

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 21, 2014

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Walter Francl
Joseph Fry
Joseph Hruda
Jennifer Marshall
Arno Matis (Left after 2nd Item)
Phil Mondor
Chris Mramor

REGRETS:
Greg Bellerby
David Grigg
Goran Ostojic
Maurice Pez
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 2768 Kingsway |
| 2. | 460 West 41 st Avenue |
| 3. | 2268 Bayswater (Gordon Elementary School) |
| 4. | 1838 Renfrew Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a Business Meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address: | 2768 Kingsway |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 38 secured market rental units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured market Rental Housing Policy and the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan. |
| Zoning: | C-2 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | Vladimir Cervenka Architect |
| Owner: | Vittori Development Ltd. |
| Delegation: | Vladimir Cervenka, Vladimir Cervenka Architect |
| Staff: | Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng |

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-7)

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site on the southeast corner of Kingsway and Earles Street. The site is the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre where the envisioned building topology for Kingsway is eight to ten storeys mixed-use buildings with retail at grade with residential or office above with lower-scaled podiums. Ms. Zeng mentioned that since the proposal came in under the Rental 100 Policy, it is allowed to have an increase in density that otherwise would not be allowed under the present zoning. The building is setback on the top floor which is recommended in the policy.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, described the context for the area and mentioned that they are looking at the proposal through two different policies. The Rental 100 Policy allows for any C-2 site to have a building up to 6-storeys but still taking into account the urban design and the context of the area. In C-2, there are certain setbacks that are carved out of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th stories in order to pay respect to the single family homes at the rear of the site. However in Norquay, the properties located across the lane anticipate a future rezoning for a 4-storey apartment building and as a result staff have required different setbacks. For the upper storeys, the setbacks are 20 feet for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and then for the 4th, 5th and 6th an extra additional 10 feet.

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

Comments on the overall development proposal with respect to:

- The proposed cladding materials;
- The proposed street-facing elevations;
- The proposed interface with existing development as well as future development anticipated under the Norquay Plan.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Vladimir Cervenka, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there were other architects involved previously. He said they tried to use the corner as a feature and to have the unit layouts be a little more unique. There are enclosed balconies on the Kingsway façade and the top has been set back eight

feet. The commercial wraps the corner with a potential for a café. He described the architecture and noted the terraces on the south façade and the Juliette balconies on the west facade. He also described the material palette noting the stone base. The residential entry is on Earles Street.

Mr. Cervenka took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the building's expression and reduce the overall scale;
 - Consider adding an amenity space for the residents;
 - Design development to improve the unit layouts;
 - Improve the proposed material palette;
 - Consider changing the colour palette;
 - Improvement to the sustainability strategy.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel supported the height and density however they thought the building's expression needed to be improved. They noted that the expression of each façade was different and the applicant needed to figure out which expression to use as well as figuring out the character of the building and how it fits into its context. Another Panel member thought that balconies would help the building's expression on the Kingsway elevation. A couple of Panel members mentioned that the Earles Street façade had a more commercial expression which would be better on the Kingsway face. The Panel had a couple of suggestions regarding reducing the scale. They thought the 6th floor should have a step or there could be 6-storeys on Kingsway and 4-storey on Earles Street to better integrate into the neighbourhood.

The Panel noted that the applicant's submission to the Panel was inadequate and incomplete. The material did not contain the policy context, the physical context and the map of the surrounding area was inadequate. Also there wasn't anything about the neighbourhood centre plan and made it difficult to understand what was contemplated with the changes in the zoning.

The Panel thought the 25 foot sidewalk width was problematic unless all of Kingsway was going to be widened. They wanted to see some sort of amenity space in the building and also had some concerns regarding the livability of the units. One Panel member noted that having a den accessed from the bedroom doesn't make it a den but an alcove to the bedroom.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the quality of the material being proposed and thought that hardy panel wasn't appropriate on a 6-storey building and would require a lot of maintenance over the years. As well they did not support the colour palette and thought that white above the dark brick base was not a good choice. One Panel member mentioned that an intermediate colour would help the streetwall expression to separate from the base.

The Panel had some concerns with the landscaping plans and thought Kingsway could have a second row of trees. They liked the use of trees on the lane but they needed to be on private property. They also thought the roof could be used as an amenity space or a more functional use.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, the Panel noted that there was no LEED™ checklist so it was impossible to understand how the building attempts to meet the green

requirements. As well there is no real expression of passive design on the building and the west façade has a lot of glazing and no overhangs that would be able to reduce solar gain.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cervenka thanked the Panel for their interesting comments. He noted that they were boards available that described the context for the area. He said he was struggling with the architectural volume and that they were not able to set back the fourth floor as they need the space to make the building work as a rental. He added that he would see what he could do about improving the material. Mr. Cervenka said the unit sizes were guided by the Rental 100 Policy.

2. Address:	460 West 41 st Avenue
DE:	417731
Description:	To construct a 6-storey and a 2-storey residential building containing 72 units all over one level of underground parking with vehicle access from the lane.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Development
Review:	Second (first as development application)
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Qualex - Landmark Residences
Delegation:	Amela Brudar, GBL Architects Andrew Emmerson, GBL Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-3)

- Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 6-storey building with 45 units and seven 2-storey townhouses on the lane. He described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the east and to the west, Cambie Street. He added that lots to the east of Cambie Street can be considered up to 6-storeys. Above 4-storeys, the upper floors should be stepped back from West 41st Avenue. The building should provide front doors onto the street as well as activating the lane by providing active uses or townhouses. Public realm features should be included such as street trees and landscape setbacks. Mr. Black mentioned that the Cambie Corridor Policy advises buildings should step back at the rear, reducing the scale of the building towards the lane and should minimize the amount of shadow cast onto adjacent properties. The proposal includes a 26 foot wide courtyard and the townhouses on the lane include patios.

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

Comments on the landscape and architecture design in general and in particular:

- Has the development permit application addressed the concerns previously noted by the Panel, including the revised south façade?
- Does the Panel support the exterior expression and the treatment to the different open spaces?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Andrew Emmerson, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that it is was a logical starting point to have the main entry point on the northwest corner. They wanted an open and clearly defined glazed lobby in the main building and they wanted to create a townhouse feel even though these are single level units. The units are typical in terms of stacking but on the 5th and 6th floor there is a sizeable setback along West 41st Avenue. Mr. Emmerson mentioned that they tried to maximize daylighting and added overhangs to mitigate solar gain. There are storage rooms for most of the units as well as open and enclosed balconies. They thought the courtyard in the middle was a little compressed so they have gone with linear through units on the back with patios. Mr. Emmerson described the material palette noting the use of glazed brick on West 41st Avenue that transitions into cementitious paneling at the back.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the West 41st Avenue frontage has outdoor patios with hedges and gates. There is also some bike storage and the main entrance to the building. There are patios at ground level for the units facing the courtyard. On the townhouse edge there is an outdoor amenity space with

a small children's play space opposite in the courtyard. There is a hedge buffer around the children's play for separation from the ground floor units. Along the rear is a strip of planting that separates the outdoor patio spaces from the lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the courtyard layout;
 - Design development to restore the previous grade levels and pedestrian interface;
 - Consider adding amenity space on the roof.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it had generally improved since the last review, although a number of elements such as colour and articulation on the north, and the grade levels were better before. The Panel felt that solar control was less convincing now (when compared to the previous submission), and the north overhang was dark and not functional. The Panel reiterated that they believed there was not enough density on the site, especially with the recent approval of the Oakridge rezoning and its associated density.

The Panel thought the south elevation of the main building had been improved. They liked the windows in the stair well but felt they were in uncomfortable locations and did not relate to the movement within. The Panel thought the grade change at the lobby didn't work very well, with suite entries too low onto 41st Avenue behind heavy concrete planters. Most members thought the previous step up from the street to the main floor and a lower courtyard was a better solution. Some Panel members thought the south elevation on the main block could have benefited from a setback at the 6th floor. Some members felt that the stair cores had been better articulated before with the raised parapet. They also thought the lack of roof access was a missed opportunity. Several Panel members complimented the interior layout of the units and thought they made for good furniture placement.

