

Date: June 27, 2018**Time:** 1:00 pm**Panel Members:****Present:**Terry Klassen (acting chair)
Amelia Hollingshurst
Glen Pardoe
Eric Toker**Absent:**Chad Russill (co-chair)
Bruce Nelligan
Robert LeBlond
Yogeshwar Navagrah
Jack Vanstone
Gary Mundy
Ben Bailey
Janice Liebe (chair)
Chris Hardwicke**Advisor:** David Down, Chief Urban Designer**Application number:** DP2015-4974**Municipal address:** 528 7 Av SE**Community:** East Village**Project description:** New: Dwelling Unit, Office, Retail and Consumer Service (4 buildings, 672 units)**Review:** first**File Manager:** Brendyn Seymour**City Wide Urban Design:** Lothar Wiwjorra**Applicant:** Gibbs Gage Architects**Architect:** Gibbs Gage Architects**Owner****Summary**

The site, within the Flood Fringe, sits within the heart of the East Village and presents unique opportunities to continue the positive direction of area development. The current application, for the full build-out, complements the density, architectural language, connectivity and porosity, mixed use and the public realm.

In general, the Panel commends the applicant on the proposed architectural massing, limiting podium height to 2 or 3 levels, characteristics of the finer-grained concept of the mews, and connection to Celebration Square (C-Square). However, the Panel expressed concern on the challenges of seamlessly achieving a best-fit public realm outcome in synch with the construction phasing aspects for this site. The Panel recommends further review of a more advanced phasing plan integrating urban design and proposed public art components, given that this project may possibly take ten years.

The Panel supports the additional density with purchase of the lane in lieu of the activated public mews between the four buildings, achieving flexibility and certainty to allow the full block build-out. Lighting, best-practices for public safety, crime prevention, and accessibility have been considered in these early stages. The Panel looks forward to further detail at future stages, specifically around the construction phasing strategy.

Applicant Response

August 29, 2018

Urban Vitality			
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
1	Retail street diversity	Retail streets encourage pedestrians along sidewalk with a mix and diversity of smaller retail uses. Retail wraps corners of streets. Space for patios and cafe seating is provided.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The two buildings to the west (Building 1 and 4) offer many opportunities for commercial/retail uses at grade. The current renderings illustrate patios and café seating adjacent to Celebration Square. The two buildings to the east (Buildings 2 and 3) propose residential uses at grade, and are activated with outdoor patios looking onto the street and the internal mews.		
	Applicant Response		
	Thank you for your support. We anticipate the Riverfront Lane frontage to contribute commercial and retail activity to the public realm, with opportunity for a variety of CRU tenants.		
2	Retail street transparency, porosity	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The renderings illustrate ample glazing into the commercial/retail units. There is no indication that these are display-only windows.		
	Applicant Response		
	The intent of the commercial and retail units is to be highly transparent to create an inside-outside relationship which fosters highly visible commercial/retail and animates the street.		
3	Pedestrian-first design	Sidewalks are continuous on all relevant edges. Materials span driveway entries and parking access points. No drop offs or lay-bys in the pedestrian realm. Street furnishings support the pedestrian experience.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Sidewalks are continuous around the perimeter of the site and through the north/south and east/west publicly-accessible mews. At the north parkade entry, the sidewalk material does not appear to span the driveway entry, however the texture proposed for the driveway entry is in keeping with other pedestrian areas throughout the development. The applicant indicated the overhead doors to underground parking would be finished in a manner that optimizes the streetscape.		
	Applicant response		
	In addition to the north parkade entry, the south parkade entry is similarly a cast in place concrete design similar to the inner courtyard and mews. The purpose of the differentiation between concrete pavers on the sidewalk and the parkade ramps is to identify the vehicle crossing while providing a quality finish on the surfaces. The intent is for both driveways to be the same look and feel as the inner pedestrian mews through the use of concrete.		
4	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	In plan, the entries into each building appear to be well defined and legible. From the renderings, it is not completely clear how each main entry is identified. The Panel anticipates future applications and encourages the applicant to demonstrate the main entry definition for each building. The pedestrian entries into the mews are visible and wide. The applicant mentioned that the use of bollards may be incorporated, however no gates will be proposed, keeping the mews public 24/7. There was some question from the Panel regarding the accessibility of loading to the residential towers since the actual question of access times/limitations to the mews for vehicles has not yet been fully determined. It is understood that this will be reviewed with the City Transportation department as part of the circulation process.		
	Applicant Response		
	The preference of the applicant, and various stakeholders engaged to date, is to maintain		

