

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 18, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Kim Smith - Chair
Veronica Gillies
Amela Brudar (excused from item #1)
Helen Avini Besharat
Leslie Shieh (excused from item #5)
Yijin Wen
Meredith Anderson
Karen Spoelstra (excused from items #2-#5)
Muneesh Sharma
David Jerke

REGRETS: Renee Van Helm
James Cheng
Colette Parsons

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Kathy Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1. 339 E 1st Avenue |
| 2. 425 W 6th Avenue |
| 3. 3560 Hull Street & 2070-2090 E 20th Avenue |
| 4. 4459 Rupert Street |
| 5. 239 Keefer Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Kim Smith 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.

1. Address: 339 E 1st Avenue
Permit: RZ-2017-00047
Description: To develop a 6-storey office building with 943 sq. m (10,052 sq. ft.) of commercial at grade; over two levels of underground parking with 275 vehicle stalls and 46 bicycle spaces. The proposed total floor area is 13,398 sq. m. (144,216 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.0, and the building height is 30.5 m (100 ft.).
Zoning: I-3 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: IBI Group
Owner: Craig Marcyniuk, Porte Development
Delegation: Jeffroy Mok, Architect, IBI Group
Martin Bruckner, Architect, IBI Group
Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Daniel Roberts, Leed Consultant, Kane Consulting
JS Tessier, Mechanical Engineer, Integral Group
Staff: Stephanie Johnson, Tim Potter & Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations.

Introduction: Stephanie Johnson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for 339 East 1st Avenue, located in the False Creek Flats Area on East 1st Avenue, mid-block between Main and Thornton Street.

The site is currently vacant. Red Truck Brewery is located to the west, Brewery Creek (SRW belongs to adjacent Lot P) and the Great Northern Way Campus (BCIT, Emily Carr, SFU, UBC) to the east. To the south are mixed use buildings, with light industrial, general office and residential units ranging from 3 to 7 storeys. A rail yard is located to the north of the subject property.

The existing zoning for the site is I-3 (Industrial District), with General Office, Manufacturing, Institutional, Recreational Wholesaling and Service Uses permitted on the Site. The I-3 (Industrial District) permits a maximum discretionary height of 100 ft. and density of 3 FSR.

This rezoning application was submitted prior to the referral of the new False Creek Flats District Schedule and Guidelines by Council on July 25, 2017. And, as such, the proposal is being considered as an in-stream application under the previous land use policies, guidelines and regulations, including the Rezoning Policy for Additional Office Uses in the False Creek Flats area which was in effect at the time of application submission.

The application is to rezone from I-3 (Industrial District) to CD-1 to allow for a 6-storey office building. The proposal includes:

- General office space on floors 2-6;
- approximately 10,000 square feet of ground floor retail at grade along East 1st Avenue and amenity space;
- A total floor area of 144,216 square feet and typical floorplate of almost 29,000 square. feet.;
- A floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.0;
- A building height of 100 feet.; and

- Two levels of parking accessed from East 1st Avenue, with 275 vehicle parking spaces, 46 bicycle parking stalls and six loading spaces.

Miguel Castillo Urena, Development Planner, introduced the project as located at 339 E 1th Ave. between Main and Thornton streets for a 6st up to 30.5 m (100feet) height and an average floor plate of 2687 m² (28919 square feet). The **context** includes:

- Railway infrastructure to the north.
- The development of four buildings consisting of the following:
 - Two Live/Work buildings with a commercial podium.
 - One Hotel
 - One Office Building
 - All connected by a public plaza, four levels of underground parking and storage.
- IC-3 zoning across (artist lofts / artist studios)
- Red Truck Brewery to the west.
- Brewery Greenway.

The parcel area is 4466 m² (48072square feet). The lot is 46' (14m) x 104' (31.8m) with a height difference of approximately 1.7 m from west to east an about 0.35 m from south to north. The proposal consists of two components 6 and 5 storey:

- Building width: 36.7 m (31.81+4.9 m)
- Building length: 95 m (40m east elevation)
- Height: 30.5m (5.5m first floor, 4.5m others)
- Setbacks: 3 Front, 8.41m and 6 m East, 6m north

The application includes 2.5 levels of underground parking, retail at the corner, a lobby in the middle with two entries and amenity at the rear. Office space above with an average of 28919 floorplate and 3 roof tops.

