

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 7, 2014

TIME: 3.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Joseph Fry
David Grigg
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor (Excused Item #1)
Chris Mramor
Goran Ostojic (Left after Item #3)
Maurice Pez
Matthew Soules

REGRETS:
Walter Franci
Joseph Hruda
Jennifer Marshall

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	1600-1620 West 6 th Avenue
2.	3501-3523 East Hastings Street
3.	7790 Cambie Street
4.	3250 Marine Way
5.	235 Kingsway

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a short business meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address: | 1600-1620 West 6 th Avenue |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To develop a 12-storey residential building including 101 secured market rental units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy. |
| Zoning: | C-3A to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | W.T. Leung Architects |
| Delegation: | Wing Ting Leung, W.T. Leung Architects
Veronika Kreuels, W.T. Leung Architects
Florian Fisch, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects |
| Staff: | Yardley McNeill and Paul Cheng |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- Introduction:** Yardley McNeill, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for an existing C-3A site within the Central Broadway/Burrard slopes area. She described the context for the area noting the I-C1 zone to the north and the site across West 6th Avenue for a future city park. The proposal is to rezone the site under the Rental 100 Rezoning Policy to allow additional height and density for 101 secured market rental units. Rental 100 projects are intended to be compatible with the urban design goals of the existing zoning, noting variations on height and density will be considered pending shadow and view analysis. The proposal is for a mix of one and two bedrooms units (some with dens) and townhouses along West 6th Avenue. Ms. McNeill mentioned that an open house was held in early May and was attended by surrounding residents. There were some concerns expressed regarding rental housing and whether the development would be for low-income residents, with a stated preference for market rental housing. In addition, concerns were expressed regarding height and massing. Staff explained that the provisions for the existing C-3A zoning and noted heights to 100 feet are permitted through a development permit process. As well there was considerable discussion regarding the future park to the north and whether the building would shadow the park.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal as well as the context and mentioned that there are a few developments nearby that have developed under the C-3A zoning with 100 foot tall towers. Across the street to the north is a lot that will be a public park in the future. Mr. Cheng noted that there are criteria for public parks when it comes to shadowing. There should be no shadows between the hours of 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM during the six months between Spring Equinox and Fall Equinox. The applicant is proposing a slight relaxation of that shadowing criterion. When a site has enough frontage there is the opportunity to go higher than 70 feet for a street wall topology. If the building is above 70 feet then what is required is that the tower should be slender and at the same time the podium should be low. That takes into consideration overall street enclosure, access to natural sunlight onto the public spaces as well as a separation of 80 feet between towers which will ensure livability in the building. Setbacks are also required in C-3A zoning to allow for a front stoop topology as well as wider sidewalks for commercial use.

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

1. Under the C3-A Design Guidelines for this neighbourhood, specific urban design requirements are expected in order to achieve a consistent urban design response involving wide tower separations; public realm enhancement and activation; access to direct sunlight, livability and overall street enclosure. This proposal seeks a relaxation to these requirements given the atypical context of this site. In particular:
 - a) Proposed front yard setback: 8 feet (Guidelines require 12 feet).
 - b) Proposed side yard setback: 4'7" (Guidelines require 12 feet for public realm enhancement, activation and to guarantee tower spatial separation).
 - c) Proposed tower width of 82 feet (Guidelines suggest a maximum width of 72 feet).
 - d) Proposed distance from the neighbouring tower to the south of approximately 40 feet (Guidelines suggest 80 feet minimum).

Given the specific context of this site, do the proposed relaxations pose an undue negative impact on the surrounding private and public realms?

2. A general performance criteria for development adjacent to public spaces is that no shadowing should be imposed on the public space between 10am-2pm during the period between spring and autumn equinoxes. This proposal looks for a slight relaxation of that general performance.

Does the proposal create an undue negative impact on the quality and usability of the future public park located directly north across West 6th Avenue?

3. In relation to a typical C3-A development on this site which would typically achieve a podium of 30 feet in height, does the proposed increase in Floor Space create an overall massing of the tower and podium elements which results in an undue negative impact on the surrounding private and public realms?