	the mews access as an open and inviting connection to pedestrians. We trust the proposed mews and courtyard design is of a high quality and therefore vehicles will be highly discouraged from entering the mews. Any loading vehicles will be coordinated to use the space at non peak hours (early morning). Main entrances to the proposed buildings will be clarified through future detailed development permits.		
5	Residential multi-level units at grade	Inclusion of two or three storey units are encouraged, particularly at street level. Private outdoor patios with access to the sidewalk are ideal. Patios are large enough to permit furnishing and active use.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
The two buildings to the east (Building 2 and 3) propose residential units around the perimeter of each building at grade with private patios and access to the sidewalk. The patios are slightly raised from the sidewalk as a privacy buffer and in response to Flood Fringe requirements.			
Applicant Response			
Each building is set above the flood level of 1042.8m (geodetic) to help prevent damage from flood events, and in addition this serves to help create a meaningful transition between public sidewalk and private residence. Each patio is designed for active use, and is enhanced using quality tile paving and by providing significant landscape plantings.			
6	At grade parking	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
There does not appear to be any at-grade parking proposed. The Panel commends this approach.			
Applicant Response			
Thank you, parking is accommodated underground within the proposed parkade.			
7	Parking entrances	Ramps are concealed as much as possible. Entrances to parking are located in discrete locations. Driveways to garage entries are minimized, place pedestrian environment and safety first.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
The parkade entries (limited to two (2)) are oriented towards the streets and are set back from the sidewalk to provide viewing of pedestrians. Ramps appear to be concealed or beyond the overhead doors. The driveway materiality is in keeping with the pedestrian realm areas. The Panel understands the material/finish of overhead doors to underground parking will make a positive contribution to the streetscape.			
Applicant Response			
Significant design effort has been made to limit the frontage of these functions and enhance their appearance. The overhead doors to the parkade are limited in the finishes available due to the requirements and function of the of rapid roll doors. Nevertheless, the applicant is proposing to source a coloured fabric if possible since a graphic cannot be accommodated. Through the use of a subtle colour to match the surrounding materials, the proposed service area will have a reduced visual impact on the public realm. Other overhead doors to service rooms are proposed as panelized overhead doors which will incorporate a graphic treatment to help animate the public realm.			
8	Other Placemaking, Public Art and Urban Design		Further review recommended
Applicant Response			
The Panel commends the Applicant's intention to integrate public art into the mews/courtyard and to make it a "friendly place for children". The expectations and the experience of a thematic place-based outcome comes with a design challenge to clearly outline priorities in articulating the chosen themes for a layered and meaningful interpretation. The river as theme is rich and contextually relevant.			
Consider expanding the narrative, and extending the story in a manner that exhibits the dynamic nature of the Bow, glacier-fed, fast and slow, steep and low, ice along it edges, the aqua water			

