

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 7, 2012

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Helen Besharat (Chair for Item #4)
Gregory Borowski
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett (Item #1 only)
Jane Durante (Item #1 & #2)
Alan Endall (Excused Item #1)
Jim Huffman
Geoff McDonell
Scott Romses (Chair)

REGRETS:
Robert Barnes
Arno Matis
Norm Shearing
Alan Storey

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. | 1300-1320 Richards Street |
| 2. | 138 East Hastings Street |
| 3. | 5675 Manson Street, 665-685 West 41st Avenue, 5688 Heather Street |
| 4. | 4837-4861 Cambie Street |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Romses called the business meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. Anita Molaro welcomed the incoming Panel members and notified the outgoing Panel members that this was their last meeting. She explained that because of time constraints, the outgoing Panel members and staff would get together at a later date to thank them for their contribution to the Urban Design Panel. Mr. Romses then noted the presence of a quorum and the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|--|
| 1. | Address: | 1300-1320 Richards Street |
| | DE: | N/A |
| | Use: | To construct a 43-storey residential tower with a 5-storey podium with commercial uses at grade. A maximum density of 11.9 FSR and a maximum height of 400 feet is proposed. |
| | Zoning: | DD to CD-1 |
| | Application Status: | Rezoning |
| | Review: | First |
| | Architect: | DIALOG |
| | Owner: | Wall Financial Corp. Norm Hotson, DIALOG |
| | Delegation: | Don Dhow, DIALOG Margot Long, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects |
| | Staff: | Anita Molaro and Karen Hoese |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**Introduction:**

Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application at Richards and Drake Streets. The site currently includes a 3-storey commercial building at Drake Street and the former Boss nightclub on the interior site. The rezoning application proposes to increase the density and height beyond that permitted under the current zoning and to build a 43-storey residential tower with commercial uses at grade. The site is in the New Yaletown sub-area of Downtown South (DTS). The policy for this area endorses high density residential development with limited commercial uses. Council's direction allows consideration of rezoning applications proposing increased height up to the underside of approved view corridors. Ms. Hoese noted that all rezonings are subject to the Green Building Policy which requires that rezonings achieve LEED™ Gold with specific emphasis on optimized energy performance. Registration and application for certification of the project are also required.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, further described the proposal and explained that the proposal is to rezone the site from DD to CD-1. She noted that the Metro Core Policy and Capacity Review Study allows for consideration of rezoning proposals where increased capacity would achieve public benefits. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting several highrise developments. She also described the policy for the area and asked that the Panel consider whether the site can support a tower proposal up to 300 feet.

Ms. Molaro then described the proposal noting that it will be a very slim tower having a floor plate of under 5,000 square feet. Downtown South Guidelines call for tower separation of 80 feet to allow for access to daylight and privacy interface. However, because of the limited opportunities for tower placement on the site, the tower is not offset due to the view cones. The tower separation is slightly less at 74 feet to the tower core and almost 80 feet at the residential floor location. To address the privacy interface the unit layouts have been configured to orient their more public/active living spaces away from the residential units in The Pointe. Ms. Molaro also noted that the number of open balconies has been increased to

12% on the provision that the additional balcony area contribute to the passive design performance of the building and that there be no enclosed balconies.

With respect to uses the DDODP allows for a maximum of 2,500 square feet of retail space on corner sites. This is in part to encourage ground oriented residential frontages along the length of the street frontage. Noting that this block is somewhat unique in this regard Ms. Molaro said the residential building, "The 501", was one of the first towers to be developed in downtown south having ground oriented retail along its frontage. She added that next door is a social housing building with ground level amenity space. The proposal is seeking an increase of retail use to 6,100 square feet. As this is a rezoning, the proposal need to meet a minimum of LEED™ Gold registered with six optimized energy points, one water efficiency and one stormwater point.

