

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: August 10, 2016

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Stefan Aepli
Meghan Cree-Smith (excused for item #3)
James Cheng
Roger Hughes
Meredith Anderson (excused for item #1)
Russell Acton
Neal LaMontagne
Muneesh Sharma
Kim Smith

REGRETS: Veronica Gillies
Karen Spoelstra
David Jerke
Ken Larsson

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 5050-5080 Joyce Street |
| 2. | 3868-3898 Rupert Street & 3304-3308 E 22 nd Avenue |
| 3. | 3030-3038 Commercial Drive |
| 4. | 885 Cambie Street (formerly 225 Smithe) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 5050-5080 Joyce Street
 Permit No. RZ-2016-00013
 Description: The proposal is for a 30-storey mixed-use tower with commercial at grade and residential above (256 dwelling units), over six levels of underground parking (including 139 vehicle parking spaces, four loading bays, and 336 bicycle spaces), with a maximum building height of 88.4 m (290 ft.) and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 14.48. This application is being considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan.
 Zoning: C-2C to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects (Norman Huth)
 Owner: Westbank
 Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Norman Huth, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Josh Anderson, Westbank
 Staff: Rachel Harrison & Ann McLean

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application. The site is on Joyce Street just north of the Joyce-Collingwood Skytrain Station, which runs along Vanness Avenue.

This proposal is being considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan, which was approved by Council in June of this year. The site is in the J1 sub-area of the plan, which allows for a mixed-use building up to a maximum geodetic height of 189.5 m. Ground floor uses must be local-servicing retail and services. Choice of use may be permitted above the ground floor, and could include local-servicing retail, service, office, or residential uses. This proposal includes retail on the ground floor with residential units above.

The site is currently zoned C-2C and occupied by several one and two-storey buildings with four commercial units on the ground floor. It is 132 ft. wide and 105 ft. deep, with a total site area of nearly 14,000 sq. ft. This half block of Joyce is all zoned C-2C, including a four-storey mixed-use building immediately north of the site and three and four-storey buildings across the street. On the other side of the Skytrain station there is a 16-storey mixed-use building (zoned CD-1) with office and residential uses on the upper floors. The southwest corner of Vanness Street and Joyce Street is occupied by a one-storey building which houses a restaurant.

The Joyce-Collingwood Skytrain Station is currently undergoing upgrades, and a new bus loop will be added to the east side to accommodate a more frequent B-line service to UBC. The precinct plan anticipates several changes to the area around the subject site. The plan allows for four-storey mixed use buildings on Joyce Street along the stretch north of Vanness, excepting for two towers and two mid-rise buildings. All towers will have an 80 ft. separation between them. The plan also anticipates a third tower on the corner of Joyce Street and Vanness Street.

The properties behind the proposed tower are currently zoned RS-1. The Precinct Plan allows for consideration of up to six-storeys directly behind the subject site. North of this, along either side of Payne, would allow for consideration of up to four-storeys. Two mid-rise buildings could also be considered on larger sites.

The proposal is to rezone the site from C-2C to CD-1 to allow for a 30-storey mixed-use building with commercial on the ground floor and residential above. There are six levels of underground parking accessed from the lane and an indoor and outdoor amenity space on the top floor. The proposed FSR is 14.48, and 45% of the units have two or three-bedrooms. Ann McLean, Development Planner, continued by noting that the base zone is C-2C which is a mixed-use zone that encourages active uses at grade and limits storefront width to 50 ft. Office uses are also permitted on the 2nd floor, and residential conditionally permitted above. Max FSR for this base zoning is 3.0, and the maximum conditional height is 45 ft. or four-storeys.

The Joyce-Collingwood Precinct Plan allows for up to a geodetic height of 189.5m over a podium compatible with existing zoning on a site with a minimum frontage of 132 ft. Ground floor uses are required to be local-serving retail and services.

