

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 25, 2013

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Daryl Condon (absent for Item #1)
Walter Francl
Joseph Hruda
Phil Mondor
Goran Ostojic (Excused Item #2)
Norm Shearing (Chair)
Peter Wreglesworth

REGRETS:
Ryan Bragg
Vincent Dumoulin
Joseph Fry
Veronica Gillies
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. | 4139-4187 Cambie Street |
| 2. | 4508-4560 Dunbar Street & 3581 West 30 th Avenue |
| 3. | 1398 Richards Street |
| 4. | 1700 East Broadway (Commercial Broadway Station) |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Shearing called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 4139-4187 Cambie Street
DE: N/A
Description: The proposal is for two 6-storey residential buildings on Cambie Street and one 2-storey townhouse on the rear lane, with a total of 76 residential units, including 11 townhouses and 65 apartment units.

Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning
Review: Second
Architect: F. Adab Architect Inc.
Owner: Dana Developments
Delegation: Fred Adab, F. Adab Architect Inc.
Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects
Nelson Chung, Dana Developments
Charlie Lorenzen, C. Lorenzen & Associates Ltd.

Staff: Grant Miller and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (3-2)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site on the west side of Cambie Street between Kind Edward Avenue and West 26th Avenue. Mr. Potter described the context for the area noting the single family (RS-1) sites across the lane. The proposal is to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD01 under the Cambie Corridor Plan. The height of the building is 6-storeys with proposed setbacks along Cambie Street and the side streets and there is a separation of a courtyard of 24 feet between the two buildings.

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

Comments are sought on the proposed form of development for this rezoning application in general, and in particular:

1. Taking into consideration the Cambie Corridor Plan and its design principles, how well has the revised proposal addressed previous panel comments and commentary on the following topics:
 - a) Massing transition to neighbouring context across the lane and along West 26th Avenue;
 - b) Separation between buildings;
 - c) Building shoulder setbacks; and
 - d) Overall expression of building as it relates to massing.
2. Does the Panel have any advice on the proposed design with respect to the interface with the neighbouring site to the north?

Mr. Miller and Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Fred Adab, Architect, further described the proposal and noted the changes that were made based on the Panel's previous comments. They

have reduced the density and massing and have reduced the FSR from 2.6 to 2.51. As well the parking has been reduced from 114 to 109 spaces. The distance between the buildings has been increased by making Building 1 narrower and shifting Building 2 towards the north by two feet. There is now about 25 feet between the buildings. Most of the massing has been reduced along West 26th Avenue to allow for more sunlight access into the courtyard. As well there is a landscape buffer to the neighbours across the lane. Mr. Adab noted that a green roof has been added to the townhouses to improve the outlook from the adjacent units. He added they have changed the architectural form and character of the building. They have reduced the horizontality and now have a stronger vertical element from the ground plane to the 4th storey. As well a change of colour has created a clearer shoulder setback. The balcony and railings have been changed to soften the expression of the building. The 5th and 6th floors have been set back to allow for better sunlight access into the courtyard.

Mary Chan-Yip, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted that they have re-worked the front entry to make it more generous. They have also added bench seating integrated into the concrete planters. Seating has also been added in the internal courtyard. The edible garden is still along the laneway and in addition they have added more on the 3rd floor amenity space. Community gardens, edible landscape and a play area have been added to the outdoor amenity space. Previously they had green roofs on Buildings 1 and 2 and now have added them to the townhouse development to allow for more storm water mitigation and for more greener overlook. Irrigation has also been provided to the green roofs as well.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the shoulder setbacks;
 - Design development to improve the building's expression;
 - Design development to improve the transition across the lane;
 - Consider reducing the glazing to wall ration on the buildings;
 - Consider adding passive design to reduce solar gain;
 - Consider moving the entries to Cambie Street.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and felt the applicant had incorporated the Panel's previous comments in the new submission.

Most of the Panel thought the separation between the two buildings had been improved and as well as privacy issues with the bedroom windows looking into the side yards. There were some concerns from the Panel especially regarding the building's shoulder setbacks as they mentioned that the building still looked bulky at the top. One Panel member noted that this was not helped by the areas that had a more vertical expression. Another Panel member mentioned that having colour up on the top actually accentuated the verticality.

As well the Panel thought the expression could be improved at the lane elevation to better transition to the single family homes. They felt it showed a substantial amount of mass and thought that the expression could be improved through a more of a setback or by changing the expression of the balconies. A couple of Panel member noted that the proposal appears as one long building when driving down Cambie Street. As well a couple of Panel members thought the building was forcing itself on a side street and that a stronger feature would be having the entrance facing Cambie Street.

The Panel thought there was a significant improvement with the massing stepping down to the neighbourhood context on the lane. However, one Panel member thought it should step down to the second floor.

