

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 27, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Amela Brudar – Chair
Helen Avini Besharat
Yijin Wen
Jim Huffman
Susan Ockwell
David Jerke (excused from Item 1)
Marie-France Venneri (excused from item 1)

REGRETS: Leslie Shieh
Derek Neale
Colette Parsons
Grant Newfield
Muneesh Sharma

**MINUTE
TAKER:** Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 2230 Harrison Drive (Finnish Canadian Rest Home)
 2. 8636 - 8656 Oak Street
 3. 325-333 Carrall Street
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Amela Brudar called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A brief business meeting took place before the presentations commenced. A formal welcome was read by the Chair we acknowledge we that we are on the unceded homelands of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth nations and we give thanks for their generosity and hospitality on these lands.

1. Address: 2230 Harrison Drive (Finnish Canadian Rest Home)
 Permit: RZ-2018-00017
 Description: To amend the existing CD-1 to develop a 6-storey Seniors Rental building consisting of 72 below market rental units, with minimum 30% of units at Housing Income Limit (HILS) rates. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.91 and the building height is 20m (65.63 ft.).
 Zoning: CD-1 Amendment
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: DYS Architecture
 Owner: Finnish Canadian Rest Home Association
 Delegation: Dane Jansen, Architect, Dysa Architecture
 Alyssa Semcyszcz, Landscape Architect, Jan Losee Ltd.
 Staff: Thien Phan & Susan Chang

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Introduction:** Thien Phan, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as located east of Victoria Drive, south of Harrison Drive and north of SE Marine Drive.

In 1961, Council approved a rezoning to permit the development of four buildings, spread over three lots and 2.9 acres, all owned by the Finnish Canadian Rest Home Association. This proposal seeks to amend the existing CD1 (13-A) to redevelop ONE of the four buildings. Built in 1962, we have:

- 2130 Harrison Drive: Two, 3.5-storey residential buildings containing seniors housing (to remain);
- 2288 Harrison Drive: publically-funded community care beds, redeveloped in the mid-1990s (to remain);
- 2230 Harrison Drive, the subject site, the Finnish Canadian Rental Housing Building, previously containing 28 vacant rental dwelling units (subject site).

In 2012, the subject site, 2230 Harrison Drive, was vacated due to rising maintenance costs, leaving an empty and aging building.

2230 Harrison Drive is an irregular site size at 27,360 sf. with a frontage of 239 ft. along Harrison and 131 ft. along SE Marine. This site is on a slope that rises up 30 feet from SE Marine Drive to Harrison Drive, and continues to rise as we move north.

Situated directly west of the subject lot is the Gladstone Street pedestrian overpass (to remain), then the Höfn Icelandic Harbour Assisted Living facility, then the German Canadian Care Home, with single family zoning to the north and east, with sites redeveloping to townhouses and multi-family. To the south across the street from SE Marine Drive are three-storey residential strata buildings. Just north are six community care facilities and seniors assisted living, creating a hub of similar facilities that support a vulnerable population.

The application proposes to redevelop one vacant three-storey building at 2230 Harrison Dr. for:

- Six-storey residential building with 72 units of affordable, social housing for seniors;
- Floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.91;
- Building height of 65.5 ft.;
- Gross floor area of 62,386 sq. ft.;
- An exterior bridge from 2230 Harrison to the adjacent community care facility for ease of movement for residents;
- Vehicle and bicycle parking at grade, while retaining the existing location of vehicle loading for the care home.

Staff are assessing this application under three policies.

Housing Vancouver's Emerging Directions prioritizes and streamlines 20 affordable housing projects by reducing the processing time by half the typical time frame. This application is one of those 20 sites with expedited timeline to advance housing targets under the SHORT (Social Housing or Rental Tenure) pilot program.

The applicant intends to align with *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* that allows 100% rental housing on sites along arterials and are well served by transit.

The *Victoria-Fraserview/Killarney Community Vision (VFK)* supports seniors housing in close proximity to transit, along with support social housing and affordable housing projects.

Susan Chang, Development Planner, introduced the project as located along Harrison with a context of one and two storey senior rental or care facilities. Across Harrison and uphill is RS-1. The site width (facing Harrison) is approximately 240' x 140' deep. There is an approximate 28' drop from Harrison to Marine Drive. This building is linked to the neighbouring care facility. They share the existing access from Gladstone which forks into two routes. At the higher level, parking is provided for the building as well as garbage and loading for the Care Facility. At the lower level, parking is provided for the Care Facility. A pedestrian bridge to cross SE Marine borders the west side.

