

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 10, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Helen Avini Besharat
Amela Brudar
David Jerke
Yijin Wen
Grant Newfield
Marie-Franco Venneri
Leslie Shieh

REGRETS: Colette Parsons
Muneesh Sharma

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. | 2221-2223 Main Street |
| 2. | 3560 Hull Street & 2070-2090 E 20 th Ave |
| 3. | 2202-2218 Main Street & 206 E 6 th Ave |
| 4. | 3625 Sawmill Crescent (8501 Boundary Rd - EFL Parcel 43A) |
| 5. | East Fraser Lands (EFL) Workshop |

BUSINESS MEETING

Panelist Amela Brudar, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. Ms. Brudar was elected as the new chair and Helen Besharat elected to remain as the vice-chair. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 2221-2223 Main Street
Permit No. DP-2017-01206
Description: To develop a 9-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade and 145 affordable housing units above; all over four levels of underground parking with 192 vehicle spaces. The proposed floor area is 10,695 sq. m (115,123 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.3, and the building height is approximately 29.9m (98 ft.). The Vancouver Park Board is also pursuing the delivery of a park at approximately 1,115 sq. m (12,000 sq. ft.) on the southern portion of this site. This application is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and the Mount Pleasant Community Plan Implementation Policy.
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Second (First as DP)
Architect: Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects
Owner: Robert Brown, Owner/Developer, Catalyst
Delegation: David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape Architecture
Staff: Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT**• Introduction:**

Development Planner, Paul Cheng introduced the project as presently at the Development Permit stage. This is a full block city owned site. This is a site that is to be redeveloped for social public housing purposes. One third will become a public park, owned and administered by Parks Board. Currently the site is a surface parking lot.

In the first UDP meeting there was concern about the fit of the project on the site. Due to the importance of this public housing project, staff decided that this project should move to the DE stage and have the rezoning pass by council, with the understanding at the Development Permit stage not only should the resolution of the form be made and earned through the UDP but also the details typically used to be vetted by the UDP at the DE stage.

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

1. At the previous visit during the rezoning stage, the UDP recommended resubmission to address the following concerns:
 - The buildings needs to reflect its site and position at the terminus of Kingsway and Main Street (prominent corner treatment in building form);
 - The buildings needs to relate to more to the park, especially in bringing in the residential relationship to the park (including an entrance);
 - The building should respond to its different orientations, both architecturally and in terms of solar passive elements, which should be integrated at the early stages of design.
 - A more integrated sustainability strategy is needed.

Please provide commentary on how the revised design has responded to these concerns.

2. Please provide commentary on the proposed interface of the building with the public park and sidewalks, and the response to the change on topography.
3. Please provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Catalyst is a nonprofit society that develops, own and operate housing. Catalysts provides workforce rental housing, recently known as the "missing middle," and aim for household incomes from 30,000-100,000. Catalyst will own and operate the building at this site as below market rental housing for the duration of the full 60 years land lease the City has granted, allowing them to increase affordability when bringing down the mortgage.

The incentive is to have the building be as efficient (less energy, less water) as possible, less utility expenses means increase affordability for the tenants. To address concerns of social sustainability, a program, called Community Connections, will be implemented to improve connections and eliminate isolations amongst tenants and between tenants and the rest of the community.

This site consists of 145 below market rental homes in addition to a retail and restaurant component. Important factors were to integrate the retail and restaurants into the project and not seen as a secondary issue. Also there has been a lot of design space research done to ensure the uses are vibrant and successful and the rent from these spaces will help subsidize the building.

The design of the building is now more conscious to the history of Mount Pleasant, particularly with the contemporary red brick. The building is no longer symmetrical to address the streets, facades and slopes more fully. As it is not known what will be done with the park, the agreement was to keep the slope to the park to avoid a flat park.

The principle residential entry has remained for convenience of moving and loading. There is an added second residential entry which allows residents direct access to the park, and an elevator which access all levels from the park.

There is a common indoor and outdoor rooftop garden. The locations of the amenities areas are designed so everyone can benefit, and have a lantern light feature. The overall approach was a lot of openness.

The landscape approach was the connection of streetscape and amenities to the indoor/outdoor areas. There are two up and down streets emphasizing the urban expression of the sidewalk. There is more green in the residential frontage. The connection to the park will be flexible, possible features such as a usable restaurant patio edge. The courtyard was opened and will have a little green and a featured tree.