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

- 1) Overall massing, including scale, height, bulk, as well as contextual response to the existing and anticipated future forms of development.
- 2) Architectural expression in general and, in particular, proposed industrial identity, variety and rhythm.
- 3) Public realm interface and proposed character, in particular, relationship with adjacent development to the east, greenway and E 1st Ave.
- 4) Liveability of proposed spaces regarding its scope, orientation and architectural response to sustainability.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** This application is coming under a rezoning guideline to maximize the viaduct of a 100 feet and a density of 3, and permits general office use. The goal is to take advantage of the guideline and have a large floor plate office building.

The vehicle access point is located on East 1st, adjacent to the Brewery Creek, in addition to the required fire alarm and fire department access. The formal entrance is half way down the building off the middle of the courtyard, which ties with the pedestrian access on Thornton Street. The goal is to take the attention away from the wall on the west facing the Brewery.

The building features a general setback due to the 15m right of way for the greenway. It is located 8.4 metres from the property line and has almost a 24 metres separation from the office building

and the live work building. The strategy to shrink the building and retain the large floor plates office is to have the building appear as two. Each building features a different color with a glassy middle spine tying both buildings together.

Additional features are a bike end of trip facility, and sun shades that have been designed to hang off the building in a diagonal orientation on the west side. To enhance the industrial character of the area the applicants are looking to have Canopies on the North side (back of building) to tie in with the railways tracks. There has been a lot of programming in the outdoor spaces to allow for occupants to get outside and have access to the outdoor facilities.

The landscape patterning approach is to embody the industrial character of the area. There is a railway type of plank paving and straight lines cut through the soft landscape areas enhanced with edible planting and orchards on top of the various rooftops.

There is a greater focus for Sustainability for the design and performance of the building. The building is subject to the new sustainability requirements for green buildings, including both Leed gold & Low emissions building, plus an integrated rain water management plan.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Besharat and seconded by Mr. Sharma 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 bike storage and to look at easier access to the bike storage through the landscape;
- Increase distinctions between the volumes, the west wall in particular. Consider breaks;
- Consider some covered spaces on the rooftop amenities;
- Look at porosity and connecting the east and west on the site;
- Carry the sunshades throughout the west side of the walls;

Related Commentary: There was general support for the massing, height, architectural expression, and the attempt to reduce the bulk of the building. The panel acknowledge the consideration of neighbouring heights and the architectural expression of the building to match that of its neighbours and the site history. It was also noted the size of the building was unique and presently there were not a lot of projects of a similar 30 000 square feet floor plate space.

The panel suggested the building would benefit from the vertical sun shades designed to act as a shade to the building and installed on all appropriate walls. The lower wall located on the west, next to the brewery, was in need of reconsideration and redesign to be more attractive and create an improved space for pedestrian connectivity and future neighbouring developments. The concept of the canopy was a bit of a foreign language but the panel is open to see how the concept and final design will be executed. The difference in the three volumes was understood by the different colour schemes, however they only differed in color and the overall architectural design was similar.

The panel suggested reconsideration of the overall connectivity across the site by encouraging walkability across the east and west sides and neighbouring sites. The vehicle connection should be looked at as it would benefit both parking lots.

The bike parking spaces should be increased. The concept of the end of trip bike facility was suggested to be enhanced to a mobility center to allow for the transition of others such as electrical bikes. The rooftop amenity needs covered spaces to be useful year round and rain protection needed in the public realm sites.

The panel approved the relationship of the building with the greenway. There was a great connection between the industrial character and landscape. Suggestions included the possibility of more than one bridge crossing and the pathways for cyclists along the landscape to be wider and clearer to avoid pinch points.

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

2. Address: 425 W 6th Avenue
 Permit No.: RZ-2017-00048
 Description: To develop a 9-storey office building over five levels of underground parking with 298 vehicle stalls, 40 bicycle spaces, and 2 Class A and 5 Class B loading spaces. The proposed floor area is 15,946.5 square. m (171,652 square. feet.); the floor space ratio (FSR) is 7.11, and a maximum geodetic height of 52 m (170.75 feet.). This application is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan.
- Zoning: C-3A to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning application
 Review: First
 Architect: IBI Group
 Owner: Nathan Gurvich,
 Delegation: Jeffroy Mok, Architect, IBI Group
 Martin Bruckner, Architect, IBI Group
 Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
 Daniel Roberts, Leed Consultant, Kane Consulting
 Karen Spoelstra, Energy Mechanic, MCW Consultants
- Staff: Michelle Yip & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended

Introduction: Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application located on the northwest corner of 6th avenue and Yukon Street in the Mount Pleasant local area. It is one block east of Cambie Street and the bridge entrance, and two blocks from the Olympic Village Canada Line station.