The Urban Design Guidelines for this area recommend:

- Front yard setback to provide 5.5m sidewalk with no overhangs, and a minimum 6 ft. step back above the podium;
- Side yard and rear yard setback from lanes at grade should be 4 ft., residential floors should be 20 ft. and above the podium at the interior property lines should be 20 ft.;
- Tower widths should not exceed 100 ft.;
- Tower separation should be 80 ft. (above 70ft);
- Floorplates should not exceed 7000 sq. ft. (650m²) and comparable to nearby Collingwood Village floorplates;
- Upper floors should be shaped to create distinction among the buildings and contribute to the skyline.

As the existing City lane to the south of the project is proposed to be closed to vehicular traffic, an east to west lane further east will need to be opened to accommodate vehicle movement. The lane will remain City property. Tree planting will be permitted, but will need to be located carefully to avoid underground services. The lane is envisioned to serve as a pedestrian connection and opportunity for informal gathering. Thus it should also be animated with by the building edge to provide pedestrian interest and safety.

To the south of the pedestrian lane will be the continuation of the BC Parkway Bike/Pedestrian trail and a new bus loop.

Public Art will be required as part of this development and can be incorporated on or off the site. A public art plan will be reviewed by the City's Public Art Committee and will consider input from the Collingwood Neighbourhood House and local artists.

The proposed building is 30-storeys in height and is below the geodetic limit. The rear and side yards are slightly less than the policy recommends, particularly at the south lane, and the building width and floor plates are slightly larger than recommended.

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

1. The proposed interface with the pedestrian lane at the south;

2. The proposed interface with the Skytrain level at the south;
 3. The treatment of the upper levels of the building to contribute to the skyline:
 4. The treatment of the lower levels to create a distinct “podium” compatible with the context;
 5. The apparent building width with regard to the balcony design.
- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant team did a year and a half of community consultation prior to coming up with a design. One of the things which stuck out was the cultural diversity of the neighbourhood. Another thing was the desire of the community for more density and for families to live in high-rises.

The client wanted a level of affordable housing for families as much as possible and asked the architects to develop something iconic, but affordable and easy to build. To achieve this, the applicants met with local artists to develop the idea of a quilt with architectural detail. Through this consultation they settled on two things to express: the idea of Still Creek and its salmon, and the story of local brothers whom started a masonry business in the neighbourhood. Thus the base gives a nod to masonry and the articulation of the tower balconies pays homage to Still Creek.

As space is an issue for families in the smaller units, outdoor space is maximized with 15% of the allowable FSR area as balconies. The building also has a library and study area for children to do homework in. This was done in an attempt to make family-oriented high-rise housing.

The building itself uses the shifting of balconies to articulate the idea of the creek through sculpting of a 3D structure. Commercial space exists on the bottom floor and loading is off the lane.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The pedestrian lane is too tight;
 - A stronger residential entry is needed;
 - A stronger base is needed at street level to compensate for the upper levels;
 - Consider connecting the tower to the ground plane by bringing it through the podium;
 - Design development to solve the acoustic issues with the Skytrain;
 - Consider more commercial spaces towards the Skytrain or the bus loop;
 - Consider a more distinct top to add to the skyline;
 - Design development to remove some of the metaphors as they drive the design too much, to the detriment of the building functionality;
 - Reduce the amount of balcony space to reduce the building mass;
 - Consider sustainability and thermal separation more;
 - The water feature is interesting, but a more generous public realm at grade would be better;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that this was an attractive design and that the simplicity is admirable. The density is very aggressive and maximizes the opportunities in area plan.

Some panel members thought that the podium seems to float too much, and needs to project more stability. Ground the building better and bring elements of the tower down to grade. As well, going a bit more vertical would be beneficial to the design to prevent it from looking like a podium with a stick on top.

These three buildings are not terribly visible as a skyline piece, so it matters in how it meets the ground more. Currently the urban design concept does not seem well thought-out. Consider how the building contributes to the street, as currently the relationship between the building and street seems a bit weak. In addition, the residential entrance is not very readable, further consideration of how the building mass touches down to the ground in this area is required. There could also be a bit more rain protection since this is an important feature in Vancouver.