The site is Leed gold as a requirement, and will be connecting with the neighborhood energy district program. To improve the sustainability of the building the applicants are will look to reduce the water footprint for the building. Green space and livability are also driving forces for the Sustainability.

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. Avini Besharat and seconded by Ms. Shieh 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:

- Improve the architectural expression of the southeast corner;
- Improve the roof area to simplify, integrate and articulate roof top mechanical enclosures;
- Strengthen and further rationalize the brick frame elements; Introduce brick elements at the lane elevation; design quality of the lane elevation to be consistent with the rest of the building;
- Further design development to the canopies as they appear relentless; break down continuous canopy to reflect grade change;
- Strengthen and improve the livability of the lobbies.

• **Related Commentary:**

There was an overall consensus that the project has improved and positively responded to the comments from the first UDP. The revised proposal respected the neighborhood, and made for a stronger design proposal.

The building massing was broken successfully with the element and material change. The steeping was convincing. The use of landscape in the project, the indoor and outdoor amenities, and the second entry was successful. The light box on top was a pleasant and subtle addition. As well some panel members acknowledged the window to wall ratio, the use of brick especially in the Mount Pleasant area, and the expression and view from Kingsway.

A panelist suggested revisiting the narrow bands of dark materials as this made the frame elements a lot stronger.

There were concerns of the treatment on the southeast corner on 7th and Main. The panel suggested this corner could benefit from improvement in the design elements. The brick element is landing on a planter, which makes the columns with the planter appear squished. A panelist noted it could be a result from the columns not quite matching. There was a suggestion that this corner could benefit from improvements with the landscape planter and other elements that open it up to the park and pedestrians. Also because the southeast corner is the prominent corner, it was suggested to introduce some fritted glass to ensure the balconies don't become a place of storage and clutter.

The lane elevation appeared ignored and if possible to introduce some brick on the lane the facades to improve the overall lane expression.

A panelist noted there was no need to connect the two entries on the main floor if this meant making the retail and loading inefficient. A panelist noted to think of the entryways as multi-functional, as a place where families gather and children play. The entrance way patterns should be opened up more to the park so it feels the individual is going to the park and not into the laneway.

The canopies appeared relentless and if possible make them more segmented.

The rooftop could be better articulated and coherent, with the addition of trees, as the two trees on top appeared sparse and lonely.

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

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 2. Address: | 3560 Hull Street & 2070-2090 E 20 th Ave |
| Permit No. | RZ-2017-00034 |
| Description: | To develop the site with 3.5-storey townhouses, a 3.5-storey apartment building and a retained heritage house; all over two levels of underground parking with 83 vehicle spaces. The proposal consists of a total of 70 secured market rental units (47 townhouses, 22 apartment units, and one heritage house). The proposed floor area is 7,050 sq. m (75,890 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.59, and the maximum building height is approximately 15 m (50 ft.). This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy. |
| Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | Second |
| Architect: | David Echaiz-M'Grath, Wensley Architecture Ltd. |
| Owner: | Andre Molnar, Molnar Group Greg Persant, Molnar Group |
| Delegation: | Durante Kreuk, Landscape Architecture, Jennifer Stamp Don Luxton, Heritage, Luxton Associates Blair Chisholm, Brook Pooni Associates |
| Staff: | Mateja Seaton & Danielle Wiley |

EVALUATION: Support with (minor) recommendations.

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Mateja Seaton, noted that this is a second submission to the Panel. The Panel previously considered the application on October 18, 2017 and recommended a RESUBMISSION.

The site is a 4-lot assembly at E 20th Ave and Hull St in Kensington-Cedar Cottage. The site is currently zoned RS-1 and occupied by single-family houses, one of which will be designated as a heritage building and relocated on the site. There is an approximate 9.5m (31 ft) change in elevation between the south-west and north-east corners of the site, and numerous large trees. The SkyTrain rails run parallel to the south property line. South of the SkyTrain rails is a City-owned community garden. The site is surrounded by single family houses to the north, east and south.

The applicant is proposing to rezone under the Affordable Housing Choices Policy to provide a 100% rental housing development. The applicant is proposing three 3.5-storey townhouse buildings (47 rental units), one 4-storey apartment (22 rental units), and a restored heritage house (1 unit). 69% are 2- and 3-bedroom units. The proposed FSR is 1.59 (increased from 1.53).

