

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** December 1, 2010

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Bruce Haden (Chair)  
Robert Barnes  
Jeff Corbett  
Jane Durante (Excused Item #2)  
David Godin  
Oliver Lang (Left after 3<sup>rd</sup> Item)  
Vladimir Mikler  
Maurice Pez  
Scott Romses  
Alan Storey

**REGRETS:**  
James Cheng  
Jim Huffman  
Steve McFarlane

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	105-167 West 2 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue
2.	104-150 East 1 <sup>st</sup> Avenue
3.	2200 Willow Street
4.	553 West 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Haden called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 105-167 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
 DE: Rezoning  
 Description: To permit the development of three residential towers on a six-storey podium that includes retail uses at grade and a daycare. Tower heights proposed are 13 storeys, 15 storeys and 16 storeys.  
 Zoning: M2 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning  
 Architect: Walter Francl Architecture  
 Owner: Executive Group of Companies  
 Review: First  
 Delegation: Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architecture  
 Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects  
 Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Recollective  
 Staff: Dale Morgan and Ian Cooper

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-3)**

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site in South East False Creek on the north side of West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. The proposal is for a rezoning from M-2 to CD-1. There will be two buildings on either side of a mid-block mews with 487 residential units and some retail uses and space for a daycare. The proposal is for three towers (16, 15 and 13 storey) on a 6-storey podium. Mr. Cooper described the ODP for South East False Creek noting that the ODP caps site density at 3.5 FSR but allows for consideration of additional bonuses for "heritage, cultural or other public amenities".

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that the site will have three residential towers with retail at grade and a daycare facility at the 6<sup>th</sup> level. The rezoning is to permit residential uses and increase the height and proposed density. Mr. Morgan described the context for the surrounding area noting that the proposal is for an entire city block. The boundaries include West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to the south, Manitoba Street to the east, Columbia Street to the west and the lane to the north.

Mr. Morgan noted that the SEFC ODP asks for a "complete community based on sustainability principles that include environmental, social and economic principles". The area is a mixed-use neighbourhood with diversity of residential occupants with family housing as a priority. There will be a mix of affordable housing, modest market and market housing. The Council Policy for the area allows for a maximum height to 38.1m. This was revised to encourage further public amenity contributions that would realize an additional two partial floors up to 6.25m in height for a total maximum height of 44.35m. The Policy notes that some variation in building height is desirable without detracting from the overall basic form of SEFC. Also, a substantial street wall height along West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is sought and roof projections may extend above maximum building heights if they do not contain habitable space and their design as a capping element or shading device and their design meets guideline requirements.

Mr. Morgan described the architectural plans for the site noting there will be three tower forms on a street wall mid rise with some retail frontage. The parking and loading will be a

single ramp for all services and underground parking including day care access and drop off. The massing is derived from shading and screening elements providing either shade or privacy to the glazed portions of the building façade. On the southern and western faces there will be horizontal and vertical screening with balconies and glazed guards of various depths that will respond to differing solar orientations. As well varied roof heights on the upper floors will give interest and scale and transitions in building heights. The mechanical and elevator overruns are integrated into the rooftop composition. The lower rooftops are accessible and usable as common outdoor space with the mid rise having urban agriculture and a daycare. The applicant will pursue LEED™ Silver equivalency to LEED™ Gold equivalent.

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

1) Massing & Height

The total height of the west tower exceeds the maximum permitted height by approximately 7 metres and the highest floor level by 1.7 metres and will require some reduction in height in at least to meet bylaw requirements for height. In the panel's view, a) Do the proposed two extra partial floors on each of the 3 towers meet the policy guidelines for a partial floor and b) What would be the optimum massing for the upper massing?

2) Density

Given the height and upper massing constraints and factoring the exclusions of the amenity bonuses, can the form of development effectively absorb the proposed density of 5.29 FSR without compromising overall urban form & livability standards?

