

Toronto Community  
Housing Corporation  
931 Yonge Street  
Toronto, ON  
M4W 2H2

Development Division  
www.torontohousing.ca



Toronto Community Housing Design Review Panel  
Minutes of Meeting  
June 2, 2016

<b>Present:</b> Leslie Gash, TCHC Andre D'Elia, Superkul Alan Waterhouse, University of Toronto Roland Rom Colthoff, RAW Design (sat out Block 16N) Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consulting Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy (sat out Living Laneway) Gunta Mackars, Stantec Antoine Beliaeff, Metrolinx (absent for 32 & part of 26)	<b>Regrets:</b> Sybil Wa, Diamond Schmitt Architects David Leinster, The Planning Partnership David Anselmi, Canada Lands Company Paul Bailey, York University Shirley Blumberg, KPMB Architects
<b>City of Toronto Staff:</b> Ran Chen, City Planning Jennifer Renaud, City Planning Graig Uens (present for Alexandra Park only)	<b>Recording Secretary:</b> Joanna Kolakowska

## Project Reviews

The following projects were reviewed by the TCHC Design Review Panel on June 2, 2016:

- **Regent Park Phase 3 Living Laneway (1<sup>st</sup> Review)**
- **Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 16N SPA (2<sup>nd</sup> Review)**
- **Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 32 SPA (3<sup>rd</sup> review)**
- **Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 26 SPA (2<sup>nd</sup> review)**
- **Alexandra Park Phase 1B SPA (2<sup>nd</sup> review)**

### 1.0 Project Review - Regent Park Phase 3 Laneway

#### 1.1 Briefing Package

A briefing package with the following was provided to panel members one week prior to the meeting:

**Regent Park Phase 3 Living Laneway (May 26, 2016)**

## **1.2 Project Information**

Project type: Living Laneway

Design Team: Brook McIlroy

Presenters: Jessica Hawes & Calvin Brook (Brook McIlroy)

Review: First Review

Conflict of Interest: Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy (sat out from panel)

## **1.3 Matters for Consideration**

The project was introduced by Remo Agostino (Daniels) & Kelly Skeith (TCHC). They described the location of the laneway as a connection between Blocks 16 and 17, north and south, with ownership shared by TCHC and owners of condo. The design team was directed to look at the lane as having its own character while maintaining the service function for the adjacent development. The consideration of the laneway as its own space is in direct response to concerns raised by DRP in reviews of block 16/17. Unfortunately, it was not possible to present all blocks at the same meeting but some changes to Block 17N have been made to contribute to the laneway. All architects for the four adjacent developments were present to hear feedback and site plans for upcoming south blocks will take into account any comments from the panel for SPA submissions.

Calvin Brook & Jessica Hawes presented the Living Laneway design on behalf of Brook McIlroy. It was developed as a result of collaborative meetings with the architects designing the four surrounding buildings/blocks. The development of the project included an examination of open spaces in the neighbourhood, public amenity spaces, food programs and community gardens. The network of nearby laneways along with the public streets was looked at as a web that holds the public amenity spaces together. As the proposed laneway connects to the City's proposed bike network, the design team also embraced the idea of the laneway as a space that will contribute to the city through bike culture. The combined effect of public amenity and bike hub merged into the "living lane" concept.

Throughout the design process, the aim was to allow the servicing function to continue but to consolidate services at either end, opening up the mid-block for "something different". The central area becomes prioritized for pedestrian and bicycle activity while still allowing for a vehicle to pass if required. One key objective was to animate this space by placing building functions fronting the lane. Opportunities have been identified to build in TCHC's operating unit office, as well as live/work units, to face the laneway. Programmatic elements such as bike rooms and repair areas have been pulled out onto the lane in order to draw people into the lane.

The character of the lane is further envisioned as a combination of "glazed pavilions" (bike rooms) and "animators" (residential, retail/commercial, live work etc.), over-laid with big trees, sculptural bike parking, seating spaces, and catenary lighting to contribute to a festive character.

## **1.4 Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects for Consideration**

The design team was commended for presenting an exciting project that could turn into a beloved place in the community. The project was noted to be 75% of the way to being successfully designed with only some issues requiring a bit more careful consideration. The panel would like to see this strategy extended to the rest of Regent Park, and the City at large if possible.

