

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 26, 2014

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg
Joseph Fry (Item #1 only)
David Grigg
Jennifer Marshall
Arno Matis (Excused Item #3)
Phil Mondor
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #2 & #3)
Maurice Pez
Matthew Soules

REGRETS:
Greg Bellerby
Walter Francl
Joseph Hruda
Goran Ostojic

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 506 West 60 th Avenue and 7645-7675 Cambie Street |
| 2. | 1480 Howe Street, 1461 Granville Street and 1462 Granville Street |
| 3. | 2290 Main Street |
| 4. | 2141 East Hastings Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg called the Business Meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the items that went to the Development Permit Board that had been previously reviewed by the Panel. He then noted the presence of a quorum and the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address: | 506 West 60 th Avenue and 7645-7675 Cambie Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To construct a 6-storey residential building and a 6-storey mixed-use building all over one level of underground parking. The proposal includes a church assembly space and 138 secured market rental units. |
| Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | GBL Architects |
| Delegation: | Amela Brudar, GBL Architects
Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects
Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jon Losee Ltd. Landscape Architects |
| Staff: | Michelle McGuire and Sailen Black |

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-7)

- Introduction:** Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that is made up of three parcels on Cambie Street between West 60th Avenue and West 61st Avenue. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan that contemplates 6-storey residential buildings in this area. Ms. McGuire described the context for the area noting the Pearson Hospital site with potential for a new Canada Line station at West 57th Avenue. As well she noted that to the east and west of Cambie Street are sites zoned RS-1 that are included in the draft Marpole Plan. To the east sites are proposed to be apartments up to 4-storeys and the sites to the west are proposed to remain as single-family. She added that these sites will be revisited as part of the planning for Phase 3 of the Cambie Corridor Plan. The rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow development of two 6-storey buildings over one and half levels of underground parking for 90 vehicles. The southern proposal also includes a church on the first level, and all the 129 residential units are being proposed as secured market rental housing.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and gave an overview of the context for the area as well as the Cambie Corridor Plan. He noted that the Plan allows for residential up to 6 storeys with a 4-storey streetwall that will be created over time. As well the Plan expects both real and visual openness between buildings. Mr. Black added that the proposal also needs to meet the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning. The application proposes 10 foot setbacks from Cambie Street and West 61st Avenue and 9 feet from West 60th Avenue. The shoulder line steps back 8 feet at level 5 on all sides except facing inward. There is a 24 foot opening between the two buildings with 6-storey walls on either side. The height of the proposal facing the single family homes across the lane has a stepped expression at 4-storeys.

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

- Proposed form of development for this site, including proposed density (2.88 FSR), height (6-storeys) and setbacks (9 to 17 feet).

- Transition of building massing the existing surrounding context to the west, including the 4-storey expression.
- Interface of the edges with the lane and the avenues (60th and 61st), including sunken spaces.
- Location and massing of the proposed church at West 61st Avenue.
- Proposed east to west courtyard (between the 6-storey buildings) width and interior upper level setbacks.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Amela Brudar, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there is a pronounced slope across the site. The site occupies the entire block along Cambie Street with two buildings. They thought a balanced approach was to divide the site so that a smaller building would be to the north with a slightly bigger building to the south with a breezeway between them. This created a linear plaza with access to both buildings providing some social sustainability. The church right now is located off West 60th Avenue but because of the slope on the slight they thought moving the church to the West 61st Avenue side would allow the church to have a stronger visual identity. The access to the parking is off the lane.

Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, described the form of development and architecture and noted that the project complies with the Cambie Corridor Plan guidelines. One of the departures is that the 4-storey shoulder does not transition down to a 3-storey shoulder at the lane. Given that there is a nature slope on the site, they felt that the transition happens naturally. Both buildings are designed with the same language and will be further developed. The colour palette has not been chosen but there will be two contrasting colours or textures.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there are connections from the ground floor suites out to the street and the laneway to provide animation. The landscaping along Cambie Street has steps and retaining walls around a flat yard.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the massing, height and density;
 - Design development to improve the visibility of the church;
 - Design development to improve the setbacks at the 3-storeys;
 - Design development to improve the livability of the long studio units;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the facades;
 - Consider adding a plaza area in front of the church;
 - Design development to improve the courtyard space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel did not support the massing, height and density and thought that the church lacked presence as a public use. They thought it was a missed opportunity regarding the church's visibility and usability. It was suggested that the applicant needed to take the most conservative approach on the site and that there needed to be considerable setbacks above the third storey especially on the lane. They thought it was not a pleasant interface

to the single family homes across the lane. The Panel suggested the courtyard could be viewed as an opportunity to benefit the occupants and that it appeared quite functional.

Most of the Panel thought the height of the building and its relationship to the street needed to be improved to reduce a sense of heaviness. As well they thought that the walls, particularly on the south façade, could use some colour or articulation. Several Panel members were concerned with the livability of the floor plan in the long, thin studio units.

As for the expression, several Panel members thought it looked more like an office building rather than a residential building. As well they thought the church could benefit from a setback perhaps with a plaza in front. As well they were concerned with the grade change in the setbacks.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the landscaping plans and thought the space could be improved. They thought the interior walkway should be treated as a social space for the residents. As well they thought there needed to be a better relationship to the amenity space.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Brudar said she appreciated the comments but mentioned that there was a lot of pressure since it is to be a rental building and needs a certain amount of density to make the project viable. As for the courtyard she noted that if there was a property line between the buildings, there would be the amount of space they are proposing.

2. Address:	1480 Howe Street, 1461 Granville Street and 1462 Granville Street
DE:	DE417538, DE417597 and DE417598
Description:	To develop a 52-storey residential tower with 9-storey podium including rental and retail uses. Also construct two 6-storey buildings providing retail and office uses.
Zoning:	CD-1 pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Third (First as Development Application)
Architect:	DIALOG
Owner:	Westbank
Delegation:	Bruce Haden, DIALOG Kelly McKinnon, PFS Studio Landscape Architects Ian Gillespie, Westbank Reid Shier, Public Art Consultant
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for three development permit applications on three sites following rezoning. The rezoning was approved by Council at a public hearing on October 24, 2013. Mr. O'Sullivan mentioned that the proposal had been to the Panel twice before and had received general support for the heights, form, density and uses. He added that this review was for further comment on the detailed design aspects and the treatment of the public realm. Because of the scope and size of the proposal comments related to the public art, configuration of the Granville Bridge greenway and programming beneath the bridge are not part of this review. Although important to the development, a separate process will take place in terms of how that will be delivered and executed. Mr. O'Sullivan mentioned that the materials for the tower and podiums will be cool-toned metal panel, stainless steel or zinc with warmer metal accent panels on the tower balconies. He also described the tower façade system noting the expression is based on the notion of a repeated open-box balcony form that will carry through the entire project. As well the podium façade system will repeat the pattern but in a slightly different design and will use wood spandrel on the inner facades.

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

- The overall design quality of the proposal and as well as the detailed design as it relates to the building surfaces, material selection and application and the architectural gestures. (Requirement for the rezoning is to maintain the zinc cladding, triple glazing, thermally enhanced slab construction, glazed balustrades, sandstone paving, ipe wood decking and basalt steps).
- Is further design development to the treatment of the public realm along Howe Street advised to achieve the following:
 - To engage active uses along the Howe Street sidewalk; comment on the placement of the skylights in light of this objective.
 - To improve the relationship of the CRUs at the base of the tower to the grade of the sidewalk to enhance visibility and access to light for those retail units.
- Should the triangular podium buildings be splayed further from the edges of the Granville bridge deck to facilitate greater quality of daylight on Granville Street under the bridge?
- Is further design development advised to reduce the depth of the stepped grade transition at sidewalks, i.e. should grade changes in the pedestrian realm be made more gradual by accommodating transition within buildings?

