

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** November 1, 2017

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Kim Smith - Chair  
Amela Brudar  
Helen Avini Besharat  
Leslie Shieh (excused from item #1)  
Yijin Wen  
Karen Spoelstra  
Colette Parsons  
Muneesh Sharma  
David Jerke  
Renee Van Helm  
James Cheng  
Colette Parsons  
Veronica Gillies (excused from item #1)

**REGRETS:** Meredith Anderson

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street
  2. 1066-1078 Harwood Street
  3. 129 Keefer Street
  4. Heather Street Lands Workshop (4949 Heather Street, 5255 Heather Street & 657 37th Avenue)
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Kim Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A brief business meeting took place before the presentations commenced.

1. Address: 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street  
 Permit: RZ-2017-00052  
 Description: To develop a 33-storey residential building consisting of 59 market units and 98 social housing units; all over five levels of underground parking with 157 vehicle stalls and 197 bicycle spaces. The proposed total floor area is 4,582 sq. m (49,323 square feet), the building height is 91.4 m (300 feet) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 10.46.  
 Zoning: RM-5A to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Henriquez Partners  
 Owner: Mark Kopinya, Architect, Blue Sky  
 Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Architect, HPA  
 Shawn Lapointe, Architect, HPA  
 Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS  
 Dane Kane, LEED Consultant, Kane  
 Staff: Yan Zeng & Danielle Wiley

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations**

The proposals for 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street as well as 1066-1078 Harwood Street were presented together by the applicant, staff, and panel.

- **Introduction:** John Grottenberg, on behalf of Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as two rezoning applications for adjacent sites at Thurlow and Harwood Streets:
  - 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street, located at the northeast corner
  - 1066-1078 Harwood Street, located at the southeast corner

The existing zoning for the sites is RM-5A, which permits a maximum discretionary height of 190 feet and density of 2.2 FSR. These sites are within the “Burrard Corridor” area of the West End Plan, which allows consideration of rezoning applications for market residential that include at least 25% of the total floor area as social housing, or replace existing market rental units one-for-one with social housing units, whichever is greater. Building heights up to 300 feet can be considered, subject to view cone restrictions and shadowing of key public spaces.

The Rezoning Policy for the West End requires a minimum site frontage of 130 feet, and typical tower floor plate of 5,500 square feet, for consideration of rezonings here. In terms of the unit mix, the Housing Mix, the Family Room Policy for Rezonings requires that 35% of the market units have 2 and 3 bedrooms. The West End Plan requires that 50% of the social housing units have 2 and 3 bedrooms. In addition, all rezoning applications are subject to the Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings, which requires that rezonings achieve LEED Gold, with a specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that the two towers are proposed by same applicant team under two separate development permits.

The rezoning policy requires 25% social housing, including replacement of existing rental units (98 on site). Developments may be considered to up to 300ft height, with no FSR cap, subject to urban design performance.

In this proposal, all of the social housing requirement is concentrated in the north tower, taking up approximately 50% of the floor space. The south tower is 100% strata units. The two towers function autonomously, with separate amenities, servicing, etc.

For the north tower (with 50% social housing), access from the lane is at the high side of the site, so the parking ramp has a large impact on the ground floor. Terracing and landscaping in the front yard setback on Thurlow St help to conceal the ramp underground. Loading is at grade, in the side yard, due to the site slope. The non-market housing entry is located at the corner of Thurlow and the lane. The entry to the market housing is on Harwood Street. The non-market outdoor amenity is on the podium roof. The market amenity is in the front yard on Harwood.

For the south tower (100% market housing), access is from the low side, so site planning is more straightforward. The main entry is located on Harwood St, with adjacent outdoor space in the front yard, mirroring the north tower. A public bike share is proposed at the lane. For both towers, the front yards on Thurlow are heavily landscaped, with the yards on Harwood having reflecting pools. The large setbacks respond to the “tower-in-the-park” typology that is required by the West End Plan.

Thorough shadow and view analyses are provided, to illustrate potential impacts on adjacent towers. Traffic patterns and activity in the lane are also sensitive issues for the project. Nonetheless, the proposal is generally in line with the West End Plan.

For both towers, a triple-pane curtain wall is used to achieve energy performance requirements. The large balconies exceed 12%, and the overage is counted as floorspace. The wood-like balcony soffits are intended to give the architectural expression “warmth”. Planting on all levels will require an irrigation maintenance plan.