Some members Panel supported the material and colour palette while others preferred the colour palette in the rezoning presentation as they thought the current selection was too dark. One Panel member suggested adding white walls on the north facade to reflect sunlight into the courtyard.

The Panel liked the lane homes and thought they improved the transition to the neighbourhood in general, although they felt the lane wall that lifts the landscaping up was not a great amenity. Some members were concerned with the usability of the four foot deck at the rear and suggested using the space to benefit the courtyard instead.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans but thought the amenity space was too small and that the children's play area was jammed into the space. As well they noted that there wasn't any separation or buffer that would reduce the noise to the neighbours. They wanted to see a couple of more feet in width in the courtyard as they thought 26 feet was just barely enough room. A couple of Panel members suggested removing the last townhouse to make more space in the courtyard. One Panel member suggested landscaping on the east property line to improve the outlook from the neighbours.

Regarding the sustainability strategy some Panel members were concerned with the limited solar control features.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Emmerson thanked the Panel for their comments and said they would take them into consideration.

3. Address:	2268 Bayswater Street (Gordon Elementary School)
DE:	417769
Description:	to construct a new elementary school on this site.
Zoning:	RS-1
Application Status:	Development
Review:	First
Architect:	DA Architects + Planners
Owner:	Vancouver School Board
Delegation:	Mark Ehman, DA Architects + Planners Kristina Zaute, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Jay Hiscox, Vancouver School Board
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a new elementary school on this site. He mentioned that West 7th Avenue terminates against the site where there is currently a narrow service lane. As part of the development the City is requiring a certain amount of dedication to expand the lane and it has been agreed that the staff parking can be located off the lane. Drop off and pickup for the students will happen on the surrounding streets. Mr. Cheng described the proposed material noting the brick base around the building. Mr. Cheng added that the main entrances might not be as legible as they could be and asked for comments.

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

Comments on the overall development proposal with respect to:

- The proposed cladding materials;
- The proposed elevations;
- The proposed visual legibility of the main entrances.

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Ehman, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there is an existing school on the site. The context is largely single family residential houses. The existing condition on site is a 2 ½ storey school and a little out building that is currently used as a pre-school. The original building dates to 1912 and in 1922 the school was extended and the gymnasium was added. In the 1960's there was a further addition to the school. The building is in poor condition and doesn't fulfil VSB's educational objectives and has suffered a loss of heritage character due to the many changes. Mr. Ehman said they went through a feasibility study and the conclusion was to replace the school and to remove the pre-school building. The proposal is to locate a new building as close to Bayswater Street and West 6th Avenue as possible. The decision was to make it a 3-storey school due to the small size of the site. The main entrance will be off Bayswater Street as it has a greater capacity for drop off. The school is split into two parts with the class room block (3-storey component) and the more common areas. Some of the rooms will be used by the community on the off hours. There are two vertical stairs and an elevator to get the students to the 2nd and 3rd floors. Mr. Ehman mentioned that the VSB doesn't fund covered outdoor play areas but they managed to move the ground floor back in order to accommodate two modest covered areas on the south side facing the play area. He described the architecture and mentioned that they wanted to create an open and secure learning environment.

Jay Hiscox, VSB, described the Legacy Program and mentioned that it is a difficult exercise when dealing with heritage building. They engaged in an exercise to find some meaningful

strategies and they will be offering a series of workshops with the neighbours and the students.

Kristina Zaute, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned they will retain the ball field but will be make it a bit smaller. The existing trees will remain and they plan to use granite to build up steps around the main doors from existing materials. They are also planning a walking/running circuit around the site and some lighting around the walkways and parking area. Also being added there are clusters of playgrounds with new basketball hoops, bicycle parking, sand play area and putting in steps for an outdoor theatre or other activities.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider adding more emphasis on the entries, perhaps with the building massing;
 - Consider adding a covered play area.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the legacy heritage program was commendable.