Ms. McNeil and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Wing Ting Leung, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they have tried to align the building to the one to the south. They have moved the building back as far as possible on the lot to reduce shadowing on the future park. He added that there is no shadow impact from the podium to the park. Mr. Leung described the material palette noting the terra cotta and swiss pearl panels.

Florian Fisch, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they have a four foot boulevard with street trees along Fir Street and on West 6th Avenue they have a planted back boulevard to act as a landscape buffer between the sidewalk and private patios. On the lane there are some stepped planters and also a trellis with vines over the parkade entry. There are two areas with common amenity space. The common outdoor amenity on the second level is accessed from the interior amenity area and on the third level there is a children's play area. On the podium level is urban agriculture and a common seating area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the front yard setback;
 - Design development to improve the setbacks at the townhouses;
 - Consider a different location for the amenity space;
 - Include the sustainability strategy in the next review.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel thought the tower width and height were generally acceptable. As well they found the podium massing and height to be supportable. They also agreed that although it would be important to maintain light on the public park, they found the amount of shadowing on the park acceptable.

Some Panel members thought the front yard setback was a little tight and thought the ground floor units were too close to the sidewalk. The front yards of the townhouses are a little short since West 6th Avenue has a lot of pedestrian traffic and they wanted to see a more generous sidewalk. Some Panel members thought that the proposed sideyard setback off Fir Street was insufficient for pedestrian comfort. Some members thought that the podium should transition to a lower height when approaching the shared west property line to respond to future neighboring development.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but were concerned with the location and quality of the outdoor and indoor amenity spaces on the lane and as well thought there were too many planters at the base of the building on Fir Street. One Panel member thought they should be moved to make the lobby space more open.

The Panel was disappointed with the lack of a sustainability strategy for the proposal. A couple of Panel members thought the bike storage should be relocated in the building and suggested solar thermal elements for heating and preheating domestic hot water given the tenure of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Leung said they struggled with the shadowing but thought about a reference to the context when they were designing the project. He thanked the Panel for their comments and remarked that the sustainability strategy should have been in the package.

2. Address:	3501-3523 East Hastings Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 87 secure market rental units. This rezoning is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.
Zoning:	C-2C1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	Eighth Avenue Developments Group Ltd.
Delegation:	Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architects Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architects Peter Kreuk, Durant Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Yardley McNeil and Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- Introduction:** Yardley McNeil, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for an existing C-2C1 site within the Hastings Sunrise Vision area. The proposal is to rezone through the Rental 100 Policy to allow additional height and density for 87 secured market rental units with retail at grade. Rental 100 projects are intended to be compatible with the urban design goals of the existing zoning, noting variations on height and density will be considered pending shadow and view analysis. The proposal is for a mix of one and two bedrooms units in a 6-storey building. Ms. McNeil mentioned that an open house was held in early May and received little interest from the surrounding residents.

Colin King, Development Planner, further described the proposal for a site on the north side of East Hastings Street at the corner of Skeena St with a lane at the rear. He noted that the surrounding context is of a redeveloping shopping area which has good transit access. The proposal will create additional height on the corner and a new retail frontage with a wider retail sidewalk. As well additional public realm will be developed along Skeena Street. The proposal will have retail uses along the ground floor with continuous weather protection. A rhythm of brick bays and balconies along with material changes emphasizes the expression of 6-storeys to the corner stepping back to 4-storeys to the east with the top floor being recessed further. Mr. King mentioned that the Skeena Street frontage has a widened public realm and the residential entry is marked with a change in the canopy. The units are elevated from grade along this street front. As well he indicated that bike parking is accessible from the lane and other ground floor uses include an indoor amenity room with children's play off the lane. He added that there are two main outdoor amenity spaces; one in the courtyard and one on the roof. The application is required to achieve LEED™ Gold.