Surrounding developments include Vancouver Police Department to the north (across the lane) and mixed-use developments at 2-, 4- and 7-storeys on the remainder of the block along 6th avenue. Across 6th avenue to the south is a 2-storey commercial building and a 4-storey mixed-use development that contains Canadian Tire and Best Buy.

This site is currently zoned C-3A, which permits a maximum density of 3.3 FSR. The rezoning proposal is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan, which allows for consideration for increasing commercial density within the Broadway: Choice-of-Use Areas to strengthen and enhance the commercial capacity, especially in areas served by rapid transit.

The proposal is for a 9-storey office building with retail at grade, at a height of 131.35 feet. and a density of 7.11 FSR.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project with related policies to the form of development:

- View Cone cuts across the site and establishes a maximum height;
- Viewpoint K, a view of City Hall from seawall on the north side of Cambie Bridge, requires that massing steps down on the west side of the site;
- C-3A regulations and guidelines:
 - Typical form of development is a low (ie. 20-storey) podium with a greater height for a limited portion (ie. 50%) of the frontage;
 - Intent of this building form is to preserve light and views for the public realm;
 - Massing should minimize shadowing on outdoor spaces (such as adjacent roof deck);
 - High-quality public realm and streetscape;

- o Design excellence to earn conditional density above 1.0 FSR.

The building is 9 storeys, with floorplates from 23000 to 13000 square feet. The building steps down to the west to respond to Viewpoint K. The building is also terraced at the south side to mitigate shadowing onto adjacent VPD and ICBC roof decks. The setback at 6th-storey helps distinguish a 5-storey streetwall, in contrast to 9-storey massing at the east end of the site.

The public realm includes a 3 feet setback at West 6th, increasing to 6 feet at the corner and on Yukon St. The office entry is at the centre of E 6th frontage. The public bike share is proposed on the lane; however, Engineering staff recommend a location on Yukon St. Amenities include a bike end-of-trip facility at P1 and roof top patios at L7 & L8.

The FSR for a C-3A is 1.0 “base”, and up to 3.0 conditionally. Proposed FSR is 7.11.

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

1. Are the overall density, massing and setbacks appropriate for this site?
2. Are the building composition and streetscape expression successfully resolved, and commensurate with the additional density?
3. Is the interface with the public realm successfully resolved?
4. Please provide any additional comments.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The massing is determined by the Viewpoint K and shadow performance for the adjacent roof deck. The basic parti is to create two distinct volumes as a way to break down the massing. The streetwall on West 6th responds to the Best Buy building and higher buildings to the west. It terraces back slightly to pull back the scale.

The building volumes are made more distinctive with colour and skin treatments. There is frame structure on the most prominent corner of the building, which references the truss frame of the original Cambie Street Bridge. The materials reference an industrial palette, with rusty reds and vibrant yellows to contrast slick glass volumes. The Alucobond panel will have a metallic sheen.

A bike share facility and bike entry are located off the lane. Bike parking and change facilities access elevators at the parkade level. Yukon Street may see changes to the bike lane, so the public realm design at grade must be coordinated with Engineering. Existing street trees are to be retained and paving will meet the building face. The accessible rooftop is designed to have outdoor meeting rooms and social areas.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

THAT the Panel recommend **RESUBMISSION** with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Building needs stronger architectural expression to earn its density, noting that it will be visible from all sides;
- Proportions of the massing need improvement;

- Structure and structural expression should be more integrated into the architecture design;
- More sensitivity in the design of building elevations, with respect to solar orientation and sustainable design;
- Improvement is required in the public realm and streetscape expression, including creation of areas of relief in the storefront and a stronger entry expression;
- Design development of the functionality of the bike share and bike access;
- Increased indoor amenity space in the building.

Related Commentary: The panel commented that the building did not meet a standard of architectural excellence and public realm design to earn its proposed density. The panel noted that the site's prominent location, and that the building would be visible from all sides. The building needs to be re-massed, to improve its proportions. Some members suggested that higher portion should be increased in height while the streetwall should be reduced; others commented that stepped massing (clad in orange) should be removed.

