
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 22, 2020

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jennifer Stamp (Chair)	Excused item 3
Adrien Rahbar	
Karenn Krangle	
Muneesh Sharma	
Brittany Coughlin	Excused item 3
Alan Davies	
Angela Enman	
Walter Francl	
Michael Henderson	
Margot long	
Sydney Schwartz	Excused item 1

REGRETS:

Marie-Odile Marceau
Matt Younger

RECORDING

SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1190 Burrard Street
2.	4745-4795 Main Street

3. 512 W King Edward Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair, MS. Stamp, called the meeting to order at 3:15pm. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1190 Burrard Street
 Permit No. RZ-2019-00085
 Description: To develop an 18-storey secured market rental residential building with 124 rental units, a rooftop indoor/outdoor amenity space, and a children's play space above the 4-storey podium; all over one level of underground parking consisting of 39 parking stalls, 4 car sharing stalls, and 291 bicycle spaces. The building height is 61 m (200.1 ft.), the floor area is 12,461 sq. m (134,128 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.67. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: ZGF Architects
 Staff: Carly Rosenblat & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (10-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Carly Rosenblat, began by noting this is a rezoning application to consolidate 5 lots, located at the north-east corner of the intersection of Burrard St. and Davie St. The site, **1190 Burrard St.**, is located within the **Downtown Official Development Plan** (1975) and falls within the 'Burrard/Granville Sub-Area' of the **Downtown South Guidelines**.

The development site is zoned Downtown District (DD) and falls within sub-area M. The site is surrounded by other DD zoned sites which contain high-density residential and mixed-use commercial buildings. The site shares a north property line with a 9 storey office tower, known as the Burrard Health Centre. To the east is a 13 storey building (known as London Place); To the south is a 10 storey building and across the street to the west, there is an existing community garden with a current proposal to rezone **1157 Burrard St** to permit a 47 storey mixed-use tower with market residential units; hotel use; commercial space at grade; and a public childcare facility.

North of the community garden is St. Paul's Hospital, and to the south of the garden is an Esso gas station. This square shaped lot has a frontage of approximately 34.3 m (112 ft.) along Burrard St. and 36.6 m (120 ft.) along Davie St. with a total **site area** of approximately 1,254 sq. m (13,500 sq. ft.). The site is currently developed with one and two storey residential buildings containing retail uses at grade and two vacant rental units above, as well as a surface parking lot. There are no residential tenants on site. There are several view cones crossing the site: B1, which protects the view from Charleston Seawall to the Lions and C1, which covers Laurel Landbridge and limits the building height to approximately 52.2m (171.3ft.)

Social Housing & ODP

Rezoning potential for the site is guided by the **Downtown Official Development Plan**, which permits the proposed social housing, retail, and service uses. The applicant is seeking an increase in floor space ratio of 4.14 FSR on a base of 5.0 FSR for a total of 9.14 FSR for the development of social housing at 1190 Burrard St. The *Downtown South Goals and Policies* allows for consideration of maximum tower heights of 91m (300ft.) in this location, while the *Downtown South Potential 'Benefit' Capacity in Downtown* allows for consideration of redevelopment of this site with supportable height up to the view cone limit. Neighbourhood context is an important consideration, and all projects must consider and respect transitions to surrounding areas. Pat will speak to the details of the form of development later in this presentation.

Social Housing:

This project meets the city's definition of **Social Housing** as set out in the ODP. At least 30% of the dwelling units will be occupied by households with incomes below Housing Income Limits set out by the Province; the housing will be owned by a non-profit corporation; and a section 219 covenant will be registered on title. Should the rezoning be approved by Council, a Housing Agreement will secure the units as Social Housing for 60 years or the life of the building, whichever is greater.

SHORT

To note, this project is part of the City's Social Housing or Rental Housing (SHORT) program, which aims for faster production of affordable housing by reducing development approval time s **in half** for high impact multi-family housing projects. Projects qualify for the SHORT program based on a screening process which assesses affordability levels, scale of the project, funding methods, and other factors such as building emissions.

Proposal

This proposal is to rezone from Downtown District (DD) to CD-1 to permit a 17 storey mixed-use building with 139 social housing units, CRU units at grade, and a social service centre. The social service centre will be occupied by QMUNITY, a non-profit group that supports queer, trans, and two-spirit people.

It proposes a density of 9.14 FSR and a height of 54.17 m (177.73 ft.). The massing positions a tower at the corner of Burrard and Davie, with a 6 storey podium. There are 34 vehicle parking spaces and 276 bicycle parking spaces over 3 levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. Proposal is for a Passive House building.

