

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 16, 2022

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Clinton Cuddington
Geoff Lister
Jennifer Stamp (excused from item # 3)
Kelly Lee
Margot Long
Natalie Telewiak (Chair)
Reza Mousakhani

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 5562-5688 Manson St.
 2. 396 SW Marine Drive
 3. 1025 Dunsmuir St.
-

BUSINESS MEETING Chair, MS. TELEWIAK, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

- 1. Address:** 5562-5688 Manson Street
Permit No.: RZ-2021-00046
Description: To develop two 18-storey rental buildings, plus an additional partial storey for rooftop amenities, including 392 secured rental units (with 20% of residential floor space provided as below-market units) with a 37-space childcare facility at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 227 parking spaces and 733 bicycle spaces. The floor area is 26,605 sq. m (286,380 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 5.97, and the building height is 63.8 m (209 ft.). The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
- Zoning:** RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: DA Architects and Planners
Delegation: Al Johnson, DA Architects
David Jerke, Van der Zalm + Associates
- Staff:** Joseph Tohill and Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Rezoning Planner, Joseph Tohill, introduced this rezoning application at 5562-5688 Manson Street being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan. The site is located a half block north of West 41st avenue on Manson Street and consists of 6 lots zoned RS-1. The area has seen significant redevelopment activity in recent years, with new townhouses and 6-storey residential apartments approved nearby. The Oakridge site across 41st avenue to the south is envisioned to redevelop into a large mixed-use development with a range of retail, service, office, civic and residential space, including secured market and social housing.

The sub-area in which the site is located is envisioned to develop into a high density residential area with a variety of new affordable housing types and tenures. Tower heights up to 15 and 18 storeys can be considered, with mid-rise building up to 4 and 6 storeys considered for sites precluded from tower development. Tower developments must include either (a) 100% secured rental units with 20% of residential floor space as below market rental or (b) a minimum of 30% of residential floor area provided as social housing. For podium forms, increases in height can be considered for proposals that include turnkey childcare.

The proposal is for a residential development with two towers at 18 storeys on two 6-storey podiums with an FSR of 5.97. 392 secured rental units are proposed, with 20% of residential floor space, (or 79 units) provided as below market units. A 37-space childcare facility provided turnkey to the City is included on the ground level. Amenity spaces are located on the 7th floor on top of the podiums and

on the roof of each tower. There are 227 parking spaces and 733 bicycle parking spaces located on three levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.

Development Planner, Omar Aljebouri presented the project's form of development.

The Neighbourhood:

- The Plan recognizes the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre as an emerging urban hub with a significant concentration of urban uses and density.
- The arterials will form part of a new commercial core while the surrounding off-arterials areas are for high-density residential with a diversity of building forms and connects to adjacent parks, shops, and services within the MTC.

The Built Form & Public Realm:

- To provide form diversity, the Plan offers two high-rise typologies:
 - 18-storey tower in open space
 - 15-storey tower on a 4-st podium. This may be increased up to 18-st for the provision of turnkey childcare
- An additional partial storey above the prescribed height for common rooftop amenity spaces contiguous with common outdoor amenity space, which is stepped back significantly to minimize visibility.
- Towers on podiums will create an urban street edge, with ground-oriented units.
- A continuous 4 storey streetwall
- Vertically expressed slim towers that are at least 90 ft. apart with a maximum of two towers per block.
- Tower tops should provide a visual terminus as viewed from street level and afar.
- A series of secondary active links are envisioned by the Plan to create neighbourhood porosity.
- These links accommodate pedestrian passage, with elements that support an informal space for movement and respite such as low-maintenance planting; informal seating arrangements; bike parking.

Existing and Future Context:

- The site is surrounded by single-family houses, which, under the Plan are anticipated to develop similarly to the site (i.e. up to 18-storey towers). To the south are existing six-storey buildings that are likely to remain.

The Proposal:

- Two 18-storey towers on podiums with turnkey childcare. The increase from 15 to 18 storeys is expected by the *Plan* for projects that offer childcare.
- The six-storey podium varies from the *Plan's* anticipated four-storey podium. The applicant is seeking an increase in podium height for project viability to deliver 100% rental units with below-market rental components and turnkey childcare.
- The upper two storeys of the podium are recessed to minimize their appearance and reinforced the four-storey streetwall. This is consistent with the *Plan's* direction for six-storey buildings in the MTC.
- A mid-block secondary active link is provided and separated the two buildings.
- The towers and podium forms generally reflect the dimensions expected by the *Plan*.
- The childcare is located at the rear of the north building.

