

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 25, 2012

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Daryl Condon
Vincent Dumoulin
Alan Endall
Veronica Gillies (Left after 3rd Item)
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #5)
Arno Matis
Geoff McDonell
Norm Shearing (Absent for 1st Item)

REGRETS:
Helen Besharat
Peter Wreglesworth

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	6361-6385 Cambie Street
2.	238 West Broadway
3.	2468 Bayswater Street
4.	2551 Kingsway
5.	201 West 2nd Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Borowski called the business meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on April 23, 2012 where 138 East Hastings Street was presented to the Board and approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1.	Address:	6361-6385 Cambie Street
	DE:	N/A
	Use:	Proposed rezoning to allow an 9-storey (29 m) building with two storeys on the lane, containing 70 residential units and commercial ground level retail for a total area of 6,212 square meters and 3.68 FSR.
	Zoning:	RT-1 to CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
	Owner:	Wanson (Oakridge) Development Ltd.
	Review:	Second
	Delegation:	Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc. Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group
	Staff:	Sailen Black and Ian Cooper

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-9)**Introduction:**

Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal and noted the applicable policy. The proposal is for a mixed-use project with retail on the ground floor and residential above. There are four 2-storey townhouses proposed on the lane. The applicable policy includes the Cambie Corridor Plan and the design guidelines for the plan. The proposal also needs to meet the Green Building Policy for Rezoning and will require LEED™ Gold. He noted that a 6-storey project was approved to the north.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal for a 6-storey project with two and three storey townhouses with entrances on the lane. The application came in before the Cambie Corridor Plan was approved by Council. However, the initial frame of reference requires design approaches that respect neighbourhood context and character. Mr. Black noted that the proposal had been to the Panel previously and received non-support. The revised design intends to respond to the approved form to the north through proposed setbacks and windows. The Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning requires LEED™ Gold design.

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

- Are the height limits in this area best addressed by lowering the building as a whole, by raising the courtyard or by some other approach?
- Does the walkway and building design read as inviting and open for free public access?
- Is the public realm interface sufficiently developed with inviting and attractive features?
- Are the interfaces to existing (south) and approved (north) building sufficiently resolved as shown?
- How does the proposed streetwall and shoulder line respond to the intent of the area plan and the unusual context of this site?

- Is the proposed palette of materials and the façade expression, including the glass and panel combination shown, an appropriate response to the location?

Mr. Cooper and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Dale Staples, Architect, described the changes noting that they are proposing a massing element with punched windows to create a better streetwall. They also simplified the elevations using a smaller range of materials. On the upper portion they have tried to animate that part of the building with the materials. With respect to the relationship with the building to the north, they recessed the building further back so the corner is more expressed and they have aligned the parapet heights. They simplified the massing overall and on the south side they have taken off the overhang. They pushed the retail back slightly and have defined it with concrete columns and light shelf to add more light in the area. The elevator has been taken up to the roof level and they have also increased the size of the roof deck and allocated an area for future solar panels.

Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, described the revised landscaping plans noting the Cambie Street frontage has been opened up with decorative seating element and planters. They are thinking of using the seating for signage. At the entrance they have pulled the accessible ramp around to the south to clean up the front entrance. A water feature is proposed to animate the front entry along with some plantings and benches to make for an outdoor lobby. Along the pedestrian access and they have incorporated more of a garden trellis with vines. The roof top amenity space has been expanded with shade trees, and a green roof (both extensive and intensive) has been added in addition to a children's play area. They have also planned some urban agriculture on the roof.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to better distribute the height on the north end;
- Consider adding elements in the courtyard to make it more inviting;
- Design development to improve the pedestrian flow through the site;
- Design development to calm the exterior of the building;
- Design development to further the sustainability strategy through passive design.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel supported the height of the building with the exception of how the height is distributed with respect to the relationship with the adjacent building to the north. As well, there may be some opportunity to develop the south with one Panel member suggesting it could be higher at that end.