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

1. Are height and density supportable?
2. Is the site planning successful?
3. Are the common amenities for the non-market and market housing successful?
4. Please comment on the architectural expression, to assist a future DP application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the “tower in the park” typology required under the West End Plan. The proposed towers are vertically divided into 3 tiers, to respond to: an intimate, low-rise existing streetscape of the 1930 and 40s; nearby midrise neighbours from the 19050s; and the new tower scale. The two towers appear alike, as the intention is to make no distinction between the social housing and market housing. The open space around the towers is intended to optimize usability. Sustainability measures include: glazed windows at 60/40, opaque windows, and other measures.

Amenities include: a gathering space near the social housing entry, a children’s play area and urban agriculture on the podium roof, and as well as smaller indoor amenities on each floor to allow for informal gatherings. At the north tower, at the southeast corner, there are children’s play areas. At the east side of the tower at grade, there is an outdoor space near an indoor gym.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Avini Besharat and seconded by Mr. Cheng and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Look at the water features at grade; consider less water and more green space
- Ensure a good maintenance plan for the planters
- Look at the sustainability measures, such as reducing the glazing
- Consider the corner building aspect of the architecture

- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel supported the height and density of the project. The treatment of the social housing component was supported because it blends with the market housing. The tri-partite division of the towers is also welcomed. The top of the buildings are well resolved. The large balconies provide ‘interest’ to the architecture.

The application of the tower in the park concept is a concern. Removing the water features to maximize greenspace and landscaping was encouraged. The outdoor amenity space could be too small and shaded. The north tower play area is a smaller play area than the south, and may not be effective for children’s play. More diversity in the children’s play space is encouraged. It was noted that saving the trees on the south tower might not be possible. Bike storage access is well-considered. One panel member recommended lowering the mechanical piece, but another panel member thought the mechanical element was an important part of the architecture.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address: 1066-1078 Harwood Street  
Permit No.: RZ-2017-00051  
Description: To develop a 32-storey residential building consisting of 143 market units, all over six levels of underground parking with 236 vehicle stalls and 180 bicycle spaces. The proposed height is 91.4 m (300 feet) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 10.11.  
Zoning: RM-5A to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning application  
Review: First  
Architect: Henriquez Partners  
Owner: Mark Kopinya, Architect, Blue Sky  
Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Architect, HPA  
Shawn Lapointe, Architect, HPA  
Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS  
Dane Kane, LEED Consultant, Kane  
Staff: Yan Zeng & Danielle Wiley
- 

#### **EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations**

The proposals for 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street as well as 1066-1078 Harwood Street were presented together by the applicant, staff, and panel.

**Introduction:** John Grottenberg, on behalf of Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as two rezoning applications for adjacent sites at Thurlow and Harwood Streets:

- 1065 Harwood Street & 1332 Thurlow Street, located at the northeast corner
- 1066-1078 Harwood Street, located at the southeast corner

The existing zoning for the sites is RM-5A, which permits a maximum discretionary height of 190 feet and density of 2.2 FSR. These sites are within the “Burrard Corridor” area of the West End Plan, which allows consideration of rezoning applications for market residential that include at least 25% of the total floor area as social housing, or replace existing market rental units one-for-one with social housing units, whichever is greater. Building heights up to 300 feet can be considered, subject to view cone restrictions and shadowing of key public spaces.

The Rezoning Policy for the West End requires a minimum site frontage of 130 feet, and typical tower floor plate of 5,500 square feet, for consideration of rezonings here. In terms of the unit mix, the Housing Mix, the Family Room Policy for Rezonings requires that 35% of the market units have 2 and 3 bedrooms. The West End Plan requires that 50% of the social housing units have 2 and 3 bedrooms. In addition, all rezoning applications are subject to the Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings, which requires that rezonings achieve LEED Gold, with a specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that the two towers are proposed by same applicant team under two separate development permits.

The rezoning policy requires 25% social housing, including replacement of existing rental units (98 on site). Developments may be considered to up to 300ft height, with no FSR cap, subject to urban design performance. In this proposal, all of the social housing requirement is concentrated in north tower, taking up approximately 50% of the floor space. The south tower is 100% strata units. The two towers function autonomously, with separate amenities, servicing, etc.

