

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 04, 2020

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jennifer Stamp (Chair)

Brittany Coughlin

Michael Henderson

Adrien Rahbar

Muneesh Sharma

Excused items 1-3

Alan Davies

Angela Enman

Excused item 3

REGRETS:

Margot Long

Marie-Odile Marceau

Matt Younger

Walter Francl

Karenn Krangle

Matt Younger

Sydney Schwartz

RECORDING

SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1247 Kingsway

2. 4750 Granville Street and 1494 W 32nd Avenue

3. 3701-3743 W Broadway

4. 8257 Oak Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair, MS. Stamp, called the meeting to order at 3:15pm. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1247 Kingsway
 Permit No. RZ-2019-00079
 Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with 31 secured market rental units and commercial units at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 16 vehicle spaces and 100 bicycle spaces. The maximum height is 21 m (70 ft.), the total floor area is 3,039 sq. m (32,715 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.60. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy
 Zoning: C-2 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Stuart Howard Architects
 Delegation: W. Neil Roberston, Architect, STA
 Pat Campbell, Landscape Architect, PMG Landscape Architecture
 Staff: Marcel Gelein & Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Jim Spillane, began by noting, this is a rezoning application for a mid-block site on the north side of Kingsway between Inverness Street and Clark Drive. It's located within the Kingsway and Knight area as defined in the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision extending generally from Inverness Street to Dumfries Street.

The site is comprised of one lot zoned C-2, and is currently occupied by two vacant commercial buildings.

The C-2 zoning generally extends along Kingsway to the northwest and southeast. To the north across the lane, there is a site zoned CD-1 which is a 3-storey building owned and operated by the Lions Paraplegic Lodge; West of the site is a 4 storey mixed use building with commercial at grade and strata above, constructed in 2011. East of the site is another Rental 100 rezoning application located at 1265-1281 Kingsway. That application also proposes a six-storey building with retail at grade and apartments above. At the corner of Kingsway and Clark Drive (1303 Kingsway), there is another rental 100 project which was approved by Council in April 2019.

There is no community plan for this area, however the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision, and city-wide rental rezoning policies do apply.

This application falls under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy, or Rental 100. This allows for increases up to 6 storeys and commensurate achievable FSR for sites where 100% of the residential floor space is rental.

There is no maximum FSR under this policy, however typical Rental 100 sites fall between 3.2 and 3.7 FSR.

Approved directions within the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision related to this site include strengthening the area as a retail precinct, through providing mixed use development with active frontages and improved streetscapes.

This proposal is to rezone the site from C-2 to CD-1 to allow a six-storey, mixed-use building with a total of 31 secured market rental apartments and two commercial spaces at grade. It proposes an FSR of 3.6 and a height of 21 m (70 ft.).

- It contains 2 levels of underground parking with 16 underground parking stalls; and 100 bike parking spaces.
- The unit mix includes 52% family units, with 39% of these 2-bedroom (12), and 13% 3-bedroom (4).

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, began by noting, the subject site is a small mid-block site with 74 ft frontage on Kingsway and a typical depth of 122 ft. It slopes down from the lane to Kingsway by approximately 4 ft.

The site is within the area of Kingsway and Knight Neighborhood Center. The application proposes a 6-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade. This is a typical rental 100 rezoning project based on existing zoning C2. The lower 4 storey massing generally is in keeping with the C2 zoning. The proposed additional two storeys have reduced floor plate. They are set back further from the lane side to mitigate the impact to neighbours, and stepped back on the street side to create compatible streetscape. The overall massing and height is generally compliant with rental 100 policy.

The neighbouring property due north is a paraplegic facility developed under CD-1 Bylaw. It is a 3 storey building with an outdoor amenity in the courtyard. The shadow impact has been assessed on equinox from 10am to 2pm. It indicates that the proposed additional two storeys would cast shadow onto the south corner of the north site and would not impact its outdoor amenity space.

The amenity room is proposed on the second floor contiguous with an outdoor amenity space on the 2nd floor roof deck. The amenity spaces are north facing and relatively small in size. The residential entrance is from Kingsway located at SE corner. The parking is accessed from the lane. Green roof is proposed on the top roof.

