

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** November 29, 2017

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Kim Smith - Chair  
Helen Avini Besharat  
Yijin Wen (excused from items 1)  
Karen Spoelstra  
Colette Parsons  
Muneesh Sharma  
David Jerke  
Renee Van Helm  
Meredith Anderson

**REGRETS:** Leslie Shieh  
Veronica Gillies  
James Cheng  
Amela Brudar  
Colette Parsons

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1068-1080 Burnaby Street & 1318 Thurlow Street
  2. 1837-1857 E 11th Avenue & 2631-2685 Victoria Drive
  3. 425 W 6th Avenue
  4. 3510 Fraser 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: 1068-1080 Burnaby Street & 1318 Thurlow Street  
Permit: RZ-2017-00054  
Description: To develop a 30-storey building consisting of 82 market residential units and 39 social housing units; all over four levels of underground parking with 176 vehicle stalls and 160 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 8.94 and the building height is 88.39m (290 ft.). This application is being considered under the West End Community Plan.  
Zoning: RM-5A to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning Application  
Review: First  
Architect: NSDA Architects  
Owner: Cameron Thorn, STRAND  
Delegation: Richard Henry, Architect, R Henry Architecture  
Tom Stanizicis, Architect, NSDA Architects  
Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk  
Staff: Stephanie Johnson & Danielle Wiley

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations**

**Introduction:** Stephanie Johnson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for 1068-1080 Burnaby Street and 1318 Thurlow Street. The site is located at the southeast corner of Burnaby and Thurlow Streets, measuring 132 feet by 131 feet. Site area is approximately 17,286 square feet.

The site is adjacent to a three-storey market rental building (1075 Burnaby St) to the north, a three-storey market rental building (1056 Burnaby St) to the east and a three-storey hostel (HI Downtown Vancouver) to the south. The site is currently occupied by three buildings containing 27 existing rental units and 14 strata-titled units

The application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the West End and West End Community Plan (Burrard Corridor subarea). For sites with a minimum frontage of 130 feet, rezoning applications can be considered for:

- Height up to 300 feet;
- Maximum floor plate of 5,500 square feet; and
- Market residential, provided that 25% of the total floor area social housing.

The new Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings also applies to this site.

The application is to rezone from RM-5A (Multiple Dwelling) to CD-1 to allow for a 30-storey residential building with:

- 39 social housing units on levels 2-8;
- 89 market rental units on levels 9-30;
- density of 8.94 FSR and height of 290 feet.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that in the “Burrard Corridor”, which spans from Thurlow to Burrard, the *West End Plan* incentivizes a substantial increase in density and housing stock, to achieve social and rental housing. Across Thurlow St, the West End Plan policy is to maintain existing zoning, with Laneway 2.0 development as “gentle” intensification.

The proposed development, at 290 feet, does not achieve maximum height (300 feet), as the top of the tower is shaped to minimize shadowing on the north sidewalk of Davie Street. The maximum floorplate is proposed: 5500 square feet for the tower and a slightly larger base.

The plan seeks large, landscaped setbacks to achieve a “tower in the park” typology. A 19 foot setback is proposed on Burnaby St, and a 12 foot setback is proposed on Thurlow St. The market entry is on Burnaby Street and the market outdoor amenity space is located in the front yard. If a PBS station is located on site (as is requested by Engineering), the common outdoor space will be reduced. The social housing entry is off Thurlow Street close to the lane. Due to the sloped site, the non-market housing entry is one storey lower than market entry. The non-market outdoor amenity space is located in the rear and interior side yards. The parkade access and at-grade loading space are on the lane. The Thurlow setback presents a fairly hard edge with retaining walls, planters, and exit stairs.

Architecturally, the more solid base is intended to relate to older West End mid-rise buildings. The tower expression refers to the older 1960s and 70s towers typical of West End.

The base zoning is 2.2 FSR, and proposed density is **8.94 FSR**.

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

1. Are overall height, massing and density supportable?
2. Does the site planning and design of the ground plane achieve a “tower-in-the-park” expression?
3. Are the common amenities for the non-market and market housing successful?
4. Please comment on the architectural expression, to assist a future DP application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the project is one of three proposed tower developments in the West End, and that each is architecturally distinct. All, however, aim to integrate the design of the architecture with the interior living space, with close attention to livable balconies. The base of the tower provides a more detailed grain, and references the 3- to 10-storey buildings in the area.

This application will be one of the first buildings under the new green buildings rezoning policy. To achieve envelope performance, the building is basically a simple box form, clad in pre-cast panel system. Thermal bridging is minimized and a higher solid wall to glass ratio is proposed.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Avini Besharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Consider integrating or joining the two playgrounds, and make them accessible;

- Consider “greening” the front yard, by moving the market outdoor amenity space to the rooftop;
- Better integrate the base and the tower (ie. “marry” the two languages).

