

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 3, 2010

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden (Chair)
Robert Barnes
Jeff Corbett
Jane Durante
David Godin
Jim Huffman
Oliver Lang
Vladimir Mikler
Maurice Pez
Scott Romses
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
James Cheng
Steve McFarlane

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	4480 Oak Street
2.	2250 Commercial Drive
3.	8498 Kerr Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Haden called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 4480 Oak Street
 DE: Rezoning
 Description: Proposal to rezone this CD-1 site to permit demolition of the A Wing of former Shaughnessy Hospital, and development of a new Children's Acute Care and Diagnostic Services building; a family-stay and respite centre; and a daycare centre; totaling an increase in floor area of 302,000 sq. ft.; along with a long-term master plan for the remainder of the precinct.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Architect: DYS Architecture
 Owner: Provincial Health Services Authority
 Review: First
 Delegation: Ron Yuen, DYS Architecture
 Mark Vaughan, Vaughan Landscape Architects
 Alan Grossert, Provincial Health Services Authority
 Staff: Sailen Black and Ian Cooper

EVALUATION: Rezoning: Support (10-0) Master Plan: Non-Support (4-6)

- **Introduction:** Ian Cooper, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for amendments to the existing CD-1 By-law for Children's and Women's Hospital at 4500 Oak Street. The rezoning application is to amend the maximum height limit, increase maximum permitted density and to increase the height limits in two edge areas from zero meters up to a height that permits the buildings that are proposed.

Mr. Cooper described the Master Plan Design Guidelines noting that it is a multi-stage process of rebuilding the hospital complex over the next twenty years. The Guidelines will provide guidance for future development and future rezoning for the entire campus. They will replace the 1999 Master Plan adopted by Council as a guide for future development. The intent is that they would be endorsed by Council and would be a filter through which all future development would be compared including the present rezoning application. Mr. Cooper asked the Panel to review and comment on the Guidelines and the long term physical plan for redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Cooper described the rezoning application noting the first phase of renewal is the hospital plant, the acute care wing, the north central part of the site and the demolishing of some part of the existing Shaughnessy wing. A daycare will be included on the southeast corner of the site which is a public benefits requirement from a previous rezoning on the site and required in this rezoning. The proposed location will require increasing the height limit from zero to permit building which opens up a previous "no-build" zone. A family respite centre residence (likely a Ronald McDonald House) is proposed on the southern edge of the site and built into the existing berm on West 32nd Avenue. This will also require an increase in the height limit from zero to permit building and opening up a previous "no-build" zone to a building.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal described the context for the surrounding area. He noted that the design of the buildings is at the preliminary stage and will probably go through a number of modifications. He noted that the following covers Phases 1, 2 and 3. The Daycare will be a 2-storey building with the intent to use part of the grassy berm to mediate between the new facility and the longstanding residential along Heather Street. The setback would be reduced to 56 feet from Heather Street. A Day and Respite Centre will be located on the south edge for which the proposed height is up to 4-storeys and the setback will be reduced to 39 feet. Demolition of the A wing of the Shaughnessy block will also occur. The Acute Care and Diagnostic Services will be an 8-storey building. Phase 4 through 7 will include a Master Plan for long-term redevelopment of the site and will eventually reduce the built footprint, expand the area of green and open spaces, introduce a new road connection from Willow to Oak Streets and a complete neighbourhood wellness walkway around the perimeter. The heritage buildings including the Shaughnessy and Mental Health buildings and the Power Plant are addressed in the Master Plan. Different options for district and renewable energy are under discussion and study and the size and location has yet to be determined.

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

- Does the Panel support surface parking as proposed.
- Introduction of the new connection from Oak Street to Willow.
- Interface between new development and existing single-family streets.

Mr. Cooper and Mr. Sailen took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Ron Yuen, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the occupancy of the Acute building won't take place until about 2016 and that there will be seven phases in total in the twenty-five year Master Plan. In terms of the phases, the demolition of Shaughnessy A wing will be in the first phase along with the Ronald McDonald House and a Daycare Centre. The children's Acute Care and Diagnostic Services Centre will be Phase Two and renovations to the existing Children's and Women's building will happen in Phase Three. The remaining phases are not included in this current rezoning.

