

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** June 6, 2012

**TIME:** N/A

**PLACE:** N/A

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Helen Besharat  
Gregory Borowski (Chair)  
Daryl Condon  
Alan Endall  
Veronica Gillies (left after 3rd Item)  
David Grigg (left after 3rd Item)  
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #3)  
Arno Matis  
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #1)  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:**  
Robert Barnes  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Norm Shearing

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	8198 Cambie Street
2.	2118 West 15th Avenue
3.	5501 Boundary Road
4.	5555 Dunbar Street

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

The business meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on June 4th where 238 West Broadway was presented to the Board and was approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. **Address:** 8198 Cambie Street  
**DE:** 415707  
**Use:** The development of a mixed-use residential/retail development comprised of two towers of 25 storeys and 31 storeys on two podium bases of 5 and 7 storeys respectively.  
**Zoning:** CD-1 Pending  
**Application Status:** Complete  
**Review:** Second  
**Architect:** James K.M. Cheng Architects  
**Owner:** Intracorp  
**Delegation:** James K.M. Cheng, James K.M. Cheng Architects  
Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg  
Jake McEwan, Intracorp  
**Staff:** Anita Molaro

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

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and mentioned that the Panel had seen the application previously in October 2011 as a rezoning. The application is now a development permit application. Ms. Molaro described the Cambie Corridor Plan urban design principles that govern the site.

The site fronts Cambie Street and the Canada Line portal and extends between SW Marine Drive and West 64th Avenue. Ms. Molaro mentioned that the site and context includes the Marine Gateway development across the street. As well the Marine Garden site is to the immediate east of the site which is a low rise rental residential complex.

Ms. Molaro noted that the application includes two towers, one at 285 feet and the other at 235 feet. She added that the heights and floor plates are consistent with the Cambie Corridor Policy. The proposal also includes a 6-storey podium and a 4-storey podium that includes rental housing with some 2-storey residential that are proposed as residential but design to be flexible as live/work units on the lower floors facing the lane mews and the Cambie Street frontage.

In terms of retail, a single storey component is proposed at the base of the Marine Drive tower that wraps the corner facing onto Cambie Street but does not extend to the open spaces in front of the live/work units. At the north end of the site a small boutique retail building is planned.

Ms. Molaro gave some history on the fire-lane access alongside the Canada Line which is necessary given the existing context and the remoteness of the two houses in the middle of the site. She noted that with the consolidation of the site the requirement for fire lane access is no longer a requirement but it continues to serve functionally as a both an off-street bike lane and sidewalk. In other words, the design restrictions associated with the fire lane access would no longer be applicable (like the asphalt surface treatment, clear 6 meter wide width,

and minimal planting). A condition of the rezoning was to improve this frontage, through better definition and treatment of the bikeway and sidewalk treatments.

Ms. Molaro noted that several key aspects to the proposal was reflected in the design development conditions of the rezoning including the public realm interface along the frontage; landscape treatments; and pedestrian linkages through the site to the lane and building form and expression.

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

Does the panel support the detailed urban design response developed for this mixed use development including:

- overall architectural quality and material treatment proposed for the development providing variety and interest to the buildings that also contributes to the character and quality of the area;
- design resolution of the open space(s) and public realm interface along the Cambie street frontage in achieving an active, usable, adaptable and relevant frontage to the residents of the site but also to the community;
- given the proposed landscape setback and treatments the proposal response to ensure that the ground oriented residential(adaptable to live-work) frontage actively engages the pedestrian;
- landscape treatments including the lane mew, pedestrian linkages through site, roof treatments the scale of the commercial podium on the Marine Drive tower base ground plane interface along Marine Drive.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

