

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 12, 2014
TIME: 3:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall
PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
David Grigg
Jennifer Marshall (Missed Item #1)
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor
Chris Mramor
Goran Ostojic (Excused Items 1, 2 & 5)
Maurice Pez (Chair for Item #5)

REGRETS:
Joseph Fry
Walter Franci
Joseph Hruda
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 3120 Knight Street |
| 2. | 1090 West Pender Street |
| 3. | 1155 Thurlow Street |
| 4. | 8888 Osler Street (formerly 1041 SW Marine Drive) |
| 5. | 1545 West 8 th Avenue |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 3120 Knight Street
 DE: N/A
 Description: The proposal is for a 5-storey residential building with 51 rental housing units. This application is being considered under the Interim Rezoning Policy for Increasing Affordable Housing Choices.
 Zoning: RT-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning/Complete
 Review: Second
 Architect: Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
 Owner: 097199 BC Ltd.
 Delegation: Stuart Howard, Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
 Otto Lejeune, Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
 Ben Aldaba, PMG Landscape Architect
 James Evans, 097199 BC Ltd.
 Staff: Yan Zeng and Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application being considered under the Interim Rezoning Policy for Affordable Housing Choices (IRP). Under this policy, for this site, which is zoned RT-2, a building up to 6-storeys may be considered to advance the City's affordable housing goals. For this project, the applicant is proposing an all rental building for fifty-one "For-Profit Affordable Rental Housing" units. All the units will be secured as such for 60 years or the life of the building, whichever is longer, which is one of the affordability criteria for the IRP. Ms. Zeng mentioned that it was the second time that the Panel had reviewed the proposal. After the initial community open house and presentation to the UDP, the applicant submitted a revised application with reduced height and density.

Colin King, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that it is a corner site with frontage along East 15th Avenue to the north and Knight Street to the west. The site has a slope across the property in two directions. Mr. King described the context for the area and mentioned that mainly there are one and two family dwellings in the neighbourhood. With regard to the form of development, Mr. King noted that the IRP allows consideration of up to 6-storeys based on urban design performance, contextual fit, neighbourliness to adjacent development, shadowing and overlook as well as streetscape character. Mr. King reminded the Panel that they had previously reviewed the proposal where a number of concerns were identified including design development to reduce the massing and density.

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

1. Does the revised application satisfactorily respond to previous Panel concerns around height, density and massing particularly as it relates to the contextual fit to Knight Street?
2. Does the revised application satisfactorily respond to previous Panel concerns around the interface of the proposed building with existing adjacent dwellings to the east and south particularly as it related to massing along the shared property line to the east?

3. Can the Panel offer general commentary on the overall success of architectural and landscape design proposals in the revised scheme?

Ms. Zeng and Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stuart Howard, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the density has been reduced. In addition they opened up a portion of the 4th floor roof for a common area deck. As well they have removed the green wall and put more greenery on the roof where they think it will be more viable. Mr. Howard mentioned that the City has modified the Rental 100 Policy and initiated maximum unit sizes resulting in the units now complying with the policy and making the building narrower. The building is 10 feet more to the west which has opened up the rear yard and the view corridor across the lane. He added that their traffic consultant and Engineering Services agreed that access for parking should be off the lane. Mr. Howard described the architecture for the project and indicated that they have added more glazing to the project and are working on meeting their sustainability goals. As well there is a new entry off 15th Avenue.

Ben Aldaba, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the concept hasn't changed very much since the last review. The green wall was deleted off the back and transition to additional green space in the amenity on the roof. They have maintained the provision for community gardens and some space for residents to plant on the roof amenity space. He added that the majority of changes were to accommodate the new entry.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to the 2-storey cornice line;
 - Design development to improve the corner unit on the lane;
 - Consider ways to improve privacy and noise abatement for the Knight Street ground floor units;
 - Consider adding other materials rather than all fiber board to the exterior.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was much improved since the last review.

The Panel supported the height, massing and density. They thought the interface conditions had been greatly improved although some Panel members thought the 2-storey cornice line on the west elevation required more design development. A couple of Panel members suggested breaking up the cornice line rather than having a continuous overhang.