The Panel did not support raising the height of the courtyard. They also felt the legibility should be increased with the addition of benches that would invite people into the space.

Regarding the public realm interface, the Panel felt the Cambie Street side was enriched, but they felt the applicant needed to pay more attention to the pedestrian flow particularly near the location of the water feature at the entrance. As well they felt some openness to the commercial units was required in order to make for a more flexible space.

There was some concern regarding the ground plane and the Panel suggested the applicant take a cleaner approach and not break it up with different design elements.

The Panel had a number of concerns regarding the interface on the north with some of the Panel stating that the building should be detached to keep the identity along Cambie Street of individual buildings. They suggested the applicant examine the design detail and the relationship between their building façade and the building to the north to reduce overlook issues.

Also, the Panel felt the proposed streetwall and shoulder line which is part of the area plan seemed to be too low and suggested some design development to the modules on the bay windows to lower them to get a better disposition of height on that elevation.

The Panel felt there was a need to further develop the hierarchy and legibility of the building. They did feel that it had been simplified since the last review but could be still calmed down with respect to the vertical bays.

With respect to the building composition and the response to sustainability, some of the Panel felt the glazing alone may not be sufficient to address the solar orientation particularly on the west façade. As well, some of the Panel felt the west façade needed to be quieter. A couple of Panel members would like to see social sustainability addressed and suggested adding an interior amenity space on the site.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Staples said he thought the Panel had lots of good comments. He said he agreed that the southeast corner could be better handled. He said they wanted the material and colour palette to be complementary to the neighbourhood. They didn't plan an amenity or social space considering the neighbourhood is rich in community spaces.

Mr. Glasner noted that it was a LEED™ mid-rise building and that they had allocated for solar panels on the roof and were looking into a domestic heat pump system.

Mr. Vincent noted that there are a lot of landscape elements including trellis, furniture and bike racks proposed. He added that because of the busy road they thought a gathering space wasn't appropriate and was better used for circulation.

2.	Address:	238 West Broadway
	DE:	415565
	Use:	To construct a new 8-storey mixed use building with CRU units on the ground floor and seven levels of residential market units and two levels of underground parking accessed by the lane.
	Zoning:	C-3A
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	W.T. Leung Architects
	Owner:	Karen Voong
	Delegation:	W.T. Leung, W.T. Leung Architects Christiane Cottin, W.T. Leung Architects Gerry Eckford, Eckford & Associates Landscape Architects
	Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)**Introduction:**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for 8-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade and underground parking. The applicant is seeking a heritage density transfer and the project will be reviewed by the Development Permit Board. Mr. Morgan described the context noting that it is located in the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. He noted that there are some street trees along the frontage. The C-3A zoning is under review however a community plan has just been completed for the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. The consensus was that density and height along this part of Broadway will not increase. Height in this sub area has a suggested maximum of 70 feet. In terms of massing the policy calls for a continuous 30 foot high podium to insure sunlight access on the north side of Broadway at the winter solstice. Mr. Morgan explained that staff have suggested the podium height could go slightly higher for the benefit of higher retail without unduly compromising sun access. All the loading and building services are provided off the lane. The project will contain 44 one bedroom units and 17 two bedroom units. The lower residential floors have enclosed balconies along the street frontage while the upper floors have open balconies. There will be two indoor meeting and exercise amenity areas which open up onto a landscaped terrace on the second floor. Mr. Morgan described the materials noting that most of the façade is clad in brick masonry. In terms of sustainability the applicant will be meeting LEED™ Silver and includes extensive and intensive green roofs, high efficiency irrigation, the use of recycled materials and planting which reduces water run-off to the city's storm drains.

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

- Height: The proposed height is 80 feet, 10 feet more than the recommended guidelines. Does the Panel support the extra height?
- Massing: The proposed massing exceeds the maximum 30 feet podium level by approximately 7 feet and a wider building width above the podium level that is 63% of site width, rather than 50%. Is that supportable?

