

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** November 10, 2004

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall and Plaza 500

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Bruce Haden, Chair  
Mark Ostry  
Larry Adams  
Robert Barnes  
Jeffrey Corbett  
Alan Endall (not present for Item 1)  
Marta Farevaag (excused Item 2)  
Steven Keyes  
Ronald Lea  
Margot Long (excused item 4)  
Jennifer Marshall  
Brian Martin (present for Items 1 and 2 only)

**REGRETS:**

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1241 Homer Street
2.	3595 West 18th Avenue
3.	1139 West Cordova Street
4.	1055 Canada Place

---

---

1. Address:	1241 Homer Street
DE:	408811
Use:	Residential (6 storeys)
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Lawrence Doyle
Owner:	Townline Homes Inc.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Richard Henry, Robet Emslie, Peter Kruek
Staff:	Dale Morgan

---

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

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced this application. The site is a small 50 ft. x 120 ft. property on Homer Street between Drake and Davie Streets. The proposal is for a 6-storey residential building containing 12 dwelling units. A roof deck is provided for the two uppermost units. Parking is provided for 12 vehicles, accessed from the rear lane via a parking elevator. Engineering Services has concerns about the proposed parking elevator and has not yet approved it. The zoning allows a maximum height of 70 ft. which is governed by the size of the frontage. The application seeks a height relaxation of 16 ft. for the elevator penthouse stair. The building is stepped on either side to address the immediate side conditions. A 12 ft. setback from the front property line is provided in accordance with the Downtown South Guidelines. At the rear, a 30 ft. setback is proposed for a private garden for the rear ground level units.

The advice of the Panel is sought in the following areas:

- Architectural expression and materials
  - Privacy issues with respect to the adjoining building;
  - The exclusive use of the amenity space on the roof for two units;
  - Use of the parking elevator.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Richard Henry, Architect, briefly described the history of small sites such as this in the Downtown South and reviewed his design rationale. He said it is a building which is about Yaletown. He stressed the importance of the parking elevator given the difficulty of providing a parking ramp on this site. Peter Kreuk briefly reviewed the landscape plan and the design team responded to questions from the Panel.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
    - The application is supported only with the inclusion of the parking elevator. The Panel is confident the technical issues can be resolved;
    - Increase plant material size;
    - Consideration of sustainable design issues.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this application and considered it to be a very good background building and a good response to this small infill site. The Panel thought the building will be very livable, and a comment was made that it is a very easy building to like.

The architectural expression was considered to be very appropriate for the area, having a nice mix of traditional and contemporary elements. One Panel member questioned whether a Yaletown response was entirely appropriate in this location, although agreed the expression is very well handled. The stepping was thought to add another level of interest to the building. The minor height relaxation to allow for the elevator room was supported.

The Panel found the overhead doors to be an intriguing and interesting addition. One minor concern was voiced about the long term mechanical performance of these doors.

The Panel had no concerns about privacy and overlook given this is a very urban situation.

The Panel strongly supported limiting the roof deck to only the penthouse units. Ideally, it should be a common amenity but is acceptable given the generous balconies and the inherent constraints of this site. One Panel member thought it should be redesigned to accommodate a common deck as well as two private decks given such a space helps to create a community, which is a cornerstone of sustainable design.

The proposed parking elevator was unanimously supported by the Panel. It was noted that traffic issues would also exist with a one-way ramp access. Panel members urged that this innovative approach to urban parking be maintained in the project and suggested the project may not be supportable without it. Parking elevators are commonly used in Europe and elsewhere and are entirely appropriate and long overdue in Vancouver. While there will be technical details to be resolved, the Panel was confident a workable arrangement can be achieved. It was noted that safety and security concerns are addressed by the use of clear glazing in the elevator booth.

There was a suggestion to increase the amount of brick on the upper floors, front and back.

With respect to the landscape plan, it was agreed to be a very acceptable urban solution. The only suggestion was to increase the size of the plant materials.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henry thanked the Panel for the feedback.

---

2. Address:	3595 West 18th Avenue
DE:	408721
Use:	Mixed (4 storeys)
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Howard Bingham Hill
Owner:	Dunbar St. Development Partnership
Review:	First
Delegation:	John Bingham, Robert Duke, Thomas Gould
Staff:	Bob Adair

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (4-6)**

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced this C-2 application at the northeast corner of Dunbar Street and West 18th Avenue. The proposal contains ground level commercial use with three floors of residential above. The site slopes south-north and west-east. Parking and loading is off the rear lane. Concrete construction is proposed with brick and painted concrete exterior.