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

- does the panel support the urban design response developed for this site and its relationship within the surrounding context taking into consideration the following:
 - within the context of downtown south, is this site an appropriate site for a tower proposal, noting the site frontage (175 ft) meets the DDODP criteria but not the site area criteria for 5.0 FSR and height of 300 ft.
 - additional height increase up to 400 ft. parapet (416 ft. underside of view cone) and the increase in density (from 3.0 to 11.90).
 - building siting, tower form and massing, including neighbourliness issues (shadow and view impacts with adjacent and nearby existing development).
 - increase in retail use along the Richards Street frontage (increase from the DDODP maximum of 2500 sq. ft. to 6100 sq. ft.).
 - open space and landscape treatments.
 - LEED™ Gold strategies.

Ms. Hoese and Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Norm Hotson, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they slimmed the building working with the 12 foot setback. The building is 50 feet wide and is the reason the core is offset. As a result, there is light in all the elevator lobbies. He noted that the building skin will be a higher performance, as they have a 40% glass area on each façade. Mr. Hotson described the architecture strategy and noted that the larger balconies add to the architectural expression of the building.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal. She noted that the large setbacks gave them the opportunity to do a lot of landscaping at the ground level. They are looking at a water feature at the corner. Urban agriculture is proposed for the lane level, and one of the roof decks over the loading will be a green roof. Both of the levels with amenity decks have large amenity rooms. The stacked townhouses have exterior entrances offering more light into the units.

The applicant team too questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development of the laneway to make it more welcoming;
- Consider design development to the canopy element at the top of the tower;
- Consider design development on the tower to maximize the opportunity for views;
- Design development to maintain the 80 foot separation.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a handsome tower.

The Panel supported the urban use, design response, the height and massing. They also supported the relaxation on the retail. They thought the tower had a strong character and liked the retail uses at grade. A couple of Panel members thought it would be worthwhile to have the whole street built out as a retail street. Most of the Panel thought the 80 foot separation from the neighbouring building should be maintained and that there was only a minor adjustment needed to make it work. The Panel supported the expression of the tower, however, a couple of Panel members thought the expression could change with the change in unit type to add more interest to the building.

The Panel supported the materials and liked the colour of the glass, especially the gold colour, as they thought it would be elegant on the tower. Some Panel members were concerned that the colour in the tower and the core were competing with the coloured glass.

Most of the Panel liked the small pool on the corner and thought it made for a nice simple entrance to the building. A couple of Panel members thought the amenity and small units on the lane could have some more windows. One Panel member suggested wrapping the glazing into the lane from the residential units. A number of Panel members noted that the laneway entrance was just as important as the street entrance and wanted to see that improved. One Panel member suggested articulated the blank wall under the stacked townhouse.

The panel liked the open space in the landscaping and liked that there would be urban agriculture spaces. A couple of Panel member thought the lane needed some improvements.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, the Panel felt that every project of this size is probably going to be LEED™ Gold from now on and suggested the applicant enhance their strategy. Several of the Panel members thought passive energy design should be expression in the tower.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Hotson thanked the Panel for their advice and said they are looking forward to exploring more as they get into the detailed design.

| | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| 2. | Address: | 138 East Hastings Street |
| | DE: | 414810 |
| | Use: | To develop this site with a six storey mixed-use building (commercial uses and a total of 97 residential units) over one level of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane. Residential use to contain a total of 18 Social Housing units and 79 Affordable Home Ownership units. |
| | Zoning: | DEOD |
| | Application Status: | Complete |
| | Review: | Second |
| | Architect: | Studio One Architecture |
| | Owner: | Sequel 138 Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture |
| | Delegation: | Jim Wong, Studio One Architecture Jonathan Losee, J.J. Ltd. Landscape Architects Mark Williams, Sequel 138 |
| | Staff: | Scot Hein |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

Introduction:

Scot Hein, Development Planner, described the proposal noting that a significant redesign has occurred since the Panel's last review. He confirmed that the social market housing obligation of 20% has been agreed upon with Housing staff. Something that is driving that is an interest to do a combustible building over a non-combustible plinth. This is the first time in twenty years that the 20% has been met in this part of the city. Mr. Hein noted that at the last review the Panel were looking for a kind of vitality and approach to the fenestration and composition and yet still be contextually relevant.

