

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 28, 2015

TIME: 3.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Walter Francl (Chair Item #1)
Joseph Fry
Jennifer Marshall (left after Item #2)
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor (left after Item #3)
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #2)
Goran Ostojic (Missed Item #1, Excused Item #2)
Matthew Soules (Left after Item #4)

REGRETS:
Joseph Hruda
David Grigg

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	5355-5387 Cambie Street
2.	555 West Cordova Street
3.	1661 Quebec Street
4.	2806-2850 Cambie Street
5.	1529 Comox Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Francl called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting between the first and second items and then the Panel considered the rest of the applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address: | 5355-5387 Cambie Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To develop a 6-storey residential building and 2-storey townhouses on the lane. The proposal is for a total of 49 units. |
| Zoning: | RT-2 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | GBL Architects |
| Delegation: | Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects |
| Staff: | Kirsten Robinson and Marie Linehan |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:** Kirsten Robinson, Rezoning Planner introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that is made up of two parcels on Cambie Street. The consolidation is on the west side of Cambie Street, one lot south of West 37th 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 Queen Elizabeth Area of the Cambie Corridor Plan, just west of Queen Elizabeth Park. The site across the lane to the west is zoned RS-1. Ms. Robinson noted that there are other significant sites in the area including the RCMP lands, the Oakridge Transit Centre (Bus Barns) and Oakridge Mall. The rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RT-2 to CD-1 to allow development of a 6-storey building with townhouses on the lane over two levels of underground parking. The proposal includes 48 market housing units (18 one bedroom, 27 two and three bedroom units) and parking for 51 vehicles.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner further described the proposal and mentioned that the built form guidelines for this segment of the Cambie corridor seek the following:

- A 6-storey principal building with a notable 4-storey shoulder setback at the front elevation, a 3-storey shoulder at the rear elevation, transitioning down to a 2-storey row of townhouses at the lane.
- The townhouses are intended to provide a scale transition to existing single family lots across the lane, as well as activate and enhance the character of the lane, noting that the sites across the lane will be in Phase 3 of the CCP.
- The recommended setback at the lane is 4 feet, with a minimum 24 foot courtyard width.
- The recommended front yard setback along Cambie Street is between 12-15 feet.
- The recommended side yard setback is between 8 and 10 feet to ensure adequate day lighting and outlook from side facing windows, as well as sufficient spacing between buildings as the corridor develops.

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

- Overall building bulk and massing: how well does the proposal respond to the built form guidelines, in particular the front and side yard setbacks?
- Design and treatment of the open space on the site: has sufficient common amenity space including children's play space been provided?

Ms. Robinson and Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the corner lot will remain and does not make up part of the proposal. The City asked that they design a building that will allow the site to be developed at a later date. As well the City has asked that they provide a knockout panel at the bottom of the parkade ramp to provide for access to the future neighbouring building. Mr. Eisenberg said that they are not seeking any variances to the built form guidelines. He noted the depth of the setbacks around the building and that the building steps down at 4-storeys to a 3-storey shoulder as per the Cambie Corridor Guidelines. He noted that the massing of the building is broken down into two basic components and is treated with two contrasting materials. He added that they thought because of the size of the building they could create a scale that was more residential. In addition to a common area in the courtyard they have provided a roof-top common terrace.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there are patios at the ground level facing Cambie Street. There is access to the courtyard space through the building as well as from the side yards from the lane. There is common shared space in the courtyard along with a children's play space and then private patios off the units in the townhouses and the main building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the setbacks particularly on the north side;
 - Consider ways to enliven the laneway;
 - Consider increasing the size of the children's play area;
 - Consider adding an amenity space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought project met the requirements of the built form guidelines.

The Panel commended the applicant for the addition of two and three bedrooms in the proposal. However they thought the applicant should do some exploration on the setbacks particularly above the 3-storey line on the north yard as they thought the proposal was unfriendly to the neighbour to the north. A couple of Panel members thought there might be too much FSR for the context and mentioned that the expression of the building required some further design development.

Some Panel members thought the townhouse expression was not engaging enough to create a lively lane. They wanted to see an expression of more community on the lane.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the child's play space as they thought it was not in the best place and too small. As well the Panel thought the roof was not developed enough and thought there should be an indoor amenity in the building as community space or room for strata meetings. It was suggested that an amenity room could be added to the roof area. One Panel member noted that the wall enclosing the parking ramp on the north side needed some design development to make it friendlier to the neighbours.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Eisenberg thanked the Panel for their feedback.