There could be further design development so that the building metaphors do not take such a prominent place in the expression. If the stories expressed by the building are compromising the function of the units then the metaphors may not be as necessary in certain areas. Give real thought to the context.

The façade is important to consider as it will really contribute to the experience for those travelling on the Skytrain. There is not a lot of control over what Translink does with the station, but the interface towards the Skytrain must be well thought out. In addition, there are acoustic issues which need to be solved in this area. Consideration should also be given to creating an easy flow for the traffic coming off the Skytrain and to increasing the amount of retail to make the area more palatable.

The decoration seems to be driving the amenities and the balconies do not seem to quite give enough space for kids. Consider either removing some of the metaphor in order to have appropriately sized balconies for each unit, or creating some additional outdoor amenity. While the rooftop amenity is a great idea, it could do more to differentiate the top of the building from other towers in the area and add to the skyline.

Too many balconies are creating challenges with sustainability. Consider whether the balcony width really contributes to the feel of the building. Overall more environmental design features need to be incorporated and more thought should be given to the solar performance.

While the water feature is exciting, keep in mind how it will look during the summer and how the public art will [might] be developed relative to the water feature.

The panel liked the idea of blossoming plum trees on the site as they will be quite striking while in bloom.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address:	3868-3898 Rupert Street & 3304-3308 E 22 nd Avenue
Permit No.	RZ-2016-00004
Description:	The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade, and residential above (112 secured affordable rental housing units), over two levels of underground parking, with a building height of 21m (69 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.60.
Zoning:	C-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects (Amela Brudar)
Owner:	Kwee Sendjaya
Delegation:	Amela Brudar, GBL Architects
Staff:	Rachel Harrison & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-8)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application on the southeast corner of 22nd Avenue and Rupert Street.

This proposal is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy (also known as IRP). The policy allows for up to six storeys if fronting an arterial street and within 500 m of a local shopping area, subject to urban design performance and the degree of neighbourhood support.

The site is currently zoned C-1 and occupied by a one-storey retail building with surface parking and five commercial units, one of which is a grocery store. The site is 260 ft. wide and 112 ft. deep, for a total site area of approximately 29,000 sq. ft. The base zoning allows for three storeys and an FSR of 1.2.

The other two corners are also zoned C-1. The northwest corner is currently occupied by surface parking and a one-storey retail building, while the southwest corner/block has a newer three-storey mixed-use building on the corner and one-storey retail on the rest of the 3800 block of Renfrew Street. Across the street is Renfrew Elementary School. The rest of the surrounding area is RS-1. While the other C-1 sites across Rupert Street could develop under the IRP the policy only allows for a maximum of two IRP applications within 10 blocks on the same arterial, so currently only one of the other C-1 sites could develop under the IRP.

The proposal is to rezone the site from C-1 to CD-1 to allow for a six-storey mixed-use building. This building will include commercial on the ground floor and 112 secured market rental units above, all over two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. The applicant intends to retain all the existing commercial tenants on the new site. Proposed FSR is 3.60 and 29% of the units are two or three-bedroom units.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, continued by reiterating that is a local shopping node (zoned C-1) within a primarily single-family neighbourhood. The existing streetscape consists primarily of one-storey retail with small frontages. There is one new C-1 development across the street which demonstrates the anticipated form of development under existing zoning. There is a significant slope from north to south comprising a 12 ft. drop across the site.

The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use development with retail at grade. A grocer is located at the north end with a corner café, and fine-grained retail will take up the remainder of the frontage. The slab is stepped along Rupert Street to accommodate grade. A residential entry is located on 23rd Avenue, and servicing is on the lane. There is a 2 ft. setback from the property line on all sides.

From Level 2-6 the massing is organized in a “U” around a shared green space on the podium. This allows access to light for residential units and mitigates shadow impacts on the rear yards of adjacent RS-1 lots. There is a 35 ft. setback to the building face and a three-storey shoulder expression at the corners of both 22nd Avenue and 23rd Avenue. To achieve this, the shoulder is “split” part-way along Rupert Street. This helps to break up the long building elevation. Levels 5 and 6 have a 6 ft. setback from the building face on all three street frontages.

A common amenity is split across two levels. It includes a small room on Level 2 with access to the podium and a larger room on Level 4 with access to the terrace.

Expected density is 3.6 FSR.

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

1. Appropriateness of the overall massing, height and density within its site context (local commercial node);
 2. Architectural expression of the long building elevation on Rupert Street;
 3. Appropriateness of the massing of the upper storeys on the east side of the development as an interface to a single family neighbourhood;
 4. Architectural expression of the lane elevation (at the podium);
 5. Identity and expression of the residential entry on E 23rd Avenue;
 6. Any further issues that the Panel members wish to comment on.
- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that the client lives in the neighbourhood and wants to invest in it.

The first three storeys are intended to “ground” the building, and are expressed in a darker charcoal masonry. The upper three storeys are stepped back and treated in cementitious panel in a lighter colour, to “lighten” the apparent massing. The building elevation on Rupert St is broken up into two blocks with a connector piece. The connector has some green colour accents, including coloured balcony faces. The three forms are articulated through a fin which wraps around the building. This fin also provides weather protection. The massing towards the east transitions by stepping down to the lower density areas.

Parking is off the lane, and an elevator and stair bring customers for the retail uses up to Rupert Street. The idea of the main commercial entry on Rupert is to give a strong high-street feel to the building.

This development is made up of 70% one-bedroom units and 30% two or three-bedroom units. There is an upper deck with a kids play area and urban agriculture.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - There is too much density for the location;
 - The building may be too tall for the context;
 - Exceptional design development is needed to merit the proposed density and height;
 - More clarity is needed with regards to the urban design approach;
 - Consider using a simple bar building or breaking the mass up more;
 - Design development of the architectural language is needed to clarify the functional intent for the “break” in the Rupert Street elevation;
 - A finer grain is needed on Rupert Street at the retail level, with more public realm space (i.e. for cafes);
 - A better massing transition is needed towards the single-family houses to the east;
 - To be neighbourly this building, needs to better contain the activities on the lane (loading, parking, etc.);
 - The residential entry is unclear, too remote and is not well-related to the massing;
 - The relatively equal area, shape and symmetry of the outdoor amenity and a private patio at the lower roof level on the ends of the building seems illogical;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel started by noting that the massing and density are inappropriate for the context and need to be scaled down to be more neighbourly. Consideration should be given to losing the ‘C-shape’ in favour of a more straightforward bar building. The proposed density is a significant ask, so a commensurate level of quality and distinctiveness must be achieved. Overall the architectural design needs more design development. The

The building does not have an appropriate interface to the street. The residential entry location is unclear and illogical; it should be relocated. The commercial space should better activate the streetscape, possibly with some at-grade open spaces. A finer grain texture is needed to break up the massing and allow it to fit more into the neighbourhood.

The building is too close to the lane, and needs to make the transition to the neighbours more elegantly. All the loading activities should be contained within the site to minimize traffic impacts on the adjacent residential buildings. As proposed, the loading docks will be loud and intrusive for the neighbours.

A higher percentage of family units would be appropriate for this building given the school across the street, and the surrounding context of single-family houses.

Consider using the roof as an amenity space in order to add a vista for the residents and give them access to solar exposure.

Balconies with shaded glass or larger, inset balconies could do more to activate the podium.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicants noted that they will take on the comments as best as possible.

3. Address:	3030-3038 Commercial Drive
Permit No.	RZ-2016-00003/DP-2016-00111
Description:	This is a concurrent Rezoning and Complete Development Application to develop a six-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade, and residential above (43 affordable market rental housing units), over two levels of underground parking (including 25 vehicle parking spaces) accessed from the lane, with a building height of 20m (67 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 4.24.
Zoning:	C-2C1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Concurrent Rezoning and Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Gair Williamson Architects (Chris Knight & David Long)
Owner:	3060 Commercial Drive Nominee Ltd.
Delegation:	David Long, Gair Williamson Architects Chris Knight, Gair Williamson Architects
Staff:	Rachel Harrison & Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a concurrent rezoning and development permit application. This site is on the eastside of Commercial Drive between 14th Avenue and 15th Avenue, and is currently zoned C-2C1. This proposal is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy (also known as Rental 100). For sites zoned C-2C1, this policy allows for up to six storeys.