Under the Affordable Housing Choices Policy, projects on sites located within 100 meters of an arterial street may be considered for up to a maximum of 3.5 storeys. One of the buildings, the apartment building, is a 4-storey building and is currently not meeting the policy. The policy also sets a limit on two projects within 10 blocks on any arterial. Council has approved an application at 18th and Commercial, so no further applications in this area may be considered under this policy if this project is approved.

Development Planner, Danielle Wiley, further described the site context: a large site in a single family neighborhood (RS-1), fronting onto two street frontages (one is a cul-de-sac), two un-opened lanes, and the Sky train to the north. The slope makes the parkade access from the north lane impractical, and opening the cul-de-sac to create an east lane would be very impactful on neighbours. Staff thus supports the proposed access off E 20th, noting that impacts on neighbors should be mitigated. The east lane will remain closed, but the north lane will be opened for fire access and servicing. Trees will

be retained on Hull St and E 20th Ave. Large-caliper replacement trees are proposed to replace the mature poplars to be removed at the north and south property lines.

In the first UDP review, major concerns included:

- *Livability of basement units*
- *Livability of outdoor space*
- *Provision of common amenities (indoor and outdoor)*
- *Connectivity to neighbourhood.*
- *Heritage house - can it be restored "as is" (ie. w/ 1930s addition)?*

Setbacks have been adjusted to improve livability of basement units and on-site outdoor space. The results is that the exterior yards have been reduced, potentially increasing impact on neighbors. The front yard on E 20th Ave and Hull St have been reduced from 16ft to 12ft. The setback at the east and north property lines have been reduced to 5ft. The courtyards are now 30ft. wide at most points. The north-south courtyard has been developed as a children's play area.

The revised design includes three rows of stacked townhouses running east-west, each at 3.5 storeys per the policy. Two buildings on E 20th Ave have been consolidated into a single building, approximately 205ft. long. The townhouses have been raised to improve light to basements, and now sit up to 6ft out of grade on E 20th Ave. The apartment building has "partial" 4th storey, with a cut-out at the north-east corner for a rooftop amenity patio. A larger amenity room is relocated to the south-east corner of the apartment building, with direct access to the courtyard.

The FSR has been increased from 1.53 to 1.59 (+2900sf).

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

1. Have the key concerns raised by the Panel at the 1st appearance been resolved?
 - Livability of basement units
 - Livability of outdoor space
 - Provision of common amenities (indoor and outdoor)
2. Are the overall density, massing and building forms appropriate for this site?
3. Is the interface with public realm and single family neighbours successfully resolved? Please consider the revised setbacks, main floor elevation/height, and building width.
4. Does the design of the apartment building meet the intent of a "3-1/2 storey, ground-oriented building", as seen from the public realm/neighbouring properties?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This is an important project for Vancouver as it provides a significant number of 3-bedroom rentals. The goal is to build a community inside a single family neighborhood.

The project has a modern aesthetic. The design visually breaks up the length of the townhouse building by using light materials as a background, and pop-up elements to mark individual units. Each unit has an individual walkway and entry so eyes are on the street and the interior courtyard.

To increase livability, building separations were increased to up to 35ft. To increase connectivity to the neighbourhood, there are several entrances to the site. The applicant team is looking to improve the condition of the south laneway, which is presently dark and overgrown, with a visual connection to the community garden and new planting along the south property line. Presently,

there is a row of trees that still have life in them; however, to accommodate density, the applicant team proposes to remove them and replace with new trees. On E 20th Ave, the parkade has been set back to allow for additional tree planting.

The design of the amenity spaces encourages meetings and social interaction. There is a 1400 square roof top amenity space, overlooking the courtyard, with an adjacent room. There is a play area and outdoor space at grade. Stairs in the courtyard were reduced and to create long spaces where kids can play and families can interact.

The applicant is proposing an information plaque providing the history of the heritage building and the deconstructive procedure to uncover its original vernacular. The heritage building will showcase a piece history against a backdrop of contemporary architecture.

The project is targeting LEED gold.

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. Newfield and seconded by Ms. France-Venneri 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:

- Stronger differentiation between the individual buildings,
- To investigate the possibility of increasing the outdoor play spaces,
- To integrate the heritage house through landscaping.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel congratulated the applicant team for returning with a revised project that had been improved in all aspects. The panel noted they were excited to see 3-bedroom townhome rentals in Vancouver.