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

1. Does the panel support the proposed height, massing, and setbacks, with a particular consideration to the impacts on the neighbouring site due north?
2. Does the commercial frontage successfully contribute to the shopping area public realm in the Kingsway and Knight Neighbourhood Center?
3. Please comment on the indoor/outdoor amenity space with regards to the location, size, solar exposure, and impact to the neighbouring sites.

4. Please comment on the architectural expression and exterior finish to ensure that a quality appearance and durability can be achieved at Development Permit stage.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted the previous architect had acquired a DP under the existing C2. The original intent was to take what was approved from the DP and rezone for secure market rental, however further into the design there were several issues with the approved DP such as the original entry to the residential portion was in the center which created several issues with connection and back of house.

The applicant noted their first was to move the entry to the residential portion to one side, and defined that entry separate to the commercial. The commercial is on the left and the residential entry has a good finish on the right hand side.

The commercial portion has a robust typology with durable materials. The material palette lightens as you move up the building. There are bays that act as support to the balconies and are the skeleton of the project.

Shadowing was a major issue, therefore staff asked us to step back the upper two floors an additional 15 ft. The applicant noted they are compliant with the entire request from staff and parking bylaw.

The streetscape on Kingsway composed of two existing trees. Due to power line they are small trees. There is a proposal to redo the sidewalk.

There is landscape and a bike rack added in the boulevard.

On the ground floor there is a small patio space, amenity on the second floor, and floor planters on the 5th level front and back. Planters integrated into the building are concrete planters.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Rahbar and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Reconsider the size of the outdoor amenity and its relationship to the adjacent residential unit and consider a rooftop amenity;
- Design Development to the commercial frontage in terms of its proportions, openings, scale/size of commercial units, and differentiation of entry points and associated canopies.
- Design Development to the exterior elevations and exterior finishes to provide a more cohesive and simplified architectural expression.

- **Related Commentary:**

Height, Massing, Setbacks and Potential Impacts to Neighbouring Site to the North

There was support by the panel for the height, massing, and setbacks.

The panel noted no impacts to the neighbors in terms of shadow to the north.

The panel noted that the massing along the lane needs simplification.

There was support for the shoulder at level 5 and up as it will improve the appearance from the street level.

Commercial Frontage on Kingsway

The panel felt that the building is not enhancing the street.

There needs to be a stronger relationship between the commercial and residential expression. The proportion of the openings at the commercial level should relate to the residential openings above. Furthermore, the proportion and scale of the commercial base seems high in relation to the top two floors of the building; the middle mass appears diminished.

The various commercial and residential entries need stronger definition in terms of lighting, canopy placement and retail signage locations.

There could be stronger articulation of the public realm at the store front, such as lighting, parking, paving and street furniture.

Indoor and Outdoor Amenity

The panel raised concerns with the livability of the residential units on level 2 adjacent to the outdoor amenity patio. Additionally, the indoor and amenity spaces are fairly small in size. The panel suggested considering a rooftop amenity as a means to resolve the livability and size issues.

The project needs a play area for young children as the project is not close to a park.

Architectural Expression and Exterior Finishes

The street elevation would benefit from a more cohesive architectural expression. There are many materials and elements that should be simplified. The architectural expression and exterior finishes do not create a cohesion between the commercial base and residential above. The landscape planter columns and decorative roof (on one side of the Kingsway elevation) contribute to a lack of cohesion.

The symmetry does not track up the building. Consider bays and varying the scale of the commercial units.

The rigor in the architectural expression is lost at the upper levels due to the stepping back of the upper levels and proportions of the residential mass.

The vertical wood proposed at the residential entry makes for a disjointed composition/elevation.

The windows are narrow and amplify the verticality along Kingsway.

The panel supported the use of brick at the base and would like to see a higher quality material for the residential materials. There is a concern with the durability of the 'wood like' material.

Other Comments

The location of the canopy is a bit of a loss opportunity; need to understand size and scale of first floor.

Some panelists noted to review the livability of the units, the north facing units look narrow and deep and super dark. The caretaker's unit on the lane is 4' below grade.

Regarding sustainability consider some partial cooling and the size of windows related to the thermal gain of building.

The panel asked for more information on the extensive green roof to know if it is feasible.