- Indoor and outdoor amenities are provided on the podiums and towers.

Staff acknowledge that the Cambie Corridor Plan is prescriptive in terms of built form.

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

1) Height, density and overall massing, in particular the proposed podium height variation from the Plan.

2) Any preliminary advice for consideration at the Development Permit stage

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Al Johnson presented the design rationale and explanation for the proposed project design.

David Jerke presented the landscape vision and plans.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. STAMP** and seconded by **MR. LISTER** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

1. Consider refinement of the expression of the massing to address symmetry and lack of variation.
2. Consider refinement of amenity spaces to enhance social gathering.
3. Review daycare location and sun exposure and refine daycare design.
4. Design development to review provision for family-oriented units in particular at the ground plane.
5. Design development to review the unit layout design to avoid blank expression on façade.

Panel Commentary

General support from the Panel on the density and height, especially support of the variation from the Plan with the six-storey podium.

There were mixed comments regarding the massing and façade approach with consistent comments on formality, rigidity, symmetry and lack of variation.

There were several comments regarding unit mix, particularly the units that are at grade and the need for family-oriented units at grade.

The daycare space was well received by the Panel, noting it is a positive attribute to this site. There were comments on the daycare's access to daylight, and what the approach and circulation are to the daycare itself both from the pedestrian-oriented circulation and vehicular.

Regarding daycare after 2 pm, a Panel member encouraged doing shadow studies beyond 2 pm is critical.

General support from the Panel of pulling back the parkade and opportunities it will provide. On the east lane, there could be more street trees.

A Panel member suggested relocating the lay-bys and pull-outs from the north-south lane to the underground.

A Panel member encouraged more indoor amenity areas on level 7 for social gatherings.

Some comments on the opportunity to enhance the public realm through design development.

General support from the Panel on the midblock break.

A Panel member noted the emphasis on having mechanical cooling.

A Panel member noted there is a lot of sun exposure on the south and lots of glass and will be expensive to heat and cool.

Some Panel members noted the solid wall on the corner is opaque.

The Panel noted a desire to see this proposal again at the Development Permit stage.

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

2. **Address:** 396 SW Marine Dr.
Permit No.: RZ-2021-00054
Description: To develop an 11-storey building, and a 19-storey building above a 3-storey podium, including commercial retail space at grade, 37-space childcare facility on Level 3, office space and light industrial space; all over three levels of underground parking, including 674 vehicle spaces and 349 bicycle spaces. The total floor area is 63,109 sq. m (679,310 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 4.5. The east building height is 50.3 m (165 ft.) and the west building height is 76.2 m (250 ft.). The application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan and the Employment Lands & Economy Review Phase 2 Report.
- Zoning:** I-2 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: HDR Inc.
Delegation: Simon Harvey, Hungerford Properties
Jim Aalders, HDR

David Jerke, David Jerke, Van der Zalm + Associates
Kevin Welsh, Integral Group

Staff: Scott Erdman and Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (7/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman, introduced this rezoning application at 396 SW Marine Drive, located at the southeast corner of SW Marine Drive and Yukon Street, across the street from the Marine Gateway development. Marine Drive Station on the Canada Line is one block away to the west. Numerous mixed-use high-rise developments, up to 35 storeys, have been built surrounding the Station in recent years. The site is zoned I-2, and is currently developed with a car dealership.

This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan and Employment Lands and Economy Review Phase 2 Report. Under the Marpole Plan, this site was identified as an Intensive Employment Area, for transit-trip generating uses such as office or institutional, while still permitting traditional industrial. Maximum heights of 100 ft. and density of 3.0 FSR were anticipated. Surface parking was discouraged, while mid-block connections were encouraged. In October 2020, Council approved the Employment Lands and Economy Review, which sought to intensify job space and deliver multi-storey industrial spaces in key locations. This review allowed for staff to consider rezoning applications that exceed the height and densities anticipated under the Marpole and Cambie Corridor Plans, including this site, for projects that propose 100% job space.