For the north tower (with 50% social housing), access from the lane is at the high side of the site, so the parking ramp has a large impact on the ground floor. Terracing and landscaping in the front

yard setback on Thurlow St help to conceal the ramp underground. Loading is at grade, in the side yard, due to the site slope.

The non-market housing entry is located at the corner of Thurlow and the lane. The entry to the market housing is on Harwood Street. The non-market outdoor amenity is on the podium roof. The market amenity is in the front yard on Harwood.

For the south tower (100% market housing), access is from the low side, so site planning is more straightforward. The main entry is located on Harwood St, with adjacent outdoor space in the front yard, mirroring the north tower. A public bike share is proposed at the lane. For both towers, the front yards on Thurlow are heavily landscaped, with the yards on Harwood having reflecting pools. The large setbacks respond to the “tower-in-the-park” typology that is required by the West End Plan.

Thorough shadow and view analyses are provided, to illustrate potential impacts on adjacent towers. Traffic patterns and activity in the lane are also sensitive issues for the project. Nonetheless, the proposal is generally in line with the West End Plan.

For both towers, a triple-pane curtain wall is used to achieve energy performance requirements. The large balconies exceed 12%, and the overage is counted as floorspace. The wood-like balcony soffits are intended to give the architectural expression “warmth”. Planting on all levels will require an irrigation maintenance plan.

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

5. Are height and density supportable?
6. Is the site planning successful?
7. Are the common amenities for the non-market and market housing successful?
8. Please comment on the architectural expression, to assist a future DP application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the “tower in the park” typology required under the West End Plan. The proposed towers are vertically divided into 3 tiers, to respond to: an intimate, low-rise existing streetscape of the 1930 and 40s; nearby midrise neighbours from the 19050s; and the new tower scale. The two towers appear alike, as the intention is to make no distinction between the social housing and market housing. The open space around the towers is intended to optimize usability. Sustainability measures include: glazed windows at 60/40, opaque windows, and other measures.

Amenities include: a gathering space near the social housing entry, a children’s play area and urban agriculture on the podium roof, and as well as smaller indoor amenities on each floor to allow for informal gatherings. At the north tower, at the southeast corner, there are children’s play areas. At the east side of the tower at grade, there is an outdoor space near an indoor gym.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Avini Besharat and seconded by Mr. Cheng and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Look at the water features at grade; consider less water and more green space
  - Ensure a good maintenance plan for the planters
  - Look at the sustainability measures, such as reducing the glazing
  - Consider the corner building aspect of the architecture
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel supported the height and density of the project. The treatment of the social housing component was supported because it blends with the market housing. The tri-partite division of the towers is also welcomed. The top of the buildings are well resolved. The large balconies provide ‘interest’ to the architecture.

The application of the tower in the park concept is a concern. Removing the water features to maximize greenspace and landscaping was encouraged. The outdoor amenity space could be too small and shaded. The north tower play area is a smaller play area than the south, and may not be effective for children’s play. More diversity in the children’s play space is encouraged. It was noted that saving the trees on the south tower might not be possible. Bike storage access is well-considered. One panel member recommended lowering the mechanical piece, but another panel member thought the mechanical element was an important part of the architecture.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

3. Address:	<b>129 Keefer Street</b>
Permit No.:	DE420078
Description:	To develop a 10-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial uses on the first two levels and 33 dwelling units on levels three to eight; all over three levels of underground parking with 39 vehicle stalls and 42 bicycle spaces accessed from the lane. The proposed total floor area is 4,582 sq. m (49.323 sq. feet), and the building height is approximately 26.8 m (88 feet).
Zoning:	HA-1A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Stantec Architecture
Owner:	0979100 BC LTD
Delegation:	Laurenz Koshthek, Architect, STANTEC Raed Alkhoteeb, Architect, STANTEC Nalon Smith, Landscape Architect, STANTEC
Staff:	Marie Linehan

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the project as a Development Permit Applicant in Chinatown HA-1A District. This is the second review by the Panel.

