

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** September 10, 2014  
**TIME:** 4.00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall  
**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Ryan Bragg (Chair)  
Joseph Fry (Excused Item #4)  
David Grigg  
Jennifer Marshall  
Phil Mondor  
Chris Mramor  
Goran Ostojic  
Matthew Soules (Items 4 & 5 only)

**REGRETS:**  
Greg Bellerby  
Walter Francl  
Joseph Hruda  
Arno Matis  
Maurice Pez

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                                   |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | 408-488 West King Edward Avenue   |
| 2. | 5030-5080 Quebec Street           |
| 3. | 5037-5087 Main Street             |
| 4. | 137 Keefer Street                 |
| 5. | 1408 East 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue |

**BUSINESS MEETING**

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

1. Address: 408-488 West King Edward Avenue  
 DE: N/A  
 Description: To develop a building with six and four storey portions at the street, and two town houses on the lane. The proposal is to create 135 units (both independent and assisted living) as well as 32 community care units (licensed complex care).  
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: NORR Architects Planners  
 Owner: Care Pacific  
 Delegation: Glenn Burwell, NORR Architects Planners  
 Carmen Kubrak, NORR Architects Planners  
 Don Ho, Care Pacific  
 Juan Monterrosa, MMM Group  
 Staff: Grant Miller and Sailen Black

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

- **Introduction:** Grant Miller, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application in the Cambie Corridor to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow a 135 unit seniors housing development providing a range of care. The development would consist of one 6-storey and two 4-storey elements including 47 strata independent and assisted living units, 56 rental independent and assisted living units and 32 community care units (licensed complex care). The site falls within the Queen Elizabeth area of the Cambie Corridor Plan. The plan supports residential buildings up to 4-storeys in height with consideration for 6-storeys close to Cambie Street and a suggested density range of approximately 1.25 to 1.75 FSR. While the Cambie Corridor Plan does not provide specific direction regarding the development of Seniors Housing, City wide policies support the integration of both Senior Supportive and Assisted Housing and Complex Residential Care (Community Care Class - B) throughout all residential areas subject to guidelines pertaining to the location (near arterials and transit), form (responding to prevailing heights and densities) and mitigation of circulation and access impacts.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal and noted that it covers eight lots from the lane to Yukon Street with a 464 foot frontage. Mr. Black described the context for the area noting the Canada Line Station on Cambie Street and the existing detached single family housing surrounding the site. He also described the Cambie Corridor Plan as it relates to the site noting that there is consideration for up to 6-storeys for buildings in close proximity to Cambie Street. As well buildings will include front doors onto the street and will seek to activate and enhance the adjacent lane by providing townhouses or active uses at the rear. The Built Form Guidelines suggest buildings should be limited in length and that there should be setbacks from the street in residential areas. As well the site falls under the Community Care Facility - Class B and Group Residence Guidelines which expects new developments to respond to the existing context. The proposal is for 154 beds in 135 units with townhouses on the lane. There are three connector locations; a 2-storey connector between the west buildings with program space at grade and a 1-storey

at-grade connector on the east for circulation. As well there are amenity spaces proposed at grade and below grade with depressed courtyards off the lane.

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

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

1. Does the Panel support the proposed density (2.27 FSR), height (6-storey) and setbacks (4 to 12 feet)?
2. Does the Panel support the proposed width of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> storeys?
3. Can the Panel comment on the performance of the different amenity and service spaces that are proposed above and below grade, considering the implications for livability and the form of the development?
4. Can the Panel comment on the lane interface, including the uses, activities and massing proposed along this edge?

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Glenn Burwell, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the project goes to the third level of complex care for seniors. The program is for 103 suites of different sizes; some are for rent and some are for sale and as well 32 care rooms will have 24 hour nursing. Along with suites there is a large requirement for amenity and service space. The amenity space includes dining areas, lounges, games areas, hobby rooms as well as a theatre and swimming pool. In addition there are service requirements that include a commercial kitchen, laundry facility and administrative offices and staff facilities. Mr. Burwell described the architecture and noted that the building steps back at the 4<sup>th</sup> floor eight feet all the way around. He added that the building functionally needs to be one building but since the Guidelines require three buildings they have added connections between buildings.