The building expression was not clear, which added to its bulky appearance. The volume with the structural "frame" was too eroded to be legible. The reference to the Cambie Bridge truss as a precedent was not successful in its current expression. The building elevations should be more carefully considered in terms of solar performance.

The public realm design requires improvement to earn density. There is a need to clearer access points, as well as points of relief and gathering places along the storefront. The canopy can be broken down to better relate to the massing. A larger entry and lobby should be provided. The bike share location needs to be resolved. The current bike parking access is not functional.

Indoor common amenities should be provided, as well as larger meeting rooms and more covered space on the rooftop. Opportunities for social interaction should be considered in the interior design.

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

3. Address: 3560 Hull Street & 2070-2090 E 20th Avenue
 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. The proposal consists of 70 secured market rental units (41 townhouses, 28 apartment units, and one heritage house) all over two levels of underground parking with 82 vehicle spaces. The proposed floor area is 6,800 square. m. (73,192 square. feet.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.53, and the maximum building height is approximately 15 m (50 feet.). This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Wensley Architecture
 Owner: Dak Molnar, Molnar Group
 Delegation: David McGrath, Architect, Wensley Architect
 Jennifer Stamp, Landsacpe Architect, Durante Kreuk
 Greg Persanyi, Development Manager, Molnar Group
 Staff: Rachel Harrison & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: Resubmission recommended

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project at Hull Street and East 20th Ave, in Kensington-Cedar Cottage. The site is a 4-lot assembly, 190 feet deep and 245 feet wide. 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 to the north-west corner of the site. There is an approximate 30 feet cross-fall from the south-west to north-east. There are several large trees on the site. The Sky Train rails run parallel to the south PL. South of the Sky Train rails is a City-owned community garden and demonstration house.

The project proposal is to rezone under the *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* to allow two 3.5-storey townhouses (41 rental units), one 4-storey apartment (28 rental units), and a restored heritage house (1 unit). 60% of units are 2- and 3-bedrooms. Underground parking is accessed off 20th Avenue. A 20 feet wide lane for emergency vehicles will be built along the south property line.

The *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* allows for consideration of a maximum of 3.5 storey ground-related units. The proposed 4-storey apartment building does not currently meet the policy. *The Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* also sets a limit on two within 10 blocks on any arterial. As Council has already approved an application at Commercial and 18th Avenue, this application, if approved, will be the last one to be considered in this area.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted two major challenges for site planning: access and tree retention. The significant slope has made access from north lane impractical, and opening the east lane and/or the cul-de-sac would be impactful for neighbours and result in further loss of trees. The current proposed access, off E 20th, balances the objectives of functional access, tree retention, and impact on neighbours.

The proposal has three “rows” of stacked townhouses running east-west, at 3.5 storeys. There is a 4-storey apartment building fronting on Hull St. While the policy seeks “ground-oriented” housing forms, staff recognizes that the apartment typology offers more housing options (ie. including

accessible single level units). Staff has indicated that they will consider a building form that is “technically” 4 storeys, provided that it is expressed as 3.5 storeys. Setbacks are: 16 feet on East 20th Ave; 12 feet on Hull St; 5 feet on the north fire access lane; and 8 feet on the east property line. The courtyard ranges from 20 feet to 34 feet.

The proposed indoor amenity room is currently in the basement of the apartment building, and should be relocated to achieve natural light and a contiguous outdoor space. There is a small outdoor space at the east property line, by a retained tree.

Expected density is 1.53 FSR.

- Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
 - 1). Are the overall density, massing and building forms appropriate for this site?
 - 2). Does the design of the apartment building meet the intent of a “3-1/2 storey, ground-oriented building form”?
 - 3). Is the response to the site context successful? (ie. interface with the public realm; mitigation of impacts on single-family properties; circulation and access; etc.)
 - 4). Is the provision of common amenities (indoor and outdoor) appropriate and successful?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant stated their design rationale and noted their extensive public engagement.

As the site is within a single family resident neighbourhood, townhouses are an appropriate transition to more density. The multi-story building was placed at the southwest corner by the railway to lessen its impact. Variation in the massing is used to break down the massing of the apartment building and create a 3.5 storey expression. The entrance is located at the west end, at the second floor, due to steep grades.

The existing lane dedication at the north property line is overgrown and feels unsafe. The design proposes pedestrian and bicycle paths which will interface with the community garden. Lighting and unit fronting onto this area will create “eyes on the street”.

The design aims to balance tree retention with providing rental housing for families. They intend to replant large-caliper trees to regain the tree canopy on the street. There is a 16ft setback, which provides an opportunity for substantial trees.

- The applicant team then took questions from the panel.
- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Gillies and seconded by Ms. Brudar and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommend **RESUBMISSION** with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Improve livability for units at the lower/basement level;
- Improve common outdoor space, and consider provision of a larger central courtyard;
- Relocate indoor common amenity room, for better solar access and functionality;
- Reconsider architectural expression, particularly for the apartment building;

- Consider if heritage house can be retained “as is” (ie. with additions);
- Improve connectivity and interface to the surrounding neighbourhood (ie “knitting”).
- **Related Commentary:** The panel members congratulated the applicants on offering a market rental housing development, and acknowledged that this was a challenging site.

Some panel members did not feel the proposed density is appropriate for the site. The basement units do not have good livability, and it was suggested to raise the building to improve access to light, or to delete the units. The amenity room below grade is not suitable. The middle row of townhouses should be deleted or reduced to create a central outdoor amenity space. Given the neighbourhood context, more family-friendly amenities should be provided.

The design appears outdated and suburban; a more contemporary design was encouraged. The overall quality of materials and detailing should be improved. The panel members were not in favour of restoring the heritage house to its original form, and suggested that it should be preserved in its current character.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and commented this development would offer the only 3-bedroom market rental townhouses in Vancouver. The applicant acknowledges the challenges with grade and livability.

4. Address:	4459 Rupert Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00013 / DP-2017-000218
Description:	To develop a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade, 12 secured market rental units, 1 car share space and 28 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.4 and the building height is 14.9 m (49 feet.). This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) policy
Zoning:	C-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application & Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	LWPAC
Owner:	James Ko, Rejoyce Investment Corporation
Delegation:	Oliver Lang, Architect, LWPAC Elaine Zeng, Landscape Architecture, Enns-Gauthier
Staff:	Michelle Yip & Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: Support

- **Introduction:** Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a concurrent rezoning and development permit application, located on the west side of Rupert Street, between 28th and 29th Avenues in the Renfrew-Collingwood local area.

The surrounding sites are zoned C-1, which permits 3-storey mixed-use developments that provide local-serving commercial space and dwelling uses. Currently, the area consists mostly of 2-storey single-family houses. There are commercial uses at the southwest corners of Rupert Street at 28th avenue and 29th avenue, and a Montessori pre-school across the street. The surrounding neighbourhood area is zoned RS-1.

The proposal is being considered under the *Secured Market Rental Housing Policy* (Rental 100), which allows for consideration up to 4 storeys. The proposal is for a 4-storey development with retail at grade and 12 rental housing units above. Density is 2.4 FSR.

Danielle Wiley on behalf of Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, noted that Rental 100 policy allows an increase in density, providing that the impacts of additional massing (ie. views, shadows, traffic, etc.) are successfully mitigated. This proposal generally follows C-2 massing, as the setbacks in this zone are designed to transition from an arterial street to single family context.

There is a single commercial unit at grade, serviced by one loading space. There is a combined garbage facility to commercial and residential uses. The basement provides storage lockers and bike parking. Parking is very limited: there is only one accessible parking space and one carshare at grade. The site is small (38 feet x 110 feet) so it is difficult to achieve underground parking.

The narrow frontage also creates challenges for meeting livability standards (ie. light and privacy) for the dwelling units. The proposal offers a courtyard (16 feet by 16 feet) on the north side, midway along the building depth, and a light well (4 feet by 24 feet) on the south side. There is no common amenity room, but there is a shared roof patio. The proposal is Passive House. Proposed FSR is 2.4.

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

- 1). Is the height and density appropriate for this site?

- 2). Is the site planning successful (i.e. site servicing, traffic & parking management)?
- 3). Is a high standard of livability of the dwelling units achieved?
- 4). Is the provision of common amenities successful and appropriate?
- 5). Please comment on architectural expression and materials.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant stated their principal goal was to achieve affordability while bringing a higher degree of livability and sustainability in smaller homes. This project is part of the firm's larger work of developing "housing systems" that help catalyze the residential construction industry.