Development Planner Patrick Chan noted this project is a Rezoning Application within the *Downtown (DD) Official Development Plan* area. This site is nested within other DD lots with another CD-1 social housing development on the same block. The site has a crossfall of approximately 1.5m from the Burrard-Davie corner to the east corner.

Chan then pointed the relevant documents informing this project as *Downtown (DD) Official Development Plan* and the *Downtown South Guidelines*. Their key objectives are:

DD-ODP (Sub-Area M)

- **Community Wellness:** New developments are to improve the general environment of the Downtown District as an attractive place to live, work, shop and visit. This can be achieved through architectural and also public realm design.
- **Form of Development:** The allowable height is 70 ft., but can be increased up to 120 ft. for social housing. However, Viewcone B which skims over the site caps the height to around 170 ft. The allowable density is 3.00 FSR but can be considered up to 5.00 FSR if social housing is provided.

Downtown South Guidelines

Massing: Generally, towers should be compact and slim, to minimise shadowing, maximise separation and views of the sky between buildings, and generally reduce privacy and overlook impacts. Tower widths should be limited to approximately 80 ft. and floorplates should be approximately 6,500 sq-ft. Minor projections beyond these parameters, for articulation, can be considered but should be limited to 3 ft. depth and no more than 1/3 of the tower width. The standard DD-zone setbacks of 40 ft. for interior property-lines; 6 to 10 ft. for front street-facing property-lines; and 30 ft. for the rear are expected.

Character: Architecturally, towers should contribute to the skyline and streetscape by sculpting the upper-floors. However, appurtenances and decorative roofs should not puncture the viewcones. The lower floors should add to a comfortable, human-scale pedestrian realm. This may be achieved by having distinct materials and fenestration pattern from the tower component, defined cornice-lines, etc. The commercial-residential interface, especially at grade, should be treated sensitively to make them distinct but still complementary. Residential entries should be seen as “punctuations” in the overall streetscape to improve building identity and wayfinding.

Public Realm: Greater setbacks up to 10 ft. along Davie Street are also encouraged to increase the variety of street activities such as spill-overs patios, as well as add opportunities for more robust street-tree planting. Richer materials, more details and lighting should be used to enhance the “close-up” view of the building for pedestrians. As such, large expanses of glass should be avoided at the lower floors. Lane-treatment should not be neglected either. Furthermore, shadows are discouraged on the north side of Davie Street from noon to 2pm.

Open Space: Open spaces, both semi-public and private, are expected and should comply with the High Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines. Balconies should be provided for family units.

Chan noted the project generally responded met these objectives. These responses are expressed through its:

Massing: A 17-stories tower sits on a six-story podium. The tower floor-plate is around 6,100 sq.-ft. and the floorplate dimensions are altogether around 83.5 ft. x 65.5 ft. to help achieve a slimmer appearance. However, interior and the rear setbacks are reduced. Staff support this variance to help the social housing program achieve more viable floorplates around 6,000 sq-ft,

which can better accommodate family-sized units with better lay-outs, and also attain the targeted unit-counts for financial viability. Furthermore, staff's support for this variance also factored in London Place's non-compliant floorplate size and location which reduces the develop ability of the subject-site if the 80 ft. tower separation is strictly applied. In previous discussion, Staff indicated a reduced setback of 35 ft. from the interior property-line and 30 ft. from the rear property-line can be considered. Projection of no more than 10ft. depth in these areas can also considered provided they are no more than 50% of the building -face they are appended to.

Character: The tower is clad in white to distinguish it from the darker colored podium.

Public Realm: The first two floors of the podium, which contain the retail units and the Q-Munity Space, are fully-glazed to achieve better visual porosity between the interior and the public realm. The Q-Munity space entrance at the Burrard and Davie corner is articulated with a double-height frame; this is to address the corner as well as improve building identity and wayfinding.

Open Space: Shared outdoor spaces for the residents on Level 7. All family units and some studios facing the rear do have private balconies.

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

1. Massing + Character

- The variance for the interior and rear setbacks. Particularly how it addresses the Downtown South Guidelines' objectives for a slimmer tower to minimise impacts to shadowing, open sky views and privacy, and the developability of neighbouring sites.
- The tower's relation to the podium, as expressed through massing, articulation and materials.
- The building's contribution to the overall streetscape, especially the Burrard-Davie corner.