Carmen Kubrak, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they wanted to create both public and private spaces. They have layered the landscaping and allowed for large boulevard trees along West King Edward Avenue but also trees within the private spaces. There is a large public plaza with a large water feature with a seating area. The area between the two buildings allows for pedestrians to walk in a park-like setting. There is a small amenity area on the second floor for the extended care and will be used mostly by visitors in the daytime. The roof area in the middle building will have a barbeque area, urban gardens and social gathering spaces.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to create a more pedestrian oriented design on the streets, especially King Edward;
  - Design development to the townhouses and the main entrance on the lane;
  - Design development to simplify the variety of forms, especially roof elements;
  - Consider providing more common open space or landscaping at the lane;
  - Link elements must be transparent and read as common space;
  - Design development to improve the landscaping on the lane;
  - Further development of residential character including material choices;
  - Consider mechanical requirements as they may affect the exterior design;
  - Consider opening up the spaces between the buildings.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal as well as the use.

The Panel supported the density, height and setbacks but thought the massing could be improved especially on the townhouses which they thought was troubling in terms of how they respond to the lane. One Panel member noted that this was their front door and should be better expressed. The Panel agreed that the centre block had the most successful frontage and wanted to see this as a precedent for the rest of the lane.

The Panel felt the King Edward elevation was ceremonial in that the rear was the truly functional elevation and that design development to increase the functionality and legibility was required.

The Panel wanted to see the bridge elements between the blocks be as transparent as possible and that the interior spaces should be as legible as possible in the form of the building. They also mentioned that the amenity and services spaces were well done. However they thought there were some issues with security as well as wayfinding and access to the HandyDART that need to be addressed.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and thought the ground level condition was well handled to create a plinth and announce the front entrance. However, they wanted to see some improvements on the lane as there was a lack of cohesiveness. As well they wanted to see a strong pedestrian oriented space along the lane frontage. One Panel member noted that it should be mews like and residential with additionally landscaping such as the addition of trees.

Another Panel member was concerned with the large tree masses in terms of root intrusion on West King Edward Avenue and whether or not they would survive in such a narrow space. As well a couple of Panel members wanted to see the spaces between the buildings opened up more and that an outdoor space could be added off the dining room. As well there was some concern regarding the sunken area off the lane and they wanted to see it moved up to grade to make it more useable.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, it was noted that the window wall ratio worked but the energy sources and performance could be improved.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Burwell thanked the Panel for their good commentary.

2. Address:	5030-5080 Quebec Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 5-storey residential building, including a total of 38 units. The proposal is being considered under the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design
Owner:	Boffo Properties
Delegation:	Craig Taylor, Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design Benjamin Beckwith, Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Josh Anderson, Boffo Properties
Staff:	Graham Winterbottom and Pat St. Michel

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Planner with the Vancouver South Division introduced the proposal for a site at East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue fronting onto Quebec Street. The area is predominately single family lots along the street with rental apartments. The proposal is being considered under the context of the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy which covers the area from East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue to East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue as well as Main to Quebec Streets. The planning work for the adjacent area was initiated by the Riley Park South Cambie Vision that was approved by Council in 2005. The Vision stated that if policy was developed for the larger Little Mountain site, then the adjacent area should also be considered for zoning changes. Over the course of two years, staff worked closely with the community to develop the Little Mountain Policy Statement as well as the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy. The policy for the larger site was approved by Council in June 2012 and generally recommends heights across the site of 6-8 storeys with opportunities at the centre of the site for 10 and 12 storey buildings. Heights immediately next to the adjacent area go from 4-6 storeys along the Quebec Street land to 4-8 storeys south of the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue lane. Mr. Winterbottom noted that the Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy was approved by Council in February 2013 and contains several principles to guide the redevelopment of the area. This includes a transition in scale and height, diverse and innovative housing types including rowhouse design. As well the Policy specifies several key connections which align with the connections on the larger Little Mountain site to provide permeability through to Queen Elizabeth Park.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that to the south will be the community hub on the main Little Mountain site. It will be a village square organized around a grove of retained trees. The proposal will have 5-storeys along Quebec Street with the upper level stepped back creating upper level decks with sheltering roofs. The construction consists of two levels of concrete with three levels of wood-frame above. There are double height townhouse-like units planned on the lower two levels with gardens, balconies, covered outdoor spaces that address both the street and the lane. The mid-storey units have generous balconies and upper level units have terraces and private decks on the roof top. The building has southern exposure along East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue which is an important future pedestrian connection through to Queen Elizabeth Park. A second row of trees is planned along the edge between the sidewalk and the building as well as a hedge for privacy and a series of public art. The front and rear elevations of the units are setback substantially in order to create covered patio areas at grade. The proposal contains 41 underground parking spaces.