The proposed height is 6 storeys with a density of 1.91 FSR. Due to a sloping site, the proposal (viewed from Harrison), presents 4 storeys with amenity rooms on the partial 5th storey oriented to minimize view impacts. The main storey is sunken between 3.5' to 2.2' below street level along Harrison screened with an existing hedge. The senior's below market rental building is connected to the Care Facility by an exterior bridge at the second level and is intended to allow seniors to live close to family members staying in the Care Facility. Building frontage is approximately 185' feet. The care facility next door also has substantial frontage. Massing is broken with vertical changes in cladding material and colour. Entry is provided at Harrison with ramp access. There is an assembly space on level 2 and a generous amenity package on the top storey with access to rooftop outdoor space.

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

1. Is the height and density supportable and in particular an appropriate fit with the context?
2. Is the massing and building expression successfully resolved relative to the building frontage?
3. Please provide comments on the following:
 - a. entry sequence.
 - b. livability at the ground level.
 - c. landscape design noting the extensive pavement indicated for access.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant asserted the below grade units are proposed to connect to the care unit for the street level handicap ramp. The Harrison frontage is a long frontage,

and the intention was to break it into smaller pieces with different colours and materials, with metal cladding to break down the scale.

The green area down the side gives an opportunity for screening and the area is a 'wooly' area with a lot of native plants, and the trees are pulled back away from the building. The trees provide natural shading for the area. There is a massive Vancouver hedge and the grade helps with noise and privacy. On the roof there is amenity space proposed with urban agriculture and a green roof. There is an amenity area with lots of trees and vegetation proposed. In the back there is solar access and amenity areas proposed. There is solar shading designed on the west side of the site. The applicant then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

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

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

- Consider additional density and height if it benefits the applicant's scheme and provides for more affordable senior's housing
 - Significantly Break up the massing of the building
 - Investigate amenity area location. Review interchanging the amenity area at 6th floor with below grade residential units to improve livability;
 - Consider further design development of the entry sequence.
 - Explore further design development of the landscape treatment
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel thought the height and density is supportable. The massing needs further design development. The frontage facing Harrison Street feels too flat and could use more definition. There could be more breaking up of massing to play with the volumes. The materiality and interface between materials could be bolder to break up the massing. Further design development is needed in the expression.

Harrison and the southern side needs design development for a pleasant entry experience. The ramp and stairs could be integrated to provide a more generous and grand entry. The main building entry could be more pleasant, visible and celebrated. The entry at the south side should be accessible. The loading area could use design development. Consider loading and unloading experience.

The unit designs are comfortable although below grade units are a concern. Units located on level two on the north and west facades are deprived of sun exposure. Patios can be provided for the West units. The best view and south exposure is allocated to parking area. The amenity areas are somewhat fragmented and could benefit from further programming. The amenity roof could be expanded and the sauna could be moved to the northwest corner where it is below grade. There are some aspects that are critical to the wellbeing of seniors. The livability of the basement could be improved by placing units at the top and the amenity at the bottom. The rooftop is fantastic.

The landscape design needs design development. The west façade could get too much sun. Trees could be good sun shade. Change the orientation so that sun shade could be on all the units.

Overall, this is a challenging site. The previous rezoning is outdated. More density could perhaps compensate for the challenging conditions and allow for an improved form of development as senior's housing is needed and valued. The view blockage is not too severe.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the comments especially around access and circulation.
2. Address: 8636 - 8656 Oak Street
 Description: To develop two 6-storey residential buildings consisting of a total of 91 secured market rental units, all over two levels of underground parking with 76 vehicle stalls and 115 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 5,452.3 sq. m (58,690 sq. ft.), the total floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.50, and the building height is 18.2m (60 ft.). This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
- Permit No: RZ-2018-00012
 Zoning: RM-3A to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: W.T. Leung Architects
 Owner: AP Canada Investment Corporation
 Delegation: Wing Ting Leung, Architect, W.T. Leung Architects
 Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
 Daniel Roberts, LEED Consultant, KANE
 Staff: Scott Erdman & Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

- **Introduction:** Scott Erdman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as an application to rezone 4 parcels under the Marpole Community Plan. The site is located on the east side of Oak St, mid-block between 70th and 71st Ave. The site is currently zoned RM-3A, currently developed with 2 rental buildings (1 x 3-storey and 1 x 4-storey apartment building) with 43 existing units in total. Together, 4 parcels measure approx. 200 feet wide and 118 feet deep. The site area is approx. 23,518 square feet.

The Marpole Plan anticipates residential buildings in this location, up to 6-storeys, with an FSR up to 2.5, and the upper storeys set back to minimize the appearance of scale and to reduce shadow impacts. Incremental and smaller lot development is supported – excessive building widths are strongly discouraged. Any new development at this location must be rental residential.