3) Public Realm

General comments on the public realm interface.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, further described the proposal noting that their neighbour, the Wall Financial Corporation project has a taller tower than this project. The general massing has been done in response to the neighbour's project and to try to minimize exposure into their suite plans. Mr. Francl described the architecture noting that the ground floor will be retail with a daycare on the 6<sup>th</sup> level. The residential entries and the daycare entry will be off of West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. The roofs will be used for amenity space and will add some character to the buildings.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that there will be private patios on the upper roofs as well as outdoor space for the daycare and some urban agriculture. The public realm will follow the SEFC guidelines. The grid in the pavement will pick up the old ship patterns on the ground plane which will come up the lane from the Wall project and continuing into this project. They aren't replicating a ship on the site but they are doing a pavement treatment to look like water and adding bench seating that will reference boat slips.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Increase the overall architectural distinctiveness of parts with special emphasis on the towers and with particular emphasis on enhancing the distinctiveness of the west tower because of its unique location;

- Consider increasing use of strong color reflecting the adjacent SEFC projects; and
  - If the height can not be revised to reduce the appearance of bulkiness and challenges with respect to adjacent buildings, then consider reduction in the overall density to achieve the same objectives.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it was a well conceived application.

The Panel thought it was a good project and exciting to see a large block handled so well noting that there were some constraints of massing and height with one Panel member suggesting that the design seemed to be fighting the constraints. Most of the Panel members thought there should be some flexibility with the height and that the towers could go higher to emphasize the base and sculpt the buildings making them less bulky. The Panel agreed that if more height couldn't be added to the towers then the project was overly ambitious for the amount of FSR allowed and the bulk needed to be reduced. One Panel member noted that one of the interesting things about SEFC is the pairing of towers and that off-setting the tower with three instead of four towers was the right way to go as it opens up the space between the buildings. One Panel member suggested sloping the building massing to the high point and then down to West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Also the top three floors could be terraced to provide a nice living space. The Panel didn't mind the mechanical excursions above the roof although a couple of Panel members thought they could use some refinement.

Several Panel members noted that the adjacency to the west and east tower was very tight with the units looking straight into one another. One Panel member suggested pulling back the tower or terracing the north façade to get a bit more light into the towers. Several Panel members thought the towers had a sameness to them and wanted to see one of the towers stand out as a landmark building. Several Panel members thought there were too many layers of residential making the buildings unremarkable. Another Panel member didn't understand why the base ended on West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and not West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

The Panel liked the public realm noting that it will draw the project into the rest of the community. One Panel member liked the use of the boat slips theme but suggested other vertical elements rather than just trees in the space as well as more areas for seating. Most of the Panel thought the mews was well handled and will benefit both this project and the Wall project adjacent. One Panel member suggested making the mews wider to accommodate crowds spilling out from the performance space in the Wall project. Also a Panel member cautioned the applicant to not over program the mews with a public art program to allow it to have its own language. A couple of Panel members thought the applicant could have used the lane to make two faces to the project while another Panel member suggested adding retail which would make the lane more useable.

The Panel thought the color palette was a bit monochromatic with several Panel members suggesting looking for one element or material that could act as a foil. One Panel member liked that the daycare would be full size with another Panel member suggested the entry could be emphasized more. A couple of Panel members thought it was unfortunate that there wasn't any emphasis on job space for SEFC noting that job space is decreasing in the area.

A couple of Panel members were concerned with the height adjacency between the west tower and tower behind it noting that in the winter months there would be some heavy shadowing of the adjacent buildings. It was noted by one Panel member that the parking seemed high at one stall per unit and a couple of Panel members were concerned with how the daycare drop off area would work.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Francl thanked the Panel for their fine commentary noting that they will consider their comments seriously. He added that they are closer to LEED™ Gold with their points. Also he noted that it was a challenging project as they are putting similar massing on three towers instead of four towers and they need to respond to the Wall site.

