

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** February 23, 2011

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Scott Romes (Chair)  
Robert Barnes  
Helen Besharat (left at 8:00 PM)  
Gregory Borowski  
Jeff Corbett (Excused Item #2 & #4)  
Alan Endall  
Jim Huffman  
Geoff McDonell  
Arno Matis  
Norm Shearing  
Alan Storey (left at 7:00 PM)

**REGRETS:**  
James Cheng  
Jane Durante (Excused Item #1)

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1041 SW Marine Drive
2.	720 Robson Street
3.	1553 Main Street
4.	3455 West Kind Edward
5.	2888 East 2 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Romses then called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address:         | 1041 SW Marine Drive   |
| DE:                 | N/A  |
| Description:        | To rezone from MC-1 to CD-1 to consolidate CD-1 zone to allow for redevelopment of the site including retention of the existing Coast Hotel, replacement of the existing pub, and development of a 6-storey building that would contain either all residential units or a mixed use hotel and residential units. |
| Zoning:             | MC-1 and CD-1 to CD-1  |
| Application Status: | RZ   |
| Architect:          | Robert Turecki   |
| Owner:              |  |
| Review:             | Second   |
| Delegation:         |  |
| Staff:              | Sailen Black and Grant Miller  |

**EVALUATION:**

- **Introduction:** Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, further described

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Robert Turecki, Architect, further described the proposal noting

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

- **Related Commentary:**

Arno - no objection to the two uses - hotel and residential use can work together - scheme has been improved since last review - massing improved - look forward to seeing it as a dev - issues on the lane have been addressed - good response to previous comments - the parking level - marine dr corner - storage room - wonder if that transition to the street could be look at to see if there is some grading issues that can be resolved - the decks - hotel use - the decks have been dropped off - the deck is a nice residential expression - could bring back in for hotel use - rather than losing them -

Norm - fully support the dual use option - creative - to have that ability to respond to the market - two different uses is great - the public realm interface at grade and the raised floor -

harsh relationship - moving planting out to the street edge is a good idea - in terms of turning the problem around - what is the experience for people inside the pub - opportunities there - pub has turned its back - enliven the corner - worth exploring - in terms where the massing has come from - falls down - the use of materials that have been indicated - in terms of moving forward - given some reconsideration to the material and color palette

Geoff - fine with use and height, density - form of dev is greatly improved from the previous scheme - complexity of the shape of the bldg provides enough interest - streetscape - seems to be an issue - busy street - wonder if the pub we are looking into a pub or blackened windows - planting up against the windows - issue with keeping it alive - could be a nasty bit of landscaping - the corner - maybe the place to create some life - the issue of getting under the floor slab - get into the parking garage in the corner - could you lower the slab to create a smaller seating area that is a step down from the pub - be more open to the street -

Alan - improvement in the form of dev since the last review - clarity to it - in general don't see any problems with the over all form of development - in terms of simplifying the form - the floor layouts - still seem to be a lot of variation - more regularity of the layout of hotel rooms - could be some moves to further simplify - one thing to take a look at is aligning the interior corridor with Marine Drive - on the north side of the bldg as well - more regular double loaded corridor - no problem with the two uses - interesting to have the hotel and the residential use - the street interface - with the pub and marine drive is a problem - the floor level of the pub is right dead at eye level - needs to be some transparency along that frontage - there are challenges with the parking access but would encourage you to find some way - do some drop bay windows - have more visibility into the space - people could look over the side walk -

Jim - agree with most of the comments - form of dev, use and density is supportable - good to see you responded to the previous Panel's comments - one comment - the pub - could move down a couple of feet and play with the parking - other problem is elevation and materials - seems bland - like to see more dev in the elevation - articulation is fine

Alan - concerted effort to respond to previous comments - like the interdiction of the inner courtyard - no problems with use - great idea - in terms of the sidewalk - agree the streetscape is inhospitable - needs a solution -