Mr. Yuen noted that the wayfinding is difficult currently and as a result they are looking at a new location for the entry. He described the overall plans for site noting that it is not a building design at the moment but strictly a rezoning massing.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Improve the integration of the Master Plan with adjacent institutional neighbours to enhance the sense of campus and provide an enhanced pedestrian permeability.
 - Consider integrating at least part of the Wellness Walk in the interior of the site.
 - Consider higher building heights if this strategy reduced site planning conflicts, enhanced the over all environment and could allow the possibility of additional uses including revenue uses.
 - Ensure a leading edge long term sustainability strategy is clearly embedded in the Master Plan.
 - Ensure a strategy for current and future effective transit links is embedded in the Master Plan as much as possible. In the short term should consider minimizing the transit isolation of the Daycare.

- Consider exchanging the Children's Play Area and the Landmark Wellness Garden. This could include the consideration of integrating the Daycare and the Patient Play Area.
 - Consider integration of cultural spaces.
 - Ensure a clear, inviting and comfortable entry sequence is central to all phases of the work to Women's and Children's.
 - Ensure there is a hierarchy of outdoor spaces from large to intimate.
 - Enhance the visibility and directness of the link to the new building from the Oak Street drop off especially during Phase 1.
 - Enhance the clarity of the intended overall experiential strategy as a means of strengthening the guidelines and making it more likely that they will be actually followed. This should include consideration of scale of future buildings and landscape.
 - Explore and represent alternative strategies **if** any or all buildings slated for demolished do not in fact get demolished.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the rezoning proposal (height, density and use) but did not support the Master Plan for the proposal.

The Panel supported the height, density and use and agreed that it was a complicated and extensive program and thought that having the massing stepping up to eight storeys in the middle of the site was a positive move. However, a couple of Panel members thought that in the short term there might be a deficiency of open space. Most of Panel the members thought there could be more height in the buildings to make it less crowded on the site. One Panel member suggested having a landmark building in the centre of the site to take advantage of the left over space. The Panel felt the overwhelming complexity of the phasing issues had resulted in a solution that has a slightly suburban feel to it. They also thought the desire lines across the entire site are really ignorable if you are not going to the hospital and as well the site will feel isolated from the rest of the city.

Several Panel members thought the relationship between Oak Street and the front door was weak and confusing. One Panel member suggested shifting the entry plaza south and east where the temporary entrance is currently located. They also thought the pedestrian links to the front door needed to be improved from transit on Oak Street. One Panel member noted the vehicle connection also didn't work especially at the junction as it was confusing as to where to go to park. One Panel member suggested a more organized parking structure that would use less surface space and give up more green space to the neighbours. Another Panel member suggested improving the functionality of the drop off area to make it stronger.

Several Panel members thought taking the entry of Heather Street was a positive move. They also thought closing Heather Street and using West 33rd Avenue was a good idea.

The Panel thought the relationship between the neighbours and the respite centre was a logical transition although they did have concerns regarding the daycare location. Several Panel members noted that it was a long walk from transit and suggested swapping locations with the healing garden. One Panel member thought the building form seemed pinched at the Willow Street end. Another Panel member thought the children's playground should switch locations with the wellness area to be closer to the daycare and hospice centre so that children would be better able to use it.

The Panel agreed that creating a foreground of landscaping would make for a nice transition from the site to the neighbours. Several Panel members suggested adding in additional small and larger courtyards to allow for outdoor space for the patients and family members use. The Panel thought the Wellness Walkway was a great idea with several Panel members suggesting adding in some respite areas with one Panel member

suggesting additional seating and wider sidewalks. Another Panel member would like to see the walkway through the site so that pedestrians are not just walking along the street. Moving the walkway more into the green space would be more appealing. Another Panel member suggested there be some sort of cultural space for the patient's use be included in the plan with a couple of Panel members suggesting the addition of a theatre space. One Panel member noted that by creating more space around the buildings there was an opportunity to create higher buildings and to make the site less institutional.