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

2. Address:	4750 Granville Street and 1494 W 32nd Avenue
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00008
Description:	To develop a 4-storey residential building with 81 secured market rental housing units over one level of underground parking consisting of 70 vehicle spaces and 158 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 13.27 m (43.53 ft.), the floor area is 5,294 sq. m (56,986 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.50. This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy.
Zoning:	RS-5 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Stuart Howard Architects
Delegation	W. Neil Robertson, Architect, Stuart Howard Architects Patricia Campbell, Landscape Architect, PMG Landscape Architects Richard Wittstock, Owner/Developer, Domus Homes
Staff:	James Boldt & Derek Robinson

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (3/2)**• Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, James Boldt, and Development planner, Derek Robinson, began by noting, the application generally conforms to the Affordable Housing Choices IRP which it is grandfathered into, allowing for consideration of apartment forms up to 4 storeys at this location. This rezoning application is located at the southeast corner of Granville Street and W 32nd Avenue. The site has a frontage of 156 ft. on Granville and 206 ft. along 32nd Avenue and is currently zoned RS-5. A Council-approved building line exists along Granville requiring a 10 ft. road dedication. There is an existing hedge located within this property that the applicant and several neighbours would like to remain, however it is likely that Engineering will require this to be removed to allow for sidewalk widening and a new tree boulevard separating pedestrians from fast moving traffic, improving pedestrian safety and comfort.

The application consists of a four storey form with an upper level stepback of approximately 8 ft. on all building elevations. The form has been shaped by the proposed retention of existing trees along Granville Street and the lane. These lots are particularly deep for Vancouver at 175 ft., which also impacts the form. The proposal is surrounded by low density RS-5 development. A density of 1.5 FSR and 81 secured rental units are proposed.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following questions.

1. Does the panel support the additional height and density as proposed?
2. The primary residential entry is located on 32nd Avenue with a limited number of street oriented ground units.

Please comment on the overall success of the public realm and whether the building adequately addresses the street frontages?

3. The applicant proposes a common indoor amenity room on the ground level with an adjacent patio space used to connect to a children's play area located around an existing tree to be retained.

Please comment on the common indoor and outdoor amenity location and functionality?

4. Three units per floor orient south towards the shared property line with a setback of 16 ft. There is also a proposed grade change of about 4 ft. from the ground level patios up to the adjacent property line.

Please comment on the separation distance and potential for privacy/overlook concerns for units oriented towards the shared property line?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted while in process the council amended the policy for this zoning. The applicant noted the previous scheme for this rezoning was stacked townhouses on only one lot. At the time, staff recommended the applicant approach the neighbor to the north about consolidation allowing for an opportunity to explore an apartment form with a corner site. The applicant noted they were able to accomplish both recommendations.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Rahbar and seconded by Mr. Davies and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Reconsider location of indoor amenity room to have a more positive connection with the outdoor space;
- Design Development to the articulation and massing to mitigate the density and reconsider the projecting hat like roofs at the top;
- Address the response to the future public realm on Granville street, and the impact it can have on the livability of units that face it.

- **Related Commentary:**

- Additional Height and Density

The panel recognized the challenges of the site in terms of existing trees and the slope. The panel was in general support of the proposed height and increase in density, however there were concerns with how the density is handled.

There was concern how the density is distributed over the site and how the massing contributes to the bulk, particularly along Granville Street. Simplifying the articulation and the massing. There are a lot of elements that contribute to a sprawling feel – eg: 'hat like' roof projections at level 3

The building butts up to all of the property lines. One panelist would support more height if it resulted in a smaller footprint.

The floorplate is monolithic and one panelist was not sure if tree retention is contributing to this. They are not convinced that the form of development and massing is appropriate, and that other forms of development should be pursued – row houses and courtyard housing.

There should be further exploration of breaking down the mass to create a finer grain scale.

There was a majority support for the design language, the panel found it to be quite appropriate not pursuing a First Shaughnessy character. A panelist noted appreciated it was not a replication of heritage as it should be its own building.

Public Realm and Street Frontage

The 32nd Ave entry was generally supported by the panel and the treatment along 32nd was well handled. One panel member suggested moving the main entry closer to Granville Street.