Proposal is to build 2 x 6-storey residential buildings, with 91 market rental units, at a density of 2.5 FSR.

Miguel Castillo Urena, Development Planner, provided with some context, as follows. the Plan anticipates the same form of development as the subject site to the north, west and south while the east remains as RM-3A. The Marpole Community Plan subarea Oak 6.3.2 is considered for 6 storeys apartment building.

The parcel is 200ft by 118 feet deep. There is a grade difference of around 9' from the north-west corner to the south-west corner along Oak St (similar along the lane) and around 2ft grade difference across the site.

The massing in the FoD consists of two 6 storey residential building separated by a 24' courtyard and two levels of parking underground. The frontage is 79 feet. The height is 58.15' (17.72m) north and 59.55' (18.15m). The setbacks are:

- Front: 14'4" (6.22m)
- Rear: 18'4" (5.60m)
- Northern Side Yard: 8'8" (2.71m)
- Southern Side Yard: 8'2" (2.44)

- Upper levels: approx. 8' except for the courtyard side (6')

The front interface displays the two main entries, two indoor amenity spaces, unit patios and three retained trees, within the proposed landscape. The rear interface includes the parking access, urban agriculture, two exits from parking, transformer and patios. The courtyard is programmed with kids play area and it can be accessed from the buildings and from the rear.

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

1. Architectural concept, massing and articulation, including its response to tree retention and existing topography.
2. Overall public realm interface and the west-east relationship, particularly the building entry sequence, courtyard and lane interface.
3. Architectural expression, materiality and sustainable design proposed.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant expressed intent to retain as much landscaping on the street as possible to create an acoustic and psychological barrier between the buildings. The entrance design was split so there were two identifiable entrances off of Oak Street. The proposed buildings are fronting on to Oak Street. To activate the lane there are gates and steps to garden plots proposed. The parking entrance is proposed at the low end of the site. The rental units have some shading devices proposed.

The proposed tree guidelines are being met with 14 replacement trees. There is a single row of trees at the boulevard proposed. The perimeter of the building design provides a good buffer of trees. There are evergreen plants proposed to mitigate noise. Along the backside there is an amenity space designed with trees for scale and heat mitigation. The proposed seating and lighting is solar oriented. At the back there is a patio with urban agriculture with planting and fencing along the back lane proposed. The proposal is 25 percent surface with triple glazing, and the sustainability requirements are being met.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

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

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project

- **Related Commentary:** The project fully complies with the Marpole guidelines. There are many competing interests and policies in the project. The energy efficiency of the building could be more efficient with a single building form instead of two. Making the building L shaped would make the building more economical instead of the cost of two buildings. The building efficiency was difficult to achieve. The internal courtyard is not that usable. The project is complying with city policies with straightforward and rational with strong support for the colour palette. The electric orange colour is supported. The rooftop may not be usable in certain areas bring the bulk down and make it economical. There could be a rooftop amenity to offset the laneway. Access to the bike storage could be more innovative.

The one tree on the north side does not belong in that space anymore. Figure out a way to add a tree that would survive and thrive in that location.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and noted that there were longer building forms in the Marpole area in certain incidences and the building form needs to be considered by Planning going forward.

3. Address:	325-333 Carrall Street
Permit No.:	DP-2018-00379
Description:	To develop the site with a mixed-use development consisting of a 7-storey building and a 5-storey building with commercial at grade and a total of 38 dwelling units and 13 micro dwelling units. The development involves the consolidation, restoration, addition and conversion of an existing 2-storey municipally designated class M Heritage building.
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Human Studio Architecture
Owner:	Millennium Carrall Properties LTD.
Delegation:	Peter Atkinson, Architect, Human Studio Bruce Haden, Architect, Human Studio Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Elijah Sabadlan, Heritage Consultant, Donald Luxton & Associates
Staff:	Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

- **Introduction:** Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project as located adjacent to Pigeon Park, which is a very prominent and important location in the DTES. The two lots are consolidated, and one is currently “empty” and landlocked. The corner lot has 2-storey heritage building, with a flanking lane. The adjacent building is 1 W Hastings at the former Bank of Canada and landmark Heritage A. The flanking HRA to the north. It is a very challenging site in terms of its geometry, adjacencies and access.

