

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** June 1, 2011

**TIME:** N/A

**PLACE:** N/A

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Robert Barnes (Excused Item #1)  
Helen Besharat  
Gregory Borowski  
James Cheng (Item #1 & #2)  
Jeff Corbett (Excused Item #2)  
Jane Durante  
Alan Endall  
Jim Huffman  
Arno Matis  
Scott Romses  
Norm Shearing  
Alan Storey

**REGRETS:** Geoff McDonel

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 606 Powell Street  |
| 2. | 555 Robson Street (Telus Gardens)  |
| 3. | 5515-5665 Boundary Road, 5448-4666 Ormidale Street and 3690 Vanness Avenue |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Romses called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

- |    |                     |  |
|----|---------------------|--|
| 1. | <b>Address:</b>     | <b>606 Powell Street</b>   |
|    | DE:                 | 414637   |
|    | Use:                | Construction of a 10 storey mixed used building all over one level of underground parking to be accessed off the lane. Main level will include commercial/retail units, second floor office and residential and floors 3-10 to be residential units. |
|    | Zoning:             | CD-1   |
|    | Application Status: | Complete   |
|    | Review:             | Second   |
|    | Architect:          | Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects   |
|    | Delegation:         | Larry Adams, Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects<br>Wanda Felt, Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects<br>Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates  |
|    | Staff:              | Anita Molaro   |

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

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following a rezoning to construct a 10-storey building with underground parking. The current neighbourhood consists of wide array of scale and density and mix of land use and buildings. Housing goals for the area is to retain and provide new affordable housing and to increase the proportion of self-contained dwelling units with both rehabilitation and new construction. Ms. Molaro also noted that the commercial goals for the area are to improve the viability of commercial activities by encouraging the upgrading of existing uses and the development of new commercial uses which serve both local residential and the working population in the area. The site is at the corner of Powell and Princess Streets, one block east of Hastings Street. The context has quite a wide variety of scale with heritage, residential buildings and commercial/industrial uses. Princess Street has been identified as a children's focused neighbourhood walk. Changes include providing a focus to this street which connects up with Strathcona School through the neighbourhood. The route has been identified as a place for children and family through art, interactive signage, as well as improvements to traffic safety and programming based on the culture and history of the area. The direction is also to develop Princess Street as a pedestrian oriented corridor emphasizing this connection through the neighbourhood across Hastings Street north/south.

Ms. Molaro stated that the proposal consists of a 10-storey and 9-storey building component comprised of 106 public held housing units and 41 units for families in non-market residential housing. In addition to the residential components, there will be a commercial office component on the second floor along the Powell Street frontage where the Rain City offices will be located. There is to be a ground floor residential amenity space along the Princess Street frontage and commercial frontage along Powell Street. Rezoning increased the density up to 5.05 FSR and the height is 117 feet. Previous design development commentary from the Urban Design Panel, and the subsequent rezoning conditions, were to improve the distinction between the Princess and the Powell Streets massing components. In addition, the applicant was asked to further strengthen the integration of the Powell Street massing with the neighbouring context by emphasizing the 75 feet high street wall expression as part of the massing and façade composition. They were also asked to improve the overall architectural

character of the building through material variety and high quality material treatments. Another condition was to maximize the use of roof spaces as outdoor amenity spaces, and where possible, include green roof treatments or urban agriculture. There was also a sustainability condition with the west façade to address solar gain for the singularly oriented dwelling units. Ms. Molaro described the material palette noting that the proposal is utilizing the use of brick masonry, different patterning of metal sidings, concrete and glazing. The project is intending to achieve LEED™ Gold.

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

Does the Panel support the detailed resolution of the urban design response developed for this proposal including:

- Overall building design/character including:
  - Resolution/distinction of the various massing and elevation components
  - Powell street massing and articulation in response to a future 75 ft. high streetwall character
    - Façade articulation including the use of and quality of the proposed materials
    - Public realm interface along Princess and Powell Streets
    - Open space and detailed landscape treatments
    - Sustainability attributes

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Larry Adams, Architect, explained that what makes the building unique amongst the 12 other City site projects, is the introduction of a significant amount of family units. It is actually a woman's focused project with programs and support offered towards women. One of the comments from the last Urban Design Panel was that for a women's focused project it was too "masculine" in character. Mr. Adams noted that they met with the City and Engineering staff and got some relaxations about paving patterns. The building expression is simple and straightforward, providing strong urban frontages with quality materials. He said they felt that the canted streetwall form will have a stronger statement especially coming from Powell Street and that the angled setback on the massing's upper floors would create a stronger line.