2. Address:	555 West Cordova Street
DE:	418532
Description:	To construct a 26-storey office tower.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Frist
Architect:	B + H Architects
Owner:	Cadillac Fairview Corp Ltd.
Delegation:	Gordon Gill, Adrian Smith & Gordon Gill Architecture Adrian Smith, Adrian Smith & Gordon Gill Architecture James Vasto, B + H Architects Kelty McKinnon PFS Studio Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architects Inc.
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-4)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced a proposal for a site on the north side of Cordova Street in the Downtown District. The site has an existing neo-classical station building from 1914 and as well there are station access to three SkyTrain lines and the Seabus. In describing the context Mr. Black noted the developments nearby including The Landing in the historic Gastown area, Harbour Centre (office tower with observation deck) and the CPR railway tracks currently being used by the West Coast Express and rail yards.

Mr. Black described the Policy for the Downtown District ODP that includes several intentions such as improvement to the general environment of the Downtown District as an attractive place to live, work, shop and visit as well ensuring that all buildings and developments in the Downtown District meet the highest standards of design and amenity for the benefit of all users of the downtown and create a distinctive public realm and a unique and pleasing streetscape in the Downtown District.

Mr. Black also noted that the maximum for density is 9.0 FSR and the basic maximum height is 300 feet but may be increased by the Development Permit Board to 450 feet with the consideration of certain criteria. The criteria includes the size and location of the site; bulk, location and overall design of the building; the building's effect on the site, surrounding buildings, streets and existing views; amount of open space; effects of overall design on the general amenity of the area and the provision of pedestrian amenities and public realm requirements. He also mentioned that there is a view cone across the site (Queen Elizabeth View Cone) with a geodetic elevation of 127.1 meters.

Mr. Black also described the content of the Central Waterfront Hub Framework. The Framework includes 22 acres that focusses on Waterfront Station and extends north from Cordova Street. He noted that the Framework does not replace Council-adopted land use policies and regulations in place which cover the area, including the Official Development Plans (ODPs) and conveys no development rights or obligations. He added that the Framework will be used as a supplementary "overlay" to guide further planning, including ODP amendments and rezonings.

The overall vision for the area is for the creation of a world-class transportation interchange at the heart of a dynamic new downtown waterfront extension. This includes development that would bridge over the rail yard and reconnect the city to the waterfront while maintaining rail function.

Mr. Black mentioned that relevant to this site, the study envisioned a new road, the Cordova Connector east of the Station Building, as well as high density commercial and mixed-use development that would take advantage of the excellent transit accessibility and that supports increased transit ridership. As well the area would extend the central business district and as well complement the activity of Gastown. Architecture in the area would be of exceptional quality, reflecting the prominence of the setting and respecting the existing heritage buildings. He added that a welcoming and beautiful public realm of new streets and open spaces would entice people and activity to the waterfront and provide opportunities to enjoy the water, mountain and port views.

Other directions in the Study include preserving street-end views including Seymour Street over Waterfront Station to the mountains; preserving the setting of the Vancouver Heritage Registry "A" buildings and improving open space and public realm design.

Mr. Black also mentioned that the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan looks at ensuring adequate floor space for future job growth in the city and encourages focusing job growth on areas well served by public transit and also identifies the Framework area as a prime location for office space due to the proximity to the Central Business District (CBD) and waterfront views.

Mr. Black explained that the proposal is for a 26-storey building (417 feet geodetic elevation) with the main entry and lobby facing onto Cordova Street. There is an open air courtyard to the west between the Station Building and the office base. A new pedestrian plaza is proposed to the east including seating in Phase 1 and a viewpoint for the public. In Phase 2 there is a provision for the future Cordova Connector roadway.