Several Panel members thought there was a livability issue with the recessed unit on the corner of the lane. Also they thought there was some livability issues with the ground floor units on Knight Street and thought there needed to be more done for privacy and noise abatement measures.

The Panel agreed that relocating the indoor amenity space to the roof next to the outdoor space was an improvement.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns with the fiber board being used so extensively on the building. One Panel member suggested using a different material on the base to break up the material palette.

A number of panel members had concerns with the lack of clarity with either a horizontal or vertical emphasis.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that the glass boxes on the southwest exposure might cause heat gain in the units. It was suggested that adding more landscaping might be helpful or reconsider the extent of glazing. The Panel would like to have seen more information on the energy performance for the building and suggested solar panels for domestic hot water.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Howard said they were happy to look at the cornice line. As well he said they were looking at various energy modeling for the building and that they have some work ahead of them to meet their sustainability goals. He added that they will look at ways to improve privacy and noise concerns for the units on Knight Street.

2. Address:	1090 West Pender Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a 31-storey office building with retail and services on the lower two levels.
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	Second
Architect:	MCM Partnership
Owner:	Bentall Kennedy
Delegation:	Mark Whitehead, MCM Partnership Mark Thompson, MCM Partnership Bryce Gauthier, SD Landscape Architecture Brian Hagerman, Bentall Kennedy
Staff:	Karen Hoese and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for West Pender Street located at the intersection of Pender and Thurlow Streets with Eveleigh Street to the south. The site is currently occupied by a small office building and an above-grade parking structure which services both the building and the neighbouring office development at 1050 West Pender Street. The application proposes a 31-storey office building and the intent of the rezoning application is to increase the density beyond that permitted under the current rezoning which is consistent with the policy. Ms. Hoese noted that the site is in Area A of the Downtown District which forms a key part of the [Central Business District](#), Vancouver's prime business district and the focal point of the region's transportation system. She mentioned that recent policy for the area supports the increased commercial capacity. The MetroCore Jobs and Economy Land Use Study which was completed in 2007 identified a significant shortfall in commercial capacity in the downtown. The subsequent rezoning policy for the CBD was adopted in 2009 and allows for the consideration of increased office space through increased density and heights up to the view cones. Ms. Hoese indicated that there are two sustainability policies that apply to the site: Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings and the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site is on the southeast corner of Pender and Thurlow Streets with the SkyTrain tunnel running below the site. The proposal is for a 31-storey office building with commercial in the first two levels and includes 486 parking stalls. He noted that the City will require a Sustainable Site Design Plan that considers approaches to layout and orientation that reduces energy needs, and facilitates passive design solutions. He added that the intent of passive site design is to reduce energy needs by reducing reliance on mechanical systems for heating, cooling and lighting for the building's needs. Mr. Black also described the goals from the Downtown Design Guidelines, noting that the design should be of a very high quality and create an interface to the sidewalks that is attractive and in scale with the pedestrian.

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

1. Whether the proposed density (18 FSR), height (403 feet) and proposed setbacks (0 to 20 feet) are supportable for the site.
2. Its contribution to an attractive environment for pedestrians through the design shown, including the proposed setbacks and massing at grade.

3. Exterior form as response to its context, including the consideration shown for local site lines.
4. The response to the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Whitehead, Architect, mentioned that the site is within one of the bigger blocks in the city with a wide lane for service vehicles and parking. In terms of the public realm, they have acknowledged Thurlow Street with a setback to create a friendlier street by introducing retail with the opportunity for seating in front of restaurants or coffee shops. Mr. Whitehead described the architecture noting in terms of the aesthetics of the building. The response in sustainable terms is to make a good envelope using triple glazing. The sunshades are on the southwest façade and they have chosen to add them onto the north face for continuity.

Mark Thompson, Architect, further described the architecture and noted that the tapered expression was to help create a better public realm at grade. They have attempted to activate the roof since they have limited space on the site. The amenity decks in the tower will be used by the tenants while the ground floor is designed more for the public. Mr. Thompson described the sustainability strategy noting that they are retaining the water on the site with the use of cistern system for irrigation.