This site is at the north side of Keefer Street between Columbia Street and Main Street, and adjacent the Chinatown Memorial Plaza. It is currently a vacant site, 50' x 122'. The adjacent site to the east is a 25' lot with an existing Heritage C- listed building ("the Keefer") of 5-storeys with commercial at grade and residential above. To the west is a 150' lot at the corner of Keefer Street and Columbia Street which has a development permit application proposing a 9-storey mixed use building, currently under review by the Development Permit Board. The proposal is for a new 10-storey building with retail at the ground floor (including a retail unit at the lane), a 2nd floor commercial mezzanine, and 8 storeys of residential above. The proposed density is 7.25 FSR with an overall height of 90'.

Under the Chinatown Design Guidelines, new buildings should reflect the historical character of the neighbourhood. The applicants are seeking a more contemporary expression, which may be considered. The intent is not to mimic historical buildings, but the design of new buildings should be informed by historical buildings, in particular:

- There should be a predominant street wall height of 70'. Heights up to 90' can be considered, with upper storeys setbacks above the 70' street wall. The upper massing should be clearly subordinate to the street wall and consider adjacent lower buildings to provide a suitable transition.
- Façade composition should reference a 25' frontage as per the historical lot width.

Historical buildings in Chinatown have clear hierarchy which should be reflected in the new buildings, consisting of: a commercial storefront base with transom windows and a high level of detail for pedestrian interest, a commercial mezzanine, an upper façade with a vertical composition, and a strong cornice line at the top.

A rear setback of 23' is required for residential uses to ensure privacy and livability across the lanes. The building aligns with the adjacent building at the rear at the east, stepping back to provide the required 23' setback to residential at the west portion.

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

- 1) Does the revised design address the previous commentary of the Panel with regards to design character, quality, and livability issues?
- 2) Is the revised design compatible with the adjacent sites and does it provide a good fit with the overall Chinatown character as outlined in the Guidelines?
- 3) Comment on the rear setback which is a relaxation.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant began by noting that they intended the new design to provide a response to the previous UDP commentary and the Chinatown Design Guidelines. The proposed street wall was straightened to the 70 foot street wall and not stepped like the previous design. The brick frame is informed by Chinatown's brick wall and cornice composition. The frame is 50 feet wide in reference to other 50 foot parcels on Keefer Street, and the two singular storefronts and balcony elements reintroduce the 25 foot pattern to create a secondary rhythm. Both historical and modern elements were considered with detailing to include reveals in the brick frame, as well as metal perforations at the storefront. There are two different colour mosaics to differentiate the storefronts. The materials provide a hierarchy. The two grey tones were chosen in order to bring the storefront forward visually. On the commercial frontage, the mechanical items have been integrated into the facades. The breezeway was deleted to address security concerns and a more generous residential entry lobby connected to the light well has been introduced.

The roof garden is utilized for outdoor amenity space. There are semi private spaces provided for social gatherings. There is a variety of plant materials proposed in various types of planter boxes. The plantings are intended for privacy and create an interesting landscape. The proposed materials are simple and durable. The wooden deck is intended to provide a warm atmosphere to the space.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Jerke and seconded by Ms. Parsons and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- The ground level needs to better address Chinatown Memorial Plaza.
  - Provide more prominence to the 25 foot rhythm; this may be tied to reducing the prominence of the frame.
  - Reduce the height of the mechanical penthouse and amenity room to provide a better transition to the lower building at 135 Keefer Street.
  - Consider the livability of the units with light wells. Increase the depth of light wells, particularly the east light well adjacent 135 Keefer Street.
  - Better emphasize the residential entrance on Keefer Street.
  - Consider careful integration of lighting into the façade.
  - Consider an appropriate colour palette.
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the panel thought the proposal was an improvement from the previous UDP presentation. The design was noted as having clarity and order, and the contemporary interpretation was appreciated.

It was noted that the façade was elegant and the balcony fretwork provided texture which should be brought to the foreground visually. There was a discussion about the prominence of the brick frame which emphasizes a 50 foot frontage. The delicacy of the façade may be overwhelmed by the frame.

It was suggested to provide a sharper taper to the frame to reduce its bulk, or a narrower frame at the sides with a bigger frame at the top similar to “the Keefer” adjacent. One member noted a “twin” of the rear elevation could be repeated at the front for a stronger 25 foot pattern. One member noted the 50 foot frontage provides relief to the repetition of the 25 foot pattern at both sides.

