

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 9, 2013

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg (Excused Item #4)
Daryl Condon
Walter Francl
Joseph Fry (Excused Item #4)
David Grigg
Phil Mondor
Goran Ostojic (Absent for Items #1 & #2)
Norm Shearing (Chair)
Peter Wreglesworth

REGRETS:
Vincent Dumoulin
Veronica Gillies
Bruce Hemstock
Joseph Hruda

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 333 East 11 th Avenue (formerly 275 Kingsway) |
| 2. | 4099 Cambie Street (King Edward SkyTrain Station) |
| 3. | 1741 East 33 rd Avenue |
| 4. | West 57-59 th Avenue and Cambie to Heather (Pearson Dogwood Major Project) |
| 5. | Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Shearing called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel had a brief Business meeting and then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 333 East 11th Avenue (formerly 275 Kingsway)
DE: 416870
Description: Concurrent rezoning and development application to develop the site with a 15-storey mixed-use building, comprising of 189 dwelling units with commercial uses at grade.
Zoning: C-3A to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning/Complete
Review: Second
Architect: Acton Ostry Architects
Owner: Edgar Development Corp.
Delegation: Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects
Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Peter Edgar, EDC
Staff: Michael Naylor for Yan Zeng and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Michael Naylor, Rezoning Planner, stated that the policy context was relayed at the previous presentation to the Panel, so it was not necessary to review it again. He offered to answer Panel member's questions, of which there were none.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, reminded the Panel that the proposal had recently been to the Panel where it received non-support. He described the context for the area noting the Best Western Hotel. He also noted that there has been a shoulder height reduction since the last review and a significant move with the opening up of the internal atrium.

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

Please comment on the revised proposal. Has the updated proposal successfully addressed panel comments which related the design development following aspects of the proposal:

- Building massing
- Architectural expression of the building
- Visual access of the internal corridor (open air atrium)
- Landscape of internal corridor (open air atrium)

Mr. Naylor and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Ostry, Architect, further described the proposal and explained that the previous massing had the appearance of being larger. The building height is still the same as at the previous review. He said there have been a couple of changes. The first one was opening up the atrium to the street. This separates the building along East 11th Avenue into two parts with the aim at reducing the apparent massing of the building. There is now within that space a glass elevator, three amenity decks to encourage social interaction and at the top is a translucent canopy that is visible from the street. As well there is a place for a potential public art component on the wall facing both Kingsway and East 11th Avenue in the slot. Mr. Ostry explained that they have stepped back the two residential floors including the amenity penthouse. He described the proposed materials which include glass and spandrel treatment and cement paneling. At the base of the building there is now a continuous 2-storey masonry expression. The north

wall has cement paneling to the ground. Since they are able to get more light into the atrium bamboo will be planted in the base of the atrium along with evergreen planters on the amenity decks. As well there is a feature tree proposed at the outdoor entry lobby.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider improving the access into the courtyard from the street;
 - Design development to improve the lane façade;
 - Consider reinstated the previous roof element.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought there was a significant improvement since the last review.

Most of the Panel thought the massing had been improved with the stepped form that helped improve the vertical expression of the building. A couple of Panel members thought it hadn't gone far enough as the building was still too bulky for the site. They noted that the open slot into the atrium was a key animator for the building and making it semi-public was an improvement as it helps to better relate to the street. However, some Panel members thought the opening from the street was a little tight. They thought the area could help to create a visual sense of opportunity for the community but thought the atrium could be further enhanced.

A couple of Panel members thought the lane façade still needed some improvement with one Panel member suggesting it have more definition. As well it was noted by a couple of Panel members that the building is out of character with the context and the setback areas are internalized when they are not in the rest of the area. Other members liked the topology and thought extending the mass to the outside of the site was appropriate.

A couple of Panel members thought the atrium roof felt complicated and wanted to see the previous design reinstated. It was also suggested that the applicant consider adding solar panels for heating hot water. As well one Panel member suggested improving the access to the bike storage.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ostry said he had nothing further to add and thanked the Panel for all their comments.