2. Public Realm:

- The ground and second floors' interface with the pedestrian realm, with regards to setbacks, rhythm and articulation.

3. Livability + Amenity

- The livability of the units. (e.g. access to natural light, air, HAD, maneuverability, etc).

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted this is a 17 storey project, with mixed uses. The focus is on the community. The result of the massing is a 6 storey street wall that locks with an 11 storey tower. The street wall is broken down to a 2 storey pedestrian scale, and further articulated with a 2 storey curtain wall.

The applicant noted this project adds a unique identity to the community that draws on the Davie village neighborhood. The applicant noted they wanted to enhance the experience at the street level and distribute active uses along Davie and Burrard frontage.

The applicant noted they are seeking variance in the view cone. They are looking for a view cone that goes from high to low. All the parapets are in the view cone limitation.

The composition of the building is a hybrid mass timber building with panelized exterior envelopes. The applicant is looking to bring the social housing units to the market as soon as possible.

There are a series of amenity spaces on levels 3-5 that have an overlook to the outdoor atrium. There is planting to animate the atrium spaces.

The landscape language contrasts the nature of the building. On the roof deck there is tiered seating with solar access. The trellis elements provide cover for the spill out from the interior. The children play area has good solar access. There is a quiet courtyard space with overlook to Burrard St. The 3 floor has a contained urban garden. The applicant noted they are proposing light boxes on the ground floor level. The ground plain is simple with some additional trees.

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. Enman and seconded by Mr. Rahbar and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design development for further integrate or differentiate the tower and podium, consider exploring tower top and fenestration pattern to further differentiate tower and podium;
- Design development to the Q-munity and residential entry points to strengthen them (consider a stronger frame element);
- Design development to the public realm to explore opportunities for seating, planting and further opportunities for activation.

- **Related Commentary:**

The project was well received by panel.

The panel found it to be a good fit for the context, the modular construction and passive house is great. The panel noted it was great to see Q-munity at this location. The panel supported the unit layout – compact but livable, there is a good amount of amenity and the street level activation was well received.

There were no concerns with variances and particular setbacks or intrusions into the view cone. The panel suggested because of the prominent corner, to have the residence and Q-munity entrances strengthened to have a stronger frame element.

Consider some differentiation or integration with tower and podium (could be in materials or setback). Consider further sculpting the tower top or fenestration presently appears like an abrupt stop. The panel noted to consider a shading device to give a unique character form to the podium

The relationship between the tower and the podium need further simplification – more than just a material change. The abrupt change in material does not help. The tower needs a setback or more vertical expression so it reads different from the podium. The tower and the podium are co-planar and need stronger differentiation. The tower is imposing esp. in context of the guidelines.

The residential entries and the Q-munity entry feel tacked on. They need to be stronger, perhaps with more of a projection especially at the corner.

The storefront is the right approach.

Like the dichroic glass.

Tower top has a repetition of window/ a cut off to the extrusion. Consider grouping the windows at the top or modifying the top so it is distinct – it's a predominant corner.

Solar projections could be more pronounced.

It's not a slim tower

Livability:

Great amenities. Units are a bit tight, compact but livable. Careful consideration of atrium treatment. NE units at levels 3-6 concern with darkness and livability/sunlight. NW corner unit accessibility to amenity room -door on west side of amenity room at level 3.

There is a great amount of children's space.

Public Realm:

Transparency at street level is good. Make sure the exit doors don't compromise the transparency. The public realm is well handled and could use more animation/attention – there are only 5 trees. The panel asks the design team to challenge city engineering. Why set back the building if nothing can happen in here but concrete?

Materiality:

Panel system requires scrutiny.

Other:

The building could be higher.

Consider more weather protection (continuous and how that ties in frame elements).

Suggest further activation of street level (i.e. bench) and pair nicely to fine grain at lower level.

There appears to be some mechanical units at level 7 quiet contemplation garden, consider placing these units on top or screened, acoustically engineered, to make space as usable as possible.

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

2. Address:	4745-4795 Main Street
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00071
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with 89 secured market rental units and commercial uses at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 80 vehicle stalls and 156 bicycle stalls. The maximum building height is 21.9 m (72 ft.), the floor area is 7,132 sq. m (76,768 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.67. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture
Staff:	Robert White & Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8/2)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Robert White, began by noting this rezoning application is for a site on the northwest corner of Main Street and East 32nd Avenue in the Riley Park neighborhood. The site, measuring approx. 222 ft. along Main Street and 91 ft. along 32nd Ave, is comprised of three parcels zoned C-2 (Commercial), and is currently developed with a surface parking lot, used by a car dealership. C-2 zoning extends north and south on both sides of Main Street, where properties are generally developed with one to 4-storey commercial or mixed-use buildings. Properties off Main are zoned RS-1 and generally developed with single-family homes.