- Do the Pacific Street grade-level entries to the terraced courtyard plazas above offer sufficient identification/announcement to those public spaces? Is further attention to CPTED and safety issues at the interiors of the steps advisable?
- The overall landscape and lighting design as it relates to the public realm: courtyard spaces, rooftop spaces, surface treatments, sidewalk seating, vehicle spaces and access, and under-bridge conditions.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Kelty McKinnon, Landscape Architect, described the plans for the landscaping and mentioned that from the start they wanted to enhance and play up the underside of the bridge. The idea from the public realm point of view is to play up the ground plane with site furnishings, lighting, architecture, public art and a signage strategy. The streetscapes are adhering to the basic guidelines and are adding a double row of street trees along Pacific Street. There is a bikeway that goes down Rolston Street so they will be adding in asphalt pathways. Howe Street is the standard streetscape treatment but they will be adding in street trees. Ms. McKinnon described the paving patterns in the spaces and mentioned that they have created a primary concrete surface with some liner banding of stone and basalt. There is a slope across the site so in order to deal with that they have created terracing spaces for tables and chairs. They have featured the stairs to make a smoother connection with the sidewalk and additional spaces to sit. There are a variety of spaces under the bridge including five retail kiosks and at the base of the building there is a terrace element for seating. Bicycle parking will also be included. The lighting strategy is still being developed but it will be to enhance the overhead structures of the bridge as well as delineating the site furnishings. There are some semi-public courtyards that are predominately wood that will serve the people who work within the buildings but are accessible for the public. There are residential terraces with play area for children and edible landscaping. The dominant feature of the landscaping is the green roof expression.

Reid Shier described the public art strategy. The underside of the bridge has two significant public art works that will be installed. One of the art pieces will be backlit photographic panels filled with imagery produced by students at Emily Carr University. The other piece over Beach Avenue is a large kinetic sculpture, a spinning chandelier based on the work of artist Rodney Graham.

Bruce Haden, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that that there is an important aspect around the public realm which is the two way car movement on Continental Street. He mentioned that one of their concerns was the building edge. They want to have a dramatic variety of buildings facades. As the retailers come on board they will be able to work individually with them to perfect the facades. They aren't sure what they will look like at this point but he added that he thought it was essential for the success of the project. As well, signage and graphics will be important and individual tenants will have the opportunity express their identity. The material strategy for the tower is two-toned as a contrast to the overall of the size and scale of the tower. They have upgraded from zinc to stainless steel as they had some concerns about maintenance. The balcony infills will be copper that will keep its brightness. Mr. Haden said they have looked at the top of tower and are comfortable with the way it terminates. From a sustainability perspective they are still targeting LEED™ Platinum for the tower.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the Howe Street frontage;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the skylights in the Howe Street sidewalk;
 - Design development to improve the ground plane in relation to the tower base on the west side;
 - Consider adding rain protection around the buildings;
 - Design development to improve the identity of the entrances to the courtyards;
 - Design development to improve the connection to the Granville Street bridge;
 - Design development to remove the curb cuts;
 - Consider placing the chandelier elsewhere in the project.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a creative project.

The Panel supported the overall design quality of the proposal and as well as the detailed design as it relates to the building surfaces, material selection and application and the architectural gestures. They thought it was a positive treatment of the bridge head and that the sidewalk under the bridge was much improved. Some Panel members thought the Howe Street frontage could be improved, made more functional, as well as better contribute to the neighbourhood to the west. They felt there could be a café or something that would articulate the street. As well they wanted to see the retaining wall at the tower interface improved. Most of the Panel thought the skylight expression could also be improved.

The Panel thought the feathering of the stepping in the sidewalks at major entries and the manner in which the ground plane interacts with the base of the building didn't offer opportunities for patios and more functional uses.