Greg - height, density, massing - main item - materiality - needs a higher quality of material - one of the first buildings that will be seen by visitors coming into the city - presence to marine drive - the specific relationship but wonder about alignment - a number of bldgs have turned their back to Marine dr - could further simplify - explore a flat iron - pity to lose the balconies - like the two uses - flexibility - along the grade level - provide some elements to hide the floor level or lower the level - open it up - location landscape out to the sidewalk would be a good idea - relationship to the ground floor along Marine drive - nice to see - canopies - sustainability - would be nice to hear more at the next stage - not just a check list - lastly the courtyard - no provision for roof deck on top of the bldg - would be a great opportunity -

Helen - support the use - the dual use is positive - lots of improvements from the last scheme - form of dev - experience of the public getting to the residential lobby be improved - not easy to find - no visual connection to the elevator - make the entry more positive - corner - need for improvement for the corner articulation - canopy and building - canopy angle - needs some design dev - important corner - the lane façade - two 1 bdrm orientation is positive - don't like the complete blank wall to the lane - could have some windows - makes the lane safer - some privacy issues between the two studios facing the landscaped courtyard - landscape is not very sensitive - shadow analysis - disappointing that the landscaping in the courtyard doesn't take this into consideration - sunny area is ignored - roof top areas on the landscape courtyard - opportunity to offer privacy - landscaping is disappointing - materials - light industrial history in

the neighbourhood - improve the appearance of the bldg - need some vibrancy on the building - looks a bit outdated -

Geoff - considered about the livability of the Marine Drive units - hotel use on the Marine Dr frontage is probably more amenable than residential - Marine Dr sidewalk does need work - maybe some planters - dropped front walkway with planters - some interest at grade level - corner of Marine and Osler needs to be opened up - more streetscape at the corner - north courtyard is solar challenged - wonder what kind of landscaping is going to work in there - use and massing and density is supportable

Rob - previous concerns have been largely addresses - the form is coming along - concerns - blank corner at Osler and Marine - missed opportunity - other concern - inside corner units - those units are lacking light - very little window space and they overlook each other - public realm - Osler is shaping up nicely - Marine - like the planting at the curb - buffer would give pedestrians some comfortable - canopy and planters underneath - given up for better materiality at the base of the bldg - canopy is conflicting with the trees - grade issue - if the grade could come down might solve some of the awkward entry - commend heading for LEED Gold target - 2<sup>nd</sup> floor landscaped outdoor space - plants that work in shade - no maintenance access to that patio which is a concern - more programming to that small space - gets some morning sun - some seating opportunities to make the space more useable - 5<sup>th</sup> floor outdoor space - no real access to that space - gets sun in the afternoon - access from the corridor - lots of people could use that space

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Tureki - once you are in the parkade can only have a 5% slope - canopy is not solid - its glass - light will penetrate

Existing pub has a sunken area - works well in pubs - handicapped access needs to be worked out - landscaping - having some other materials might be a good idea - dusty area along Marine Drive - landscaping doesn't always look that good covered in dusty - some sort of hard surface with interest might be a better treatment

---

2. Address:	720 Robson Street
DE:	414406
Description:	To develop a 5-storey building with a 2-storey and three stores of office space above grade. Two levels of underground parking to be maintained and restored.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	First
Owner:	Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Review:	First
Delegation:	
Staff:	Sailen Black and James Boldt

---

**EVALUATION:**

- **Introduction:**

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:  
Relationship of the proposed bldg to adjacent neighbours  
Ped realm interface and acknowledgement - high bar  
On the detailing of the bldg and the relationship of its part

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

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

- **Related Commentary:**

Jim - nice project - the relationship with the neighbours is well done - like the how stair at the lane tightens of the lane - ped realm interface - done a nice job of layering the façade - steps down in grade well - detailing - such a detailed heritage façade - signage - could be an outrageous corner but what you've done is conservative - exit stair that opens onto Granville looks like its forgotten about the materials being used - the heritage bldg is detailed with granite face - have concrete around the glazing - should have equal level of materials - going to be at a main intersection - should be heading for LEED Gold - operable windows would be a nice thing to have - like the translucent sun shades - look like they are the same family as the heritage

Alan - agree with what Jim said - the bldg form and massing - lot of thought put into that - lot of heritage facades along Granville St - number of subtle height relationships that have been thought through - new bldg facades relates to the heritage - ped realm - in some respects not sure what you could do - pay attention to the details of the bldg materials - on the 2<sup>nd</sup> level need to get some controls when the - guide what happens to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows - with the wrong tenant could be a disaster - signage needs to be thought about - where it will go - how you control it and integrate it into the bldg - like the terracotta material - will come down to the module you chose and how it gets topped off