The Panel liked the way the building was massed on the site and thought the cladding materials were appropriate. Regarding the entry canopies, some of the Panel thought there needed to be more emphasis addressing entry and arrival and also suggested adding skylights that repeat down the corridor. They thought the main block made the project most successful and thought the building was massed well with the community.

The Panel supported the colour palette but noted that it was important to consider the materials to ensure the long term longevity of the building. One Panel member thought there might be too much of the taupe range and thought the older building was a little more cheerful. Another Panel member wanted to see the horizontal character of the building finding its way into the brick.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with some Panel members suggesting that covered exterior play was important. As well they wanted to see would like to see a better integration between the interior and exterior spaces. One Panel member thought multi-purpose room would be more successful with an outdoor room adjacent. Another Panel member thought there could be some green spaces in the staff parking area as well as more outdoor seating on the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ehman thanked the panel for their constructive comments.

4. Address:	1838 Renfrew Street
DE:	417682
Description:	To construct a 4-storey mixed use building consisting of 48 residential units and commercial units over two levels of underground parking on this existing site.
Zoning:	C-2C1
Application Status:	Development
Review:	First
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	Renfrew 2 Homes Ltd.
Delegation:	Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Dal Thind, Renfrew 2 Homes Ltd.
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-5)

- Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located in a small pocket of C-2C1 zoning at Renfrew Street and East 2nd Avenue. There is a significant grade change on the site from the front to the back with the lane being higher than the street. Ms. Linehan described the context for the area noting the adjacent 5-storey community care facility for seniors. The proposal is for a mixed-use building with commercial at grade including residential units at the lane with 3-storeys of residential above arranged around a central courtyard. She mentioned that staff are seeking a wider sidewalk along Renfrew Street to provide a 20 foot sidewalk width. Due to the lane grades the parkade entry is at the low point close to the lane entry. The ramp has an L-shaped configuration which bisects the commercial floor level. Ms. Linehan mentioned that there is a kind of bridging element at the courtyard containing the stair well and two bedrooms for the adjacent units per floor. She also mentioned that the applicant is seeking a height relaxation.

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

- Height relaxation;
- Configuration of the ground floor and quality of residential units at the lane;
- Design of the courtyard including the impact of the bridging element;
- Overall design and material treatment.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Scott Kennedy, Applicant, further described the proposal and mentioned that since it was a difficult site with a high lane they sought a height relaxation in order to bring the building up a bit. He added that they are asking to match the parapet height along the street. The program has mostly 2-bedroom units around a courtyard design in order to provide daylight to as many bedrooms possible. He said they wanted to make small, affordable multi-bedroom units. Mr. Kennedy added that in order to get the loading bay to work on the lane they needed to get it at the lowest point. As well the entry is on the corner with a depressed courtyard to get more light into the area.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and mentioned that the courtyard is really a light well and will have some shade tolerant plantings. As well there are some vines to layer the space.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the spatial quality of the courtyard;
 - Design development to improve the loading bay;
 - Consider adding some rain cover over the top floor walkway;
 - Design development to improve the entry.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought it needed some design development.

The Panel supported the height relaxation and thought the project was well suited to the scale of the neighbourhood. The Panel thought the courtyard was very constrained and needed more light. A couple of Panel members suggested a relaxation on the lane to improve the courtyard (and match the adjacent building's setback). The panel also thought it would be beneficial to make the bridges more transparent. One Panel member suggested giving up the balconies at the back to add more room in the courtyard. The Panel supported the material and colour palette.

Although the Panel supported the landscaping they thought the sidewalk should meet the building edge and that the loading bay needed some improvement as it has an abrupt street edge and poor daylighting. Some Panel members thought there should be rain cover on the top floor of the walkway.

One Panel member suggested adding another commercial entry off East 2nd Avenue to help open up the corner and activate the area. Some Panel members thought the main entry seemed forced into the corner and rather understated. The Panel wanted to see the entrance more pronounced and as well to continue the canopy.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Kennedy said he appreciated the Panel's comments. He said they looked at putting the entry in other places but couldn't make it work. There is a canopy over the entrance; it was just broken off on the model. He added that he would love to widen the courtyard to 25 feet and would look at how to make that work.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.