The Panel supported the material palette and supported change from the zinc cladding to stainless steel. There was some concern with the wood deck as some members thought it may be hard to maintain and slippery in wet weather. The Panel also thought there needed to be rain protection on the buildings but that it could be done discreetly.

The Panel thought the public realm was supportable but was the most challenged because of the connection with the Granville Street Bridge. A couple of Panel members noted that the entrances to the raised courtyard were not well expressed for public access. As well they thought there was an awkward connection to the bridge deck level from these spaces. One Panel member thought the trees could be separated or a paving pattern could be created that would announce the grade level entrances more legibly.

Most of the Panel thought that the curb cuts were problematic and encouraged Engineering Services to consider eliminating them. They wanted to see the ground plane be created as a people place that would as engaging as possible. As well, the Panel supported the 2-way street system proposed by the applicant.

The Panel supported the inclusion of public art in the project but thought inclusion of the chandelier as an art piece was a great idea, they believed that it might be in the wrong place. They wanted to see it to be somewhere more visible or in a location where people could get closer to it and perhaps be able to interact with it.

The Panel agreed that it was important to create a public place under the bridge and to make it a celebratory space. They thought this would be something very different from any other place in the city.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Haden agreed that more work needs to be done on the courtyards. He noted that it is an odd site and not really a pedestrian route. The retail concentration will be mostly on Continental Street. As for weather protection, Mr. Haden thought it would be a mistake to default to the standard condition as they are trying to make a space that is distinctive. As well people will be able to dash under the bridge to stay dry.

3. Address:	2290 Main Street
DE:	DE417545
Description:	To develop a new 9-storey mixed-use building with 89 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture
Owner:	0919675 BC LTD.
Delegation:	Arno Matis, Arno Matis Architecture Chris Phillips, PFS Landscape Architects
Staff:	Tim Potter

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site at Main Street and East 7th Avenue. He described the context for the area noting the low lying commercial buildings to the north of the site. The proposal is under the Mount Pleasant Plan and is a development permit submission after rezoning for a mixed-use (commercial and residential) building.

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

Comments were sought on the proposed Development application in general and in particular as follows:

- On the success of the overall character, expression, and detailing. Are there any areas that may require further design development?
- With respect to treatments of edges and transitions to the sidewalks along Main Street, East 7th Avenue and the lane, comment on the success of the architecture and landscape design in terms of how they meet and defining these public realm areas.
- Comments and feedback on the landscape design of the roof decks and terraces.

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Arno Matis, Architect, described the changes that occurred after the rezoning stage for the proposal. He noted that there were comments at the last review with respect to reducing the building height which the building now reflects. As well there was a desire to increase the setbacks for the townhomes on East 7th Avenue so they have now been pushed back. They also wanted to increase the decks to comply with the guidelines. At the rezoning there was a discussion about making spaces for artists on the lane. These are now townhomes that are double height with a loft bedroom. Regarding solar gain, the building will get a fair bit of shading from #1 Kingsway on the south façade. As well there is a lot of overhang that helps on the western façade. Mr. Matis also noted that the amenity space has been moved to the corner on the second floor.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the retail steps down along Main Street and the paving in the public realm reflects the expression of the building. The ground floor patios are raised up and separated for more privacy. The common area on the roof has garden plots, gathering spaces with a gas fireplace as a small children's play area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider simplification of the patterning;
 - Consider adding greenery to the lane;
 - Consider mitigating solar gain on the facades.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought there was a high level of design.

The Panel thought it was an ambitious approach to the site and location and thought the overall character and expression was successful. They also thought the treatments of the edges along Main Street were well handled. The building's cantilevered form creates some good outdoor space and the units plans are well thought out. A couple of Panel members thought the patterning could be simplified as they were unclear as to whether it was a punch card or tree form expression.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and thought the roof decks were exciting with one Panel member being concerned with how the applicant would handle privacy issues. A couple of Panel members would like to see more greenery on the lane.