	<p>colour changing with turbid sediment at high water, feeding the riparian nature along its banks, with fish moving along its ebb and flow, birds of prey dipping and diving, the river always drifting along, always the driving attraction, always drawing in, always animating its reach in authentic display - a mountain river on course, across the regional landscape.</p> <p>The subtle and yet profound expression in details can animate a storyline that best reflects the range and layering of potential activity that can happen in the space.</p> <p>How the overall design of natural tone and crisp line complements the storyline needs to match up with an outcome that provides good soil and rainwater capture for a healthy, green and thriving landscape.</p>		
	Applicant Response		
	<p>The proposed public space has been revised and advanced with the local river concept in mind. Wood topped concrete seats that are reminiscent of logs jamming on the river edge have been added on the grassed slope. These extend into the fountain area where the concrete seating has been broken up with natural boulders that one might find along the river edge. In some instances, the wood topped concrete benches and rock seating overlap to further create a sense of a natural setting. Also, additional East Village pavers have been added down the center of the mews in a winding fashion to represent the river bard winding through the site.</p> <p>Since the full build out of the art component is not required for density bonusing until Phase 4, therefore the Applicant has proposed to Administration that details of the art be provided under separate future development permit, or perhaps submitted as part of the future Phase 4 detailed development permit. This will also allow for a fulsome art and feature design to take place and acknowledges the phasing in-which the courtyard is constructed.</p>		
	Urban Connectivity <i>Provide visual and functional connectivity between buildings and places, ensure connection to existing and future networks. Promote walkability, cycle networks, transit use, pedestrian-first environments.</i>		
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
9	LRT station connections	Supports LRT use via legible, dedicated pedestrian pathways to stations with direct routes. Avoids desire lines / shortcutting through parking areas.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The site design provides pedestrian pathways and sidewalks that connect with existing infrastructure that lead to the nearest LRT station. Although the proposed parking is above the bylaw minimum, the applicant explained that this allows the flexibility to react to the market demand for the tower programming, which is ultimately a sustainable approach. While the Panel understands the logic and business model for providing additional parking, there is still some query as to the appropriateness of exceeding the bylaw in a location that is heavily focused on reducing auto dependency.		
	Applicant Response		
	<p>The Panel's support of the applicant's decision to provide a parking ratio which is flexible and responsive to market demand is appreciated. The land use bylaw applied to this site requires a minimum of 689 parking stalls which the proposed development complies with. Within the total parking stalls required, a minimum of 573 parking stalls are required for residential based on the minimum bylaw requirement of 0.85 stalls/unit. The current proposal, as per the DP DTR3 package, is providing a 0.906 stalls/unit ratio, which results in 609 residential parking stalls. We feel that this is a relatively small deviation (6%) from the minimum bylaw requirement.</p>		
10	Regional pathway connections	Supports walkability via intentional urban design connections to pathway systems.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel had mixed feedback on the Applicant's connection or lack of connection to the Riff via the proposed public mews pathways. The argument can be made that framing the edge of the Riff with Tower 3 (south east) will strengthen the Riff. The opposing point of view is that the north/south		

	and east/west orientation of the development's public mews does well to connect with Celebration Park, however does not relate to any other existing or proposed pedestrian connectivity. The Panel understands that the proposed mews orientation does attract pedestrians from the street sidewalks into the site and connects pedestrians with the street via the mews, thereby maintaining activity on the street sidewalks and supporting CRU's along 6 th Ave, 7 th Ave and 5 th street.		
	Applicant Response		
	In the proposed design, the SW Building orients the main entrance towards the East Village Riff and 5 Street Plaza to create a visible architectural feature which contributes to the public Plaza environment. While the proposed public courtyard is not directly on axis in plan to the Plaza, the proposed mews still attracts pedestrians from nearby 7 Avenue or 5 Street SE as the mews access is only a few steps from the Riff. The proposed public mews connect from the inner courtyard to the following; to the west is Celebration Square, to the north as well as east is street-front retail along 6 Avenue and 5 Street, and to the south is "K Block" which may include retail, commercial, or residential in the future.		
11	Cycle path connections	Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to bicycle storage at grade.	Further Review recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The development north edge is adjacent to the proposed cycle route. Connection from this route, although not identified by a designated cycle path, appears to be safe. It is unclear if there is public bicycle storage at grade, however there is ample private bicycle storage within Buildings 1 and 2. The construction phasing should consider bicycle storage both privately and publicly. The Panel anticipates future reviews for this site and encourages the Applicant to clearly identify the public bicycle storage.		
	Applicant Response		
	The proposed site plan has been revised to provide 32 class 2 public bicycle stalls at grade within the property which are easily accessible. This compliments 28 existing class 2 stalls on along the sidewalk. By accommodating the aforementioned 60 bicycle stalls in and around the proposed development, we trust that the project is doing it's part in providing supporting public bicycle use.		
	There is a total of 386 proposed class 1 bicycle parking stalls being provided on site; 366 on parkade level 1, and 20 on the main floor of the NW Building, which is a above the bylaw requirement. The proposed class 1 stalls are for private use by the future residents and tenants of the East Village Courtyard. In order to provide additional bicycle storage for the development 435 bicycle storage lockers are being proposed within the parkade spread across levels 1 through 4, which are in addition to the aforementioned class 1 bicycle stalls. The 435 bicycle storage lockers are traditional storage lockers which have been oversized in order to allow storage of one bicycle in each. While they aren't official Class 1 stalls because they are located below parkade level 1, we believe this proposal allows the future residents additional bike storage, a bike storage option with increased security, and flexibility to meet residents' needs.		
12	Walkability - connection to adjacent neighbourhoods / districts / key urban features	Extend existing and provide continuous pedestrian pathways. Extend pedestrian pathway materials across driveways and lanes to emphasize pedestrian use.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	See comment #10.		
	Applicant Response		
	Similar to comment #3, the parkade access surfaces are finished in a similar way to the public courtyard/mews. This provides a quality finish with the added benefit of identifying the vehicle crossing.		
13	Pathways through site	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.	Further Review recommended
	UDRP Commentary		