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

- Has sufficient design development occurred that would warrant support?
- Is there significant differentiation on either side of the expressed passage through the building? Should they be different given the strategy for colour and fenestration?

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Tomas Wolf, Architect, further described the proposal. He said he agreed with some of the Panel's comments from the previous review. They have moved the building towards the lane and shifted one floor over so that there is more space for the open courtyard. They opened the link between Hastings Street and Pender Street to the sky. They have also moved the stairs from inside the courtyard, and incorporated one in the north block, and one was also moved next to the south block so there is more open space in the courtyard.

Jim Wong, Principle at Studio One Architecture, noted that the building has a more contemporary design than the previous scheme. There is a link through the center of the building that is open to the sky. He described the material and colour palette. The courtyard colours have been lightened as well as the cladding materials. The walkways and stairways have been simplified. All the CRUs face either the street or the lane other than a small unit in the center which opens onto the courtyard, which will be a community space.

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He noted that moving the building helped bring more light into the courtyard which will help support the planting. He mentioned that the owner is partnering with an urban agriculture team that will convert the courtyard space to a fruit and vegetable garden. As well there is an urban agriculture deck that will get 6-7 hours of sunlight during the summer. At the lower level they have introduced an interesting paving pattern with lighting fixtures to make for a more urban experience. There is also a large courtyard that will be accessible for the art program and will be surfaced with polished concrete. A shade courtyard is planned that will be used for an outdoor living room/community space.

Mark Williams, owner, explained that they are the first non-government project and they have found a way to make the social housing work. Of the eighteen units 50% will let the tenants contribute no more than the welfare portion for the rent which is \$375 per month. The other 50% will be at local CMHC market rent or BC Housing income rent. The units are being sold at a reduced cost to the F.J. L. Housing Society. The balance of the 79 units will be offered under an affordable home ownership program and they have been working with CMHC to assist buyers in their purchases. The community and courtyard is going to be programmed by the Canadian Foundation for Creative Development and Innovation. They will be housed in one of the commercial units and they will take care of all the programming for the community link and the courtyard. The project podium will be operated by the local Urban Growers Association in conjunction with the community and residents with collective gardening plots.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider changing the materials on the base of the building;
- Consider some articulation to the parapet;
- Consider adding urban agriculture to the upper roof.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the project was much improved since the previous review.

The Panel agreed that one of the biggest changes was the amount of light getting into the courtyard and that there was more useable space there now. They liked the material palette and the subtle colour shift on the Hastings Street façade composition. A couple of Panel members thought the base materials should be more durable given that the painted concrete could be used for graffiti.

The Panel liked the rhythm of the store fronts along Hastings Street as it keeps with the character of the area. As well, they supported the punched windows which are similar to the existing window style but have a more modern approach. Some of the Panel members thought the parapet line needed a little more articulation to fit into the saw-tooth silhouette of the neighbourhood. Also, the lane elevation could be strengthened with a stronger colour. One Panel member thought skylights could be added on the top floor to allow for light into the kitchen and bathroom spaces.

The Panel agreed that having 20% of units for social housing and having it integrated into the project was commendable. The Panel liked the flexibility of the suite layout that allows for residents to decide how to furnish them. One Panel member suggested the applicant furnish a couple of units to give potential residents some ideas on how to arrange their furniture.

A couple of Panel members were concerned with the width of the walkways at the courtyard level, and thought they could be opened up to allow for more sun and a place to build community relationships. They also liked the way the garden had been organized. One Panel

member would like to see the roofs used for urban agriculture which would mean extending the stair one level and maybe the elevator.