The Panel supported the colour and material palette and thought the use of wood added some historical significance to the proposal.

Regarding sustainability it was recommended that the applicant target 40% glazing on the building and that all the facades should respond appropriately to solar gain.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Matis thanked the Panel for their great comments. He said they will look at simplifying the pattern. He added that it speaks to the future of Main Street with a pixel pattern.

4. Address:	2141 East Hastings Street
DE:	DE417510
Description:	To construct a new 4-storey multiple dwelling containing commercial uses (first floor) and a total of 38 dwelling units above (first to fourth floors), providing a total of 33 parking spaces having vehicular access from the lane.
Zoning:	C-2C1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Matrix Architecture
Owner:	Robert Cadez
Delegation:	Paul Lebofsky, Matrix Architecture May Chan Yip, PMB Landscape Architects
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a small site mid-block on East Hastings Street. The block consists of older developments, primarily 1-storey commercial buildings with some older mixed-use buildings. Ms. Linehan described the context for the area noting that the zoning to the north across the lane is RM-3A which permits medium density residential development including low-rise apartment buildings. At present, the sites across the lane consist of older houses and some single lot duplex and smaller multiple unit developments. Under the zoning, lots on this block may be consolidated in the future to provide apartment building development. Ms. Linehan mentioned that the proposal fits within expectations of the C-2C1 zoning in that it is a 4-storey mixed-use building. She added that the applicant is seeking a height relaxation as a result of the site grades. The grade change along East Hastings Street is approximately five feet. The lane is lower than the street with a drop of about eight feet along the west property line for an overall cross from the high point to the SE corner to the low point in the NW corner of thirteen feet. In describing the proposal, Ms. Linehan noted that the rear massing steps generally with the angled setback but there is an encroachment of approximately seven feet at the west elevation. She added that due to the challenges with the site topography, the Director of Planning is able to consider supporting an appeal to the Board of Variance to relax the height envelope. The height is generally compliant along the East Hastings Street frontage and a setback is provided at the fourth storey to assist in articulating the building massing as no setback is required. A sidewalk width of around six feet is also being provided at East Hastings Street as part of a general policy on the part of Planning and Engineering to improve sidewalk width and pedestrian comfort on commercial arterials. This will also allow the provision of patios and outdoor displays for future commercial tenants.

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

- Height relaxation.
- Overall architectural design and expression relative to the Guidelines objectives to "enhance the appearance and character of the street as a shopping area' and provide "a general high quality of design".

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Lebofsky, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the project is meant to be as affordable as possible. He described the architecture and mentioned that the design has a modern, industrial

expression. They tried to create significant outdoor spaces for the units on the lane side. At the top of the building there is a lot of glass to get as much light as possible into the units.

May Chan Yip, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping for the proposal noting that the streetscape along East Hastings Street will be the standard finishing since the neighbourhood is in transition.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the façade on the lane;
 - Consider improving the canopy expression;
 - Consider adding an indoor amenity space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the project would be a nice addition to the neighbourhood.

The Panel supported the height relaxation and thought the façade on East Hastings Street was well handled. They liked the material and colour palette but felt the canopy under the lower decks seemed awkward and that signage needed to be taken into consideration. As well they thought the façade on the lane needed design development as it did not relate to the Hastings Street façade. As well, the lane façade at grade would benefit from a more sensitive treatment of the large expanse of concrete and the lack of screening for elements like the pad mounted transformer and loading dock.

Some Panel members thought there needed to be an indoor amenity space and one Panel member suggested adding skylights in the upper corridor.

The Panel supported the landscaping but thought more could be done along the lane and as well as find a way to improve the streetscape along East Hastings Street.

The Panel commended the applicant for giving prominence to cyclists with the storage room at ground level however one Panel member thought there should be some glazing into the space.

It was noted that although the first and fourth floors have solar shading the third floor did not.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lebofsky thanked the Panel for their insightful comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.