The proposal received is for a mixed-use development, and includes:

- Ground-floor commercial retail space,
- Light industrial use in a 3-storey podium,
- Office use in two towers above, at 11 storeys and 19 storeys in height,
- A density of 4.50 FSR.
- The proposal also includes a mid-site pedestrian connection, and a 37-space childcare facility as the in-kind public benefit.

Development Planner, Omar Aljebouri presented the project's form of development.

The Neighbourhood:

- Marine Landing is envisioned as a walkable urban node centred around the Marine Drive Station. The area will transition to higher intensity residential and employment uses, with tower forms concentrated around the station and a general pattern of descending heights moving away from the Cambie Street and Marine Drive intersection.
- Some overarching urban design principles include:
 - Strengthened natural urban systems and an animated public realm.
 - Buildings of varying heights and forms that are social, flexible for employment needs and promote industrial stacking.
 - Appropriate transitions to the context.

The Public Realm:

- The recent industrial history and proximity to a busy arterial have created undesirable conditions and a disconnected public realm network. The intent is through incremental site-by-site changes to re-establish the natural urban systems through the design of streets and lively public spaces, prioritizing generous sidewalks and shorter blocks through active links and pedestrian mews.
- On this site, the vision is to include:
 - An improved walking and cycling route at the north edge as well as a blue-green system.
 - A portion of a primary active link at the eastern edge.
 - A “green” expression at the west edge with large trees to improve the urban tree canopy and reduce the urban heat island effect.
 - A new road at the southern edge.
 - A north-south 40 ft.-wide mid-block pedestrian mews, with active frontages and openness to the sky above. The mews should generally be 1:1.5 in ratio to avoid a tunnel effect.

The Built Form:

- Large intensive employment sites should be campus-like with multiple buildings of varying heights and floorplate sizes.
- Height should respond to context. Two tower typologies are anticipated: one being tall and slim (up to 76.2 m (250 ft.)), while the other is short and bar-like (up to 51.8 m (170 ft.)).
- Podiums are expected to be designed with flexibility and include stacked light industrial uses. The massing should respond to the public realm connections and places on-site, including streetwall definition, framing of pedestrian mews and allowing sunlight penetration to streets and public spaces.
- Articulated massing that reduces perceived bulk.
- Building interface that enhances the pedestrian experience with minimal blank walls.
- Public-realm activating uses at grade.
- Strategies to mitigate noise, pollution and address open space deficiency in the area.
- High-quality private indoor and outdoor amenities.

Existing and Future Context:

- West: the existing Marine Gateway (approximately 350 ft. high); and west of Cambie Street are the recently approved Ashley Mar Co-op (approximately 304 ft.) and Denny’s site (335 ft.).
- North: Existing towers up to approximately 331 ft.
- East and south: Currently I-2 forms are expected to remain up to 100 ft. or depending on site consolidation to have towers similar to this project.

The Proposal:

- Two office towers: a tall tower to the west while the other shorter and bar-like to the east.
- A podium with commercial and light-industrial spaces. A north-south pedestrian mews bisect the podium. Upper levels bridging elements are proposed.
- A childcare space on Level 3.
- Indoor and outdoor office amenities on top of the podium.

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

- 1) Height, density and overall massing.
- 2) The response to the public realm aspiration of the Marine Landing Guidelines (e.g. planting; solar access; treatment; activation; interface), in particular for the pedestrian mews and the pedestrian-level east building elevation.
- 3) Any preliminary advice for consideration at the Development Permit stage

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Simon Harvey and Jim Aalders presented the design rationale and explanation for the proposed project design.

David Jerke presented the landscape vision and plans.

Kevin Welsh presented the sustainability strategies for this project.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. CUDDINGTON** and seconded by **MR. LISTER** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Refinement of the ground plane design to improve the public realm.
- 2) Re-locating daycare relative to the overhead coverage.

Panel Commentary

General support from Panel for height, density and massing.

A Panel member noted concerns with the deep overhang for the childcare area on the south side.

The Panel noted daycare location and daylight access need design development.

The landscape design was well received by Panel and suggested enhancing the ground plane and how it is connected to the podium.

The Panel suggested the massing of the ground plane could benefit from the solar study.