The Panel's advice is sought on the following:

- Treatment and resolution of the main residential entry and the overall resolution of the south elevation;
  - Transition and impact on the residential neighbours to the rear, noting the recently revised C-2 guidelines seek to address privacy and overlook issues and provide landscaping and improved interface with adjacent residential neighbours;
  - Materials and detailing and the proportion of brick and concrete.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** John Bingham, Architect, reviewed the design rationale in response to the new C-2 guidelines and the severe slope of the site. Thomas Gould briefly described the landscape plan and confirmed the intent is to provide a green roof. The design team responded to questions from the Panel.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
    - Design development to the entry and south elevation to refine the canopies and glazing; to consider entry inconsistency and provide greater entry presence and coordination of the Dunbar façade;
    - Design development to the lane, including additional planting and consideration for increasing the garage setback on the northwest corner, and maintaining a minimum 2 ft. setback;
    - Design development to consider enhanced view screening of the garage terraces, either planting and screens or setbacks;
    - Design development to the roof deck to resolve access and railings. Also, the relationship between allotments and formal planting and consideration for reducing the amount of paving and reducing the difference in treatment of the two roof elevations, potentially by adding planting to the lower roof.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel thought considerable design development was needed to the south elevation, including resolution of the entry. There are a number of awkward inconsistencies in the way it

---

is presently resolved and detailed. The service entry next to the residential entry is not supported and should be reconsidered. It was thought it could be resolved with some minor reconfiguration of the CRU. The Panel also found the canopy too small and too high to be effective as weather protection, and the detailing looks unresolved.

One Panel member found the absence of a deck at the southwest corner to be a lost opportunity given its potential for sun exposure and daylight.

The Panel had concerns about the lane elevation. With respect to the setback, while a relaxation of 6 inches is fairly minor, most Panel members saw no reason why the 2 ft. setback should not to be provided. The Panel strongly urged that additional landscaping be introduced in the lane, including some trees and more substantial hedging than is shown. There was also a suggestion to create some more significant recesses, perhaps in the entry areas to the townhouse stairs. In general, the Panel thought that everything possible should be done to create a feeling of domesticity in the lane. The parking entry and loading might be set back and lightened up. A suggestion was made to consider glazing all or part of the individual garage doors. The garage doors for a residential appearance was thought to be an interesting approach but they need to be softened. While they look like residential garages they do not have a residential scale and the massing around them also seems contrary to what is intended.

The Panel strongly recommended including more substantial landscaping on the garage roof terraces, including trees, or some other screening elements to soften the edge and increase the residential feel.

The Panel found the proportion of brick and concrete unresolved, and the brick columns create too strong a vertical expression for the lower part of the building. A suggestion was made to reconsider the colour and/or material of the upstands. Other suggestions were to consider more brick on the top floor on Dunbar and to reconsider the glazing pattern which seems too busy and not the right expression for this neighbourhood. There was also concern that the Dunbar and 18th Avenue elevations look like two different buildings.

The Panel recommended considerable design development to the rooftop. Full accessibility is important, and at the very least it should be a green roof as a sustainability gesture. The rooftop is not yet resolved in terms of how the spaces will be used and how the railings will be dealt with, which will also affect the appearance from the street. The Panel supported the provision of garden plots but thought it needed to be thought through much further, taking into account that not all residents will want to take advantage of them. There is currently too much paving on the roof. As well, although breaking up the space is supported, the two areas need to be better integrated and equally landscaped.

Continuous street trees on Dunbar Street was strongly recommended.

There was a suggestion to consider weather protection for the corner CRU, and to provide a more horizontal expression.

The floor plans should be clarified with respect to what is identified as den in front of the bedroom, which is not consistent with the landscape plan which identifies this area as enclosed balcony.

The Panel noted the revised C-2 guidelines are resulting in an improved relationship to the neighbouring single family area.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bingham said the Panel has provided them with good information to work with.

---

3. Address:	1139 West Cordova Street
DE:	408870
Use:	Residential (31 storeys)
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	James Cheng
Owner:	Hillsboro Investment Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	James Cheng, Blair Guppy
Staff:	Ralph Segal

---

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

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced this application for Lot 19, Precinct 3, Harbour Green Park. There are fairly precise by-law and guideline parameters for this precinct. The proposed tower meets the height limit of 94 m but seeks a relaxation of the 625 m<sup>2</sup> floorplate guideline. In the shoulder zone of the tower a 6.5 percent increase up to 665 m<sup>2</sup> is sought. A side yard setback relaxation is also requested, which staff support because it provides better street definition, particularly to the waterfront walkway.