Robert Barnes, Landscape Architect, stated that with the landscaping, the City and Engineering staff have given them some concessions to go ahead and do a "carpet of paving" and landscaping on the street. The patterning will be like a quilt and repeated in the courtyard. The grid itself comes off the building so it is integrated with the building incorporating a combination of warm and cool tones. Powell Street will be conventional concrete treatment with street trees and standard City tree grades. The courtyard is to be family oriented and as it is a small space, there is an overlapping program. The amenity space will flow out into the area where there will be moveable tables and chairs, a children's play area as well as some urban agriculture. Mr. Adams added that within the play area, there won't necessarily be conventional play equipment but will have some unique designs like stainless steel domes and components that children of various ages can play on or interact with. As well the podium will have a staff courtyard that will be separate from the residences. As well, on the roof there will be more urban agriculture which relates to the studio apartments in the upper portion of the structure.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development on the passive solar shading on the west side with vertical fins;
- Consider expressing the building as two buildings;

- Consider continuing and expanding on the playful items such as the colourful balcony panels.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the project would fit nicely with the community and context.

The Panel thought the mansard roof made for an elegant and different façade on the building however one Panel member thought the Princess Street frontage looked institutional and needed a more residential quality. A couple of Panel members were concerned that there was too much bulk on the site, with one Panel member suggesting one floor be removed, and to perhaps express the building as two different buildings while having more of a subtle dialogue between the two buildings. They felt this would make the building more interesting. Also, some Panel members thought the building could have more playful elements. The Panel supported the colour palette and proposed materials.

The Panel liked the use of punched windows in the design but noted that they would require attention to the design and detailing to make the sills and other aspects of the window be well expressed.

The Panel thought the landscaping and the public realm was well handled and liked the open space on the south side. A couple of Panel members suggested strengthening the amenity space on the sixth level. Another Panel member suggested adding trees in the lane to soften that expression.

The Panel supported the applicant achieving LEED™ Gold but several Panel members had concern regarding the possible heat gain on the west side of the building, as they felt the proposed sun shades were not adequate enough.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Adams thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that the Panel at the previous review suggested incorporating solar shades, but they were willing to remove them at the request of this Panel. However, he stated that when they did their solar analysis they came out as the best choice, as the vertical fins didn't help with preventing the solar gain.

<b>2.</b>	<b>Address:</b>	<b>555 Robson Street (Telus Gardens)</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Use:</b>	The application proposes a mixed-use development covering most of the city block. A residential tower of 512 units is located at the corner of Robson and Richards Street. A new 448, 195 square foot office tower with public plaza is located along Georgia Street and a 44,700 square foot increase to the existing building at Robson and Seymour Streets.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	DD to CD-1
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Review:</b>	First
	<b>Architect:</b>	Henriquez Partners
	<b>Owner:</b>	Concert Properties
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Peter Wood, Henriquez Partners Kelty McKinnon, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg
	<b>Staff:</b>	Ian Gillespie, Westbank Anita Molaro and Wayne Drobot

---

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

##### **Introduction:**

Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal by giving a brief policy outline of the site. The site is subject to the Downtown Official Development Plan which has been adopted by Council. The Downtown Official Development Plan talks about office development and allowing residential development on the shoulders of the Central Business District. The area in the lane between Seymour and Richards Streets and the Kingston Hotel is the area that allows residential. This application does meet the Policy for the area. It talks about maximum heights for the area which are allowable up to the view cone. There is a view cone that restricts the height on the Telus Buildings and there is also a view cone that restricts the height on the residential buildings as well. The site is also subject to design guidelines along Robson Street which recognizes that Robson Street is an area of greater pedestrian activity as it leads down to the two stadiums that terminate at the end of Robson Street. Mr. Drobot explained that the Scotia Tower is already impacting the view cone so there is Council adopted Policy that says that if you can prove your building is entirely within the shadow of an existing building you can go up to the existing height provided you have a higher level of architectural criteria and have a higher level of sustainability. He remarked that at rezoning staff will be making allowance for the intrusion into the view cone but the applicant must detail and prove that out at the development permit stage.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting the local context includes a number of residential highrises and office buildings. The proposal is bounded by West Georgia, Robson, Seymour and Richards Streets. The existing Telus facility (William Farrell Building) on the Seymour Street frontage and along with the corner building were revitalized in 2000 with a double glass façade with the midblock building being converted into an atrium in 2007.