The Panel suggested further enhancing the connection to place through landscape design.

A Panel member encouraged the green roof to be more responsive to urban agricultural plantings.

A Panel member suggested pulling back the parkade to retain the tree on-site.

A Panel member noted concerns with the east elevation and the amount of green wall. The panelist suggested design development to address how the building relates to the east lane.

A Panel member suggested exploring the opportunity to bring artists into the industrial context.

A Panel member noted appreciation for the sustainable design strategies in the project.

A Panel member suggested creating a more balanced composition between the taller and shorter podium.

A Panel member noted there was an elevator overrun proposed in the shorter tower but not for the taller tower.

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

3.	Address:	1025 Dunsmuir St
	Permit No.:	DP-2021-00824
	Description:	To develop a 16-storey Office Building, with a one-storey retail pavilion and a public plaza; all over 2 levels of below grade parking, providing 173 vehicle parking spaces and 273 bike parking spaces, including a connection to the existing retail concourse and the Burrard Skytrain station. The building height is 260'-0", and the total floor area is 461,619 sq. ft.
	Zoning:	DD
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	KPF
	Delegation:	Marianne Kwok Vincent Defaud Kevin Welsh, Integral Group Joseph Fry, Ryan Martin Levin Stoelting Daniel Fung
	Staff:	Hamid Shayan

EVALUATION: Recommend Re-submission (6/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Development planner, Hamid Shayan, began by noting this is a proposed DP application to replace an existing 7-storey parking structure at north-west corner of Bentall centre with a 16-storey mass timber office building, featuring sub-grade parking, connection to the retail concourse and the Skytrain, retail at grade, a lobby, and rooftop. The building is fronted by a large public plaza, which is activated by a 1 storey retail pavilion.

The site is zoned DD and is located in area “A” under Downtown Official Development Plan and mostly surrounded by office buildings. It is considered as established high-density prestige employment node.

The project sits within the current Bentall Centre complex with Eveleigh Street to the north, Dunsmuir Street to the south, and Thurlow Street to the west. Site has some constraints; The Canada way transit link passes underneath from southeast to northwest. The site has a significant slope. From southwest corner, Melville and Thurlow street intersection, it has 22 feet drop to the north at Eveleigh and 11 feet drop to the east at Burrard Street. The applicant recently has done some temporary improvements such as the mural which add to the character of the area.

This proposal is governed by some applicable plans, policies and guidelines and is generally aligned with urban design objectives including:

- Improve the general environment of the downtown district as an attractive place to live, work, shop and visit.
- Maintain the highest standards of design and amenity
- Create distinctive public realm and a unique and pleasing streetscape in downtown district

The proposal is envisioned as a loft-like structure. The cubic form started directly from the ground and articulated with cut-in spaces. The rectangular plate and centred core provide deep leasing depths. The mass of the building steps back at multiple levels, providing many of the office floors with loggias or terraces. Terraces provide access to exterior space from the office and line the south elevation of the development, facing the new Dunsmuir Plaza. They cascade across the facade to allow extra daylight into the breezeways and to the existing facades of Bentall 3 and Bentall 4. The highest occupied level is graced by a large rooftop terrace with ample greenery and planting.

The site also is under 6 intersecting View Cones (B2, C1, C2, 3.2.2, 9.2.1, F1). At this location, the maximum geodetic height is 115.3 meters (378.5 ft.) under View Cone B2. As per the provided shadowing analysis, no extra shadow impact is expected on the nearby public areas however there is some shadow impacts from pavilion to the plaza which staff will be considering to minimize it in their future review process.

Hamid Shayan continued with elaboration on public realm design strategies which comprise of 4 components:

- 1- The Plaza south of 1025 Dunsmuir is re-imagined to align with these aspirations. The entire space along Dunsmuir is regraded, providing an accessible space connecting Dunsmuir, Burrard and Thurlow as well as entries into 1025 Dunsmuir, Bentall 3 and Bentall 4.
- 2- In between the buildings is the Thurlow Breezeway and the Eveleigh Breezeway, leading from the Plaza to surrounding streets. Activating the Plaza and Breezeways with retail, café and restaurant patios and landscaping.
- 3- The Pavilion is a low, mass timber structure and is the most prominent feature of the Plaza. It is simultaneously a café where people socialize and a sculptural object inviting engagement and participation.
- 4- Retail spaces at the first two levels of the building and carefully considered landscape design, aim to activate more fully the corner of Thurlow and Eveleigh, while also increasing pedestrian accessibility, porosity through the site and increased connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhood.