The following is the feedback and recommendations of the panel on the matters for consideration. Unless otherwise noted, the following is the consensus opinion of the panel.

**Vehicle Access** – Several panel members felt the design might have been a little conservative with the use of bollards for vehicle control. It was noted that these could be added after the fact but will not likely look as good as designed up front. Alternatively, shared traffic could be an informal arrangement that is successful and it could be an alternative to bollards if other design cues are used.

It was noted, that some thought should be given to the design in terms of discouraging parking. It would be unfortunate to have this space become “overflow parking” for the nearby aquatic centre.

**“Eyes on the Street” Concept** – Some panel members felt that this could be a great way to connect to the street network, as there are examples from old Regent Park where these connections did not exist. . The design could consider the possibility closing off some portions of the laneway to support street parties or other similar events.

**Relationship to Adjacent Development** – The idea of the bike storage spaces in the adjacent condominiums was felt to be a strong one. The design of these bike pavilions should consider some visual permeability onto the street. The laneway project creates more pressure on the adjacent buildings to provide more animated facades.

**Seating Areas** – More benches are desirable in this space. Some though should be given to how they could be designed to have more than one function and prevent the lane from becoming a “hang out” space.

**Soft Landscaping** - The trees are a critical component of this and should be carefully considered in terms of the location and technical details that will allow viability. In general, it was felt that more soft landscaping would be desirable.

## 1.5 Panel’s Directions

Consideration for the following key issues should be contemplated:

1. The details of the design need to be considered more carefully as this will determine the success of the project. The narrow space will present some challenges and should be factored in. Elements such as lighting and signage should be explored further.
2. Investigate the potential for making the bicycle rooms act as vestibules into the laneways. Connecting the adjacent buildings to the lane through these rooms could help animate the lane and allow people to appropriate the space.
3. Consider the use of knock-down bollards, which will allow for sporadic vehicle access while maintaining an “outdoor living room” for the majority of the time where kids could play safely without vehicular traffic.
4. Provide more multi-functional seating space.
5. Examine the use of trees and soft landscape further.

6. Explore the design of the connecting points on the far ends. Where does the lane extend to and/or how does it terminate? If possible, work to draw people into the lane with design detailing. Contact City Council regarding putting in a crossing signal at River Street.
7. Carefully consider programming the space but leave room for appropriation of space by the community.

## **2.0 Project Review - Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 16N SPA**

### **2.1 Briefing Package**

A briefing package with the following was provided to panel members one week prior to the meeting:

#### **Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 16N (May 26, 2016)**

### **2.2 Project Information**

Project type: Site Plan Application

Design Team: RAW Design & Thinc Design

Presenters: Erica Govan & Carsten Liesenberg (RAW Design), Peter Heyblom (Thinc Design)

Review: Second Review

Conflict of Interest: Roland Rom Colthoff, RAW Design (sat out from panel)

### **2.3 Matters for Consideration**

The project was introduced by Kelly Skeith (TCHC). The design has been re-framed from the presentation about a year ago. TCHC is required to replace 300 units at grade and the design of this building aims to provide a significant number of grade related units. The building is located in the northwest corner of Oak Street and Sumach Street and is strongly influenced by its connection to the park and contributing to a consistent streetscape along Sumach Street with block 12 and adjacent block 17N.

Erica Govan and Carsten Liesenberg presented the overall design highlighting the consolidation of common program/utility spaces to the underground which allowed for more at-grade units as well as amenity space and a TCHC Operations Unit (OU) office on the ground plane. The OU office and bike parking are designed to face the lane for animation.

The building plan allows for a residential entrance and small amenity space in the NW corner of the building with the service loading and parking positioned at the interior. This allows for the positioning of grade related units along the perimeter – along Sumach, Oak and Tubman. These units have access to exterior space with vertical separation between shared outdoor amenity and private yards. In total the

building has 182 residential units. Of those units, 27 are at-grade, another 15 are four or five bedroom and about 40% are three bedroom units.

Formally, the building massing is playing off of the stepped condition of the building. The façade aims to take on a playful character by incorporating splashes of colour.