With respect to the remaining lot, the Panel thought the applicant should be cautious because they felt that the density might not be achievable for that site given the relationship.

Regarding sustainability, it was mentioned that the glazing ratio seemed very high to the solid wall and that there needed to be some passive design in the building to deal with solar exposure. It was also mentioned that a green roof wasn't necessary and that storm water retention could be used for irrigation instead.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Adab said he had no further comments.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 2. Address: | 4508-4560 Dunbar Street & West 30 th Avenue |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | The application proposes to allow one 6-storey mixed-use building with a grocery store and two smaller commercial units on the first level and 72 dwelling units on levels two to six with a maximum height of 21.3 m (69.8 feet) on Dunbar Street and 11 3-storey townhouses with a maximum height of 14.2 m (46.2 feet) along West 30 th Avenue. The proposal has a combined FSR of 2.51 and includes a public plaza on the southeast corner of Dunbar Street and West 30 th Avenue. |
| Zoning: | CS and RS-5 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | Henriquez Partners |
| Owner: | The Harwood Group |
| Delegation: | Richard Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Norman Huth, Henriquez Partners Chris Phillips, PFS Landscape Architects Daen Campbell, The Harwood Group |
| Staff: | Michelle McGuire and Paul Cheng |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- Introduction:** Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that includes two sites located on Dunbar Street and West 30th Avenue. She described the context for the area noting that the Dunbar site is the entire block between West 30th and West 29th Avenues and are zoned C-2. Currently the site includes the Stongs supermarket and one single storey commercial building. The West 30th Avenue site is across the lane from Stongs and is zoned RS-5 and currently has a small surface parking lot that serves Stong's customers. Adjacent to the development to the north and directly to the west across Dunbar Street is a mix of low-rise retail and mixed-used buildings (C-2 zoning). To the east and west of Dunbar Street and to the south are sites that are mostly developed with single family housing (RS-5 zoning). As well across Dunbar Street is the Dunbar Library and one block to the south is Memorial West Park and the Dunbar Community Centre.

Ms. McGuire described the proposal noting that it is for a 6-storey mixed use development with a grocery store and two smaller commercial units on the first level with 72 dwelling units on levels two to six all over two levels of underground parking. The proposal for the West 30th Avenue site is a three and a half storey townhouse development with eleven units all over one and a half levels of underground parking. The proposal also includes a public plaza at the northeast corner of Dunbar Street and West 30th Avenue. She noted that there will be parking for 127 vehicles (85 commercial spaces and 142 residential spaces).

Ms. McGuire described the applicable policy (Dunbar Community Vision) which was approved by Council in 1998.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that it is two sites that are being applied for a rezoning. He gave a history of the C-2 zoning to provide some context to the Panel. He mentioned that about twenty years ago Council asked the Planning Department to start allowing residential uses in C-2 zones, which resulted in more development on C-2 sites. In 2003 the C-2 zoning was revised to address

some concerns with respect to overlook and privacy. What is required now are setbacks off the rear lane for the second and third storeys and a further setback for the fourth storey.

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

1. Do the sites, zoning context and proposal (form of development) support the additional height and density being sought for:
 - a) The Dunbar Street site?
 - b) The West 30th Avenue site?

For the lot facing Dunbar Street:

2. Taking into consideration the resulting building form of a typical 4-storey C-2 development, does the proposal produce an interface with neighbouring properties that is sensitive and neighbourly with respect to:
 - a) Overlook;
 - b) Visual privacy;
 - c) Shadowing?

Are there any further design improvements that are suggested?

3. Considering the original C-2 zoning, the north-south orientation of Dunbar Street, the original 66 foot width and the future road width resulting from Council-adopted road-widening policies (80 feet), does the proposal impact the experience of the public realm in a sensitive manner with respect to:
 - a) Street enclosure;
 - b) Shadowing?
4. Please provide commentary on the proposed public plaza with respect to functionality, size and location. Does this design help to maximize the activation of this plaza by the public?

For the lot facing West 30th Avenue:

5. Taking into consideration a typical development under the current RS-5 zoning, does the proposal produce an interface with neighbouring properties, to the north and to the east, that is sensitive and neighbourly?
6. Does the architectural character and typical siting demonstrate a sensitivity to the existing established streetscape of single family homes along West 30th Avenue.

Ms. McGuire and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Gregory Henriquez, Architect, explained that the Dunbar Area has seen very little change over the last 50 years. He said they were very sensitive when they started the process and went out to the community with a series of public information meetings prior to applying for a rezoning of the site. There were important issues identified in terms of redevelopment including retaining Stongs and keeping the community plan that was developed fifteen years ago that recommended 4-storey buildings. He mentioned that Stongs was the anchor for the neighbourhood in order for the rest of the retail in the area to continue to be viable. He added that there will be two CRUs anchoring the corners. He explained that the townhouses will have a flat at ground level for seniors and then a 2-storey townhouse for families making for more affordable housing.