The site is approximately 7,000 sq. ft. and is currently occupied by a three-storey mixed-use building with seven rental units above grade. Along this section of Commercial Drive to the north, there is a mix of one to three storey buildings zoned C-2C1, with commercial at grade and either office or residential uses above. The Skytrain guideway is located behind the site, including a greenway. The sites to the east are duplex-zoned, RT-5AN and RT-5A. To the west is Clark Park, and on either side of the subject site is the Stratford Hall School. A third building was recently built for the school at 3150 Commercial Drive. The school buildings are two to three-storey buildings.

The proposal is to rezone the site from C-2C1 to CD-1 to allow for a six-storey mixed-use building with commercial on the ground floor and 43 secured market rental units above. There are two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. Proposed FSR is 4.24, and 26% of the units have two-bedrooms.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction, noting that base zoning for the site allows four-storey mixed use buildings to a height of 45 ft. and a density of 3.0 FSR. A 15 ft. setback from the lane is required for residential uses. Under the Rental Incentive Guidelines staff may consider a six-storey proposal subject to urban design performance. The proposal is six storeys with a density of 4.24 FSR.

There is a significant grade change on the site of about 13 ft. from front to back. Therefore, the building height at the front is about 63.5 ft., and the height at the rear is about 76.5 ft. A 6 ft. setback is provided at the front uppermost level to provide a five-storey streetwall expression along Commercial Drive. The required 15 ft. rear setback to residential is provided at the lane. No further stepping is proposed at the rear, noting that the units at Level 5 and 6 are two-storey units with a courtyard separation at the uppermost level.

The immediate context is the Stratford Hall School which occupies the two remaining sites on the block. Parking for the school sites is located under the Skytrain guideway.

The lane is a standard 20 ft. wide lane, with the Skytrain guideway and greenway occupying the adjacent two 33 ft. lots. The distance from the rear of the building to the nearest single family site is therefore 100 ft.

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

1. Overall height, form and density, in particular:
 - a. Height and setback at the rear and transition to single family sites, as well as the interface with the Skytrain guideway.
 - b. Courtyard design.
 2. Location and quality of common amenity space.
 3. Overall architectural expression and materials, including the treatment of the exposed side walls, noting they may remain exposed in the long term as the school sites are relatively new buildings.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that this site is at the bottom of the Victoria diversion, an area which is characterized by large buildings without a lot of street presence. This is a mid-block, embedded lot with the potential to attract pedestrian traffic.

The elevation at Clark Park rises steeply, and the crest of the hill has a row of trees. The site slopes moderately across the front and more than a storey towards the back. Primary design concerns include privacy impacts on the school, the safety of the laneway and traffic impacts on the school during rush hours.

The C-2C1 guidelines were used to create setbacks, and the sidewalk was widened. The applicants also noted that at the entry alcove landscaping has "been brought into the building". The site is too narrow for a conventional parkade and driveway, so has two separate levels of parking, one below grade and one off the lane at grade.

The units include simple, compact studio units and two-storey, two-bedroom units. The family units are raised to the upper levels to mitigate the noise from Commercial Drive and the Skytrain. A mass wall is proposed to meet acoustic requirements, and there is an objective to provide acoustic solutions that will also allow each unit to have access to fresh air. The target is to achieve LEED Gold. There are deep window recesses and balconies with generous overhangs to mitigate solar exposure.

