

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 24, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Helen Avini Besharat
Amela Brudar
David Jerke
Leslie Shieh
Marie-France Venneri
Yinjin Wen
Grant Newfield
Muneesh Sharma

REGRETS: Colette Parsons

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 8444-8480 Oak Street |
| 2. | 146-186 W 41st Avenue & 5726 Columbia Street |
| 3. | 1296 Station Street |
| 4. | 725-747 SE Marine Drive |
| 5. | 1506 W 68th Avenue & 8405-8465 Granville Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Amela Brudar, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address: | 8444-8480 Oak Street |
| Permit No. | RZ-2017-000057 |
| Description: | To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 40 market units over two levels of underground parking with 56 vehicle stalls and 53 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 3,524 sq. m (37,938 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.50 and the building height is 19.8 m (65 ft.). This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan. |
| Zoning: | RT-2 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | AVRP Architecture |
| Delegation: | Troy Glashner, Leed Consultant, E3 ECO Group Inc. |
| Staff: | Scott Erdman & Grace Jiang |

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations.

Introduction: Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman, introduced the project as this is an application to rezone 4 parcels under the Marpole Community Plan. The site is located on the east side of Oak, mid-block between 67th and 70th Avenues. The site is currently zoned RT-2, each lot has a SFD. Together, 4 parcels measure 132 feet long and 115 feet deep. The Site area is approximately 15,177 square feet.

The Marpole Plan anticipates residential buildings in this location, up to 6-storeys, with an FSR up to 2.5, and the upper storeys set back to minimize the appearance of scale and to reduce shadow impacts. The Plan also requires mid-block connections along Oak St through blocks longer than a standard block length.

The Proposal is to build a 6-storey residential building, with 40 market units, at a density of 2.50 FSR. Proposal includes a contribution of half the width of a future mid-block connection, on the northern edge of this site. Another development, approved at Public Hearing on Jan 16, provides the other half. Coordination between the two will be facilitated during the DP process to ensure a cohesive design of the MBC.

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, introduced the project as this area is located in the centre of Marpole Area. Oak Street is a busy traffic corridor with narrow sidewalks and long blocks. 67 Ave is a vital connection between east and west Marpole.

The base zone of subject site is RT-2, the same to the north, south, and the west. The east side of the site is zoned RM-8, which expects courtyard and stacked townhouse. Further to 67 Ave intersection area is C-1 zone, and to the 70th Ave intersection area is RM-3 zone developments.

In the Marpole plan rezoning policy allows up to 6-storey residential and 2.5 FSR in this area, other than the corner site can be 8-storey and 3.0 FSR. These transparent models demonstrate the proposed massing of two current rezoning applications. The policy encourages incremental developments and suggests a 100 ft maximum building width, and also anticipates notable setbacks above 4th floor. Another focus of the policy is the improvement of the public realm along the Oak Street, to transform the Oak Street from a traffic route to an urban residential character street. The policy supports an east-west mid-block connection in this block to enhance the walking and cycling experience and habitat connectivity.

The site is 132 ft wide and 115 ft deep with a 6.5 ft cross drop from Northwest corner to South east corner. The proposal includes a 6-storey residential building and 2 levels UG parking. FSR is 2.5. The proposed building frontage is 107 ft, upper two storeys have 8 ft shoulder setback on four sides.

Setbacks from the Oak street curb to the building face are 34 ft, including a required 14 ft SRW and 20 ft additional front setback. The rear setback is 16 ft. it meets the minimum policy requirement. Side yards, it provides 10 ft on the south and 15 ft on the north, which includes a 12 ft SRW for mid-block connection and 3 ft additional side setback the ground floor is recessed approx. 3 to 4 ft on all sides to accommodate more landscape and larger patios.

Along the Oak Street, an 8 ft wide sidewalk is provided with 6 ft treed boulevard on both sides. The proposal provides a 12 ft SRW along the north property line. This is a half of the required mid-block connection. The application on the north provides another half of the connection. Further design development and coordination of the entire 24 ft SRW will be required to create one enjoyable and safe walking and cycling public pathway.

Indoor and outdoor amenity spaces are well provided. An amenity room is adjacent to the entry lobby, and a multi-purpose room is close to the mid-block connection, with a child play area co-located. An additional common open space is provided on the roof-top deck to accommodate more social activities.

