

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 31, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Kim Smith (Chair)
Yijin Wen
Karen Spoelstra
James Cheng (Excused from all items)
Meredith Anderson (excused from item 2)
Helen Avini Besharat
Nell Gasiewicz
Amela Brudar (excused from item #3 and 4)
Veronica Gillies (excused from item #3)
Muneesh Sharma
Mark Ostry, for item 1 only
Richard Henriquez, for item 1 and 2 only
Walter Francl, for item 2

REGRETS: Neal LaMontagne
Renee Van Halm
David Jerke

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 1. 1445-1455 W Georgia Street |
| 2. 1133 Melville Street |
| 3. 2221 Main Street |
| 4. 950 Main Street |
-

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: **1445-1455 W Georgia Street**
 Permit No. RZ-2017-00002
 Description: The proposal is for a 46-storey residential building (comprised of 128 market residential units), with a building height of 156.7 m (514 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 14.2, over eight levels of underground parking (195 vehicle spaces and 166 bicycle spaces). This application is being considered under the General Policy for Higher Buildings.
 Zoning: DD to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application (General Policy Higher Buildings)
 Review: First
 Architect: James KM Cheng Architects (Dawn Guspie)
 Owner:
 Delegation: James Cheng, Architect, JKMC
 Dawn Guspie, Architect, JKMC
 John Wong, Landscape architect, SWA Group
 Staff: John Grottenberg & Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Rezoning Planner, John Grottenberg, introduced the project as a rezoning application located at the corner of West Georgia, Nicola, and West Pender Streets. The existing zoning for the site is DD (Downtown District), Area 'G', which permits a maximum discretionary height of 450 feet and density of 6 FSR. The application is to rezone from DD (Downtown District) to CD-1 to allow for a 46-storey residential building, with 128 market strata units.

In December 2015, Council endorsed consideration of a rezoning application for a "Landmark Gateway" building for the site, exceeding the height permitted by the current zoning, provided it meets the requirements of the General Policy for Higher Buildings. This policy allows buildings to enter the Queen Elizabeth View Cone (3.2.1), and thus the Granville Bridge View Cone (12.1.3) limits the maximum height to approximately 515 feet.

In order to "earn" the greater height, the Higher Building Policy requires architectural excellence and a high level of sustainable design. To quote from the policy, a Higher Building must:

- With respect to architecture, "establish a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city's skyline";
- With respect to sustainability, it must "demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption", including a "45% reduction in energy consumption as compared to the 2014 Vancouver Building By-law"; and,
- As well, it must "provide on-site open space that represents a significant contribution to the downtown network of green and plaza space".

In addition, all rezoning applications are subject to the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning, which requires that rezonings achieve LEED Gold, with a specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

The proposed floor area is 257,477 square feet, with a density of 14.2 FSR and height of 514 feet.

To note: the intersection design shown indicates the future intersection redesign, which will be undertaken as part of a separate City-led process for the “Georgia Gateway”.

The intent is to “normalize” the Georgia/Pender intersection to create an improved and expanded public realm and shorter pedestrian crossings. The final intersection design and materials will be determined through this separate City-led process.

Patrick O’Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the project as flatiron site bound by Nicola, Georgia and Pender. Mr. O’Sullivan described the context buildings and the site dimensions and noted that there is a 16 foot crossfall from Georgia St. to Pender St.

Mr. O’Sullivan said that the base zoning permits 300 feet in height, which is relaxable to 450 feet. The proposed height for this rezoning is 514 feet which extends 66 feet into the Queen Elizabeth View Cone. The height is then capped by View Cone 12.1.3 (Granville Bridge to Grouse). The average floorplate is 6,465 square feet. The circulation core is located along the south side and expressed on the exterior with a stone finish.

Because the site is not served by a lane, parking and loading is accessed from Pender Street with two curb cuts and a porte cochere. There are 9 levels of underground parking.

The public realm at-grade is 20’-4” from building face to curb on Georgia.

