

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 4, 2014

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Walter Francl (Excused Item #4)
Joseph Fry
David Grigg
Joseph Hruda
Jennifer Marshall
Phil Mondor
Goran Ostojic
Maurice Pez (Chair)
Matthew Soules

REGRETS:
Greg Bellerby
Ryan Bragg
Arno Matis
Chris Mramor

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 2750 SE Marine Drive |
| 2. | 3365 East 4 th Avenue (Beulah Garden Home Society) |
| 3. | 1819 West 5 th Avenue |
| 4. | 688 East 19 th Avenue |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Pez called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 2750 SE Marine Drive
DE: 417334
Description: To construct two 11-storey towers and a 3-storey townhouse building. This includes two affordable rental housing buildings and a total of 220 residential units.

Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Review: Second
Architect: DYS Architecture
Owner: Social Purpose Development Partners Inc.
Delegation: Dane Jansen, DYS Architecture
Gerry Eckford, ETA Landscape Architects
Darren Kitchen, Social Purpose Development Partners Inc.

Staff: Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and mentioned that the property was rezoned to CD-1 to allow a certain topology of housing. This parcel is a City owned site and the City is trying something new as a way to achieve some of their housing goals. The site had been offered through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to look for a housing provider that could build, maintain and manage the project. He mentioned that it is a difficult site in that there is a very dramatic slope down from SE Marine Drive to East Kent Avenue. Mr. Cheng noted that when last reviewed by the Panel, their comments were not so much concerned with the buildings but instead with the overall, site planning especially with respect to the access for pedestrians from SE Marine Drive. They also wanted the applicant to look at a barrier free access from SE Marine Drive. As well there were comments regarding the plaza as the Panel thought it was a little empty with not much activation. Furthermore there were some other spaces which the Panel thought were under programmed.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Dane Jansen, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they have added a of barrier-free entry point from SE Marine Drive into the communal gardens and then an elevator that will bring people down to the porte-cochere. A second, more direct entrance and formal entrance, involving stairs has also been provided.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that with the opportunity for access from SE Marine Drive they were able to provide urban agriculture and an amenity space. At the front in the central open space, they have adapted that to accommodate the fire truck access and created a central node element that is more detailed with planters and a large central tree and sitting area. There are no curbs so it makes the area more open and they have articulated the edges for a softer approach. The children's play is enclosed with gates at each end and accessible through the main amenity area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider terracing the high retaining wall located east of the parking ramp for a softer treatment;
 - Also consider a more artistic treatment to the walks;
 - Consider a better integration with hard and soft surfaces in the play area;
 - Consider activating the outdoor space located between the two towers, at the portecochere level, with active uses such as amenity rooms and transparent glazing.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had addressed the Panel's concerns at the last review.

The Panel noted that their concern regarding the site connection to Marine Drive was a point of discussion at the last review and appears that there has been some real improvement. Some Panel members were disappointed that it had happened through the use of a lift and thought it would have been nice to have the transition through another way. One Panel member suggested that there could have been a significant design feature on how to get from the plaza to the garden to the street. As for the big turnaround area, they realized that it was hard to program but thought there could be an amenity connecting to it. As well several Panel members thought the high walls as you approach the roundabout could be terraced for a softer treatment

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought the planting strategy was a big switch from the passive area to a community garden however, one Panel member wondered how plants would grow in limited sunlight.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the blank wall facing the turnaround and suggested there could be a more artistic treatment to the wall. As well it was noted that since the views are to the south and west and there are a number of solid walls on those facades, that the applicant might consider adding more windows so that residents can enjoy the views. Although the Panel said they appreciated the hard surface needs in the courtyard, they wanted to see a better integration with the play area.

Regarding sustainability, the Panel noted that sun protection on the facades had been addressed however they were disappointed with the lack of information in the package regarding green design.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Jansen said that with respect to sustainability, they were hoping to use hot water heating. As for SE Marine Drive, they tried to look at the best of what was along the street and as a result are proposing a double layer of planting with a wall.

Mr. Eckford said that it was their intention on SE Marine Drive to run the fence line in the middle of the planting to provide a strong structure along the street. As well they will look at terracing the large wall.

