

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 6, 2013

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg
Daryl Condon
Walter Francl (Excused Item #1)
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock
Joseph Hruda (Absent for Item #1)
Phil Mondor
Goran Ostojic (Absent for Item #1, Excused Item #2)
Norm Shearing (Chair)

REGRETS:
Vincent Dumoulin
Joseph Fry
Veronica Gillies
Peter Wreglesworth

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 601 West Hastings Street |
| 2. | 650 West 41 st Avenue (Oakridge Centre) |
| 3. | 3496 Mons Drive (Vancouver Christian School) |
| 4. | 3365 East 4 th Avenue (Beulah Garden Home Society) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Shearing called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel had a short business meeting between the first and second items considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 601 West Hastings Street
 DE: N/A
 Description: The application proposes to amend the existing By-law to allow for a 25-storey office building with ground level retail space and a public plaza.
 Zoning: Amend CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning
 Review: First
 Architect: B+H Architects
 Owner: Morguard
 Delegation: James Vasto, B+H Architects
 Patrick Fejer, B+H Architects
 Eddie Wu, B+H Architects
 Geoff Nague, Morguard
 Juan Monterrosa, Enermodal Engineering
 Staff: Karen Hoese and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for a site located at the intersection of Hastings and Seymour Streets within the Vancouver Central Business District (CBD). The site is currently occupied by a public plaza and is part of the existing CD-1, dating back to 1984, that includes 333 Seymour Street located immediately to the north. This rezoning application is only for the portion of the CD-1 that is south of the lane. The proposal is for a 357 foot office building, with retail use and a new public plaza at street level. The intent of the rezoning application is to increase the density beyond that permitted under the current zoning. Ms. Hoese noted that the Policy for the area supported the proposed uses and increased density. Within the CBD area, the MetroCore Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan emphasize non-residential uses and the creation of job space close to transit. In response to this plan, the Rezoning Policy for the CBD was adopted in 2009. The objective of this policy is to increase the potential for commercial capacity by guiding rezonings for non-residential buildings to reach heights and densities up to the view cones. All rezoning are subject to the Green Building Policy, which required that rezonings apply for LEED™ Gold certification with specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and noted that originally the site was intended to provide an attractive public gathering space for people in the downtown as open space is very limited. Mr. Black mentioned that the height is limited by a view cone to approximately 357 feet above Hastings Street. The adjacent zoning allows for consideration of heights up to 450 feet, although consideration needs to be given to building size and location, siting, surrounding buildings and existing views. The design guidelines for the Downtown note the importance of good open space, and that new structures in an area of older buildings should respect their scale, window rhythms and general façade treatments, as well as environmental considerations such as minimizing shadowing on public areas. Mr. Black explained that the City was willing to consider rezoning of the site if the quality of public amenity can be maintained. He added that for

this site, there is the potential to improve access to sunlight, daylight and publicness. The current proposal is for a 25-storey office tower with commercial space at grade with parking access from the lane. Mr. Black described the form briefly, noting the exterior curtain wall intended to respond to adjacent buildings, and the covered, open-air plaza for public use that has been designed to maximize the sun at 12 noon.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the proposal, including the following:

1. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development in general, including approximately 24 FSR and 357 feet in height, as designed?
2. Noting the existing quantity and quality of the public amenity, including places to gather and the view of the sky above the dome, does the proposed size, layout and proportions of the plaza provide an attractive and welcoming space for the public that performs as well or better than the existing plaza?
3. Does the massing of the proposed tower respond well to its specific context, considering its relationship to nearby neighbours, shadowing, and impacts to the public realm?
4. Noting the rezoning stage of this application, does the Panel have any preliminary comments on the exterior expression and especially the treatment of the open space treatment as shown?

Ms. Hoese and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Vasto, Architect, further described the proposal and noted the challenges they were faced with which included the small foot print of the site and how to address the parking. He added that their main concern was how to address the ground plane and the public realm in the public space. Mr. Vasto said they intent to connect the parking of 333 Seymour Street with the proposed new parking under the lane on three levels. He mentioned that they have had a chance to observe how the current plaza is used and found that it is rarely if ever used by the public. He said that in their opinion it is a cold space and there isn't a reason to go there. In order to create the job space on the site what they are proposing is to carve away the bottom three levels and give that back as an amenity with an interesting soffit that in the evening will glow and during the day will allow in lots of light.