The “Urban Room” is a covered space at the base of the building that includes a water feature and ramps and a stepped walkway to connect Georgia and Pender. The main entry is into the lobby at the north side of the core. The materiality is primarily curtain wall glazing and stone cladding and in select locations, metal mesh in the glazing units.

Public art in the flag plaza is a collaboration of 3 adjacent sites to pool their public art funds for a significant work at this location.

Mr. O’Sullivan then took questions from the panel.

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

1. Do you support the proposed form, height and density?
2. Does the proposal achieve the standard of architectural excellence set out in the General Policy for Higher Buildings?
3. Does the proposal achieve the sustainability standard as set out in the General Policy for Higher Buildings?
4. There is a 68 foot separation between the proposed tower and the existing tower to the east. Consider issues of access to light, shadows and preservation of views.
5. Consider the proposed building character and materials.
6. Consider the success of how the tower addresses and meets the ground plane, particularly the design of the public realm, pedestrian connections, and the design of the ‘urban room’.

Applicant’s Introductory Comments: The applicant team followed with a Powerpoint presentation to introduce the urban design, architecture and sustainability. The applicant noted the two applicable view cones, the flat iron site and that the proposed tower height meets the City objective for a domed skyline.

The urban room at grade has been designed to relate to and reference existing public spaces and elements in the vicinity of the subject site. The area of the public realm has been maximized and the urban room has been designed to allow for public access and connection. The shaping of the tower and façade orientation intends to minimize the loss of privacy between towers. The applicant also discussed the overall lighting strategy.

On sustainability, the applicant explained that the plant materials were selected for biodiversity; triple glazing is proposed, and the balconies are designed with insulation to avoid thermal bridging.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Muneesh Sharma and seconded by Ms. Helen Avini Basharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- remove the trees on Georgia Street in front of the proposed urban room to make more clarity to signify a public space that is an ‘urban room’ not an ‘urban short-cut’;
- open up the plaza by adding or removing something, for example lifting glass walls, or some gesture to make the area feel more public as well as the private spaces;
- push the sustainability aspects more in the next phase;
- improve the response to solar gain on the west side of the building and see how that evolves in the next phase.

Related Commentary: The panel noted the proposal was elegant and sophisticated. The gateway building along with the density and height was supported. The building separation to the residential tower to the east is handled well. The structural scheme is bold and will require pier review. The proposed building character and materials are clearly laid out and it is a rich material with a lot of texture.

The ground plane needs improvement at the east property line. The lighting strategy is especially strong. The fins and directing rainwater down them should be emphasized more. The slope of the grade is challenging, and the applicant should explore ways to improve the condition at the base of the building. The building could benefit from lifting the glass and make it more permeable and transparent.

One Panel member said that the design is too car-centric. The port cochere aspect of the ground plane takes too much away from the urban room and could be reduced. The triangular park and the plaza is a gateway so the design should be comprehensive. There is too much emphasis on the walkway because it is only for residents. The ground floor could use space for others to use. The plazas on the west and east could be more user-friendly.

The west elevation needs a more passive approach to solar. The public art orientation is good.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their great comments, and looked forward to refining the proposal.

2.	Address:	1133 Melville Street
	Permit No.	RZ-2017-2015027
	Description:	The proposal is for a 34-storey office building with retail at grade, having a maximum building height of 167.6 m (550 ft.), a floor area of 55,566 m ² (555,047 sq. ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 18.20, over six levels of underground parking (231 vehicle spaces and 221 bicycle spaces). This rezoning application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the Central Business District (CBD) and CBD Shoulder, General Policy for Higher Buildings and Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments.
	Zoning:	DD to CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning Application (General Policy for Higher Buildings)
	Review:	Second
	Architect:	James KM Cheng Architects (James Cheng)
	Owner:	Carlo Timpano, Oxford Properties
	Delegation:	James Cheng, Architect, JKMC Adeline Lai, Architect, JKMC Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS Studio
	Staff:	Linda Gillan & Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Linda Gillan, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for 1133 Melville Street. The site is located mid-block on Melville Street between Bute Street and Thurlow Street with a frontage of 231 feet on Melville Street, and a depth of 132 feet, and a site size 30,500 square feet. Currently, there is a 10-storey building with above-grade parking and office on the site. The application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the Central Business District (CBD) and CBD Shoulder, which encourages commercial intensification in the CBD.