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

- Does the Panel support the proposed massing, density and height?
- Does the Panel support the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage and in particular the proposed exit solution in relation to the streetscape?

Mr. Winterbottom and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Craig Taylor, Architect, further described the proposal with a power point presentation and mentioned that the existing site had primarily 1940s and 1950s single family and some multi-family units. The site is adjacent to the future Little Mountain development and to Queen Elizabeth Park. They have been trying to incorporate the changing neighbourhood into the design solution. They want to maintain a high level of design quality and materiality and as well uphold the commitment to environmental design. The proposal is being built under LEED™ Gold with one of their primary goals that has driven the design decisions was to encourage livability as associated to family and family oriented units. There will be 38 units as well as 1 and 1.5 parking stalls to the units which is in excess of the requirements. Mr. Taylor described how the form and the massing of the building was developed and as well the architecture. They have planned the balcony design to offer passive shading to the facades. The roof decks will give great outdoor space for the penthouse units. Mr. Taylor mentioned that they are providing a new pedestrian path at East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and a bike path on the northern end of the site. He added that they are planning to provide natural light in the stair wells that will add more natural light into corridors. Mr. Taylor also mentioned that they are planning on adding public art on the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue edge.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal. He noted that they are looking at fairly large garden spaces along the ground plane. They are able to maintain a level of transparency but allow for a friendly edge along the public side of the property.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue facade;
  - Design development to improve the function of the path leading to QE Park adjacent to building;
  - Design development to improve the entry;
  - Design development to enlarge and improve the usability of the amenity space and consider moving the amenity space to the roof;
  - Design development to the glazing of the exist stairs;
  - Consider improving the security aspects around the bike storage.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design responded to the rezoning policy.

The Panel supported the massing, height and density and noted that there is a good scale for what is emerging in the neighbourhood and setting a good precedent for what was to come. With regards to the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation, the Panel thought it needed some design development. They mentioned that it seemed forgotten and yet was a primary elevation.

The Panel questioned the resolution of the path leading to Queen Elizabeth Park. They thought the function of the path could be important and if does remain, there needs to be

some discussion with the City regarding design development. Currently it seems redundant and poorly resolved with uncomfortable spaces and poor vistas created.

The Panel appreciated the form including the contemporary nature and the devices that are being proposed including external shades. Some Panel members thought the soffit was a significant element in the design and that it needed to be treated correctly though the use of materials or lighting.

With regards to the entry, the Panel thought there was a lack of celebration and was an opportunity lost and it was suggested the entrance might be better located on West 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

There was support for the staircases and the attempt to use glazing to bring light into the common corridors. There were some questions regarding how functional they might be and there might be some other ways to leverage more light.

Panel had some questions regarding potential overlook issues and suggested an investigation to assess exposure and privacy be completed.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the amenity space and how it was going to be used and suggested it be larger and perhaps relocated onto the roof.

The Panel also suggested improved access to the bike storage especially around security and safety.

The Panel thought the landscaping was a successful approach.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Taylor said that all the Panel's comments were valuable and they will take them into consideration as they move forward with the project. Mr. Kreuk said they are striving for greening the lane but are not sure if that is achievable.