Norm - lovely assemblage of built form - supportive of the - relationship of the back of the bldg to the residential - slight variance as to where that wall should be - Granville St is designed - the details and materials - good - can't see it going any further - the heritage piece - helpful to hear it was required to be maintained - needed to be some kind of separation between the northern edge and the new bldg - doesn't give the façade any breathing room - bring that back and let the façade read a bit - warrants that - not to go to LEED Gold is a missed opportunity - understand the issue - given the type of bldg - small bldg - its management and achievable -

Arno - the small projections into the height envelope are supportable - not that significant - treatment of the bldg skin and the façade - the upper portion - the vertical black cap - it is not clear how that it is expressed - would like to see more details - horizontal sun shade - not sure about breaking the line - in the heritage bldg there is a strong line - make more out of the vertical line in the upper part of the bldg - shame that the roof top of the office portion isn't developed into an accessible space - would encourage the applicant to look at that opportunity - not sure about the planter above the heritage - not sure that is necessary - could delete it to allow the heritage façade to come thru more clearly - motive at the base isn't fully developed as yet - in plane the folding could be expressed stronger - materials at the ped level - keep the quality of the materials high

Rob - nice project - the relationship of the forms to the neighbours is supportable - ped realm treatment is dictated by the city - carried through well - the best you can do is take that and shape it to the rhythm of the bldg - detailing and articulation is great - maybe it needs more excitement at the corner - the tenant will be the one making it interesting - support all the accessible deck - landscape design - maybe should think about the planter over the heritage bldg - is that conflicting the purity - roof top deck that is useable or extensive green roof

Geoff - relationship to the neighbours is fine - breaking that up with small frosted windows gives it some interest and privacy - break up the blank back wall - ped detailing along Granville - bit of an awkward pinch point at the north east corner - not other issues - decent bldg - dark colors of the bold façade is obvious considering colors in the neighbourhood

Helen - comfortable with the relationship and setbacks - public realm is fine - supportive of the project - will be a great addition to this important corner - planter - is going to ruin the heritage façade - not going to be positive - urge you to take a lot of care in detailing the vertical in between the new and heritage - needs a lot of care to make justice both to the new bldg and the heritage - vertical reveal into the heritage and the adjacent bldg - LEED - don't think you should be chasing LEED points but would like to see you increase your energy points - operable windows would be great - maybe more positive not to duplicate colors on the heritage bldg - like the metal reveal in the concrete - take care with the location of lights - not sure about the soffits material - going to be seen from the pedestrian level - height of the framed wall is going to be detrimental to the commercial level - nice to have the freedom of adjusting it - improve the experience of the commercial

Greg - supportive of the proposal - color palette is nicely done - like the deep color of the terra cotta panel - woven in with the office - sense of the bldg tying together well with the neighboring bldgs - lane is unsightly right now - like how it is being done - like that the heritage bldg gets new life - right relationship with the heritage and the new bldg - ped realm - satisfactory - sustainability - operable windows - signage will be a key component - not sure about the stair on Granville - how it is treated - ties together nicely - glazing and straightforward elegant canopies and the stepping of the sunshades - less playful - three elements slightly at odds with each Other Business

Alan - great the façade is being well preserved - like the proposal - nature of the sculptural elements - the interesting part is the shifting of the glazing with in the façade - could be

pushed more - the three different elements of the frit, sun shades and glazing - could be worked to be more three dimensional - perhaps more glazing in the stair wells on Robson would be helpful.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mark Thompson - no comments - great comments and feedback - look forward to continuing with the project

---

3. Address:	1553 Main Street
DE:	414477
Description:	To develop this site with a 7 storey commercial and office building on the Main Street frontage, a 10 storey residential building on the Quebec Street frontage and an 8-storey residential 'skybridge' between the two buildings
Zoning:	FC-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Dialog
Owner:	Onni
Review:	First
Delegation:	Bruce Haden, Dialog David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Beau Jarvis, Onni Group Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects
Staff:	Dale Morgan

---

#### EVALUATION:

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 10-storey and 8-storey mixed-use building located in South East False Creek in the railroad lands bordered between Main and Quebec Streets. He noted that the application was last reviewed by the Panel during the rezoning stage on April 1, 2010.