The Panel supported LEED™ Gold for the proposal but a couple of Panel members were concerned with a lack of details being included in the Master Plan and suggested it was important to include them because of the long time frame and the possibility of other teams taking on the other phases. It was suggested that the energy components be included in the master plan and having a facility that will reduce energy requirements.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Yuen noted that the rezoning is over three phases. He said that since health care is always changing it may not be the current proposal that forms the plans in the future. He thanked the Panel for their comments.

2. Address:	2250 Commercial Drive
DE:	414184
Description:	Reuse major parts of existing masonry 2 and 3 storey building which currently consists of a movie theatre to become a 5 storey mixed use building with retail/commercial on ground floor with 4 storeys of residential on top.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Image Development Inc.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Francois Marchand, Ankenman Marchand Architects Mary Chan Yip, DMG Landscape Architects
Staff:	Ann McLean

EVALUATION:

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the proposal following a rezoning. The Urban Design Panel reviewed the rezoning proposal on September 23, 2009. The site is located at the north east corner of Commercial Drive and East 7th Avenue, just north of the Broadway and Commercial Street transit hub. The proposal is to add two storeys to an existing three storey retail and office building.

Ms. McLean noted that the rezoning changed the site from a C2-C zone to CD-1. The main reason for the rezoning was to increase the maximum permitted height from 45 feet to 63 feet as this will enable the addition of two floors while retaining the existing structure. The renovated building will retain commercial use on the ground floor and provide residential on the four floors above. The existing cinema will not be retained. The existing building contains two floors of underground parking. There are currently seven commercial units at grade with frontages in the twenty foot range.

The renovations will create commercial storefronts closer to the sidewalk with narrower structural columns. The 58 units above grade include a mix of one and two bedroom and studio units. The new upper levels will contain two-storey units. A significant portion of the existing brick cladding will be retained to satisfy LEED™ requirements. Additional materials include both corrugated and lapped metal siding.

At the rezoning review in September 2009 the Panel suggested design development to the following:

- Consider increasing the weather protection along Commercial Drive;
- Consider more patio space on the sidewalks for coffee shops and restaurants;
- Design development to the barrel element at the corner; and
- Consider an indoor/outdoor amenity space.

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

- Has the proposed development addressed the Panel's earlier comments?
 - At this complete development application stage has the integration of existing and new materials advanced appropriately for this context?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tim Ankenman, Architects, said they were excited to be able to repurpose the building as it is only twenty-five years old. Part of the

negotiations that happened at the public hearing was to move the project from LEED™ Silver to LEED™ Gold. They were also asked to retain 75% of the building's structure and another requirement was for storm water retention. In order to retain 75% of the structure they had to keep the brick façade which will be repointed and cleaned. Mr. Ankenman noted that when they came to the Panel previously there were two basic issues. One was the way they had treated the streetscape. They have now set back some of the store fronts to allow for an outdoor patio area. All the store front colors and materials will vary as well as the canopies to add an interesting texture to the street. The other concern was the barrel element on the corner which has been downplayed with some floating elements. There is also a secondary layering on the corner to announce the entrance. There will be a living green wall along the lanescape.

Mary Chan Yip, Landscape Architect, noted that the concept hadn't changed much but they had refined the planters to allow for more soil depths and there will be terraced landscaping along the lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to ensure the durability of the living green wall;
 - Consider utilization of part of the parking for storage, bike parking or other uses; and
 - Review the use of the Beech tree at the roof level.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant for making the changes the Panel had suggested at the previous review.

The Panel again commended the applicant and the owner for reusing the building rather than demolishing it. The Panel agreed that the design changes to the retail units would make them more viable. One Panel member was concerned with the northern most retail unit as there is currently an exhaust vent from the underground parking which could make the area a home for street people.

Several Panel members lamented the loss of the theatre and job space. The Panel thought the proposed mixed uses had been very well handled and will be a good addition to the neighbourhood. One Panel member suggested making the stairway a primary mode of circulation given that it will be a five storey building. One Panel member didn't endorse the units with bedrooms hidden behind a hallway.

