

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 9, 2014

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Walter Francl
Joseph Fry (Item #1 Only)
David Grigg
Jennifer Marshall
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor
Chris Mramor

REGRETS:
Joseph Hruda
Goran Ostojic
Maurice Pez
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 7350 Fraser Street |
| 2. | 2000 Trimble Street (Queen Mary Elementary School) |
| 3. | 510 Seymour Street (formerly 538 West Pender Street) |
| 4. | 188 East 32 nd Avenue |
-

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: | 7350 Fraser Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | The proposal is for a 6-storey residential building with 96 rental units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy. |
| Zoning: | RT-2 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | Cornerstone Architecture |
| Owner: | Archstone Projects |
| Delegation: | Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture
Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Parm Garcha, Archstone Projects |
| Staff: | Grant Miller and Tim Potter |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application running the full block on the east side of Fraser Street between East 57th and East 58th Avenues to allow for the development of 96 unit secured market rental building. Mr. Miller described the context for the area noting that to the north of the site is a small C-1 node and to the east across the lane, the area is zoned RS-1 and is developed with detached houses. The site is well served by transit with north and south bound bus stops within one block. Mr. Miller explained that the rezoning application was being considered under the Rental 100 Policy adopted in May of 2012. Rental 100 supports rezoning for additional height and density to be considered when 100 percent of the residential units will be secured for as market rental for the life of the building. More specifically, the Rental 100 Guidelines support consideration of an RM-4N type development on arterial RT zoned sites. Rental 100 also includes the Housing for Families Policy, which targets 25% of units to have two or more bedrooms and be designed to meet the City's High Density Housing for Families with Children guidelines. The application proposes 20 of the 96 units (21%) have two or more bedrooms.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site has an existing rental building that is approximately 40 years old. A new purpose built rental building under the Rental 100 program ranging from four to five storeys is proposed. Below grade parking is access from the laneway.

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

In addition to any comment on the overall form of development proposed for this rezoning application, the Panel's advice is sought on the following questions:

1. Comments on the success of the massing and site planning for the proposal with respect to height and interface with adjacent sites.
2. Comments on the success and prominence of the entry locations and way-finding for the proposal in terms of how the proposal addresses Fraser Street.

3. Comments on the success of the units located to the southeast of Level P1/Level 1, towards East 58th Avenue and the lane in terms of living accommodation below grade and site planning options for the proposal.
4. Comments on the success of the Landscape Plan.
5. Preliminary advice on materials, expression, and massing refinement for the applicant that could be carried forward in design development through the Development Permit process.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Simon Richards, Architect, further described the architecture for the proposal and mentioned that they were trying to find a vocabulary that was not out of place with the current context but looked to the future development of the area. Along the Fraser Street frontage the articulation is similar to the residential houses with 24 foot bay recesses with a 12 foot gap. All of the units at ground level have a townhouse frontage with gates and patios. Given the slope on the site, there needs to be a core at each end of the building. There are a couple of units that are below grade with one unit that has a large courtyard and three bedrooms. Mr. Richards described the material palette noting the brick and mentioned that they are still working out the colour palette. He added that they are planning to use LEED for Homes - Mid-rise rating system as part of their sustainability strategy.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans and mentioned that they have set up layers for privacy along the ground floor units facing Fraser Street. There is an amenity space on the roof with some garden space.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the north and south facades;
 - Design development to improve the livability of the below grade units;
 - Remove entrance off Fraser Street;
 - Consider lightening up the colour palette;
 - Design development to improve the southeast corner patio;
 - Consider moving the transformer to another location;
 - Consider adding a ground floor amenity space;
 - Considering adding trees along Fraser Street and the lane.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a handsome building.

The Panel supported the height, density and massing and thought the building was sympathetic to the neighbourhood but thought the north and south facades were not well resolved in terms of wayfinding and suggested making the entries a bit more prominent. They noted that it was a long building and that the expression felt confused and perhaps should be divided into two buildings or articulated further to break down the length. They liked the brick returns on the pull outs but they seemed to have little significance when looking directly at the building; there was little distinction between a horizontal or vertical emphasis.