---

2. Address:	104-150 East 1 <sup>st</sup> Avenue
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	To rezone the site from M-2 to CD-1 to permit the development of a six-storey residential building with a total of 170 residential units. Rezoning is required to permit residential uses consistent with the South East False Creek Official Development Plan (SEFC ODP). The proposed density of 3.5 FSR and the maximum height of 38 meters conform to the SEFC ODP.
Zoning:	M-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Rafii Architects
Review:	First
Delegation:	Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Rene Marcotte, Rafii Architects Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting (Sustainability)
Staff:	Dale Morgan and Ian Cooper

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)**

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site in Southeast False Creek (SEFC) on the south side of East 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and the corner of Quebec Street. The proposal is to rezone from M-2 to CD-1 and generally conforms to the ODP for density and use. The ODP caps site density at 3.5 FSR but allows for consideration of additional bonuses for heritage, cultural or other public amenities. The policy for SEFC focuses on a diversity of residential uses to accommodate all incomes, with family housing as a priority with an emphasis on a high degree of liveability.

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, further introduced the proposal noting that the site is being rezoned to permit a 6-storey mid-rise and a 12-storey residential building with a total of 170 residential units. Mr. Morgan described the context for the site noting that it is located in the rail yard sub area in SEFC. He also described the policy context noting that the ODP for SEFC requires sustainability initiatives that include environmental, social and economic principles. It is a community of differing social strata, embracing a mix of affordable housing, modest market and market housing. The maximum height for the area was recently increased by an additional 20.5 feet to accommodate an additional two partial floors.

Mr. Morgan described the proposed architecture noting the forty foot breezeway and the ground floor units facing the lane and the street. The top of the tower will contain 2-storey penthouses. He noted the articulation at the corners with balconies and insets to attempt a slimmer, more vertical expression at the end elevations. There is some concern regarding the unit depths on the south facing units as they are only fourteen feet wide. The penthouses will have roof gardens and there will be a shared amenity space with garden plots on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor roof.

Mr. Morgan described the shadowing impacts noting that there will be some impacts on the adjacent site to the north at midday on the proposed building and to a lesser extent on the yard setbacks during the afternoon. Late afternoon sun on the tower will cover much of the open common amenity space on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor. There will be considerable shadowing on the west face of the social housing at midday and in the late afternoon.

Regarding sustainability, the applicant will be pursuing LEED™ Silver to Gold equivalency. A Neighbourhood Energy Utility (NEU) for heating and domestic hot water is planned.

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

- 1) **Density & Height:** Is the proposed density of 3.5 FSR and the maximum height of 38m supportable?
- 2) **Massing & Expression:** General comments on the mid rise and tower form are requested. Should there be greater similarities of material expression to bring greater cohesion and unity to the proposal? Is the massing of the tower form well handled? Should there more variety and sculpting of the upper massing of the tower?
- 3) **Livability:**
  - a. An internal corridor for the mid rise and its location relative to building's depth, the single combined entry point and elevator has resulted in unit plans that are unusually deep, relative to their width and height, compounded by the single configuration of the ground oriented units.
  - b. Do the tower units facing south towards the lane be given greater consideration for potential privacy and overlook impacts?

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Road Rafii, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the south facing units will be narrower and deeper because of some sustainability issues. The units have much smaller windows in proportion to the floor plate and the units on the north façade have wider windows to benefit from the daylight. He also noted that they aren't applying for a density increase. Mr. Rafii described the architecture for the proposal noting that they had complied with the guidelines for Southeast False Creek.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the plans noting that the character of the landscape was designed to play off the history of the rail yards that used to be in the area. They plan to use materials, patterning and planting that will reflect that history. On the ground floor there will be ground floor oriented patios and an amenity patio at the back with a rainwater trough. The main amenity deck on the sixth floor will have urban agriculture with a children's play area. The top of the tower will be individual penthouse units.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to the south tower base to the lane
  - Design development to the lane unit approach and entry condition.
  - Ensure the clarity of entry without diminishing the overall building simplicity and integrity.
  - Careful attention to the layout of the deep, south facing units to ensure liveability.
  - Consider some work-use that reflects the historical industrial uses.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it would be a nice addition to the neighbourhood although a couple of Panel members lamented the loss of the industrial area.