Most of the Panel liked the landscaping plans with one Panel member being concerned with the type of plantings being used and suggested plants with deeper roots. Another Panel member was concerned that the Beech tree on the upper floor which might get too big over time for the space. It was also suggested that more greenery could be added to the lane.

The Panel supported the materials and thought they would be well integrated into the building. They noted that LEED™ Gold was supportable. One Panel member noted that there were too many parking stalls considering transit is right on the street and suggested converted some to storage space and bike storage.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman thanked the Panel noting that it was a far better project because of their comments.

3. Address:	8498 Kerr Street
DE:	414223
Description:	To develop this site with a 77 unit multiple dwelling (townhouses).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Raymond Letkeman Architects
Owner:	Parklane
Review:	First
Delegation:	Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Chris Sterry, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Kevin Shoemaker, Polygon Norma Shearing, Parklane
Staff:	Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Pat St. Michel, Planner, introduced the proposal for the first development parcel in the East Fraser Lands. The area is comprised of 126 acres of previous industrial land, much of which was the White Pines Sawmill that closed in 2001. Ms. Michel noted that the site extends from Kerr Street to Boundary Road and from S.E. Marine Drive to the riverfront.

The East Fraser Lands were undertaken by Parklane Homes in 2004 as a majority landowner and they have seen it through a major planning and public process from policy statement to the Official Development Plan to rezoning. The process included many public engagement events, open houses, workshops and meetings with staff and citizens of the East Fraser Lands Committee. James Cheng Architects and PWL Partnership were the key consultants through most of the process that resulted in the form of development and East Fraser Lands Guidelines that were part of the rezoning approved by Council.

The East Fraser Lands Official Development Plan was approved by Council in December 2006. East Fraser Lands is envisioned as a complete community that will ultimately have about 7,750,000 square feet of development consisting of:

- 7,225,000 square feet of residential;
- 250,000 square feet of neighbourhood serving shopping and restaurants;
- 270,000 square feet of 'flex use' including offices and live-work;
- 25.2 acres of park including a continuous riverfront walk and two major ecological corridors;
- a community centre;
- two schools, and
- childcare facilities, and other public amenities.

The Comprehensive Design Guidelines were approved as part of the rezoning of Area 1 and Area 2 of East Fraser Lands. The guidelines include:

- public realm plans for all streets and public spaces;
 - site-wide sustainability strategies including rainwater management, shoreline biology, songbird strategy;
 - illustrative built form and design characteristics for each development parcel;
 - architectural and landscape guidelines;
 - preliminary public art plan;
 - heritage statement of significance and implementation plan;
-

- in advance of subsequent City rezoning policy changes, the East Fraser Lands committed site-wide to achieve LEED™ Gold and Built Green Gold in its buildings; and
- buildings in East Fraser Lands will ultimately be served by a neighbourhood energy utility, with provisions being made to link in to the system when it comes on line.

There are three neighbourhoods in East Fraser Lands; the western, the central, and the eastern neighbourhood. The three neighbourhoods are defined and separated by two eco-corridors that extend and connect from the Fraser River up to the existing communities to the north.

The intent was to build a complete community from day one starting with the shopping and higher density buildings of the central neighbourhood, Area 1, which was rezoned in September 2008. It is the densest, most mixed use neighbourhood with building forms ranging from 3 to 24 storeys. However, despite best intentions, subsequent to rezoning, the downturn in the economy made securing development financing challenging for the higher density concrete buildings and project scales of this neighbourhood.

The decision was made to proceed with rezoning Area 2, an area of more modestly scaled, largely wood-frame projects, for which market conditions are more favourable. Area 2 allows approximately 1,562,500 square feet of residential use. Buildings range from 3 to 12 storeys, with building heights increasing as they approach the Kinross Corridor and the central neighbourhood. Council approved the rezoning of Area 2 in January 2010. It is here that 8498 Kerr Street is located and consists of two parcels of about 3.5 acres in total with a 0.33 acre of public neighbourhood park running between the two parcels.

The neighbourhood park will be part of a public pedestrian corridor connecting to Marine Way and the existing Champlain Heights neighbourhood to the north with potentially a connection across the CP rail-line if a crossing agreement can be struck in the future.