Development Planner, Hamid Shayan, also noted that in order to activate the public life at night, a lighting strategy has been proposed upon staff’s preliminary commentary. The material of the buildings includes Clear glazing installed within dark bronze mullions and trims, concrete piers and fire rated wood spandrel, and wood textured aluminum soffit panels.

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

- 1) Public Realm and Landscape Strategies;

Please provide feedback on the following:

- a) The overall performance of introduced plaza area and breezeway connectors as the active and inviting pedestrian links.
- b) The quality of the public realm and building interface at Dunsmuir St, Thurlow St. and Eveleigh St.

- 2) Design Development and Materiality;

Please comment on the architectural expression, articulation of the massing, and material treatment of the office building and retail pavilion with consideration of the below:

- a) Is the pedestrian scale and relationship with the context establish a rhythm appropriate with the character of the area?
- b) Is the massing sufficiently articulated to produce a high quality addition to the prominent urban culture of downtown Vancouver?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Marianne Kwok presented the design rationale and explanation for the proposed project design.

Joseph Fry presented the landscape plans and vision for this project.

Kevin Welsh presented on the sustainability strategies for this project.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. LEE** and seconded by **MS. LONG** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Re-submission of the project addressing the Panel member's comments noted in the minutes.

Panel Commentary

Summary

There was general support for the building design with some mixed feedback on the length of the building and the kind of density within the location that it is sited.

There was feedback on the design of the plaza, in particular the pavilion. The panel noted whether or not the proposed public realm design is in response to what is best needed in this area. Most panel members noted that the plaza, and pavilion design should be reconsidered.

Panel commented on the functional design and programming of the elements at the ground plane and what the target use in these spaces should be.

Panel commented on the connection between the pavilion design and office; as one project but distinctive space within the site.

Public Realm and Landscape Strategies

Panel suggest further design development and programming of ground plane.

Some Panel members noted the pavilion could be more supportive of the way people flow through the site and still facilitate access to light on sunny days. Panelists noted the plaza feels like a bypass space and not a place for people to engage and socialize. Comments were also made with concerns to understanding whether this be a “place” or “non-place” or a “place to draw yourself through”.

Some Panel members noted the breezeway provides quality corridor for social gathering and pedestrian connection.

A Panel member noted the breezeway could be wider.

Some Panel members noted non- support for the overall performance in which the plaza in the breezeway is working because people are not being protected from the rain. Panelist encourage rain coverage in and around Bentall buildings three and four.

A Panel member noted concerns with the second layer of landscape blocking the plaza.

A Panel member does not support the location of the amphitheatre being on the street side.

A Panel member noted the orientation of the pavilion will be casted by the shadow and therefore there is no need for canopy.

A Panelist noted there is a need for more open spaces and there are already too many buildings in the downtown core, another building in the plaza is the wrong move; also noting non-support for a pavilion in the plaza.

A Panel member noted concerns with having a retail space at the podium base.

Design Development and Materiality

General support from Panel on the massing of the office building with mixed feedback about the length and density within the existing location.

A Panel member noted the concrete and timber propositions on the inside should not be undone by the use of artificial materials on the outside when perhaps glass could be more beneficial.

A Panel member noted appreciation for the use of interior wall separations to create 60/40, allowing the building to be more of a glass structure.

Some Panel members suggest the building could be taller. Other Panelists commented the building needs to be either taller or shorter than the Bentall building but not the same size. Another Panelist noted the building needs to be a bit narrower.

Some Panel members noted concerns with the plaza; it either needs more open space for pedestrians to encourage engagement or extend the breezeway to move pedestrian traffic through.

Other

A Panel member noted concerns with challenges in heating and cooling of the building in the future.

Some Panel members noted appreciation for the rigour, simplicity, and relentlessness of the building.

A Panel member noted the presentation was incredibly light for a DP application and concerned with how the description of the way the site works is not highly developed and communicated at this level.