Bryce Gauthier, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping for the proposal and mentioned that there will be urban agriculture on the podium deck and seating will be provided on the roof terraces as well. At the ground level there is a strong relationship between the commercial units and the public realm with the use of planters. The concept of the paving is to reflect and other elements will play off the form of the building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the lane;
 - Consider ways to bring more light to the ground plane;
 - Design development to improve the passive design of the building.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it would be a contrast to the other buildings in the area.

The Panel supported the height, massing and form of development and thought the proposal responded to the Rezoning Policy. They thought there had been a lot of effort in the pedestrian environment but felt it could be improved. Improvements should include a more resolved approach for the canopy and its relation to the groundplane and one Panel member suggested adding a sidewalk for people coming out of the parkade.

As well there were a number of Panel members that thought the pedestrian realm needed to have the same power of expression as the tower. One Panel members suggested finding a way to bring more light to the street as well as some delight. The approach to rain protection required better resolution. Another Panel member suggested adding some street trees along Pender Street.

A couple of Panel members thought the curved form was breaking away from the grid and thought it should bend more to have a better interface to the building to the east. One

Panel member thought the increase of floor plate size got uncomfortable as the building gets closer to the top.

The Panel thought the applicant needed to improve the passive design for the building. Although Panel liked the horizontal fins being used for sunshades they lacked logic and rationale. Several of the Panel members noted that north façade might not need the same expression as the south façade. As well they thought the canopy intersected oddly to the sunshades.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Thompson that the Panel had some good comments and would take them under consideration as they move forward with the project.

3. Address:	1155 Thurlow Street
DE:	417385
Description:	Concurrent rezoning and development application to develop a 22-storey building with a new Central Presbyterian Church, childcare facility, retail at grade, 45 non-market rental units and 168 market rental units.
Zoning:	RM-5B to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning/Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects
Owner:	Central Presbyterian Church
Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects Shawn Lapointe, Henriquez Partners Architects Amber Paul, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Rev. Jim Smith, Central Presbyterian Church Goran Ostojic, Integral Group
Staff:	Grant Miller and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- Introduction:** Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for the a concurrent rezoning development permit application to rezone this site from RM-5 to CD-1 to allow development of a 22-storey mixed-use building including market and non-market rental housing, retail space, church and preschool. The proposal will include 168 market rental housing units and 45 non-market rental housing units. The site at the corner of Thurlow and Pendrell Streets is currently developed with a 2.5-storey church which includes a preschool that will be accommodated in proposal. Mr. Miller described the policy for the zoning noting that retail use is not permitted unless the building is designated as a heritage building. As well he mentioned that the policy considers rezoning application for projects involving social and supportive housing or community care facilities or group residences.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the proposal has the Mole Hill community to the north and St. Paul's Hospital to the east. The proposal is a combined rezoning and complete development permit application and is a 22-storey residential building with commercial space at grade. There are 45 units of below-market housing for seniors and 168 units of market rental proposed.

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

- Whether the proposed density (9.45 FSR), height (206 feet) and setbacks (0 to 5.6 feet) are supportable on this site.
- The contribution made to the pedestrian interface along each of the three public sides of the site, given their different intensities, uses and adjacencies.
- The handling of the interface with the existing residential building to the west.

Mr. Miller and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Gregory Henriquez, Architect, gave a brief history of the project. He mentioned that the church has a dwindling population with a need to revitalize the church. Since they own the land they decided to become the developer and take ownership of the market rental units. It is a complex program with a need for retail at grade to produce revenue for the church. Mr. Henriquez described the architecture noting the expression is of a little building which is the church and a larger building which is the

residential building. He also described the material and colour palette noting the use of fritted glass, wood and concrete. There are a number of crosses on the three facades to identify the church component.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to reduce the massing and the perception of density on the site;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the tower;
 - Design development to improve the lane expression;
 - Design development to improve the bike parking.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the integration of uses worked for the site.

The Panel had some diverse opinions regarding the proposal but commended the applicant on taking on a difficult and complex program. The complex program brought up some concerns from the Panel including the conflict of ownership. All Panel members felt that this could be refined even from those Panel members who supported the proposal.

Some Panel members thought there was a crowding of the site to some degree which had more to do with the tower and how it is resolved rather than the podium. The frit glass and other materials will give prominence to the church and the reading of the other ancillary spaces but some Panel members thought there were some problems with the overall expression.