Richard Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the lane is a full floor higher than Dunbar Street. There are two lots along West 30th Avenue with townhouses that will transition to the single family homes to the east. He said they have made for three sections along Dunbar Street to break up the scale of that facade.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and explained that they are saving the large elm tree on West 30th Avenue that adds to the plaza in front of the townhouses. There is an amenity space on the roof top with urban agriculture, children's

play and other spaces for the residents to use. As well they wanted to improve the quality of the streetscape with street trees and new paving.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and liked the context of the building being the neighbourhood heart and providing a meeting place and a grocery store.

The Panel supported the strategy for the site and thought the applicant had considered the adjacent sites as well. They also supported the height, massing and density and thought it was consistent with content that should be seen on these types of sites. One Panel member remarked that the stepping of the building gave a nice expression on the street. They had no concerns regarding overlook and shadowing as they thought the applicant had put a lot of care and attention into that as well. There was some concern regarding the height of the building relative to the plaza and thought it could benefit from another setback and that it could be a bit wider.

A couple of Panel member suggested dropping the elevation on Dunbar Street at the midpoint by one storey as it would create a softening of the massing at the upper level. They liked the anchoring of the ends of the building with CRUs as it would bring some activation to the plaza at that end.

The Panel thought the applicant had put a lot of thought into the configuration and proportion of the units as well as how they had been arranged and their orientation. They also liked the stacked townhouses configuration and mentioned that this type of housing should be encouraged as a buffer between established neighbourhoods. One Panel member mentioned that they were a great prototype to use elsewhere in the city.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henriquez mentioned that they had no further comments.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 3. Address: | 1396 Richards Street |
| DE: | 417049 |
| Description: | To develop a 43-storey building with a 9-storey podium, with market residential at the tower and rental units on the podium. The proposal also contains a daycare and a small retail unit. |
| Zoning: | CD-1 Pending |
| Application Status: | Complete |
| Review: | Third (Second as Development Application) |
| Architect: | DIALOG |
| Owner: | Onni |
| Delegation: | Alan Boniface, DIALOG Brady Dunlop, DIALOG Gerry Eckford, Eckford + Associates Chris Evans, Onni |
| Staff: | Anita Molaro |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and gave some background on the project. She noted that the proposal is a development permit application following rezoning and the basic form of development had been supported by the Panel. The Panel had two areas of concern at the last review which included the units that are contained with the diagonal slot between the tower and podium building. The other concern was the way the façade of the podium was being handled relative to its overall proportion and expression

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

Has the proposal appropriately responded to the Panel's previous concerns noted below:

- Livability of the units oriented in the slot;
- Façade treatment of the Richards Street podium.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Alan Boniface, Architect, further described the proposal and discussed the changes since the last review. He explained that the intent of the design was to be a simple, modern approach to the podium and the tower. Mr. Boniface mentioned there has been an elongation of the slot that wraps around onto Richards Street with a relationship in width to the tower. There is a lighter portion on the top with balconies that are elongated to take advantage of the sunlight and views. He explained how they had changed the façade in the slot and added an amenity space on the roof.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal. He explained how the expression of the slot was changed at the ground plane. They have taken the east end of the slot and opened it up with a walkway and sidewalk to Pacific Avenue. The relationship and connection between the loading dock and the commercial/residential lobbies has been changed by raising the curb to reduce the stairs by providing a series of ramps.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to further improve the façade on Richards Street;

- Design development to improve the transition to the development next door.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought their concerns from the last review had been addressed.

The Panel thought the livability of the suites in the slot was improved and although they thought the applicant had improved the façade treatment on Richards Street they still preferred the playfulness of the lane side façade. They still thought it could use some design development to make it light and elegant. One Panel member suggested introducing some playfulness on the balcony expression. Another Panel member suggested softening the white balcony against the dark background.

Some Panel members thought the stepping at the 4th floor so that the building transitions to the building to the north seemed incomplete.

Regarding sustainability, it was suggested that since the applicant would be striving for LEED™ Gold that the energy points could be improved.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Boniface had no further comments but thanked the Panel for their input.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 4. Address: | 1700 East Broadway (Commercial Broadway Station) |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | Workshop to discuss upgrades to existing transit station including construction of an additional platform for Expo Line trains going towards downtown Vancouver, widening the crossing over the Grandview Cut between the Millennium Line platforms and access to the rest of the station, and improving the areas where passengers wait for the 99 B-Line. |
| Zoning: | CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Workshop |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | AEOCOM |
| Owner: | TransLink |
| Delegation: | Bryan Shaw, AEOCOM Matt Edwards, TransLink |
| Staff: | Anita Molaro and Chris Robertson |

EVALUATION: Non-Voting Workshop

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for updating the TransLink station at Broadway and Commercial Street. There are a number of pieces to the retrofit design that the applicant is proposing that is being driven primarily by the introduction of the new east side platform to service the Expo Line which will extend across Broadway through to 11th Avenue and will incorporate aspects of the existing transit station. As well, the applicant is looking at potential future expansion and the interfaces with the adjacent properties. She noted that the adjacent properties have future potential for development.