The general Policy for Higher Buildings allows for up to 550 feet. In order to “earn” the greater heights, the GPHB (General Policy for Higher Buildings) also requires architectural excellence and a high level of sustainable design. To quote from the higher building policy, a higher building must:

- With respect to architecture, “establish a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city’s skyline”;
- With respect to sustainability it must “demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption”; and
- must meet the requirement for a 45% reduction in energy consumption as compared to the 2014 Vancouver Building By-law
- must also contribute to downtown network of green and plaza space

The Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments also applies for this site.

With the objective of achieving higher sustainability standards on large development sites, additional studies are required as part of the application with regard to:

- district energy,
- sustainable site design,
- green mobility,
- rainwater management,
- solid waste diversion.

The Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings also applies for this site, for an office building this requires a minimum of LEED Gold. The application is to rezone from DD (Downtown District) to CD-1 to allow for a 34-storey office building, with commercial uses at grade.

The proposed floor area is just over 555,000 square feet (office / commercial), an equivalent to 18.20 FSR, with a proposed height of 550 feet. The site also needs to provide 0.87 FSR to meet requirements of single site covenant. The FSR listed above only reflects a proposed new building.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as on the north side of Melville Street between Bute and Thurlow streets. Several existing office and hotel towers located to the north, south and east, and a residential tower located to the west.

Due to requirements of the applicable rezoning policy, this review involves an enhanced Urban Design Panel, with special panelists Richard Henriquez and Walter Francl, as local experts on tower design.

On the site, there is currently a ten-storey building comprised of 5 storeys of above-grade parking and 5 -storeys of office use, with vehicular accesses from both the lane and Melville Street. The proposal for an office building on a site that is currently zoned DD. The proposal is to limit vehicular access to the commercial lane only, thereby increasing the pedestrian walkability of the Melville street sidewalk.

The proposal takes the opportunity to perform some “urban repair”: Deleting the curb cuts on Melville Street; providing a sidewalk widening to 18 feet; an urban plaza fronting a restaurant use on Melville Street, and an improved mid-block pedestrian access through the site, for which there exists a legal easement. Furthermore, a café is proposed to front a second patio located adjacent to the pedestrian access.

This rezoning application is supported by the General Policy for Higher Buildings, which seeks to mark the prominence of the “Central Business District in our downtown skyline”, while also encouraging the provision of commercial business uses (residential use is not permitted in this area). This particular site has been identified in this policy to attain an overall building height of 550 feet, which penetrates through the Queen Elizabeth View cone.

Further policy requirements for this rezoning include the following:

- That the building “establishes a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city’s skyline”.
- That the building “demonstrates leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption...”
- That the building ”significantly demonstrate and advance the city’s objective for carbon neutrality for the new buildings with a stated objective to achieve a 45% reduction in energy consumption as compared to the 2014 Vancouver Building By-Law.

Mr. Cheng then took questions from the panel.

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

1) This project proposes a significant penetration into the council-adopted Queen Elizabeth View cone. As such, a high standard of architectural excellence is expected.

Does the proposed building make “a significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city’s skyline” when viewed from:

- a) the building’s effect on the Queen Elizabeth view cone;
- b) the building’s effect on the skyline from various other viewpoints represented?

- 2) Please provide commentary on the tower proposal's overall strategy with respect to proportion, modulation and variability of texture.
- 3) Please provide commentary on the proposal's response to the public realm, with respect to the outdoor patios, pedestrian linkages and the interface of these spaces with the building's ground floor.
- 4) Please provide any other commentary on the proposal's architectural design.
- 5) Taking into account the proposal's cited sustainability strategy; does this building "demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption"?
- 6) Will this "sustainable design" be resilient to unexpected changes from design phase through its operating life?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant provided a Powerpoint presentation. The applicant team started by noting the building is already targeted for a LEED Platinum sustainability goal. The project has an integrated approach for the urban design aspects. The applicant outlined the panel's previous comments and how the comments were responded to. The boxes of the building corresponded to the surrounding building context. The building was set back more in the current proposal than the previous building. The lane was treated as if it were a frontage.