For the landscape, an extensive green roof is proposed, a courtyard with irrigation, and private patios at each end with circulation space in the middle. Basalt stone pavers offset the lighter tones of the building. The planting is intended to create year-round interest. Along the south planter edge there is an evergreen hedge to mitigate overlook. While there are existing street trees at grade, it may be that a very old street tree will be replaced with two other trees.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Greater consideration is needed with regards to the acoustic treatment of the rear elevation;
 - The rooftop courtyard design warrants more consideration with regard to privacy and unit layout;
 - Design development is needed for the concrete side walls to improve expression;
 - Consideration may be given to adding art and/or detail to the concrete sidewalls;
 - The building expression may be too rigid and needs to respond to the context and functional program to a greater degree;
 - Reconsider the unit mix to include additional family-sized units;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel supported the height, form, and density as well as the setbacks. However, the Chair noted that more context and detail information should have been provided with the presentation materials for this concurrent application.

The main issue was noise and the treatment of the rear elevation adjacent the Skytrain. More careful design development will be required to resolve the acoustic and ventilation issues. It was also noted that the response to the Skytrain adjacency could serve as the form generator, and inform a more distinct expression for the rear elevation. More consideration is also needed with regards to heat gain at rear and front façades in the morning and evening, respectively.

The overall architectural expression was noted as clean and elegant, but perhaps too rigid. While the sense of restraint was appreciated, it was noted that the building's strict adherence to a pattern may not be advantageous to the unit layouts. One member suggested wider flats may be more suitable for family units, for instance, rather than the two-storey units.

It was suggested to flip the elevator core to improve the connection from the main entry through to the common amenity space.

It was noted that the solid concrete side walls could pose problems as they are too strong and not cost effective, as well as quite utilitarian. They may be broken up as a frame. Perhaps provide art on the side walls to contribute to the neighbourhood. The courtyard may be expressed with a seam detail on these walls.

Some members noted that the insertion of the residential use in the school block is a bit odd. There were comments on the unit mix with some panel members noting there were too many 400 sq. ft. studio units more appropriate to downtown. Other members thought that there would be a good market for these units for students. In general the panel supported the rental aspect, but some members noted that family units are more needed in this neighbourhood. Other members noted that the provision of two elevators, storage rooms, and a good-sized amenity room were positive features for a small rental building.

The adjacency of the courtyard space to the master bedrooms, rather than living space, was questioned. More privacy is also needed at to the courtyard. Some members felt the outdoor space was too small, while one panel member noted it was fine due to the proximity to Trout Lake. It was noted that the second exit stair at the courtyard is not required and should be deleted.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the comments, and noted that many of the things mentioned will be taken into account. The courtyard was added as an auxiliary space since the units at the top already have balconies, but the sidewalls will be considered. For the most part the school attendees are from beyond the community, so family units are not necessarily needed on this site.

4. Address:	885 Cambie Street (formerly 225 Smithe)
Permit No.	DE420157
Description:	To construct a mixed-use building containing one level of retail, three levels of office and 22 levels of residential (94 dwelling units) over six levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Third (Second at DE)
Architect:	GBL Architects (Andrew Emmerson)
Owner:	Boffo Developments
Delegation:	Stuart Lyon, GBL Architects Gerry Eckford, ETA Mike Boffo, Boffo Developments Stuart Hood, Integral
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the project as a development application following a rezoning. The site is located at the corner of Cambie Street and Smithe Street. It is 125 ft. by 120 ft. and has a 12 ft. cross-fall from high to low.

Surrounding buildings include Rosedale Gardens (26 storeys) and the Rosedale Hotel (20 storeys). There is also a 21-storey residential building, an 11-storey office adjacent to the immediate east (Law Society Building) and a 28-storey residential building to the south. Across Cambie there are two to six-storey buildings, and a three-storey commercial building exists to the southwest.

The proposal is for a mixed-use building containing one level of retail, three levels of office (levels 2 through 4) and 23 levels of residential space over six levels of underground parking. Overall there is a total height of 284 ft. and a density of 11.39 FSR.

The floorplate is 9278 sq. ft. for the office and 6488 sq. ft. for other uses. Proposed are 94 residential units with 9.6% of open balcony.