Patrick Fejér, Architect, described the design principles for the proposal. He said they wanted to increase the slenderness of the tower and are planning a frit pattern on the façade with textured recessed panels. He said they wanted to make a useable workplace layout for the floor plan that allows for views on all four corners. The mechanical penthouse will be concealed by the skin of the building extending past it. Mr. Fejér mentioned that they are proposing a two level restaurant that will overlook the plaza. He added that they are looking at having public art displayed in the plaza.

Eddie Wu, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they are proposing a memorable urban park that people that can relate to that has a modern design. He said they want to get more people to use the space. They have terraced the area and have edge conditions that will allow for people to sit. A sculptured wall is proposed that will animate the façade. Featured lighting is planned throughout the area with plantings for a miniature botanical garden.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the plaza expression;
 - Design development to improve the overall expression of the tower;
 - Consider opening up the view from the corner to the Seabus terminal;
 - Design development to improve the canopy expression.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting building.

The Panel supported the proposed form of development, the overall height and massing. In summarizing comments, the Chair also noted a couple of sticking points. One area for further development was the role of the Seymour Street edge and its relation to the plaza at the Hastings Street level; the opportunity to connect better with the 333 Seymour Street site; and the connection with the foot of Seymour Street. Another area was the tower, which benefited from elegant proportions but needed stronger form-giving ideas at the development permit stage than were shown. The Panel didn’t think the plaza met the definition of a public park since it had a number of constraints. However, they thought it was an improvement over the existing plaza.

A couple of Panel members thought the size of the restaurant area into the plaza was too big and made for more constraints in the plaza. As well they were concerned with the grade change and thought the seating buffer forced pedestrians into the sidewalk. One Panel member mentioned that the sidewalk was narrow and didn’t help the situation. Another Panel member thought the steps could be made into an active edge and that it needed an opening. As well it was suggested that there could be places where people can sit instead of stairs.

The Panel thought the tower responded well to its context and that the proportions were well done. However a couple of Panel members said they were looking for “big idea” and thought the formal moves were arbitrary. It was suggested that the restaurant was blocking the view down to the Seabus terminal. They thought the canopy would function well but wasn’t sure that it related well to the street.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Vasto thanked the Panel for their comments.

2. Address:	650 West 41 st Avenue (Oakridge Centre)
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a mixed-use development including buildings at a range of heights up to 45-storeys with commercial, office, residential and public amenity space.
Zoning:	Amend CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	Second
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects
Owner:	Ivanhoe Cambridge and Westbank
Delegation:	Greg Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects Duncan Paterson, Gensler Darren Burns, Stantec Chris Phillips, PFS Landscape Architects Ian Gillespie, Westbank
Staff:	Dwayne Drobot and Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for development of Oakridge Centre. He gave a brief history of the site noting that it was built in 1956 and was the first open air shopping center in Vancouver. The mall was enclosed in 1983 with further renovations done in 1993. The site is at the convergence of two transit lines. Mr. Drobot noted some key actions including planning for mixed-use areas with pedestrian-oriented public spaces so that goods and services are within a safe and enjoyable 10-minute walk from where people live. As well the development need to supports existing and new transit infrastructure.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal for the Oakridge Centre and provided some background on development at the other station. Ms. St. Michel also described the initial rezoning submission from 2012, comments made at the Urban Design Panel workshop in December 2012 and responses and changes made in the resubmission.