2. Address:	3365 East 4 th Avenue (Beulah Garden Home Society)
DE:	417246
Description:	To develop a 4-storey multiple dwelling building with 54 units of affordable market housing for seniors.
Zoning:	CD-1 (Pending)
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second
Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
Owner:	Beulah Garden Home Society
Delegation:	Duane Siegrist, Integra Architecture Inc. Mark Van Der Zalm, Van Der Zalm + Associates Inc.
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting the Panel reviewed the proposal in October 2013 as part of a concurrent rezoning and development application proposal. The Panel supported the rezoning but did not support the DE and citing a number of aspects needing design development. The site is mid-block between Rupert Street and Cassiar Streets and completes the northern flank of a senior housing campus. Mr. Moorey noted that the surrounding context is mostly RS-1 single family residential. He also mentioned that the site has a slope from west to east and falls around twenty-two feet. The slope impacts efforts to maintain the desired 3.5-storey expression required and precipitates the need to step the building. The building presents itself as 2-storey against the single family residential to the west and transitions to 4-storeys behind the sloping grade on East 4th Avenue with a 3-storey expression on the east property line. Mr. Moorey noted that the elevations are composed of repetitive bay elements with balconies and two large stone planes, all with the intention of reducing the perceived building length of 266'-0". He mentioned that the landscaping has been pulled back at the ground plane to allow for daylighting for the lower units.

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

1. Based on the previous comments made by the Panel, is there consensus these issues have been addressed by the revised proposal?
2. Design development to refine the architectural character in response to existing context.

At present the apparent length of the proposed development exceeds the adjacent, lesser scale residential form. Consideration should be given to the composition of building elevations. Specifically, the repetition and cadence of architectural elements, massing and materiality of 'formal' elements and the transition in building height should all be utilized to partition and reduce the perceived length of the building.

3. Design development to improve the building siting.
Consideration should be given to reinforce the roof line transition in building height. The sloping condition of the site may be seen as too complex to merit a single architectural expression along the ground plane. Efforts to transition the slope might be assisted with the introduction of a 'datum' line registered by a building base.
 4. Design development to improve the transition in building height.
Consideration should be given to reinforce the roof line transition in building height. The introduction of an upper storey setback, integrated with the building 'step' and along a transitional elevation element at entry, might provide an assembly by which to accomplish this.
 5. Design development to improve the sustainability strategy.
Consideration should be given to both passive and active means.
-

6. Consideration should be given the proposed colour palette.
The perceived weight of the proposed colour palette might be reconsidered.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Duane Siegrist, Architect, further described the proposal and gave a short power point presentation. He mentioned that the overall size and massing of the building was not been revised and as well the size of the building is the same with 54 units but there are more two bedroom units. They have revised the elevations, minimized the length of the building which now has a more prominent massing break. The roof has been revised from the mansard roof to a flat roof which allows for the top storey to be more recessed. The amenity space at the north has been reduced. Mr. Siegrist also mentioned that there has been design development to improve the architectural and entry expression. Regarding sustainability, they have added large roof overhangs and louvers as sun shading as well as a rainwater collection system. He noted that the colour palette has also been revised.

Mark Van Der Zalm, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they planned the landscaping to create an opportunity to recreate, relax and interact. The entry area has a social flex space and is edged with gardens. The 4th floor space is defined by herbaceous and perennial gardens allowing the residents to share the garden space. This space will also be used for social gatherings, BBQ and seating.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider integrating the stone into the building;
 - Design development to enlarge the outdoor amenity on the roof.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design was a pronounced improvement since the last review.