It was stressed that the treatment of the ground level is very important in Chinatown in particular due to the interface with the plaza. The storefront and canopy lack visual interest in comparison to the intricacy of the balconies above and need more detailing. The storefront may come forward so that it is not blocked by the frame and will better address the plaza.

The members expressed concern with the livability of spaces adjacent the light wells and recommended redesign of units and/or deeper wells to provide more light penetration. Some members mentioned that the use of white at the penthouse might be considered too stark and not contextual, although some panel members appreciated the contrast to Chinatown’s traditional colour palette. There were similar comments with regards to a suggestion to use red for the balcony fretwork.

The rear setback was noted as an “anomaly” fitting the character of Chinatown lanes. The lane activation was appreciated and the lane treatment was seen as more successful because it is asymmetrical. It was recommended to consider built-in planters rather than pots at the roof.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel.

---

4. Address:	Heather Street Lands Workshop (4949 Heather Street, 5255 Heather Street & 657 37th Avenue)
Description:	The City is developing a Policy Statement for the Heather Street Lands that will inform a future rezoning for the site. The Policy Statement will set principles and objectives for land use; sustainability; heritage and culture; transportation; building types and heights; and public benefits. The purpose of the workshop is to get feedback on emerging directions and three site concepts, to inform development of a preferred concept.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins + Will
Owner:	Deana Grinnell, CLC/MST Partners
Delegation:	Ryan Bragg, Architect, P & W Margo Long, Landscape Architect, PWL Brennan Cook, Consultant, MST
Staff:	Kirsten Robinson & Ann McLean

---

### Non-Voting Workshop

- **Introduction:** Kirsten Robinson, project planner introduced the site by outlining the past year throughout which staff have been working with Canada Lands Company and the MST Joint Venture (Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations), and their design team led by Ryan Bragg of Perkins + Will, to develop vision for the future of the Heather Lands.

The planning process will result in a Policy Statement which establishes principles and objectives relating to land use; density; building types and heights; transportation; and sustainability.

The purpose of the workshop was to get the Panel's feedback and advice on the draft conceptual plans, general approach to form and massing, and ideas that will guide future rezoning of the Heather Lands site.

#### Background:

The Heather Lands are 8.5 hectares (21 acres) in size, located north of 37th Avenue, south of 33rd Avenue, and bounded by the lanes behind Willow Street and Ash Crescent.

The Heather Lands are part of the traditional territory of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

Prior to its relocation to Surrey in 2012, it was the site of the RCMP's British Columbia headquarters and operations centre employing approximately 1,500 people.

Three principal buildings remain on the site including:

- Administration building,
- Office building, and
- Fairmont Academy building is an 'A' listed heritage building, originally built in 1912, and operated for 4 years as a private boys' school.

The existing zoning is CD-1 which allows for office, institutional and uses required by the RCMP.

---

The 2005 Riley Park South Cambie Vision anticipated redevelopment and supported institutional, cultural and recreational uses, retention of the Fairmont Academy and residential buildings up to 4-storeys.

In July 2016, City Council approved a planning program to create a new vision for the Heather Lands, which will explore building heights and densities beyond what was contemplated in the RPSC Vision.

The site is located close to several schools and parks, including Oak Meadows Park VanDusen Gardens, Queen Elizabeth Park, Eric Hamber Secondary School, and a Francophone Elementary and High School.

There are other large development sites in the area including:

- St. Vincent's Heather to the north with an approved rezoning for institutional uses and a height of about 6 storeys;
- Oakridge Centre which has an approved Rezoning for mixed use, including community uses and a park, and tower heights from 19 to 44 storeys;
- Oakridge Transit Centre site, with an approved policy statement for mixed use including a park and child care with residential mid-rise building, and 4 towers up to 15 storeys
- Cambie Corridor Plan Phase 3 - in progress with proposed 4 to 6 storey residential to the east and west of the Heather Lands site, and notably the Municipal Town Centre (MTC) proposing mixed use along Heather Street with residential heights up to 18 storeys. It is currently zoned RS-1.

The MTC plan envisions Heather Street as primarily a bike and pedestrian route with most auto traffic diverted to Manson Street.