Advice from the Panel was sought on the architectural and landscape design in general, and in particular on the following items:

1. Response of the application to the intents and goals of the Downtown District ODP and the Central Waterfront Hub Framework;
2. Relationship of the overall tower form to its existing and future context; and
3. Performance of the detailed architectural and landscape design in terms of the public realm interface, including the proposed interface with the Station building.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Gordon Gill, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they started with the context to understand the relationship between The Landing and the Station Building, and to understand the context in which the accessibility, both vehicular and pedestrian would be required. He said they looked at the position of the building relative to the heritage buildings and then positioned the building a little more eastward in the middle of the site. There are at least 32 different constraints on the site with the lowest point of the building and the highest point of the building over the future right-of-way access to the Master Plan. It was recommended that they slide the building about 5 meters to the west to avoid any cantilever condition. They wanted to maintain the public plaza and future accessibility to the waterfront on the eastern side and they were also interested in what kind of courtyard space they could create between the heritage station and the proposal. The building at the base, at the lobby, is about 8,000 square feet and rises up to the fifth storey to get a normalized floor plate.

Mr. Gill mentioned that they have conformed to the view corridor. He also mentioned that the floor plates are smaller than what is normally found in office buildings but the client

was interested in having a Class A building. They looked at the building in a language that was different from a conventional box as there is nothing conventional about the site. It is a gateway to a future Master Plan and defines one of the busiest spaces in the city and sits on the edge of the CBD and Gastown. He added that once they established the parameters they looked at what would make the space special. They sought to provide a quality of space at the courtyard that was defined by an art wall which is a folded faceted wall. Their intent was to not make it a reflected glass box, but to use clear glass as long as they can meet the energy codes.

The building is sloped on the roof to the south as they are planning for photovoltaic panels on that roof. The faceted façade is folded so that it can self-shade as much as possible. The courtyard to the west is framed by the faceted wall so that at the scale of the pedestrian it will look like an art piece that is transparent. He added that they plan to detail that wall very carefully. The north view will give a defused north light and the prismatic reflection of the existing heritage building will bring new life to the east façade. In the master plan on the west side between the heritage building and the proposal is a direct pedestrian connection to the future Master Plan which may or may not have retail that is connected to the station.

Mr. Gill noted that there is a viewing platform towards the north that overlooks the tracks to the harbor and as well there is a series of landscaped corridors that define what will be for the future the right-of-way access. There are seating and fountains planned to create intimate spaces in the courtyard. There is a café in The Landing with a patio that will be kept that helps animate the urban space. They are planning similar programming in their plaza.

The applicant gave a one minute video presentation.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the relationship between the new building in general and the Station Building;
 - Design development to the proportions of the lobby and courtyard;
 - Design development to improve the public spaces at the ground floor with respect to daylighting, CPTED, and circulation;
 - Design development to improve the sustainability features and passive design.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they felt the proximity and relationship of the tower with the Station Building was ultimately a disservice to the station.

The Panel recognized that this is a critical site in the city as it will set precedent for development that will occur in the future as outlined in the Framework. It is also an important site as it has visual access points to the mountains and the waterfront and it is at this point where Gastown begins. All these points suggest a response that is really worthy of the site's position. By and large the Panel thought there was a viable building form that could occupy the site but comes down to a question of "fit".

Panel supported the proposed height but found the proportions of the form and apparent density was seen to be awkwardly placed and accommodated on the site. This was most evident in the relationship with the adjacent heritage buildings. Panel felt the proposed density may be accommodated on site but not in the current form.

The Panel noted that the perception from the public is that the site is a public space although it is actually a private space. They mentioned that development on the site is going to change the landscape of the city forever. Although this is the right of the owner, the result is that the applicant needs to respond in a way that accepts and is cognizant of the role of the public realm and how its effect in changing from a private to public space. The Panel also noted that the relationship to the future northern development (Framework) and how the continuity of the public realm is seen is very important as well as its relationship to transit and, of course, the adjacent two heritage buildings.

With regards to the relationship to the Station Building, the Panel thought the proximity of the station to the building and resulting courtyard was a concern. They thought there were daylight issues as well as CPTED issues. Some Panel members saw the faceted art wall as an opportunity and one that could help to mitigate the relationship. Overall, the Panel had concerns with the proximity and suggested that perhaps the ground floor could be seen as an extension of the overall public realm and with more porosity. As a result, the perception of the site and the private space would in fact be much more public. Some members thought the area could be enclosed and as well the building could be moved more to the east but that also brought up issues of its proximity to The Landing.