The Panel encouraged the applicant to go further with the sustainable strategy. One Panel member thought the south façade could use some passive sun shading.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Wolf said he had no comments. Mr. Williams said they had met with one of the native artists and are thinking of doing some cast in concrete native art for the project along the streetscape.

| | | |
|----|---------------------|--|
| 3. | Address: | 5675 Manson Street, 665-685 West 41st Avenue, 5688 Heather Street |
| | DE: | N/A |
| | Use: | The application proposes to rezone the site to permit a 6-storey residential development over 1 1/2 levels of underground parking. The proposed density is 3.1 FSR, with a gross floor area of 10,741 square meters (115,617 square feet) and a height of 17.7 meters (58 feet). |
| | Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| | Application Status: | Rezoning |
| | Review: | First |
| | Architect: | Formwerks Architectural Inc. James Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Inc. Kim Barnsley, Formwerks Architectural Inc. |
| | Delegation: | Daryl Tyacke, Eckford Tyacke & Associates Landscape Architects Troy Glusher, E3Eco Group |
| | Staff: | Sailen Black and Dwayne Drobot |

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-6)**Introduction:**

Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, described the proposal that is located on West 41st Avenue between Heather and Manson Streets. The site is five single family lots. He noted that the context is evolving in the area. While north and west of the site are single family dwellings, a 6-storey building has been approved to the east of the site. To the south is Oakridge Centre which has an approved policy statement for heights of up to 24-storeys in certain locations. Mr. Drobot noted that the policy for the area is the Cambie Corridor Plan which was adopted by Council in May of 2011. The policy for the area calls for residential buildings up to 6-storeys in this location, with upper floors stepped back from the Avenue.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal. He noted that this is the second project under the new Cambie Corridor Plan and a first chance for the Panel to help identify new solutions or unwanted outcomes. The site is two blocks from the West 41st Avenue Canada Line Station. Most of the other lots nearby are single family homes.

Mr. Black explained the guidelines for the area noting that residential buildings will be allowed up to six storeys and buildings should provide front doors onto the street. Buildings are intended to activate and enhance the adjacent lane by providing active uses at the rear. As well, buildings will affect the character and feel of the street, and should be limited in length to allow for sunlight, views and a general feeling of openness. He added that, in general, a maximum building frontage of 150 feet is desired. Mr. Black stated that the building architecture should be of its time while considering the architectural history of the neighbourhood, the surrounding neighbourhood context, and the emerging character of the neighbourhood. As this building must meet the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning, the applicant should be seeking a minimum of 63 LEED™ points and must register and apply to certify.

Mr. Black described the proposal noting that it is a 6-storey multiple dwelling with 125 residential units including 2-storey townhouses off the rear lane.

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

South massing - building frontage - 263 feet

- Does the proposed handling of frontage perform as intended in the Cambie Plan?
- Is a single elevator core possible if integrated into building design, and other issues are resolved?

Public realm interface and grade transition - moving from street/lane to building

- Is the vertical separation between existing grades and new decks and patios well resolved?

North massing - transitional scale north towards RS-1

- Is the proposed range of setbacks effective in transitioning to single family neighbours?
- Does further sculpting make sense here to improve shadowing for houses to the north?

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

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

James Bussey, Architect, further described the proposal, noting that it is their best interpretation under the guidelines. He added that the site is very constrained so they recognized the need for the different elements, and to have different forms and textures. He said they tried to give an ample setback around the street edge in order to provide adequate pedestrian response. Considering the lot is close to the Canada Line Station they wanted to have a lot of density on the site in order to give more people the opportunity to live near a major transit stop. Mr. Bussey said that one of the big moves for the contextual response was to play up the amount of brick which allows for a sense of permanence on the lower three and four floors. The sustainable strategy includes LEED™ Gold with the possibility of making LEED™ Platinum, and as well, they plan on doing energy modeling for the building. There will be community gardens on the roof along with other activities. They are proposing large and deep terraces on the ground floor with apartments that can be used for live/work activities.