The panel supported the density and massing of the building, including the additional height for the 4-storey apartment building. The vocabulary of the architecture has improved and has a right positive modern fit. The modern backdrop to the heritage house was well received.

The livability of the project and its connectivity to the neighbourhood have been greatly improved. The reduced yard setbacks were supported, as these were enabling a more livable project, with wider courtyards. Raising the basement units will also increase their access to light. The outdoor space and common amenities have also been significantly improved. More play space would be a further improvement, particularly because the development is oriented to families.

Suggestions for improvement included: revisiting the band of colors and materials on the townhouse buildings to better differentiate them; looking at how the outdoor space can be improved to draw in neighbourhood kids; using landscape and materials to better integrate the heritage house.

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

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 3. Address: | 2202-2218 Main Street & 206 E 6 th Ave |
| Permit No. | RZ-2017-00060 |
| Description: | To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of retail at grade and 65 strata residential units above; all over two and a half levels of underground parking accessed off the lane with 99 vehicle stalls (including 1 car share space) and 2 class B loading spaces. The proposed floor area is 6,255 sq. m (67,332 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.86 (above grade) and 0.38 (below grade), and the building height is approximately 22.7m (74.5ft.). This application is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and the Mount Pleasant Community Implementation Policy. |
| Zoning: | IC-2 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | Tom Bunting, Studio B Architects |
| Owner: | Sefano Faedo, Portliving |
| Delegation: | Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates |
| Staff: | Sarah Crowley & Danielle Wiley |

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations.

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Sarah Crowley, introduced the application as a site comprised of 3 lots and located on a south-east corner site of Main St and E 6th Ave. The current zoning is IC-2 and the site is currently occupied by a 2-storey commercial building and single storey auto garage and sales building. The site size is 1,620 m² (17,445sq. ft.), and measures approximately 40 m wide x 40m deep.

The application is submitted on behalf of PortLiving to amend the existing IC-2 zoning to CD-1 to permit a 6-storey mixed use development with retail at and below grade (2 levels), 65 strata residential units, and 2-1/2 storeys of underground parking accessed from the lane. This application proposes a total FSR of 4.24 (3.86 above grade and 0.38 below grade) and a height of 22.7 m (74.5 ft).

Applicable policies include the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and The Mount Pleasant implementation Policy- Lower Main Urban Design Framework.

Development Planner, Danielle Wiley, noted that there are many nearby rezoning are in process or approved, including an adjacent development to the south. To the north on Main St, there is a 3-storey heritage building across 6th Ave, and kitty corner motel building. A new plaza, adjacent to a VAHA development, will be developed across the street. The neighbouring building to the south has a diagonal, terraced form; the tightest point is approximately 10ft. from the interior, shared property line. Livability and overlook is a consideration.

Danielle noted that the rezoning policy for this sub-area of Mount Pleasant has overall urban design concepts for the neighbourhood, as well as detailed design parameters for this block. The Moutn Pleasant design concepts include:

- Hilltown: Buildings get higher as they climb slope; accentuate topography;
- Laneways: “Active” places to walk work & play; still accommodate servicing;
- Culture & Economy: Encourage high tech & creative economy;
- Architectural innovation: Welcome contemporary bldgs w/in historic fabric.
- Housing diversity: Diverse tenures and unit types.

The form of development guidelines for this block specify:

- 9 -storeys on south end of block; 6 storeys on north end (subject site)

- FSR Range: 3.0 to 4.9 FSR (with highest density at the sound end of block)

The proposal is a 6-storey development (7 storeys, including the mezzanine level). The public realm at grade includes a voluntary “alley”/mid-block connection at south PL (15ft.). The intent is to link to the lane and animate the public realm. The retail front is on Main St and wraps onto the alley. There are effectively 3 levels with partial basement and a mezzanine. The intent is to attract more variety of tenants & uses. There is a residential lobby and 3 townhouses on East 6th Ave, a 4ft. setback at the lane, and loading and parkade entry is at the lane. The height is 74.5ft at the lowest corner (68ft. at the high corner); FSR is 3.86 (above grade).

Program and massing are as follows:

- Strata residential, 65 units (approx. two-thirds family units);
- South property line has 15ft - 20ft setback, with two internal units per floor;
- The lane has 4ft setback at the north end; 20ft at the south end;
- Main St has 8ft. setback. East 6th Ave set back is 1.5ft at corner, increasing to 8ft;
- Private roof patios on roof top. Amenity space at Level 2 with a small patio.