Several Panel members had concerns regarding the public realm and in particular that their impression was the proposed connector (street) is being valued more than the Station Building. This relative value and the role it plays in the Central Hub Framework is something that needed to be considered. There were some questions as to whether the road should be for vehicle traffic or simply a connector that connects pedestrians to the waterfront.

With regards to sustainability there were some concerns regarding this very significant building should be exemplary in its context and there were specific concerns as to the energy performance. Panel felt they could expect more from the building and as well the solar shading on the south is not doing much for the building.

The entire public domain is a critical piece because of the value of the site in the public's mind. A "lollipop" design approach was brought up by a few Panel members who felt that type of design could very well blend into the area over the years. However, the overall Panel felt that the applicant's approach was more viable than a "lollipop" building. They thought the proportions of the lobby and courtyard in context with the public realm needs to be reconsidered. As well, they thought the movement patterns on the site and how they connect to adjacent sites needed to be considered, which includes future northern development as well the existing Gastown lanes. Panel members noted that there is a lot of movement that occurs through the Station Building, which is a public building, and the proposal in its current form would make it difficult for people to move through the end of the Station Building.

- **Applicant's Response:** - great - love to have these kinds of discussion - the comments are fair - look forward to addressing - some things were enlightening - three tiers of space that should be addressed - insightful set of comments

3. Address:	1661 Quebec Street
DE:	418488
Description:	to construct a 15-storey residential building. The proposal is for a total of 174 units.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Rafii Architects
Owner:	Concert Properties Ltd.
Delegation:	Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Richard Henry, Richard Henry Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Craig Watters, Concert Properties Ltd.
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for one of five buildings that belong to one large parcel that has been rezoned. He noted that there have been some changes to the site plan from the original ODP and it was agreed at a previous review of the Urban Design Panel that overall the proposal has an improved set of principles for the public realm. He mentioned that the public park is more legible in terms of its shape and relationship with the sea wall. Mr. Cheng mentioned that the other buildings planned for the site will be developed in the future. The laneway was originally envisioned as a road to provide vehicle circulation throughout the area however during the rezoning it was found that there wasn't a lot of space for a full road so it is now going to be more of an enhanced laneway. The courtyard on the lane will be open to the public and includes a water element. The water element separates the public aspect of the courtyard from the semi-private area that will be primarily accessible by the residents of the building but also accessible to the public. Mr. Cheng mentioned that providing underground loading has become difficult due to circulation so what is being proposed is a couple of loading areas on the lane. He also mentioned that there are private patios facing Railspur Mews and the top two storeys are penthouse units.

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

- Commentary on the overall site planning of the proposal including the interface between the private and the public realm and the quality of the proposed public spaces.
- Does the proposal succeed in providing a sense of visual openness and accessibility between the semi-private courtyard and the public realm?
- Does the proposed Railspur Mews public plaza provide a variety of possible activities for the public to enjoy? Should there be more design elements that will draw the public to this space?
- Does the proposed on-grade loading scenario succeed in providing a workable loading zone while minimizing its impact on the public realm?
- Does the proposed interface with Railspur Mews sufficiently activate the public realm?
- Commentary on the proposed architectural character and its response to the general principles of the Design Guidelines.
- Do the two proposed penthouse storeys create a legible and architectural "finish" to the top of the building while also minimizing impact with respect to shadowing and overall building mass?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Richard Henry, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they had the opportunity to redesign the public realm and juggle some of the building volumes. One of the objectives was to create a stronger sense of place and they have created a hierarchy of circulation mechanisms so rather than having a normal city street, they went to a wider boulevard entrance to the park. As well they went to a laneway mews to make it more accessible for all vehicles. Mr. Henry mentioned that there were a couple of important nodes that were mentioned in the original ODP. They are using the courtyard to place a piece of significant public art. Mr. Henry described the architecture and mentioned that the penthouse units have been setback on the north side to reduce overshadowing of the park. The tower will have solar shading devices that will integrate with the window systems. On the west façade there is a combination of horizontal and vertical shading devices. He also noted that they have moved the parking ramp off Switchman and added a townhouse bay.