While considering higher density and taller building forms, the proposal is intended to reflect key principles of the 2007 Policy Statement. Ms. St. Michel described the initial rezoning submission from 2012 and how it related to and varied from the policy statement. She reminded the Panel that there was a workshop in December 2012 where the Panel provided comments and advice on three main areas: Density Height and Massing, Connectivity and Permeability and Public Place-making. The Panel had commented that the density was aggressive, but felt it could be accommodated on the site. The Panel thought the 45-storey height was in the realm of taller buildings in Vancouver and needed to be looked at in the broader context. The location of the tallest buildings at the northeast corner close to transit was thought to be the right approach. It was commented that there was no better place to do this proposal given the transit lines and the scale of the site. The larger tower floor plates were thought to be appropriate, however there was concern regarding the monolithic scale of buildings on Cambie Street.

The Panel thought that visibility and accessibility were key to the success of the public open space on the roof, that it should be visible from the street, the transit plaza and the southeast and northeast corners of the site. The public open space needed to come down to grade, bringing the landscape down to the street. The Panel made references to the

Spanish Steps and terraced rice paddys. In general, the redevelopment needed to be less internalized and connected in a stronger way to the surrounding community.

It was suggested that the community centre/public buildings might better be a separate building, with a stronger identity and sense of destination.

Ms. St. Michel then described the changes in the resubmission. While the overall density and height remain the same, changes were made to the massing. Large slab buildings were reconfigured to be point tower forms with height increases of 2 and 5 storeys. Towers proposed are 7,500 to 8,500 square foot floor plates. A tower has been relocated from West 41st Avenue to the High Street, and further variety, setbacks, and public spaces have been introduced along the Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue edges. Several oak trees will be retained on Cambie Street near West 45th and West 41st Avenues near Heather Street. Smaller CRUs have been introduced along Cambie Street and at West 45th Avenue by the relocated Safeway.

There are significant changes in public place-making and connectivity, particularly the number and design of access points to public roof-top open space. There are now six locations with access from the public realm to the roof-top. Designs are more generous and integrated with landscape, levels and uses. Restaurants and other uses have been added to activate the space. The High Street has been reconfigured to connect to Heather Street and the parking entry has been moved eastward giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists. Off-street bike routes are now proposed all around the perimeter of the site. The Civic Centre has been relocated to the High Street where it can have a greater presence.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

- **Density Height and Massing:** Is this an appropriate building form, height, and density for a redeveloped Oakridge Centre?
 - The proposed intensity and height as a transit-oriented development, a municipal town centre, and in the context of the evolving neighbourhood.
 - Scale and massing of the varied building types and tower floor plates.
 - Comment on massing changes made in the resubmission.
- **Connectivity and Permeability:** How well integrated, permeable and connected is the proposed redeveloped centre with its context and with transit?
- **Public Place-making:** How public are the public places on the site?
 - How successful is the proposal, and the changes made in the revised application, in making the proposed roof-top commons a welcoming, accessible, visible and highly public place?
 - How successful are the public street interfaces of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street?

Mr. Drobot and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Greg Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal using a power point presentation and gave an overview of the history of the site. He noted that the project is unique in that the mall has to remain open during the construction. The development should take about ten years to complete. The site will be LEED™ Platinum neighbourhood with a site wide utility management system dealing with environmental issues. He mentioned that the social sustainability strategy includes a mix of people that will inhabit the site and that the economic sustainability means making sure the mall grows with retail as well as office space for jobs. As well he talked about including cultural sustainability with the community centre, civic center, day care and

library. Mr. Henriquez described the layout of the site noting that they want to make sure there is a strong streetwall that creates and defines space and creates the public realm. He described the public commons that is the centre of the project and allows the neighbourhood as a whole to use the space.