Panel members were concerned with the livability in some of the units especially the one below grade. As well they thought there didn't need to be an entrance off Fraser Street as it would just add to security issues and complicate the circulation in the building.

The Panel supported the material palette but thought the colour palette could be lighted up a bit.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but thought the southeast corner patios were a bit problematic with one Panel member suggesting the addition of a retaining wall. The Panel thought the roof garden was nicely handled. One Panel member noted that the location of the transformer was problematic and should be on the northeast corner away from where people will want to sit outside. Another Panel member wondered why there wasn't a ground level outdoor amenity space. As well it was suggested that trees could be added to Fraser Street and the lane.

One Panel member thought that having the building's address on Fraser Street might be confusing for emergency situations when the entries were in fact off the side streets.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Richards said he thought the Panel comments were fair and said he didn't like the basement suites either.

2. Address:	2000 Trimble Street (Queen Mary Elementary School)
DE:	417459
Description:	To construct a new 2-storey addition while retaining and seismically upgrading the existing heritage "B" building.
Zoning:	RS-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Delegation:	Peter Lang, IBI/HB Architects Anita Leonoff, IBI/HB Architects Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architects Raymond Afan, Vancouver School Board
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-6)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a school bounded by West 4th Avenue, West 6th Avenue, Trimble Park and Trimble Street. The site is mostly surrounded by single family RS-1 zoning which is a typical condition of a school in a residential district. Currently on site is an L-shaped assembly of a 1914 red brick 3-storey building that is attached to a 1955 gym building. As well there is a 1966 building connected to a 3-storey 1926 heritage building on West 6th Avenue.

The proposal is for the construction of a new 2-storey addition while retaining and seismically upgrading the existing Heritage B School as part of the Vancouver School Board's seismic upgrade program. The landscaped forecourt and the red brick building and heritage resources will be retained. The 3-storey existing building retains classroom use but will connect directly to the other school areas via a glazed link to the new addition. The glazed link will differentiate the new and old parts of the school with the use of massing and materials. The main entry has level access to the playing fields while the single storey multipurpose room links to the taller volume of the gym.

With the new addition and the retention of the heritage buildings and landscape there will be an improvement to the internal and external accessibility and increasing the play area. Mr. King described the material palette which will be mostly brick with colour accents in the window systems. The expression has a more industrial aesthetic with extensive use of a vertical corrugated metal cladding and accents in a lighter horizontal siding. Drop-off is anticipated along Trimble Street including the main entry to the school. Staff parking will be retained along West 6th Avenue.

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

General commentary is sought from the Panel on the overall success of architectural and landscape design proposal, and particular advice as it relates to:

- The material expression of the east elevation.
- Accessibility concerns from West 6th Avenue.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Peter Lang, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned the onsite developed area of the project has always been hardscape. There is a park and the single family neighbourhood which contains a lot of greenery. The playing fields are well used so they will be maintained. This proposal was

subject an intensive public consultation process which determined everything from the form of development, the budgeting and the heritage resources. Part of the process looked at several options for the site which included keeping the heritage buildings with a new addition. They have consolidated all of the educational facilities into one area, aligned all the floors and relocated the elevator. This made for a better connectivity between the spaces. They wanted to make a statement with the main entrance so that it was visible from all approaches to the school. Mr. Lang described the material palette and noted that the new building needed to not mimic architecturally the heritage building that was being retained. As well they will be upgrading West 6th Avenue and formalizing the parking.

