

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 26, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Kim Smith (Chair)
Karen Spoelstra (Excused from Item #1)
Helen Avini Besharat
Yijin Wen
Neal LaMontagne (excused from item #1)
Nell Gasiewicz
James Cheng
Renee Van Halm
Muneesh Sharma
David Jerke (Excused from item #1)

REGRETS: Veronica Gillies
Meredith Anderson
Amela Brudar

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|-----------------------------------|
| 1. 1920 SW Marine Drive |
| 2. 55-79 & 87-115 SW Marine Drive |
| 3. 860 Richards Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Kim Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A brief business meeting took place before the presentations commenced.

1. Address: **1920 SW Marine Drive**
 Permit No.: RZ-2017-00018
 Description: To develop a Class B Seniors Community Care Facility with a capacity of 90 beds and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 0.93. The proposal includes retention and adaptive reuse of the existing Heritage A listed Casa Mia mansion. 58 beds are to be publicly funded by agreement through Vancouver Coast Health.
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: Third
 Architect: IBI Group
 Owner: Gavin McIntosh, The Care Group
 Delegation: Peter Lang, Architect, IBI Group Architects
 Caelan Griffiths, Landscape Architect, PM & Landscape Architects Ltd.
 Patricia Campbell, Landscape Architect, PM & Landscape Architects Ltd.
 Donald Luxton, Heritage Consultant, Donald Luxton & Association Inc.
 Staff: John Chapman & Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** John Chapman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as an application to rezone a single parcel located on south/west side of South West Marine Drive from RS-1 to CD-1 to permit development of a 90-bed seniors' community care facility, class B.

Note that this is considered the first review of this project at Design Panel. This site was the subject of a similar rezoning proposal, submitted initially in 2013, which has now been withdrawn. Notably, this proposal includes a partnership with Vancouver Coastal Health to deliver 58 publicly-funded beds. The remaining 32 beds will be private-pay.

UDP considered a similar application for this site from Stuart Howard on May 8, 2013 and did not support the application. A revised application was considered on Dec 18, 2013 and did receive support from the Panel. This application, however, was subsequently withdrawn.

The proposal includes heritage preservation and reuse of the existing Casa Mia mansion, which is a Class A Heritage listed building, and development of a 3-storey (2 storeys above grade) addition with basement and underground parking. The parcel is 65,612 square feet. The parcel dimensions are 230 feet frontage by 285.5 feet deep, located on SW Marine Drive near Angus Drive on the escarpment above the Fraser River. The proposed FSR is 0.93 and the height of the existing building is 46 feet (14.2m) and height of additions (38 feet) 11.65 m. 24 parking spaces (22 underground) are provided.

Vancouver Coastal Health is a partner in this project; they will fund 58 of the 90 beds. The project is designed to meet Vancouver Coastal Health design guidelines and City of Vancouver Community Care Facility guidelines. The Community Care Facility is a conditional use in RS-1.

Policies used to assess this application include Heritage Policies and Guidelines, the Heritage Action Plan, Community Care Facility - Class B and Group Residence Guidelines, and the Southlands Plan.

- The Southlands Plan goals include maintaining and enhancing the single-family estate character in this sub-area to protect the environmentally sensitive escarpment lands.

- Support for the preservation of heritage resources is facilitated by permitting sensitive infill or conversion units.
- The City's Heritage Policies and Guidelines support protection of potential heritage resources. Community Care Facility guidelines suggest that facilities should be located in residential neighbourhoods across the city. Currently there are no publicly funded beds in SW Vancouver.

This proposal is considered specifically on the heritage preservation and opportunity to secure new long term care spaces for seniors. The City of Vancouver has a number of tools available for heritage conservation and protection, including zoning provisions, heritage designation, Heritage Revitalization Agreements, and rezoning.

Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project and noted the importance of locating seniors' complex care facilities in residential neighbourhoods across the city to allow seniors to remain in their neighbourhoods as they age.

Enhanced landscaping is planned along NW Marine Drive. The pool will be filled in and outdoor seating, rooftop patio and an outdoor lower level terrace are provided. The public will be able to view the interior of the space due to the design.

The architectural design of the new addition is meant to contrast Casa Mia but aims for compositional balance, well detailed and rendered in high quality materials. The massing and landscaping are intended to preserve the views.

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

Advice from the Panel is sought on the proposed architectural and landscape design in general, and specifically:

1. The form of development including height, density, and massing.
2. The response and relationship of the proposed addition to the existing Casa Mia.
3. Building site and design.
4. Architectural expression

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Project architect Peter Lang of IBI Group noted the challenges fitting the project into this residential, large estate neighbourhood and discussed how the project design attempts to preserve the streetscape, respect privacy and minimize potential overlook.

The mass is kept low by fitting many of the residential rooms in the sub-grade level. The exterior walls of the garage will be preserved and incorporated into the interior of the entry lobby, using extensive glazing to frame the historical façade at the new building entrance. Colour and materiality of the addition are intended to complement but not mimic the existing house.

Caelan Griffiths from PMG Landscape Architects explained how the landscape plan responds to the heritage building. There is a beautiful perimeter wall that is intended to be preserved. The planting scheme is tactile and species selected for therapeutic value.

Donald Luxton, Historical Consultant, explained that the house is the master work of architect Ross Anthony Lort, and is done in a Spanish Colonial Revival style. The interior is particularly notable, and the this application will preserve as much as possible, while recognizing that some elements will need to be upgraded to meet current building and fire codes.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Gasiewicz and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff and that the project return to the Panel at the DP stage:

- Improve the colour of the new wing to differentiate the heritage and new components, and to minimize potential glare off the new building
- Increase hierarchy of main entrance to improve wayfinding.
- Add canopy cover to primary entrance to improve the pick-up and drop-off experience in rainy weather.
- Add seating and permanent shading to outdoor areas.
- Add shelter to accommodate use of outdoor space, including sitting and walking.
- Add shade and a washroom to the rooftop patio.
- Clarify the difference between the heritage building and the new addition through colour and materiality
- Find an inspiring and artistic solution to the fountain that is well framed by the Casa Mia building.

Related Commentary: Overall the panel supported the use and appreciated the work done to keep the massing hidden. However, there are opportunities to refine the separation of the existing building and the new addition. The panel would like to see the rationale for the design of the addition further developed, and feel the relationship between the heritage building and the addition should be made more explicit.

The hierarchy of entrances should be clarified as the new, main entrance is not well established. Ease of pick up and drop off in the rain must be considered. There could be a glass connection between the three floors where the new wing joins the heritage building.

There is a corner of the sunken courtyard that will get sun, and shading should be considered. The livability of the sub-grade side yard units is a concern because they seem low and ‘walled in’ and will receive little or no sun.

Additional planting and landscaping should be brought into the middle of outdoor spaces. As proposed the landscape is restricted largely to the edges. Seating should be accommodated with ‘sittable edges’ throughout the landscape. More planting, including larger plants and grasses, are recommended for the rooftop patio. The courtyard should have more places to wander. Encourage expanding on the idea of the ‘trellis’ and seating under the trellis. The intimate scale of the garden area should be replicated throughout the lawn area in order to make it more accessible.

The Chair recommended mitigating the impact of night-time lighting on neighbours with a shutter system.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team noted the good comments from the panel. The attempt was to unify the buildings with colour but we will revisit the idea. Trellis’ and washrooms at roof level might be difficult to build without the roof becoming another ‘storey’.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2. Address: | 55-79 & 87-115 SW Marine Drive |
| Permit No.: | DP- 2017-00039 |
| Description: | Rezoning application for 55-79 SW Marine Drive (East Site) and 87-115 SW Marine Drive (West Site) for two six-storey residential buildings. A total of 101 social housing units are proposed with a combined floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.40. |
| Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | RZ |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | GBL Architects |
| Owner: | City of Vancouver |
| Delegation: | Paul Goodwin, Architect, GBL Architects Rodrigo Cepeda, Architect, GBL Architects Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Ltd. Graham Plant, Development Representative, CPA Development Consultants |
| Staff: | Zach Bennett & Marie Linehan |

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- Introduction:** Zak Bennett, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a pair of sites located along the north side of SW Marine Drive mid-block between Manitoba and Ontario Streets. Presently the sites are developed with single-family houses. The sites fall within the Marpole Community Plan, which allows for consideration of residential buildings up to six storeys and up to 2.5 FSR in this location. The south side of Marine Drive is primarily zoned I-2 and developed with a mix of commercial and industrial buildings, as well as a CD-1 (475) site developed with large format retail. To the north, across the lane, sites are zoned RM-8 and can be developed with townhouses up to 3.5 storeys. Further north, the zoning is RS-1 and primarily developed with single-family houses.

The 87-115 SW Marine Drive (Building 1 - west) site is composed of three lots totalling approximately 17,004 square foot, with 132 foot frontage along Marine and a site depth of 124-132 foot. The proposal is for a six-storey residential building with 48 social housing units and 38 underground parking spaces. An FSR of 2.32 is proposed.

The 55-79 SW Marine Drive (Building 2 - east) site is composed of four lots totalling approximately 17,619 square feet, with a 141 foot frontage along Marine and a site depth of 122-131 feet. The proposal is for a six-storey residential building with 53 social housing units and 41 underground parking spaces. An FSR of 2.48 is proposed.

The Social Housing definition is rental housing where at least 30% of the units meet the HILS standards set by BC Housing.

There is a single-family lot remaining at 83 SW Marine Drive between the two assemblies that is not part of the application. Note the lot is 33' x 131' and not 50' wide, as noted erroneously. A development study is provided for the middle lot which shows a five- storey building with four-storey shoulders at about 2.2 FSR.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction, noting that the built form guidelines in the Marpole Plan recommend six-storey buildings with notable four-storey shoulder setbacks to provide compatibility with adjacent lower buildings as the Marpole Plan develops. In particular, it is recommended to provide stepping via the shoulder at the rear to minimise shadow and massing impact and provide a transition to future townhouse sites across the lane.

For sites with a minimum depth of 130 feet it is encouraged to provide a row of townhouses at the lane to assist with the transition in building height. However, the lot depths for this block vary from 120 feet to 130 feet, so a continuous townhouse edge to the lane is not required. The Marpole Plan notes that developments including more than one building may display a single strong architectural concept and a consistent architectural language, and encourage creativity to distinguish the buildings and introduce variety to the streetscape.

In terms of the public realm, the north side of SW Marine Drive is intended to have a green landscaped edge with wider sidewalks and a double row of street trees. It is recommended that ground floor units provide patios and entries facing the street for pedestrian interest. In these ways, it is intended that Marine Drive will evolve into a more walkable area. The first floor may be raised three feet above the sidewalk to provide a more comfortable relationship with pedestrian and vehicular traffic, noting Marine Drive is a busy arterial.

The recommended setbacks are 12 to 16 feet for the front yard. There is an angled front property line with a minimum setback of 12 feet provided. The minimum side yard setback is 8 feet, noting 11 feet is provided at the front portion of the building and 8 feet towards the rear. The minimum rear yard is 16 feet. The rear setback to the main mass for both buildings is about 37 feet and there is a 25 feet setback to a one-storey rear extension that contains the amenity room with adjacent common outdoor space. Noting the grade change, the rear yard is excavated for outdoor space with landscape terraces up to the lane. Four-storey building shoulders are provided at the front, and five-storey shoulders at the rear.

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

- 1) Comment on the overall height, density and form of development relative to the Marpole Plan Built Form Guidelines.
- 2) Is there an appropriate transition of the built form to surrounding sites?
- 3) Comment on the amount and quality of the common outdoor amenity space.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the site was paired down in size from earlier versions. The building has to be no more than 3 feet above the sidewalk. The ramp is designed to allow a consistent elevation at the street edge. The project is between Main and Cambie Streets, and in the area the grade changes and is interrupted by a curve. The flood plain in the area is at the edge of the site, tracing Marine Drive. The change in topography aligns with the angle of the flood plain. There are different 'thicknesses' expressed in the building. The massing of the building is designed to allow as much solar access as possible on the site. The site design is responding to the grade. There is children's play planned in the amenity space of both buildings.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Cheng and seconded by Mr. Wen and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommend **Resubmission** with following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- The design should respond to the unique site conditions: the location at the apex of the curve in the street geometry, the topography, the flood plain, the adjacent industrial area and the evolving pedestrian character of Marine Drive.
- The buildings should be expressed as a pair. The architectural design may work with symmetry, or express a 'joyful distinction' between the buildings.

- There should be an urban design acknowledgement and response to the smaller site between the buildings.
 - Amenity spaces should be located at the north and south side.
 - Reconsider or utilise the covered roof space at the rear.
 - Consider shared amenity spaces between the buildings.
- **Related Commentary:** The density and use was supported by the panel, and the panel commended the city on providing this type of housing. However, it was felt that the proposed form of development does not yet reflect the unique context or the analysis of the site. A transition should be made to the middle site. The buildings should emphasize the prominence of the site and respond to the curve in the block. It was noted that the buildings will set the precedent for development under the Marpole Plan for this block. It was noted that the typology is too familiar, repetitive and symmetrical, which does not respond to the dynamics of the site. It was felt that the proposal crowded the front yard and compromised the objective to improve walkability on Marine Drive. The front yard landscape treatment is a series of broad steps and terraces so there is no transition and no privacy. A stone wall at the edge was mentioned as an option to expand patio space in the front yard and provide a transition. The setback and slope of the roof could be improved to better respond to the slope and improve solar access. The main entries to the building need to be more strongly announced.

It was suggested to make up for the lack of sun on the north-facing units by adding amenity areas at the south. The covered space on the north side is not purposeful and should be deleted or used. It was recommended to create more space to play, and distinct outdoor spaces, which may be achieved by sharing the spaces. The use of the embankment for planting and the slide was supported. It was noted that urban agriculture could be replaced with traditional planting at the north side.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and the comments from the panel were well noted. Clear direction on the setback and building position recommendations are welcomed.

-
3. Address: **860 Richards Street**
Permit No.: DP-2017-00566
Description: Development Permit Application for a City of Vancouver park located at the intersection of Smithe and Richards Streets. The proposal includes structures for a café and maintenance building as well as for an elevated pedestrian bridge, berming, storm water features, and overhead sky frames.
- Zoning: DD
Application Status: DP-2017-00566
Review: First
Architect: Dialog Architecture
Owner: City of Vancouver
Delegation: Brady Dunlop, Architect, Dialog
Matthew Though, Landscape Architect, Dialoct
Joe Mcleod, Landscape Architect, Parks Board
- Staff: Jason Olinek
-

EVALUATION: *Deferred*

The Development Planner Jason Olinek and the Applicant presented introductions to the Project.

However, the Panel decided there was not sufficient information to provide an evaluation on the presentation and asked the Applicant to present at a later date.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.