3. Address:	5037-5087 Main Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 5-storey residential building, including a total of 41 units; eight of these will be rental replacement units. The proposal is being considered under the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy.
Zoning:	RM-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Delegation:	Craig Taylor, Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design Benjamin Beckwith, Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Josh Anderson, Boffo Properties
Staff:	Graham Winterbottom and Pat St. Michel

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a building fronting onto Main Street. He described the context for the area noting that there are rental apartments and duplexes fronting Main Street with one mixed-use building at the corner of East 33<sup>rd</sup> Street. The application is being considered under the context of the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy which covers the area from East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue to East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Main to Quebec Streets. The planning work for the Adjacent Area was initiated by the Riley Park South Cambie Vision, approved by Council in 2005. The Vision stated that if policy was developed for the larger Little Mountain site then the Adjacent Area should also be considered for zoning changes. Over the course of two years staff worked very closely with the community to develop the Little Mountain Policy Statement as well as the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy. The Policy for the larger site was approved by Council in June 2012 and generally recommends heights across the site of 6-8 storeys with opportunities at the centre of the site for a 10 and a 12 storey building. Heights immediately next to the Adjacent Area go from 4 to 6 storeys along the Quebec Street lane and 4 to 8 storeys south of the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue lane. The Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy was approved by Council in Feb 2013 and contains several principles to guide the redevelopment of the area. This includes a transition in scale and height, diverse and innovative housing types and connections and permeability.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal as well as the future context for the main Little Mountain site. She noted that there will be a community hub that will be a focus of local shopping as well as a neighbourhood house on Main Street and childcare directly across the lane behind East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The building will have 41 units including 8 rental replacement units and 41 underground parking spaces. There is a grade change of approximately 7 feet from Main Street to the lane.

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

- Is there support of the proposed massing, density and height?
- Is there support for the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage and in particular the proposed exit solution in relation to the streetscape?
- Is there support for the interface with the lane and the handling of the approximate 7 foot grade change from Main Street?

Mr. Winterbottom and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.



- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Craig Taylor, Architect, further described the proposal with a power point presentation and mentioned that the existing site had primarily 1940s and 1950s single family and some multi-family units. The site is adjacent to the future Little Mountain development and to Queen Elizabeth Park. They have been trying to incorporate the changing neighbourhood into the design solution. They want to maintain a high level of design quality and materiality and as well uphold the commitment to environmental design. The proposal is being built under LEED™ Gold with one of their primary goals that has driven the design decisions was to encourage livability as associated to family and family oriented units. There will be 41 units as well as 41 parking stalls. Mr. Taylor described how the form and the massing of the building was developed and as well the architecture. They have planned the balcony design to offer passive shading to the facades. The roof decks will give great outdoor space for the penthouse units. Mr. Taylor mentioned that they are providing a new pedestrian path at East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and a bike path on the northern end of the site. He added that they are planning to provide natural light in the stair wells that will add more natural light into corridors. Mr. Taylor also mentioned that they are planning on adding public art on the East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue edge.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal. He noted that they are looking at fairly large garden spaces along the ground plane. They are able to maintain a level of transparency but allow for a friendly edge along the public side of the property.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the function of the path leading to QE Park adjacent to building;
  - Design development to improve the entry;
  - Design development to enlarge and improve the usability of the amenity space and consider moving the amenity space to the roof;
  - Consider improving the security aspects around the bike storage.
  - Design development to improve the livability of rental units on Main Street.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design responded to the rezoning policy.

The Panel supported the massing, height and density and noted that there is a good scale for what is emerging in the neighbourhood and setting a good precedent for what was to come. The façade on Main Street could be improved regarding privacy especially for the rental units. As well the Panel thought there was some potential overlook of the balconies as they wrap onto the path and wanted to see that improved.

The Panel questioned the resolution of the path leading to Queen Elizabeth Park. They thought the function of the path could be important and if does remain, there needs to be some discussion with the City regarding design development. Currently it seems redundant and poorly resolved with uncomfortable spaces and poor vistas created.

The Panel appreciated the form including the contemporary nature and the devices that are being proposed including external shades. Some Panel members thought the soffit was a significant element in the design and that it needed to be treated correctly though the use of materials or lighting.