The zone is HA-2 (Gastown). The intent is to recognize this area’s special status as “old Granville Townsite” and to preserve Gastown’s “turn of the century” historical, architectural character. The allowable FSR is performance-based. For infill sites it is 70 feet maximum. An additional 7 feet may be considered to enable stronger parapet expression, to enhance compatibility with historic context. For heritage sites “Outright” allowable height on a site with a heritage building IS the height of the heritage building. Any additional height is highly discretionary. HA-2 Guidelines contemplate a maximum one-storey addition on heritage buildings, well set back from building face. In the past, Planning has very occasionally supported taller additions in HA zoning. Anything taller than a one-storey addition must achieve very high standard of excellence, in terms of architectural quality and “heritage retention/response”.

The applicant’s “Response” for the design proposal entails market rental development across both sites, with retail at grade. Two components are heritage façade retention and an addition on 325 Carrall which is a new infill development at 333 Carrall.

The proposed infill site includes:

- A 7-storey building with a height of 77 feet (exceeds 70 feet max)
- A 77 foot height proposed (i.e. 70 foot and a 7 foot relaxation). Taller Level 1 (12 feet clear) for retail, plus 9.5 foot ceilings for micro dwellings, as per Micro Guidelines.
- Some units face onto courtyard with 1 W Hastings with some livability concerns.

The expression is iron grey brick cladding with a simple frame with bays. It is a deeply inset openings with Juliette balconies. A cornice and canopy are located at Level 1, plus a simple cornice at top.

The proposed McConnell site includes:

- Façade retention only (corner-piece). Side wall on lane is “new” construction. Level 1 façade is reconstruction from archival photos (no longer exists).

- A 4-storey addition. Level 2 is highly glazed and set behind parapet of retained façade. Levels 2 and 3 are solid “boxes” set at angles. Level 5 is significantly set back w/ glazed expression. It contains an amenity room.
- Garbage facility at rear, off lane. Loading is proposed to be off-site.

The proposed Program includes:

- A CRU at grade in McConnell Building. A garbage facility at the rear, off lane. Loading is proposed to be off-site.
- Residential entry and amenity at grade in Infill building.
- A larger amenity room and a roof terrace at Level 5 (addition)
- 38 units. Mix of micro dwellings and studios. Most have a Juliette balcony (except units facing courtyard).
- Storage and bikes in underground
- No parking

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

1. Are the height, massing and expression of the addition above the McConnell Block appropriate and successfully resolved, in terms of heritage retention and architectural excellence? (Noting that the Guidelines recommend limiting additions to heritage buildings to 1 storey.)
2. Are the overall height and density supportable on the infill building? (i.e. max. discretionary height of 70ft, plus additional 7ft relaxation for parapet expression).
3. Is the expression of the façade on Pigeon Park successful, as it relates to: the landmark heritage building at 1 W Hastings; the at-grade/pedestrian public realm; and the larger context of historic Gastown?
4. Please comment the detailed architectural expression and materials.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced Geo Sim model to the panel to experiment with a more ‘experiential’ view of the project. The site is located in Pigeon Park. The intention is to restore the building form, façade retention and saving the building as much as possible such as cornices, window treatment and storefronts as well as the character pieces. The wall condition is in rough shape. The site is very narrow. The height of the infill and the height of the addition are planned to be increased. There is a 7 storey building proposed and the intention is not to overshadow, so the proposed detailing is clean and not ornate while still meeting the HA-2 guidelines. The brick façade is sunken in the proposal. The addition is designed not to compete with the form and character with rest of the site. The intention is to create a separation between buildings with a broken up massing. The proposed amenity is on the fourth level and visible from the street. The applicant asked the panel to comment on relaxing the building height for the addition. The applicant asked opinion of the panel on the windows on the courtyard and the lot consolidation.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**
 - Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Avini Besharat and seconded by Ms. Ockwell and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project

Related Commentary: The panel support the building as proposed and described the project as “outstanding”. It was an excellent response to the area. The height and massing is supported. The building could be taller and more relaxations are supported. There are a few minor comments for consideration; the level of detail is supported. The taller building is more successful than the addition. The shorter building is hinged from the taller building. The detail between the tall building and the addition could be considered. The façade of the taller building is good not aligned with the neighbouring building. It is an excellent building and refreshing. However, one panel member differed and was of the opinion that the new building should be more of a background building than currently proposed.

The materials are appropriate. The proportionally it is well balanced. The project retains and revitalizes the area. The building efficiency is very supportable. The height on top is supportable. The glass or glazing could be considered for energy efficiency.

The rooftop could use more communal space. There should be green provided on the building. Increase the roof garden space. On the taller building the rooftop should be accessible.

Overall, it is sophisticated architecture that is well done. The contemporary detailing will help the project. Additional floors help balance the massing. The top element in white is playful.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and appreciated the comments on the detailing. It is critical that the amenity is good because the units are small.
- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.