James Cheng, Architect, further described the proposal. He said they concentrated on knitting their project into the community rather than being a dominant site. He said there was a difference of opinion with the neighbourhood. They wanted all retail and they thought it would not survive and so as a result it was suggested to have a coffee shop/cafe at the end of the site which they did with the retail pavilion. They have decided to express this building in wood as a gesture to contrast with the large building on the site. There is also a south facing children's play area and terraces that the neighbourhood could use. The site will also contain public art with an art walk going to the river in the future. There is some potential for art on the façade of the building and that is part of a program they are currently involved in producing. The scale of the podium is 4-storeys, with urban agriculture on the roof that will include a green house. They tried to understate the building with materials to reflect the early modern period along Marine Drive. Mr. Cheng described the materials and the colour palette. As well he described the sustainability strategy noting that there is frit on the railings that will hang below the slab on the west facing façade that will cut down solar exposure. He added that it changes on the other facades in response to what is required for solar exposure. Mr. Cheng mentioned that the live/work units are designed with front and back patios with the front being used as office space or retail.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal noting that one of the fundamental principles was the notion of connectivity to the Canada Line. They wanted to make that connectivity interesting. The café will have an outdoor terrace facing south overlooking the children's play area. There is a large park space with green space and tables. The mid-block connector is open to the sky. The lane becomes the front door in terms of the access to the parkade and the idea is to turn it into more of a mews with some outdoor spaces and street trees. There is also a rain garden planned. There is an indoor/outdoor amenity with a greenhouse and urban agriculture on the south podium roof.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider more exuberance in the design of the wood pavilion;
- Review the retained edge on the live/work units to allow for better circulation;
- Consider adding more open space at the commercial podium;
- Consider thermally breaking the slabs whether they protrude at eyebrow or balcony situations.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well-developed scheme.

The Panel supported the architectural quality of the proposal as well as the material and colour palette although one Panel member thought more colour could be introduced. For the most part they thought it was a well thought out scheme; simple and disciplined. However one Panel member commented on the urban design principles being about the slimness of the tower and thought both towers could be modulated to give a more vertical expression.

The Panel very much liked the retail pavilion while a couple of Panel member thought there was an opportunity to be more exuberant with the architecture and to break away from the formality of the rest of the scheme.

A couple of Panel members thought there was a pinch point on the commercial podium on Marine Drive and thought it needed to be more open. One Panel member thought it needed a little more character and a better relationship to pedestrians on the street. Another Panel member thought the drop off areas needed some work as well as weather protection.

The Panel said they were impressed with the thoroughness and attention to detail in the landscape and the ground plain. Several Panel members had some concerns with the circulation through the site. They were unsure about the relationship between the pedestrian walkway and the live/work units. However they did feel that the relationship with the guideway was well managed. Another Panel member wondered if the circulation would work for both pedestrians and cyclists. As well they thought more attention could be given to the lane noting that the success of the lane was going to depend on what was developed on the adjacent site.

One Panel member thought a small gesture that represents something of the neighbourhood could be added to the open space in the way of public art.

Regarding sustainability, the Panel had some concerns with the projecting slabs and felt it was important that there should be thermal breaks and a higher grade of glass. They noted that all the balconies and eyebrows that weren't insulated would contribute to heat loss in the building. One Panel member suggested adding vertical fins on the west elevation and as well to make the sun screens moveable.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Cheng thanked the Panel for their comments. He said they will go back and look at the design. He noted that a lot of Marpole is industrial with some rental residential buildings so he didn't feel there was a Marpole language that they could use in the architecture.

---

2.	Address:	2118 West 15th Avenue
	DE:	414745
	Use:	To develop this site with a mixed-use building containing commercial units on the ground floor with residential units above all over three levels of underground parking.
	Zoning:	C-2
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
	Owner:	Cressey Development
	Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects David Evans, Cressey Development
	Staff:	Paul Cheng

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-8)****Introduction:**

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, described the C-2 zone, noting it is for 4-storey, mixed-use, commercial retail streets outside the downtown area. The zone applies to properties located on West 4th Avenue, Kingsway, Main Street, East Hastings Street, Victoria Drive and portions of Cambie Street, Broadway and Dunbar Street. Furthermore, this zone typically interfaces with low density residential zones located across the rear service lane.

Mr. Cheng noted that this was not a typical C-2 site as it is not part of a continuous shopping strip. The site has a sloping terrain with a large open space between the street and the building. He noted that the applicant is requesting a height relaxation and that the Development Permit Board can entertain height increases in exceptional cases. In this case, the applicant is requesting a fifth storey of residential in exchange for converting the City owned land from a parking lot to a public park.