The advice of the Panel is sought in the following areas:

- Overall architectural expression and landscape design;
  - Floorplate and setback deviations;
  - Public edges, with particular emphasis on Cordova Street and the park.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** James Cheng, Architect, briefly described the design rationale and proposed materials, and Blair Guppy reviewed the landscape plan. The design team responded to questions from the Panel.
  - **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
    - Design development to the townhouses on Cordova and the north side to simplify the expression, with consideration of additional horizontal treatment;
    - Design development to the fourth and fifth floors shoulder on the north side to better integrate with the tower;
    - Design development to the 15th floor joint to enhance tower continuity including consideration of lowering this joint;
    - Design development to bring the line of the tower to grade, at least on the north side of the park.
    - Design development to west edge of the property to improve adjacency to public space and to clarify the terracing and stepping strategy on the west edge. Also, to provide views from the common space, if possible.
  - **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this application and generally found it to be a very handsome addition to the neighbourhood. There were some suggestion that it could be a little too subdued for what is developing into one of the premier addresses in the whole country, which perhaps warrants something a little more distinctive.

The Panel had no concerns about the increased floorplate given there is no impact on views.

---

With respect to the overall architecture, the tower design strategy was thought to be largely successful, with some suggestions for improvement in design development. In particular, the Panel felt strongly that the tower should come to the ground in a much bolder fashion on the north side of the building noting this is where the building will be seen from the water. As well, further consideration should be given to levels four and five to provide a better integration with the rest of the tower, possibly with a change in fenestration. The Panel also questioned the position of the "break" at level 15 which seems about midpoint in the tower and not relating to the top or the bottom sections. The screen at the top of the tower was thought to be interesting; the metal panels of the elevator core less so. The Panel supported the materials and thought the limestone and metal panel will offer a nice contrast and departure from the exterior treatment of many of the neighbouring towers.

The Panel had no concerns about the side yard setbacks.

The Panel generally found the architectural expression of the townhouses to be less clean than the tower, almost as if they are a different project. One suggestion was to introduce a continuous floating plane two floors above the amenity level which might help knit the townhouses and the tower together better. There were recommendations to simplify the townhouses to better complement the rich materials being proposed. Some Panel members commented that they strongly favoured what had been originally proposed for the neighbouring townhouses on Cordova, largely because it provided some relief from what is becoming the standard response to townhouses in Vancouver. Such a direction for this project would be welcomed because the city can afford to have some distinction to its townhouse bases and offer something complementary. A concern was expressed that the downtown is becoming too domestic.

With respect to the interface with the adjacent property on the west it was noted there is still the potential for the wall to be quite large and blank, calling for a little more consideration in this area. There was a recommendation to give greater consideration to rationalizing the design with respect to the shared pedestrian/vehicular space so that some of the ingredients from one could flow into the other to create a stronger edge, noting it will also be viewed from above. It was recommended there be some careful sculpting and that a way be found to provide a view to the water from the amenity area. Some Panel members did not believe the westerly public realm interface lived up to the quality of the rest of the project in terms of private/public interface conflicts. Expansion of the green roofs was also recommended, including possibly legislating a percentage of landscape on the private decks.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng thank the Panel for its astute comments and said he believe the project will benefit from refinements.

---

4. WORKSHOP:	1055 Canada Place (VCCEP)
DE:	408490
Use:	Convention Centre Expansion
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Preliminary
Architect:	Downs Archambault
Owner:	VCCEP
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Russ Anthony, Ken Grassi, Jim Brown, Mark Whitehead
Staff:	Ralph Segal, Anita Molaro

---

Bruce Haden advised a question was raised about whether he may be in a conflict of interest on this application because his partner, Norman Hotson, did a small amount of work on this project a few months ago. Mr. Hotson has had no involvement whatsoever with the current roof design. Mr. Haden advised he has discussed this matter with the applicant and City staff who agree with his judgment that he is not in a conflict of interest.

**Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced the project and briefly reviewed its history to date. The Panel did not support the preliminary application when it was reviewed in July 2004. It was subsequently approved in principle by the Development Permit Board on September 13, 2004, subject to a lengthy list of conditions. This workshop review is intended to be a progress report on the moves the design team is making in preparation for submission of the complete application, which is expected in February 2005. Mr. Segal stressed the project is on a very "fast track" and site preparation has already begun.

