

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** June 12, 2024

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Webex, Virtual

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Craig Taylor  
Stephen Aepli  
Aik Ablimit  
Michele Cloghesy  
Reza Mousakhani  
Geoff Lister  
Jane Vorbrodt

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1188 Cardero St

Chair Craig Taylor called the meeting to order at 3:00pm and noted the presence of quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

Address: 1188 Cardero St  
Permit No.: RZ-2023-00086  
Description: To rezone the subject site from RM-5D (Residential) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 22-storey building and includes: 198 secured rental units with 20% of the floor area secured for below-market rental units (approximately 37 units); A floor space ratio (FSR) of 8.0; and A building height of 68.8 m (226 ft.) with additional height for mechanical appurtenances. This application is being considered under the West End Community Plan.

Application Status: Rezoning Application  
Architect: B.O.P Architects/PFS Studio Landscape  
Delegation: Adrian Politano, Architect, B.O.P  
Chris Mramor, Landscape Architect, PFS  
Staff: Carl Stanford & Leifka Vissers

**EVALUATION:** Support with Recommendations (6/0)

### **Planner's Introduction:**

**Leifka Vissers**, 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 policy under the West End Community Plan. Leifka concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

**Carl Stanford**, 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. Carl 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 additional height does the proposal achieve satisfactory resolution of its massing, & volume considering:
  - a) If the built form expression is sufficiently sculpted for sunlight and views,
  - b) Are the upper levels of the tower appropriately "tapered", and,
  - c) Is the podiums relationship to the streetscape successful.
2. Does the proposal achieve a successful public realm providing a lively and pedestrian friendly design considering.
  - a) The legibility of points of entry; and,
  - b) The overall success of its at-grade design, its accessibility and landscaping.

### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Applicant Adrian Politano, Architect for B.O.P noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Chris Marmor, Landscape Architect for PFS, 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 **STEPHAN AEPLI** 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. Further design development to refine the balcony expression,
2. Further design development to the façade expression to reduce the number of changes in the materiality,
3. Maximize the extent of outdoor areas prior to development permit submission.

### **Summary of Panel Commentary:**

There was general support from the panel for the project.

The panel commended the comprehensiveness of the package and panel presentation.

The panel supported the additional height and resolution of the massing and volume. The panel supported the increase of floor plates. The panel noted the relationship with the podium is successfully done.

A panelist noted to consider the transition between the top of the podium to underneath the soffit.

Panel members noted the general architectural expression along with the sliding forms and the resulting reduction in the bulk of the façade and building is a success.

Panel members noted the expression of the materials and how they are broken up could be improved. It currently tends to erode the successful elements. There are too many types of expressions which takes away from a strong building design.

A panelist noted the lobbies are successfully done.

A panelist noted their concern with considering this project a "gateway" project.

There was general support for the resolution of the public realm and providing a lively and friendly pedestrian design.

The inside and outside visibility with the amenities is a success.

A panelist noted to consider the size of the play area especially being inside courtyard and how much

will it be used. The Small children's play area can get smaller due to health and safety regulations requirements at later stages. There are opportunities for outdoor play areas. Space should be adequate for tulip tree. Very supportable project.

A panelist noted to consider the tree at the corner that navigates the change at grade consider opening the aperture more, so the entry is more visible.

A panel member noted to consider eliminating a floor at one of the forms and adding a floor to the other to increase the height difference and achieve a stepping to reinforce the skyline.

The panel generally noted the tapering of the roof is successful.

The relationship to the mansion was generally successful.

The panel recommended further development of the extents of the concrete panels and the balconies design prior to development permit.

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