	See comment #10. The Panel commends the design intent of the finer-grained design of the publicly accessible mews with the use of art, active programming at the tower bases, and public gathering spaces. The Panel anticipates refinement of the lighting design within this area and the evolution of the overhead “fly fisher cast” feature.		
	Applicant Response		
	<p>The resolution of the proposed art and interactive water feature will develop as the future full detail development permits are submitted. As indicated on the new phased landscape plans submitted as part of the DP DTR3 response, all bonus items (including art) will be in place by phase 4 as required for density bonusing. Since the full build out of the art component is not required for density bonusing until Phase 4, and therefore we have proposed that details of the art be provided under separate future development permit, or perhaps submitted as part of the future Phase 4 detailed development permit. At present an allowance has been identified within the bonus schedule for public art and preliminary concept design with a manufacturer is underway.</p> <p>Nevertheless, because the proposed development is phased certain elements or infrastructure will be constructed in each earlier phase. Freestanding lighting elements have been accommodated within the current site plan (DTR3) through bollard and pole lights which will be installed based on the extents of each phase.</p>		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	See comment #10.		
	Applicant Response		
	In addition to the Applicant response for comment #10, we believe the proposed public mews and courtyard will ultimately add a unique experience to the public space network within East Village.		
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Views to Celebration Park have been captured successfully from within the public mews. New areas of interest or views are proposed within the site through public art and the refinement to landscaping forms that support the narration of relevant themes.		
	Applicant Response		
	During the design of the site and buildings the views into and from the courtyard have been important considerations. The result is a comfortable, accessible, and unique public space which crosses the development site. In addition to the numerous proposed features within the mews and courtyard, the proposed development massing contributes in an interesting way to the East Village skyline through contrasting high-rise and mid-rise buildings.		
16	Vehicular interface		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The vehicular strategy is commended – no vehicle access into the site at grade, with the exception of service vehicles, though per comment #4, there was still some interest from the Panel to understand the manner in which loading to the residential towers would occur if the street is indeed closed to traffic for parts of the day (like Stephen Avenue) versus closed all of the day (like a private access, requiring appointments for vehicular access) versus being open to traffic all of the day (like Granville Island). It is understood that the Applicant will be discussing this with the City Transportation department as part of the review process.		
	Applicant Response		
	As previously noted, any loading or waste vehicles will be privately managed to use the space at grade during non-peak hours (early morning). The proposal is for the access to be ‘closed’ all day to vehicles as the spaces are intended for pedestrian use, therefore any service vehicles which require access will be privately managed or scheduled.		

17	Other		
	Applicant Response		
	Contextual Response <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass, spacing and placement on site in consideration to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i>		
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
18	Massing relationship to context	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The massing of the four towers respects adjacent buildings of height. The development consists of four towers, two higher and two lower. This allows breathing room between existing and proposed adjacent towers. The massing also maintains views from the taller towers.		
	Applicant Response		
	Thank you for the support of the proposed massing.		
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The sun shading studies provided by the applicant do not appear to impact the Bow River. Although the internal public mews will experience shadow, there are moments, due to the porosity of the development, that allow sunlight into the mews.		
	Applicant Response		
	In order to take advantage of the sunlight into the inner courtyard, the proposed landscape plan has been adjusted to create a “grassy knoll,” with the addition of manicured sod, rather than an area for significant tree plantings. The revised design will allow individuals to sit and/or play on the sod area, and additional seating has been incorporated near the proposed fountain feature. Additional seating reflects the proposed seating throughout the site (log jam design intent).		
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The massing orientation to the street offers a distinct base and tower articulation. The massing of each tower respects adjacent existing towers.		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
21	Massing distribution on site		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel supports the strategy of four separate buildings on this site, and the variety in footprint size/shape, building heights, and architectural design. The differentiation of the office tower is a positive aspect. The Panel encourages the Applicant to explore the variety of materials and form as the design develops.		
	Applicant Response		
	Materials have been curated for the overall development through a combination of contrasting and complimentary materials, as shown in the conceptual renderings. While detailed materials have been provided for the NE and NW buildings, future detailed development permits are required for the SE and SW buildings at which time further material information will be provided. The design intent is to maintain similar criteria for selecting the materials on the south buildings.		
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Support

UDRP Commentary			
The treatment of the tower bases provides a comfortable human scale, as illustrated by the renderings provided by the Applicant. The use of canopies, glazing, and articulation of the façade at grade provide interest and shelter.			
Applicant Response			
Thank you, in addition we feel the proposed warm materials and transparency at-grade contribute to a quality public/pedestrian realm.			
23	Other		
Applicant Response			
Safety and Diversity <i>Promote design that accommodates the broadest range of users and uses. Achieve a sense of comfort and security at all times.</i>			
Topic		Best Practice	Ranking
24	Safety and security	CPTED principles are to be employed - good overlook, appropriate lighting, good view lines, glazing in lobbies and entrances.	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
Although the development proposes significant jogging or articulation of the facades at grade, the design does well to minimize hiding spaces and maintain sightlines. Areas of concern may be the proposed "canoe" art feature as it presents a hiding place, and the development of CRU's along the south face of tower 1 as the design currently proposes large planning and landscaping elements that may provide hiding spaces. The Panel requests further detail on the lighting strategy for the site. The lobby entries appear to have ample glazing.			
Applicant Response			
As previously noted under item #19, the inner courtyard has been revised to reduce the hiding spaces at the inner courtyard by replacing the previously proposed trees and plantings with sodded area and additional seating. The revised design in this area provides significantly greater visibility and seating options to enhance the activity of the NW Building's south-east CRUs. The frontage of the CRU is faced by hardscape allowing traditional table and chair seating as well as the opportunity for informal seating on grass, boulders, and concrete steps.			
The lighting strategy for the courtyard/mews proposes to combine bollard, pole, and in-soffit lighting to create a visible and appropriately light space. Locations for the bollards and pole lighting have been provided in the current comprehensive DP DTR3 drawings, with in-soffit lighting being shown in the detailed DP drawings. To supplement the base lighting strategy there is potential for the future "fishing line" art piece to incorporate an ambient lighting element.			
25	Pedestrian level comfort - wind	Incorporate strategies to block wind, particularly prevailing wind and downdrafts. Test assumptions and responses via Pedestrian Level Wind Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	TBD
UDRP Commentary			
Information on this item is not included for review.			
Applicant Response			
The design of the East Village Courtyard project has considered the pedestrian level comfort, as well as deployed the principles of winter design to mitigate wind. By providing public mews the development creates breaks in the building frontage mitigate wind from the street wall. Furthermore, the proposed setbacks, façade jogging, canopies and articulation break up and provide shelter from the wind. The proposed landscaping delivers a combination of deciduous and coniferous trees are in order to allow sun penetration and to block cold winter winds.			
26	Pedestrian level comfort - snow	Incorporate strategies to prevent snow drifting. Test assumptions and responses via Snow Drifting Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	TBD
UDRP Commentary			