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

- Does the Panel support the form of development as it relates to height, density and massing?
- Comments on the success of the courtyard as space as it relates to the quality of open space provided
- Comments on the quality of the interface to the lane at grade as it relates to landscaping measures to green the lane and to possible CPTED concerns.
- Advice around the location of massing at fifth floor level to the lane as it relates to the interface with existing single family dwellings.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Scott Kennedy, Applicant, further described the proposal and mentioned that because the lane is higher than the street the ramp had to have a 16% slope. The stepping at the back tends to go to the structural bays for a typical wood frame building. They are proposing a roof top patio that will have some greening of the roof. In terms of their energy strategy he said they are exploring Passive House standards. They have insulated the elevator core and other strategies to help eliminate thermal bridges. They will be doing an energy modeling to further determine their strategy. Mr. Kennedy described the material palette noting the brick on the exterior.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that Skeena Street has a proposed bike share area. They are planning on adding planting as a buffer to the units along the lane and the roof amenity space will have room for a barbeque, table and chairs.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the expression especially on the southwest corner;
 - Consider adding a step at the 3rd floor on the lane to improve the transition;
 - Consider improving the livability of units on the 5th and 6th level with inboard bedrooms;
 - Consider individual access for the lane units on the ground floor;
 - Consider enlarging the roof top amenity deck.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and liked the simplicity of the building.

The Panel supported the height and massing and thought it would be a great addition to this section of East Hastings Street. Although the Panel liked the stepping after the 4th floor, they thought the expression was a bit monotonous especially on the southwest corner. That façade is a blank wall and needs more windows and as well needs more expression at the corner to emphasis the coffee shop use. A couple of Panel members thought massing on the lane should have a step at the 3rd floor which would be more at scale with the area.

Most Panel members were concerned with the ramp and suggested providing a secondary way to get in and out of the underground. Suggestions included providing a stair or a stair and a runnel. As well there was some concern regarding possible CPTED issues.

Although the Panel supported the unit layouts, it was mentioned that there are a couple of units on level 5 and 6 that have inboard sleeping units that with some extra depth could be improved.

The Panel supported the landscape plans, however some Panel members thought the townhouses on the lane should have individual access to help activate the lane and improve the landscaping. They also liked the open space courtyard but wondered if having children's play space was the right use for the space. They mentioned that the space was not working as it is too dark and needs something to warm it up. However they liked the roof top deck but because of the small courtyard space a number of Panel members thought this area should be enlarged. Several Panel members suggested moving the transformer in the lane to a different location.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, it was suggested that the applicant look at a hydronic system for heating the building for future proofing the building as well as using condensing dryers

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Kennedy thanked the Panel for their comments and mentioned that they have been struggling with a lot of the same issues the Panel mentioned. He added that they have put an emphasis on creating an energy efficient building.

3. Address:	7790 Cambie Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a 6-storey residential building including 27 market housing units.
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	TMC Development Inc.
Delegation:	Amela Brudar, GBL Architects Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects Mark van der Zalm, VDZ Landscape Architects Joe Lepur, TMC Development Inc. Joanne Sawatzky, Lighthouse
Staff:	Kirsten Robinson and Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-3)

- **Introduction:** Kirsten Robinson, Planner, introduced the proposal for a site that is made up of a single parcel on Cambie Street. The lot is on the northeast corner of Cambie Street and West 62nd Avenue. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan that contemplates 6-storey residential buildings in this area. The site is located in the Marpole Plan area, west of Winona Park and near the Marine Landing Canada Line Station. Ms. Robinson mentioned that the site across the lane to the east is zoned RS-1 and is included in the recently approved Marpole Plan and is identified for apartments up to 4-storeys. The proposal is for rezoning the site from RT-1 to CD-1 to allow development of a 6-storey building over two levels of underground parking. The proposal includes 27 market housing units with 11 one bedroom and 16 two bedroom units and parking for 23 vehicles.

Allan Moorey, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site is located on the southeast corner of Cambie Street and West 62nd Avenue. He described the context for the area noting the one and 2-storey houses. The site backs on to the nearby Winona Park. Given the single lot corner site, the development proposal is comprised of a single primary building. There are no townhouse units proposed. The result is the building “book-ends” future development to the north which will assume the Cambie Corridor model of primary building, mews and townhouses along the lane. As per the guidelines Level 5 is setback from the primary building face and presents a 4-storey shoulder. A relaxation was granted along the east lane elevation where the guidelines recommend a massing setback at Level 4 and a 3-storey shoulder transitioning to residential beyond. The additional height granted was a result of a 4-storey development anticipated in the adjacent Marpole Plan. The main entrance is located at the corner of Cambie Street and West 62nd Avenue. Ground level units are oriented to the two street frontages and open out to private patio spaces which form a landscaped buffer around the building perimeter at grade. The parking entry is off the lane in the northeast corner of the site.

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

- The proposed form and massing rigorously adheres to the Cambie Corridor Guidelines. Comment on the overall success of the massing, expression and proportion of the base and upper floors.
- Comments on the landscape/open space interface along Cambie Street and West 62nd Avenue.

- Does the Panel support the proposed height, massing, density and form of development?

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that this is probably one of the first proposals for a single lot along the Cambie Corridor. They have located entrance to the building off Cambie Street and at the corner of the building. This is reinforced by a clear gesture that was achieved by undercutting the ground floor on both facades of the building creating more space at the corner. The building has ground oriented units with generous patios and the retaining walls along the edge have been set back two feet from the property line to allow for planting. The overall form is consistent with the Cambie Corridor Guidelines with the exception of the variance on the setback on the lane. Cambie Corridor Guidelines suggest a transition from a 4-storey shoulder to a 3-storey shoulder and they have proposed a continuous 4-storey shoulder that will still provide transition to what will be a 4-storey development across the lane and to the north of the property. The basic massing is broken down into two components; one is the base with punched windows and cladding in a combination of brick and cement panels and the second component is the light weight core which is wrapped in a combination of window walls and cement panels. Solar gain has been reduced with the use of continuous balconies and overhangs. Mr. Eisenberg described the unit layouts noting the two bedroom units on the corners. The roof deck is used as a private area for one of the top floor units.

Mark van der Zalm, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and mentioned that it mimics a lot of the texture that is proposed through the building architecture. The ground plane has earth tone pavers. There are open spaces off Cambie Street with a small planting buffer to the street. There is a custom bench feature at the entrance. There will be plantings around the parking ramp and there will be moveable planters on the roof top patio.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the massing;
 - Design development to improve the proportions of the overall building
 - Consider adding solar shading to reflect the individual façade exposures.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a nice little building.

The Panel supported the height, the conceptual intent, and liked the contemporary form of the building. However, they were uncomfortable the massing, particularly the 2-storey setback on the top of the building which was seen as a direct response to the Corridor policy and did not reflect the potential of a proposal on a single lot. Some Panel members found the expression too symmetrical and wanted to see a 3-storey shoulder as they felt the 4th floor setback did not work. A couple of Panel members mentioned that they struggled with the rigorous adherence to the Cambie Corridor Guidelines that didn't anticipate this kind of building form.

Some panel members felt the conceptual approach of the glass volume wrapped with a solid volume, although acceptable as an approach was not legible and failed in its current form.

There were some concerns with the setbacks noting that when the building next door is built the eight foot setbacks might not work and cause livability issues.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and liked how the patterns reflected some on the building. One Panel member thought the proposal would benefit from having an access point to the plaza off West 62nd Avenue while another member thought the landscaping could use some softness on the south elevation. As well it was suggested that there could be some seating areas. The private terraces are generous but could benefit from some more plantings such as small trees.

Regarding the sustainability strategy it was suggested that the building could use some shading features on the southeast corner and the overall strategy was not well documented.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Brudar said they appreciated the comments and thanked the Panel for understanding the challenges. She added that they look forward to working with the City to work out the challenges.

