layering and materiality could be further developed;
- The landscaping is too commercial and corporate and doesn't take into consideration the live-work residential uses;
- There should be more amenity space for the live/work residents;
- There should be a more credible separation between the live work/space evident in the unit plans.

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

1. Have the panel's previous concerns been satisfied successfully?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that the architectural expression has been edited down to a more controlled identity. A look was taken at 'landing' the buildings. The area is not well-developed currently, but up the hill the predominant material is brick. So brick has been used at the ground floor and re-enforced though canopies. Wherever one walks in the site, you can walk through the site without re-tracing your steps. The entryways have been opened up and highlighted through arch details, and there is now another way into the hotel for pedestrians at the upper levels. As in other developments, there is a shared larger amenity for the buildings.

The circulation pattern is an essential component to the site design. There is a bicycle route along great northern way, and there is a setback which responds strongly to this condition through an active and animated space, and the slope has been taken advantage of by adding retail entries where the grade drops down. The type of open space provided is the most appropriate considering the live/work space locations.

All of the rainwater goes down into a depression to create a very native, bipedal area. Water elements are used throughout the site to add playfulness, and there are private patios on the live/work, rooftop space on the hotel, and urban agriculture up at the roof.

Public art has been thought about, and there is a planned space for a significant piece of art.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development on the live/work spaces to make them look less like condos while still encouraging the live/work dynamic;
  - More consideration should be given to bicycle movement throughout the site;
  - Consider a changing, dynamic art component which is connected to Emily Carr;
  - The urban agriculture is not necessary or successful over the office building.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel started by noting that the concerns from the previous panel have been mostly resolved. However, it looks like static public art options are being explored and the applicants should consider a more dynamic option instead. Try doing something which would work with Emily Carr to create a cultural precinct.

Re-consider the urban agriculture; it is on top of a commercial building and will not be used. The playground needs a little bit more design development as well. Also, develop the live/work typology a bit more. Spice things up a bit.

Younger generations do not get around by cars, and more thought needs to be given to cycling in consideration of this. Develop the bike storage and parking much more, and really encourage bicycling in the area by provision of cycling concessions.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that it is interesting how the panel liked the previous pixelated scheme a bit better. The live/work the comments are appreciated, and there could have more work facilities in the area.

3. Address:	320 Granville Street
Permit No.	DP-2016-00666
Description:	To develop the site with a 30-storey office building, with retail at grade and mezzanine levels, a total floor area of 35,140m <sup>2</sup> , and eight levels of underground parking accessed off of the rear lane.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Third (First at DP)
Architect:	Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc. (Steven Wagner)
Owner:	Granco Holdings Ltd.
Delegation:	Steven Wagner, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc. James Von Klemperer, Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates David Stoyko, Connect
Staff:	Jason Olinek

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-2)

- Introduction: Jason Olinek, Development Planner, started by noting that this site was rezoned in 2013 under the Metro Core Plan as well as the Central Waterfront HUB Framework which emphasized non-residential uses and the creation of job space close to transit. The proposal matches the CD-1 permitted height and density.

View Cones across the Cambie Bridge and Queen Elizabeth Park limit heights on the site to about 368 ft. The Base DD zoning for nearby sites limits FSR to 9.0 and the basic height to 300 ft. with a maximum conditional height of 450 ft. The Green Buildings Policy requires LEED™ Gold certification and emphasizes optimized energy performance.

This is a development application for a 30-storey office tower located at W Cordova Street and Granville Street. The proposed height is approximately 367 ft. and proposed FSR is 24.24. For context, the site is within the older financial district character area with significant heritage landmarks nearby including:

- RBC building to south (Heritage A)
- CPR (Waterfront) Station (Heritage A)
- Sinclair Centre to west with overpass to Granville Square (Heritage A)

An aim for this character area is to consider or strengthen the relationship of new development to the existing context. This may include expression of scale, architectural rhythm, coordinated open space or at grade uses.

Immediate Public Realm context is important to review as well. It includes:

- Granville Square due north, connecting with the Cordova pedestrian Bridge.
- Entry plaza to Grant Thornton Place
- The approved office tower at 601 W Hastings
- The RBC building and
- Water Front Station

The Downtown Design Guidelines aim is to create good, at grade, public open space. Such spaces include varied, visually interesting spaces which are accessible by a wide range of people throughout the year. Spaces could also be activated by at grade uses, such as retail shops and restaurants.

The tower silhouette will have a prominent lasting impact on the city skyline viewed from the north and in the harbor. Waterfront Station and Granville plaza make it unlikely that development will obscure the building's skyline silhouette in the immediate future.