The Granville Street is frontage is challenging given the dedication and the tree retention.

There were concerns with hat grooves on top and third floor and how those impact 4th level units. A suggestion was to take a look at the tri-partied expression.

Regarding the public realm there were a number of comments around the dedication and retention of the existing hedge row on Granville Street if it is widened. The hedge provides a significant buffer and the proposed tree planting does not provide enough.

One panelist voiced CPTED concerns with the area between the existing hedge and the proposed trees.

The trees behind the hedge along Granville make the space feel narrow.

There is a concern that the trees behind the hedge are within the dedication line.

Indoor and Outdoor Amenity

The proposed location of the indoor amenity room in the inside corner of the courtyard should be reconsidered. The panel recommended relocating the indoor amenity so that there is a better relationship with the outdoor amenity; it will make it more usable and provide a better visual connection

The natural play area was well received however noise from Granville Street is a concern, and the play area will be in shade most of the day.

Privacy/Overlook Concerns to the South

There were no concerns with overlook to the south.

A generous landscape buffer should be provided.

Other

There was much commentary about the sloping/projecting roofs at level 3 and 4. The level 3 roofs impact the 4th floor.

Concern with privacy and overlook at the inside corners of the courtyard.

The planting scheme seems defensive.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.

3. Address:	3701-3743 W Broadway
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00078
Description:	To develop a 14-storey mixed-use building with 153 secured rental units and commercial uses at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 53 vehicle spaces and 301 bicycle spaces. The maximum building height is 52.63 m (172.7 ft.), the total floor area is 11,537.4 sq. m (124,187.5 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 5.34. This application is being considered under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program.
	Zoning: CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Leckie Studio Architecture and Design
Delegation:	Michael Leckie, Architect, Leckie Studio Rodrigo Cepeda, Architect, Leckie Studio Kaitlyn Pelletier, Landscape Architect, Hapa Collaborative Jason Packer, LEED Consultant, Recollective Farouk Babul, Owner/Developer, Westbank
Staff:	Carly Rosenblat & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Carly Rosenblat, began by noting, this is a rezoning application for two lots at the North West corner of Broadway and Alma St. One lot is zoned RS-1 and is currently vacant. The other lot is zoned C-2 (general commercial) and has an existing retail strip mall. The site is approximately 23,200 sq. ft. in size with a lot width along W Broadway of approximately 187 ft. and a depth along Alma St. of approximately 125 ft. There are no residential units on site.

The property to the North is zoned RM-4 which permits multi-family dwellings at a density up to 1.45 FSR and building heights to a maximum of 10.7m (35.1 ft.). Directly north of the subject site, there is a 3 storey rental apartment. There is also a 12 storey building two blocks to the north.

Located a block to the North-West are the Jericho Lands, a 90 acre parcel co-owned by Canada Lands Company (a federal Crown corporation) and the MST Partnership, a joint ownership group composed of the Musqueam Indian Band, Squamish Nation, and Tsleil-Watuth First Nation. Potential land development of this site is currently under review, with a full buildout of the site anticipated to take place over 15 to 20 years.

To the East, is a mix of 1 storey commercial and 4 storey mixed-use buildings zoned C-2 along W Broadway. Conditional development potential of a C-2 zone would be a maximum 13.8 m (45 ft.) in height and 3.0 FSR most likely in the form of a four-storey mixed-use building with commercial uses at grade. To the South, is a 4 storey mixed-use building with 1 storey commercial uses beyond, also zoned C-2. To the West, there are Single family homes zoned RS-1, which permits residential development up to 0.7 FSR and 10.7m (35.1 ft.) in height.

To note, this intersection may potentially be a site of a future Broadway Skytrain Extension from Arbutus St. to UBC. The applicant has been asked to provide an emergency exit to accommodate a potential future skytrain.