There is a 32 ft. side yard setback to the east property line, and an 80 ft. separation from Rosedale Gardens. The office entry is located along Smithe Street and the residential entry is located along Cambie Street.

Materials include masonry cladding, glass canopies, painted concrete and metal panel.

There is a commercial amenity terrace at levels 3 and 4. A residential amenity exists on Level 6 and a landscaped private residential roof terrace is on level 9. At the roof level there is an inaccessible extensive green roof and an accessible area with planters and seating.

Height is limited to 284 ft. by the Alder Terrace view cone as no intrusions are permitted into this space.

Previous Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- A simpler more rationalised commercial frontage - the double row of street trees have been removed - provides increased weather protection;

- The folded band fascia has been removed;
- The base expression has changed to a punched masonry façade and metal louvres;
- The stepping at the penthouse levels has been reduced by one level;
- The thermal performance of the building has been addressed with increased wall percentage and the additional of external louvers;

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

1. The applicant's response in addressing the consensus items from the previous UDP appearance (listed above);
 2. Architectural expression - the composition of forms, elements, materials and tower shaping including the modified undercut above the office uses;
 3. Overall approach to the landscape design including the public realm (street trees, seating area, setbacks at grade and weather protection) and landscaped decks, outdoor amenity spaces and green roof.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by mentioning that the major moves have not changed since rezoning. The comments last time were with regards to the treatment of the façade, the stepping at the top, the public realm, and the amenity terrace. An interior row of trees made the space on the sidewalk claustrophobic, so the second inside row was eliminated and the canopy was extended outwards.

The commercial frontage has been opened up to increase visibility into the CRU spaces and the heavy sill at the base has been removed. The steel canopy structure is now suspended to improve the commercial base.

The current scheme has more horizontality. More of a gesture has also been made towards the Yaletown context by introducing more solids at the base, such as the linear strips of stone cladding. There are also 2 ft. insulated upstands around the building at the residential levels to provide better energy performance and improve sun shading. This allows for improvements in sustainability by reducing the overall glazing percentage to less than 50%.

Elimination of the inner row of trees creates a more pedestrian-friendly public realm. There is now a singular saw cut pattern on the street wrapping around the building. More attention was focused on the two entries to enhance the paving systems. The commercial entrance creates a notch on the southwest corner and now includes additional seating.

At the sixth level amenity area open space is limited. The urban agriculture has been deleted, and the children's play area has been enhanced to create an engaging corner. There is a terrace with a canopy and an outdoor kitchen which works into the children's area and wraps around to the south. There is also a stand-up bar area with fire and water to allow for socialization and overlook onto the street. A green roof is provided on the tower roof.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider further design development of the floating expression of the stone and the formal expression of the podium generally to "ground" the building;

- Break down the expression of the large blank exterior wall at the sixth level Amenity space;
 - Extend the canopy over to the office entry and remove the planter at the lane;
 - The children's space deserves some bold equipment;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that this proposal generally addresses the consensus items from the previous panel appearance well. The building looks cleaner and tighter than the previous submission.

At the 6th floor there is a residential unit fronted with a blank wall going up several floors at two master bedrooms. Consider providing some glass at this corner to add light into this space and make it a true corner unit.

The attempt to bring Yaletown into the project is appreciated, but the panel was split on whether the composition of brick and stone cladding appeared appropriate. Some members thought that there is a bit too much variation in lengths or colour, and that adding some verticality would make the base more cohesive with the rest of the building. Other panel members liked the base because it looks a bit "odd" or mannered. The panel also suggested that the stone expression continue across the rear elevation.

The canopy on Smithe Street should be continuous and does not need to terminate the way it does. Additionally, the planters on the lane are a barrier preventing people from carrying on across the lane for rain cover. The residential entry is also not as legible as it could be.

As proposed, the amenity area has a bland appearance. Refine the expression of the amenity space blank wall, or introduce glazing to the corner unit to enhance this area.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and mentioned that they will take care and interest in responding. There is an opportunity with regards to privacy and the wall, and other options for the canopy will be explored.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.