Seventy-seven townhouse units are proposed in 15 buildings, with a floor space total of about 136,000 square feet. The townhouses are organized along mews that provide access to garages integrated into each unit. The southern mews also serves to provide maintenance and disabled access to the mid level terrace of the park.

It is a sloping site with approximately a 10m grade change north to south. It is bounded by Kent Avenue to the south, which runs parallel to the existing CPR rail-line, and steeply sloping Kerr Street to the west. Both Kerr Street and Kent Avenue will be significantly upgraded as part of the implementation of East Fraser Lands, and both will offer bike lanes fully separated from traffic, as well as be part of the future bus transit network.

Several properties fronting on Marine Drive and cutting into the development parcel were not acquired or rezoned as part of Area 2. As a result, future Road E to the north of the parcels will be configured with a turnabout dimensioned to accommodate turning fire-trucks.

The seventy-seven units proposed are three bedrooms, some with an additional flex room, ranging in size from about 1400 to 2000 square feet. The rezoning form of development for these parcels anticipated three to four storey townhomes described as a 'low-scale hillside community, accentuating the sloping topography'. The preliminary building forms were flat-roofed with partial fourth floors and upper level roof decks.

Typically parking was provided in garages, in tandem and single configurations, with a few double car garages, all accessed from exterior private drives. Fundamental to the concept

was that the private drives be 'enlivened by dwelling entries and substantially planted to enhance livability and to create the feeling of a small scale, well treed street or mews.'

Key aspects of the guidelines that apply to this site include reference to the industrial past of the area, the working river, and northwest modernism, and the simple forms and structures common to all of these.

From a sustainability perspective, there is a rainwater management system along each mews. The songbird strategy has been recognized in the plantings north/south in the semi-public space, the park, and the spaces between buildings. The buildings will meet Built Green Gold.

Modifications from the preliminary form of development at rezoning include:

- A reduction in number of units from 82 to 77 and a slight reduction in floor space of about 5,000 square feet (from 140,243 square feet to 135,995 square feet). The rezoning allows for modest re-allocation of area between parcels.
- Change from flat roof form and partial 4th floor with roof decks to three level townhouses with a full upper level, and sawtooth roof forms. The sawtooth roof form draws upon the industrial mill buildings that previously occupied the site.
- Modification of typical unit design along the lower level mews, including a shift to primarily double car garages on the south side of the mews. However this results in most dwelling units not having direct access from the unit to the mews.
- An increase in effective park space by agreeing to statutory row on the sidewalks and steps serving the townhouses, thereby eliminating the need to duplicate the steps in the park.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought with respect to the townhouses on the following:

- The architectural expression:
 - Repetition across the site.
 - Use of colour.
- The quality and experience of the lower level mews:
 - Extensive double garages and lack of dwelling presence and connection to the mews.
 - The relationship of double garage end units to Kerr, neighbourhood park, Road E
- The response to the topography of the cross-slope buildings 1, 9, and 10
 - Building 10: overall height; height of unit terraces in relation to park and walkway; resolution of grade change in the last unit
 - Building 1: all one level resulting in extensive grade change at Road E
 - Building 9: all one level, single roof form
- Kent Avenue frontage: the effect on the public realm and sense of entry of all dwelling entry stairs parallel to Kent

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Kevin Shoemaker, Polygon, noted that the project will be Built Green Gold. Ray Letkeman, Architect, further described the proposal noting that one of the principles of the design guidelines was the reference to the history of the site. They decided to use a similar form that referenced the old industrial form in the buildings making and the units on Kent Street twenty feet wide. Originally they had a sawtooth expression on all the roofs but pulled them back to get more variety. Mr. Letkeman described the architectural details, materials and color palette for the townhouses noting that they attempted to do more with the architecture. He also noted

that because of the grade change they have been able to add basements to the townhouses.