Peter Heyblom presented the landscape design which works in context with block 17; it is expressed through similar streetscape treatment, which follows the Phase 3 Context Plan and urban design guidelines. The sidewalk is set back with a planting strip adjacent Sumach and Oak. The entrance ways are combined as much as possible to allow for maximum planting. There is a provision for bike racks on the corner of Oak and Tubman which allows for the creation of a more prominent area at Sumach and Oak with paving and seating. The amenity terrace is split into “four rooms” to allow for variety of use – wide long seats, planting beds, community gardens and play area.

Ran Chen from City Planning clarified with the team whether sufficient shadow studies had been done with respect to the position of the outdoor amenity space. The design team confirmed that the amenity area is positioned to get quite a bit of sunlight.

## 2.4 Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects for Consideration

The panel commended the design team on the planning of the building stating that it is very thoughtful with the programmatic elements having been well laid out.

The following is the feedback and recommendations of the panel on the matters for consideration. Unless otherwise noted, the following is the consensus opinion of the panel.

**Sidewalk Separation** – The panel pointed out that in time, Sumach Street could become a busy collector street. It was felt by the panel that this should be taken into account in the design of at-grade units. Currently these units have the same setbacks on Sumach as the other streets which may not work as well due to the different conditions. Is there a way to differentiate given the busyness of the street? These townhome units need a bit more separation from the sidewalk due to the close proximity to pedestrian movement.

**Façade playfulness** – The façade articulation was welcomed by the panel; however, they felt that the idea of being playful is not reflected in the building quite yet. The current design reads much more as functional. The suggestion from a few members was that the façade needs either more consideration of colour or articulation. Specifically, The East elevation could be broken down a bit further; the recesses could be quite a bit deeper or the light/dark relationship could be switched up.

**Building Massing** – A member of the panel pointed out that the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor reveal does not currently align to the adjacent block which makes the 3<sup>rd</sup> story feel like a separate building. It was suggested that this should be re-examined.

**South East Corner** – There was a concern over the large size of the windows of the townhome unit onto the laneway. This corner is a key transition moment into the laneway and the treatment of that window is not fully resolved.

**Bike Room** – The panel felt that the bike room has potential to become something “celebrated”. A few questions for consideration were raised: Can it be connected to the interior? Does it have daylight? Skylight? In general it was felt that the storage pavilion should be more transparent to allow for some

visibility onto the lane. This could work in tandem with the OU office, which has lots of “eyes on the street” during the daytime - the bike storage could have the same contribution during off hours.

**Amenity Space** – Given the target group for this building being families it was suggested that the shared amenity space could be more adaptable to allow more space for different user groups (ex. Children vs. elderly)

## **2.5 Panel’s Directions**

Consideration for the following key issues should be contemplated:

1. Reconsider the at grade condition of the townhome units based on which street they are facing. Ensure that sufficient separation between public and private realm exists.
2. Further investigate the façade treatment to make it more playful as per the designer's intent. Be careful of the use of colour as it is not always successful. Consider further articulation of the façade, especially along the East elevation.
3. Develop the design of the South East corner in more detail as it is a key transition into the Living Laneway project.
4. Explore the design of the bike rooms in combination with the laneway project to allow for a creation of a unique space and for more on street animation.
5. Consider providing a more flexible/adaptable program in the shared amenity space.

## **3.0 Project Review – Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 32 SPA**

### **3.1 Briefing Package**

A briefing package with the following was provided to panel members one week prior to the meeting:

**Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 32 (May 26, 2016)**

### **3.2 Project Information**

Project type: Site Plan Application

Design Team: Regional Architects, Vertechs Design

Presenters: Sony Rai and Drew Sinclair, Regional Architects and Viive Kittask, Vertechs Design

Review: Third Review

Conflict of Interest: None declared

### 3.3 Matters for Consideration

The project was introduced by Remo Agostino. This was the third presentation for this project and it was structured to directly address the comments provided by the DRP at the previous review in April.

Drew Sinclair from Regional Architects explained that the mandate of the building originally was to be more playful as a series of shifting mass volumes. However, as the program was to engage with the user group, and early concern was raised that highlighted that the massing is to be dignified and elegant. He pointed out that the primary purpose for this development is to address the needs for the demographics starting in the mid-70s. The organization of the ground floor was re-shifted after the first review, as well as opening up some of the ground plane on the adjacent exterior.