Foad Raffii, Architect, mentioned that they looked at every possibility for the entrance to the loading but because they had to raise the building to meet the new flood plain requirements they needed to find a location that would allow bringing trucks onto the property. As a result they have adding loading surface loading off the lane.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there will be a huge children's play area in the city park so they wanted the focus on the courtyard to more of a quiet, relaxing place. There is dock area along the edge of the water with picnic tables. Railspur Mews will have catenary lighting to make for a unique expression. Urban agriculture and children's play is proposed for the roof of the podium and as well there are a number of private patios on all the levels. An extensive green roof is proposed for the top of the tower.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider a change in the colour and material palette to enliven the building;
 - Design development to better incorporate the framing elements to be more rational and volumetric;
 - Design development to relocate or remove the exit stair in the courtyard space;
 - Consider adding an indoor and outdoor amenity space at grade;
 - Consider increasing the identity of the loading area.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the overall site planning was successful as a continuation of the new site plan introduced at the rezoning.

The Panel supported the architectural design and thought it was in keeping with other projects in the area. Several Panel members thought there was too much grey painted concrete and suggested using an alternative material such as metal panels or adding another colour. However, they did think that the white frames added some interest to the facades although they lacked rational and were viewed as an appliqué. One Panel member suggested wrapping the corner unit decks in the tower around the facade and adding more windows that would be open to the views.

The panel thought the lower podium and townhouses were handsome and that they vary in their material palette. As well they noted that the penthouse glazing was similar to the framing elements and needed some character as well as the addition of sustainability features. As well some Panel members thought the tower was a little bland and that the framing elements looked a little appliqué. Another Panel member thought the framing

elements at the corners could increase the identity of the building and suggested extending them in such a way as to them so they feels better connected to the tower.

The Panel thought the landscaping for the most part was well handled along with the public realm and proposed open spaces but found a couple of elements in the landscape that were problematic. This included the exit stair that comes up from the courtyard adjacent to the lane. The Panel wanted to see the stair either relocated or deleted as it interrupts the flow of the space. One Panel member suggested finding a way to engage the water in the courtyard perhaps with the use of some stairs. As well there was a suggested to have the access to the townhouses from the laneway.

A couple of Panel members wanted to see a ground floor amenity space with corresponding outdoor space. Another Panel member suggested making the below grade gym more of a multipurpose room and add in a washroom and kitchen area. Panel indicated if there was a way to connect the amenity spaces to the outdoors it should be investigated.

A couple of Panel members thought the loading was hard to find and suggested the applicant find a way to better identify the area.

A few members thought the townhouses should provide better activation to Railspur Mews and to the lane. Most members felt that Railspur Mews did not require more elements to draw people, but should instead be simpler to create a quieter space of respite.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Raffii acknowledged the positive feedback from the Panel and said that they would do their best to bring them into the project. He mentioned that they didn't want to fence off the landscaped courtyard from the public. As well he noted that there isn't an amenity space at grade, however they is one on the 8th floor.

Mr. Henry acknowledged that the Panel had some good comments especially about the grey colour palette.

4. Address:	2806-2850 Cambie Street
DE:	418529
Description:	To construct an 8-storey mixed-use building with relocation of the lane and to move the heritage house from west 12 th Avenue to West 13 th Avenue as part of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement on this consolidated site. This proposal includes a restaurant and retail at grade and a total of 133 residential units on West 13 th Avenue and above the retail.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Fifth (First as Development Application)
Architect:	IBI Group Architects
Owner:	Shato Holdings Ltd.
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Group Architects Gwyn Vose, IBI Group Architects Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architects
Staff:	Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced a proposal for site with an existing heritage house that will be relocated. He noted that the site previously had a gas station and currently has an existing White Spot restaurant. Mr. Potter noted that the existing zoning is C-2B and the base zoning is RT-6 which allows for 4-storey and 2.5-storeys respectively. The proposal is for a development application after rezoning and that the heritage house will be relocated to West 13th Avenue. As well there will be a new lane running north/south behind the development and connecting to West 12th Avenue. As well the lane will be closed that runs east/west to Cambie Street.

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:

1. In general how well have the comments from the last appearance been addressed which, in brief, were as follows:
 - a) Design development of the 2-storey curtain wall;
 - b) Design development to improve the expression of the upper volume; and
 - c) Consideration of the stick development at the corner of West 13th Avenue and Cambie Street.
2. Comments on the success of the design of the Cambie Street storefronts. Do the varied and angular orientations of the glazed storefronts contribute to the adjacent public realm areas? How well does this treatment belong to the formal parti of the building?
3. Comments on the public realm space and landscape treatments along each of the streets such as West 12th Avenue, Cambie Street, and West 13th Avenues in addition to the treatments around the relocated heritage house.