Mr. Morgan also noted that on the previous review by the Panel, their comments focused on the building and the supporting structure underneath it. There were concerns with livability with the units directly below the bridge and further design of the open plaza.

Mr. Morgan noted that Panel's comments formed the basis of the design conditions of the rezoning application. He also noted that staff had some concerns with the possible feasibility of the bridge structure and its importance to a successful design outcome. Mr. Morgan said that the first design condition dealt with further clarity and resolution to the structure and architectural expression of the long span and support of the higher massing. The second design condition dealt with the livability issues for those units that were directly below the bridge structure. There were further conditions that dealt with the design development to the open plaza. There was also a condition from Engineering Services to relocate the parking ramp to the south side of the site (not the open courtyard itself) because of a future bikeway on the north side. Consequently, the ramp was moved from inside the building to the courtyard open and exposed to the unit's above.

Mr. Morgan described the architecture of the proposal noting that there will be two mid rise components. The mid-rise building along Main Street will have retail at grade and office space above. The building on the Quebec Street side will be all residential with ground oriented units. The bridge building will be residential. The ramp has been relocated but it is negatively impacting the central courtyard. There are fourteen columns planned to support the bridge structure. The units under the bridge element have been relocated and an amenity space will be provided in their place.

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

- Has the proposed form of development addressed the previous key concerns of the Panel and the Council approved design conditions of the recent rezoning, as noted below?

---

**From the UDP Minutes of April 21, 2010****Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

- Design development to the bridging element for better integration into the building;
- Design development to the column elements;
- Review the viability of the retail units;
- Design development to the plaza area to make for more privacy to the residential units;
- Design development to the plaza to allow for more public interest;
- Design of bridge building (inconsistent articulation);
- Plaza should be more public and reflect clear design strategy.

**Rezoning Design Conditions**

- design development to bring further clarity and resolution to the structure and architectural expression of the long span and support of the higher massing;

**Note to Applicant:** Staff support for the proposed form of development is subject to the successful resolution of this critical element. In collaboration with the engineer of record, provide detail analysis of the proposed structure and its architectural expression. Investigate a bridging structure that is a clear span without need for or minimal mid span support, expressing and further emphasizing the bridge like quality of the building, while maintaining openness and transparency thru the centre of the site.

- design development to address livability issues of the dwelling units located directly underneath and near the sky bridge;

**Note to Applicant:** Mitigate issues associated with lack of sky view, natural light and shadowing, either through substantial increases in floor height to achieve a double height loft space (without increasing overall building height) or relocating dwelling units and substituting other uses such as amenity spaces, or vertical circulation. Indicate on the drawings the proposed soffit treatment of the underside of the upper massing, providing detail sections.

- design development to the open plaza to address the following:
  - greater intensity and detail development of landscape treatment;

**Note to Applicant:** Given the size and volume of the space, the proposed landscape treatment appears under developed requiring further resolution, detail and embellishment. Consider adding larger trees to fill the high volume of the open plaza.

- compatibility and resolution between private and public uses, including the retail frontage that face onto the open plaza;

**Note to Applicant:** Spatial layering, that separate and zone different uses should be subtle and gradual, avoiding hard edges and boundaries that divide the large central space into two disjointed halves, instead of a unified whole.

- improved interconnectivity between the public realm of the surrounding streets and the central open space;

**Note to Applicant:** The public realm along the new side streets should be expanded where it interfaces with the open plaza, providing further landscape amenity and seating.