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

W.T. Leung, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that given the arterial nature of Broadway they could have a higher streetwall and that the building has had a strong

presence on the street for over 30 years. They developed a terracing form that is more sympathetic to the adjacent context. There is also a forecourt for the residential entry to give further emphasis to the residential entry.

Christiane Cottin, Architect, noted there is an urban and commercial feel along Broadway so the idea was to provide a contextual response that is more orderly and linear. There are enclosed balconies on the lower floors while on the south elevation is more playful and open. The colour accents animate the building elevations.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He noted that the street trees may need to be replaced. There is room for a planter and a green screen along the lane to provide more interest. The podium at the rear has private terraces with extensive and intensive green roofs that provide dedicated maintenance access. The trees are set back on the eastern wing to provide some visual privacy to the unit. In the outdoor amenity space a children's play area is proposed along with a small cabinet for book exchanges and toy storage for the children and a seating area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Height supportable subject to shadow analysis; massing may have to step back;
- Design development to the residential entry;
- Design development to the lower blank walls along the lane and side yard lane façade;
- Add more urban agriculture and more extensive and/or intensive green roofs;
- Provide access for landscape maintenance.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal as well as the height, massing and materiality.

The Panel thought the project was well handled and supported the additional height to the podium as they thought it was within an acceptable height to the adjacent properties. Several Panel members had concerns with the ramp configuration to the underground parking and suggested possibly flipping the loading and sharing the entrance with the residential ramp. A couple of Panel members noted that the residential entry needed some improvement to distinguish it from the retail and as well improve the rain canopy. One Panel member suggested more lighting could be added in the entry as it faces north. They also thought any landscaping in the area needed to be shade tolerant.

A couple of Panel members thought the lane could be better animated so it's not a magnet for graffiti. One Panel member suggested taking some of the colour from the building into the lane and also a suggested having a unique painted mural on the west wall.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel member suggested more green space could be added to the upper parts of the building. Another Panel member suggested more landscaping to the roof terraces on the fifth level and as well several Panel members thought there could be some urban agriculture included. A couple of Panel members thought there should be some shading added in the children's play area. A number of Panel members were concerned that some of the landscaping wasn't accessible and thought it would be hard to maintain.

Regarding sustainability most of the Panel thought the solar response for the building was well done. Although there isn't a sustainability strategy required, one Panel member suggested adding an accessible green roof to the project.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Leung thanked the Panel. He noted that the loading bay location is due to the width of the site and would not clear the street grade when it gets down to Broadway if it was changed. He also noted that the shadowing on the north side of Broadway doesn't hit the property line but does cross the sidewalk.

Mr. Eckford said they would look at access to the larger planting areas and thought adding urban agriculture was a good idea.

3.	Address:	2468 Bayswater Street
	DE:	415512
	Use:	To construct a new 4-storey commercial/residential building over two levels of underground parking.
	Zoning:	C-2C
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Shift Architecture
	Owner:	Mosaic Homes
		Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture
	Delegation:	Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Kristina Kovacs, Mosaic Homes
	Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

Introduction:

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development with 31 residential units and three commercial retail units. He noted that the applicant is proposing a form that extends partially into the angled envelope recommended in the district schedule. The commercial frontage along Bayswater Street is also longer than recommended in the zoning. Mr. Black noted that the residential entry is positioned between the storefront and the lane parking element. He then described the Policy for the area and mentioned that the C-2C zoning intends to maintain commercial activities and services that require central locations to serve larger neighbourhoods, districts or communities. He also noted that heights of building are limited by a maximum vertical height of 35 feet, although the Director of Planning may permit an increase. The district schedule recommends that the maximum frontage for any commercial building be 50 feet. However, a relaxation of this requirement may be permitted if a pedestrian amenity area such as a courtyard or resting area is provided, or where pedestrian interest is otherwise maintained.