2. Address:	4099 Cambie Street (King Edward SkyTrain Station)
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a mixed-use building with commercial at grade and residential units on the upper floors, with a height of 8-stgoreys (approximately 27 m/88 feet) with a partial mezzanine contained in the ground floor and a total of 65 market condo units.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	Second
Architect:	W.T. Leung Architects
Owner:	TransLink
Delegation:	Wing Ting Leung, W.T. Leung Architects Konning Tam, W.T. Leung Architects Daryl Tyacke, ETA Landscape Inc.
Staff:	Michael Naylor for Yan Zeng and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-3)

- **Introduction:** Michael Naylor, Rezoning Planner, stated that the rezoning site is within the Cambie Corridor at a location that called for mixed uses. He noted that the King Edward Canada Line Station is located on the site. The Cambie Corridor Plan requires grade-level commercial and, as well, suggests upper level commercial. Due to the economics of second-floor commercial, it is not offered in this proposal. He then noted that the other parameters of the Cambie Corridor Plan relate to density and height, and that the development planner would speak to that.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal and for a new structure above the existing transit station at King Edward Avenue and Cambie Street. The proposal is to rezone the site from C-2 to CD-1 under the Cambie Corridor Plan. Mr. Potter explained the design principles in the Cambie Corridor Plan and mentioned that the building should have a shoulder line and setbacks at the upper floors. As well he noted that the constraints on the site include not touching the station structurally.

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

In addition to any comment on the overall form of development proposed for this rezoning, the Panel's advice is sought on the following questions:

1. How well does the project respond to the Cambie Corridor Plan design principles?
2. How successfully does the project incorporate and integrate with the existing station building (King Edward Canada Line Station)?
3. Please comment on the overall architectural expression of the building and in particular, the success of the Cambie Street elevation.
4. Please comment on the overall landscape design as it relates to the following:
 - a) Public realm interface and its existing conditions;
 - b) Outside amenity space;
 - c) Other rooftop spaces.

Mr. Naylor and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Wing Ting Leung, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that when the station was built it was thought that any new construction would have a lower building form than what is being proposed. He said the higher volume should probably be at King Edward Avenue but because of the station there is a restriction that the new structure cannot touch the station. Mr. Leung described the

architectural design noting that the floor slabs over the station will be suspended from the building's core. The building will be suspended over the station with a skirt that will prevent animals and dust from getting under the overhang. He noted that the building will include bike lockers, bike storage and bike repairs.

Konning Tam, Architect, explained that they are following the setbacks of the existing station and have created a 4-storey streetwall along Cambie Street with a series of five bays that have a bold colour. The design of the main building is more neutral in color and has a horizontal expression. There is a southwest facing amenity garden and a series of green roofs on the building. Mr. Tam described the building's materials noting the terracotta cladding and aluminum panels.

Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He said they are proposing decorative pavement with walk-over spot lighting. They will move the bike parking closer to the street and introduce a more decorative bike rack. In addition they are proposing a seating element in front of the transit station. The lane treatment will have a small planter and a cable trellis system against the wall as an alternate to a green wall. The building's amenity space is on the second level above the transit station and will have some community gardens as well as screening/fencing and hedge material separating the private patios. The top two floors the individual terraces having plantings between them and planting around the elevator core.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider adding second storey retail;
 - Design development to improvement architectural expression;
 - Design development to reduce the impact of the concrete wall on the lane to the neighbours.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and recognized the challenges of building over the Canada Line Station.

The Panel thought the proposal responded well to the Cambie Corridor Plan noting that the guidelines for Kind Edward Avenue allow for 4-storey buildings to step down in their massing. They agreed that building over the station was a challenge but thought it was supportable. Some of the Panel agreed that in order to have the increase in density the applicant should provide second storey retail. The disagreed with the applicant's explanation that it wouldn't be viable and thought there were ways to make it work.

Most of the Panel supported the architectural expression and had no concern with the public realm design. Some Panel member thought the horizontal expression wasn't working and suggested the punched balconies be expressed as a horizontal element. Some Panel members agreed that while the structural solution to build over the station was creative the scheme would gain strength if the building elevations reflected this structural system. One Panel member thought the building could be lifted one floor over the station since it has a flat roof as a way to engage the element and respond to the datum line. Another Panel member thought the station should be more prominent in its expression against the proposal. Some members noted that the project had the potential to set a precedent for mixed-use buildings at transit stations.

The Panel agreed that townhouses would not have been the right response for this site on the lane because of the depth of the site. A couple of Panel members were concerned with

the massing and the building's relationship to its neighbours. There were some members who thought the lane could use some design development as well. They noted the 30 foot high wall of concrete and thought it was too severe against the single family homes across the lane.