Mr. Henriquez described the changes since the last review that include the access to the roof, the new access from West 45th Avenue and a better connection in the middle of the site. He noted that the slab buildings have been replaced with smaller point tower forms in order to get better light into the space behind them. He explained that there are many access points into the site and with the new design they shifted the access to the parking over to the east. As well Safeway now has its own parking entrance and the connectivity to the mall has been increased. A new street has been created that is against the neighbourhood with trees on both sides. As well there is a major transit plaza, a new pocket park on Cambie Street, a neighbourhood plaza beside the community centre, a new grand plaza which has all the restaurants spilling out onto it and also a cross-roads plaza on the north side that is a major entrance in from the neighbourhood. Mr. Henriquez mentioned that the massing hasn't changed since the last review as well as the number of storeys hasn't changed for the tallest tower which remains at 45-storeys. He added that towers have been moved away from West 41st Avenue and have added more density inboard of the site to reduce shadowing impacts.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the proposal noting that the public realm plays a key role in achieving the idea of a complete community. It will be fully accessible and well connected to transit and the different areas of the site. A wide range of recreation and amenity will be developed. The roof top provides a unique opportunity to provide an open space with a wide range of recreational opportunities. The commons consists of a number of elements. The circulation is organized around a half mile loop and links a series of different outdoor rooms including the water art garden in the centre, the great lawn, community gardens and the "rec room" which is an outdoor area for fitness and children's play. As well dining terraces will be off a series of restaurants and there are seasonal gardens around the commons. There is even a dog park proposed on the east side of the commons. Mr. Phillips mentioned that there is a large public art budget and they intend to use public art as a connector that links the site from the south to the north maybe through sculpture, light, water fountains and other elements. The idea is to bring in a major artist to make this a city wide destination. Mr. Phillips said they have increased the connectivity through the site and to the roof top and they are well connected to grade level, and are legible and visible. There are major public spaces at ground level including the transit plaza at the corner of Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue, the pocket park on Cambie Street, a neighbourhood plaza at the Community Centre and dining courts.

Duncan Paterson, Architect, described the proposal regarding retail design. They are looking for a diversity of retail types and services including after-hours retail, active night retail especially to the transit plaza. As well the retail should spill onto the street by creating pedestrian zones that spill in and out of the site. He said they are also looking for a variety of retail including creative retail, new forms of dining that will complement the activities on the site. He added that letting the pedestrians always have clarity on coming back and through the site is important. Having a central plaza space at the High Street is fundamental to establish the identity of the neighbourhood. The anchor retail is important as that allows a pedestrian thoroughfare that will draw people around the site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Strengthen the expression of the hilltop town analogy;
 - Consider draping the upper level public space down to grade along the northwest of West 41st Avenue frontage;
 - Improve the legibility and connectivity of afterhours movement through the site to transit and make the internal passages read as streets;
 - Allow the anchor stores to be fully expressed on the West 41st Avenue frontage - West 41st Avenue should not try to be like a local shopping street.
 - Design development to reduce the size of the water feature.

Related Commentary: The Panel supported the proposal and complemented the clear and comprehensive approach to a very challenging and complicated project. The Panel thought the changes made to the planning since the 2012 workshop greatly improved the over-all composition of the main design elements of the project. **The Panel supported** the density, height and massing as well as the mix of uses proposed. The Panel also believed the balance of jobs and households on the site were appropriate response to the crossroads transit location and to the City's goal of creating and supporting a town centre. The Panel thought that the arrangement of heights, with the tallest towers at Cambie and West 41st Avenue was appropriate to the transit oriented location of the site, Some Panel members thought that the two towers had become heavier in expression, and should be refined to express greater verticality. Concern was also expressed about the symmetry of the two towers and it was thought this approach should be reviewed. They further believed that the terraced and lower edge transition to the southwest was the correct urban response. With respect to the tower relocated from West 41st Avenue to the High Street, the Panel response was varied. One member preferred the previous openness and thought it would be better to add greater height buildings closer to transit and questioned why the height was limited to 45 storeys. Another Panel member thought adding height at the transit corner made sense, while reducing f some tower heights along High Street creating a steeper transition to the southwest. Other Panel members fully supported the arrangement of heights and building locations. The Panel thought the massing changes of the two previously larger and longer floorplate buildings to point tower forms was a positive move.

The Panel discussed the language of the architecture and how the various towers related to each other and to the rest of the development. The Panel appreciated the poetic concepts, especially of the Hilltop Town analogy and thought that strengthening this imagery was important in the further development of the design. One Panel member commented that the architecture could better integrate built form and open space by extending landscape up into the built form layers and that the transition from tower to open space could be further developed. One Panel member thought that the architectural expression should move either to a more common language, or to greater variety. Another thought that there were groupings of towers that should be expressed as communities. Other recommendations included bringing the expression of residential down to the street through the retail layers.