Considerable work has been done by the design team since the Panel last saw this project and a number of interesting innovations have been introduced. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed these features, which include the introduction of the folded land form concept into Thurlow plaza, changes to the transition zone, improvements to the walkway and simplification of the Burrard Street edge. Staff are disappointed, however, with the lack of progress on the water-based master plan items, particularly at the west end of the site. Staff also have some concerns about the grand staircase area where a number of blank walls seem to be evolving. Feedback from the Panel is also sought with respect to the proposed Park Board restaurant at the edge of the park and the termination of the park at the plaza and the access tunnel area.

Russ Anthony (VCCEP) explained this is a critical time for the project and they have been working closely with the City and the Park Board. He noted the float planes have been temporarily relocated and he confirmed that VCCEP is committed to proceed with the Master Plan, the services for which are now being put in place. Marketing of the water-based development is expected to begin in the first half of next year.

Mark Whitehead, Architect, briefly reviewed how the design team has developed the project to its current stage and Mark Reddington, Architect, highlighted the guiding principles. Jim Brown, Architect, focused on the prior-to conditions of the preliminary approval and the Landscape Architect, Don Wuori, explained the ecological approach to the landscape plan. The design team responded to questions from the Panel.

The Panel was asked to focus its comments on the following:

- Grand staircase alignment, treatment of the seawall-to-street link, Park Board restaurant and its relationship to the adjacent performance area;
- The tunnel link from the seawall to the waterfront drop-off and Waterfront Road;
- Public views and plaza edges;
- The roof.



- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Resolution of the transition zone and the merging of the three components: the park, the plaza and the waterfront walkway access;
  - Consideration for the roof edge and whether it needs to be of consistent thickness all the way around the building, and/or whether the edge can be thinner;
  - Enhancement of the connection of the north plaza edge to the water;
  - Consideration for the glass elevator: either integrate it more with the building or make it a stronger element;
  - Consider simplifying and strengthening the southeast edge, including the entry area around the south wall;
  - Retail viability and the need to provide animation;
  - **The Roof:** The Panel considers the design team to be completely on the right track and urged that as many steps as possible be taken to strengthen the current approach, specifically enhancing the scale of where people connect with the roof.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel considered the project has come a long way since it was last reviewed, the discernible improvement being the introduction of the "weave", which is a key aspect of making the project more successful. The design team was encouraged to continue on the current course. The views and access to the roof from within the building were fully supported.

#### **Roof**

- The introduction of the weave is an excellent way of creating the opportunity for people to get closer to the green roof and to see and experience it. It would be really good if you could find a way for people to be about to go out on some of those depressed areas of the roof and actually step out onto a plaza right next to the green roof;
- The north rooftop patio seems too small a gesture relative to the size of the roof;
- There are a lot of wedges in the project where one edge comes to another; rather than just have them dying into one another there is need to understand how one surface runs into another;
- There are areas of the roof that are interesting and some that are awkward. The east face and the west side of the gathering space is very successful;
- The unsuccessful faces are the south face of the roof close to Burrard Street (facing Canada Place Way) which is foreign to the rest of the building;
- The southeast corner needs some consideration to make it read in a more interesting way;
- The south end of the western portion of the high roof looks like a gymnasium roof and needs further consideration; it might be more interesting if it was more angular than shown;
- The fold for the escalators on Canada Place Way is too much of a void as an expression;
- I find the green roof, even though it has been improved with the weave etc., has a relentlessness to it that is overwhelming. There is room to develop the material treatment of the roof so that it doesn't have to be completely 100 percent green. In some larger areas of the roof it could just be a roof and I think it could be developed further. The simplified edge along the east edge is good;

- The folded land form idea makes a lot more sense than before - it is much stronger and clearer. It really does seem to be a continuous form when viewed from the Coal Harbour end, even with the huge plaza in between;
- The strong edges are good and the weaves are fantastic to be able in certain places inside the building to be able to come across daylight and see the roof;
- The sections of the roof are very exciting. You can now experience the roof from within the building which is a great improvement;
- The public access up to the rooftop level is a great gesture;
- The area that still needs some design development in the southeast Burrard edge (the chalet roof). No problem with the "gymnasium" roof;
- The north-facing viewing deck area off the restaurant needs some design development including the stair and elevator up to that space - it is not well integrated into the design;
- Welcome the roof and the fact that it changes its position and sometimes can be seen from inside the building; also that there is a smaller version of the same kind of green roof on the plaza which may even be publicly accessible and demonstrate the ecology of what's on the roof;
- Pleased to learn you are testing the vegetation for the roof in an exposed waterfront location because that is a concern;
- One area that confuses me is the articulated valley along the roofline at Canada Place Way where it drops down. I understand it is offered as a view for the inside space meeting room level, but from Canada Place Way looking up it reads as a balcony, so perhaps you should make it one.