MIRHPP

The enabling policy is Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP), which is a limited pilot program that enables up to 20 rezonings city-wide for new buildings that provide 100% secured market rental housing, with a minimum of 20% of the residential floor area permanently secured for moderate income households with incomes between \$30,000-\$80,000 per year. If approved by Council, the rental units will be secured through a Housing Agreement which will be registered on title and in effect for 60 years or the life of the building, whichever is longer. As part of the MIRPP selection process, staff vetted projects for eligibility and ranked based on a number of performance criteria established on key policy objectives. Some of the criteria used to evaluate MIRHPP projects included: compliance with MIRHPP and other City policies, affordability, the total number of new rental units created, the impact on existing renters and rental housing units, and proximity to transit.

3701-3743 W Broadway proposes to deliver a significant number of new moderate income and market rental units in a location that is well-served by rapid transit and would not displace any existing rental units or residential tenants. This site is split-zoned. Under the MIRHPP policy, additional height up to 6 storeys may be considered for RS-1 zones and for C-2 zones, a height up to 14 storeys at arterial intersections may be considered. Additional considerations for rezoning include neighbourhood context.

Proposal

This proposal is to rezone from RS-1 and C-2 to CD-1 to permit a 14 storey mixed-use building with 153 secured rental units and commercial at grade. Amenity space is located on the rooftop. The proposed density is 5.35 FSR which is equivalent to approximately 124, 187 sq.ft. (11,537 sq.m.) and a height of 172 ft. (52.63 m.). It includes two levels of underground parking that contain 53 vehicle parking spaces, which is accessed from the lane on the north side of the property. There are 301 bicycle spaces proposed and a Public Bike Share station located to the west of the main building entrance.

Development planner, Patrick Chan, began describing the site conditions and context. The subject-site sits at the threshold between a mixed-use C-zone and the quieter R-zone neighbourhoods, and this presents an opportunity to explore what a transitional node can be, in terms of scale, architecture and public realm. Broadway, immediately west of the site, tapers down to 60 ft. from its typical 80 ft. Right-of-Way. The site itself has an approximate 3m crossfall from the SW to the NE corner. There is a tree at the SW corner striding between the joint property-line. To the north are RM-4 lots which currently permitting three-storey apartments. There are some tower-in-park typologies up to 12-storey built a few decades ago in the vicinity. The other three corners of the Alma-Broadway junction are C-2 lots which permit up to 2.50 FSR and up to 45 ft. height. To the immediate west, the scale of development is single-family houses up to 35 ft. in a 2.5 storey level with low site-coverage.

Chan then noted that while the MIRHP Initiative indicates heights up to 14-storey may be considered, it is not specific about other urban design objectives. When rezoning policies do not recommends specific design and performance objectives, the base zone may be referenced to understand and evaluate any differences in impact to the surrounding context. In this case C-2

is the base zone. One of the distinctive features about the C-2 type is the terracing at the building's rear to minimise bulk in the interfacing area with the often lower scale buildings across the lane. This terracing also helps lessen shadow impacts should these lower scale buildings be to the north of subject-site. Furthermore, if the subject-site shares a sideyard with an R-zone, then the massing is stepped back above the third-floor at its side to make for a gentler transition. For larger developments, the C-2 Guidelines recommend incorporating varied breaks, projections and recesses, especially with vertical elements to break down appearance of expansive width and bulk.

The project's key design features are then presented: The design's key parti comprises of interlocking and shifting volumes stacked on each other. The volumes gradually get slimmer from 12,800 sq-ft at the 165 ft. wide podium to 5,200 sq-ft. (67' x 80') at the top few floors. The average plate size is around 6,000 sq-ft. A matrix of vertical phenolic fins, acting as an organising element, encases the volumes. These volumes rest on a one-storey-plus-mezzanine commercial floor that is slightly recessed to visually expand the at-grade public realm. An amenity-room sits as the 15th level on the roof, and a fin-matrix extends full-height to enclose the roof space.

Staff recognize that while the proposal differs substantially from the typical C-2 form, some measures were considered to mitigate its transition to its lower scale surrounds. For example, these stacked volumes terrace away from the westerly R-zone lots. And, from the eighth floor a higher, a distance of 78 to 82 ft. is maintained from the west property-line. These measures strive to provide some degree of openness on the side of the building closer to the R-zones.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following questions.

Massing, Height + Character:

- Relation of the massing, height and expression to its surrounding concerning measure of scale, sense of openness, access to sunlight, attention to topography, privacy, and contextual fit.
- The fin-matrix's relation to its overall massing and bulk.
- Character as a residential building.
- Role as transition point from the more commercial Broadway to a residential setting.