The Panel thought it was important to have commercial along Cambie Street at grade. One Panel member noted that the wayfinding to the station could be improved.

The Panel liked that the public realm interface was deeper and thought there could be more trees along the Cambie Street frontage. They also thought the outside amenity space was well handled. Although the Panel liked the idea of the lighting in the pavement, one Panel member suggested the applicant find a product that couldn't be smashed.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Leung thanked the Panel for their comments.

3. Address:	1741 East 33 rd Avenue
DE:	417154
Description:	Four 3-storey buildings consisting of 31 residential units within a co-housing community of which two units are required to be rental, over one level of underground parking.
Zoning:	CD-1 pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Third (first as Development Application)
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Eighth Avenue Development
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Judith Reeve, Judith Reeve Landscaping Ed Kovic, Eighth Avenue Development Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group
Staff:	Ann McLean

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following rezoning under the Interim Rezoning Policy to Increase Affordable Housing Choices Across Vancouver's Neighbourhoods (March 2013). The project was considered under this policy as it provides a Cohousing model of residential development. Cohousing includes a collaborative design process and common amenity space that encourages contact among residents. Ms. McLean described the context noting the site is surrounded by single family residents. The proposed residential units are located in two 3-storey buildings flanking a common courtyard and the amenity area is located a 2 ½ storey building at the lane. Parking is provided in one level of underground access from the lane. Under the CD-1 Bylaw, two units must be rental. There will be 31 units in total.

Ms. Mclean mentioned that the proposal was reviewed by the Panel twice during rezoning and was not supported. The key aspects requiring improvement from the January 16, 2013 meeting included:

- Design development to reduce height and density (Previously noted at 1.26 FSR; height of 36.8 feet);
- Design development to focus the mass in the first 35% of the site as well as the rear volume;
- Consider an east/west orientation for the proposal;
- Design development to reduce overlook to the neighbours;
- Consider further passive features in terms of the envelope;
- Further development the landscape aspects especially in the courtyard;
- Consider a flat roof on the one storey component;
- Consider moving the kid's room adjacent to an outdoor area; and
- Consider easing back the volume adjacent to the courtyard to reduce shadowing.

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

1. If the revised proposal adequately addressed the Panels previous comments.
2. If the design has achieved a form that is compatible with the single family context
3. If the proposal creates a successful interface with the public realm – street and lane.

Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tim Ankenman, Architects, further described the proposal noting that they inherited the site and they needed to carefully look at the Panel's previous comments and redesign the entire project as a result. He said they decided to orient the units north/south and change the architectural expression so there wasn't a lot of massing up against the single family homes. They moved the elevator into the common house as a way to make the project intermingle. Instead of having the massing on either side of the project they put it into the middle of the project and created gable roofs. They also looked at doing front entry stairs and balconies and everything else that makes for a single family character. The main entry comes up a slight ramp at the second floor in a bridge overlooking the courtyard. They have programmed the courtyard with gathering spots for people. There is an outdoor kitchen and covered eating area. Mr. Ankenman said that the idea was to create a village-like atmosphere.

Judith Reeve, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that one of the things co-housing is interested in is sustainability and food production. They are adding a layer of fruit trees in with the other species of street trees. There is a water feature proposed at the entrance to the courtyard. She described the planting in the courtyard noting the opportunity for a lot of movement in the area so there will be trees in moveable planters. As well as a greenhouse and lawn is planned. Off the lane there is a vegetable garden and fruit trees. On either side there is a way to direct roof drainage water and send it in a swale and then into some collection tanks to be used for irrigation.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Considering improving the area around the guest suite;
 - Considering reducing the size of the windows for better sustainability.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the architecture and landscape would enrich the lives of the people that will live there.

The Panel agreed that the revised proposal had addressed the Panel's previous concerns regarding the architecture. They thought the form was compatible with the single family context. Although the project is larger than the properties surrounding the site, the Panel thought the interface was supportable.

Some Panel members thought the front façade proportion was nicely handled but was weakened by the roof extension. A couple of Panel members had some concerns with bedroom windows being opposite other bedrooms windows but because the inhabitants were part of the design development the panel was less concerned than they would typically be in this instance.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding the shadowing in the courtyard but thought the applicant had handled that issue as well as possible. One Panel member suggested making a break in the façade to get more sunlight in the area. Also they thought the side yards could be improved especially around the stair wells and walls.