**Roof edge:**

- I feel like the roof edge has a heavy and dumb quality to it. Maybe its thickness should vary;
- The roof edge is far too thick. This is an area where it may be more interesting to move into a tectonic level where you actually see what the elements are that make it up;
- Support for the wood underneath the roof edge;
- My major concern is the detailed articulation of the roof edge. It is far too thick and clunky looking. It needs to be far more refined. On the original model some of the triangulated roof edges had more potential for elegance;
- I'm not sure the roof edges are too strong but they may not be strong enough from an engineering point of view. The edges may have to change;
- The roof edge lacks a certain elegance;
- The roof edge is the most important thing that has to be resolved at a finer level of detail. I feel strongly that the roof edge and overhangs on the south side should be different than the north side, particularly on the south side which is where you have the least overhang and where you need it the most. It needs to be reduced a lot and has to become more tectonic and refined.

**Northeast Elevation:**

The Panel strongly supported the amendments made to the northeast elevation, particularly the added drama at the corner. Introducing the public space at the corner was especially appreciated.

**Comments included:**

- The elevator has to be removed or relocated - It takes away from the simplicity of the gesture you've got going
- The glass elevator seems a bit incongruous with the rest of the building; not sure whether it's the location or the form meshing with the building;
- I think it either wants to be more prominent or more integrated, and I would prefer to see it go slightly above the roof;
- The elevator core on the northeast corner will help a lot to animate that corner;

- Concerned about the canted columns on the north face of the building. There is a risk the canted aspect of the supporting columns will fight with the angled profile of the roof in the northeast corner, particularly when you see it from the harbour;
- The move to pop up the northeast corner and create a public space there is fabulous;
- The elevator shaft element at the end is very good - it draws people down and gives them an obvious way to get up to that space without having to go into the building;
- The height of the northeast corner is great. If you can make that cantilever work in a thinner roof edge I think it will be quite successful;
- The fact that the roof has been elevated to accommodate a public restaurant and place for local people to enjoy this building is a big plus. Having the ability to go there without entering the restaurant would be good as well;
- There is need for more structural architectural emphasis on the northeast corner.

#### **Thurlow Plaza/Transition Area:**

- The continuum of the gathering space (plaza) and the tension created between the two forms is very positive. I would like to see that section stepped even more and widening the two north stairs or the gap between at least one of the edges, to maintain the impression of ultimately being able to get to the water;
- The stair feels mean in terms of the scale of the gesture of the space;
- The stair to the west should be grander;
- Encourage you to exploit the notion of getting people to the edge wherever possible and feeling the drama;
- Concern about the awkward geometry at the juncture of the grand stair, the restaurant, the walkway and the connection to the waterfront drop off; there is a lot happening that needs a sense of resolution, which has to occur at the conceptual level;
- I think the plaza is much more of a civic space now and I like the fact that it is defined by the building roof edges;
- Excited by the new plaza. It has been missing in the city for a long time. We have so many green spaces next to the waterfront but a real absence of a large, slightly more formal place that can be used for general public gatherings;
- the plan needs a bit of work where the new elements have been added, i.e., the Park Board restaurant, the tunnel and pop up forms as you make the transition to Harbour Green Park. These gestures need to be a bit bigger and woven into the landscape more;
- The transition from manicured park landscape to the wild rooftop form is too clear-cut and needs to overlap; The transition from natural landscape and man-made landscape should occur with soft rather than hard landscape;
- The main gathering space opens up too late in terms of its view to the west. I think it would be more successful if the embankment to the west of it came down sooner rather than as shown. I like what it is doing but I think it has the opportunity to open up more down at the northern end of it and I think that should be considered;
- There should be consideration for where ten thousand people will spill out - one of the problems with the gathering space is that its connections to other spaces are too minor;
- The stairs that connect it are tiny and I think there should be further consideration of how they spill down to each of the areas that surrounds there;
- The move to treat the Thurlow terrace as an accessible green roof over top of the restaurant which in turn animates the edges of the plaza, is a very good move;
- It is very successful in terms of the long view as you approach the project from Harbour Green and the waterfront walkway where you can see the green merge with the roof. Unfortunately that's the only place where pedestrians will experience the green roof at eye level;
- As much as I appreciate the introduction of the green roof over the restaurant and animating the east edge of the Thurlow plaza, there is also something lost in losing the fold of the roof coming down and meeting grade;