Public Realm:

- The commercial floor design's ability to extend Broadway's commercial life and scale down to the residential context.

Livability:

- The units' general connection to the exterior and access to natural light from the interior and balconies.
- Sustainability and maintenance issues.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted they shift the volumes and broke down the massing and articulation in an incremental way to the overall bulk and appearance of the building.

The project is treated like a terminus project along the Broadway corridor. This project is addressing the affordable housing crises in Vancouver. The project is future forward in that it considers the neighborhood and the future Broadway sky train line.

The applicant noted they took in consideration the comments collected at the open houses regarding concerns with the view.

The public realm is made of understanding how to create connection through operable glazing systems along Alma and corner of Broadway. There is a break for the entry of the building. The project has a high degree of walkability in the neighborhood. There are a high number of bicycle stalls. The intent is to encourage connection to the public realm.

The fin system is carried down to the front of the balconies to mediate the effects of urban exposure for privacy. The fin system is at the scale of the tower window elements, they have considerable scale.

Regarding landscaping, West Broadway and Alma have very public frontage groundscapes relating to the interior architecture and vibrant public realm. Patios are spilling out seating at the lobby frontages. There are carpets that roll out from the exterior to interior spaces. Stepping to the west a midblock connection is provided, there is some permeability from west Broadway into the lane and some planting and raised planters. There is some vegetated screen and aesthetic character to the laneway. There is greenery spilling over the edges.

The amenity is angled to provide a beautiful view to the mountains. There is sun exposure to the south for urban agriculture.

The window to wall ratio is at 40 percent. The project is primary and electric building and there is deep soil depth to help with storm water management.

The project is hitting all the sustainability city requirements.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Davies and seconded by Ms. Coughlin and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Reconsider the fin expression as it relates to the perceived bulk of the building and their impact on light and views to open space;
- Reconsider the size and number of operable windows to improve daylight and natural ventilation;

- Design Development to the western edge to provide a better fit to the single family residential context to the west recognizing that it is potentially short term, consider further stepping down.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support from the panel.

The panel noted with the existing context it is hard to imagine the project knitting into this; however given the future context and the rapid transit line to UBC what is being proposed appears appropriate.

It is a fresh approach to housing. It is important rental housing for a certain income group.

Height, Massing and Density

The panel supported the height and massing proposed, particularly given the future transit station. It makes sense to develop density housing around transit.

The project will be a catalyst for redevelopment in the neighbourhood.

It is a challenging project for the neighbourhood given the current context. The project needs to be more neighbourly, particularly along the west property line. This edge could benefit from more stepping or setting back.

The vertical mulliens/fins are deep and it adds bulk to the building. Consider a mullien half as deep. Consider pulling more density in to neighborhood and pulling the green into the project.

Panelists noted that the rhythms between the vertical and horizontal portions of the mulliens/fins are the same the whole way up the building. Consider changing the depth of one of them.

The screen around the perimeter of the roof at level 15 challenges the height of the building (14 storeys max.). It blocks views out and it hides the rotated amenity room.

The building 'blocks' step out to the same line along Broadway – this contributes to the mass.

The building will act as the terminus of Broadway. Consider providing a perspective view from further down Broadway.

One panel member suggested increasing the floor to floor heights, and expressed concern with the inset balconies veiled behind the deep mulliens/fins.

Public Realm

The public realm has been very well handled. The panel likes the transparency, the retail wrapping west, and the change in elevation.

Panel noted that the residential entry reads as too formal.

The townhouses along the west are well done. Suggest exploring a different vocabulary. There should be something more at the groundplane at the corner such as public art, to indicate turning.

Product Durability

The team is taking a big leap of faith with the proposed building material.

The deep horizontals will be problematic – how to clean once water and dirt collects on them.

Other Commentary

The panel noted to keep watch of livability and performance of units, consider increasing the size and the number of operable windows to improve daylight and natural ventilation. Also consider increasing the floor to floor heights on the narrow units.

The fins will block daylight and impeded more freer views out of the units.

Consider the proximity of dining room to dog run.