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

1. What improvements to the building design can be made to mitigate the proposal's impact on the neighbouring properties with respect to noise, odours and increased vehicular traffic at the lane interface?
2. In comparison to a typical 4-storey C-2 development, does the proposal negatively impact the neighbouring properties in an undue fashion? What design improvements can further mitigate against overlook, loss of visual privacy and over-shadowing?
3. Taking into consideration the arterial nature of West 16th and the existence of a bus stop at the West 16th interface, does the proposed interface with the public sidewalk on West 16th require further design improvements for pedestrians and transit-users?
4. Staff are conscious that the businesses in the existing building will likely be unable to operate as such in the new proposal. While the loss of the existing businesses that function as the neighbourhood's "third-places" is lamentable, are there any design moves to the ground storey commercial retail space and the proposed park that can ensure future flexibility and programming for formal or informal social gatherings?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

---

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal noting that there will be 52 residential units on four levels on top of a retail use at grade. A food store is planned with loading off the lane which will be enclosed. They are adding a vertical element to echo the current "Ridge" sign to give a historical identity to the site. Mr. Bruckner described the architecture and the material and colour palette. The residential entrance is on West 15th Avenue as well as two townhouses stepping down to the west. On the lane side the building is setback further than what is suggested in the guidelines. He described the steps they took to reduce overlook to the neighbours to the west. Mr. Bruckner noted that they have a traffic study underway that showed the project will create less traffic than the current commercial uses generate. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Bruckner noted they aren't required to meet LEED™ but they are going to take a passive approach to the design by limiting window areas to 50% vision glazing to wall ratio. On the south side they have a gridwork of concrete to help shade the windows, and the balconies will provide shadowing on the east and west side. He added that they will be doing an energy study and the project will be subject to the new ASHRAE standard that will soon be required in the Building Code. Since they will have a grocery store on the main floor they are looking at heat exchange between the residential and the store.

Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. The overall goal with the park design was to create an entrance for the commercial space but also a space that was flexible and could adapt to future uses. They wanted it to be open and to strike a balance between hard landscape and soft landscape. They created a space with long linear elements which provide a grade transition with some seating areas. There is a generous area at the front of the building with bike parking. As well a water garden is planned. Mr. Vincent described the landscape plans for the plaza at the residential entry. The lane has a lot of planting with evergreen and some pines and hedges. The outdoor amenity space will have some horizontal screening for privacy and a children's play area. On the second level, the decks are generous including the planting areas which is kept back to reduce overlook onto the neighbouring residential. The fourth and fifth levels will have trees and hedges. Urban agriculture is planned for the upper terraces.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to improve the wayfinding to the commercial parking access;
- Design development to enclose the loading to mitigate impacts on the residential;
- Consider wrapping the units on the West 16th Avenue façade to reduce the blank expression;
- Design development to simplify the façade on the lane portion of the project and to address overlook issues through terracing the upper floors;
- Design development to better incorporate the "Ridge" sign into the project;
- Design development to improve the uses and programming of the park area and to be better activated by the building's ground floor uses; and
- Design development to "future proof" the retail space so that smaller incremental retail uses could be accommodated should the grocery store fail.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel supported the height relaxation but were concerned with the management of the upper floors and the terracing at the back level. They felt the design needed to be simplified and also needed a better cohesiveness between the different elevations. Several Panel members felt the terraces should be further articulated on the lane facade. As well, they

thought the units should be wrapped around to the West 16th Avenue façade to reduce the blank wall expression.

The Panel thought the access to the residential parking was supportable but thought the wayfinding to the commercial parking was a challenge and need to be improved.

Although the Panel supported the architectural design they felt the “Ridge” sign should express the entrances to the building. Several Panel members suggested enclosing the loading and garbage area to reduce noise and odours. One Panel member stated that the sign should be a powerful form in the architecture and the way that it was being incorporated stripped it of its meaning and history.

The Panel thought the bus stop should be covered on West 16th Avenue with an additional gathering area added at that location to animate the corner. They also wanted the applicant to reconsider the route between the bus stop and access to the retail.

The Panel was unclear about the retail strategy and felt that a single store strategy might need to be revised. They wanted to see the applicant future proof the retail to allow for small retail frontages. They noted that the location would be better served with a mix of uses considering the context for the area.

Regarding the park, the Panel felt it wasn't really a park as there was a lack of clarity and suggested the applicant look at further animation to allow for some programming and other ways to animate the space. They felt there needed to be stronger linkages into the building and the bus stop. As well they wanted to see more seating and social areas.