The architectural expression is schematic as it is at the rezoning stage, but the intent is to achieve a colourful “mosaic-like” cladding, accented against a white base colour. A mural is proposed at Level 1 to animate the lane.

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

1. Are the site planning and at-grade uses successfully resolved?
2. Are the massing, setbacks and adjacencies successfully resolved?
3. Is an appropriate standard of livability achieved? (ie. dwelling units and common amenities)
4. Are the height and density supportable, in the context of the Mt Pleasant Plan?

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

The applicants noted due to the building to the south setting back to the property lines presented a challenge. The mass and shape of the site is squared-shaped. The corners of the buildings are more solid and monochromatic, with fins. The corners correspond to the larger family units, with studios in the middle of the plan. The panelized cladding system that adds an abstract dose of colors, derived from the neighborhood context. The proposed mural at grade is inspired by the successful Mount Pleasant Mural festival.

The applicant is proposing a mid-block connector from Main St to the lane, as “heritage alley” and innovative piece of the urban realm. An existing heritage brick wall (currently located on site) is proposed to be retained, and will frame the alley. The retail is layered (sub-grade, at-grade and mezzanine) to create more diverse uses, and allow for successful access and exit points. The underground retail allows for the possibility lower priced leasable space for the neighbourhood.

There are two main components to the landscape: the ground level streetscape on 6th Ave and Main St, and the laneway. There are street trees along the boulevard edge with brick pavers and planting in between. The laneway has unit pavers, in a random pattern to mimic a meandering stream. The rooftop has private patios with 42-inch planters to create barriers. Planting is made up of small decorative trees and low shrub planting and perennials. The rain water management plan is to use the planters and ground level trees to infiltrate some of the water.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved Mr. Wen and seconded by Ms. Shieh 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:

- Increase the building setback and review adjacencies to the South, (to improve livability and overlook of units on the south elevation);
- Redesign the indoor and outdoor amenities, addressing concerns of programming, size and location;
- Review the rooftop massing and detail, in particular access stairs to patios;
- Review the west elevation to improve response to solar orientation.

- **Related Commentary:**

Generally, the panel found the project to be a successful, with a simple form and straightforward fit to the site. The panel approved of the overall design approach and response to the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood context, including the alley, mural art, and materiality. The panel supported the idea to retain the brick wall.

Height was not a concern and site planning was seen to be successfully done, but some panel members commented that the building massing was pushed too far, and density should be reduced. The setback on the south is too close; the panel noted the applicant should better respond to the adjacent building by increasing the building separation or introducing light wells.

The panel noted that the amenity space required design development, including programming the outdoor space. The indoor amenity room is too narrow to be useful, and too dark. Consider alternate locations, including the roof top or adjacent to the lobby. Bike transport and access to storage should be better considered. The panel supported the landscaping pattern; they found it to be unusual and well-fitted to Mount Pleasant.

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

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 4. Address: | 3625 Sawmill Crescent (8501 Boundary Rd - EFL Parcel 43A) |
| Permit No. | DP-2017-01227 |
| Description: | To develop a 5-storey multiple dwelling residential building consisting of 120 affordable rental units, all over one level of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 8,679 sq. m (93,430 sq. ft.), and the building height |
| Zoning: | CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Complete Development Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects |
| Owner: | Robert Brown, Catalyst |
| Delegation: | Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, DKL |
| Staff: | Danielle Wiley |

EVALUATION: Resubmission with recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Danielle Wiley, described the site as located in the extreme north-east corner of East Fraser Lands/River District. The parcel has three building lots arranged around a cul-de-sac, plus a small park (Promontory Park) at the “point”/entry. To the east is Boundary Road and to the north is a heavily treed slope, with single family properties above (Champlain Heights).

The East Fraserlands Design Guidelines offer the following recommendations for this parcel:

- Cul-de-sac should provide a central open space to orient building frontages, buffered from Marine Way;
- Provide a pedestrian link from the north (Champlain Heights) into the EFL neighbourhood, running west of the site and across the park to Marine Dr intersection;
- Provide a pedestrian link (6m ROW) at the north property line to Boundary Rd;
- Allow 5-storey strata residential on other two lots; 18-storey tower at corner (under construction);
- For this lot, allow two 4-storey buildings, to transition to single family houses to north.

The application deviates from the guidelines, in proposing a single 5-storey building secured rental building. Staff are considering the height increase, as the topography mitigates view impacts. The single building is proposed for efficiency and affordability.

The public realm design, at grade, includes the following:

- Main entry at the mouth of cul-de-sac with adjacent amenity rooms;
- Common outdoor space facing the cul-de-sac, in a forecourt in front of the building;
- Loading adjacent to the outdoor amenity;
- Parking ramp at west end of lot;
- Due to the slope, the north-east portion of level 1 is below grade (used for storage);
- Ground-oriented units along Sawmill Crescent (south) and the pedestrian path (north).

The building length measures approximately 375 ft., but is broken by “kink” in plan. This geometry creates open spaces on the cul-de-sac (forecourt) and on the north side (courtyard). A setback at the north-west corner creates a green space at the “entry” to the cul-de-sac. The 5th storey is setback at this corner, to create a visual interest expression at this highly visible corner. Otherwise, the building is a full 5 storeys without setbacks.

The building massing is articulated using an alternating pattern of inset/projecting balconies. Changes in the cladding colour are also used to visually break up the long building elevations. There is deep soffit to create strong roofline to “cap” the building.

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

1. Do you support the approach to create a single building (rather than two, per the Guidelines)? If so, is the overall building massing successfully resolved?
2. Is the site planning successfully resolved? (inc. site servicing, open space, pedestrian links, etc.)
3. Is the architectural design successfully resolved?
4. Is a good standard of livability achieved? (inc. common amenities)

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This development will provide rental and managed affordable housing. The site is long and narrow, which posed challenges to achieving the allotted density. The approach was to try to treat the development as a single building with a significant break.

There is a single entry and common areas on the ground floor next to the elevator core. An additional amenity terrace at the west end (5th floor) will take advantage of the sunlight in the afternoon. There is access to the bike parking from the main level, due to the change in grade. There are pedestrian walkways along the north and south property lines.

The landscape design aims to connect the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. There is good solar exposure and a safe cul-de sac. The loading bay is combined with the play component and pedestrian circulation to create a good multipurpose space. On the north-west corner, there is a little gathering space that will be linked to pedestrian circulation and the future park.

The building will achieve LEED Gold and there will be a hydroponic heating system.

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. Jerke and seconded by Ms. France-Venneri and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel RECOMMEND RESUBMISSION of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Provide a significant break in massing, possibly introducing a hinge element connection between two wings. Breaking down the massing could be achieved in one or two buildings;
- Increase height to 6 storeys to maintain density;
- Review the livability of north-facing units and outdoor spaces; Deep recessed north facing bedrooms should be avoided;
- Review the long corridors, elevator core and stairs, to improve building operation and livability;
- Connect the north and south outdoor spaces, and further develop the north-west corner outdoor space;
- Consider more contemporary architectural expression.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel noted the site was beautiful but has an interesting geometry that poses challenges to the site planning and building massing.

There was a difference in opinion whether the massing should be split into two (or 3) buildings, or could be successful as a single building. Many panelists suggested that issues of site planning, amenity, livability and architectural expression would all be improved by splitting the massing into two buildings. Two buildings would help connect the orphaned outdoor spaces at the north and south sides of the site. The buildings could be connected by glazed bridges or an atrium. Lost density could be regained in a partial 6th-storey.

The Panel noted that this social housing development needs to achieve a higher standard of quality, design and livability. A panelist noted that the north-facing units and open spaces do not have sufficient sunlight. The north-facing units should have a narrower depth and no inset balconies. The internal corridors are long and dark, and belong to an outdated typology. Consider adding an elevator at the east end of the building, or splitting the elevator core. The corridors should be punctuated by day-lit exit stairs or other breaks/openings. Amenity rooms could be provided in each building.

There was an appreciation for the south-facing outdoor space. The linkage of the basketball court and loading zone helped animate this space. The north-west corner could be developed as a naturalized space for children's play.

The building elevations feel relentless, monotonous, and repetitive. Suggestions included having two buildings, each with a simple expression, with a hinge element at the middle. The panel encouraged further design development with a more contemporary expression. A question posed is "what is the experience the building trying to create?"

- **Applicant's Response:** The challenge with the site is there is no more square footage even with an increased height. Breaking up the buildings means additional costs which means loss of affordability.