The site is located in close proximity to rapid transit, which will deter car ownership. The building is designed to provide ample personal storage and bicycle storage spaces.

The design adapts a typical C-2 building with a courtyard, to improve livability. The courtyard brings natural daylight to both sides of each unit and cross ventilation. The courtyard allows for more compact floor plans. Material expression balances robustness (with wood end walls and exposed timber) and softness (with a folding metal curtain).

The goal is to make all outdoor spaces accessible, including the courtyard, roof terraces and the roof patio. The landscape design complements the architecture, with trees in planters around the perimeter of the roofs, and a mix of pavers and engineered hardwood. The Building will be Passive House certified and could potentially be a net zero building.

- The applicant team then took questions from the panel.
- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Brudar seconded by Mr. Wen, THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel complimented the applicant for its Passive House strategy. The panel was in full support of the project, including height, density and the parking relaxation. The panel commented that the project was innovative and beautifully executed.

The panel members found the units to be very livable. The landscape architecture is in line with the architectural concept. The use of corrugating metal screening on the façade was acknowledged as a stand-out detail of the building.

Minor suggestions included on the provision of weather protection and sun shade devices on the west elevation, and lowering the canopy on the street frontage. Consider increasing the unit sizes.

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

5. Address:	239 Keefer Street
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00703
Description:	To develop an 8-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade and mezzanine levels, office uses on the second and third levels, and 25 market dwelling units on levels four through eight; all over two levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the lane via a car-elevator.
Zoning:	HA-1A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Mallen Gowing Berzins Architecture
Owner:	Brian Roche, Rendition Developments
Delegation:	Aaron Urion, Architect, Mallen Gowing Berzins Architecture Julian Pattison, Landscape Architecture, Considered Design
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: Support

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as a second visit to the Urban Design Panel. During the first review, the general massing was found to be correct. The main concern was the architectural expression of the front facades. Chinatown always has the challenge of how to reconcile a more contemporary façade design with the existing historical context. The particular block on the north side does not have any historical buildings. There are Chinatown guidelines; however they be may be interpreted loosely and rigidly.

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

- 1) After the first review, the Urban Design Panel recommended resubmission of the project after incorporating the following recommendations to be reviewed:
 - Improve the façade at the street, office and residential elevations;
 - Improve the way the expression works together from one language to the other;
 - Improve the street activation along the storefront;
 - Control and evolve the facades into a simpler expression;
 - Improve the outdoor space amenities of the office;
 - Add more organizing elements, or ‘order’ and ‘integrity’;
 - Research to improve the colour and materiality of the building;
 - Clarify the parti-expression as it is too busy;
 - Make the office and residential expressions distinct from each other.

Please provide commentary with respect to how the revision has responded to these recommendations.

- 2) Does the revised front façade demonstrate an acceptable level of compatibility with the historic buildings in the neighbourhood?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The approach was the review of the internal programs. The separation of the tri-parti was expressed with a strong contemporary expression on the top and middle, separating residential and office from commercial.

Heavy steel members were placed, which are also used as solar fins, which have lighting components to bring up some of the horizontal components of the building. There is a transparent canopy that unifies the lower commercial and mezzanine. To unify the whole façade there is an added screen element. The screen element for the residential units can be moved horizontally and below are fixed horizontal screens that go across the office. The applicant stated the intention is to inform viewers below this is the office.

The approach was a unity of materials. All the windows are very similar across, for a more simple expression, and carried to the back of the facade. The front has a more of an urban fabric because of the north facing façade. The Upper façade is of a darker colour to focus the attention on the lower proportion of the building.

The applicants stated they were able to achieve lower balconies and more in set balconies for the office amenity. The rooftop provides a bamboo garden courtyard to provide an active space for all.

The landscape concept derived from taking elements of the Sun Yat Sen garden and reinterpreting in a contemporary way. Elements include lantern lights, rocks turn in to play objects, islands that act as a noble point and related urban agriculture and tree planting.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Besharat and seconded by Ms. Gillies,

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project.

- **Related Commentary:** There was a general support for this project. The applicants were congratulated for taking into account the panel's recommendation in the previous Urban Design Panel, and returning with a much improved project. The design and architecture respected the Chinese history of the location while remaining contemporary.

Minor suggestions included to revisit the design of the offices as they appeared slightly residential and to revisit the opaque walls as they appeared on the busy side.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:30.