A bike entrance is proposed at the lane. There is a green network of spaces in the area, so the intent is to contribute to the network. The spaces are occupy-able. The public art could bring continuity to the space. Each box design has an animated character, and the lighting strategy reinforces that. The intent is to create an animated building.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr.Yijin Weng and seconded by Ms. Nell Gasiewicz, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:
 - THAT the Panel the project **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:
 - To refine the boxes to be more discreet, whether through fins or colour, or verticality or horizontally, but a more discreet definition of the different boxes
 - To work with more landscaping on the rooftops
 - to develop the entrance with more strength, looking at both the entrance doors and detailing the V column.
 - look at the pocket park and reconsider the cantilevered building element and the bamboo use

Related Commentary: The panel noted that the proposal was a vast improvement from the last submission. The building invites the participant to view it as part of the urban environment. The parti is strong. The fins and depth should be more variegated to make the boxes discreet elements. The entry door is small and might need more elaboration to announce the entrance

Increase the amount of covered areas. The bike facilities were appreciated by the panel. The cantilevered meeting room is not necessary and crowding the park, according to one panel member.

Bring in more landscaping, for example, more landscaping on the roof invites more viewing. Overall, it is a strong scheme.

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

3. Address: **2221 Main Street**
 Permit No. RZ-2017-00008
 Description: The proposal is for a nine-storey mixed-use building, including commercial at grade and residential above (145 social housing units), with a floor area of 10,695 m² (115,123 sq. ft.), a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.3, and a height of approximately 29.9 m (98 ft.), over four levels of underground parking (192 vehicle spaces and 196 bicycle spaces). The Vancouver Park Board is also pursuing the delivery of a park at approximately 1,115 m² (12,000 sq. ft.) on the southern portion of this site. This application is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and Implementation Policy.
- Zoning: IC-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Rositch Hemphill Architects (Bryce Rositch)
 Owner: City of Vancouver
 Delegation: Robert Brown, Catalyst Community Developments Society
 Bryce Rositch, Architect, Rositch Hemphill
 David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape Architects
 Nic Paoella, Marcon Developments
 Staff: Joyce Uyesugi & Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Joyce Uyesugi, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a site in the Mount Pleasant community. It is a full-block site, located on the west side of Main Street between 6th and 7th Avenue. Currently on the site is a surface parking lot.

The site size is about 35,000 square feet, with a frontage of 264 feet along Main Street and 132 feet along the Avenues. The adjacent sites to the north and to the east along Main Street are currently zoned IC-2, but are covered by policy that allows for rezoning for mixed-use development, up to between 6 and 9 storeys. Zoning to the south is C-3A (mixed-use); there are currently some historic buildings on the block that make up a significant historic streetscape. Immediately to the west is I-1 industrial zoning that has been identified for land use review as part of future planning for the Broadway Corridor. The block to the northwest has recently been rezoned to I-1B to allow for the retention of a heritage building and up to 125 feet in height and 6.0 FSR for employment uses, including Digital and IT employment uses.

The proposal is to redevelop the site with a 9-storey mixed-use building, with commercial uses at grade and 145 units of social housing above. The unit mix would include studios and one-, two-, and three-bedroom units. The proposed density is 3.3 FSR, and proposed height 98 feet, with 4 levels of underground parking.

Applicable Policies and Guidelines

The applicable policies for this site are the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and the Lower Main Urban Design Framework. The policies anticipate rezoning of the sites along Main Street between 2nd and 7th Avenues, from light industrial to mixed commercial and residential uses, with the intent of creating a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented community that transitions between the downtown communities and Southeast False Creek, and Mount Pleasant. On this site, mixed-use development of up to 9 storeys and 3.0 FSR is anticipated. This proposal is at 3.3 FSR, and the 10% increase in density is being considered because of the on-site social housing amenity being provided.