The Panel thought the materiality, massing and composition had improved although one Panel member thought the stone portion of the façade didn't seem to fit and wanted to see a material expression that was integral to the building. It was suggested that in order to better integrate the stone there could be accents of the material on the building or added into the landscaped walls. The Panel liked the roof design and thought it was an improvement from the mansard roof and noted that the roof seemed to be stepped when seen at the pedestrian level.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought it was interesting how the building folds into the landscape. One Panel member encouraged the applicant to use locally sourced stone. The Panel liked the addition of the amenity space on the roof but some members felt there wasn't a need for the one on the ground floor. They also thought the outdoor amenity space could be larger and that there could be less urban agriculture and more seating.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy. One Panel member noted that since the building will be occupied by seniors, thermal comfort is going to be important. It was noted that a well-insulated building will work well in both winter and summer. The applicant was encouraged to do some energy modeling. As well it was suggested to add solar panels on the roof for domestic hot water.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Siegrist thanked the Panel for their comments and mentioned that there will be air conditioning in the project. He said he agreed with the Panel regarding the use of stone. As well he thought the Panel's comments regarding the amenity space were useful. He reminded them that the residents will also get to use the amenity spaces in the adjacent buildings as this site is part of a campus of buildings. Regarding the solar panels, he said it was the client's choice not to have them.

3. Address:	1819 West 5 th Avenue
DE:	417855
Description:	To develop the site with a 6-storey mixed-use building containing a total of 25 residential units.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture
Owner:	Orr Development
Delegation:	Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects Tim Orr, Orr Development
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-8)

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site on the northwest corner of Burrard Street and West 5th Avenue. The proposal is subject to the North Burrard C-3A Guidelines and the area is bound by Pine and Cypress Streets and by West 1st and West 8th Avenues. He noted that the context is in transition which currently has various types of small retail, office and service uses between one and three storeys. Recent development has included automobile dealerships that have three and four over-height storeys. Increasingly there are mixed-use developments (commercial/residential) in the range of six and seven storeys nearby at 6th and Burrard. The proposal is for a 6-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade and 5-storeys of residential above. In most respects, the project conforms to the By-law and Guidelines although three relaxations sought are somewhat significant. The first relaxation concerns the rear setback at the lane. The fifth and sixth floors encroach ten feet into the rear setback with balconies full against the property line. Another aspect is a relaxation in height. The Guidelines suggest a maximum height of 13.7m (45'-0") while the parapet on the sixth floor is at 22.5m (73'-9"). He mentioned that extensive height studies have been carried out, noting that the current surrounding context is underbuilt. Lastly, a 3.0m (10'-0") deep corner over the length of the east face of the 6th storey encroaches into the Burrard St. View Corridor. Efforts have been made to reduce the impact of these height related relaxations by minimizing both the residential and retail floor to floor height.

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

- Comments on the juxtaposition of formal elements from an architectural or compositional perspective.
- Advise on the potential implications of the proposed massing in construction.
- Comments on the proposed relaxations sought in height, setbacks and the building's relationship to the Burrard View Corridor.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, further described the proposal with a Power Point presentation. He mentioned that in terms of density they feel that the site can handle the size of the project given the closeness to restaurants, shops and transit. He also described how the project adheres to the C-3A Guidelines. As well he noted that the additional proposed height has a minimal impact to adjacent properties. In fact, most adjacent buildings would have existing views blocked by a new 4-storey building compliant with the C-3A maximum height. Regarding the view cone between West 7th And West 8th Avenues, Mr. Yamamoto said that they had shifted the upper level massing to the west to reduce impacts into the view cone. He added that when the trees on Burrard Street

are in leaf, the view is blocked to the north. Mr. Yamamoto described the architecture noting the ground floor retail along Burrard Street that turns the corner along West 5th Avenue and as well turns the corner into the lane. The residential lobby is located on West 5th Avenue while parking and loading is accessed from the lane. The proposal consists of three stacked boxes: the ground floor retail box, the 2nd to 4th floor box and the 5th and 6th floors in the third box. Mr. Yamamoto described the material palette noting the dark metal panels on the second box while the third box is clad with a curtain wall interspersed with frosted glass panels.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there is a large amount of rooftop space that will have large outdoor patios for the units on the 2nd, 5th and 6th floors. The two 6th floor units will have access to private roof decks from their units. There is currently existing trees on both Burrard Street and West 5th Avenue that will be retained while two more trees will be added to Burrard Street.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development so that the building does not intrude into the view cone;
 - Design development to strengthen the lower level box and improve the materials;
 - Consider adding weather protection along Burrard Street;
 - Consider adding an indoor amenity space in the building;
 - Improve the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal although they thought it was a unique solution.