Since April's meeting, the design team attempted a further articulation of the upper volume with a change of balconies along the higher levels to differentiate the mass from that of the lower levels. The south private garden space has been adjusted to allow more public engagement. Changes include a lowered fence, the garden is pushed back from the street, as well as a glazed volume projecting out of the building to engage the public realm. The external expression of the townhomes was also refined with further differentiation of at grade units vs. the remainder of the building.

In response to comments relating to site access & entrance conditions, it was pointed out that the portecochere element is intended as a shared space for pedestrians and vehicles. It is meant as a tall space allowing light to penetrate into the space. The ramp as it goes down is out of the visual realm of pedestrians along the street. There has been additional consideration for screening for the ramp and for private residence space. In response to the consistent criticism regarding access across the site for pedestrians, there is an attempt to link to an existing public walkway across the TDSB land. The goal was to increase the visibility and accessibility to the public walkway.

Viive Kittask presented the alterations to landscape design focusing on the South End of the project. The new scheme addresses the south end as a gateway to the Regent Park community. Refined landscape strategies include paving that wraps the corner and additional seating with the potential for future art installations such as lighting or sculpture.

Ran Chen from City Planning explained that there are still some planning concerns in respect to the ramp access; however, City staff are working with the design team to resolve the issues.

### 3.4 Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects for Consideration

The panel acknowledged the clear format of the presentation and the difficulties of the unusually shaped lot; however, overall it was felt that the scheme has still not addressed some of the key issues regarding site planning. The panel felt that the program is dictating the design; the panel is not able to affect programmatic requirements.

The following is the feedback and recommendations of the panel on the matters for consideration. Unless otherwise noted, the following is the consensus opinion of the panel.

**Building Massing** – It was generally felt that the moves and adjustments were a bit timid. The parapet line could really benefit from being broken up as in current configuration it feels like there are too many discreet parts that are not being tied together. Additionally, there is a need to lighten up the element on the west side near the entrance to make it feel less heavy.

**Engagement of Public Realm** – The opening up of the Southern corner was well received.

**Interior Social Space** – It was acknowledge that progress was made in respect to better connections to retail space from the interior. However, previous comments regarding the lobby space and creating transparency across the east-west axis have not been addressed.

**Site and Building Access** –It was felt by several panel members that the site plan has not changed significantly and that the surface parking and loading situation is not acceptable. It was noted that the Northern drop off area is heavily paved and will be brutally hot for a good part of the year. The amount of open space that has been given over to vehicular circulation compromises the amount of open amenity space that can be provided. Having seniors navigate around a primarily vehicular space is somewhat challenging.

### **3.5 Panel's Directions**

Consideration for the following key issues should be contemplated:

1. There should be a continued effort refine the massing and façade expression.
2. There should be a further consideration of access across the site. Ken Greenberg suggested two potential solutions: One is to take the problem “inboard” by moving the public walkway and onto the private site. This would require a strong landscape move. The other approach is to take the problem off line and involve TDSB & City and create a solution that bridges the property line.
3. Reconsider moving the ramp to the area where the porte-cochere is to open up the courtyard space to be an amenity.
4. Reconsider having the drop off in a lay-by. Although, it has been acknowledged that the city would not allow a lay by in this area as an accessible drop off is not possible along the main streets, the panel suggested that the possibility of a layby needs to be escalated within the city beyond engineering staff.

## **4.0 Project Review - Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 26 SPA**

### **4.1 Briefing Package**

A briefing package with the following was provided to Panel members one week prior to the meeting:

**Regent Park Phase 3 Blk 26 (May 26, 2016)**

### **4.2 Project Information**

Project type: Site Plan Application

Design Team: KPMB Architects & NAK Design Strategies

Presenters: Shirley Blumberg (KPMB Architects) & Robert Ng (NAK Design Strategies)

Review: Second Review

Conflict of Interest: None declared

### 4.3 Matters for Consideration

The project was introduced by Remo Agostino. He explained that from the time of its first review, the office program has been removed from the building and it is now designed as fully residential.

Shirley Blumberg presented the design as being based on the idea of stacked boxes changing in colour. She explained that there may be some confusion surrounding which scheme is being presented as it has changed back and forth due to feedback from the city in regards to massing and the resulting overhang over the sidewalk. The project is located along Dundas Street, very close to the park and the aquatic centre. The design aims to carefully consider animating the street. In this building, Daniels has taken on the challenge to provide affordable family units of three bedrooms, both in apartment form and in townhome form. The design is based on a simple plan with all servicing being buried. The design includes for a common play area and garden plots at the top of the base building. The townhouses are differentiated from the rest of the built form and are designed with consideration for the transition between sidewalk and entrance. Shirley highlighted that the City has some concerns over the length of the podium tower and is looking to reduce the 2.4m overhang.