Troy Glasner, Sustainability Consultant, described the sustainable strategy and noted that they are at 68 points and looking for a potential LEED™ Platinum rating. They are planning to do some energy modeling, and as well they will have water efficiency with a cistern and plantings on top of the roof. He added that there are opportunities for passive applications that they have yet to decide on.

Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. The terraces off the ground floor units are close to the sidewalks and have a street access. All the plant material at grade is drought tolerant and, drip irrigated. There will be urban agriculture and composting, tool storage, and a greenhouse on the roof. As well, there is potential for adding solar panels in the future. There is a mews treatment along the lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to break up the massing;
- Design development to the rear façade to step it down to the residential homes across the lane;
- Design development to the blank side walls on the east and west;
- Design development to reconsider the architectural vocabulary to a more contemporary expression;
- Consider an opening in the massing in the middle of the site;

- Design development to reflect passive design.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the proposal and thought it was falling short with respect to the Guidelines under the Cambie Corridor Plan.

The Panel felt the building was trying to maximize the density, and trying to do so by adhering to the guidelines, but it is not really responding to its context enough. They also felt that it did not recognize what is around it and what may be built around it in the future. They felt the façade along West 41st Avenue was relentless, and that the attempt to break up the massing was a token gesture at best. One Panel member noted that having the elevator core in the middle of the building actually accentuated its length. As well, they thought the rear facade needed to be more stepped down in its scale to the single family homes across the lane. The Panel was also concerned with the flat facades on the east and west sides of the building.

The Panel felt the architectural form was too traditional, and that there was an opportunity to have a more contemporary expression. One Panel member noted that there are some great mid-century buildings at Cambie and West 41st Avenue, and the project hasn't done anything to reflect that architectural style. Most of the Panel felt the building's architecture did not have a unified context and didn't fit the neighbourhood.

The Panel noted that there isn't any light penetrations or views through the building and its massing is really too large for the site. Several Panel members suggested that there should be an opening in the middle of the building as a way to align the building to the lane. This would also invite people to walk through the site considering West 41st Avenue is a transit node.

Regarding sustainability, the Panel felt the strategy needed more work, but they did support the landscaped roof and the landscaping at grade. One Panel member thought the team seemed to be after LEED™ points rather than finding passive approaches that would be reflected on the building.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Bussey thanked the Panel for their comments.

| | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| 4. | Address: | 4837-4861 Cambie Street |
| | DE: | N/A |
| | Use: | To provide 41 residential units with a total area of 40,189 square feet (3,733.5 square meters) in a 5-storey building at FSR = 2.017. Forty-nine underground parking spaces and 86 bicycle storage spaces are proposed. |
| | Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| | Application Status: | Rezoning |
| | Review: | First |
| | Architect: | Ramsay Worden Architects |
| | Owner: | Mosaic Homes |
| | Delegation: | Rob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Benn Duffell, Mosaic Homes Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting |
| | Staff: | Sailen Black and Grant Miller |

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-3)

Introduction:

Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application to rezone a mid-block RS-1 site on Cambie Street to CD-1. The site falls within the Queen Elizabeth area of the Cambie Corridor Plan. The plan supports residential building up to 6-storeys in height with a suggested density range of approximately 1.5 to 2.0 FSR. The project is also subject to the Cambie Corridor Housing Policy which requires the provision of up to 20% guaranteed market rental units. Mr. Miller noted that the application was made in December 2011 and is subject to the City's Green Building's policy requiring LEED™ Gold.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting the unusual adjacency to the south of a recently developed rowhouse project. Mr. Black described the Cambie Corridor Plan noting that residential buildings are allowed up to 6-storeys here. Above four storeys, the upper floors are to be stepped back from Cambie Street. As well buildings should provide front doors onto the street and seek to activate and enhance the adjacent lane. He added that residential buildings should step back at the rear as well, reducing the scale of the building towards the lane and should minimize the amount of shadow cast onto adjacent properties. The design should allow for delineation of the public and private realm and accommodate a front patio/entrance. Care should be taken on sloped sites to ensure does not create blank wall conditions on any side.