The rezoning application is generally compliant with the rezoning policy and design guideline.

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

- 1) The policy supports a maximum 100 ft building frontage. The proposed building width exceeds the maximum by 7 ft. Please advise if the proposed building width is supportable.
- 2) Please comment if the design of the public realms, including the Oak Street and the mid-block connection, successfully improves public spaces for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3) Please comment on the pros and cons of the ground floor undercut on all sides, in terms of the public realm, private open space, livability, etc.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The goal was to maximize the public realm and green space for the tenants on a small site.

Due to the undercut the building was going to be taken straight down, however there was a concern there would not be enough space left over. The applicants have lifted the building high enough to allow for natural light access at the edge of the building even with the undercut. The building was pulled back in to provide natural light for the ground units.

A challenge to the building was the level of surrounding noise. Closed balconies were used as a feature to protect against the noise and for energy performance. Initially the applicant had proposed closed balconies on both sides of the building but this was not supported by the Planning department.

The applicants approach was to create a public realm that corresponds to future developments while providing a development that is protective of its surrounding conditions. The major focus was to keep the architectural quiet and clean, and provide a base for the landscape architect to enhance the site. The applicants noted they are not yet dealing with the materials and expression of the building but more so the massing.

There are courtyard spaces under the overhang to create separations between public and non-public and private versus semi private. To the back and side of the building there are provided courtyard space on the ground floor to soften the back lane and humanize the space. The focus is to bring people out and eyes on the street.

There is a mid-block green space connection in the back lane, which can provide for a future green buffer zone. However, first the applicant team will have to revise the true connection of the space as there is 12 ft on the site property and 12 ft. on the neighboring property which has moved forward. For this space the applicants are aware and have taken into account the habitat connection (provide habitat, nesting, plant material, along with respite seating and decorative painting), which is a regulation from the City.

On the rooftop there is substantial courtyard space and a shared amenity space. The rooftop also has the mechanical, which has been screened with a fair amount of landscape planting and tree planting, for noise reduction as well.

There are double street trees (provided by the City and Applicant). They are staggering leading to the main entry for visibility.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Venneri and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Further design development to the undercut of the building at the ground floor;
- Increase the rooftop amenity and review the location of the mechanical equipment enclosure;
- Review and improve the lobby entrance experience with consider adding architectural elements (canopy, signage);
- Review the corners of the building at the top floor; further design development needed to the circular stairs.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was a general support for the increased height to 107 feet. Members of the panel supported the length and frontage.

Panel found it difficult to comment on the function of the mid connection public realm however they supported the proposal as it will be a great addition to the site and area and believe it will be more successful once coordination with neighboring site is established. The chair commended the applicants for the indoor amenities as they were ample for the size of the project.

A panel member supported the lineup of trees on Oak St, as it can be a real challenge dealing with sound and light and the trees are a beneficial solution that will allow the light in and sound out.

A main concern was the undercut of the building. The panel was not convinced the undercut served a lot of purpose. There was uncertainty as to how much of the undercut space will be used as Oak St is very busy. Suggestions included re orienting some of the amenity space to the west side as the North and South side undercuts will create a loud and dark space. The undercut may need higher hedges along the Oak street side, and look to see if the overhang can be minimized. The panel found the four circular corners of the building a good idea but needed more design development to work with the balcony configurations.

Other suggestions included looking at the rooftop and finding a way to minimize or relocating the mechanical equipment as it was bigger and heavier than expected. Explore to see if the rooftop common amenities can be made bigger (okay to make the individual areas smaller), provide a cover, and explore a stronger connection with indoor and outdoor amenities.

The mid-connection greenspace could benefit from nodes at each end to provide flexibility along the path, and the landscape experience from the entry at Oak st is strong however could also benefit from added architectural elements to increase visibility.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2.	Address:	146-186 W 41st Avenue & 5726 Columbia Street
	Permit No.	RZ-2017-00055
	Description:	To develop the site with two 4-storey stacked townhouse buildings and four 2-storey townhouses at the lane. The proposal consists of 40 three-bedroom market units (many with lock-off suites), over one level of underground parking with 71 vehicle stalls and 99 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 7,753 sq. m (83,457 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.87 and the building height is 12.2 m (40 ft). This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
	Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Raymond Letkeman Architects
	Delegation:	Jim Bussey, Architect, Raymond Letkeman Architects Mark Pickell, Architect, Raymond Letkeman Architects Jonathan Losee. Landscape Architect, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Troy Glashner, LEED Consultant, E3 ECO Group Inc.
	Staff:	Scott Erdman & Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations.

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman introduced this application is to rezone 7 parcels under the Cambie Corridor Plan. The site is located at the southeast corner of 41st Ave & Columbia St and is currently zoned RS-1, each lot has a SFD. Together, 7 parcels measure 320 feet long and 140 feet deep and the site area is approximately 43,923 square feet.

The Cambie Corridor Plan anticipates 4-storey residential buildings in this location, with townhouses along the lane. Between Columbia & Ontario Streets, the Cambie Corridor Plan anticipates an FSR range of 1.25 to 1.75, with setbacks above 3 storeys, and an activated lane. Note that the Plan's FSR is an estimate (not a limit) and is based on intended urban design performance with respect to the site, form and neighborhood context. Cambie Corridor Phase 3 anticipates townhouses behind this site.

The proposal is to build a residential development that includes two 4-storey stacked townhouse buildings along 41st Ave, and four 2-storey townhouse buildings along the lane, for a total of 40 market units (noting that 29 include lock-off units), and a density of 1.88 (1.87) FSR.

Development Planner, Jason Olinek, introduced the project noting the immediate context is all existing RS-1 but noting there is anticipated. As part of the Cambie Corridor Plan, this is in the Oakridge Town Centre at the intersection of W 41st and Columbia. The site is comprised of the consolidation of 7 lots, measuring roughly 320ft long ranging from 133 to 141ft deep. Site slopes down approx. 2 meters along Columbia and then down another 2 meters along the lane, 4 meters total on the diagonal. The proposal is for 4 storey back-to-back walkup townhouse with secondary suites at the front and 2 storey walkup townhouses at the lane.

Below are some of the objectives Staff will use to evaluate the application:

OAKRIDGE TOWN CENTRE

- Density in the approximate range of 1.25-1.75 FSR. The proposal slightly exceeds that at 1.88,
- FoD for residential buildings is anticipated up to four storeys on frontages,
- Two storeys walk up units are anticipated at the lanes,
- Above the three storeys, the upper floor shall step back significantly from 41st Avenue,

- Buildings should provide front doors onto the street and lane to activate and enhance the public realm interface,
- Proposals are required to include public realm features such as street trees and landscaped setbacks.

BUILT FORM GUIDELINES - GENERAL

- Buildings should be reduced in scale towards the lane,
- Buildings should be limited in both real and perceived length to allow for sunlight, views, and a feeling of “openness”,
 - In general, this application satisfies the suggested maximum building frontage of 150 ft.
- Buildings should be set back from the fronting and flanking property line 10 - 15 ft, Considerations to evaluate include the nature and character of the fronting street (i.e. local versus arterial),
- The public and private realm should be delineated and to accommodate patios and entrances,
- To provide visual interest and variation,
- Entrances should be clearly recognizable and appropriately scaled to the street,
- Architectural expression should be of its time while considering the architectural history and the emerging character of the neighborhood.

LANEWAY DEVELOPMENT AND COURTYARDS

- The space between the primary fronting buildings and the lane buildings - the courtyard - needs to be large enough to ensure the livability of all units. A minimum 24 ft depth is suggested and provided,
 - Massing should also strive to maximize the sunlight available to the courtyard, such as through variation in height.
- Laneway buildings can be up to 2 storeys in height and should consider the design conditions for overlook and privacy,
- Lane buildings should generally consider setbacks to allow for edge elements such as landscaping,
- Entrances and windows should directly face the lane, and appear to have a transparent nature to them.

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

- 1) Form of development (height, density, massing, setbacks);
- 2) Outdoor open space design;
- 3) Contextual relationship and,
- 4) Advice for further design development prior to DP Application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

This is a high density site with a ground plain of 40 units per acre. The site is located near transit, bicycle paths, retail and great walkability.

The building expression is contemporary row houses with each household defined separately. Starting on Columbia Street, which has a higher density, there are nodes on the corner and where the slope decreases the massing is broken down slightly. The two storey housing expression on Columbia Street will take you away from the higher density and takes you down to single family three story townhouse

arrangement. The elevation settles down to be similar to the single family homes. The design is of a downplayed traditional articulation with glass railings and hardie panel with Swiss Pearl bay features and stone base doors. The row of townhouses has large viable roof decks.

Most of the units have access points off of 41 and the courtyard. There is also courtyard access to all the two storey apartments that face the lane. Parking is accessed from the lane. Every unit has access directly from the parking via private stairs to enhance security. Town house units additionally provide storage and a flex room.

The site provides a public realm and private realm. There is lots of planting to provide a nice interface street expression. There is a private outdoor space at 41 and increases towards the courtyard. The courtyard is established at a 24 ft cut back to 32 feet to allow for additional sunlight. The amenity space indoor and outdoor is grouped to allow for efficient connectivity. There is an 8 ft outdoor patio.

The public realm is designed so pedestrians can walk freely through the area but also recognize it's a semi private zone. There will be access points off of 41 and Columbia to help the public differentiate what's public versus private and allow for eyes on the street. There is children's play area and ample seating outdoors. The indoor amenity space is animated with colorful decorative surfaces and furniture.

There will be a significant number of small trees planting. There is a nice layered planting along 41st, the corner to the two storey buildings to create a more private residential garden feature. Pergolas have been added to also define the public versus private areas and raised planters for the outdoor amenity zones. The roofscape has a variety of raised planters. Laneway is animated with plant material expression to soften the effect of building against the lane.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded MS. Avini-Besharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Support the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Explore providing elevator access to the courtyard for general accessibility;
- Consider simplifying the courtyard design and consolidate fragmented spaces;
- Explore livability of north facing units to have more light access from above;
- Mechanical systems to be closely looked at as they may add additional bulk to the massing.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported the height, density and setback of the site. The change of grade in the stairs made it feel more open and neighborly and the site planning with the change of grade was successful. There was a good relationship to the surrounding areas and development there was a nice residential feel like the rest of the neighborhood.

Some of the panel members found the massing to be a little big and made the site feel bulky. The panel suggested further design development was needed with more high quality and real material. The units facing north could benefit from more sun and natural light from above. Panel members suggest that with a high density development one cannot get away with any elevators. Also accessibility from the unit to the parkade and parking to the main entry should be better resolved.

Other recommendations included knowing where your mechanical system is going to be as it will affect how your height will look like and consider breaking up the massing.

It is important to provide accessibility and storage for cyclists as well as a practical elevator for bikes to the units.

Some panel members noted, in regards to the DP stage, it was hard to comment how the site will fit with the rest of the neighborhood.

Suggestions included creating nodes of open space within the courtyard to allow for more light. The outdoor amenities appear a bit over packed and would benefit from having one strong clean space then various cluttered spaces. The area along 41st should provide accessibility to all walks of life.

The panel found with the limited open space the landscape was successfully handled to mitigate with these issues. A suggestion was to clean up the planting.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

3.	Address:	1296 Station Street
	Permit No.	DP-2017-01097
	Description:	To develop a 13-storey mixed-use building consisting of retail at grade and employment space, such as office or creative products manufacturing, on levels two to thirteen. In addition, common indoor and outdoor amenity is provided at level thirteen. The proposed floor area is 26,369 sq. m (283,834 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.9. This application is being considered under the False Creek Flats Innovation Hub FC-2 Zoning and Development By-Law and Policies and Guidelines.
	Zoning:	FC-2 Sub-area A
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	MCM Partnership
	Owner:	Rize Alliance
	Delegation:	Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
	Staff:	Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations.

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Jason Olinek, introduced the application as this proposal is located in the new FC-2 zone, Parcel A. This is the first Urban Design Panel for an application under the new False Creek Flats regulations. This parcel is in the “Innovation Hub” sub-area.

The regulations permit density up to 7.0 FSR and height up to 22.9m. The application is seeking these maximums. Staff will evaluate the application based on the following:

- All applicable policies and guidelines and the relationship of the development with nearby residential areas;
- The height, bulk, location and overall design of the building and its effect on the site, surrounding buildings and streets, and existing views;
- The amount of open space, including plazas, and the effects of overall design on the general amenity of the area;
- The effect of the development on traffic in the area; and
- The provision for pedestrian needs.

General Design Considerations for the Innovation Hub are site layout, building design, building separations, widths, depths, and setbacks that reinforce the surrounding urban scale and street network.

Other more specific objectives applicable to the evaluation of this proposal include:

- Unique Spaces - Meaning places which create opportunities for public engagement in a variety of distinct places;
- Flexible Floor Plates;
- Active and Engaging Uses at Grade;
- Building Massing;
- Architectural Components that;
 - (a) Reinforce the near view with high-quality materials;
 - (b) Express a finer grain urban fabric;
 - (d) Storefronts should be transparent;
 - (f) Building interface at the public realm should emphasize details and proportions at the scale of the pedestrian.

- On-Site Public Open Space that
 - (a) Create inviting and comfortable places for people;
 - (b) Encourage lively building edges and more welcoming street experience;
 - (c) Encourage 24/7 activity and public life;
 - (d) Consider ways to ensure safe, clean, clutter free environments; and
 - (e) Landscaping elements and public art, including temporary projects, are encouraged.

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

- 1) Form of development; the height, bulk, location, setbacks, and overall design;
- 2) Outdoor open space and landscape design;
- 3) 3) Architectural expression.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The combination of their principles and prominent location (Terminal and Station) of this corner gateway site warranted something bold. This has been achieved with inspiring design, materiality and form.

The significant neighboring sites include Pacific Railway, the sky train, Vancity, residential and Thornton Park. Part of the strong design principles was maintaining the sense of urban realm.

The massing has been held well to the corners of this site. There has been a lot of dialogue over the quality of the building and to keep it grounded to represent quality spaces expression that was still of the same level of the neighboring sites. Efficient office floor plates have been created that can accommodate both small and large tenants. The ultimate goal was to create an office development that both occupants and public can benefit from.

The site is quite narrow from east to west and on the south end is a bit constrained by the sky train. Loading is off of Terminal and off of Station St is the underground parking.

The building concept was taking a holistic approach and aspirations of the flats. There is a duality of past, present, future and contrasting the old with the new.

There are a series of different volume strides. It was decided on a tri partied of the three volumes and two of the volumes have a significant reduction in glass. This allows for opportunity to express the building in different ways. As much solar shading possible has been incorporated which impacts a bit on how the building is positioned.

The bottom volume is a glass piece to engage the public realm and allow as much daylight as it is constrained due to the sky train. Elements of the ground floor retailing are punctured through with color to be more playful, welcoming and visible.

The color selection is rooted from a grit and earthy history of the area. Materiality includes metal cladding, composite panel, and pattern detailed texture. There are contrasting colors on the ground clay pavers, reds and yellows, to define clearly the angles of building from ground plain.

This building is considered a public art through landscaping and the building lighting.

The outdoor public realm has an industrial expression which includes a long big sculptural table for food and beverage outlets. There is envisioning bringing in elements of art. The ground floor has a gym and an outdoor space associated with the gym. There are roof terraces on the rooftop and a series of terraces for the tenants to enjoy a natural space. Each terrace is slightly different in shape and form. On the rooftop there is a private space that is associated directly with a larger office space and all other rooftop space is accessible by all tenants for large and small gatherings with covering and seating.

Planting has been incorporated to allow for protection. There were lots of vibrant tree planting, plants integrated more in the paving to allow for less use of water. The slab and most of paving on ground allows good opportunity for storm water infiltration.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved Ms. Avini-Besharat and seconded by Mr. Jerke and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel support the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- To look into improving performance with respect to solar heat gain and glare on the glazed areas;
- To look at continuous weather protection along the retail edge;
- Look at building interface and views with adjacent heritage building with bus parking lot;
- Consideration of a dedicated bike elevator and lobby and increasing number of bike parking.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel found this to be a great and unique project. They commended the applicant's execution especially with the design challenges in a constrained site. There was overall support for the height, massing, setbacks, architectural and landscape expressions, and materials. The angles of the building were appreciated and having the old next to the new gave the building lots of character.

A panel member noted there was a dynamic relationship with the building and the building to neighboring sites. The mix of outdoor spaces and glass was successful. The panel found the open space approach to be successful on all levels. A suggestion was to look at the interface with the adjacent building with the bus parking to be more successful.

A panel member noted the sustainability and mechanical systems were well detailed and presented.

Maintenance issues with the glazed volume were to be expected. Suggestions included looking at the acoustics when considering the type of glazing. The applicants may want to consider a different material; fritted glass may help with the solar gain.

The dark color selection is not convincing. The applicant should look at reversing the dark on the ground then go lighter as you move up. Also with varied materials and colors while having the panels in the same tone could make the building stand out more. It was noted to stray from using slippery pavers in the front as this is not safe.

A panelist noted an important aspect to include is consideration of a dedicated bike storage and transportation. There should be safe and defined bike access, sufficient bike parking and a dedicated elevator to the units.

In the outdoor open space the planter and stairs can funnel down to where people can go.

A panelist noted to encourage Public Art in the design as there was good opportunity. The retail edge could benefit from having a year round weather protection

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

4. Address:	725-747 SE Marine Drive
Permit No.	DP-2017-01099
Description:	To develop a mixed-use building consisting of commercial uses, 368 dwelling units, a childcare facility and a neighbourhood house annex. The proposed floor area is 28,620 sq. m (308,070 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.98, and the building height is 63.1 m (207 ft.).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	Francl Architecture
Owner:	John Conicella, Serracan Gino Nonni, Serracan
Delegation:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Mahlbod Biazi, Francl Arhitecture Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Paul Cheng, introduced the project as presently in the development permit application stage following a rezoning of this site for this particular form of development. Coming in with the development permit application are the refinements for architectural, materiality and site planning. South of marine drive is mostly made up of an industrial zone and north of marine Drive are mostly RS-1 zoned properties.

Rezoning is permitted in areas that have been previously rezoned under a CD-1. This site was originally rezoned to allow for motel use.

This is a large, almost a full block in size, site in the north east corner of southeast Marine Drive and Fraser St. Due to it's size one of the Urban Design moves for this site was the provision of pedestrian walk through for convenience to walk through the site to Chester St as well as on Marine Drive to the street further North.

This particular project is bigger than typically seen in a rezoning. During the process it was discovered that certain amenities should be added. This project includes a 37 spot daycare with outdoor playing space and a neighborhood house that is directly adjoining the daycare.

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

- 5) The development proposal on this large sloping site seeks to provide at grade through site pedestrian access and also a vehicular drop off area for the daycare. Please comment if there are any potential improvements that could be made.
- 6) Please provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression and materiality. Is there a need for more variation between the different buildings?
- 7) Please comment on the strategy for providing amenity spaces to the dwellings.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

There was a lot work with the neighborhood in terms of the massing. Various options provided and presented at the open houses. The final massing is a representation of consensus thinking from individuals in the neighborhood.

The focus was to build a site that could be inhabited by people in the area. A place where one can imagine living and raising a family. There are a total of 363 units. 53 percent are two bedrooms or more.

In the original submission the retail frontage was a single storey off of Marine Drive. The panel found this to be a tough exposure to be one level above a street of residence, it is now a two storey commercial frontage. The rhythm on the street has been tightened so you have a retail frontage that could be occupied by smaller neighborhood tenancies supporting people living and coming and going from the neighborhood.

The retail texture is a stone material to give a substantial base to the building. The materiality of building on the low rise is carried from floor to floor. On the taller structure it is stretched to fit with the height. The balcony extensions are of different characters. The tall towers have a darker palette and the low rise buildings are of a lighter palette. The materials used allow an envelope that responds to the sustainable initiatives. This will be a Leed gold certified project.

Amenity spaces for the residents include a shared courtyard space, an amenity room on the second floor of the tallest tower. A roof space and a roof deck garden with elevator access. The applicants are presently working with a public art consultant, and have approval to open a competition to submit public art proposals for a shared space within the courtyard. The courtyard was designed to be a permeable space shared by tenants of the building and individuals from the neighborhood. The space is quiet and shielded from the business of Southwest Marine Dr.

There is a bike path running across the North edge of the site and there will be mobile bike stalls and rentals. The Daycare is a practical amenity to the site and shares a kitchen facility with the neighborhood house.

Landscape worked with the architects to sculpt the suspended slab in the courtyard to allow for good soil. The main entrance is barrier free access. The size of daycare represents an accurate outdoor environment. The outdoor play space has an interesting typography so that it is not flat. Weather protection is provided along the retail frontage pedestrian path. The attempt was to create a small Granville Island space from the courtyard.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Wen and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Simplify the architectural expression and provide differentiation between the commercial, podium buildings and tower itself;
- Explore drop off from the lane and improvements of the drop off area from the courtyard
- Explore the possibility of connecting levels so both parking access ramps can be used for the entire site;
- Consideration of design development of the commercial canopies.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel expressed this was an important project as it would set a precedent for the rest of the neighborhood. There was some general concern for the architectural expression of the buildings, and the use of the high quality material. The panel noted the building could benefit from further design

development to separate the commercial and residential and simplifying the materiality. The move on the façade is a staggering move to a price at being too busy and too monotonous. A panelist noted that Marine Drive is very different from Fraser St and treating the buildings as the same is not respectful to the neighborhoods. Suggestions included simplifying the expression of each building and allowing the tall tower, L shaped tower, and the two buildings in the back have its own vocabulary. Allow the midrise of the taller buildings be expressed separately from its base. The architectural expressions of the townhomes should relate more to the single families.

Change in materiality will also help with marketing as presently looking at the models there is a lot of repetition. A panelist noted they don't need to be iconic buildings and required an extensive amount of change but at minimum two expressions and acknowledging that even background buildings can be simple and beautiful.

There was concern about the drop off to the child care facility. Suggestions included looking at providing a roundabout for better flow of vehicles and traffic at the daycare. Panel noted the lane is not ideal for drop offs but if there is no another alternative to work with engineering to provide a designated pull over drop off spots. The panel noted their appreciation for at least providing the 5 parking spaces for drop offs but was not suffice and there was room for much needed improvement. The commercial retail space should have their separate designated parking.

Then panel supported the courtyard space and commended the amount of green provided. The size of the amenity spaces provided was successful. The dedicated access to the rooftop amenities was an appreciated addition as it is not usually seen. The bike access to the bike storage as an amenity is very well handled. A suggestion was to provide rain screens.

In regards to the play space a suggestion was to think of the transition of kids from school/daycare to home and provide a bigger space.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

5. Address:	1506 W 68th Avenue & 8405-8465 Granville Street
Permit No.	RZ-2017-0059
Description:	To develop a 10-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade, office space at the second level and 45 market residential units on levels three to ten; all over three levels of underground parking with 138 vehicle stalls and 112 bicycle spaces. The proposed total floor area is 6,699 sq. m (72,105 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.6, and the maximum building height is 41.15 m (135 ft.). This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning:	C-2 & C-2C to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Austin Zhang, Westland
Delegation:	Jeff Christianson, Architect, IBI Group Nicole WU, Landscape Architect, VDZ Madeline Pearson, LEED Consultant, E3 ECO Group
Staff:	Thien Phan & Georgina Lyons

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Thien Phan, introduced the application as, located on the southwest corner of Granville Street and West 68th Avenue, this proposal seeks to rezone the site from C-2 and C-2C to CD-1, to permit the development of a ten-storey mixed-use building, containing 45 strata condo dwelling units, with commercial use on the ground floor and office on the second floor.

This existing site consists of five parcels of one- and two-storey buildings with both commercial units with 11 rental units. Directly to the south is the 14 to 18-storey Marpole Safeway development. East of Granville is within the same policy area as the subject site, and allows for mixed use up to 12 storeys. North along Granville is a C-2 subject to mixed use redevelopment of 8 storeys based on the Marpole Plan. Directly to the west is RS-1 that will not be considered for rezoning under the Plan.

The Granville sub-area of the amended Marpole Community Plan anticipates strengthening and enhancing Granville Street as the ‘social heart of Marpole,’ reinforcing it as a ‘high street.’ This includes bringing higher buildings to a previously low density neighbourhood.

The Plan anticipates 12-storey mixed use buildings in this area with an FSR of up to 3.5, with consideration for an increase in density for developments that incorporate a minimum of 0.5 FSR of commercial/office space above the first floor.

The proposal seeks:

- A building height of 135 ft. and a total floor area of 72,105 sq. ft;
- An FSR of 3.6 which includes 0.7 FSR above the first floor, meeting the intent of the policy;
- The podium includes indoor and outdoor amenity space for residents and commercial tenants;
- Three levels of parking accessed from the rear lane;
- 45 units of market housing of floors three to 10. At 75% of all units being family housing, the applicant has more than doubled the 35% family housing requirement as per the Plan.

Development Planner, Georgina Lyons, introduced the application as, presently the majority of the site is zoned C2-C, the portion on the west adjacent to the Safeway development with greater lot depth is C2. The C2-C zone anticipates a 4 storey mixed use building with no setback at the rear and side and a 2 ft front yard setback.

This application is proposing Commercial at grade along Granville and 68th Ave with the residential entry located off of Granville. There is an office on the second level and 8 levels of residential in a tower form above.

The applicants are proposing an FSR of 3.6, which is below the maximum expected in the amended Marpole plan. The floor plate is 5 611sqft within the range outlined in the amended Marpole plan. The intention for this area with regards to height is for building heights peak at 70th and then descend in a saw toothed pattern to 68th. The proposal is 10 storey and 135' in height, which is below the height limit anticipated in the plan.

With regards to the setbacks, the podium is:

- 2' setback off of Granville;
- zero lot line off of W 68th;
- 3ft off of the lane.

The residential tower is:

- 8' from Granville;
- 19'10" from W 68th Ave;
- 15' from the lane, this rear setback consistent is with what would be required for residential under the base zoning.

The parking access is from the western lane which leads to three levels of below grade parking. The loading, garbage and services areas are all off the lane.

This application is providing two amenity areas for the residential, one in a pavilion on the podium and the other in the tower. Both are adjacent to the outdoor amenity area. There are two outdoor amenity areas for the office level on the second floor. One is located off Granville. The other is located at the rear of the site off the lane. The three lots to the west will remain single family. When the plan was being drafted the residents in the area requested that their lots be excluded from the plan and remain RS-1. The current proposal is within the density and height range expected in the plan. The tower has been located to allow sunlight on the podium as well as avoid shadowing the RS-1 lots to the west.

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

1. on the proposed height, massing, density and use?
2. Comment on:
 - The overall landscape design;
 - The building's interface with the public realm at grade and the single family lots to the west;
 - The approach to sustainable performance.
3. comment on the architectural expression, to assist a future DP application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments: The building form is a result of the zoning; it is quite a compact form. A lot of effort was placed on picking the place on the site that would allow the max amount of natural light into the amenities and the residential. The position of towers reduces the amount of shadows on the houses next door for most of the day.

For the residential the tower is of cubic form, as a result some portions have been brought down to grade and different corner expressions to the form are being explored. Different height expressions have also been explored to fit the mechanical.

The commercial and residential entrances are grouped together in the center. The tower comes down to grade at the entrances to provide a variation in the expression.

On the ground level the landscape is mainly focused on high street design. Concept includes matching the surroundings and connections of streets to the main entrance

On the level 2 office space there are two bamboo gardens to create a clam, relaxing, Zen garden space. The gardens are intended to be both physically and visually enjoyed. The bamboo elements are vertical so they can be seen from street level to upper level.

There is an outdoor play area. On the east side there is a sitting area that is adjacent to the indoor amenity room. A community garden is provided to allow for some urban agriculture by all.

The Building will be taking the Low Emission Green Building path. This has formed the expression on the outside with the 50 percent glazing.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved Ms. Avini-Besharat and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel support the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Provide continuous weather protection on 68th Avenue;
- Further design development of commercial expression on 68th;
- Mitigate impact of parking exhaust and general mechanical exhaust on the lane;
- Further design development of bike parking access.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported the height, massing, and density of the project. It was a well done proportioned project and the content provided was the right amount of information to allow for an appropriate review.

A panelist noted the appreciation of the effort to make the tower visible with the massing. The analysis and clarity of the parti was well done and strong. The 4 modules of the part is well expressed. A panelist noted they appreciated how the tower kisses the sidewalk. The panel found the façade on Granville St to be very strong.

A recommendation in regards to the interface with the public realm and family lots to the west was to take in to consideration with the design the back alley to the building for this area is usually the dirty side.

For the DP stage the entry to the office and entry to the residential there is no differentiation. Continuity of weather protection on Granville would help out with the success of the retail.

The amenities were successful and appreciate providing an organic space for tenants. A panelist commended the applicants for not capping the roof top.

The panel supported the overall landscape design. It was refreshing to see landscaping play with organic forms and linear design. A panelist noted the sustainable performances of the electrical boilers and hot waters were successful.

Other suggestions included looking at mitigating the parking exhaust and mechanical exhaust on the lane and the potential impacts on the single family homes. Bike access required further design development for bike parking access. The commercial expression on 68th and the transition to the single family homes needed further design development.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant and City Staff thanked the panel for their commentary.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.