- provide an opportunity for a children's play area;

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bruce Haden, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they had seen the site as a transitional site with a series of influences. On one level it is part of the SEFC private lands but it is also part of the historic context of Main Street. It is also an unusual place in the city in that the Main and Quebec Streets are off the city grid. They have tried to create a formal language and have the component of the sky-bridge be more oriented to the city grid. He noted that one of the mid rise components will contain office space that will allow for excess heat from the offices to heat the residential units. Mr. Haden noted that constructing the sky-bridge takes a different kind of structural methodology and they are trying to find an affordable solution with the columns. Regarding the parking ramp, Mr. Haden noted that it is their strong preference to have the parking ramp come in from the north as the southern side of the site which is impacted by the parking ramp. He noted the materials included some brick with a lighter palette for the sky-bridge to distinguish it from the other building elements.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the plans noting that the landscaping of the spaces are now more functional. On the upper levels there are some amenities with different outdoor areas. There is one area with a hot tub, barbeque and lounging space and another space which gets more sun so they will be able to add urban agriculture. They are also trying to integrate, in a careful way, some of the mechanical aspects.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to minimize the negative impacts of the parking ramp and better integration into the form of development;
  - Design development to the plaza and the columns, considering visual impact on the courtyard and livability concerns;
  - Design development to the façades of the office component;
  - Consider the detailing of the soffits;
  - Consider adding more height in the retail; and
  - Consider playing up the contrast of the two towers against the bridging element.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal although the applicant had yet to successfully resolve some of the previous concerns of the Panel.

The Panel appreciated the boldness to the scheme and some Panel members noted that it will be the execution of the details that will make or break the project. They liked the design of the bridge building and felt it was elegant and not over powering the other components. Most of the Panel felt there was more development to be done in many areas such as the parking ramp and hoped that the design development would continue moving forward with the project. A couple of Panel member wondered if the three buildings could have a different colour palette to give more emphasis to the design.

The Panel felt the office component still needed some work on the façade to make it successful. There is a large “outdoor room” set up with the parti of the building and yet those facades are the least interesting. Several Panel members noted that the soffit of the buildings will be highly visible and should be well detailed.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the retail as they thought it would be challenged because of the location and how the area was designed. One Panel member thought the canopy was unrelenting while several other Panel member thought there needed to be more height to the retail to make it successful.

There was unanimous consensus by the Panel that the relocated vehicle ramp was a significant negative on the courtyard and adjacent uses and needed to be much better integrated with the form of development. Several Panel members advised putting the ramp within the commercial building, as in the previous rezoning application. Another Panel member noted that moving it to the middle of the courtyard was obviously the wrong thing to do, as it would split the site into two spaces and bring further unwanted emphasis to the open ramp. A number of Panel members noted that there would be a lot of traffic noise and overlook issues caused by the ramp’s location that would impact the residents. A couple of Panel members suggested softening the area with the use of landscaping such as a trellis or screens. Some Panel members felt the location of the ramp was a lost opportunity because it was a barrier that prevented spill over from the commercial area into the courtyard, which would further animate the courtyard.

The Panel felt there was an irony that the part of open plaza which was weather protected from the bridge-building was mostly water with the columns and that there was an opportunity to make a more interesting and useable gathering place, with a more varied activities. One Panel member would rather see lawn in the middle and water around the outside of the plaza. In regards to the columns expression, comments ranged from bold to fascistic. One member thought they acted as an effective filter between office and residential uses. Several Panel members thought the size of the columns could be varied in size to add more interest and that the art amenity budget might be used to bring further detailed development to the columns, to make them more special in some manner. Several Panel members were disappointed that the columns had lost their free form plan arrangement.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Haden noted that the ramp was an issue but that there were technical issues if they shift it to the west and he did state that it needed to be mitigated. Regarding the columns, Mr. Haden thought the columns had some simplicity about them as they landed in the water which would also allow for some interesting shadows. He noted that the design already has a number of strong moves and they want to stress the functionality of the project.

Mr. Bruckner noted that the Panel’s comments are on areas that need to be addressed to make a better project. He thought the office building had a simple design and didn’t see changing it as it’s about maximizing the space. He did note that they could have the brick be a different colour for each of the components.

---

4. Address:	3455 West King Edward
DE:	414465
Description:	Relocation and seismic upgrade to the 1914 wood-frame heritage building and construction of a new replacement school. The existing main school will be demolished once the replacement school is complete.
Zoning:	RS-5
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Review:	First
Delegation:	Peter Lang, IBI/HB Architects Anita Leonoff, IBI/HB Architects Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Henry Ahking, Vancouver School Board
Staff:	Pat St. Michel and James Boldt

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-4)**

- **Introduction:** Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a major initiative for upgrading and renewal of the Kitchener School. She noted that the program was initiated to ensure seismic safety of Vancouver's schools but has now been expanded to recognize the role schools play in the community. The Neighbourhood Centres for Learning and Development program will also deliver additional and enhanced school and multi-purpose spaces that will serve both the school and the larger community.