General Brock Elementary School is located to the southeast across Main and 32nd Avenue, and Riley Park is located approximately 100 m to the west. Further west is Hillcrest Park, including the Hillcrest Community Centre and Nat Bailey Stadium. Nearby rezoning applications for 5- and 6-storey strata residential buildings have recently been proposed and approved south of 33rd Avenue under the Little Mountain Adjacent Policy Area.

Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy & Rental Incentive Guidelines

This application is in response to Rental 100, or the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy, which allows for consideration of increases in C-2 zones of up to 6 storeys and commensurate achievable density for projects where 100% of the residential floor space is rental. There's no maximum FSR under this policy, however typical Rental 100 projects fall between 3.2 and 3.6 FSR.

Approved directions within the Riley Park Community Vision related to this site include strengthening the important shopping area along Main St between 16th and 33rd Aves, providing additional housing near the Main St shopping area, ensuring continuity of shops and services, and improving pedestrian comfort and safety.

Proposal

This proposal is to rezone the site from C-2 to CD-1 to permit a six-storey, mixed-use building with a total of 89 secured market rental residential units and commercial units at grade. It proposes an FSR of 3.67 and a height of 21.9 m (72 ft.).

- The proposal includes 2 levels of underground parking.
- And a Unit Mix of approximately 35% family units.

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, began by noting this site is long and shallow and is relatively flat. The long frontage is on Main St taking up more than half of the block, and the short side is on E 32nd Ave with an exceptional shallow depth of 101 ft.

Main St is a north-south oriented commercial street. Riley Park Community Vision states that the shopping area along Main St between 16th and 33rd Ave should be strengthened as a major neighborhood shopping area and special community place. The unique Main St character should be retained and enhanced.

Currently Main St is primarily lined by one to three storey commercial buildings on both sides and featured with diverse commercial use at grade, wrapping-corner retails and sidewalk displays. There are incremental changes in this area, including two 4-storey C2 developments across E 32nd Ave, a couple other 4-storey C2 developments on the nearby blocks. Most of these development sites have a small frontage.

The E 32nd Ave has large mature trees on both sides and provides convenient access to Riley Park from nearby school and residential properties. There are two large street trees on the south side of the site with a small encroachment. On the west side of the site, there are typical low-density residential properties. Many of them have mature trees in the back yards.

The application is for a 6-storey mixed use development with commercial at grade and residential on the second floor and above. The proposed rear setbacks of the building are smaller than C2 zoning requirements and other typical rental 100 developments due to the shallowness of the site. The building expresses a 4-storey streetwall on both streets through stepping backs above the 4th floor. It also emphasizes a full 6-storey expression at the corner and a height variation on the north end to further articulate the front massing.

The shadow study illustrates that, in comparison to the existing C2 zoning, the proposed additional height casts morning shadow onto the edge of the neighbouring properties in equinoxes. It shadows on Main St in the afternoon and will impact the east sidewalk around 3pm in equinoxes.

The application proposes a restaurant wrapped from Main St onto E 32nd Ave. The main residential entrance is pushed to the corner flanking the lane. The parkade access is from the lane and the ramp is parallel to the lane. The indoor and outdoor amenity spaces are proposed on second floor and the adjacent roof deck. They appear small in size considering the anticipated residents it will serve.

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

1. Does the panel support the proposed height, massing, and setbacks?

2. Take into account the existing and anticipated developments on Main St, has the long frontage of the building been effectively broken down to achieve a compatible and appealing streetscape?
3. Does the design of ground plane successfully strengthen the unique character of Main St's shopping area with regards to diverse commercial use, wrapping-corner retail, active commercial frontage, and engaging pedestrian realm?
4. Please comment on the lane interface and proposed indoor/outdoor amenity space with regards to the location, size, solar exposure, and impact to the neighbouring sites.
5. Please provide preliminary comment on the architectural expression and materiality to inform development application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted this is a typical rental 100 project. The applicant is looking at how to manage the additional height with a site that is extremely shallow. There is a sidewalk requirement from the City of Vancouver which adds limitations to the project.

The street wall and building length have been broken up in a few elements with different heights, but still want to have a single language that connects the buildings. The applicant noted they are looking to use project piers at the whole length of the building and the upper floors setback are treated the same as the front.

The amenity is located at the center of the building. The applicant noted there will be patios on the second floor for some of the units and an atrium amenity space. There is planting on the edge with the guard rail on top to provide separation and privacy for units on Quebec Street. The ground floor is responding to the rhythm of Main Street. At the lane there is parking and loading.

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. Francl and seconded by Ms. Coughlin and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design development to the architectural expression through exploration of change in materiality, repetition and break down of massing to provide a more contextual response;
- Design development to provide a more contextual response to the fine grain nature of Main street in using different materiality to break down the massing and provide further articulation;

- Design Development to provide more variation between the building and public realm, further exploration of the relationship to the residential entry to the commercial portion;
- Reconsider the size, location, and programming of indoor and outdoor amenity spaces as presented;
- Design development to improve the character and activation of the lane.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support from the panel for the ht., massing and setbacks.

The panel noted the heights and setback are well handled.

The panel noted concern with the massing, architectural expression and materiality. The verticality is making the building appear higher than it is, and it is contributing to the mass at the top of the building.

The materiality should be explored to further breakdown the mass, provide a more contextual response in regards to Main Street and treatment at the corner.

The main concern was the Main street frontage; expression of building is long and repetitive, consider something to relieve frontage and this will enhance the public realm.

The residential entry is in the right location however it is to plain with the commercial. The immediacy of doors to the sidewalk is uneasy.

The panel noted to consider a smaller store front while opening it up.

The amenity are too small, consider other program opportunities such as common workspace or a kitchen as the units are fairly compact. The outdoor amenity is tight.

The stepping at the laneway is appropriate however develop more character and activation.

A panelist noted on E 32nd Ave at the north side there are a lot of large setbacks and two large street trees look at opportunities to provide some more public realm.

Ensure the passive cooling requirements are met without over cooling the units. Look at the overheating requirements.

Massing:

Main street is eclectic and has a fine grain nature and small CRUs

Further break down the massing

Articulate the building at the ground plane – the long frontage needs variation.

Consider treating the corners differently to break down the massing/expression.

Consider smaller storefront/retail expression – reconsider column/pilasters.

Consider different materiality and expression to assist in breaking down the mass.

Long Frontage + Expression:

The building does not respond to the context – it is not a Main Street building. It's not varied and textural like Main Street. The frontage is long, relentless, monotonous and repetitive. A change in expression at the corner should be explored to distinguish the corner.

The building does not interface with the current Main Street context. It's a bit lifeless. No small CRU language.

Ground Plane:

The UDP asked the applicant to challenge city engineering to do more with main street to enrich the public realm. The current design does not strengthening the Main Street groundplane – it's reliant on a tenant to do that.

Like how the building steps back.

More variation between building and public realm.

Lane Interface + Amenities:

Like residential lobby at lane corner.

Lane is fine – little to no impact on neighbours. The stepping is good.

Lane needs more character – it's a pedestrian way too. More activation, planting, public art.

The outdoor amenity is small, too small. Consider amenity on the roof (even though the building is wood frame).

Look to get more space at the ground plane.

Patios at level 2 are too big for res. Units and the amenity patio is too small – consider placing amenity room at the corner above the res. Lobby.

Architectural Expression and materiality:

Quieter expression at top of building – set back.

Repetitive expression

The design emphasizes the wrong things – relentless vertical pilasters makes it look larger. The pilasters are continued at the upper level in the set back area – not good. Consider skipping every other pilaster.

Step or break the canopy to relieve the length of the building.

Consider different materiality to further break down the mass.

Other:

Reconsider balconies over balconies.

Level 5 and 6 balconies need privacy screen between decks.

Insulation/windows – consider better performance.

Consider passive cooling east – west and shading.

Consider weather protection at the long level 5 decks

Like variation in balconies.

Residential entry needs to feel more gardeny – more greenery, a canopy, bench, further set back from the street. It reads like a CRU rather than a res. Lobby.

Review the retention of the existing street tree on 32nd Ave. There is a concern that the building excavation is too close to the root protection zone, and the design relies heavily on the existing street trees to help soften the massing and contribute to the public realm.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.