The Panel thought the proposal handled the FSR nicely and supported the height, massing and density. However most Panel members thought there might be some modules and plans that were a little too deep noting that mid rise building with deep sides create planning problems. There was some concern regarding the livability of those units. The Panel also thought the proposal would fit into the neighbourhood. One Panel member noted that if the building was taller it would be easier to deal with some of the spatial issues and that there should be more variety in the sculpting at the top of the building. Several Panel members were surprised that there was such a large setback on Quebec Street and encouraged the applicant to take particular care in planning the area.

It was noted that the expression and materials would be important but that there was a nice modulation to the design with nice simple facades. The Panel liked the simple approach taken by the applicant.

In terms of shading, a couple of Panel members noted that the applicant had improved the energy use in the building. One Panel member suggested the applicant eliminate the thermal bridging as it wasn't necessary. Another Panel member suggested adding shading devices to the east façade as well as the west.

Most of the Panel supported the location of the corridor and the configuration of the ground oriented units. The Panel liked the notion of the sky bridge over the open space. A couple of Panel members noted that it was a long walk to the units in the far east side of the mid rise and encouraged the applicant to add a secondary entry to assist with the way finding. One Panel member had some concern regarding security with the street level units on the lane. Another Panel member suggested adding a window at the end of the corridor for some natural light.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Foad said he realized that the deep units might be a concern but they have designed similar units in Yaletown and they were very popular. He added that he believes they can design some liveable floor plans. He noted that the design of the units on the lane have followed the guidelines for SEFC. Mr. Foad stated that the distance between the tower and the next future project will be the same as the Olympic Village with the same setback. He added that they will improve the visibility of the front door and make it more legible. Mr. Foad thanked the Panel for their comments.



3. Address:	2200 Willow Street
DE:	414244
Description:	To construct a new 25 unit multiple dwelling unit complex consisting of two buildings over one level of common underground parking.
Zoning:	M-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	McFarlane Green Biggar Architecture and Design
Owner:	Kenstone Properties Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Michael Green, McFarlane Green Biggar Architecture and Design Susan Scott, McFarlane Green Biggar Architecture and Design Leigh Merrigan, McFarlane Green Biggar Architecture and Design
Staff:	Marie Linehan

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

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the application for a site in the FM-2 District of Fairview Slopes at the corner of Willow Street and West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She noted that there is a change of grade of about one storey sloping down from the lane to West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue although the site is fairly level across the West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage. Ms. Linehan described the context for the surrounding area.

The proposal consists of two rows of townhouse units separated by a common courtyard and the applicant is seeking a conditional density of 1.5 FSR. The Fairview Slopes neighbourhood has an existing pattern of pedestrian view corridors through breaks in the building massing and the proposal has a break in the rear row of the townhouses in response to the view corridor to the rear.

The False Creek Guidelines, when referring to sites over 100 feet in frontage, notes that in order to avoid a "monolithic" appearance to the street frontage, it is encouraged that a finer grain of development through the expression of individual units within a development be sought. We therefore more typically see a conventional rowhouse expression in the newer developments on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Ms. Linehan noted that this segment of West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue has a somewhat more normalized pedestrian environment as compared to further west where it is more free-way like. There are pedestrian routes down Willow Street and along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the controlled intersection and crosswalk at Moberly Road and down to False Creek, the seawall and Granville Island. Ms. Linehan noted that the proposal includes a green roof and roof decks on the rear units. The overall height of the building proper complies, but the guardrails will require a height relaxation. She added that the City is able to consider height relaxations to allow for access and maintenance of green roofs.

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

- The proposed massing and architectural expression at West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue where articulation is provided via a curved screen wall with a random pattern of vertical Corte steel louvers, rather than a more literal expression of individual units.
- If a break in the massing should be considered along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue in light of the frontage width.
- The treatment of the first storey wall along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Willow Street in terms of pedestrian interest.