Mr. Potter took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that their presentation is in response to an improved form of development, massing and density. He mentioned that from a sustainability point of view the building will be LEED™ Gold. Mr. Bruckner added that they are unable to add anything
-

other than the elevator lobby and overrun, as well as mechanical equipment on the roof but would have liked to have been able to add an indoor amenity room.

Gwyn Vose, Architect, mentioned that overall they have tried to keep the design simple. It is basically two forms that are changing. This version has been edited down with a white volume on the bottom with a darker volume on top. There are strong vertical louvers through the top volume which makes it a glass box with sustainability features on the east and west facades. He noted that at grade they tried to be purposeful with the angles. The idea is to give some visual interest that gives opportunities for seating. The building has been reduced in height by about six feet through the elimination of a mezzanine. The stick looking bank that was on the south side has been eliminated. Mr. Vose said there was a slight overlap of the two boxes to tie the two volumes together.

Grant Brumpton, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the street character is very much in keeping with what is happening further to the north on Cambie Street. They are proposing a planted median with trees and then from the property line in they have introduced a series of plinths and stairs to help modulate the grade. There is a water feature at the lobby entrance which has been scaled back and as well there is a patio area. On West 13th Avenue there are existing street trees that will be retained and there is an allowance for a bike share pad as well. The heritage home will have an open yard and the mews down the middle is a series of private patios. The roof deck includes urban agriculture, children's play area, outdoor eating and living areas.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the intersection between materials;
 - Design development to better illustrate the sustainable measures;
 - Consider aligning the fins and improving their position to reduce solar gain;
 - Design development to simplify the angles in the store fronts;
 - Design development to improve the entry;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the north façade as well as the northeast corner;
 - Consider improving the proportions of the upper volume; and
 - Consider improving the livability of the amenity room.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an improvement since the last review.

The Panel appreciated the simplification and clarification of the overall form and parti and thought the simplicity of the material palette was successful. However, Panel thought the approach relies upon the clear resolution of the volumes and that the material treatment at the intersection of the materials needed to be resolved. Some Panel members thought the lightness and proportions of the top volume was lost from the previous version. Panel also thought the vertical fins could be aligned better with the windows. They also thought the fins should be turned slightly to improve their function in shading the building as this would not change the concept or detailing of the building but would be a benefit in reducing solar gain.

The Panel appreciated the simplification of the store fronts but some Panel members questioned the need for the angles and wanted to see them reduced or eliminated. They felt that there was a finer grain missing along the store fronts and the vertical plane was missing adjacent to the public realm. As well the Panel had some concerns regarding the

void at the entry as they felt it wasn't the same language as the rest of the building. They wanted to see the entry have a stronger identity to make it a prominent feature.

The Panel was divided about whether or not the awnings should follow the angles of the store fronts or should simply absorb the geometry.

The Panel had some concerns with respect to the north face of the building as they thought it seemed lost since there aren't any angles in the façade like the rest of the building. They thought the angles differentiated the scale and rhythm of the façade and the lack was really apparent on the north façade. They noted that the north face was a primary façade since it can be seen from City Hall. Panel felt this was an opportunity missed but also an responsibility of the façade to respect its context.

As well the Panel had some concerns regarding the northeast corner, as they felt that although this was a lane elevation, it was also a primary elevation because of its relationship to City Hall. They felt that there were ways to make it a more noble elevation with the use of more detailing, texture or the addition of more vegetation.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and thought there was a good level of detail in the public realm but felt this could be improved at the store fronts. One Panel member asked the applicant to carefully consider the species of trees between the heritage building and the new building. Some Panel members thought the amenity room could be a little more welcoming with one member suggested adding window to add daylighting into the room.