Chris Sterry, Landscape Architect, described the site planning and landscaping design noting that it had been developed to be consistent with the principles that were established at rezoning. Pedestrian permeability was one of the principles that were developed at the rezoning and it consists of a lower lane that will be connected to the park on a level grade. There are breaks in the buildings with a visual connection to the lane. As well there will be some urban agricultural components within the development along with a rainwater management system. There are rain gardens being planned with a continuous gravel trench along the mews. The songbird strategy was also something that came out at rezoning and there will be locations within the site that will have specially selected plants to attract birds. He noted that there will be railings, layered plantings to define garden spaces and breaks in the mews with places to sit. There will also be continuous trees along the mews and plantings in front of the unit entries. The park is a narrow space and on a steep slope and will be developed in three platforms. There are several amenities planned for the park including a children's play area, gathering space with harvest table and urban agriculture components.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Increase variety and intensity of colour with the intention of enhancing the visible unit differentiation.
 - Design development to the south side of the mews to increase the visual quality including giving consideration to increased transparency, quality and variety in detailing of garage doors and revised roof forms.
 - Design development to building 1 to improve the grade cut condition to the east.
 - Design development to building 10 to improve grade relationship and resolution of south end of building.
 - Consider increasing the number of roof decks to take advantage of the views and sun conditions.
 - Design development to enhance private outdoor space for as many units as possible.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a very good example of row housing.

The Panel thought the architecture referenced the industrial history of the site but did it in a fresh and contemporary way. The panel supported the repetition of the roof forms, but encouraged the applicant to find opportunities to introduce some variety, or find 'moments of particularity'. The Panel agreed that it was appropriate to turn the townhouses in the three blocks running cross-slope.

The Panel thought the overall the design vocabulary worked well but noted that some of the units would be more attractive if they there were decks on the south side. The south orientation and views should be take advantage of. The Panel supported the configuration of unit stairs parallel to Kent Street and thought it was an appropriate response to the grade and a reference to industrial loading docks.

The Panel liked the saw tooth theme noting that it speaks of the previous industrial area. The saw tooth roof forms could further reference historical sawtooth forms as a means of introducing light to the upper level. Several Panel members thought the flat roofs could be

improved with the addition of skylights or roof decks to make for more variety of unit types.

The panel thought the cross-slope buildings were important counterpoint to the east-west buildings and were an appropriate orientation to the park and Kerr Street. Some of the Panel liked the Building 10 units but most felt it still needed further work. They did agree that the south end unit needed further resolution. One Panel member thought building 10 blocked access and light into the park. Most panel members thought the cross-slope buildings should step and terrace more with the slope. It was suggested that these buildings would be an appropriate place to depart from the sawtooth roof forms. One panel member suggested that revisiting the unit and parking configuration on these buildings would help free up ability to respond to slope.

The Panel felt the colour palette needed some work as they thought the colors were muddy and needed to be clearer and more vibrant. Colour could be used to counter the repetition, enhance variety and unit distinction. One Panel member thought the brick was unusual and didn't seem industrial.

The Panel had some concerns with the livability in the south mews and thought the quality and experience could be improved. They noted that more design development could take place with the type and quality of garage doors or perhaps with the addition of windows. One Panel member noted that the garage doors gave a more suburban expression to the townhouses. Other Panel members thought single garages with some outside parking, or single garage doors would be an improvement, and that further work was needed to break up the extensive façade of double garages. Several panel members mentioned the long, low sloping roof forms over the garages and suggested that a different roof form should be explored. Several panel members suggested more use of pavers would enhance the mews, and that trees with large canopies are critical.

One panel member thought it was a lost opportunity to not provide lock-off suites, or some single level units. Another panel member suggested further consideration be given to passive solar design.

The Panel thought the landscaping was well done in breaking up the hard and soft surfaces. They also felt it responded well to the topography of the site. Several Panel member thought there needed to be more private outdoor space for the units. One panel member commented on the richness of experience provided by the cross-grain of the east/west mews and the north/south park and open space.

With respect to the park, the panel thought it was a good response to the topography. One member commented that the six outdoor rooms created in the terraces of the park were a very pleasurable way to address the slope.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Shoemaker thanked the Panel noting there were a few things that they hadn't considered with the design for the project.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.