4. Address:	3250 Marine Way
DE:	417721
Description:	To develop two new multiple dwelling buildings, 5-storey and 11-storey high, containing a total of 145 dwelling units and an additional 2-storey amenity building.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
Owner:	Polygon Homes
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects John Vose, IBI/HB Architects Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
Staff:	Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)

- Introduction:** Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development application in East Fraser Lands, also known as the River District that is located in the southeast corner of the city along the Fraser River. She noted that this is the fifth application and that two developments are already built and occupied and another two are currently under construction. She described the overall context for the River District noting that it is comprised of three neighbourhoods, 130 acres and about a mile of shoreline. This proposal is on a site located on the western edge of the future Kinross Corridor Park space. The site is challenging in topography and configuration with a slope angled across the site and a grade difference of approximately forty-one feet from the northwest corner to the southeast corner. The proposal has an 11-storey building adjacent to the park and a 5-storey low-rise along Pier View Crescent. It also addresses Marine Way with amenity space for residents instead of townhouses. Regarding the expression, Ms. St. Michel noted that the guidelines call for contemporary west coast modernism that recalls the forms, components and materials of the industrial working river and the mill. Sunlight and public places are an important consideration in the guidelines as well and consideration of massing and other relationships to public spaces. Regarding the sustainability strategy, the proposal will use hydronic heating and make provisions for future a connection to the neighbourhood energy utility using waste heat from the metro Vancouver incinerator in Burnaby and as well the proposal needs to meet LEED™ Gold equivalency.

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

- The eastern aspect of the 11 storey building: the view from Marine Way, the relationship to and shadowing of the park, and the expression of horizontality and terracing referenced in the guidelines.
- Materiality and detailing and the reflection of the industrial past and the river.
- Response to topography: the 5 storey building along Pier View Crescent and in relation to the slope down from Marine Way.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they had spent some time trying to work out the access to the underground parking. He added that they had an analysis done with geotechnical and structural engineers regarding the location. It was thought that it was better to have it away from Marine Drive as they would need to build a retaining wall because of the slope

across the site. He said that their goal was to not exceed a height of 5-stories in the wood frame building. It needed to be a simple building with no stepping or overhangs and reflect the curve of Pier View Crescent. At the bend in the street is the entry way to the building. The roof of the parkade is a common space for both buildings along with an amenity area. Mr. Bruckner described the sustainability strategy noting that they are targeting LEED™ Gold.

Gwyn Vose, Architect, mentioned that the expression of the buildings has a lot of horizontality which they have done with the balcony expression and slab edges. On the south side they have some prominent balconies that add shade. On the east side there are horizontal bands for the slab edges. The terra cotta panels reflect the industrial heritage of the site along with the metal pieces such as the metal structure on Marine Way as well the corrugated metal roof and panels on the side of the buildings. The light standards also have the character of a marine industrial expression. Mr. Vose described the shadow impacts on the park as well as the site.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, further described the landscaping and mentioned that they are including some of the industrial character of the site but have shifted their emphasis to a song bird strategy. They have looked at a landscape that could embrace the slope and at the notion of the park space coming up through the site to the bank. They aren't recreating the forest that used to be there, but are acknowledging it with their landscaping strategy. Down on the urban edge facing the street, it starts to have more of the industrial character. The slope was not easy to deal with but they tried to keep the wall heights below three feet so there is a lot of stepping going through the site. There is a water feature and a feature wall that marks the entrance to the tower. With respect to the sustainability strategy there is a green roof on the tower and high efficient irrigation.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to recognize the prominence of the east elevation. Consider simplifying the expression, increasing the horizontality, borrowing from elements of the south elevation, and strengthening the base.
 - Consider strengthening the west coast modern expression in the building, with the industrial past being reflected more in details and elements experienced at grade.
 - Design development to imbue a greater sense of honesty in the materials and further distinction between the two buildings.
 - Design development to enhance the design of the parking entry.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and found the project had some strong design attributes.

For the most part, the Panel thought the architectural expression was well done and that the amenity building was a powerful aspect of the proposal. Panel member opinions varied on whether the lower building expression would benefit from some terracing, but most agreed that the eastern elevation needed further work given its prominence. Comments included carrying a big horizontal move through the elevation, borrowing from the south elevation, simplifying, creating a base for the building, and addressing possible CPTED issues in the way the building addresses the park edge. Shadow impacts on the park were thought to be acceptable.

A number of Panel members commended the applicant on their efforts to get parking integrated on the site while dealing with a substantial grade change. Several Panel members commented the applicant could better address the quality of the parking entry

given its prominence and suggested the battered stone wall expression could be extended to this location. The Panel supported the simplicity of the form of the low-rise building and the way it met grade, and most did not think it needed to reflect the stepped forms of the guideline massing.