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

5. Address:	1529 Comox Street
DE:	418115
Description:	To construct a 4-storey multiple unit residential infill building to the rear of the existing character building. The application includes relocation and renovation of the existing pre-date building.
Zoning:	RM-5
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Carrera Management
Delegation:	Timothy Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Daniel Martins, Ankenman Marchand Architects Damon Oriente, Damon Oriente Landscape Architects Nevin Sangha, Carrera Management
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced a proposal under the Laneway Infill Program for the West End. He described the context for the area noting that across the lane is a 3-storey, 40 unit strata building with decks to the lane and a previously approved 3-storey infill building. Adjacent to the site is a 3-storey walk-up building and 2.5-storey character home. The existing dwelling on the site has non-original alterations to the rear, which will be removed.

Mr. King explained the Guidelines for the project noting that they expect a ground oriented laneway infill dwelling, addressed from the lane with a shared courtyard space and the infill should preserve the existing character to the street with high quality and authentic details and materials that are sensitive to the adjacent dwelling and the host building. As well the courtyard space is an important piece and the family units must have access to the private play space.

Mr. King mentioned that at the previous review by the Panel in August, the proposal got non-support. He described the consensus items for improvement which included better integration of the two buildings on the site including the addition to the dwelling, improvement of the courtyard, provision of an indoor amenity space, improvement to the unit layouts, improvement to the tree retention and that windows should be added to the bike storage.

Mr. King described the proposal noting that the key to the Laneway Infill Program is delivery of at grade activation of the lane and the development of the green strip. The 1907 building predates the Parking Bylaw, so replacement of existing parking plus parking for the new units is required. The site is providing off-site car share parking. He mentioned that the most significant change to the proposal is the addition of parking at grade and the side yard area to the south which has been pulled back to allow for a tree to be retained in that area. As well all the family units in the infill have private balconies and the rooftop has been developed as common open space and is setback from the edge of the building. Mr. King mentioned that 10 units are now proposed instead of the previous 13 with two and three bedroom and an internal amenity room, communal laundry and bike storage.

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

Does the revised application successfully address previous panel concerns around:

- Integration of the two buildings on the site.

- Additions to the existing pre-date dwelling.
- Provision and quality of common and private amenity spaces. including the addition to the dwelling
- Livability of proposed units.
- Tree retention.
- Grade activation of street, courtyard and laneway frontages.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Timothy Ankenman, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they have some concerns as well with CPTED issues in the garage area and they are working with the car companies to see if they could add a garage door on a timer because there will always be one space open for the communal car. He explained that they are trying to stay true to the original character of the existing building in terms of the front façade and its relationship to the street. As a result they aren't using a lot of historical features and that is why the existing building will not be heritage designated. He described the architecture and noted that they have added a veranda on the front, a porch, a gable roof, front entry stair and celebrated the entry. He added that they have carved out a portion of the building in order to retain the large existing tree which will also signify the entry to the infill.

Daniel Martins, Architect, described the material palette noting the addition of a natural wooden colour and the rest is a white hardi panel. With the colour scheme they are trying to bring the natural colours from the original building into the new building but adding some brighter colours.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider enhancing the entrance to the infill and adding weather protection;
 - Design development to consider another material rather than using faux wood;
 - Design development to consider the use and function of the proposed amenity space
 - Consider a more open plan for the two bedroom units in the infill;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had improved the design since the last review.

The Panel thought there was a better treatment of the heritage and as well a better integration between the infill and the existing building. As well they liked that the courtyard was larger and that some of the units will now front the space. However, Panel members thought the entrance to the infill was difficult to find and thought it should be more visible to improve security. As well, it was suggested that the area could use some rain protection. One Panel member had some concerns regarding security for the open carport structure and suggested overhead or sliding doors.

The Panel had some concerns with the material palette noting that the use of faux wood reduced the level of contrast and didn't think it was the best strategy. They wanted to see more contrast in the material expression.

Panel members thought the amenity space was too small and might not be used. One Panel members suggested making it open to the lobby so that it would have more space for community functions.

A couple of Panel members were concerned with the livability of the units in the basement. They noted that the second bedrooms tended to be a bit on the small size but that the units were in keeping with affordable housing. A couple of Panel members suggested reducing the amount of rooms in the two bedroom units and having an open floor plan that would allow the space to be more flexible for the residents.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans but thought there should be more programming on the roof patio. The Panel applauded the applicant for the improvement to the tree retention strategy. They did however still have some CPTED concerns and encouraged the applicant to add more windows on the first floor on the lane or in the stair wells.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman thanked the Panel for their comments and said he looked forward to incorporating them in the project.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.