**Related Commentary:** Overall, the height massing and density was supported by the Panel. The simplicity of the architectural expression is appreciated. The site planning is well handled. The proposal does not read as a “tower in the park”, due to the extent of programming and hard surfaces at grade. The outdoor amenity spaces seem cramped and overly programmed. The urban agriculture could take up less space and be less linear.

Some panel members thought the architectural expression of the base is quite heavy and does not suit the top of the tower. The higher solid to glass ratio is appreciated. The success of the design will depend, in part, on the quality of the pre-fab panel system for the exterior cladding. Consider providing weather protection canopies at the upper roof terraces on the tower. Examine the floorplans and unit layouts to address potential privacy issues with the proposed tower across the lane.

The public art should be pursued sooner than later; the corner at Thurlow and Burnaby should be considered as a possible location.

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

---

2. Address:	1837-1857 E 11th Avenue & 2631-2685 Victoria Drive
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00031
Description:	To develop the site with an 11-storey residential building consisting of 72 secured market rental units and 68 strata units, and the relocation of a 4-storey heritage house; all over two and a half levels of underground parking with 117 vehicle stalls accessed off the lane. The proposed floor area is 9,713 sq. m (104,553 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.59 and the building height is approximately 34.7 m (114 ft.). This application is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
Zoning:	RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Perkins + Will
Owner:	Evan Allegretto, Intracorp
Delegation:	David Dave, Architect, Perkins & Will Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Rachel Harrison & Marie Linehan

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project and outlined the rezoning policy, noting the project falls within the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan (GWCP) which directs development for the site. This site is within the 'Station Residential' sub-area of the Commercial Broadway Station Precinct of the GWCP. The GWCP provides two residential tenure options in this area: either 50% market strata and 50% secured market rental for all residential floor area or 80% market strata and 20% social housing for all residential floor area. The applicant has chosen the 50/50 option.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction noting this is a second review of the rezoning proposal by the Panel. In terms of built form, for the Station Residential Area of the Grandview Woodlands Plan, a 10-storey midrise with a 6-storey podium is recommended. For this site, a Heritage-B listed house is being retained and relocated to the northeast corner of the site and three site trees are retained, one at East 11th and two at the lane, as required by staff.

In the previous review the panel had concerns with regards to the building massing and compatibility with the neighbourhood context of 3 - 4 storey apartments and houses, as well as the transition to the retained heritage house on the site. Recommendations were made to express the massing in such a way as to break up the perceived bulk and to revisit the frame element. There were also recommendations to develop the streetscape to be more sensitive to the finer grained context, particularly along Victoria.

To address the perceived bulkiness and compatibility issues, the 6-storey podium has been reduced to 5-storeys and the height of the midrise increased to 11-storeys. There are shadow studies to show the difference between the heights as per the Grandview Plan and the proposal. The change is intended to improve the compatibility of the podium height with the neighbourhood and the heritage house, and to provide greater distinction between the podium and midrise to help to break up the perceived bulk. While it varies from the specific heights outlined in the GWCP built form guidelines, staff can consider this change if it is seen to meet the overall intent and provide improved compatibility. It is also noted that the site has constraints due to the heritage house retention.

Along Victoria Drive, the spacing between heritage and proposed building has been increased from 7' to 10'. A corner notch and 4-storeys are provided as a transition.

The public bike share has been relocated off-site and ground level access provided for the units along Victoria with a 6' patio setback. This is in addition to the required 7' side yard.

Ground level access is also provided along 11th with 10' patios setbacks in addition to the required 10' front yard. Bay windows and balconies have been added to the podium to provide a more residential scale. Public realm improvements will be provided with a 15' statutory right of way along 11th and 18' along Victoria Drive.

With regards to the frame element, the midrise floor plate complies with the limit of 6, 500 sf to the building proper noting that the balconies are exempt. An option was explored to delete the frame and to articulate the balconies at the north face which was not pursued.

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

- 1) Comment on the changes in response to the previous recommendations, in particular the perceived massing and response to solar orientation.
- 2) Provide comments with respect to the height and massing, noting the application is still at the rezoning stage.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant restated the issues noted in the previous review and outlined how the revised proposal responds to those issues, in particular the building bulk, massing relative to the house and trees, livability of the units, and streetscape. It was noted that some aspects cannot be changed, including the retention of the trees and the heritage building as required by Planning, and the tower location, which is also prescribed by spacing requirements relative to adjacent properties. There is a reduction in height of the podium which was transferred to the midrise. The shadow studies show minimal impact as compared to the previous height. The south and north sides are designed with bays and balconies.

In addition to the setbacks, there are vines proposed on the wall adjacent the heritage house to soften the interface. Heritage colors are to be provided for the house. The new building includes bronze colour panels. On Victoria Street the front entries were set back to provide covered porches.