- Should further articulation of the 1<sup>st</sup> story wall, or the introduction of a more three dimensional quality be provided via inset or projecting entries be considered.
- The height and solidity of the concrete wall as you turn the corner to Willow Street and at the courtyard entry where a lower wall could perhaps be provided.
- The green roof and roof decks at the rear units.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Michael Green, Architect, further described the proposal noting that West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a very busy street so they wanted to reconcile the façade and try to transition the site from a building close to the street to one that was more appropriately addressing the street corner. The idea of the façade on the north side was to have windows that don't open because of the noise from the street and by creating screens gives some privacy to the units while retaining their views to the north. The southern units are focused around a central courtyard to give people the opportunity to be able to leave their doors open to the courtyard to a secure outdoor environment. On the north side it is unlikely that people will use their front yards so it is more about the pedestrian experience. Mr. Green noted that there are roof deck gardens proposed on the south facing units and parking will be accessed from the lane. Mr. Green described the proposed materials noting it would be a simple, quiet palette.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider a small common activities space in the courtyard;
  - Design development to the landscape; and
  - Consideration to secondary connection to West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue at the east end of the site.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it would be a great addition to the street in this area of Fairview Slopes.

Most of the Panel thought the architectural expression was strong and broke up the massing well. They thought it was a well put together project and would stand out in a varied street character. One Panel member noted that it was a wonderful example on how to take a difficult site and turn it into something nice. The Panel supported the height relaxation noting that the use of the roof top decks would be appreciated by the residents. Most of the Panel liked the screen wall on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and thought it would be successful. A number of Panel members thought it was unfortunate that retail would be lost.

Several Panel members thought there could be a second connection down to West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Several Panel members were concerned with the unit size noting the amount of light might be restricted. One Panel member suggested adding a lock off suite on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Most of the Panel supported the materials and the colour palette.

There were some concerns regarding the landscape plans. One Panel member thought it was a bit monotonous and thought the plantings were sparse. Another Panel member noted that plant selection would be important to make the landscape interesting and thought there should be a landscape architect on the project. It was noted that the creativity of the building demands that the landscaping plans support the architecture. A couple of Panel members would like to see more common outdoor space and some seating opportunities as well as lawn space. This would give a place for the residents to gather with a couple of Panel members suggesting losing a unit for a little communal space.

Several Panel members acknowledged the fence design and liked that it goes up into the building with one Panel member stating that it was almost public art. One Panel member noted that a location for a signage plate was needed and that the lighting along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be important regarding how the fencing is lit at night.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Green said he thought the Panel had some fantastic comments.

---

4. Address:	553 West 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
DE:	414251
Description:	This proposal is to develop the site with a seven storey multiple dwelling building containing 24 units. The access to parking is through a legal right-of-way at the rear of the building.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.
Owner:	No. 255 Seabright Holdings
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. Al Tanzer, LandSpace
Staff:	Bob Adair

---

**EVALUATION:**

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 7-storey multiple dwelling with 22 residential units and parking for 22 cars underground with access at the rear of the building. Mr. Adair described the context for the area noting that the Panel supported an earlier version of the proposal in 2009. The application was withdrawn after major concerns were received from residents in the building to the east about impacts on the third floor roof decks along the eastern property line. The building was subsequently redesigned with additional setbacks and the addition of a seventh floor to recoup the lost FSR.

The main residential entry will from West 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The two ground floor units also have direct entries off the street. The western portion of the building has a front setback generally matching that of the western neighbour. This increased setback is intended to provide an enhanced public realm treatment, similar to the development to the west. The massing pulls back on the upper floors on both sides to acknowledge the residential windows and decks in the neighbouring development. Privacy between adjacent roof decks is handled with screens and landscaping. There are no common amenity spaces provided but there are two private roof decks for use of the top floor units. Stairs are not shown in the application material and it is unclear if stairs could be worked into the unit plans.

Mr. Adair noted that the principal exterior material is a Dryvit cladding system, with a 'Reflectit' coating (metal panel texture), a window wall system for the glazed portion and painted concrete for the exposed lot-line walls, fin walls and at the lane. Glass canopies in aluminum frames will provide window shading on the south façade.