The Panel thought the public placemaking of the project was very successful and that the strongest moves were in the public realm, particularly in bringing the commons down to the ground and making it accessible. The new access from the south was especially well received. The Panel thought that the accessibility and legibility of the 'hilltop' would be enhanced by another access at the northwest corner. The Panel acknowledged the high percentage of the site given to public open space. With respect to the design of the roof-top commons, Panel members recommended decreasing the extent of water garden in the interests of increasing areas that people could access and use. The excessive length of important bridge connections was also noted. It was thought that creating more

unprogrammed open green space would better serve and be more flexible over time. One Panel member questioned the design and geometries of 'pocket park' on Cambie and wondered whether pedestrians could be engaged in a more natural setting. Another member thought the roof-top access to the north of the pocket park could be better connected to this space.

There was discussion around the relocated Civic Centre site; one Panel member thought it needed to be located at the transit corner, while most thought the new location gave it greater presence and ability to serve the local community. The Panel thought that achieving connectivity, a really clear public way, through the ground floor of the retail centre to the civic centre, the high street and the community to the southwest is essential. Movement through the ground floor, particularly after hours, needs to be more clear, and the internal passage should read as a street. Wayfinding is an important next step in the project's design development.

The Panel acknowledged the differences between the Cambie and West 41st Avenue frontages and encouraged the anchor stores on West 41st Avenue to be fully expressed, rather than trying to reference the scale and rhythm of a local shopping street.

One Panel member encouraged taking full advantage of the energy potential and transfer from the mixed uses and building types on the site, and of the potentials of the ground water under the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for all the commentary.

3. Address:	3496 Mons Drive (Vancouver Christian School)
DE:	416986
Description:	To construct a new K-12 school, with underground parking and outdoor play space, on an existing school site in a residential neighbourhood.
Zoning:	RS-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second
Architect:	Omicron
Owner:	Vancouver Christian School
Delegation:	Kevin Hanvey, Omicron Randy Sharp, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects Andrew Tong, Vancouver Christian School
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)

- **Introduction:** Marine Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit for a new K-12 school for the Vancouver Christian School (VCS) to serve 600 students. The existing K-8 school on the site has 375 students, so there will be an increase of about 275 to the student population. It is the desire of the VCS to consolidate their school at a single site; the high school is currently off site in Burnaby.

Ms. Linehan explained that the site is located centrally in a “superblock” which was master planned after WW2. The superblock is bound by the arterials of Rupert and Boundary Streets, East 22nd Avenue and Grandview Highway and is at a 45 degree angle to the city grid. She added that this creates added traffic pressures in the neighbourhood. The site is flanked by three parks under the title of Falaise Park, the main park to the west and then there are two long, skinny “pencil” parks to the north and east. The most challenging site condition is the location at the dead end of Mons Drive. It is surrounded by lanes on four sides with no street frontage. The north and east lanes adjacent the parks are not open for vehicular traffic. This creates traffic problems at drop off and pick up which the school wants to address.

Ms. Linehan noted that the footprint similar to the existing 1-storey school but has been increased to 2-storeys. It is an L shaped building with entry and common public spaces at the juncture of the L and class room wings on either side. Underground parking is provided. Due to the change in grade of 20 plus feet across the site, the parking can be accessed at grade at the west lane. Other measures to improve traffic flow are the provision of a wider turn around circle so that cars can circulate past parked cars on the circle. There are also surface spaces under the wing at the south west side and cars have a secondary exit at the west lane.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
Please provide comments on the proposed resolution of items raised at the previous UDP review (August 28, 2013) as follows:

1. Design development to improve the built and landscaped edge conditions, including providing a clearer relationship and access to the parks;
2. Design development to improve the suspended wing space or move the square footage elsewhere (*noting that the building is at the maximum height*);
3. Design development to improve the entry to the school;

4. Design development to program the roof top space;
5. Design development to articulate the gymnasium wall by considering adding clerestory windows;
6. Design development to consider using a brighter color palette for the project;
7. Any other development or design issues of interest to the Panel.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Andrew Tong thanked the Urban Design Panel for the first review. He said they have had a long history in the neighbourhood but the building being 58 years old needed to be replaced. He explained that the Panel's comments had challenged them to make a better school. He added that they are happy with the results in the resubmission.

Kevin Hanvey and Randy Sharp addressed the design conditions through a power point presentation. Mr. Hanvey explained that the Panel's comments had improved the project but they were not able to add square footage to a third floor. They improved the entry to the school, programmed the roof top space, addressed and improved the edge conditions around the site, reduced the number of parking spaces, added some clerestory windows to the gym, improved the landscaping, used a brighter colour palette and improved the sustainability strategy. He noted the new double height atrium entrance space and the views through the building to the park. As well they have increased the canopy size at the entry. In working with the landscape architect they were able to get the low point of the site below the covered play area. Mr. Hanvey explained how they programmed the roof top with a multi-purpose room with doors onto the patio area. He noted that they worked to reduce the parking on the site and think they have the right amount of parking for the school.

Mr. Sharp explained how they improved the edge conditions which included tripling the setback from the park. As well they have added play areas, an outdoor classroom and multi-purpose areas. There is a green screen with climbing plants on the outside of the gym and an added row of trees. The lane which is not being used will be grassed over to make it integrate into the park.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to resolve the architectural forms;
 - Consider making the gym expression simpler;
 - Consider a warmer colour palette;
 - Consider improving the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had addressed their previous concerns.

The Panel agreed that the reshaping of the suspended wing had helped address their concerns but they felt that the forms were still not fully resolved and didn't find their way to the ground. One Panel member suggested the applicant simplify the elements to make for more clarity to the formal logic of the architecture. The Panel also thought the siting had been improved along with the view from the front entrance through into the park especially. They liked the improved entry to the school with the canopy and the double height space which gives it more prominence. As well they thought the edge conditions had been improved.

Several Panel member thought the suspended form had been well articulated and that the gym expression had been improved but they thought it could be simpler and cleaner.

The Panel supported the improved use of the roof and thought adding the multi-purpose room was a good idea. They still wanted to see some change to the colour palette as they thought it was still too somber. A couple of Panel members suggested using warmer colours.

The Panel thought the outdoor space had been well developed especially the connection from the interior to the exterior although one Panel member thought there could be more clarity in the landscaping.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns with the traffic circle and wondered if there was enough room for drop offs and pickups. One Panel member was concerned that run off from the site might affect Still Creek and suggested the applicant find ways to mitigate that problem.

Regarding sustainability, one Panel member suggested using the strategy as an education tool and to add solar panels to the roof as well as skylights to improve light into the school.

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

4. Address:	3365 East 4 th Avenue (Beulah Garden Home Society)
DE:	417246
Description:	Concurrent rezoning and development application to develop a 4-storey multiple dwelling for affordable market housing for seniors.
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning/Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
Owner:	Beulah Garden Home Society
Delegation:	Duane Siegrist, Integra Architecture Inc. Mark Van Der Zalm, Van Der Zalm Landscape Architects Jack Clerkson, CPA Development Consultants Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group
Staff:	Yan Zeng and Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: Rezoning: SUPPORT (6-2) Complete: NON-SUPPORT (0-8)

- **Introduction:** Cynthia Lau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a concurrent rezoning and development permit application that comes in under the Interim Rezoning Policy on Increasing Affordable Housing Choices. The proposal, by Beulah Garden Home Society, is for a senior housing development that comprised of 54 units. The Interim Rezoning Policy is one of the action items under the Mayor's Task Force on Affordability, and it states that, rezoning proposals will be evaluated on criteria in the following three categories: affordability, location and form of development. Ms. Lau noted that the proposal is for a senior housing development with one bedroom, one bedroom and den as well as two bedroom units. The affordability criterion has been met through the proposed life-lease concept. She added that the project meets the rezoning policy under the Hastings Sunrise Community Vision as a senior housing project.

Allan Moorey, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site completes the north flank of a campus of senior housing. He described the context noting that the site is surrounded by predominately residential single family homes. As well he described the existing development and explained that there are a number of units that the Beulah Garden Home Society manages. The site has a slope across the site and the parking entry will be from the lane with an axial connection on East 4th Avenue from the larger facility across the way. He described the elevation that is an assemblage of bay, deck and roof. An enhanced front yard has been provided in order to terrace planting and to help transition the shifting grade towards the building. The building presents itself as 2-storeys against the single family homes and the lane and then transitions to 3.5 storeys.

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

1. With consideration given the slope and cross fall of the site, does the height and massing satisfy the ground oriented, 3.5 storey expression sought after and provide an appropriate response to both site and surrounding residential context?
2. Does the proposed development present a coherent assembly of architectural elements, roofline, base and entry among others and do these contribute to the legibility of the building?

Ms. Lau and Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Duane Siegrist, Architect, further described the proposal using a power point presentation. He mentioned that the project is for 54 residences with underground parking. Beulah Gardens Society has a need to provide more
-

affordable housing for seniors to compliment there existing campus. He described the context for the area noting the park and mentioned that the properties surrounding the site have steep slopes. There is a raised crosswalk and decorative treatment for the front entry. The massing of the project has a mansard roof that reflects a 3.5 story design. Mr. Siegrist described the architecture noting the ground oriented units have a private patio space and the other units have large balconies. He added that the roof will provide an outdoor amenity space. He also described the material palette noting the mix of cement panels, cedar siding and stone cladding.

Troy Glasner mentioned that the project will meet LEED™ Gold certified. He added that they are working on maximizing the water use to reduce water consumption and as well are planning to meet the energy requirements. There will be fueling stations for plug-in vehicles in the parking and they are planning for a future potential solar thermal system.

Mark Van Der Zalm, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the site and mentioned that they are trying for a natural garden with a sense of whimsy. They are constrained with lot lines in order to get lighting into the lower storey and the other element is the number of trees on the south-west corner. Another aspect of the landscaping plans is to have connectivity to the other buildings across the street to the south. A bioswale is planned for storm water retention and with some native plant materials. The social spaces include spaces for board games, places of refuge and observation particularly in the southern exposed location. There are raised planting areas, rain barrels for harvesting some water and a small green house in the northeast corner of the site. The roof top space is meant to be flexible with seating and raised garden plots that are moveable.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the architectural expression;
 - Design development to improve the building's siting;
 - Consider improving the entry expression;
 - Consider improving the colour palette;
 - Consider improving the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the rezoning part of the proposal but did not support it for as a development permit application.

The Panel agreed that it was a challenging site but thought there were a number of improvements that could be made to the design. Some Panel member said they would have preferred a 2-storey stepping in the façade. But given that the applicant didn't want two elevator cores they felt the building had been massed as best as it could be. The majority of Panel members thought the mansard roof form was not appropriate. . As well some Panel member thought the building siting could be improved and wanted to see something that registered the datum line.

The buildings scale in the neighbourhood is very long building and would benefit by breaking down the scale into smaller pieces. The panel felt the site was too complex to have a single architectural expression. The building could have a stronger expression at the base particularly at the western end. A couple of Panel members thought the entry could be better articulated.

Most of the Panel supported the choice of materials and how they were used on the building although a couple of Panel members thought there were too many elements being used. Most of the Panel thought the colour palette should be changed for a more 'happy' colour.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and thought great efforts had been made to manage the grade however one Panel member thought the grade still looked unresolved at the upper end of the site. One Panel member mentioned that the bioswale could drop down into the courtyard space as it was hanging above the courtyard. As well it was suggested to add a trellis on the roof deck for some shading.

Regarding sustainability, it was mentioned that the facades are the same on all sides and since seniors can be sensitive to heat, it was suggested that some passive features be included in the sustainability strategy. As well it was suggested to make use of solar heating for domestic hot water.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Siegrist thanked the Panel. He acknowledged the building's length but said he didn't think it was relentless. He said they would take a look at the sustainability strategy and see where they can improve on it.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.