- The applicant team then took questions from the panel.
- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Helen and seconded by Mr. Yijin 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:

- Provide more efforts to blend the building into the residential neighbourhood with materials or refinements to the massing, without diluting the overall concept.
- Provide more breathing room between the new building and the heritage house if possible.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel agreed the project was much improved and the design responded well to the recommendations. The densification in the area was appreciated.

It was noted that the reduction in the height of the podium was a better response to the neighbourhood scale, and the expression of the massing was improved. The changes were noted as subtle but overall the proportions work much better.

It was recommended that the frame could be improved by studying a different grid proportion or pattern, or by opening up the corners of the frame. The L-shaped component could be further distinguished in a different colour.

The project was noted as elegant and much more respectful for the neighbourhood. It was not suggested to do drastic changes, but further refinement at the development permit stage to provide a better fit. It was noted as a great precedent for the neighbourhood.

- Applicant's Response: The applicant team appreciated the comments.

---

3. Address:	<b>425 W 6th Avenue</b>
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00048
Description:	To develop a 9-storey office building over five levels of underground parking with 298 vehicle stalls, 40 bicycle spaces, and 2 Class A and 5 Class B loading spaces. The proposed floor area is 15,946.5 sq. m (171,652 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 7.11, and the building height is 40 m (131.35 ft.). This application is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan.
Zoning:	C-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning application
Review:	Second
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Nathan Gurvich, Cressey (West 6 <sup>th</sup> ) Dev LLP
Delegation:	Peter Lang, Architect, IBI Group Architects Jeff Mok, Architect, IBI Group Architects Jen Stamp, Landscape Architect, DKL Daniel Roberts, LEED Consultant, KANE
Staff:	Michelle Yip & Danielle Wiley

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, noted that this rezoning application was previously presented to the panel on October 18th. This site is located on the northwest corner of 6th Ave and Yukon St in Mount Pleasant. It is currently zoned C-3A, which permits a maximum density of 3.3 FSR. The rezoning proposal is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan, which allows for consideration for increasing commercial density in areas served by rapid transit.

The initial proposal was for a 9-storey office building with retail at grade at 7.11 FSR. The revised proposal is for a 10-storey office building with retail at grade at 7.16 FSR.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, described the proposed form of development. She noted that maximum height is limited by a view cone at the west side of the site, and ‘viewpoint K’ at the east side of the site.

As the rezoning policy does not have design guidelines, staff look at the intent of the base zoning. The typical building typology under C-3A zoning is a lower (ie. 3-storey) streetwall with greater height for a limited portion of the frontage. The intent is to allow views and access to light for the public realm. Shadow impacts should minimize shadowing on public and private outdoor spaces. Additionally, conditional density is earned via the provision of a high-quality public realm and streetscape, and design excellence.

The Panel’s concerns about the previous submission were:

- Overall massing did not have a clear parti, and stepped “boxes” seemed extraneous;
- Structural “frame” on 9-storey massing did not have clarity;
- The building was tight to setbacks and public realm was not generous.
- The bike facilities and the public bike share were not resolved.
- More indoor amenity should be provided.
- Architectural expression did not meet standard of excellence to earn proposed density.

The revised Design response:

- The massing is 6 storeys at the streetwall, stepping up to 10 storeys at the west side;
- The west “block” is more clearly expressed as a distinct volume;



- The structural frame has been replaced with a fully glazed, faceted envelope with vertical fins for solar shading;
- The podium element is also highly glazed, with vertical fritting and spandrel at the lower half of the pane, and horizontal shades;
- A larger entry niche and larger setbacks are provided on the street frontages, to enhance the public realm;
- The public bike share (PBS) location and bike facilities have been revised; and
- Additional indoor amenity rooms are provided at the top floor.

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

1. Is the “re-massing” of the building successful?
2. Is the interface with the public realm design resolved?
3. Does the architectural and public realm design now meet a standard of excellence to earn the proposed density?
4. Are the common amenities successfully resolved?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant applied the motif of a bar code on the elevations. The curtain wall design has deeper vertical mulling caps on the west side and a motif with a frit. The building overhangs the public bike share on Yukon St, and a more visible entry is provided for the bike storage.

The landscape design is simplified to provide a ‘quiet’ atmosphere, using a salmon theme. There is a water feature and ample patio space at grade. At the rooftop, more colour is introduced into the landscape, walls and planting wall design. A fish scale pattern is proposed on the raised benches.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Spoelstra and seconded by Ms. Van Helm 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:

- Reconfigure the exit stair and bike share, to improve access;
  - Consider rain protection for the outdoor amenity spaces;
  - Consider extending the frit pattern to the building corners;
  - Consider changing the frits to horizontal for the podium;
  - Simplify the overall design
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the massing is more proportional. The setbacks and lowered streetwall are improved. The lobby is more distinct and the retail expression is improved. The building design needs to be ‘quieter’. The shading devices on the south side and window washing could benefit from simplification.