Ms. St. Michel described the context for the area noting there are two existing heritage buildings on the site. There is a 1914 Heritage A wood frame building located on the westerly side of the block and a 1922 Heritage B brick building in the centre of the block with a 1960's addition.

The 1914 building has been assessed and has significant heritage value. The proposal is to retain the 1914 building and relocate it to the southwest corner of the site and to integrate it with the new school building. Ms. St. Michel noted that although the brick building does have heritage value, and the Heritage Commission would like to see the building retained, the cost of the seismic upgrade is more than the Vancouver School Board can handle financially. The plan is to demolish the building after construction of the new building and retrofit of the 1914 building.

The main entry will be from King Edward with drop-off activities. As well a secondary entry is planned for West 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The existing playing fields to the east of the school will be retained and careful attention has been taken to ensure the retention and health of the existing oak trees.

The Neighbourhood Centre of Learning part of the school will be located at the eastern end of the building and includes a gymnasium, library and a large multi-purpose room. The proposed building has been kept to two storeys for a good neighbourhood fit, and to allow the height of the 1914 school to dominate. Through design development, building mass on the northwest corner has been reduced to address neighbourhood concerns.

The 1914 heritage building is clad in painted wood shingle and board siding. The new building will have wood beams, columns, brackets, fascias, and soffits while the lower levels of the gym will be architectural concrete. The main wall cladding will be fiber

cement shingle and board, contrasting the grey of the school, with the red colour recalling the red brick of the 1922 school. While the 1914 building has been grey for some time, the Heritage Commission has asked that research be done to see what the colours may have been used at an earlier time.

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

- The relationship between the retained 1914 school building and the new school.
- The architectural expression and the colour and use of materials.

Ms. St. Michel and Mr. Boldt took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Peter Lang, Architect, further described the proposal noting the new location of the 1914 heritage building. He also described the prime location for parent drop off/pick up traffic which will be on the south side of the site. He noted that there will be some changes to the playground area. Mr. Lang described the architectural plans for the site noting the proposed materials will be wood and concrete. He also noted that the proposed colour scheme and stated that they are planning to do a True Colors analysis of the 1914 heritage building and may revisit the colour scheme based on the results.

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the retention of the eighty year old oak trees around the perimeter of the site. He also noted that they will be removing two street trees because of the parking access and will be relocating a couple of trees. The landscape will address the site circulation and the children's play area. He noted that the design is integrating indoor and outdoor educational opportunities. Outside each one of the classrooms there will be a seating area that could be used for classroom activities. They are also taking advantage of some sustainable initiatives to harvest rain water with a hard surface stream. An outdoor amphitheatre is also planned.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider simplifying the architectural expression;
  - Design development to make for a more urban expression; and
  - Consider the use of brick on the exterior.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The majority of the Panel members supported the idea of relocating the 1914 heritage building to the corner for its prominence on the site. There were a couple of Panel members that talked about the importance of keeping it in its current location and giving it even more prominence perhaps by making it the 'front door' to the project. Most Panel members liked the contrast between the new school and the heritage building.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the architectural expression and vocabulary of the new building design. They thought the building design was very complex, busy and that it needed to be simplified. Most of the Panel thought the buildings had a more rural expression and that it didn't fit its semi urban context. They also thought the buildings could even be a bit more formal to match the formality of the site defined by the mature perimeter Oak trees. One panel member found that because of all the skewed plan geometries, it resulted in the more rural and informal expression of the building, perhaps a

more orthogonal and simple composition would bring an urbanity to the expression. A couple of Panel members suggested a more contemporary design vocabulary.

The Panel acknowledged the applicant for the spirit that had gone into the making of the project. They felt there was a lot of sensitivity and care that had gone into the planning regarding the learning environment for the children. They also felt the built environment that was being created could be an educational aspect for the children's experience of the buildings.

Several Panel members wanted to see more inventiveness in the architectural design. They noted that there was something familiar, and even dated, about the design that has been seen throughout the city in commercial architecture. They encouraged the applicant to up the anti in the design that would better match the spirit of the project.