One of the key principles in the Lower Urban Design Framework is for buildings to respond to Mount Pleasant's "hilltown" identity, working with the natural slope to create a hilltown perspective up the slope toward the heart of the community. As such, the sites to the north on both sides of Main Street are envisioned for development up to 6 storeys, stepping along the slope. The block to the east envisioned 9 storeys at the southern end, and a transition on the northern portion toward the lower 6-storey forms.

The Mount Pleasant policies also anticipated a public open space on the southern portion of this site. During the pre-application stage, the Vancouver Park Board committed to acquiring, developing and maintaining a space of about 12,000 square feet for park use. The open space, or park, does not form part of this application. The site is not affected by the Main Street view cone, which starts at 6th Avenue.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project and noted the 'open space' was a major requirement of the project previously in the plan. The building proposed is a "flat iron" in order to respond to the atypical context of the Kingsway viewpoint. However the park called for maximized sun exposure, and staff directed that the building site should be located on an orthogonal shape on the northern two-thirds of the site. The proposed building would be at an oblique angle when viewed from Kingsway. The site slopes downward. The proposed large terrace for the CRU units has not yet been confirmed permissible by the Vancouver Park Board.

Mr. Cheng then took questions from the panel.

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

- 1) Please provide commentary on the overall proposed massing, with respect to the unique context of topography, existing buildings and street configuration in this area.
 - 2) Please provide commentary on the proposed interface with the new park, Main Street and East 6th Avenue.
 - 3) Please provide commentary on the emerging architectural expression of this proposal, keeping in mind that another more detailed review with the Urban Design Panel is expected during the Development Permit phase.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting the site is owned by the City of Vancouver. Catalyst Community Developments Society and Marcon Developments are partnering with the Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency to develop the site. Fifty per cent of the homes are proposed to be suitable for families. A restaurant retail space is proposed. The rental housing is intended to comply with the City's social housing definition.

The affordability will be improved over time as the building is paid down. It is a complex project. It is designed in a U-shape plan for maximum light access. On the ground floor, there are retail uses. The residential entry is located off 6th Avenue to facilitate a convenient and safe drop-off area. The proposed amenities include a social room, it is located at the terrace for scenic access. The sustainability goal is LEED Gold.

The streetscape is reflective of the Mount Pleasant policies, with allowed spaces to be flexible. There is a child-friendly amenity space proposed at the upper floor.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Nell Gasiewicz and seconded by Ms. Karen Spoelstra, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommend **RESUBMISSION** the project after incorporating the following comments:

- The building needs to reflect its site and position at the terminus of Kingsway and Main Street.
 - The building needs to relate more to the park, especially in bringing in the residential relationship to the park.
 - The building should respond to its different orientations, both architecturally and in terms of solar passive elements, which should be integrated at the early stages of design.
 - Look at the bike journey to the bike storage for loading and unloading.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the project was commended as social housing, but the design ignores the Kingsway/ Main Street terminus as a major element. There should be more of a response to the park and interaction with the park and residents. The emerging architectural expression should not be so formal and symmetrical.

Recommendations include: there should be a prominent corner facing Kingsway to identify the building, there should be an entrance on the south and east façade and the U shape could be turned to have the opening on the South side to interact with the future park.

There is no mention of sustainability and integrated design should be implemented earlier than later. District energy should have thought to it. Resilient energy should be considered. The orientation for a children's space is not the best use and should relate to the park. The location of the bike station is not good.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant mentioned the interface with the park and the constraints surrounding the location.

4. Address:	950 Main Street
Permit No.	DP-2017-00441
Description:	To develop a 6-storey building comprising 26 non-market rental units for Aboriginal adults who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and medical clinic/pharmacy on the ground level.
Zoning:	FC-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Patrick Stewart Architect (Patrick Stewart)
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Delegation:	Simon Davu, Development Manager, Terra Housing Consultants
Staff:	Jason Olinek (for Patrick Chan)

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project as located on Main Street between National and Prior Streets. It is 50 feet wide by 100 feet deep, Double Fronting Lot with no significant site slopes. This project is being brought forward as part of the Development Permit Board process. A physical model has not been required by the Director of Planning for this application.