The exit doors on Yukon St and bike share may be in conflict. The landscape design and use of red accents are exciting and dynamic for pedestrians. The roof could use some solid screens for noise mitigation.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel.

- 
4. Address: 3510 Fraser Street  
Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of a senior's centre at grade and 56 seniors housing units above. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.54, and the building height is 21.83 m (71.62 ft.). This application is being considered under the Housing and Homelessness Strategy.
- Zoning: C-2 to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning Application  
Review: First  
Architect: DYS Architecture  
Owner/Developer: Jaymes Pawlue, Ventana Construction  
Delegation: Dane Jansen, Architect, DYS Architecture  
Travis Warren, Landscape Architect,  
Staff: Sarah Crowley & Danielle Wiley
- 

#### EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Sarah Crowley, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as located on the south-east corner of Fraser St and E 19th Ave. The site, zoned C-2, is occupied by a 1-storey commercial building and surface parking. The site size is 1,197 m<sup>2</sup> (12,886 square feet), and 105.7 feet wide by 121.9 feet deep. To the east are RS-1 zoned properties with single family houses. To the south is a 4-storey mixed use development under C-2 zoning. To the north, across East 19th Ave, is the Glad Tidings Church, zoned CD-1.

The application, submitted on behalf of Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (VAHA), is to amend the C-2 zoning to CD-1 to permit a 6-storey mixed use development, including:

- seniors centre at grade;
- 56 seniors housing units;
- A floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.54;
- A building height of 21.83 m (71.62 feet); and
- 5 parking spaces and one car share space at grade.

Applicable policies include:

- Secure Market Rental Housing (Rental 100)
- Housing and Homelessness Strategy
- Kensington Cedar Cottage Community Vision Plan (KCC)

The existing C-2 Zoning permits a height of 13.8 meters (45 feet) and 2.5 FSR. Rental 100 permits the proposed 6 storeys.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that the proposed development is on a corner site with no lane, which creates a challenging interface to the adjacent RS-1 properties. Due to poor soil (peat bog), no underground parkade is proposed. Instead a limited amount surface parking is provided, and loading and passenger pick-up would occur on the street.

The senior's centre, which occupies most of the ground floor, is double-height with a mezzanine. The entries to both the senior's centre and the residential use are on E 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. Utility rooms, storage and bike parking, which are typically provided in a parkade, are also located at the ground floor. Levels 2 to 6 contain secured seniors rental housing. All 1-bed units have open balconies, and studios have Juliette balconies. The amenity room at Level 2 has a small, east-facing terrace. A second, larger terrace is located at Level 4, has better solar performance.

---

As the Rental 100 policy doesn't have design guidelines, staff consider the intents of the base zoning. C-2 prescribes specific setbacks to transition to a single family neighbour:

- 2 foot setback from lane at Level 1;
- 20 foot setback from lane at Levels 2 & 3; and
- 35 foot setback from lane at Level 4.

In a rezoning, staff typically ask for a further 8 foot. setback at Levels 5 and 6 to reduce the impacts of additional height. The proposed development meets the setbacks for Levels 1 to 4, but does not provide these additional upper storey setbacks.

The FSR base zoning is 2.5, and the proposed is 3.54.

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

1. Are the overall height and massing supportable?
2. Is the interface to the RS-1 properties to the east successfully resolved?
3. Is the site planning and ground level successfully resolved?
4. Are the design of the street elevations and storefront successful?
5. Is the provision of common amenities successful?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the entrances are pushed to the corner and off to the side due to the slope. There is a darker articulation at the front lower portion to break down the façade.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

THAT the panel recommends **RESUBMISSION** of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Relocate the main entry to the seniors' centre to Fraser Street
  - Create an accessible passenger drop-off/pick-up area for residents and visitors, preferably covered;
  - Combine the two outdoor amenity terraces to provide a larger space, and mitigate overlook to the single family neighbours;
  - Increase upper storey setbacks to at the east elevation;
  - Strengthen the corner expression at Fraser and E 19<sup>th</sup> Ave, and better tie to the ground floor;
  - Reconsider the colours and materials in relation to the "frame" design, and consider a lighter colour for the recessed balconies;
  - Revise the east elevation, to better integrate with the overall architectural design;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel recommended the massing at the east be revised to be more neighbourly to the adjacent single family properties. The building is too close to the neighbouring site. Provide further stepping down for a better transition.

On the corner, the lowest balcony should tie better to tie the building corner to the ground floor. The back of the building requires a more “finished” design. The Level 2 amenity does not provide a space that is usable. The rooftop could be used for a larger amenity that does not overlook the neighbours. Explore more lively and contrasting colour accents to animate the building.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and acknowledged the changes suggested by the Panel.
- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm