

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 4, 2025

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Joe Wai Meeting Room (110), Main Floor - City Hall, 453 W 12th Ave

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Catherine Lemieux (Chair)

Jon Stovell

Bob Lilly

Aya Abdelfatah

Aaron Petruic

Parisa Seyed-Hoseini

Sarvnaz Golkar

James KM Cheng

Walter Franci

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1402-1460 Burrard St, 900 Pacific St & 1401-1451 Hornby St.

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

Address:	1402-1460 Burrard St, 900 Pacific St & 1401-1451 Hornby St
Permit No.:	RZ-2024-00099
Description:	To rezone the subject site from FCCDD (False Creek Comprehensive Development District) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The revised proposal includes form of development changes that have resulted in a change to the proposed density and unit count. The proposed height and uses are consistent with the original application. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 40 (west) and 54-storey (east) (with additional height for rooftop mechanical) mixed-use building and includes: 1,089 market rental units; Commercial space on the ground floor; A floor space ratio (FSR) of 11.83; and Maximum building height of 162.6 m (534 ft.). This application is being considered under the Rental Housing on City-Owned Land – Public Benefits Pilot Rezoning Policy. The proposal exceeds the height and density anticipated in the applicable policies.
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Architect:	David Schmitt Architects
Delegation:	Ana Maria Llanos, Architect, Diamond Schmitt Architects Matthew Beall, Architect, DSA Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, PWL Kevin Welsh, LEED Consultant, Introba
Staff:	Grace Jiang & Nick Danford

EVALUATION: support with recommendations (8/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Nick Danford, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the applicable policies. Nick concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Grace Jiang, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighborhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built-form guidelines for this project. Grace 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. Given the prominent location and evolving context, are the proposed heights supportable?
2. Does the proposed form, massing, and architectural expression achieve:
 - Visually compelling skylines,
 - Positive contribution to the bridge gateway, and
 - Exceptional architectural creativity and excellence?
3. Please comment on the quality and quantity of the proposed public realm with considerations to:

- Contribution to the downtown network of open space;
 - Complement to the neighborhood public realm.
4. Please comment on the courtyard's performance, particularly considering its permeability, livability, accessibility, and interface.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Ana Maria Llanos Architect for Diamond Schmitt Architects noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Derek Lee, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design and Kevin Welsh, sustainability consultant presenting on the project's sustainability strategies.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Mr. Cheng** and seconded by **Mr. Stovell** 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:

- Consideration of more engagement at the laneway;
- Consideration of successful implementation of the Burrard Steps, including wayfinding, accessibility, and the impact on CRU viability;
- Review the requirement of balconies for all units within the context of the indoor and outdoor amenity quantity and quality, including consideration of rooftop amenities;
- Consideration of more engagement of the bike room to the courtyard;
- Review of the accessibility of the courtyard;
- Confirmation of compliance with the Higher Building Policy;
- Further design development of the expression of tower top;
- Further study from the project heading south, including sections through the building;
- Further study of the porosity throughout the project and connection to the neighborhood;
- Recommendation for the project to come back to the UDP at the DP stage.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was general support for the project from the panel.

The analysis of the tower plates and tower height is generally successful.

Rethink the ground plane and consider how the project is seen coming down from Burrard Street.

Consider further study of going south from Burrard Street and north-south porosity through the site.

Some panelists found that the north corner is very important, and the plaza should be more there to create a different sense of urban scale at the entrance. Consider adjusting the geometry of the plaza to merge with the Burrard Steps.

A panelist noted that opening the south corner and having commercial uses there could be more successful and benefit the neighborhood. It is also noted that south-facing courtyard is important and would be more successful than a square courtyard.

Some panelists felt that the courtyard should be open to the public, including the creation of a central public open space with a concentration of restaurant, activities, and commercial. Others felt that it was also important to secure this space for the residents and families, given the scale of the development and some panelists noted that the public access through the courtyard would compromise the flow and activity at the Burrard Steps.

Many noted the access to the courtyard is questionable and should be further reviewed. Access to the courtyard could include both public and private/semiprivate access. Presently does not feel welcoming.

Some panelists felt that the courtyard needs further development, including locating amenity spaces or other active uses to interface with the courtyard; enhancing accessibility and inclusiveness; and increasing transparency and 'eyes on the courtyard'.

Some panelists pointed out that having the Burrard Steps as part of this development and developing it as a successful public open space is critical to this project.

Some panelists felt that the Burrard Steps may not be ideal for commercial and suggested rethinking the location of the commercial. Some noted that the CRUs at the Burrard Steps could be a hit or miss with engagement considering the success with business. Some felt the retails facing the bridge could work due to its high visibility, though its success would depend on how the programming attracts people around.

Consider the accessibility to all commercial spaces. Presently not as successful.

A panelist suggested further design development to enhance the wayfinding of the public accessible elevator at the end of the public arcade and improve the overall welcoming and attractiveness of this public space.

The lane frontage is important in this neighborhood and needs further work and an active edge. Many agreed the parking at the lane is not a successful solution and the applicant should consider some other form of expression (i.e. townhouses, live-work studio).

Consider the treatment of the lane, the pedestrian and bike path. All these elements will be part of the neighborhood fabric and should serve the building and community successfully.

A panelist noted that a more liberal interpretation of tower and podium relationship could be considered, with a focus on the contextual fine grains, keeping 'eyes on the street'. It was also noted that the podium could be simplified and built less, having the structure vertically instead of horizontally to create an interesting neighborhood scale and mediate the transition to the larger scale in downtown.

Some panelists found the architectural design of the tower and podium successful. Others noted several areas for improvements, including: the podium could benefit from greater variation; balconies could be used more to enhance the tower expression and break down the tower massing; the stepped form at the tower tops should be stronger, with at least two storeys difference; the treatment of the tower terminations could be improved, as the extension of the glazed façade from below is not considered successful; the proportion of grid and module could be more rational; high-quality material should be considered for this landmark building; further development of the plans and elevations of the tower to

give it stronger expression.

A panelist noted that the window-to-wall ratio is low and will impact daylight access to the units; the townhouses along Hornby need more design development to improve the livability and relationship with the street.

Some panelists suggested flexibility in balcony requirements with consideration of more livable interior space and greater common amenity spaces.

Consider connecting indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. Consider larger indoor amenity spaces and more programming especially for the rental building. A panelist noted the rooftop garden, and plots are well done and will be used, and having access to the rooftop contributes to the livability of the buildings.

Many noted the importance of having an official confirmation of the compliance path of the project to better assess its execution. If it will be going with the Higher Building Policy, it should meet its requirements.

It was strongly recommended that the project come back to UDP at the DP stage.

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