The proposal consists of mixed-use office and residential and will replace the two existing parkades along Richards Street with a 21-storey office tower on West Georgia and a 45-storey residential tower and retail podium on Robson Street that wraps around to Richards Street.

The existing White Spot restaurant on the north end of Seymour Street will be replaced by an extension of the office block over the lane creating a covered plaza with retail functions. The north end of the lane accessing Georgia Street will be closed to vehicles and will be reconfigured to turn out onto Richards Street. The Kingston Hotel, located on Richards Street, will remain as it is as a separate owner.

Ms. Molaro explained that current zoning permits a base height of 300 feet and where the policy permits, an increase in height up to 450 feet or to the underside of the view cone. The heights are restricted on the site by several view cones, including the most restrictive one being over the residential building which will only allow a height of 404 feet. The office building is proposed at 289 feet and an addition of three storeys is proposed on the fifteen storey William Farrell Building. Another aspect of the view cone limit is where a pre-existing building has impeded the view cone. The Scotia Tower, built in 1977, is 452 feet in height and encroaches well into some of these view cones. As a result, there is an opportunity to shape the residential building in such a way in front of the Scotia Tower that goes beyond the view cone height limit of 404 feet to a height of 442 feet. This will be assessed as part of the more detailed development permit process including an expanded High Building Urban Design Panel review.

Ms. Molaro stated that the residential floor plate of 9,500 square feet is significantly larger than many of the residential buildings within the context. In terms of buildings of a similar size within the area, the closest residential building is Capital Residences with a floor plate of 8,200 square feet. The Scotia Tower has an office floor plate of approximately 10,000 square feet. A more recent example that the Panel had seen recently is Burrard Gateway with a floor plate of 6,500 square feet and a height of 550 feet.

Ms. Molaro remarked that the residential tower itself has been shaped to minimize its scale as seen from Richards Street with a narrow façade articulation, however it has a fairly broad profile over 110 feet in width as seen by pedestrians moving along Robson Street, westbound from BC Place.

Ms. Molaro stated that Planning was not supportive of the proposed cantilevered extensions over Robson and Richards Streets (as part of the residential building) but were prepared to consider the protruding elements associated with the commercial/office building.

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

**Form of Development**

- does the panel support the urban design response developed for this site:
- buildings' siting and open space strategy.
- heights to underside of view cone (Residential 404 feet plus potential additional view shadow up to 452 feet, subject to Higher Building Review UDP at DE stage and Commercial at 289 feet).
- density (Residential - 15.72 FSR) (Office - 11.26 FSR).

**Other aspects of the form of development including:**

- Residential building
- Does this site, within this context, both immediate and within the downtown peninsula, support the proposed height, scale and massing of the residential building.
- Relationship and neighbourliness of the residential building with existing buildings (Telus building across the lane, Kingston Hotel adjacent, l'Hermitage across Richards Street) including shadow and view impacts.

- Are there additional opportunities/measures that should be considered to further express/enhance the building's architectural composition and sustainability performance (LEED Gold).
- Office Building
- If the built form extensions over the street are supportable (office) - what are the urban design principles that should be considered?
- How should/can they contribute to the public realm?
- How should/can they contribute to the architectural merit of the overall proposal?
- What is the role of the space generated within (occupancy)?
- Proposed lighting concepts as an integrated component of the building's architecture.
- Back projection LED integrated into exterior envelope treatment.
- Projection LED as feature elements of the building's façade expression.
- Are there additional opportunities/measures that should be considered to further express/enhance the building's architectural composition and sustainability performance (LEED Gold).

•Public realm and Landscape  
Public plaza at Georgia Street:

- Role and contribution to the public realm of Georgia Street
- Covered plaza as a feature component of the overall development composition
- Integration of the lane with active uses as part of an expanded public realm as a connection between Robson Street and Georgia Street.

Public realm interface of the various street frontages including:

- Integration of existing building along Richards Street frontage, including the number of vehicle access points.
- Proposed augmentation to the existing buildings along Seymour Street.
- Continuity of Robson Street
- Other landscape treatments: Green roofs, sky gardens, vertical green walls

Mr. Drobot and Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Gregory Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal and indicated that it is a unique opportunity to design something of significance on Georgia Street and amplify the urban experience through the use of public art. He added that they wanted to use technology, and the idea was to define specific opportunities using "media walls". They are proposing for Telus to have a rotating artist-in-residence program, who would create digital images on these media walls. They are also talking to non-profit organizations to see if they would be interested in participating in the making of some dynamic public art for the development. Mr. Henriquez noted that they may not be in the location as indicated at this review, and that they have a company looking at the building to come up with some proposals.