Regarding the materials, the Panel would like to see brick introduced and were disappointed with the use of hardy panel. Some of the Panel thought there was too much use of wood and would like to see it used more strategically in the project rather than used every where.

The Panel was supportive of the sustainability strategy with one Panel member suggesting the addition of a green roof. LEED™ Gold certification was commended by some Panel members. Several Panel members noted that having the overhangs on the building were great for summer shade and also for passive solar in the winter.

Regarding the landscaping, the Panel supported the retention of the oak trees. One Panel member noted that there was a lot of asphalt being used for the walkways and thought they should be concrete to make them more durable.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lang addressed the relocation of the 1914 heritage building noting that they are moving it to the corner of the site to minimize the impact of the interior façade. All the windows are on the side elevation and any other location would require modification of the exterior of the building. He added that they have been sensitive to how they will attach the new construction to the building. Regarding the material palette, Mr. Lang noted that the intent was to make it fit into the neighbourhood and to have a more residential look to the materials. He added that it would be nice if they could use brick on the exterior of the buildings. Mr. Lang also noted that they wanted the design to be playful and respond to children. Mr. Ahking added that the 1914 heritage building in its present location restricted the development potential for the site.

5. Address:	2888 East 2 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue
DE:	414477
Description:	To develop a mixed-use building containing 61 residential units and commercial space at the ground floor.
Zoning:	C2-C1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill
Owner:	
Review:	First
Delegation:	
Staff:	Marie Linehan

#### EVALUATION:

- **Introduction:**

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

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

- **Related Commentary:**

Jim - conditional height - lift up the back - patios and landscape - fantastic to have the units off the lane - really nice to see - architectural expression - broken down well - doesn't look like one big building - the church elevation looks like you forgot about it - needs some paint

Alan - conditional height - support that - patios along lane - good idea - suggestion - could maybe return the brick around the corner maybe introduce a 2 storey rhythm of brick to relate to the single family across the lane - more residential - expression massing along Renfrew - articulated the corner to get a more prominent expression is good - the setback on the south next to the church - unfortunately that there is a 3 foot minimum setback - almost better to request a variance so the retail could be pushed to the property line - windows looking at the church won't work - treat that as a fire wall - is there an opportunity to have some wired glass between the corridors to have a perception of space -

Geoff - nice project - good project - residential on the back lane is great - no problem with the height - street façade has been broken up - south wall - not much you can do - try to make it a bit better -

Norm - support all the previous comments - roof deck for common use could be bigger

Arno - also the public space seems small - like the idea of pushing the retail to the south to the setback line to get a two foot step on the south façade and maybe even wrap the balconies on the upper floors to create more articulation on the south façade - well done project - good

project - elevator with half level stops - maybe take another look and see that the units are being serviced properly

Rob - no problem with what I see on the south side - overall massing works well - turns the corner well - top level at the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the lane helps with the massing of the bldg - 2<sup>nd</sup> ave in particular is nice elevation - even though it has the same material Renfrew feels duller - punch it up more - like the massing at the back but more color and variation could make the lane even better - patios are great and the trees - yes to the path - is there any more opportunity for greening at the loading to continue the lanescape - conditional height - supportable - agree the roof patio could be bigger and maybe some green landscaping - streetscape - exposed aggregate on private property - why use the material unless the city makes you use - more interesting materials could be used

Geog - south massing and elevation could use more work - patio and landscape along the lane is good - maybe some more articulation - planting - conditional height - supportable - massing works well - no issues

Greg - south massing could shift the commercial right up to the property line - Renfrew architectural expression works okay - increases cadence would work better - would look more articulated - break it down and increase the cadence - patio - nice idea only drawback - fairly large terrace - units are somewhat deep - maybe shady - don't have a solution - nice interface with the residential - height supportable - patio needs to be increased

- **Applicant's Response:** Architect - notion of being able to interconnect between the corridors - trying to figure out how to achieve that - roof patio - would like to have it bigger - bldg code limits unless you have two exits - with doing some research they found that the roof decks aren't used by a lot of people at any one time - good comments - appreciate the suggestions

### Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:49 p.m.