With regards to the entry, the Panel thought there was a lack of celebration and was an opportunity lost and it was suggested the entrance might be better located on West 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As well the Panel had some concerns regarding liveability in Unit R.

There was support for the staircases and the attempt to use glazing to bring light into the common corridors. There were some questions regarding how functional that might be and there might be some other ways to leverage more light.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the amenity space and how it was going to be used and suggested it be larger and perhaps relocated onto the roof.

The Panel also suggested improved access to the bike storage especially around security and safety.

The Panel thought the landscaping was a successful approach but thought the planting should be prominent along the lane. They would like to see the vegetation cascade on the lane to soften the edge or perhaps the trees could be moved to the lower level.

The Panel thought the design of the 2 bedroom rental units on Main Street didn't really work and needed design development to make them more livable.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Taylor said that all the Panel's comments were valuable and they will take them into consideration as they move forward with the project. Mr. Kreuk said they are striving for greening the lane but are not sure if that is achievable.

4. Address:	137 Keefer Street
DE:	418195
Description:	To develop a 9-storey, multiple-family dwelling building with a commercial retail unit on the main floor, providing 19 parking spaces over four levels (via automated parking system) having vehicular access from the lane.
Zoning:	HA-1A
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Stantec Architecture
Owner:	James Schouw & Associates
Delegation:	Doug Hamming, Stantec Architecture Jiang Zhu, Stantec Architecture James Schouw, Doug Hamming, Stantec Architecture
Staff:	Paul Cheng

#### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-4)

- Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development in Chinatown. The proposal is for a 90 foot building in the HA-1A zone. Mr. Cheng noted that in 2011, the Planning Department revised the HA-1A zone. This was a result of the Historic Area Height Review Study which looked at the zoning of Gastown and Chinatown and parts of the Downtown Eastside around Victory Square where revitalization could be encouraged in these areas through development. What resulted was an increase in building height which was once 70 feet maximum to 90 feet maximum. He added that there were also some challenges with the 25 foot wide lot topology. The parking bylaw required a certain amount of parking which was basically impossible to land on that size lot. The parking bylaw was revised and furthermore the extra height and density was permitted. Mr. Cheng described the proposal noting that it is midblock on Keefer Street between Columbia and Main Streets. As well he described the context for the area noting that there are a few empty lots in this block as well as some historical buildings. He also noted that there has been some rezonings in Chinatown recently that allowed up to 150 feet in height.

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

- 1) The HA-1A District Schedule requires a rear yard setback of 23 feet for all residential uses. The reasons for this setback are: a) to insure a standard of livability for dwelling units with only one viewing aspect towards the lane and; b) to insure a certain amount of openness for the service lane, which are intended for animated pedestrian-oriented uses. A relaxation may be permissible if the proposal involves a courtyard typology, or if the proposal is in an existing building. Given the particular site context, does this proposal warrant a relaxation to the required rear yard setback?
- 2) Provide commentary on the overall architectural design of the proposal, given the Chinatown context.
- 3) Does this proposal impose an undue hardship on the livability of the existing adjacent dwelling units at 133 Keefer Street, with respect to the existing light-wells?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Doug Hamming, Architect, mentioned that the proposal emerged from an interest in the challenge of a 25 foot wide lot in a heritage neighbourhood. He noted that there is retail at the base with residential above. The pediment line of the retail reflects the existing retail along the street. The suites are open concept living and will be defined by the furniture rather than by walls and dividers. The

top floor is divided in half with a penthouse with living accommodations on one floor and sleeping accommodations above and then a roof garden. The parking will be accessed by a mechanical "cross parker system". The advantage of this system is that the floor space required to install the machinery is small which helps to reduce the costs and still accommodate parking on the site. The expression is a modern interpretation paying homage to the vibrant colours and materials found elsewhere in Chinatown. The retail units are expressed by a canopy and then there is a laneway access to the centre to the building. Mr. Hamming mentioned that landscaping is essentially a set of roof gardens that are accessed privately. Regarding the setback, he added that they feel the suites are more livable if they are pushed out to the edge of the property line. He added that they feel the proposal is a transition building for the area.

James Schouw, Architect, described the proposal and mentioned that Keefer Street is a main pedestrian arterial connection from Strathcona and for people living in the area. He noted that the SkyTrain Station is close to the site. They wanted to make the site practical to build something and to lend some interest to Chinatown. He added that it is important to have retail on the site since there is so much pedestrian traffic on the street. Mr. Schouw said they wanted to keep the materials light and reflective as possible.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the building's overall expression to fit the area's context;
  - Provide an argument as to how the additional FSR is a benefit to the community;
  - Design development to mitigate the height in relationship to the adjacent building;
  - Provide a clear illustration and assessment of how the building impacts the existing light wells in the building next door;
  - Consider locating off-site parking in order to address issues with the lane elevation;
  - Design development to simplify the expression of the building.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they thought the expression did not fit the context for the area. They felt that the proposal did not respect the buildings and the context in which it will sit.

The Panel was mixed when it came to the issue of the rear setbacks. Some were in full support of a setback while others found it unacceptable if there were to be more development across the lane and a number who suggested other alternatives including a daylight angle that would be a way to determine what kind of setback should be allowed. It is important to note that one of the comments was about the 20% increase in FSR and the Panel felt the question as to the benefit provided to the community to justify the additional FSR was not answered. The Panel members questioned as to whether the proposal was earning that FSR.

The Panel had a lot of commentary on the architectural character of the proposal. There were a number of comments regarding how the materiality, colour and form of the proposal were incongruous with the context. Even those Panel members, who found the building to be attractive, didn't necessarily feel it was appropriate for the historic district. There were comments regarding the fact that the proposal was synonymous with gentrification. It does speak to the fact that the image the building portrays is one that is going to set a tone that this is perhaps more upscale. Overall, with respect to the character, some of the Panel members felt there may be a lack of authenticity while other Panel members thought it might not be appropriate to the context.

The overall mass was discussed by the Panel members and they thought there needed to be a little more respect to the overall massing of the district and the building's immediate neighbours. Some Panel members objected to the height and its relationship to the adjacent building and some objected to the parapet which has a larger presence than what some would like to see. Some panel members questioned the subdivision of the Keefer façade, creating a form that has no typological reference. Other Panel members felt that the contextual response was strong enough or appropriate enough. This included the recessed balconies and an appropriate sawtooth form.

Regarding whether or not there is an undue hardship on the livability of the existing adjacent dwelling most of the Panel members thought there wasn't an issue although some did feel that there was some hardship. It was noted that there wasn't anything in the package that described the adjacent spaces in any form and as well the model does not describe it. They felt that it was impossible for the Panel to comment on that issue as a result.

The proposed unit layouts were presented as "lofts" but were drawn as enclosed bedrooms, with awkward connections at the exterior walls. Design development is recommended.

The Panel thought the parking on the lane made it challenging to animate the lane and it was suggested that the applicant find parking off site for the residents in the building. If parking was not relocated, the proposed approach to the lane as described was not successful and would need design development.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Zhu said that they had presented the proposal to the Chinatown Historical Area Planning Committee and they supported the architectural expression.

---

5. Address:	1408 East 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (formerly 3120 Knight Street)
DE:	418174
Description:	To construct a 5-storey rental building containing 51 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1 pending
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Third (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Stuart Howard Architects
Owner:	097159 BC Ltd.
Delegation:	Stuart Howard, Stuart Howard Architects Otto Lejeune, Stuart Howard Architects Ben Aldaba, PMG Landscape Architects James Evans, 097159 BC Ltd.
Staff:	Colin King