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

1. Urban design/architectural aspects:
 - Overall station building expression and retrofit strategy with existing station components including the proposed expansion of the east side platform;
 - Overall station building design strategy that accommodates for a potential future expansion for an additional west side platform;
 - High quality architecture and materiality that also highlights access and openness;
 - Overall station design and built form interface/relationships with (including setbacks/proximity and visual access):
 - Existing (Shoppers Drug Mart) and
 - Future development sites:
 - Safeway site
 - West side of Station fronting Commercial Drive between Broadway and East 10th Avenue.
2. Public realm:
 - Achieving good connectivity/accessibility for transit users, pedestrians and cyclists;
 - Public realm interface with active edges providing interest and weather protection;
 - Achieving a safe environment both within and around the station.
3. Other opportunities and issues the Panel would like to come on.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matt Edwards, TransLink, described the proposal and mentioned that the station is the busiest with 150,000 people passing through the station every day. Here said there is a capacity issue and further to that the station upgrade is to

help with the successful implementation of the Evergreen Line and to support future capacity increases of the rapid transit network. The first phase was completed in 2009 in which an elevator was relocated as well as stairs and an escalator were added and the 10th Avenue entrance into the station. The second phase of the project includes construction with an addition inbound platform for the Expo Line with associated platform access improvements. This is to accommodate the projected increase in transfer volume from the Evergreen Line. The widening of the crossing over the Grandview Cut forms part of the project and connections of Platforms 1 and 2 with the north station concourse. Upgrading of the bus waiting areas serving the station complex is not part of the presentation as it has been separated out as a distinct project that they are working on at the moment. Part of the station will also include provision of a secured bike parking room. Benefits of the upgrade include improved capacity, accessibility and customer amenities. The upgrade supports the provincial transit plan objectives which seek to double the capacity of the Expo Line through complete expansion, lengthening of trains, upgrades to station and supporting systems to meet the demands of 2041.

Bryan Shaw, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they are in design drawings with a lot of the functional planning resolved but not necessarily fully represented in the presentation. He explained that it is all about moving people through space and the most important space is the platform itself. In terms of the architectural expression of the station, they have been experimenting with many things and from a design team perspective there is still a lot of opportunity for input at this stage. He explained the architectural design using a power point presentation.

- **Related Commentary:**

- There is a lack of vision for this transit hub. You can't think about designing a station without knowing all the contextual aspects in which it will sit;
- A stronger emphasis should be placed where the station interfaces with the public realm
- The station needs to be more subtle and sophisticated in its approach
- It is very difficult to design the public space because there isn't any context for what will be built next door;
- The station should be completely redesigned;
- This proposal should be about defining future development opportunities while making this station also work with handling future rider loads;
- Should be a great civic place and then the form will come from it;
- This is too important a site in the city not to be tied into future development on neighbouring sites ; The wrong question is being asked, the scale is all wrong and the design is not unifying the station;
- The architectural response needs to be simpler and unifying in order to bring the station components together
The simpler concept of the train shed design seems to be the better approach;
- It needs to be a single train station and allow for multiple purposes in the future;
- The boat skin doesn't seem to fit so another metaphor needs to be developed;
- The station needs to contribute to the urban fabric;
- Needs to be thought of as more than a transit station;
- The design doesn't celebrate the station, where do you walk into the building, where are the places that need to be announced to the users;
- Would like to see a simple basic but elegant form that could span the distance from one end to the other;
- Would rather see a simple roof form that can run from end to end with some skylights that celebrate where you arrive or leave so they have purpose;
- Celebrate what Vancouver wants to be regarding being a sustainable city as this is a great opportunity for education;

- Make the sustainable elements part of the structure such as collecting rain water to use in the public spaces;
 - Retention of the hoop trusses is a shame.
 - This is a great opportunity to have some innovative architecture.
- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Shaw stated that now was the time to hear input on the design of the station. He said he didn't disagree about the statements of the importance of the station and that it does need a strong expression. He added that they were not in a position to expand their thoughts beyond the station to the surrounding possible development sites. They are only trying to optimize the functions in the station based on how people will access the station now and in the future. Mr. Shaw explained that a lot of work had been done with respect to the bus strategy as this has a great deal of influence on how people access the station. The at-grade station is actually beyond their scope as this time but they recognize the need to improve that area. The boat hull metaphor was an expression that follows the path of the users since there is a significant difference in length from one station to the other. Mr. Shaw added that he appreciated the comments from the Panel.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.