Mr. Henriquez described the architecture noting that they are proposing the office building to be LEED™ Platinum with triple glazed windows and radiant heating as well as other sustainable strategies. They are planning to have a covered public plaza with a restaurant that will spill out into the plaza. The residential building scale will relate to the Kingston Hotel with a series of elements that project out over the sidewalk. They are proposing LEED™ Gold for the tower which will be part of a site wide geo-exchange utility. This will capture the heat that is generated from the Telus Hub which has all the telephone lines in the province. The amount of cooling to keep the Telus tele-communication systems from overheating is immense, so they will be taking that rejected heat and storing it in the ground to be used for hot water heating

in the residential tower. He added that there is a potential for this to be a net producer of heat where surplus heat can then be sold to other sites.

Ian Gillespie, Westbank, noted that one of the commitments made with Telus was to re-skin the existing Telus building as well as the addition of canopies down Richards and Seymour Streets. It also includes moving the White Spot to mid block on Seymour in addition to another retailer. The existing atrium will have new elevators and staircases and there will also be a “pop-up” restaurant and a presentation center in the atrium. The presentation center will become retail space after the residential units are sold. Mr. Gillespie stated that they are planning to improve the lane with pavers that will allow grass to grow through and possibly more LED light features. As well there will be retailers in the laneway as well as access for loading.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

**Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

- Design development to the ground plane to make for more open public spaces;
- Consider having the cantilevered spaces in the office building be used as public spaces.
- Design development to the retail façade and podium on Robson Street;

Related Commentary: The Panel supported the project and thought for a rezoning it was a well considered and put together package.

The Panel thought this was an exciting project and supported the size of the floor plates, the overall form, massing, variety of uses and density. They liked the design for the Telus tower with the bridge-like element providing a bold and unique expression to define that end of the development.

The Panel had some concerns with the ground plane especially the sculptural plaza canopy element on the north side, as they thought it seemed a bit awkwardly jammed under the building and made the plaza seem tight and crowded. One Panel member noted that the public realm should have a large airy open space considering the size and scale of the development. Also, the applicant could consider the existing wall on the Telus building by using some form of animation that could also go on in the lane or other creative ways to make the blank façade interesting.

A couple of Panel members thought the scale of the residential tower was overly aggressive and this particular location didn’t seem like a tall building site. One Panel member thought it was because of the location and the other residential buildings in the area. It was suggested that it have a descending scale towards Yaletown as it seem a bit too big and is causing some proximity and privacy issues for the buildings across the lane. Another Panel thought the first five or six floors being right up against the existing Telus building seemed tight and suggested adding more office space on those floors.

The Panel supported the direction that the office building is taking and thought the sustainability and green building strategies were well expressed. Although most of the Panel supported the cantilevered portions in the project there were a number of Panel members who were concerned with them projecting into Seymour Street as they felt the street end view was impacted. There was an appreciation that they are public art in nature with several Panel members feeling the spaces should also be used as public spaces.

The Panel wanted the main public plaza space to have an open and comfortable feeling and as a result had some concern regarding the wood structure in the plaza. They thought it collided



somewhat awkwardly into the rest of the composition. They were also concerned on how it would be cleaned and how pigeons would be kept out of the space.

The Panel thought the existing atrium should be experienced at street level and if it is a public space the stairs should be visible and easily accessible. There was a comment regarding using the atrium as another potential light box for public art. Some panel members suggested the light boxes have more hierarchy in scale rather than all being the same. One Panel member thought the atrium could be one of the more exciting aspects of the project.

The Panel thought the weakest point in the design was the lower four storeys on the Robson and Richard Streets corner. They thought it seemed fragmented and lacked the simple and bold clarity as the rest of the project. One Panel member suggested the entrance could be moved to Robson Street.

The Panel supported the plan to keep the existing buildings as they add flavor and character. They liked that the Kingston Hotel would remain as it creates a unique and memorable situation within the development. Some of the Panel acknowledged and were concerned that the hotel would be adversely impacted for a long period during construction.

The Panel liked the plans to animate the lane, with a couple of Panel members suggesting that given the large scale of the buildings in the laneway area, it was going to take a lot to make it pedestrian friendly.

The Panel thought the sustainability strategy was well done.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for their comments and thought they were helpful as they move forward with the design.