Robert Ng presented the landscape design pointing out that there is a variety of tree strategies along the ground plane – some to screen private terrace from sidewalks, with others being boulevard trees. There is careful consideration of the relationship between the amenity green space and the private yards of the three bedroom townhomes. These are designed to be screened. The amenity space will include for sufficient softscape and an aspect of fire to promote gathering and warmth.

Ran Chen from City Planning explained that the concerns in respect to the large footprint of the tower is that the elongated shape will read as too monolithic along Dundas street and not transition easily to the surrounding neighbourhood which has many townhomes. The concerns regarding the overhang are in relation to making sure the street feels open for pedestrian use and that it does not inhibit growth of the boulevard trees.

### 4.1 Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects for Consideration

The panel was in agreement that the team presented an elegant looking building with good integration of the landscape.

The following is the feedback and recommendations of the panel on the matters for consideration. Unless otherwise noted, the following is the consensus opinion of the panel.

**Building Massing** – The panel expressed that the massing shows a clear idea of stacking. Several members expressed a preference for the elongated tower over the square and recognized that it was a good strategy to split the slab to allow light penetration. It was suggested that maybe it is possible to be a bit more playful with shifting the planes.

**Building Materiality** – There was a discussion among panel members about the use of glass, in particular the dark glass. Several members have expressed concern about the dark glazing reading as too severe, cold and foreboding. A suggestions was made to consider integrating some more solid

material. Related to this, one member expressed concern regarding making the building energy efficient given the vast amount of glazing.

**Building Overhang** – There was some disagreement among panel members as to which sectional relationship is preferred. It was noted that the original scheme reflected the program well and now the overhang is not driven programmatically. There was also some concern that the overhang would limit your view and sky exposure.

**Ground Plane** – It was noted that the townhouses and front yard proportion work well and that there is a nice balance of scale between townhomes, podium and tower. Several members expressed that subtle articulation in paving design should be considered to articulate the entrances as it currently reads a bit too uniform. The panel also felt that the retail frontage along Dundas needs a bit more further study to control retailers coming in and give it an identity. It was noted that the bike parking is well positioned along the main entrance.

**Family Friendliness** – The panel noted that it is great to see the development of larger family oriented units as we don't have a lot of affordable housing in the core. However, the current iteration of the design scheme does not feel child friendly; it reads as an elegant adult building. This needs further development to make sure the building meets the needs of the residents it is intended for.

## **4.2 Panel's Directions**

Consideration for the following key issues should be contemplated:

1. Explore the materiality of the building exterior further to ensure that the building is not perceived as too cold and overwhelming.
2. Further examine the sectional relationship of the overhang to the street and to the interior spaces.
3. Explore methods of creating a family friendly atmosphere within the building.
4. Examine how paving design can be used to delineate entrances to the building.

## **5.0 Project Review - Alexandra Park Phase 1B SPA**

### **5.1 Briefing Package**

A briefing package with the following was provided to Panel members one week prior to the meeting:

**Alexandra Park – list 3 packages (May 26, 2016)**

## **5.2 Project Information**

Project type: Site Plan Application

Design Team: Teeple Architects, LGA Architectural Partners, Janet Rosenberg Studio

Presenters: Martin Baron (Teeple Architects), Kris Payne (LGA), Greg Warren (JRS)

Review: 2<sup>nd</sup> Review

Conflict of Interest: None declared

## **5.3 Matters for Consideration**

The project was introduced by Andrew Goodyear. He explained that the application for SPA was submitted quite a while ago and pending a minor variance application the plan is to start demolition in the fall. He mentioned that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the Alexandra Park revitalization is currently out for RFP. Once a developer partner is selected, the Phase 2 of the plan will be further discussed with the community, City, Councillor, DRP and other stakeholders.