Information on this item was not included for review.			
Applicant Response			
In order to provide a publically accessible courtyard and mews, the development is prepared to utilize a timely private snow removal service to ensure access is maintained year round.			
27	Weather protection	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The renderings illustrate canopies at main entrances to the residential lobbies and the CRU entries. It is not clear on the site or main floor plan if each entry is protected by a canopy.			
Applicant Response			
Noted, DP DTR3 drawings have been revised to show overhangs which have been strategically located to shelter the majority of entrances. Further full detail development permits will be provided in the future for the SE and SW buildings, as required by City Administration, at which point the entrance designs can be fully assessed.			
28	Night time design		Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
Further design detail is requested by the Panel to evaluate this aspect and its integration with direct and ambient qualities with respect to amenities and the public art component.			
Applicant Response			
The consultant team has been working closely with a manufacturer to integrate lighting design into the mews design. Lit bollards in the theme of the river have been provided along the North South mews, while larger pole spot lights have been strategically located on the site to accentuate areas of on site where specific programming elements are occurs (fountain area, seating areas). Locations for the bollards and pole lighting have been provided in the current comprehensive DP DTR3 drawings, with in-soffit lighting being shown in the detailed DP drawings. To supplement the base lighting strategy there is potential for the future “fishing line” art piece to incorporate an ambient lighting element.			
29	Barrier free design	Site access to be equal for able and disabled individuals. Provide sloped surfaces 5% grade or less vs ramps.	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
At this level of design, the public realm appears to meet barrier free design, providing ramps to entries and a relatively flat or gently sloped hardscaped area. The residential units at grade do not appear to be barrier free, with steps up to each private patio and exterior entry. The Panel encourages the applicant to provide exterior ramps to some accessible units at the ground level.			
Applicant Response			
We can confirm that the public realm is a barrier free design. In regards to residential buildings, barrier free access to all units is provided through the building main entrance. At-grade units are challenged to incorporate a barrier free ramp due to flood level requirements, which require the main floor to be a certain distance higher than the adjacent street grade. Based on an internal review of grades, with an elevated main floor level it is not possible to incorporate a ramp in many instances; however two at-grade units on the NE tower have been revised to be accessible from the sidewalk. A transition from public to private in these instances is still maintained through landscape buffers and residential patio gates.			
30	Winter city	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
See comments #19.			
Applicant Response			
As per comment #19, there are time periods when sunlight reaches the public courtyard and mews spaces. Sun exposure is achieved through efficient tower floorplates and the			

	development of mid-rise buildings.	
31	Other	
	Applicant Response	
	<p>Service / Utility Design <i>Promote design that accommodates service uses in functional and unobtrusive manner. Place service uses away from and out of sight of pedestrian areas where possible. Screening elements to be substantive and sympathetic to the building architecture.</i></p> <p>UDRP Commentary</p> <p>Garbage and recycling appears to be stored within the buildings. Pick up appears to be at the east and west edge of the public mews. Further review is recommended for the frequency of this pick up and obstruction of the mews and how that may or may not relate to access into the mews (per comment #16). (see page 28 of the Applicant's submission for the white boxes at the east and west edge of the mews)</p> <p>Applicant Response</p> <p>Note: The white boxes shown as part of the UDRP submission are the Enmax Lift Out panel locations. Since the UDRP submission the locations of the lift out well panels has been adjusted towards the edge of the property line.</p>	
	Topic	Commentary
32	(specify)	TBD