The Panel was disappointed with the sustainability strategy with a couple of Panel members noting that the west and south facades would be a challenge in meeting energy and solar gain management targets.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Bruckner said he appreciated the comments from the Panel and would work hard to make it a better project.

---

3.	<b>Address:</b>	<b>5501 Boundary Road</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	415742
	<b>Use:</b>	Application to construct three residential towers, mid-rise and two podiums of community amenities and commercial spaces.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	CD-1
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Complete
	<b>Review:</b>	Second
	<b>Architect:</b>	GBL Architects
	<b>Owner:</b>	Wall Financial Corporation
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership
	<b>Staff:</b>	Anita Molaro

---

### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-7)

#### **Introduction:**

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

The proposal should meet the key urban design principles as an extension of Collingwood Village regarding massing, circulation and open space. The applicant is seeking to achieve a deliberate, clear and legible open space through the site connecting pedestrians from Ormidale Street to the corner of Boundary and Vanness Streets. Ms. Molaro noted that Vanness Street is also a bike route through the area.

Regarding the massing, the key principles are to continue the pattern of low-rise 4-storey buildings along the internal edge of Collingwood Village as they relate to the single family neighbourhood. The tower at the corner of Vanness and Ormidale Streets is an extension of the Collingwood pattern of tower buildings. The Boundary Road two tower component could have a more urban response, with a strong streetwall expression and similar character. The higher of the two buildings is to be consistent with the height of the Telus building.

Ms. Molaro indicated that public circulation through the site is one of the key urban design principles that was established through the rezoning. Access will be from Foster Street through to the corner at Vanness Street with a pedestrian crossing, as well as access up through the site. A large open space is planned at the foot of Foster Street with narrow links through to Boundary Road.

The tower heights range from 29-storeys, 31-storeys and 32-storeys with the two towers on Boundary Road at almost 300 feet and other at 263 feet in height. The 29-storey tower has an 8-storey podium while the other two towers have an 8 and 9 storey shoulder. The low-rise on Ormidale Street, given the slope, will be a stepped 6-storey building.

There are a number of public amenities included in the proposal. Collingwood Neighbourhood House will be in the base of the north tower and will include a child minding facility and flexible space for large meetings. Mosaic, a non-profit organization that supports immigrants and refugees will front Boundary Road. Retail use is planned for the corner of Vanness and Ormidale Streets.

---

The proposal falls under the Larger Site Rezoning Policy and therefore requires LEED™ Gold for sustainable site design.

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

Does the panel support the detailed urban design response developed for this mixed use development including:

- revision to the massing strategy for podium that now links the two Boundary Street towers
- the general massing strategy to reduce the apparent scale of the tower and podium elements
- architectural expression that enhances the towers individual identity while still maintain a strong relationship to each other
- to provide variety and interest to the architectural expression of the buildings
- massing response as a singular massing form of the lower mid-rise building (along Ormidale) as a transitional form between the higher density tower and the low-rise (single-family) residential context across the street
- the proposed materials as high-quality, durable materials that contribute to the character and quality of the area
- integration of the building(s) public realm interface(s) given the varying slopes of the site and site edges
- detailed design response to the site circulation, open space and landscape treatments, including:
  - integration with circulation/open space patterns of neighbourhood including public connections through site to Boundary/Vanness corner;
  - legibility and treatment of pedestrian connection up through site from Foster through to Boundary Road;
  - detailed design treatment of pedestrian/vehicle mews;
  - overall landscape treatments including roof treatments;
  - Sustainability attributes (LEED™ Gold).

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

#### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Stu Lyon, Architect, described the new additions to the project since the rezoning. He noted that the right-of-way has been expanded for the sewer going through the site. On Vanness Avenue there has been an addition to the width to allow for a new bike lane and also some additional widening of the boulevard. Mr. Lyon remarked that considering they need to meet the six additional energy points under the LEED™ scoring system that meant they would have to have a serious approach to the façade of the buildings. They determined that they would be dealing with a vision glass factor of around 50%. They have achieved that through the use of spandrel glass which is insulated. They have covered the slab edges but the balconies still project and as well they are planning to use Swiss pearl over the facades. They have set up the Swiss pearl panels as screens on the outside faces of the building and then dropped them short of the top to give the building a sense of scale.