Per the applicant's material, the proposed six storey, the 24 unit apartment building serves to provide much needed social housing for some of the thousands of people on the waiting list for the Lu'ma Native BCH Housing Society. The purpose is to provide stable, affordable non-market housing for low and moderate income Aboriginal tenants in Vancouver. The building is 1 storey ground floor concrete construction with 5 storey wood residential above.

The design intent is to inter-connect Aboriginal cultural expression within a "western" apartment concept. The Cultural expression is to be integrated into the design through the use of form, art, material, texture and colour. Resident Services include laundry, an indoor amenity room (on the main floor) and a common outdoor patio facing east on level 2.

The Architectural Form relates to the building heights nearby and the roof of the building has been kept flat except for the culturally expressive traditional gable-end longhouse form. This traditional form is intended to reflect the Indigenous structures of the West Coast.

Objectives for development in FC-1 include:

- Compatibility of uses (including residential) in a high-density mixed commercial use neighbourhood
- Continuity of Built Form and a consistent street wall
- General concerns for privacy, noise, safety, light, ventilation and weather protection
- Architectural components are not intended to fit any one particular style but rather the quality design should relate to the existing buildings as well as having Small scale, Visually clear and individualized storefront,
- Entrances should be highly visible and clearly expressed.
- Development should be respectful of the existing fabric.
- As a double fronting lot, the Station Street façade should also be part of the consideration.

Form-wise, the building is divided roughly into halves. Its southern wall-plane above level 2 is recessed ~15' back from the front property line. Cornice lines approximately align along the block. The overall height is ~60', less than the allowable 75 feet. Materials include a thick band of cedar planks along the base reconciliation artwork and portions of Hardie Plank Siding.

Mr. Olinek then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted up to 30% of tenants will be referred to the building by the friendship centre. The applicant intends to give it some commercial street frontage and amenity space as well as meet BC Housing requirements. The proposal has gone through other iterations.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Yijin Wen and seconded by Ms. Meredith Anderson and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommend **SUPPORT** the project after incorporating the following recommendations:

- The façade on Main Street should respect the way Main Street creates a street wall. Rather than stepping back with part of the façade, integrate a full façade expression.
 - Develop the Station Street façade in terms of architectural expression and materials.
 - There should be a stronger commercial expression with higher windows in it.
 - A stronger presence at the residential entrance is recommended.
 - Reconsider the landscape additions to the CRUs and consider more of a hardscape element for an 'urban expression' and bike parking.
 - Reconsider the large fin walls with particular respect to daylight and structural requirements.
 - Reconsider and minimize the stepping of the building in particular for the wood framed structure.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the use of the building was welcomed, commended the meaning on the facades, and the native art elements were supported. The massing scale and proportions need improvements. The window heights do not allow enough natural light. The units will not have enough natural light due to art element, although the art is welcome. One panel member suggested the longhouse concept go down to the bottom, and to use "the simplicity of the longhouse in the expression" of the entire Main Street facade.

Align the façade where you are stepping. The second floor amenity room corridor is more than 6 meters. The exterior walls and finishes are a concern. Does the cedar need long term maintenance. Cedar may not be allowable under code. The amenity space could use some glass doors to increase light. Add more wood or brick to the Station Street facade.

The landscape could benefit by providing site furnishings and bike racks in lieu of plantings. The planters could be raised or removed. The plant material is a missed opportunity in referencing to first nations materials, use native species in the plant pallet. Privacy wise, the fin wall at Station Street is not needed at that length. There are some privacy concerns at the second floor.

The amenity deck could use a private hedge. Wood decking could be fine. The landscape architecture could use some custom furnishings. It will be a nice place for residents to hang out. A few more trees are recommended. Parking in the front or the back would be useful. On the main floor there is an opportunity to add planters. The landscaping is not successful at the entry.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked panel and will consider the panel recommendations.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.