The Panel thought the applicant gave a well-presented argument in support of the design but they felt that it was not adhering to the guidelines and the architectural context on the rest of the street. They also noted that despite the unique architectural form and expression of the proposal, the Panel's consensus was that it did not support the significant relaxation to both density and height requested by the applicant.

While there were some members that supported the design they thought there could be some improvement including strengthening the ground level box as well as the articulation on the lane. They also noted that the materiality of the lower level box was somewhat bland.

Most of the Panel had no concerns regarding its construction as well as the height while other members of the Panel didn't support the height. Their main concern was the building's intrusion into the view cone. One Panel member wanted to see the applicant show the structural frame in the building.

Some Panel members wanted to see the weather protection improved along Burrard Street and they wanted to see some amenity space in the building. As well one Panel member noted that the one bedroom unit on the corner of the third floor was not livable.

There were some concerns regarding the lack of a sustainability strategy especially with respect to the third box that is clad in glass curtain walls.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Yamamoto said their intention was to create density on the site that they felt was appropriate and do it in a way that minimizes the impact to the neighbours. He added that they will work with staff to clarify the issues.

4. Address:	688 East 19 th Avenue
DE:	417862
Description:	To construct a 4-storey mixed-use building containing commercial uses at grade and a total of 30 residential units.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Francl Architecture
Owner:	Kevin Cheung
Delegation:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Gerry Eckford, ETA Landscape Architects
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, highlighted the proposal for a site on the south west corner of Fraser Street and East 19th Avenue. He described the context for the area noting the 2-storey commercial to the north and single family homes to the west. The proposal has a 22 foot clear wide courtyard that is open to the south and provides entries to all the residential units. There are vertical screen walls and planters separating the units with the residential lobby on East 19th Avenue. Mr. O'Sullivan described the material palette noting the metal panel at the canopy edges on the commercial level, cementitious panel on the residential elevations and wood soffits. There is a small amenity space at the lane.

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

- The scale, proportion and overall performance of the courtyard in view of the amount of circulation (bridging elements, stairs, elevator), access to light and air and privacy.
- The success of the proposal's composition, materials and expression.
- The overall landscape design as proposed, particularly the courtyard space in terms of daylight exposure, choice of materials and plant selection.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, provided an overview of the design concept and process and referred to the model. He mentioned that the proposal is a courtyard scheme and fits within the allowable envelope but steps back on the upper floor on both sides. The courtyard is south facing and will get a lot of sunlight. They have covered all the walking surfaces including the use of a glazed covering on the top walkway. Mr. Francl described the architecture noting the colour scheme and wood soffits. The suites have small second bedrooms that will receive daylight through the courtyard. He described the sustainability strategy noting the use of solar control features built into the roof and canopy elements.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that it was a direct response to the neighbourhood context. At the ground plane East 19th Avenue is more residential with boulevard treatments and new street trees. The Fraser Street frontage has a generous setback and with opportunities for more plantings. All of the existing street trees will be retained and new ones will be added where possible. The courtyard has simple entries into the units with a bright green poured resilient surface that will be soft enough for children's play. There are also planters with some interesting shapes in the courtyard and planters on the upper terraces.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to make the south stairs transparent;
 - Consider enlarging the windows facing the courtyard for more light into the units and using frosted glass for privacy;
 - Consider relocating the amenity space or opening it to the lane.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a good addition to the street.

The Panel thought it was a handsome project and was well defined. They liked the courtyard scheme although they wished it could be a little larger. One Panel member suggested making the courtyard stairs at the south end as transparent as possible. They also supported the building expression and the material and colour palette. Several Panel members mentioned that they liked the detailing of the building and how it turned the corner at Fraser Street acknowledging the importance of that corner.

A couple of Panel members suggested adding frosted glass to the windows looking into the courtyard for added privacy. One Panel member would like to see the bike storage located in a better location for access.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans with a couple of Panel members suggesting adding a tree in the middle of the courtyard for more privacy. As well several Panel members suggested having the amenity space open to the lane.

One Panel member encouraged the applicant to get the project LEED™ Gold certified even if it isn't required.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Francl thought the Panel had some good comments and said he would look at incorporating them in the proposal.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.