Most of the Panel members thought the material palette might have a more honest expression to reflect the site's history. They thought the terra cotta material was not the best choice for the proposal and suggested using more metals and other materials such as wood. They thought that wood could be used on the pergolas and other elements to reference the lumber history of the river. One Panel member noted that the former buildings were simple forms. It was suggested that as the proposal was further away from the river and the industrial buildings of the past, that west coast modern might be a better approach to the expression. A couple of Panel members thought the northeast interface at grade required work around the exit and how the stairs were handled and as well to reduce any CPTED issues.

The Panel supported the landscaping strategy and thought it was exceptional. They liked the idea of moving through the amenity building and thought it anchored the movement through the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed that keeping the design simple was important.

5. Address:	235 Kingsway
DE:	417686
Description:	Construction of a 7-storey mixed-use building containing retail shell at grade and residential units above on the 2 nd to 6 th floor.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Robert Ciccozzi Architecture
Owner:	Port Capital Development
Delegation:	Robert Ciccozzi, Robert Ciccozzi Architecture Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects Robert Vrooman, Port Capital Development
Staff:	Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a mid-block site located on Kingsway between East 10th and 11th Avenues. He described the context for the area noting the Best Western Hotel to the north. The proposal is for a 6-storey mixed-use building of multi-residential over a commercial base. The application is seeking a 10% heritage density transfer.

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 development application, the panel's advice was sought on the following questions:

- Is the overall form of development, height and density supportable in consideration of the site and its related context?
- Comments on the success of the amenity room and in particular the composition of the related amenity terrace.
- Comments on the success of the landscape design overall.
- Advice on materials and expression and their success in terms of:
 - Contributing to solar performance and related LEED™ objectives.
 - Provision of weather protection.
 - Effectiveness in offering relief and visual interest in the overall composition of the Kingsway elevation.

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Robert Ciccozzi, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned they wanted to have a layering of materials with a series of steel systems. The sixth floor is pulled back with stair cases to the roof decks. There are canopies above the entry doors to the retail spaces and there is a loading bay and parkade entry on the lane.

Rod Maruyama, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned there are private roof decks and then a shared common outdoor space. The units that face the amenity space on level 2 have their own private outdoor patio and are bordered with a planter and decorative fencing. The amenity space has an open space with lawn and a gathering space with a fire pit, pergola and a barbeque area with seating. The units on the 6th level have their own outdoor patio with fencing for privacy. There is a middle planting area that creates a buffer and a garden plot for each unit.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider making the material and colour palette stronger with more contextually appropriate materials;
 - Design development to improve the amenity spaces;
 - Addition of weather protection the full length of the Kingsway façade;
 - Design development to the lane elevation to decrease the visual weight and lack of neighbourliness;
 - Consider adding more than one street tree along Kingsway.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a nice infill building.

The Panel supported the form of development, height and density and thought it was a very marketable project. The Panel sought a more contextually relevant material palette and thought it could be stronger with the use of metal or other materials and that the colour palette could also be improved to make the building more distinctive.

The Panel was disappointed with the location of the amenity room and thought it was located in a left-over space. They noted that a lot of work needed to be done to soften the interface and create a connection between the two levels. As well they thought the weather protection should be the entire length of the building along Kingsway.

Some Panel members thought the lane expression could be improved by reducing the height of the wall along the lane. As well they thought the concrete parapet should be deleted and changed to glass to help take the hard edge off the lane. Some Panel members thought the stair well could be increased and that the lobby space seemed a little pinched.

The Panel supported the what landscape plans were provided but thought there should be more than one street tree on Kingsway and the landscape on Kingsway was lacking. They mentioned that one of the nicest features of the development was the landscaped roof deck.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ciccozzi said he agreed with the Panel regarding the amenity room. He thought it was a good idea to take the roof off the terrace and open it up, pull back the amenity room and terrace the upper area into that space. He said it would also reduce the impact on the lane. Regarding weather protection he noted that they are using a steel system that could accommodate weather protection along the Kingsway façade. He also agreed that they could introduce some stronger quality materials.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.