

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 21, 2025

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Virtual via Teams

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Helen Besharat
Sarvnaz Golkar
Aya Abdelfatah
Scott Mitchell
Tony Osbron
Allyse Li
Aik Ablimit
Michelle Cloghesy
Jon Stovell

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 6428-6438 Cambie Street & 480-488 W 48th Ave
2. 8080 Yukon Street
3. 1395 Rolston Street

Chair Helen Besharat called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address:	6428-6438 Cambie St and 480-488 W 48th Ave
Permit No.:	RZ-2024-00046
Description:	To amend CD-1 (730) (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 26-storey mixed-use rental building and includes: 182 units with 20% of the floor area for below-market units; Commercial space on the ground floor; A floor space ratio (FSR) of 10.24; and a building height of 79.6 m (261 ft.). This application is being considered under the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy and Cambie Corridor Plan. The application requests consideration of density and height in excess of the existing policies.
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Architect:	Donald Yen, Urban Solutions Architecture Ltd.
Delegation:	Donald Yen, Architect, Urban Solutions Architecture Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, Prospected Refuge Landscape Architects
Staff:	Simon Jay & Benjamin Duffix

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (7/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Simon Jay, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as per the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy and Cambie Corridor Plan. Simon concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Benjamin Duffix, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built-form guidelines for this project. Benjamin then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

1. Height, Density, and overall form for this site adjacent to the Langara 49th Ave. Station, noting that the proposed height and density exceeds the Policy requirement.
2. The proposed approach to the public realm and streetscape, with only a small retail unit adjacent to the plaza.
3. Any additional design development considerations.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Donald Yen, Architect for Urban Solutions Architecture noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Aya Abdelfatah** and seconded by **Scott Mitchell** 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. Improve the public realm at podium level by increasing the amount of retail;
2. Further activation at the north 48th ave;
3. Consider relocation lobby at 48th ave;
4. Consider more commercial retail along Cambie and at the corner of 48th Av.;
5. Consider eliminating the east pathway right of way;
6. Arrange better surveillance and a more sympathetic interface with future projects to the east.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was general support from the panel.

The panel was general in support of the height, density and form for the site.

A panelist noted due to its adjacency to the high volume traffic transit station the height is appropriate.

Regarding materiality consider the balance of the brick. There is a lot of solid grey. Consider the impression of the tower it's a tower for younger individuals.

At the development permit stage consider further articulation both at the podium more design development at the tower itself to make it more of a vibrant tower and podium.

Due to the addition in height the interface is lacking, the urban and commercial frontage needs to match the high-volume traffic. The small retail space is unfortunate and will not fit the amount of foot traffic.

Consider increasing commercial on the ground floor for further activation and better integrate the public realm with the commercial space. Consider more retail at the corner of 48th and Cambie.

Consider a more urban activated plaza with less buffers that connects the transit immediately adjacent.

The students having direct connection to the public realm off campus would be nice.

A commercial frontage to the campus would be successful. Even the landscape articulated on the frontage would benefit from further development.

The east set back is presently claustrophobic.

If the SRW is to remain consider active uses because presently the pedestrian walkway feels unsafe and narrow.

Consider relocating the amenity office and residential Lobby, possibly rotated towards 48th ave and have the amenity spaces for residents and students take up frontage on Cambie street.

The inclusion of the bike elevator is positive.

Panel noted the importance to consider the future context of the site there is a level of densification because of its approximation to the station.

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

2. Address: 8080 Yukon Street
Permit No.: RZ-2025-00008
Description: To rezone the subject site from CD-1 (88) to a new CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of four buildings of social housing. This proposal includes: A total of 847 social housing units; A total floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.99; Building One is a six-storey building with a height of 19.2 m (63 ft.) and 123 units for seniors; Building Two is a 20-storey building with a height of 59.4 m (195 ft.) and 200 units; Building Three is a 32-storey building with a height of 95.1 m (312 ft.) and 272 units; and Building Four is a 28-storey building with a height of 83.2 m (273 ft.) and 252 units. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan. The City's Tenant Relocation and Protection Policy applies to this site. This policy provides assistance and protections to eligible renters impacted by redevelopment activity. To learn more visit: vancouver.ca/protecting-tenants.
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Architect: GBL Architects
Delegation: Thomas Lee, Architect, GBL Architects
Bryce Gauthier, Landscape Architect, Gauthier & Associates
Carla Guerra, CEO, Purpose Driven Development
Staff: Mateja Seaton and Michelle Alborg

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Mateja Seaton, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as per the Marpole Community Plan. Mateja concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Michelle Alborg, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built-form guidelines for this project. Michelle then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