The Panel supported the height and thought the setbacks made sense while several Panel members thought there was too much density on the site. As well they thought the pedestrian interface worked well but thought there could be a little more space on the lane for pedestrians. As well they thought some sort of retail or amenity could give some life to the lane.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought they were respectful of the church use. There were some concerns regarding the retail and play spaces when compared to the primary uses in the project. The Panel also had some concerns regarding the bike parking although they thought it was an innovative use there were significant questions as to its functionality and access.

It was noted that the residential units could benefit from some planning as they might be difficult for furniture placement.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henriquez said it was important that they make the project as cost effective as possible. He mentioned that they have support from the residents in Mole Hill for the proposal. Although they would have liked to have designed a taller and thinner building, the view cone does not permit any more height on the site. As well he noted that retail is essential for the operation of the church for revenue and to provide meals for the church and the homeless.

4. Address:	8888 Osler Street (formerly 1041 SW Marine Drive)
DE:	417434
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial retail on the ground level and 81 residential units over 2 levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Third
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Tria Homes
Delegation:	Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects Amela Brudar, GBL Architects Mia Harth, Swordfern Garden Design Raj Wijar, Tria Homes Shaun martin, Shawn Martin Consulting
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for at the northeast corner of Osler Street and Marine Drive. The site is in an area of transition from the primarily industrial uses to the south to the residential MC-1 zoned properties to the north and west of the site. Mr. Black noted that the MC-1 Guidelines recommend a maximum height of 45 feet with step backs at the upper floor. The site was rezoned to consolidate two MC-1 sites (8866 Osler Street) into the CD-1 (276) site at 1041 South West Marine Drive and rezoned the combined properties to CD-1. The proposal will retain the existing hotel and develop the remainder of the property with a 6-storey building. Part of the existing building will be converted into a fitness centre and five CRUs will be added at grade facing Marine Drive. The proposal is for 81 residential units and the orientation of the building is to the south.

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

1. Its fit within the arterial streetscape, including the quality of the proposed pedestrian realm and landscaping along SW Marine Drive.
2. The contribution to the streetscape along Osler Street, given the existing and expected residential development in the MC-1 neighbourhood to the north and west.
3. Consideration given to the residential interface, including views, privacy, shadowing and design of outdoor spaces for residents.
4. Proposed materials, colours and composition.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Amela Brudar, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they inherited the proposal and had to fit a new program within an established form of development. The unit size and commercial requirements have changed and they have kept the commercial at grade.

Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, described the architectural design and mentioned that they proposed a series of vertical extrusions along Marine Drive that lead up to the more prominent mass at the corner of the building. The mass is broken down into two pieces, one of 6-storeys and one of 4-storeys, which transitions down to the scale of the neighbourhood.

Mr. Eisenberg described the sustainability strategy and mentioned that there is a high wall to window ratio in the project. The balconies will have glazed enclosures to mitigate street noise and to maintain the heat on colder days. On the west façade they have proposed aluminum sliding solar screens. As well he described the material and colour palette and noted that they are using high quality cement panel as well as masonry clad volumes.

Mia Harth, Landscape Architect, mentioned that there are three main landscape areas for the project. Along Osler Street there is a series of planters with a bit of screening and street trees. On the second level there are four private patios with planters that provide screening as well as a landscaped area. On the fifth deck there is an open lawn, children's play area, table and a barbeque area as well as seating and common agriculture area for the residents to share.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider lightening the colour palette;
 - Consider punched opening in the balconies;
 - Design development to improve the corner at Osler Street and SW Marine Drive.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it fit well within the arterial streetscape.

The Panel agreed that the submission was an improvement from the previous one but felt there was still room for improvement. They thought the dark grey might be too dark making the building expression heavy. Several Panel members thought the colour could be lightened up and as well a punch of colour added to the colour palette. A couple of Panel members thought that the expression along Osler Street was well handled but wondered if the balconies could have punched openings to add more light to the units.

A couple of Panel members suggested the applicant address the issue of balconies that look into other units.