Since the rezoning the building expression has taken a curvilinear form rather than the canted, angular form previously shown. The design concept results in variation in the envelope plane suggesting a ripple effect which emphasizes the horizontal stacked floor plates. Predominate tower materials include curtain wall glazing, with some metal and stone being employed at grade. The side-yard is improved to 12.5 ft. (3.8 m.) against the Grant Thornton building starting at Level 3, and rounded corners improve view angles from other neighbouring offices. This is not a residential block, so the typical 80 ft. tower separation is not a requirement.

Previous Panel's Consensus on key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design Development to podium level;
- Consider simplifying facades regarding sustainability;
- Design development of how building meets the ground;
- Consider weather protection around the building.

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

1. Please comment on materiality in general and with respect to the curvilinear geometry.
  2. Please comment on the public realm interface, the entry and the design of the at grade pedestrian spaces.
  3. Does the Panel support the proposed architectural expression and relationship to the neighbouring context?
  4. Please comment on the applicant's response in addressing Consensus items from the rezoning UDP appearance.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by noting that this site is important as the origination of Granville Street and as a gatepost to the waterfront. The sculptural quality to the building was born out of previous commentary, with the shadows cut down due to the rounded corners. The concavities have been balanced with convexity and offset with a series of ripples across the curtain wall to add complexity to the building. There is a supple waving to the building which is reflected in the parapet at the top, and this is meant to parallel the idea of waves and water when seen from a distance.

The soffits are to be done in a wood material and are to be lit at night. There is also a coverage given along Granville Street and Cordova Street to allow for travel under cover. A good portion of the site has been given over to public use, and there is retail and restaurant uses inside the building itself.

The plaza at the corner is a key space. The intent was to create a flow into the plaza and into the lobby to try and tie them together through materials. An attempt was made to respond to context by using basalt and granite as materials in the lobby. There are some tight edges to the site which have been softened, and include spaces to sit and perch. The overall design is one of tight spaces punctuated by the plaza.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - A better balance is needed between the reflective properties of the glass windows and sustainability approach to optimized energy performance;
  - Design development of the public entry to relate to immediate context and encourage better access to daylight for the space;
  - Pay more attention to solar orientation to promote sustainability and improve passiveness;
  - Consideration should be paid to bike circulation and bike amenity provisions;
  - A better connection (more porosity) is needed between Cordova Street and Granville Street;
  - Consider additional social amenities for the offices including on the roof top;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the project has improved a lot from the rezoning scheme, but that more design development is needed to hide the mechanical parts better.

The podium needs much more attention as there is a lot of mass sitting on a tiny base. Do something to express the base a bit more to give the building more presence at the ground plane. If the building is not going to respond to the context of the buildings around it then more needs to be done to emphasize this aspect. Maintain the purity of the form, but be more sensitive to orientation. Consideration should be given to the depth of the mullions and to doing something with the slab edges in order to exaggerate the ripple more.

Additional porosity is needed both visually and to provide a connection to the adjacent transit station. The transition of the sloping grade to the lobby is not very well resolved. It would be better if there was a more seamless flow of glass going to the ground.

The building is more self-defined rather than complimentary to the surrounding buildings, which is ok. However, design development of the pedestrian entry is needed so that it fits in more with the area. Take the podium to the next level of design by going further with design development. There are accents of wood around the building, but this could be used further to enhance the building. More openness is needed with regards to the pedestrian access; both through architecture and by using lighter materials.

Think about how sustainability and energy performance will work in this building considering all the glass. More of a narrative is needed with regards to sustainable performance. This building should be targeting LEED Platinum, but currently does not seem to be doing enough to achieve even LEED Gold. The materiality is neat, but consider triple-glazing. More attention should also be given to providing bicycle amenities and to promoting bike use in the building.

There is an FSR exclusion for amenities, so more innovation needs to happen with regards to shared spaces. There is no excuse to not have more social and open spaces. Take a look at what is happening in other countries and cities in order to get ideas on how to improve social sustainability.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that the comments were very perceptive and instructive. A design will be developed with a bit more amplitude for the shape of the building, although only so much can be carved out of the mass. More attention will be paid to the base, and it would be great if the amplitude of undulation could be increased at the top.

---

4. Address:	3198 Riverwalk Avenue (EFL Parcel 10)
Permit No.	DP-2016-00793
Description:	To develop a seven-storey residential building containing 142 dwelling units over two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Riverwalk Avenue.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects (Paul Goodwin)
Owner:	Polygon
Delegation:	Paul Goodwin, GBL Architects Kevin Shormaker, Polygon
Staff:	Danielle Wiley

---

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

- Introduction: Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project, noting that the site is in East Fraserlands (River District). This is a development permit application following a masterplan rezoning for Area 2. Proposed are two seven-storey residential buildings with a total of 143 units. The total floor area is 148 000 sq. ft., which is 12 000 sq. ft. more than was anticipated in the rezoning as floor space is proposed to be transferred from another River District site to this parcel.