-
3. Address: 512 W King Edward Avenue
Permit No. DP-2019-00708
Description: To develop a 6-storey residential building with 51 secured market rental units over two levels of underground parking consisting of 38 vehicle stalls and 66 bicycle stalls. The proposed building height is 20.70 m (67.90 ft.), the total floor area is 3,082.39 sq. m (33,178.63 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.0. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan and the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy
- Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application (SHORT)
Review: Second (First as DP)
Architect: Badbury Architecture
Staff: Omar Aljebouri & Alina Maness
-

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (7/1) Adrien needs to review this one. I had to step down and I did not take notes.

Introduction:

Development Planner, Omar began the presentation by explaining that this is a DP application following rezoning. Given the site's prominent location, Staff would appreciate the Panel's input. He then gave an overview of the project and its physical context. He discussed the overarching vision of the Cambie Corridor Plan for the neighbourhood, followed by a short description of the subject site, before highlighting consensus items of the Panel's earlier review at the rezoning stage. Omar then gave a short summary of Staff's rezoning conditions.

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

1. Overall development of the public realm and landscape design. Please consider all yards, as well as at-grade interface and its integration into the overall design of the building;
2. Development of the building facades, especially the legibility of stone-patterned spandrels, and treatment of the south façade;
3. Development of building amenities such as building entrance, lobby and rooftop outdoor amenity. Please consider factors such as accessibility and programming;
4. The overall sustainability strategy, especially with respect to slab projections and roof cover.
5. Any additional comments and advice.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant explained having taken over the project from Arno Matis Architecture, who saw the project through the rezoning stage; and how they tried to retain as much of the design as possible.

Applicant noted that the project was well received at the initial UDP Meeting during rezoning.

The project has a solid landscape expression at ground level facing King Edward and Cambie.

The amenity was moved to the corner of Cambie along with the residential entrance. There is an addition of outdoor amenity space: playful rooftop garden terrace for residents to be used for big gatherings.

Expression of textured glass with stone pattern and introduced gold tinted glass.

Design uses less energy through energy modelling to figure out most efficient result. One strategy is to reduce penetrations through walls for increased energy efficiency.

On the side of King Edward, extended the sidewalk to add urban feel to the area of a busy intersection, making it a functional and interesting space.

The applicant noted they kept the ground level sleek and modern to get a clean edge to the public realm.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project it was moved by **MR. HENDERSON** and seconded by **MR. SHARMA** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design development to consider a more pronounced lobby entrance;
- Design development to consider additional use for tenants on the rooftop;
- Design development to soften the impact of the retaining wall through landscape design;
- Design development to consider weather protection on the roof;
- Design development to consider placement of opaque windows to optimize privacy.

Related Commentary

There was a uniform support for this application in general.

Panel members supported the location of the building on the Cambie corridor.

Panel members did not support the public realm and landscape design. Some panel members recommended softening of the retaining wall. Additional space fronting the retaining wall would help. Consider breaking the plinth to improve its appearance. It was suggested that the existing retaining wall be incorporated into the design of the new.

One panel member did not support the removal of all existing trees along both W King Edward and Cambie Streets and the resulting landscape public realm.

Panel members appreciated the expression of the extended balconies, as it creates a visually interesting appearance that is unlike other developments of the Cambie Corridor, and without too many complications. However, a more advanced sustainability strategy is encouraged. LEED Platinum should definitely be pursued. Breaking the slabs at the balconies would benefit the sustainability strategy, as well as introducing mechanical ventilation to the interior hallways. It was noted that the upper floors shoulder setback is not appropriate for this prominent location with close proximity to high volume transit. A 6-storey street wall would be a much more appropriate response. It would also strengthen the architectural expression of the building.

Panel members appreciated the stone patterned spandrel glass. However, it was noted that building facades seem less legible with regards to the stone patterned elements. It seems less essential as the balconies. It was noted that the simplicity of the material and architectural expression at the rezoning stage read stronger. It was suggested that materials should be simplified. Also, the amount of transparency should be reduced, as currently the excessive glazing is impacting the legibility of the façade and is creating privacy issues.

Panel members acknowledged the thoughtfully planned compact units and accessibility of amenities for families. It was noted that the south facing units pose a number of livability issues, especially with regards to solar access.

Panel members appreciated the rooftop space and recommended considering adding washroom, canopy, BBQ, urban agriculture. It was noted that the rooftop compost area is interesting, but might not be very useful. Consider relocating the rooftop access to the north of the core.

Some panel members recommended widening the lobby entrance to make it more prominent. Also, consideration should be given to aligning the main entrance with the architectural expression of the angled spandrel panel.

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