-
5. Address: East Fraser Lands (EFL) Workshop
Description: The City is working on a ten-year review of the East Fraser Lands (EFL) Official Development Plan (ODP), which will inform ongoing implementation in EFL, including the future rezoning of Area 3. The purpose of the workshop is to get feedback on two site concepts for Area 3, to inform development of a preferred concept.
Application Status: Workshop
Review: Second
Architect: Gohl Architects & DIALOG
Staff: Linda Gilan & Danielle Wiley
-

EVALUATION: Non-Voting

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Linda Gillan, introduced the application as, in June 2017, Council directed staff to review and update the East Fraser Lands Official Development Plan (or EFL ODP) to reflect the following:

- New Council policy and standards;
- Changing environmental conditions due to climate change;
- Delivery of public benefits; and
- Options to increase housing diversity in Area 3.

Staff have been working with the proponent, Wesgroup, and their consultant team of DIALOG and Gehl, to develop two new concepts for this part of EFL. The planning process will result in recommended changes to the EFL ODP and corresponding CD-1 by-laws. If approved, they will be used to inform ongoing implementation in the area and future rezoning of Area 3.

The East Fraser Lands are 51 hectares (128 acres) in size. The site is located in southeast Vancouver, south of Marine Drive and Marine Way, between Kerr Street and Boundary Road, along the north arm of the Fraser River.

The EFL ODP was approved over a decade ago, in 2006. It includes:

- about 7.7 million sq. ft. of development, including housing, shops and services;
- a network of parks and plazas; four childcare centres;
- two school sites;
- a community centre; and
- sites for affordable housing.

EFL is envisioned to have three distinct neighbourhoods, the central, western and eastern neighbourhoods. Build out of the western neighbourhood (Area 2) is well underway and the central neighbourhood (Area 1) has zoning entitlements in place. Construction is underway or almost complete on the four corners of the Town Square, at the north end of High Street. The eastern neighbourhood - Area 3 - is about 15.8 hectares, or 39 acres in size, including roads and parks, and is the last significant area of EFL to be rezoned.

The Planning Process is anticipated to be completed by summer 2018. We are seeking the Panel's feedback to inform selection - or further development - of a preferred concept, leading to emerging design directions for this area.

Development Planner, Danielle Wiley, noted that the slope from Marine Drive to the river is quite gentle compared to the western neighbourhoods. The Avalon Corridor is intended to be a day-lit water

course through Area 3, from north of Marine Drive to the river. New flood control policies will impact grading and shoreline design. The railway will remain as a low point, and grades will be raised to the south. The shoreline will feature an “integrated” dyke, which doubles as a bike/pedestrian path.

Guiding UD Principles for the EFL/ODP area:

- 3 Distinct neighborhoods: Area 1 with greatest density, height and intensity of uses.
- High St as commercial spine of EFL:
 - Anchored by “town centre” at north end (Marine Drive) and a plaza & community centre at south end (riverfront).
- Continuous Foreshore:
 - Continuous park along the riverfront with a variety of conditions;
 - Accommodates biking, walking and a range of activities (ie. “beach”).
- Mixture of Building types & scales:
 - low-rise, G-O: typically facing lanes; also concentrated in Area 2;
 - mid-rise streetwall buildings on most “standard” neighbourhood streets;
 - towers: in “clusters”, and concentrated around High St;
- Neighbourhood Greens w/ “Public edges”:
 - Each neighbourhood has its own local green space(s)
 - Parks and other public spaces need overtly “public” edges

Staff have asked the proponents to develop two concepts, distinct from the ODP, generally organized around two different approaches to park space:

- Concept A: Wider riverfront park with nodes” (with a narrower Avalon Corridor);
- Concept B: Larger “destination” park at Avalon Corridor (with a narrower riverfront park).

Generally, the height should step down west to east (High St to Boundary) and north to south (Marine to riverfront). Shadowing on major green spaces must be avoided. Staff are open to exploring different scales of block sizes and scales, as the applicant is interested in courtyard typologies. A mix of towers, mid-rise and lower-rise, with a range of housing options, is anticipated. Currently, the tallest tower is proposed at 28 storeys, compared to 18 storeys under the approved ODP.

Concurrent with this Area 3 study is a “re-think” of riverfront plaza, as staff is exploring an option to create a stand-alone community center. Density currently allocated to this parcel would need to be redistributed, which requires further study. If a dirt site option is pursued, there will be an opportunity to create a more direct relationship between the community centre and riverfront plaza.