Martin Baron presented the design for the SQ2 condominium building. He highlighted that both street fronts have grade related units. The big changes from the previously presented scheme are in relation to the courtyard (now a privately owned public space - POPS). Other changes included the reduction of the number of townhouses in the courtyard from 7 to 5, the addition of 3 points of access into the courtyard, and adjustments to the underground layout. The townhomes have maintained their basements but are a part of the OBC Part 3 building. Further adjustments include a clearer delineation of the outdoor amenity space and a change in the building colour from a grey/black to a bronze. Although the panel recommended the addition of retail space at the last review, the development team did not feel that a commercial space at Vanauley would be viable.

Kris Payne presented the design of the townhouses that are located along Augusta and Paul Lane Gardens. There are two key design drivers: community consultation and context. The design incorporates materiality that works with the proposed condo as well as the surrounding existing houses. The townhomes include covered front porches, bay windows, and patterned brick. The materiality is intended as a continuation from phase 1a – brick with a concrete panel. One change that was highlighted is the lowering of the ground floor as much as possible while still allowing for a basement window; this is meant to decrease the number of stairs leading to the front door.

The landscape design was presented by Greg Warren. The presentation focused on the courtyard, based on the feedback provided during the previous DRP review. The approach was to create an open, publicly accessible space, with several access points. There are now 3 points of entry: one from Paul Lane Gardens to the north, one from Augusta Street to the west and one from 20 Vanauley to the south. The new design includes a resolved fire route, community orchard and outdoor library, as well as a heated on leash dog area. The courtyard works in tandem with a future park to the north and renovations to the 20 Vanauley landscaping improvements to the south. The design incorporates benches throughout with integrated lighting.

Graig Uens from City Planning clarified that the City supports the inclusion of market townhomes as it allows for both TCHC and market residents to inhabit a similar building type, therefore allowing for better integration in this phase. It is seen as a positive change from the first phase.

#### 5.4 Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects for Consideration

The panel complimented the team on opening up the courtyard and moving the design forward. The building plan was noted to be sophisticated and successful in its integration of the exterior and interior spaces.

The following is the feedback and recommendations of the panel on the matters for consideration. Unless otherwise noted, the following is the consensus opinion of the panel.

**Courtyard Design** – The panel commended the team on providing a nice model of shared space with the inclusion of an orchard, seating areas, etc.; however, they noted that this set up will involve a high level of maintenance and that there needs to be a commitment on the part of the condominium for upkeep. The towns in the courtyard were felt to be a bit orphaned and there was a debate about the appropriateness of the juxtaposition of private yards within a public courtyard. Suggestions were made to add a large table to the outdoor library and to further consider if the current location of the dog area is appropriate due to its proximity to the orchard. There were also suggestions that the surrounding fences might feel a bit too relentless and the diagonal path might not permit the best layout of space in the courtyard.

**SQ Condo Building** – It was suggested that the SQ2 building should work with the axis of the courtyard in order to ensure that a private area does not necessarily get more privileged vistas than common space. The colour was noted to be an improvement from the previous scheme as the metallic sheen would render it differently under varying light conditions. There was a discussion regarding the appropriateness of glass railings along the Vanauley Street frontage and it was noted that the condition of the at-grade units should be considered from the interior condition.

**Block 13/14 Townhomes** – The townhomes were commended for their choice of material palette with compliments on the use of brick patterning and the use of colour in the bay windows. Some panel members expressed concern over the use of white brick as it may cause the façade to appear flat and may be difficult to keep clean over time; they felt that more articulation should be considered through recesses or overhangs. There was also concern over the steepness of the stairs and limited size of porch, with a recognition that this is in part governed by the property line.

**Bike Parking** - The location of an at grade entrance to condo bike storage was noted to be convenient but the panel advised that the bike stair needs a very shallow pitch to make it work. There was a general consensus that secure and covered bike parking for the TCHC townhouses units should be considered, particularly in future phases, due to limited outdoor space adjacent to the units themselves.

#### 5.5 Panel's Directions

1. Consider the grade relationship of the townhouses at the base of the condominium on Vanauley Street. Explore the public to private transition for these at grade units.
2. Explore the central path further and the flow through the courtyard in particular. Look for ways, such as steps in the paths, to discourage cyclists from using the courtyard as a thoroughfare.
3. Reconsider the location of the dog area in close proximity to the orchard; look for a less central location.

4. Further explore the treatment of the fences bordering the POP space; planting or screening should be considered.
5. Consider solutions for secure and/or covered bike storage for the residents of the TCHC townhomes.