The Fairmont building is not represented in the concept design. The MST Partners, with the support of CLC, have requested removal of the Fairmont building as a measure of reconciliation as it represents an extremely difficult era for First Nations peoples in Vancouver and Canada. The proposal replaces the building with a cultural amenity showcasing indigenous inspired architecture. A process to discuss this proposal with the public is underway.

#### **Planning Process:**

The planning process is anticipated to be completed by late spring 2018. At this stage in the process feedback is sought on the three concepts, to inform selection (or further development) of a preferred concept and emerging policy.

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

- 1) Commentary on the overall urban design approach, including the preferred option or concept elements
- 2) Advice on the character, configuration and connectivity of public open spaces
- 3) Height, massing and built form
- 4) Connection and built form relationship to the surrounding neighbourhood (noting that policy for the potential future context is being developed concurrently)
- 5) Location of area "heart" (retail/cultural centre/childcare) in relation to nearby uses (hospital, Oakridge Centre, Queen Elizabeth Park)

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant has been working with the City of Vancouver for quite a while. It was a unique opportunity to work with the First Nations to bring about a unique site.

The significance is quite important to the project team. There are views to the north and south and storm water that flows to the site, so it has unique conditions. The intent is to bring back natural elements in a contemporary way. There are ecological intentions at the site. The intent is welcoming, gathering, and community on the site.

The design is a response to the evolving context, and the intent is to introduce ground oriented townhouses. The layering of the form is intended to create more of an intimate scale. The affordable housing is dispersed throughout the site. Housing is an important aspect at the site. The proposed height is 'dropped down' to allow more porosity and a more intimate relationship to the physical form. The taller height is at the centre of the site. There is a cultural 'heart' in the design scheme: a cultural centre, a retail component, and place on the site for gathering.

There are strong east west biodiversity hotspots and rewilding planned at the site. On the cultural side, after talking to the First Nations, water on the site from a storm water standpoint could improve the livability aspects. The applicant noted the connections and linkages proposed at the site to create a 'gathering space'. In regards to the grid design option, there are fewer opportunities to retain trees. The forest trail is intended to be an embodiment of movement. The existing trees create a southern and northern park that is 'connected' to allow movement through the site. The design cues come from the vistas rather than a more formal design. The sustainability aspects are intended to be strong and more developed.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Related Commentary:** The programming was appreciated by the panel. However, there might be another scheme that focuses on the First Nations cultural concept as inherent in the form. The cultural concept should allow for meaning built into the design. Is there a way to build around the cultural values? Is there a way to design to do something special and make the site unique?

The challenge is how to implement the design with First Nations values. For example, address issues such as 'connection' versus 'isolation'. An example of reconciling this challenge is by implementing inter-generational housing. Also address 'connecting' in terms of doing things differently to make a place that allows for values that are unique to the site. An approach might include designing a community kitchen instead of just a community centre.

Design with nature integrated into the built form. Indigenous architecture is based on nature, specifically 'wind' and 'shadow'. Consider how the wind will play and shadows on the site. The project should be net zero energy to honour the First Nations. Borrow from the book 'Design with Nature'. Shape the space and use the buildings to tell the story. Map the cultural pieces and the ecological pieces together.

The site contains different forms, but the townhome might not be the right form, according to a few panel members. The adjacency to the neighbours should be addressed. The neighbours should react to what you are doing. The townhouses might not be on the correct side. Maybe the form should be mid-rise in that area.

There could be multiple places for the 'heart' of the site. One panel member did not prefer one big local retail centre, and instead recommended there could be smaller retail nodes instead. However, one panel member recommended that retail should be at the heart.

The grid chops up the site, but for accessibility to the site, the grid is preferred according to one panel member. The 37<sup>th</sup> Ave urban edge should be a 'soft' edge. There could be fewer cars, so make car access less accessible.

According to one panel member, it should not be a big open park space. The open space appears to have a trail emerging. And the trail, or forest path, is appreciated, but it should knit the streets better together. The trail that is emerging should be further developed and explored.

The cultural centre should be a separate building so it has its own form and identity. The character of the community centre building could become generic, so the one place to start is by using wood material.

Art should be contemporary to 'open up' the First Nations cultural discourse. In conclusion, do not make it another subdivision with added on pieces that reference First Nations culture. Is there a way to go further with the design concepts?

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel, and would further consider the principles and cultural values of First Nations in the design expression and programming going forward.
- Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.