The rezoning masterplan anticipated two buildings at seven and six storeys respectively. It recommended that massing should terrace down towards the foreshore. Development should provide an animated street frontage with a large break between buildings to provide views to river from the street. The masterplan specifies that the west building should help to “frame” the neighbourhood park as a portal to the river and should also provide an animated edge to the park. The east building should define a mews with Parcel 11 for shared access to loading and parking. Overall architecture should have a “unique expression” to respond to the riverfront location.

This proposal responds to the general intent of the rezoning masterplan. The two buildings are separated by north-south courtyard and terrace down towards the Foreshore Park. The height of both buildings is 25.5m (10ft. floor-to-floor). Setbacks are set at 2 m. at the north (street) and west property lines (PLs), 6.5 m at the east PL (mews) and 3.0 m. at the south PL (foreshore).

There are ground-oriented units around the perimeter of both buildings with private patios intended to animate the pedestrian realm. Both lobbies face into the courtyard; one is located at the street, and the second is located further into the courtyard.

There is one 800 sq. ft. common amenity room in the east building, at grade, which is intended to serve both buildings. The courtyard provides outdoor common space for both buildings. The rooftop terraces created by the stepped massing are all private.

In terms of architectural expression, the building massing is broken into three horizontal sections. The lower three storeys are clad in light-coloured brick veneer; the middle “band” projects slightly and is clad with copper sheet metal; and the upper two storeys are clad in light-coloured concrete panel. Balconies with continuous posts act as vertical “super-structure” elements.

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

1. Is the expression of the street elevation (including the two entries) successful?

2. Does the design succeed in ‘framing’ the neighbourhood park, and animating its eastern edge (at grade)?
  3. Comment on the architectural expression and detailing, and its appropriateness for this unique riverfront location.
  4. Is the overall density and distribution of massing appropriate? (Note: An additional 12 000sf (from rezoning masterplan) is proposed to be transferred to this site.)
- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant team stated that the forms of the buildings were influenced by the curve in Riverwalk Avenue and the requirement to terrace down to the foreshore. The courtyard provides open space as well as a visual connection to the river, and the units are skewed within the floorplan to capture the views of the water. The courtyard widens towards the foreshore to capture the most light possible.

The main floor is raised to create separation from grade. The entry lobbies are tied together with a trellis, spanning the courtyard. There is a strong horizontal expression to the buildings, emphasized by the use of the three cladding materials in “bands” around the buildings and deep overhangs. This horizontal expression is then accented by vertical posts and by a random vertical pattern in the cladding.

The landscape also responds to the river and the historic sawmill elements. Weathering steel is used, and the geometry of the walkway is orthogonal, with overlapping elements to pay homage to the history of the area. The entry court serves as a patio and will be animated by the amenity space. There is also urban agriculture. There is a seamless transition between public and private realms towards the river. The park edge has been especially animated, and everyone has a yard or a patio. The green roof has limited access for maintenance in order to respect the bird-friendly strategy of the area.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - More clarity of the entrances is needed;
  - At the park edge more porosity is needed along with more connection to the units on that side;
  - Design development on the detailing of the copper edges;
  - Consider introducing some timber into the project to respond to the river;
  - Open the green roof partially to the public.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel generally appreciated the project but noted that the western building entrance seems subservient to the patios around that area, so there is the potential for people to miss the entrance and try to enter the patios. Provide more definition to the entryways in order to fix this.

More connection needs to be provided between the residents and the neighbourhood park, even if it is just visual. Ideally there would be some kind of corridor which would allow people to pop out into the park.

Consider more modulation around the front of the building. There is a random flying fin on the corner of Building A which should be removed, and a few other small things which could be cleaned up. The brick side ends with piers, and these could be removed to better allow for the bending expression at the end of the building.

These two buildings have very nice shapes, but design development is needed on all elevations to provide more structural coordination between them. Consideration should be given to providing more differentiation between the buildings, and on one of them there are columns which may not be necessary. A better transition also needs to be provided between materials throughout the structures. Really look at the colour and extent of materials, and try not to make the buildings look too symmetrical.

Considering the proximity to the river, and that the patios are not very generous, the roof should be opened at least partially to the public. As well, more consideration should be given to enhancing the bike access to the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that the comments were very good. There is an agreement that the success of the building is in the detailing of the materials, and especially the copper. Perhaps wood could be introduced at the entrances to enhance them, and more porosity and connection to the park will be considered.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.