Previously they had a cut through the middle for the entrance but as they developed the scheme they found it worked better if it was continuous and more extensive deck that could be accessed from both towers. He noted that Mosaic has a space requirement so they shifted them to the first and second level of the space between the two towers on Boundary Road. The Ormidale Street building will be between five and six storey with a brick façade as it is a transition building into the residential neighbourhood. The roof will be an intensive green roof with elevator access. Mr. Lyon described the architecture for the Vanness Street tower noting that they have used a lot of the same materials as the other towers but has a horizontal motif. It also has an intensive roof deck on top of the podium with an amenity space. Collingwood

Neighbourhood house will be in the base of Vanness Street building so they can take advantage of the community gardens as well there will be a child minding center. There is also a small commercial space on the first level.

Mr. Lyon noted that previously they had the parking access coming in between the buildings but they found it was better if they could take the parking underneath the buildings. That allowed them to take the road up to the lane which will have bollards to keep the traffic slow through the area. This will also allow for an alternate route on and off the site. He added that loading hadn't been dealt with at the rezoning. There are now three loading spaces.

Regarding sustainability, Mr. Lyon remarked that the project will be registered as LEED™ Gold equivalent and they come under the guidelines for EcoCity initiatives which includes six energy points that they need to achieve.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect described the plans for the landscaping. He said they had a lot of opportunities to engage with the neighbourhood. They listened to them with regards to circulation. The sewer line determined what kind of landscaping they could do on top of the right-of-way. He noted that because of the grade change they need to have ramps and stairs that can't be put over the right-of-way. The hard surface area adjacent to the Neighbourhood House will be used for markets and entertainment. It will have water, and power, will be programmed to engage with the Neighbourhood House and will be a public space. As well the area will include community gardens, an outdoor children's play area, and a water element. There are also quiet spaces around the edges. A bike station is planned for the corner of Vanness and Ormidale Streets as it is on the bike route. There is an entry plaza off Boundary Road to allow the grade change to happen. There is an internal street that forms a pedestrian mews that will be lined on both sides with trees and plantings. As well, there are individual entries to the ground floor suites. There will be a series of rain gardens that move water down along Boundary Road. The roof tops on all of the buildings will have urban agriculture as well as play areas and gathering places. They are planning to use a high-efficiency irrigation system using spray heads which can be better maintained.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to improve the parti of the towers and podiums;
- Design development for great clarity in the parti between the Vanness Street tower and the two towers on Boundary Road to differentiate the character;
- Design development to improve the architectural expression of the towers on Boundary Road;
- Design development to respond to the curvature of the site on the Vanness Street building;
- Consider adding variety and colour to clarify the character between the different buildings;
- Design development to express the entry through the Vanness Street building;
- Consider improving the pedestrian connection through to Boundary Road;
- Consider including places to stop through the pedestrian mews;
- Design development to improve the sustainability strategy through passive design.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel agreed that it was an ambitious project and thought it had improved since the rezoning. The Panel thought the Boundary Road connecting piece was successful but thought the upper storeys of the bridge could be expressed differently. One Panel member suggested the bottom floors could be stronger with glazing on the top floor while another Panel member

suggested making it more transparent or having a different character. They also thought the Vanness Street tower was too similar to the towers on Boundary Road and agreed that there was a sameness to all three towers. One Panel member stated that the Vanness Street tower was not as resolved as the two towers on Boundary Road and suggested more refinement. It was also suggested that the entry be pulled through the building into the inner court.

The Panel thought the towers on Boundary Road could have similar expressions but that the other tower on Vanness Street should have a different expression. A couple of Panel members encouraged the applicant to explore a form that is different that breaks away and responds to the slight arch of the Vanness Street frontage. One Panel member said it should be more organic in its plan form. This would allow the project to have variety in the architectural expression. Most of the Panel thought the Ormidale Street mid-rise was supportable but could benefit from a clear separation at the mid-block core. A couple of Panel members suggested using different materials to allow for different expressions and help to reduce the monotony.

The Panel thought the landscape plans were the most successful part of the project. The Panel supported the public realm interface and the handling of the ground plane. They thought there was a huge improvement since rezoning. One Panel member thought there should be more softening in the landscape and less hard surface that would allow for more space for children's play.