- The retail at the waterfront north side of the public plaza facing onto the waterfront and diverging public access to either side works well. Raising the northeast corner is also positive;
- The form added to the west side of the plaza is a great continuation of the main roof and I think it just makes that plaza what it is. It is a real civic place and a plaza - not just a vast open space;
- Concerned about the retail space tucked underneath there and the pop-up of the end which blocks getting down to the water - hard to see how that retail will work;
- Support the idea of the park and plaza being separate;
- The grand staircase/seawall/ Park Board restaurant/ tunnel area is the weakest point. All the elements are there but it maybe needs another step back to the basics as to how the plaza relates to the park and whether the restaurant is at the right place etc.;
- No concern about public view/plaza edges encroachment. The containment there will make it quite an exciting space in terms of the restaurant, the restaurant edge and wedge, and the main building itself. It will be a great space and the gestures made on the plaza level I really quite like;
- My primary concern is in the vicinity of where Harbour Green Park meets the plaza and meets the mini folded roof;
- Question the Park Board restaurant having a green roof. It should be part of the park and not taking an idea that belongs to the convention centre and doing yet another mini version of it;
- I like the fact that the restaurant has moved inboard to the circulation system but the circulation system needs to maintain a generous scale given the number of people being moved down and to the park;
- The kink in the two curves of the waterfront walkway is a problem and it is an opportunity to create something that gives meaning to the change in geometry;'
- It is really important that the access to the floating docks be well resolved. As well as telling a story about the ecosystem of the roof there is another story to tell about the fish habitat and you are not really making much of it;
- Retail is not the solution for animating everything and I don't think that much retail will be successful;
- The retail at the end of the plaza should be reconsidered;
- The terminus to Harbour Green is fairly clumsy;
- The roof of the Park Board restaurant should be a different form in contrast to the convention centre roof;
- Concerns about the tunnel link to the waterfront edges. It needs to be very bright, secure and safe for people to use at any time. If there is some way to bring natural light into it in a continual way it could emphasize that there is an underworld to that plaza. It needs some continuous daylight so people feel safe;
- Pubic views at the plaza: the rising escarpment that terminates in retail could fold down a little sooner;
- There is a need for more surfaces like the large staircase which connects the plaza towards the water, or larger staircases;
- There is not enough emphasis to connecting the end of the plaza down to the water;
- I prefer the Park Board restaurant where it is now, mainly because it gives preference for pedestrians on the walkway.
- I would encourage you making the underground tunnel more normal.
- The tunnel circulation is a very major component and it still doesn't feel like it's part of the design conversation quite yet.

**South Façade:**

- Great improvement on the southeast façade especially the south façade which seems to have some very strong forms created by the roof and a somewhat longhouse expression on the south edge which is appropriate

- The vertical circulation on the south side of the building where the building connects to the city needs a lot of development and simplification. It looks too busy or not coordinated enough.

**Walkway Edges:**

- The walkway on the north edge is getting better but I still think there needs to be some animation in the middle of that stretch as you go past the building ... seems like a long stretch where nothing is happening;
- The lower water edge needs more development. Concerns about retail viability there;

**Street End Views:**

- I think we're talking about a minor obstruction and I don't have any concerns with what I see.

**The Skin:**

- Good direction on the skin - look forward to seeing it at the complete stage.
- I like what I see in the glazing. There is a great "kit of parts" approach to what is being proposed;
- Not sure about the details of the skin - it is not very exciting. The skin and the glass walls of this building are very important at a pedestrian level;
- I know there is a strong desire to use as much wood as possible in the project and wonder if wood was considered for the walls;
- With regard to the skin, I agree it would be good to push that skin a little bit further in terms of its technology - not necessarily expensive but to search for solutions that might speak more about the building as a whole and specifically with regard to green sustainable solutions;
- There are opportunities at the south end of the building for double skins or natural ventilation or greenhouse structures, etc. The skin could change around the building.

**Burrard Street:**

- The Burrard Street end needs further work. The square apron that represents the entrance is fairly predictable and there are other approaches that would have greater interest. As well, where the apron spills down to street level needs some further consideration to make it successful.

**Building Penetration:**

- Hopefully there will be lots of entrances to the building; the idea of being able to penetrate from the inside to outside is key to a successful public building.