The proposed FSR is 2.93, just under the maximum 3 FSR permitted. This discretionary increase in FSR means the application will be going to the Development Permit Board in January for decision. The proposed height is 73.7 feet to the parapet which is in excess of the outright 30 feet permitted and also above the maximum 70 feet recommended by the Guidelines.

Mr. Adair noted that the applicant did not include information on sustainability measures with the application beyond the proposed glazed canopy extensions on the south façade, but brought along additional information for the Panel to review.

Mr. Adair noted that there are high urban design expectations in the C-3A District and there are specific criteria that the Development Permit Board is required to consider in granting

discretionary increases in height and FSR. The major criteria listed in the zoning documents include:

*The Development Permit Board may permit an increase in the maximum height of a building, and FSR, provided that it first considers:*

- *the height, bulk, location and overall design of the building and its effect on the site, surrounding buildings, streets and existing views;*
- *the design and livability of dwelling uses.*
- *the amount of open space, including plazas, and the effects of overall design on the general amenity of the area;*
- *the provision for pedestrian needs;*
- *the preservation of the character and general amenity desired for the area;*

With respect to height, Mr. Adair noted that staff will be notifying surrounding property owners and will be considering that input. Since the site to the east is only 4-storeys and the sites to the north and south are office development, it is expected that most of the responses on the height issue will relate to views across the site from the property to the west. He also noted that the proposed main roof height of 73.7 feet aligns closely with the top floor of the neighbour allowing views over the roof for the upper floor of that building. At this point staff are therefore not inclined to support additional height for private roof decks given that these two units already have significant deck areas adjacent to their living space at the 7<sup>th</sup> floor level.

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

- the earning of the proposed discretionary increase in FSR to 2.93, and in height to 73.67 feet to the parapet level ( 77 feet to guard level).
- the expression of the lower two floors on West 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and their contribution to the streetscape.
- the overall exterior materials quality and detailing.

Mr. Adair took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Cheng, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the concept of the building was to have a two storey podium and line up with the high rise building next door. On the east side there is a three storey element which is to match the three storey massing of the low rise mixed-use apartment. He noted that the model maker had made a mistake with the townhouse podium; the ground floor is supposed to be raised up a couple feet from the street so it creates a separation between the public and private areas. Mr. Cheng described the architecture noting the use of punched windows and extra landscaping in the front. To earn the discretionary FSR they are proposing to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalent.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement: (Bruce: note first line before unclear on tape)**
  - Consider use of translucent materials in place of clear glass at minimum on levels three and four on the east side to reduce overlook issues.
  - Design development to improve the relationship between tower and podium whether by increasing the contrast or simplifying and integrating the two further.
  - Consider use of bolder colours and/or higher quality materials particularly at grade.

- Review the landscape maintenance access.
- Consider actual LEED™ certification.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the overall massing had improved.

The Panel thought the design handled the adjacencies well and that the massing was supportable. They also supported the additional height in order to avoid adjacency and overlook issues. The Panel commended the applicant for listening to the neighbour's concerns. One Panel member thought the front façade was problematic as the tower comes down flush to the ground and looks unresolved.

Most of the Panel thought the exterior materials needed to be improved with the addition of bolder colors and better detailing. A couple of Panel members thought the patios didn't work as they were too deep and the heavy concrete wall only accentuated the problem.

One Panel member noted that the planter that separates the building to the east had no access and the landscaping would need to be maintained once in a while. One Panel member suggested adding a bold third color to improve the look of the building. Another Panel member suggested accentuating the base to make for a stronger contrast. Most of the Panel would like to see higher quality materials rather than painted concrete on the exterior. One Panel member noted that the glass sunshades on the south were not well integrated into the architectural expression.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but were concerned with the lack of a common outdoor amenity space. Also a number of Panel members didn't like the hatch opening to the private patios and suggested adding a green roof to get the height for a proper access. One Panel member would like to see more glass blocks on the eastern façade as it would add in the light but still be private. A couple of Panel member thought the planters on the terrace were unusable.

Several Panel members suggested the applicant consider LEED™ Gold certification as a way to earn the additional FSR.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng said they would commit to LEED™ Silver certification for the project.

### **Adjournment**

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