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a corner site with frontage along East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north and Knight Street to the west. Mr. King mentioned that the context for the area is mainly lower one and two family dwellings with some low density multiple dwelling buildings. As this was a rezoning, the proposal is required to meet LEED™ Gold. Mr. King reminded the Panel that they had reviewed the proposal as a rezoning on February 12<sup>th</sup>. He added that staff had sought advice on height, density and massing as it related to contextual fit, especially with regards to the interface with existing adjacent dwellings across the lane. He noted that the Panel had supported the project with consensus items for agreement being: design development to the 2-storey cornice line; design development to improve the corner unit on the lane; consider ways to improve privacy and noise abatement for the Knight Street ground floor units and consider adding other materials rather than all fiber board to the exterior. These concerns have been folded directly into the rezoning conditions and are noted in the applicant's booklet. In describing the proposal, Mr. King noted that the entrance is located on East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue which resulted in the address change. The two bed units fronting East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue have their own entries. The parkade entrance is from the rear lane and there are two common outdoor amenity spaces at roof level with an indoor amenity room at fifth floor level and another outdoor amenity along the east side yard. Through the rezoning process a pad was secured for a public bike share facility. Mr. King mentioned that there will be an interim condition before the bikes are provided. In the previous review the Panel asked for privacy and noise abatement for the ground floor units along Knight Street and as a result there is now a fence with planting behind it.

Advice from the Panel on this development application is sought as follows:

- Does the application satisfactorily address previously panel concerns?
- Specific commentary on the quality of external material finish.
- Specific commentary on the success of the perimeter treatment to Knight Street as it relates to both privacy of units and interface to the street.
- Commentary on the success of the at-grade landscaped area as it relates to ease of access.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stuart Howard, Architect, further described the proposal noting the changes since the last review. He mentioned that the major change in terms of the massing and articulation of the building was the provision of balconies. As a Rental 100 project they have severe cost restraints and long with unit size constraints that

have been posed on them by the City Policy. The addition of a large outdoor space was a positive addition as well as moving the building further back to lessen the shadow impacts on the neighbourhoods to the east and south. Mr. Howard said they have changed the expression to be more vertical and less horizontal. They have toned the colours down a bit and added some muted blues and greens. The top of the building has been lightened up somewhat to try to reduce the apparent massing. The balconies have a layered look and the open balconies add more interest to the east elevation. He mentioned that there was a struggle on where to add the bike share space but ended up adding it along East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The building has been sunk further into the ground that reduces the perceived height of the building. Mr. Howard described the materials noting that they have chosen a high quality fiber board that has a 50 year performance warranty and gets some LEED™ points as it is made from recycled materials. They have also added some stone cladding around the entrance.

Ben Aldaba, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there have been some changes since the last review. This includes the addition of the amenity space near the bike share. They have also included community garden space on the roof. They have tried to enhance the buffer on Knight Street with a continuous hedge row and as well they have provided additional trees. South of the bike share is a continuous hedge that will screen the amenity space.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the building façade at the rear;
  - Design development in collaboration with Engineering to develop an interim use for bike share space;
  - Consider adding access to the lane for the rear ground floor unit;
  - Consider adding street trees along Knight Street;
  - Design development to reduce the solar heat gain in the enclosed balconies.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had adequately addressed the Panel's previous concerns.

The Panel thought the building was more handsome as they preferred the vertical expression. They also thought the main entry off East 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue was stronger. A couple of Panel wanted to see the back elevation further expressed and that the one ground floor unit to have its own access from the lane.

The Panel supported the colour palette and that the building would be a lovely addition to the neighbourhood. They also supported the protective gardens for the units facing Knight Street with a couple of Panel members suggesting the addition of street trees.

Although the Panel thought the bike share was somewhat of a challenge, they agreed that the space could be used for something else until the program was in place. One Panel member suggested adding some trees to define the area while another Panel member suggested that Engineering could reduce the curb in the space so cyclists can ride up directly and as an interim could be made into a rain garden. A couple of Panel members suggested putting the bike storage on the main floor and moving the resident's storage into the underground.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that the west façade was improved with the addition of enclosed balconies although one Panel member suggested the applicant find a device to

reduce the solar heat gain. It was also suggested that there could be a canopy over the garage door to mitigate noise to the unit above.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Howard said he agreed that it would be great to have street trees but that might not be possible on the City property. He added that they did look at putting the bikes on the main floor however there isn't enough room to fit all the bikes in that space.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.