Mr. Gillespie said he agreed with most of the comments. He stated that he wants to get a really strong retail on Robson Street but that they were looking for an anchor tenant so the façade hasn't been developed until they get that tenant who will work with them to develop the façade.

3.	<b>Address:</b>	<b>5515-5665 Boundary Road, 5448-4666 Ormidale Street and 3690 Vanness Avenue</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Use:</b>	To rezone these 32 properties, currently zoned CD-1 (220 and 224) to a new CD-1 Bylaw to permit redevelopment with three residential towers (31, 32 and 29 storeys) on the Boundary Road and Vanness Avenue frontages and a mid-rise (8-storey) building on the Ormidale Avenue frontage. A total of 1,319 dwelling units are proposed. Proposed FSR is 5.99 (799,218 square feet). The project would include a large outdoor public space on the Ormidale Avenue frontage and proposes approximately 33,000 square feet of Community Amenity Space in the two towers fronting Boundary Road.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	CD-1 (220 and 224) to a new CD-1 By-law
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Review:</b>	First
	<b>Architect:</b>	GBL Architects
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Stu Lyon , GBL Architects Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Recollective
	<b>Staff:</b>	Anita Molaro and Alison Higginson

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-2)

##### Introduction:

Alison Higginson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning at the easterly boundary of the Collingwood Village development adjacent to Boundary Road. The site is in the Renfrew Collingwood Community Vision area, just east of a potential Neighbourhood Centre around the Kingsway/Joyce shopping area. The vision document does not identify the site as a "Large Site" with specific Vision directions relating to rezoning or development. The Vision document does support consideration of changes to existing CD-1 by-laws, which applies here, as long as they go through a full rezoning process incorporating appropriate community consultation. The policy context being considered is the location of the site on a major arterial, with good access to transit being equi-distant between the Pattison and Joyce SkyTrain stations. Ms. Higginson noted that the City's Rezoning Policy for Green Buildings will apply, as well as EcoDensity policies for large sites.

Ms. Higginson noted that the site is comprised of thirty-two individual parcels, which are under option to purchase by the developer. The rezoning site also includes the north-south section of lane through the block, and Engineering Services has indicated a willingness to consider the closure and sale of the lane. Ms. Higginson described the existing zoning noting that the intent in the by-laws was to provide opportunity for redevelopment and create something of a buffer between the adjacent one-family neighbourhood and Boundary Road. There has been no uptake on the zoning, and the sites all remain single-family, other than one which is developed with a small ambulance station.

Ms. Higginson noted that 1,173 dwelling units are being proposed, with a mix of studio, one-bedroom and two bedroom units. The proposed uses are entirely residential with the exception of a community amenity space which is being offered as a public benefit, and that the space will be on the lower two levels of the two towers on Boundary Road. She noted that

staff are in discussion with local community groups and stakeholders regarding potential use or user groups for that space.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for the site which is located mid way between Joyce Street Expo Line Station and Patterson Station in Burnaby. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the site is located in the Collingwood Village area and is across the street from the Telus building.

The applicant is seeking to achieve a deliberate, clear, legible sequence of open space through the site connecting pedestrians from Ormidale Avenue to the corner of Boundary Road and Vanness Avenue. Ms. Molaro noted that Vanness Avenue is a bike route through the area. Another approach to be considered is having the open space part of the street end condition in order to create a more defined multi-use open space as well as providing a strong public connection through to the corner.

Ms. Molaro described the proposed massing noting the design principles are to continue the pattern of low-rise 4-storey massing along the internal edge of Collingwood as they relate to the single family neighbourhood. A tower at the corner of Vanness and Ormidale Avenues is sited to act as an extension of the Collingwood pattern of tower buildings, in addition to two towers that are sited along Boundary Road. The two Boundary Road towers could have a more urban response, with a strong streetwall expression, and may have a similar relationship in height to the adjacent Telus building with the maximum height of the proposed towers limited to the Telus building's height. She noted that parking access will be from Boundary Road as well as Ormidale Avenue.

The proposed response to the organizing principles include a large open space at the foot of Foster Street with a narrow link through to Boundary Road. The tower heights range from twenty-nine, thirty-one and thirty-two storeys. The tower on the corner is planned for 29-storeys with an 8-storey podium and the two towers are to have an eight to nine storey shoulder.

Ms. Molaro described the proposed sustainability features noting that LEED™ Gold is required under the Rezoning Policy.