Mr. Black noted that under the Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings the design needs to show a minimum of 63 points, and the applicant must register and apply to certify.

Mr. Black explained that the proposal is for the rezoning of two RS-1 lots to allow the development of a 5-storey multiple dwelling with forty-one units.

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

- Is the open space treatment, including setbacks, landscape design, and the parkade structure above grade at the interior property lines appropriately handled?
 - Noting the long term neighbours to the south, what is the appropriate response and siting on this property in terms of scale and overlook?
-

- Is the transition from the public realm to private unit entries well resolved in terms of the changing grades and landscape elements?
- Considering the proposed stepping and overall height, does the proposed massing create an appropriate transition to the lower scale houses to the west?
- What is the optimal treatment of the above grade portions of parkade facing onto the lane on this particular site?

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

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Bob Worden, Architect, further described the proposal. The building will be all residential and the design recognizes the unique nature of Cambie Street. He noted that the future of the neighbourhood is to be walkable and they tried to create an engaging front entry and streetscape. The façade is layered with rich materials and garden walls with private gates. The units range from just over 600 square feet to just over 1,000 square feet. The building is a 5-storey wood frame building with a stepped top floor. Mr. Worden described their sustainability strategy noting that they will achieve LEED™ Gold.

Daniel Roberts, Sustainability Consultant, noted that they are targeting LEED™ Gold and the building has a low window to wall ratio. In terms of energy performance, a full energy simulation will be applied to the building.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. The site has a fair amount of grade change and careful attention has been put into the design as it falls along Cambie Street. The unit steps with some stairs up to their patios moving north across the site and as well the landscaped walls that express where the entry point are also step with the grade. The lane has a planter that is stepped down from the rear garden with plantings that can hang over the wall.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Reduce parkade structure and retaining walls around site;
- Consider more entrances on the lane;
- Design development to improve the architecture on all sides;
- Consider improving the sustainability strategy.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the proposal as they thought the massing and size of the structure around the buildings weren't appropriate for the site.

The Panel thought it was a competent project in general and that the planting treatment was appropriate. Several Panel members suggested there was an opportunity to have more entrances at grade for private spaces on the lane. The Panel had no concern with the scale and massing to the development to the south. However, one Panel member thought there should be some gesture that acknowledged the scale of that development to make for a smoother transition.

Most of the Panel were disappointed with the architecture and thought it could have gone further. They thought it was a conservative approach and looked like so many other apartment buildings in the city. One Panel member noted that the site was across the street from Queen Elizabeth Park and that Cambie Street has the heritage boulevard and wanted to see the heritage addressed in the design. Several Panel members were concerned that the building didn't fit into the context of the area. They noted that there aren't any other sites along Cambie Street that have raised parking garages. They were concerned that the context for

Cambie Street wasn't being considered in this proposal. One Panel member stated that other buildings along the street have a more formal entry fronting onto the street which this proposal lacks.

One Panel member noted that the building was more promising in detail in terms of material and colour palette and that the form could be improved. Another Panel member suggested the building could respond better to the slope of the site. It was suggested that the building could be stepped in plan to add more light or a step the roof line to respond to the slope of the site.

Most of the Panel thought the transition from the public face to the public realm on Cambie Street was well handled. One Panel member thought the building could do with some further articulation or be stepped at the lane to transition better to the single family homes across the lane.

Most of the Panel noted that there wasn't any expression of the sustainability strategy and that the building needed to respond to its orientation. They suggested that solar panels could be added in the future on the roof.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Worden thanked the Panel for their comments. He said they were looking at the building's relationship to Cambie Street and have discussed how to make the front area come out to the sidewalk so the Cambie Street experience doesn't just become a wall of condos. He thought it might mean moving the entry to the center of the building and perhaps they could lower the building by one foot which would help the lane expression.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.