The Panel thought the landscape could be improved especially at the corner of Marine Drive and Osler Street since this seemed to be an important entrance into the building. They wondered if there was a way to eliminate the stairs to improve the public realm and allow pedestrians to circulate around the corner.

A couple of Panel members suggested the applicant add some street trees on SW Marine Drive. As well they thought that there were some privacy issues with the units that open into public spaces and suggested adding a privacy screen.

Several Panel members had some concerns regarding the viability of the CRUs with one Panel member suggested that one large tenant might be the way to go.

A couple of Panel members thought the white roof would look terrible over time and suggested greening the space. The Panel supported the sustainability strategy.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Brudar thanked the Panel for their comments.

5. Address:	1545 West 8 th Avenue
DE:	417504
Description:	To develop an 8-storey multiple dwelling unit building containing 20 dwelling units over one level of underground parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second
Architect:	Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects
Owner:	Kenstone Properties Ltd.
Delegation:	Steve McFarlane, Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects Jean-Philippe Delage, Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects Sarah Siegel, Hapa Landscape Architects
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for mid-block site on Burrard Slopes. Mr. Moorey noted that the Panel had previously reviewed the proposal in 2012. The proposal has now been changed to include a 10% heritage density transfer. The applicant is seeking a relaxation for the proposed elevator over-run. The proposal has a courtyard and includes 19 three bedroom units and 1 two bedroom unit with through unit planning that enhances daylighting and cross ventilation opportunities. There is a central light well and the overlook to adjacent units is mitigated with the use of translucent glazing and a clerestory of vision glass above. Mr. Moorey described the proposed material palette noting the use of window wall, masonry, architectural concrete and tempered glass guards.

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

1. Considering the adjacent existing low-rise development or the potential for redevelopment of those site(s) to the east with a potential massing height of up to 100 feet, comments were requested on the scale and materiality of the east wall along the property line.
2. Given the proximity of those units adjacent to the common access courtyard, comments were requested on the privacy separation provided and possible impact on livability.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Steve McFarlane, Architect, further described the proposal and highlighted some of the key aspects. He said they wanted to create a building that would blend with the future development of the adjacent sites. In terms of the massing, he said they wanted to keep it simple with a quiet interplay of solid and void elements. Mr. McFarlane described the material palette noting the brick which has a bit of a sheen to help in animating the large simple surfaces of the building. They are proposing wood soffits on the underside of the balconies. The building will have three units per level. He noted that one of the challenges was the size of the site so they introduced a deep and generous light well for ventilation and additional daylighting to the suites.

Sarah Siegel, Landscape Architect, described the proposed landscaping and mentioned that at the entrance some low planting is proposed. There are two units that have entrances at the front of the building with one walkway. In the courtyard they wanted to make it available for multiple uses. There are different levels for sitting and the planting is

ornamental with some edible planting choices. The separation between the private patios and the courtyard is through plantings.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the blank wall condition;
 - Design development to improve the privacy of the private patios on the ground floor to the courtyard;
 - Design development to mitigate solar gain on the west façade.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a sophisticated design.

The Panel liked the look of the building and thought it offered a contrast to the other buildings in the neighbourhood. The Panel had no concerns regarding the party wall treatments.

Some Panel members thought there were opportunities to take advantage of the views that hadn't been fully explored especially on the upper floors.

A number of Panel members thought the concrete wall on the lane was imposing and wondered if there could be some glazing adding above the landscaping. As well they thought the applicant should consider the finishing in relationship with the other proposed materials. Several Panel members suggested the applicant revisit the use of the dark brick although they liked the use of wood soffits.

The Panel thought the courtyard was well handled but thought there could be some concerns if the site to the east was ever redeveloped as the light access could be blocked. As well they thought it was more of a visual garden as they thought people would feel uncomfortable using it as there is little privacy. They also thought there needed to be a stronger barrier between the ground floor unit and the courtyard space. However the Panel liked the generosity of the roof top amenity spaces.

Regarding sustainability, several Panel members has some concerns regarding solar gain on the south facade. They noted that this needed to be improved otherwise the residents would be running air conditioning most of the day.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. McFarlane thanked the Panel and said he thought their comments were well-considered and would help to improve their design.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.