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

- 1) What is your preferred concept? Or preferred “elements” of each concept?

Please provide further commentary on:

- 2) Configuration and character of public open spaces (riverfront, Avalon corridor, as well as smaller open space);
- 3) Block pattern and street network and design, including connectivity to surrounding neighbourhoods;
- 4) Height, massing (inc. tower locations), and building typologies.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

The starting point for the team was the public realm framework for the new neighbourhood. Understanding the principles of the original ODP, and looking at the existing natural features of the site, helped to define open spaces as the defining elements of the plan. A 30m setback from the water

edge is required for flood control. It was also necessary to incorporate 8.2 acres of public park space. These factors drive the block pattern, street network and building orientation and massing.

A third component to the Area 3 plan public realm are semi-enclosed courtyards. The approach was to create high capacity high control space to result in a multi-functional space both for the individual resident and for social interaction.

The streets can be identified in three character identities:

- Neighborhood circulations streets, which are more typical curb and gutter streets.
- Pedestrian priority narrow streets.
- Laneway or Paseo streets, where cars are the guest and pedestrian are the priorities.

Concept A: Concept A is primarily defined by the distribution of park space along the river's edge, providing a range of possible experiences along the river front. The design intent is to create a series of "episodes" rather than a continuous path. A narrower north-south Avalon Corridor still provides opportunity for an urban watercourse (40m in width), providing an experience of the conveyance of water.

This concept includes the tapering down in height from west to east. High street will remain the center of attraction and commercial activity for residents and visitors. Variation in massing is also tied to street dimension (i.e. laneways have lower-scaled buildings). Building massing along the south side of each block has been pushed to allow sunlight in the courtyards.

Concept B: The key driver of Concept B is a large, central Avalon Park. This concept introduces an interesting, larger neighborhood amenity. The wedge-shape is based on the original ODP.

The block pattern is similar to standard downtown blocks in Vancouver, with podium and tower typologies. An east-west, pedestrian-only "living lane" would be residential in character than the "paseo" in Concept A. Kent Ave is an important interface, as a façade to the neighbourhood, so variation of height and massing is proposed. This concept introduces more formal edges to the street wall and open spaces (Avalon Park and riverfront). This allows for more massing and height along the waterfront and park edges. The waterfront experience is less about the moments along it and more about the conveyance through it.

For long term flexibility and resiliency, in both concepts, there are higher, deeper at-grade spaces to allow for existing buildings to convert to other live-work or light industrial uses. Both concept A and concept B are 3.8 million square feet in density.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was a consensus that each concept has its merits. The riverfront location is unique and placing the neighborhood park along the river provides an opportunity to reinforce the connection to the water. At the same time, a panelist noted that the schemes do not lose the connection to the neighbourhood to the north.

A panelist expressed concern that, due to climate change, the riverfront park could be compromised in the future. Another panelist noted that it was difficult to choose one of the park concepts over the other, due the mixture of people who would be served (i.e. adults are more drawn to water and kids are more drawn to large open spaces for play). The majority of the panel preferred the variation of spaces/episodes along the waterfront, as opposed to a long continuous space.

A panelist noted the preference for Concept A primarily for the connectivity to the water, and because it is well-match to the larger Metro Vancouver to build links across the river. This concept also offers a

finer grain of building massing which steps down to the river. On the other hand, another panelist noted that the larger central creates a plan that feels less congested.

The panel appreciated the stepping of massing from the north down to the water, creating opportunities for good views and sunshine. The panel liked the interior courtyards, noting the building typology resembles a European approach. The emphasis on the live-work uses and tying to the industrial uses across Boundary Road in Burnaby were also well-received. A panelist encouraged the applicants to provide the architects enough flexibility to “future proof” the neighbourhood for changing uses (ie. conversion of parkades).

In comparison to Area 3, the High Street now feels low in density. The applicant should look at how to animate streets that connect to High Street, including segments of finer-grain buildings (ie. the paseo).

Suggestions included: more careful studies of shadowing (ie. in the courtyards); provisions for natural light in the underground parking to facilitate a future conversion; more density in the “right” areas (including increasing tower height in some locations). In addition, consider a “jewel”, such as an art exhibition space, as a destination to draw people to the eastern side of the site.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant and City Staff thanked the panel for their commentary.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.