1. Please comment on the proposed height, density and massing, along with the project's integration into the surrounding context.
2. Please comment on the success of the proposed interfaces to;
 - SW Marine Drive,
 - Yukon Street and
 - The mews.courtyard.
3. Please comment on the general building expression across all four buildings, along with comments on the composition and cohesion of the base, tower and crown.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Thomas Lee Architect for GBL Architects noted the objectives and gave a general

overview of the project followed by Bryce Gauthier, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Tony Osborn** and seconded by **Aik Ablimit** 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. Design development to the top to improve top of the crown in all three buildings;
2. Ensure the elevator and stairs will be adequate for the success of the muse.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was general support from the panel for the proposed height, density and massing and form of development.

Stepping down the building tower to the lower scale residential buildings to the north was a successful move.

The interface is generally successful.

The interface on Marine Dr is successful with the forest of existing trees.

Consider further design development to have greater clarity with the vertical and horizontal expressions. Parts of the buildings there is strong vertical expression to the base where the horizontality was not maintained. The way the materials relate to the horizontal changes in the material in the spandrel is nice.

The window wall expression is cost effective and successful.
The rounded balconies at the lower and courtyard are successful.

Some concern with planning requirements to have a crown on the buildings, the building appears to abruptly end at the top. Consider how to best terminate the ribbon expression at the top.

Some minor concerns with the stairs and public access to the muse. Review accessibility from South Marine Drive.

Further explore connecting the Muse to the West to Yukon. Further explore connection from Yukon to the connection at the Marine Drive.

Being that it is an intergenerational living space consider a children's play area at the ground level. This would mean to consider the amount of direct sunlight.

Consider allocating the additional open space to the Central Courtyard, the building footprint can be reduced to support this.

The panel appreciated the number of existing trees retained.

Consider some sort of accessibility ramp as part of the landscaping strategy and within the parameters associated with the social housing.

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

3. Address: 1395 Rolston Street
Permit No.: DP-2024-01152
Description: To develop this site with a 27-storey, mixed-use building. The proposal includes: 201 social housing units; 37 space childcare facility; Retail at grade; A floor space ratio of 9.71; An approximate height of 85 m (278.9 ft.); Three levels of underground parking. The development application follows the rezoning application approved in principle by City Council at a Public Hearing on July 12, 2022, and the CD-1 By-law was enacted by Council on January 21, 2025. This application is being processed concurrently with and will be subject to Council approval of a text amendment, approval of the Form of Development, and decision by the Development Permit Board.

Application Status: Complete Development Application
Architect: Diamond Schmitt Architects
Delegation: AnaMaria Llanos, Architect, Diamond Schmitt Architects
Nicholas Potovsky, Architect, Diamond Schmitt Architects
Staff: Ji-Taek Park

EVALUATION: Support (7/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built-form guidelines for this project. Ji-Taek then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

1. Does the proposed building massing meet the intended urban design as outlined in Granville Loops policy Guidelines?
2. Does the proposed building interface at-grade provide sufficient pedestrian interest for public realm, as intended by Granville Loops?
3. Provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression and materiality.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant AnaMaria Llanos and Nicholas Potovsky, Architects for Diamond Schmitt Architects noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed. The landscape Architect was available for questions.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Aik Ablimit** and seconded by **Sarvnaz Golkar** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **Support** to the project.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was support from the panel.

The proposed building massing meets the intended guideline.

The forms are a beautiful symmetry with the buildings across the street.

The building wraps all three interfaces successfully while being mindful of the public realm.

The building entries are successful.

Appreciate the amount of extra outdoor facades for the units to have windows on multiple sides.
Appreciate the double-sided units, the family units with double sided windows and exterior walkway.

The architectural materiality is generally successful. The panel noted the simple elegance is successful and hope the material will remain as such as the project moves forward.

The benches provided on the sloping street on Rolston is commendable.

The Pacific and Rolston corner are well done.

Prioritizing the commercial at the along Granville and Pacific makes sense.

There was minor concern with the shadowing on the daycare/children play area.

No stair down from Pacific to Granville bit of a loss opportunity, without will be hard to keep people interested going to the CRU in upper Granville.

Some minor concern with the indoor and outdoor amenity space, appears more of a passive and seated areas. Consider having more active components.

Some concern with the lack of laneway for the parkade entrance. Consider understanding the conflict with having the parkade entrance sandwiched in between two highly active areas.

Consider revisiting the parking access plan.

With the sloping street and pedestrians coming and going for different purposed consider some form of signage wayfinding.

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