Some Panel members thought the area around the guest suite could be improved. They thought that having it adjacent to the lane was the right location but access to it was complicated.

The Panel supported the landscaping and thought it was rich in terms of all the activity spaces. One Panel member suggested the applicant look at the central roof terrace

suggesting the smaller roofs on either end were not necessary as it creates a larger massing on the lane.

Regarding sustainability, the cross ventilation in the units was supported but since there is a close proximity to the other family homes the size of the windows could be minimized to eliminate privacy concerns. As well it would reduce the heat loss and heat gain.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman said the Panel had some useful comments that were welcomed. He then thanked the Panel.

4. Address:	West 57-49 th Avenue and Cambie to Heather Streets (Pearson Dogwood Major Projects)
DE:	N/A
Description:	Vancouver Coast health proposes to redevelop the site to meet the current and future health care needs of the community while introducing a mix of new uses. The City of Vancouver is leading a collaborative and consultative planning process with CCH and the surrounding community to create the Policy Statement to guide and inform future rezoning and development permits for the site. This workshop will review the draft planning concepts, guiding principles and policy statements of the twenty-five acre Pearson Dogwood site.
Zoning:	RT-2
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	DIALOG
Owner:	Vancouver Coastal Health
Delegation:	Martin Nielsen, DIALOG Joost Bakker, DIALOG Joseph Fry, HAPA Landscape Architects Stef Schiedon, Lower Mainland Facilities Management Marie Fontaine, Lower Mainland Facilities Management
Staff:	Yardley McNeil and Patricia St. Michel

EVALUATION: Non-Voting Workshop

- Introduction:** Yardley McNeil, Rezoning Planner, introduced the workshop for the Pearson Dogwood Major Projects on a site between West 57th and West 59th Avenues, Cambie and Heather Streets. In 2009, Council approved a policy review program to create a Policy Statement for the site. In 2013, the project was started and the Policy Statement will guide all future development on the site and permit the project to proceed to rezoning without the need for an ODP. The third round of Open Houses has just been completed with the community and staff are at the stage of finalizing an illustrated concept plan for the Policy Statement. Ms. McNeil asked the Panel for their advice on the draft Guiding Principles, the proposed concept plan and the alternate massing option that has been included and the key elements that will make up the Policy Statement. She noted that the anticipated completion of the planning program is early 2014.

Ms. McNeil gave some background on the site and explained that it is a 25 acre parcel and the existing zoning is RT-2. The site was originally used as a tuberculosis sanatorium to address the polio epidemic in the 1950's. It was later used for the severely physically disabled. A second building was constructed in the 1970's for seniors needing 24 hour care. Currently there are 233 people residing on the site. Ms. McNeil added that the intention is to demolish all existing buildings and retain the significant trees in the middle of the site as part of the proposed park system.

Ms. McNeil described the context for the area noting that the site is one of several large developments anticipated along the Cambie Corridor including the Oakridge Shopping Centre and Langara Gardens redevelopments, new construction at Cambie Street and Marine Drive and the Cambie Corridor and Marpole Community Plans.

Ms. McNeil explained the development objectives for the redevelopment of the site for higher density residential uses. This includes retaining existing residents on site in a variety

of housing options as well as expanding the health care related services to the area. As well the YMCA is to be relocated from West 49th Avenue to Pearson and local serving retail and office space will be added. She added that 20% of the units are for social housing, a dedicated park will be added, child care and adult care is included and not for profit space is also planned. As well road and bike improvements are proposed along with the construction of a new West 57th Avenue Canada Line Station.

Patricia St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal of the Pearson Dogwood site and highlighted some of the guiding principles that apply to urban form. She noted that Pearson is third in hierarchy of station areas along the Cambie Corridor in the context of the Canada Line. Oakridge Centre is first in the hierarchy given its role as Vancouver's only municipal town centre and its location at major crossroads of current and future transit. Marine Drive and Cambie Street similarly is a major transit hub with strong east/west connections. Pearson, while an important site and opportunity, has limited east/west connectivity.