The Panel also supported the entrance to the parking and the internal car circulation. One Panel member noted that the area would be stronger if there were places to stop.

Regarding sustainability, several Panel members noted that the buildings doesn't express their orientation and there are no shading devices on the south or west facades. One Panel member suggested that given the traffic noise from Boundary Road the applicant should consider higher quality windows that will also help with the thermal issues.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Lyon said he appreciated the suggestions from the Panel and thought that adding some height might improve the project however they are fixed along with the floor plate sizes according the Collingwood Village principles. He said it has been a challenge in terms of how to manage the FSR, how to make it seem smaller and more delicate on the site but that they will continue to work hard to improve the project.

---

4.	<b>Address:</b>	<b>5555 Dunbar Street</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	415626
	<b>Use:</b>	To construct a new 4-storey building with commercial uses at grade and residential above with one and a half storeys of underground parking.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	C-2
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Complete
	<b>Review:</b>	First
	<b>Architect:</b>	Rositch Hemphill Architects
	<b>Owner:</b>	0926355 BC Ltd.
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects Julie Hicks, Viewpoint Landscape Architects
	<b>Staff:</b>	Tim Potter

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

##### **Introduction:**

Tim Potter, Development Planner, described the proposal for a development on Dunbar Street near West 39th Avenue. Mr. Potter described the context for the area noting that across the lane is single family residential. He noted that the height in the District Schedule permits a height of 45 feet at the street stepping down to 15 feet at the lane. As well, side yards are not required but should one be provided it needs to have a minimum width of 9 meters. Off street parking should be located below grade and main building entries should be clearly identifiable and accessible from the street. Also the entries should provide generous weather protection. Mr. Potter stated that the height of the proposed building meets the height set in the District Schedule and the setbacks are compliant. The proposal has a courtyard scheme to enhance the solar access to all the units.

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

In addition to any comment on the overall form of development proposed for this rezoning application, the Panel's advice was sought on the following questions:

1. Recognizing the function of the courtyard space to maximize sun access to the courtyard level and to provide daylight access to the units: does the proposal successfully resolve the goals of solar access and circulation?
2. How well does the proposal relate to the neighbouring site, immediately south and its courtyard space. (Note: this site was constructed in 2004).

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

##### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Keith Hemphill, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they wanted to comply with the C-2 zoning with requirements for setbacks at the top floor, in the lane and on the second floor. He described the rationale for the courtyard scheme noting that this is the eighth building that they have designed with a courtyard. The courtyard design allows for the units to have light at both ends and gives the residents daylight at different times of day. There are residential units on the lane at grade that will have a substantial amount of landscaping. Mr. Hemphill described the architecture noting that they chose brick as their principle material on the front with a lighter palette of materials on the top floor. As well the Dunbar Street side has a strong palette of materials and colour. The upper terraces are quite large and have outdoor fireplaces.

---

Julie Hicks, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. She described the plantings for the courtyard that will tolerate the light conditions. The lane units have landscaping with a lawn area and patio space. On the front street trees are proposed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to add more privacy to the units;
- Consider a more contemporary look to the façade.
- Consider offsetting/staggering the courtyard elevated walkway for more light/bigger openings.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the courtyard concept and said they liked the way it gave more light into the units. A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding privacy around the bedroom windows with one Panel member suggesting adding planters. Another Panel member suggested having one larger opening for the courtyard. There was also a suggestion from one Panel member to put the elevator in the middle of the courtyard as a way to animate it.

Some Panel members thought the Dunbar Street expression could be improved to have a more contemporary look. They felt the fabric canopies would get dirty over time and suggested glass or metal be used instead. One Panel member noted that the applicant needed to think about signage.

The Panel encouraged the notion of translucency in the stair wells. As well they thought the lane expression was well done.

The Panel thought the unit plans were well resolved using cross ventilation and a lot of natural light.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Hemphill thanked the Panel for their feedback. He said he thought they could get a larger open space in the courtyard. He said that there are a number of ways to get translucency into the courtyard. He saw a heritage building that used glass block on the floor in the corridor to bring more light into the building. Mr. Hemphill added that the only problem with the exit stairs being translucent is that there will be light into the neighbouring building 24-7 which could be a problem.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.