Consider common amenity at level 8 – these are very large decks for so few units.

Allow for opportunity for the off grid amenity to be visible all the way down to Broadway.

The landscape is well handled; the planters are deep but narrow.

Project appears to be heavy on the bike culture. Consider pulling more bike parking up to level P1.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.

4. Address:	8257 Oak Street
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00074
Description:	To develop an 8-storey mixed-use building with 62 strata-titled units, office space on the second level, and commercial retail space at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 69 vehicle spaces and 124 bicycle spaces. The maximum building height is 31.7 m (104 ft.), the total floor area is 5,917.5 m (63,696 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.50. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning:	C-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Delegation:	Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, GBL Architects Chris Huxtable, Architect, GBL Architects Jim Dema-Ala, Landscape Architect, EG Landscape Architect Anitta Doug & Rick Ren, Owner/Developer
Staff:	Lecia Desjarlais & Haizea Aguirre

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Lecia Desjarlais, began by noting, this is an application to rezone one split-zoned parcel under the Marpole Community Plan. The site is located on the northwest corner of Oak and West 67th Street. Site is zoned RS-1 and C-1 and is currently developed with one single-storey building with 8 commercial retail units and a surface parking lot. The Marpole Plan anticipates mixed-use buildings up to 8-storeys at the intersection of Oak and W 67th Avenue, with ground-floor commercial uses and residential above. Across the lanes on either side of Oak St, are sites that were recently zoned RM-8A and may be developed to townhomes. Outside this intersection on Oak Street, rental residential buildings are permitted up to 6 storeys.

A density up to 3.0 FSR is supported with consideration for an increase for developments that incorporate commercial or office space above the first floor. The proposal is to build a mixed-use building with ground floor commercial use, office use on level 2, and 62 strata residential on levels 3 to 8 with a total density of 3.52 FSR. 2 lane-fronting townhouse units are located on levels 1 and 2. An indoor and outdoor amenity space is provided on the roof. Three private decks are also included on the roof level. A minimum setback of 22 ft. from the curb has been provided along Oak St as per the Built Form guidelines.

Development planner, Haizea Aguirre, began by noting, under the Marpole Community Plan, the future context along Oak is residential 6 storeys while the four corners at Oak and 67th Ave will be mixed-use 8 storeys. Behind the lane, the Plan anticipates townhouses up to 3 storeys.

Oak Street at West 67th Ave will become a focus for this area, developed as an urban mixed-use "node", creating a vital connection between east and west Marpole. Create an urban plaza at Oak Street and West 67th Avenue, as new development occurs, that provides a comfortable gathering space with a lively commercial edge and helps establish a sense of place.

Additional housing variety, including apartments and townhouses, will be introduced, providing a sensitive transition in scale and height to the surrounding residential areas. Wide sidewalks,

street trees and planted boulevards will create a comfortable, safe and attractive walking experience along Oak Street. West 67th Ave is a desirable neighborhood walking and cycling route that connects the Granville shopping area, library, schools and churches to the Canada Line station. Bus service is provided along Oak, and Marine Gateway Station is 700 m to the south

Located on the northwest corner of Oak and 67th Ave. the site is approx. 160 ft. frontage along Oak and a depth of 115 ft. currently zoned C-1 and RS-1 and developed with a 1-storey strip-mall and parking lot. The height is up to 8 storeys, including a 2 to 3 storey podium. The FSR is up to 3.0* with consideration for an increase for developments that incorporate commercial/office space above the first floor. Office use above the first floor level is encouraged. Residential and/or commercial uses permitted on upper floors. A mix of commercial uses, Ground floor commercial units must provide a range of sizes with small street frontages and active access to the street. Lot consolidation, to achieve a commercial frontage along Oak Street of approximately 160 feet from all corners, will be supported. Storeys above the podium should be located to allow light through the block and articulated to minimize shadowing. Use building setbacks and landscaping to transition between commercial and residential uses along streets. Provide public realm improvements that include increased sidewalk width, street trees and amenities such as seating, bike racks, etc.