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

- Is the proposed length of commercial frontage on the west façade appropriate for this particular location?
- Does the proposed massing extending beyond the zoning envelope create any issues for nearby neighbours?
- Is the passage on Bayswater sufficiently developed as a notable building entry?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Cam Halkier, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they had tried to bring some historical context into a neighbourhood that is in transition. He described the architecture and explained that it is a white brick warehouse/loft building that is similar in appearance to a renovation with a small contemporary addition at the back end that signals the entry to the residential spaces. Their intention was to improve the streetscape of the neighbourhood and bring a quality building with quality materials. The addition of some recesses on the south elevation is to help with the shading of the top floor. The trees on the south and west side will provide shading on the lower levels. The residential entry is located closer to the neighbourhood and is demarked by a monument with a vertical light providing some wayfinding

to the back of the building. He also described the material and colour palette proposed for the building.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, further described the proposal noting that Bayswater Street has an existing public realm and that the street trees will be retained. Some planters and pots will be added on the ground floor at the front which will be maintained by the commercial strata. On the lane side there will be a reinforced grass handicap parking stall and also a bench. There are planters proposed along the lane to keep the lower units back somewhat from the lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to improve the quality of the residential entry;
- Considering moving the bike racks from the residential entry;
- Consider a more contemporary expression to match the context of the neighbourhood;
- Consider moving the handicap parking into the parkade;
- Consider adding an amenity space in the building.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel thought the commercial frontage was appropriate although a couple of Panel members were concerned with the depth of the CRUs. The Panel supported the massing and liked the entry to the building. Several Panel members wanted to see more transparency and light at the entry with one Panel member wondering if the handicap parking space would benefit from some weather protection. The Panel supported the passage on Bayswater Street but thought the bike racks at the entry should be moved.

The Panel liked the simple approach of the building's expression however they thought the warehouse aesthetic was not appropriate for the context. A couple of Panel members would like to see an amenity space in the building. Several Panel members suggested using one of the CRUs for an amenity space which could also help the entry. One Panel member pointed out that there wasn't a signage strategy indicated and thought it needed to be done at the early stages of the design.

Several Panel members thought the grass in the handicap parking area didn't work and would end up being muddy when it rained. As well a number of Panel members thought the parking should be moved to the underground with one Panel member suggesting the position of the transformer in the lane could be changed and a wall built around it.

Several Panel members thought there needed to be a canopy at the entrance and that the parking at the lane needed to be reconsidered.

Several Panel members were concerned with the livability of the residential units as they are small and long and on the second floor they seemed particularly dark.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Halkier thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that the expression was driven by the client. Regarding the handicap parking, he said he appreciated the comments regarding the grass. He also agreed to look at the signage strategy and that they will work with a sign company. It probably will be a heavy channel with an inset panel, cut out and backlit. As well they are planning to integrate ventilation into the signage.

Ms. Kovacs said they there didn't plan for an amenity space thinking that the neighbourhood is the amenity as people will want to live in the building because of the area.

4.	Address:	2551 Kingsway
	DE:	415404
	Use:	Twelve units STIR residential building with commercial at grade comprised of 5-storeys (4 on the laneway) on the north side of Kingsway in the Norquay neighbourhood.
	Zoning:	C-2
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Robert Bradbury Architecture
	Owner:	Vaneagle Holdings Inc.
	Delegation:	Robert Bradbury, Architect
	Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-9)**Introduction:**

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting the proposal is in the policy context of the Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan which was adopted by Council about eighteen months ago. In the Norquay Plan, there is a rezoning policy for Kingsway between Gladstone and Killarney streets to permit for new mid-rise buildings of 10-14 storeys in height. One of the main principles of the plan is the requirement for wider sidewalks along Kingsway to increase walkability along the main shopping district. Currently, there is a lack of traffic lights along this portion of Kingsway, which discourages pedestrian access across Kingsway. Since Kingsway is part of the major road system that serves the lower mainland, the City is obligated to have three lanes of traffic during rush hour so there wasn't an opportunity to widen the sidewalks by taking away from the roadway. Instead the Plan proposes to widen the sidewalks through increased setbacks from the front property line through redevelopment. There is a variety of lot divisions and ownership patterns along Kingsway with mostly larger lots (100 to 150 foot frontages), however there are some blocks, such as the one for this proposal, that are smaller. The sidewalks in these blocks will be the most difficult to widen and the frontages may suffer until the neighbouring building develops in order to get a consistent sidewalk width along the street. The proposal responds to staff's direction to provide an 8' setback for the ground floor only, which will provide an interim state of a wider sidewalk fronting this development that could permit some patio life. This condition would also anticipate redevelopment of the properties located due west, at which time the 8 ft. setback would provide a transition between the 12' setback required for redevelopment to the west and lack of setback from the existing building to the east, which is already fully developed and permanent.

Mr. Cheng noted that the proposal is for a 5-storey building or a high 4-storey up from the lane. There is a change in elevation from the lane to the front of about 6 ½ feet. Usually C-2 requires a twenty foot setback over the ground storey and a further fifteen setback for the fourth storey. However there isn't a setback with this proposal due to the unique situation where the rear lane forms a T-section so it is not directly over someone's backyard. Furthermore, the properties located across the service lane will also be subject to a new rezoning policy that will permit 4-storey apartment buildings.

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

- Taking into consideration both the interim state and the final state, is this the optimal response in terms of achieving the desired wider sidewalks based on this half of the block?
- Is the rear interface acceptably neighbourly given the intention of future built form of 4-storey apartment buildings across the lane?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Robert Bradbury, Architect, further described the proposal noting that he thought it would be interesting to have the upper massing over the lower to create some shelter when it rains. He said that one of his design goals was to relax some of the depth of the building by stretching the building out and creating light wells in the center of the building with landscaping. He said this would create an oasis from the busy traffic and noise of Kingsway and would give more light into the units. They also wanted to create a large, useable amenity space on the second floor. Mr. Bradbury noted that the other challenge of the project was the parking. Since the back lane is higher than Kingsway it made it difficult to put the parking below the building. As a result they are asking for a relaxation in the parking noting that they are also adding rental stock in the area.

Mr. Bradbury took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to the Kingsway façade;
- Consider reducing the number of materials being used;
- Design development to the amenity space to make it more useable.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the proposal although they did support the use.

The Panel thought the setback strategy was unsupportable and that over time the sidewalk strategy would need to be changed. The proposal to setback only the ground storey was generally regarded as highly detrimental to the viability of the commercial retail space. They thought there should be a more interesting and possibly changeable design solution to solve the problem. They also thought there wasn't enough information to judge how this strategy would resolve itself over time. Several Panel members thought there were accessibility issues as well because of the nature of the site. They weren't supportive of the long and narrow commercial spaces as they thought they might not be viable.

Several Panel members thought the Kingsway façade needed to be broken up with one Panel member suggesting slipping the massing as a solution to push back the building to create a setback rather than having the eight foot overhang. Most of the Panel thought there were too many different materials and suggested the building needed to have only one principal material. A couple of Panel members thought there should be setbacks on the back of the building.

Most of the Panel thought the small courtyard could be delightful if handled competently. Several Panel members thought there were also lots of challenges with the amenity space and might be hard to get residents to use it.

The Panel noted that the information package was so thin that it was hard to understand the intent of the building.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Bradbury noted that a material board was submitted to the City. He mentioned that the courtyard was an attempt to keep a bit of a serrated edge on the laneway. If they could reduce that they could increase the depth of the courtyard. Regarding the setbacks and flanking walls, he noted that this was an interim solution as the street is changing. He said they chose the brick material to match the neighbouring property but was open to have something different.

5.	Address:	201 West 2nd Avenue
	DE:	N/A
	Use:	Workshop to review an alternate form of development under the Council approved CD-1.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	N/A
	Review:	Second
	Architect:	GBL Architects
	Owner:	Concord Pacific Stu Lyon, GBL Architects
	Delegation:	Daniel Eisenber, GBL Architects Margot Long, PWL Landscape Architects Peter Webb, Concord Pacific
	Staff:	Scot Hein

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

Introduction:

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the workshop for an alternative form of development in the CD-1 zone. He noted that there was a previously supported form of development by the Panel at the CD-1 stage. Mr. Hein gave a short history of the site and explained that another architectural firm had brought forward a proposal for the site. The Panel at the time appreciated that it was a passive through-ventilated scheme. As the project evolved there were some challenges in terms of the size of the project with respect to financing. As well, the project started to get closed in and became more atrium-like, so there was a discussion around finding alternative forms of development. He said that they wanted to do better with respect to the form of development while still respecting the prevailing CD-1. The proposal meets the existing CD-1 zoning in terms of density and height but with a different form of development. Mr. Hein stated that he was looking for the Panel's comments on whether this different approach to the basic form of development is heading in the right direction, and if so the applicant will bring back the proposal once a development application was submitted. Mr. Hein described the emerging context for the area and noted that there have been some changes in the overall Southeast False Creek precinct. He added that they are looking at some alternative sites for the school. He acknowledged that the proposal is for an important site and that there is more potential being next to the park. He added that it is an important building in that it faces the water. They are looking at opening up the site with some possibility of bringing the park into the site.

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

Is this alternative form of development on the right track as opposed to what was previously seen by the Panel?

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Stu Lyon, Architect, noted that if they proceed with this form of development there will be a more detailed presentation at the development permit stage. He explained that there are two major considerations although the height and the FSR remain the same. They are planning on adjusting the width of the building, the width of the footprint and the shape of the footprint. He said that the previous design was enthusiastically embraced because it was an interesting form that came to the Panel with a very high atrium space through the center of the project. It turned out to be a costly form and there were also issues around liveability. One of the benefits

of the new design is that it releases more land and provides more open space. As well they thought that perhaps the form of the building could be a hinge on the corner. They were able to pull back the building, provide a curve and created a visual way into the site. They have retained the passageway that is part of the development of Southeast False Creek consistent with developing more pedestrian networks through the area. He added that it will be an all residential building with townhouses and an amenity space at the ground level around the 2nd Avenue side.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, mentioned that in the previous plan the park was privatized and in this plan they are proposing to have a continuous public linkage all the way through to the park to meet up with existing walkways. The notion of permeability is strong plus the idea that there is an opportunity to celebrate the corner as a gateway site. The other notion is that there is a variety of different activities that can happen that celebrate the extension of the stormwater treatment and the expression of the water.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the direction of the alternative form of development and thought it was on the right track in comparison to what was previously seen by the Panel. They also saw it as a new opportunity for the area with the addition of the park. Most of the Panel thought there was a significant improvement over the previous scheme with one Panel member stating that it could be a landmark building. Another Panel member thought the applicant needed to take into consideration how the building will be seen from the intersection.

Several Panel members suggested the architecture should be bold and perhaps something uncommon. One Panel member thought there could be a taller building at the park and a couple of other Panel members thought it could be curved. They also liked that there were views to the waterfront with one Panel member suggesting the passage-way could be larger.

Several Panel members liked that the curving building recognized the two geometries and the way 2nd Avenue meets the building. One Panel member thought the east building at grade could be cut back to improve the pedestrian experience. A couple of Panel members thought there was the potential to build a stronger awareness of the public space at the intersection. They noted that it was an important artery through False Creek.

Applicant's Response:

Peter Webb said it sounded like everyone was excited to see the changes to the proposal and he thought the new design would improve the marketability of the project.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:27p.m.