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

Does the Panel support the urban design response developed for this site, taking into consideration the extension of the built form pattern of Collingwood Village and its relationship within the surrounding context including:

- Form of development including:
  - Building's siting;
  - Tower forms and massing;
  - Heights (32, 31 and 29 storeys);
  - Density;
    - Site circulation, open space and landscape treatments:
- Integration with circulation/open space patterns of neighbourhood including public connections through the site to Boundary Road/Vanness Avenue corner.
  - Neighbourliness including shadow and view impacts;
  - LEED™ Gold strategies and Rezoning Policy for large sites.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal noting the Collingwood Village guidelines which suggest that the towers should be oriented towards the north. The buildings will be residential except for some amenity space. He added that there hasn't been a decision on who will be using the amenity space at the moment. There are residential frontages around all of the buildings, with the parking located underground with primary access of Boundary Road, and with an additional access off Ormidale Street. Mr. Lyon noted that they saw the two towers on Boundary Road as a pair, anchoring the end of the Collingwood Village community, and that they are the same height as the Telus building. Mr. Lyon noted that since the project is at the rezoning stage they haven't indicated architectural character or how they will detail the buildings. He noted that they had a community meeting in November of last year with various comments that helped shape the location of the buildings on the site.

Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Sustainability Consultant, noted that they had done energy modeling for the project as well as a district energy feasibility study, which looked at generating and dumping heat through the use of the sewer system. The study concluded that it would be feasible to use such systems for the site. He added that they will be using passive design features and external sun shades to control solar gain on the buildings. There are also plans for storm water management and urban agriculture.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the open space is neighbourhood focused and helps define how the buildings are arranged on the site. A large, 84 plot community garden and orchard will be on one side of the plaza. An open space will be used for market days and rain structures will be located in the plaza area along with a children's play area. Storm water will be collected from the surface as well as from some of the roofs. Two runnels systems are planned to take the storm water on the site to the water feature. All the roof tops will have extensive green roofs.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider additional height to the south tower;
- Consider breaking the long low-rise block on Ormidale Street into two blocks;
- Design development to allow for the landscaping and buildings to coexist more harmoniously;
- Consider adding retail/commercial space to the project.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal as well as the density and thought it was appropriate given the site's location.

The Panel thought it was a comprehensive proposal and that it was a schematic rezoning package where they got to focus on the urban design and rezoning related issues. Most of the Panel thought the tower locations were well thought out and that the heights had been well considered, but thought some additional height was needed on the two Boundary Road towers, particularly the one higher up on the hill to the south. However, a couple of Panel members thought the height should be added to the tower at the corner of the lane and Boundary Road. As well a couple of Panel members thought the massing hadn't addressed the Collingwood Village in the built form. They felt that the rise in height from the Collingwood residential neighbourhood to twenty nine storeys might be too much. There was also some concern from several Panel members regarding the height and potential oppressiveness of the streetwall podium. Some panel members suggested taking some of the area out of the Vanness Avenue tower to transition the massing better down to the single family homes in Collingwood by stepping it down from the Kingsway towers to Vanness Avenue. The Panel liked the curved

aspect of the building on Vanness Avenue and thought it had the potential to be an exciting design.

In terms of site circulation, the Panel thought it was well resolved, however several Panel member thought the long block on Ormidale Street could be broken up to relieve the monotony of the massing and give more permeability to the site in this area. This would also give some visual penetration through the site to align with the main entrance off of Boundary Road.

One Panel member thought the buildings on Ormidale Street as well as the middle building would sit better on the site if they picked up the diagonal employed in the landscape design and would create a more interesting dynamic that was complimentary with the way the landscaping has been designed in the public space.

The Panel thought the landscape plans were well developed and had a lot of detail. However, most of the Panel felt that the landscaping didn't relate well to the buildings. Some of the Panel were concerned with the courtyard space and thought the space between the 6-storey and 31-storey buildings needed to be improved.

Several Panel members thought some neighborhood type retail space could be added to the project especially along Boundary Road to service the residents.

Regarding the public art, it was suggested that an artist should be involved as early as possible with the project.

Most of the Panel thought the applicant's presentation package was "a little thin" in terms of getting an understanding of the project, particularly related to architectural character and design vocabulary.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Lyons thanked the Panel for their comments and that they looked forward to developing the site. He said he realized that it was thin package of information for the Panel. He added that they need to find out if the form of development is going to be acceptable before they get further into the design. The amenity spaces will be associated with the open space and as well he noted that they had talked about adding a small amount of commercial space to the proposal.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.