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there will be a hard surface forecourt with basketball standards, places for bicycles and a place for children to be active. Around the edges of the building they will replant after construction and they are developing courtyards and outdoor learning spaces adjacent to the library and the multiple use room. They have also built some stone amphitheaters and will be improving the plantings at the retaining walls. They are planning a space that offers a learning opportunity for the children with growing vegetables as well as a butterfly garden. The oak trees will be retained at the entrance however some diseased trees will be removed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the expression of the new addition to better respect the heritage;
 - Design development to improve the entrance to the school;
 - Improve the accessibility from West 6th Avenue as well as handicap access;
 - Consider using more colour to liven the expression and reconsider the industrial aesthetic;
 - Consider using the roof as an outdoor activity space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they thought the expression of the new addition did not respect the heritage aspects of the site, neither as a complementary or a contrasting addition.

The Panel acknowledged that the project had gone through a lot of deliberation with the neighbourhood and agreed that the plan capitalized on the site. However they also thought the new addition read as a number of small components that badly connected to one another. They felt there was a disconnect between the heritage buildings and the new addition. One Panel member noted that they didn't want to have the new building look like a heritage building but felt it could express the spirit of the heritage through the use of colour or materials while another Panel member suggested using a west coast expression as opposed to an industrial expression.

The Panel also wanted to see a more prominent entrance to the school and felt that the accessibility from West 6th Avenue could be improved. They also wanted to see handicap access from the playing fields to the school.

The Panel supported some of the material palette and liked the use of brick as a primary element but some Panel members thought the use of metal siding didn't reflect the heritage of the site. One Panel members suggested using wood as a material to liven and soften the expression. Another Panel member noted that the when viewed from a distance, the east façade's colour was minimized.

Some Panel members thought the views to the north should be better considered in the design which would help improve the east elevation's expression.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel members cautioning against using industrial materials. One Panel member suggested using the roof for some activity space.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lang said that parking off West 6th Avenue is not only for the school (20 spaces) but for the park, lawn bowling and daycare. Disability access is for those facilities as well. He said they would take all the comments into consideration and try to address as many as possible. He also mentioned that the Vancouver School Board is concerned with having access to the roof. Mr. Lang said they are trying to balance the amount of expensive materials against economical materials but use them in an elegant way. As well they are trying to use colour within a residential context so they don't want something too strong that won't fit the neighbourhood. There is a 16 foot high hedge that is not on the school's property on the north property line so as a result they are trying to take advantage to the views to the north from the second and third levels.

-
3. Address: 510 Seymour Street (formerly 538 West Pender Street)
DE: 417745
Description: To construct a new 10-storey office building.
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Complete
Review: First
Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Owner: Serracan Properties
Delegation: Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Peter Odegaard, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Peter Kruek, Durante Kruek Landscape Architects
Edward Archibald, Serracan Properties
Staff: Ann McLean
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a corner site in the downtown. This area of the downtown permits office/commercial use and requires continuous ground floor retail-commercial and does not permit residential uses. She noted that a 10% transfer of Heritage density is also permissible. Ms. McLean described the context for the area and noted that the properties around the site are zoned DD with the exception of the 29-storey mixed-use building zoned CD-1 across the street. The guidelines for the “central core” area of the DD zone, requests a “strong, elegant Downtown focus with a sympathetic pedestrian environment”. The adjacent buildings have a variety of heights and uses including parkades.

The proposal is a 10-storey building with parking provided underground and accessed by two car elevators from the lane. The entry to the offices is provided off Seymour Street and entries to the retail/commercial units at grade are from both Seymour and Pender Streets. Weather protection is provided around the building and an amenity space is proposed at the top level.

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

1. Discretionary Earnings: Has this project earned the discretionary density 7.0 FSR (plus an additional 10% heritage density transfer) for a total of 7.7 FSR?
2. Architectural Expression: Are the proposed materials, detailing and expression suitable to each of the orientations?
3. Has the public realm interface provided a “sympathetic” environment for the pedestrian?

Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Mark Whitehead, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site is close to transit making it suitable for office space. It is a boutique office building with a significant amount of amenity space on the roof. The building is in proportion to some of the older buildings in the neighbourhood. The site grade precludes a ramp into the parking so two parking elevators have been introduced at the lane. Mr. Whitehead described the architecture noting the cast in place concrete and accented by a wood trellis.

Peter Kruek, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the sidewalk is not changing but in the setback areas they are introducing a higher quality of material other than the city standard. He added that a lot of that space will be used for

outdoor use for the retail. The upper deck is a bit of a party room as there is an outdoor kitchen space, fireplace and gathering area as well as planters.

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 thought it was well done.

The Panel supported the additional density and thought the massing was appropriate for this site. They liked the architectural expression with the set in windows and the use of faux wood. As well they liked the colour accent in the window recesses and thought the basket weave of the concrete on the lane façade was appropriate. However, a couple of Panel members thought the party wall could have a stronger expression.

One Panel member suggested the applicant flip the insets around the windows to have them better address Seymour Street and their solar exposure. Another Panel member wanted to see a return of the glass in the retail around to the lane.

The Panel thought the applicant had done a good job of dealing the edges in the public realm. As well they liked the outdoor amenity space on the roof.

Regarding the sustainability strategy it was suggested that the applicant provide extra shading on the west side of the building using a passive component to the wall system.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Whitehead mentioned that the northwest face doesn't get a lot of sun as the rest of the city shadows the site. He added that he thought the Panel had some good comments and would consider how the insets address Seymour Street.

4. Address:	188 East 32 nd Avenue
DE:	417626
Description:	To construct a 4-storey mixed-use building containing retail shell (first floor) and residential dwelling units (second to fourth floors) containing a total of 18 dwelling units all over one level of underground parking providing a total of 18 parking spaces having vehicular access from the lane.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Matrix Architecture and Planning
Owner:	The Atrey Group
Delegation:	Paul Lebofsky, Matrix Architecture Robert Cadee, The Airey Group
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application located at the southwest corner of Main Street and East 32nd Avenue. She described the context for the area noting the single family zone across the lane. The proposal is for a 4-storey mixed-use building with commercial at the ground floor and three levels of residential above with a total of 18 units including one and two bedroom units and studios. Ms. Linehan mentioned that the proposal fits generally within the expectations of the C-2 District Schedule and Design Guidelines.

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

1. Overall design and architectural expression in light of the conditional density.
2. Treatment of the enclosed balconies.
3. Treatment of pedestrian weather protection.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Lebofsky, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the building was split into box like masses. The proposed building design provides a variety of unit types and every unit comes with deck space or an enclosed balcony. The design provides continuous retail along Main Street and around the corner to East 32nd Avenue. Commercial parking will be located at grade off the lane.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider improving the building's entrance expression;
 - Consider adding windows to the blank wall;
 - Consider improving the material palette, providing greater clarity of material use;
 - Design development to improve the lane expression.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design of the building worked well.

The Panel thought the proposal had a nicely resolved scheme and that the retail and residential were expressed simply. However a couple of Panel members thought the corner needed to be more clearly activated. It was an opportunity to capitalize of views and aspect that was not taken. The Panel had a mixed reaction to adding weather protection to

the building with some thinking it would ruin the architecture while other thought it was necessary given our weather. As well a number of Panel members thought the building entrance could be better articulated.

The Panel thought the enclosed balconies fit the scale of the building however one Panel member recommended organizing the openings for the enclosed balconies and aligning the sills. Several Panel members thought adding windows could improve the blank wall along with some vertical elements.

Some Panel members felt the material palette could be improved. They noted that the mix of stone veneer and cedar didn't work. Greater clarity could improve the architectural reading of the building mass.

Some Panel members thought the lane expression could be improved as it was made up of mostly doors and gates. Panel members also felt the expression of the upper portion of the building on the lane should have the same rigour and attention as the street facades. The Panel supported the landscape plans but one Panel member though East 32nd Avenue could be improved with the introduction of granite paving or metal surrounds.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.