The proposed project is in line with the policy. There is an FSR of 3.5. This is an 8-storey mixed-use development with 4 commercial units on the ground floor, office space on the second level and market residential above, including 4 studios (6%), 36 (58%) 1-bed, 16 (26%) 2-bed, and 6 (10%) 3-bed. There is a total 62 units. Two townhouse units and an amenity space are located off the lane. There is 2 levels of underground parking, and outdoor and indoor amenities on the roof. Setbacks from the Oak Street and 67th Avenue curb to the building face are 22 ft.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following questions.

1. Density and massing.
Please consider the increased density (from 3.0 to 3.5 FSR) for providing office space above the first floor and transition in scale and height to the surrounding residential areas.
2. Public Realm.
Please consider the ground and second floors' interface with the pedestrian realm specially Oak Street and 67th Av corner
3. Amenities.
Please comment on the overall success of the indoor/outdoor amenity space with regards to the location, size, solar exposure and impact of the proposed private roof decks
4. Any preliminary comments for consideration at the Development Permit stage.
Please consider sustainability features, landscape design, and architectural expression

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The overall massing design wanted a contrast to the residential area.
There is a horizontal band from levels 3 to 6.
Additional setbacks were provided in addition to the ones required by the Marpole Plane.
Pushed levels 3 to 6 away from oak and provided a landscape buffer.
There is a lot more landscaping to soften the massing.
The applicant noted they wanted to activate the lane so kept the residential on the quieter side.
The activated lane compliments the two townhouses.

The office level recess back from the residential for some solar shading
The applicant noted they provided a small plaza in the corner.
The commercial lobby is kept off from Oak Street.
There are recessed balconies rather than having them protruding, this help reduce the noise from the street
There is a roof top amenity space; in addition there are 3 private decks.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Coughlin and seconded by Ms. Enman and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design Development to the residential entry ramp and the relationship of the residential lobby to grade;
- Design Development to strengthen the expression of the middle mass in context to the commercial levels and the junction between the commercial and residential.
- Design Development to the commercial entries at grade.
- Consider flipping the amenity deck to the west.

- **Related Commentary:**

Density and Massing

The panel supports the proposed density, height, uses and massing.

The massing creates little shadow to adjacent sites.

The office space is important so the extra density is supportable – 3.5 of office is earned.

The residential middle band is well done and there is a lot of detail at the windows. This level of detail should be taken down to the groundplane.

The expression of the middle does not speak will to the office (level 2). The middle mass needs to be strengthened, perhaps raising the shoulders.

Public Realm

The public realm is well handled.

At the corner plaza consider adding glazing so it reads from both sides, or increase the size.

The office entry is very deep and feels narrow. Consider pulling forward.

The lane is well handled and is softened.

There needs to be better programming at the commercial as it relates to the public realm.

The residential entry lobby is high up from the street. Consider pulling it closer to grade.

Amenities

The amenity is a nice size and the roof access is excellent. Consider flipping the amenity to the west side of the roof for better sunlight.

Consider providing some rain protection at the outdoor amenity.

Prelim. Comments for DP Stage

The materiality at the ground plane feels corporate/institutional. And it is difficult to understand the proposed materials within the future context. It's not understood why the same material at the ground plane is used again at the top floors.

Consider solar shading. The balconies are good however they are accessed off of bedrooms, not living spaces.

More details on the sustainability strategies are needed. There is a lot of thermal bridging with the proposed architectural expression. The shading and the overhangs are good – consider low E glass.

The panel supported the project with recommendations.

The panel noted it was a simple project but with a lot of texture and attention to detail.

There were no concerns with the height, massing density and use.

The panel felt the 3.5 FSR was well handled and earned.

Overall the massing is well handled.

The panel suggested flipping the notch at level 7.

The north façade appears forgotten, it is flat.

Some members recommended strengthening the middle mass and its relation to the office below.

The materiality at the ground plain is not a good vision of the future character.

Entry to the residential lobby is a significant hike up.

Office lobby entrance has a deep recess to it.

The publicness of the stairs and the seats that are incorporated in them are successful.

The rooftop amenity is successful.

The sizes of the indoor and outdoor amenity are nice.

The landscape is well handled, there were some concern how it will be maintained.

Consider relocating the amenity deck to the west for better exposure.

Additional comments included consider wheel chair accessibility and could use more rain covering or solar shading on the top floors.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.