Ms. St. Michel noted that the Phase 2 Cambie Corridor Policy supports 6-storey mixed-use at the corner south of West 59th Avenue and 6-storey residential beyond this first block. The Marpole neighbourhood to the south is currently going through a community planning process. The draft plan proposed 6-storey apartments and 3-storey townhouses on the blocks of West 59th Avenue facing Pearson. However, Council recently decided to pull back from change in the area immediately south of Pearson. These areas will be remaining single family with the exception of a possible small area of transition immediately behind the 6- storeys approved policy on Cambie Street.

To the north of the site is Langara Gardens for which a planning program will be starting up in the near future to consider its future and create policy to guide it. The proposal is to retain the four existing 18-storey towers and redevelop the low rise garden apartment area.

The plan being considered today evolved from three earlier plans presented at June open houses that demonstrated a variety of site planning approaches: core, continuum, and cluster.

Today's proposed plan combines the central park of the Core scheme, and the east/west linear public open space of the Continuum scheme. Several great strengths that reflect the guiding principles created through the process. The plan retains the most significant grove of trees on site, opens out to the neighbourhood to the south, and creates a car free, pedestrian, wheelchair and cyclist oriented space as the central focus of the site.

Vehicular access is in a mews and street system in a perimeter around this central open space. Strong diagonal connections are made from the surrounding community to transit and from Churchill Street to West 59th Avenue and Cambie Street. Overall the proposed FSR is 2.8, in building forms from three to twenty-eight storeys.

The proposed massing shows the tallest buildings organized around the park, with heights stepping down somewhat towards the station. The alternate plan illustrates a pattern of height increasing at the station and descending west and south.

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

1. Height and massing:
 - height pattern of tallest buildings located centrally on the site, or at future transit station with transition downward to the west and south;
 - transition to 59th Avenue and the Marpole community single family homes;

- relationship between the 25 storey building and surrounding built form in the SW quadrant;
 - range of building types, forms and heights: balance of mid-rise, tower/podium and low-rise.
2. Site Plan: General concept and organization of the site.
 3. Guiding Principles: Is there anything we've missed?

Ms. McNeil and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stef Schiedon further described the proposal noting that one of the biggest problems of healthcare is financial sustainability and that is one of the tasks at hand with this development. In the future this will help to feed new healthcare deliveries in the city. The guiding principles are to create a sustainable, healthy environment for people. The YMCA, a community health centre and therapeutic pool replacing the existing pool are planned for the site. The plan is to have an integration of different people from all social layers.

Joost Bakker, Architect, mentioned that it is endowment for healthcare and nothing like this has been seen in the province before. The province has given Coast Health the opportunity to explore this type of development and report back early next year.

Martin Nielsen, Architect, further described the proposal and said that it was a privilege to work on the project. It is not a typical development and the proceeds will go back into our health system and they are reinstating health services on the site. He explained that they have five whole health elements that they have put together for the project: flow, access, growth, thrive and harmonize. These are themes they are trying to integrate into the project. Flow is about the flow of water through the site, water as a therapeutic tool and flow of energy through the site. Access through the site will be important because of the different needs of the residents. They are looking to provide food on site. Currently there is an existing urban agriculture on the site, Farmer's on 59th which will be reinstated as part of the project. They are also looking for a diversity of open space from intimate spaces to celebratory spaces. They will also be introducing a diverse range of housing and residential care. Mr. Nielsen described the context for the site and noted that there is a lot of open space around the site with the schools and a golf course in the area. He said the site feels disconnected right now and the road network is broken at the site. Part of the plan is to integrate the project back into the urban fabric. Mr. Nielsen said that they are trying to de-institutionized health care and plan to have a distribution relative to abilities of other residents who can be served the community healthcare centre.

Joseph Fry, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the plan is to create a pedestrian oriented space through the centre of the site and that will address some of the grade changes. The Ash Street corridor is partly road but is fully pedestrianized. The existing trees are in great health and will be retained. Smaller parks will happen at the corners of the site with elements of water that will draw people into the site. The use of water on the site is consistent with ideas around sustainability and they see it as a narrative for health and wellness on the site. He added that the urban agriculture is interesting and they will be looking at opportunities to engage that on roofscapes and a place to keep the Farmers on 59th that is an active part of the public realm. They tried to reinstate the grid for pedestrians and bikes although there will be bus loops through the site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Related Commentary:**
 - This is an opportunity to do an outstanding development for Vancouver Coastal Health and the City;
 - The applicant has a duty and responsibility to not leave anything on the table regarding good design;
 - The site could achieve significant density without impairing the community;
 - Don't think the development should turn its back on Cambie Street as more density could live there
 - It is unfortunate that both Langara Gardens and Pearson are not coming in together. There is a lost opportunity if both sites aren't maximized for their development potential and benefits;
 - The YMCA should be more visible on the site, and used to animate the park and public spaces. Orienting the building along West 57th Avenue is a lost opportunity;
 - Panel members were split on whether the taller towers should be located in the center of the site. Some members suggested perhaps the density on Cambie Street could be equal to the density in the middle of the site;
 - Having a community with health and wellness as the context will bring richness to the plan;
 - The parks seem a little formal;
 - Would like to see some more complex and innovative forms; more mid-rise massing is needed to achieve greater variety;
 - Unclear of where station will come up. Rapid transit station should be a celebration of the public realm and the station should be a fantastic anchor point; higher density should be placed closest to the transit station; height 'story' needs to make sense;
 - West 57th Avenue should be thought of as a grand street and some Panel members thought towers should not be placed along the full length of the street;
 - Would like to see a storm water management plan;
 - The road system and drainage to the catch basins doesn't lend itself well to getting into the ponds;
 - The storm water doesn't necessarily have to go down Cambie Street to the Fraser River;
 - Like the goals to create a unique community and the social sustainability of the proposal;
 - Langara Gardens and this site are going to sit in contrast to the Cambie Corridor Guidelines;
 - This site has the potential to grow beyond the Cambie Corridor guidelines; this is an opportunity to provide their own cadence along Cambie
 - Buildings need to be different from the other new projects along Cambie Street with more variety in building forms;
 - The height is supportable;
 - The ratio of solid to void is a bit problematic;
 - Supports Guiding Principles;
 - The proposal would benefit from more definition on the built form with stronger edges on the whole site;
 - Like how pedestrians and vehicles will move through the site;
 - The interior courtyards that are formed by the building massing seems less differentiated;
 - The project may look good in 2013 but what will it look like in 2030: is this the best design for the site;
 - The southwest section isn't well defined and a 25-storey tower is too abrupt against surrounding lower buildings; intermediate scale is needed here; density should be focused more towards West 57th Avenue with softer density to the south;
 - Greater density along West 59th Avenue;

- The mid-rise buildings along Heather Street seem out of scale and character;
 - Vehicle movement through the site seems very suburban and unclear;
 - Those towers forming the “arch” have a clear rationale but loses its clarity at the north-east corner of the site. There is no relationship to the arch on the ground plane which calls into question the placement of the towers;
 - Liked the large park spaces, but smaller open spaces aren’t well defined;
 - The complexities of the project have reached a level of resolution but the results are very familiar. The project offers very little that is new or engaging;
 - Could the site, be more bold;
 - Would like to see more sustainable principles such as net zero buildings;
 - Consider greater amounts of family units as future needs will likely surpass proposed amount;
 - There is an opportunity to have a link with the CoV staff that are working on the Healthy City Policy;
 - The Panel agreed that there is an opportunity to do really exemplary architecture and make this a walkable and fantastic neighbourhood but it is not there yet.
- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Nielsen thanked the Panel for their excellent comments. He said some of the comments were questions that they have been struggling to answer. He said he realizes that West 59th Avenue has the weakest edge and they are trying to expand that to a single family topology.

Mr. Schiedon said the Panel had offered some valuable commentary. He noted that one of their challenges is the number of agendas that need to be met and the timelines being faced by Vancouver Coastal Health. He added that they have been thinking about Cambie Street and making a difference response on that edge.

5. Address:	Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan
DE:	N/A
Description:	Workshop to seek input and advice on the draft Land Use Plan and urban design directions.
Zoning:	N/A
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	N/A
Owner:	N/A
Delegation:	N/A
Staff:	Scot Hein and Tanis Knowles Yarnell

EVALUATION: Non-Voting Workshop

- **Introduction:** Tanis Knowles, Planner, introduced the workshop noting that the DTES Local Area Plan is one of the four areas that Council has directed staff to undertake. Through the adoption of the Terms of Reference, Council struck a unique process where staff are working closely with the DTES Local Area Planning Committee. They have been working for over two years to get the Terms of Reference agreed along with the planning process while find ways to engage with the broader public. The other thing that Council had staff undertake was the Social Impact Assessment of the DTES and the plan also focus on accelerating the implementation of the DTES Housing Plan which was adopted in 2005. The Plan had a big focus on looking at the future of the neighbourhood in terms of assuring that it meets the needs of all residents with particular focus on ensuring the low income community is able to remain and not be displaced through the future plans for a mixed income neighbourhood.

The Plan today is a selection of the information panels that were presented to the public in July at the first round of open houses. There are also other panels not seen by the Urban Design Panel that cover things like local economy, community health and well-being that relate to the social impact assessment and the findings of that work.

Ms. Knowles mentioned that there are some big opportunities for alternate approaches to development particularly on East Hastings Street.

Scot Hein, Development Planner, further described the plan for the Downtown Eastside and noted that they started with research since they knew the DTES had an older, historic and industrial context. The area has its own identity and urban fabric and they wanted to be contextual and have a tool to assess the density aspirations towards certain housing opportunities. They tried to look at higher densities and form without looking to slim tower or tower podium buildings. There are a lot of examples of contextual lower ambient yet still very dense kinds of topologies in the neighbourhood. Mr. Hein mentioned that they are very interested in housing opportunities for the area. He said they are looking at loading up the density along Hastings Street and the Hastings Viaduct. As well they are planning to tie in transportation systems.

There are a number of historic neighbourhoods in the DTES including Victory Square, Gastown, Chinatown, Strathcona and Kiwassa and Thornton Park. As well there are a couple of new neighbourhoods: Hastings East (from Heatley Street to Clark Drive) and Hogan's Alley. The industrial neighbourhoods include Railtown and the port area. The emerging direction includes retaining community assets that have been identified in the DTES Social Impact Assessment, developing new Social Impact Guidelines, ensure diverse development and engage the DTES residents and stakeholders in the planning and future

development. As well the development of transportation principles that will make walking and cycling safe and will support transit improvements. The parks and open spaces will also be looked at within the plan to enhance already existing parks, explore expanding neighbourhood green and open spaces, support urban ecological systems and explore ways to increase accessibility to a greater sense of community.

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

- Whether staff are aiming properly given the potential differences within the areas;
- Topologically and contextually if staff are calibrating form and scale and architectural expression correctly given the differences in the area.

• **Related Commentary:**

- The Panel thought it was a challenging area but could see the amount of work that staff had done in relation to the plan;
- The buildings will change as they run out of useful life;
- This is an urban space and its getting more urban all the time;
- ?The Hasting East portion of the study looked like a density study but lacked the integration of those important elements that make neighbourhoods
- Regarding the East Hastings corridor, it is barren on both sides. Could non-residential uses be encouraged such as two or three floors of secondary office space with residential above;
- Make this a neighbourhood that people can stay in or young people can afford;
- Where is the alternative housing? Compressed land value could produce more interesting housing;
- The flanking flat iron building will work well as an urban design move but not sure what benefits it brought to the area.
- The Panel was not convinced with the gateway site and thought what might be more appropriate as a continuous expression of the historical scale and character further west;
- The Panel felt there are lessons that could be learned from the Cambie Corridor Plan particularly around questions of land assembly (size of developments) and the homogeneous expression the guidelines produce;
- The Panel wanted to see the plan be more principle based;
- The Panel didn't want to see the area become less gritty as this used to be an industrial area;
- The laneways have such character and it would be a shame to have them become more sanitized;
- The area is part of the waterfront and the port and the Panel saw this as an important element that should be integrated and celebrated in the plan;
- The Panel supported the public spaces;
- The Panel Staff's work regarding "Places and Strategies" work recognizing that there are important spaces that need to be protected;
- ;
- They wondered if there was another typology of public realm, one specific to the character and composition of the DTES;
- The Panel thought the names of the sub areas was important such as Japantown. Although this might not exist anymore, it is still part of the history of the area and needs to be acknowledged;
- Could have more street trees, something significant that could bring a sense of pride;
- Could there be a way to expand Oppenheimer Park or other parks in the area;
- Would like to see commercial building that can also take artist's space or studio space;
- Some of the sub-area can afford to take large building typologies
- Not only creating housing but creating neighbourhoods as well;

- The integration of affordable housing units mixed with market seems like a good idea on paper, but with only a relatively small percentage of affordable housing units per development the Panel questioned whether there was an efficient management model;
- The challenge is going to be having non-profits manage affordable housing projects.
- The panel generally felt there was a great deal of work that still needed to be done.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.