

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 24, 2014

TIME: 3.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Walter Francl (Chair)
Joseph Fry (Excused Item #1)
David Grigg
Joseph Hruda
Jennifer Marshall (left after Item #2)
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor (left after Item #2)
Chris Mramor
Goran Ostojic (Absent for 1st Item)

REGRETS:
Ryan Bragg
Maurice Pez
Matthew Soules

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 468 West 33 rd Avenue and 4946-4958 Cambie Street |
| 2. | 126-168 East 35 th Avenue |
| 3. | 1600 Harwood Street |
| 4. | 1645 Harwood Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Francl called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 468 West 33rd Avenue and 4946-4958 Cambie Street
- DE: N/A
- Description: To develop two 6-storey buildings and a 2-storey townhouse that includes 68 residential units and commercial use at grade.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
- Application Status: Rezoning
- Review: First
- Architect: GBL Architects
- Owner: Kenstone Properties
- Delegation: Tom Bell, GBL Architects
Paul Goodwin, GBL Architects
Joseph Fry, Hap Collaborative Landscape Architects
- Staff: Ben Johnson and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-4)

- **Introduction:** Ben Johnson, Senior Planner, Vancouver South, introduced the proposal for a three lot consolidation on the edge of Queen Elizabeth Park in the Riley Park South Cambie area. He noted that the site falls under the rezoning policy contained in the Cambie Corridor Plan. He also mentioned that the Canada Line was configured to support a possible future station at the intersection of West 33rd Avenue and Cambie Street. Mr. Johnson described the Policy for the area noting that it supports rezonings for 6-storey residential development with the introduction of townhouses on the lane where possible. As well the Policy supports consideration to small-scale, local-serving retail around a possible future Canada Line Station. Opportunities should be explored to create unique and notable buildings that reinforce view lines and perspectives created by the unique alignment of Cambie Street. Mr. Johnson added that the Policy establishes a target to deliver a minimum of 25% family housing.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal for a site on three single family lots at the southeast corner of Cambie Street and West 33rd Avenue. He described the context for the area noting Queen Elizabeth Park to the north and the potential Canada Line Station at the intersection. The proposal is for a 6-storey residential with 68 units including four 2-storey townhouses along the lane and commercial space at grade. Mr. Black mentioned that the proposal is under the Cambie Corridor Plan that considers opportunities to integrate small scale locally serving commercial space focused around a potential new station at 33rd Avenue, considering the relationship to the park and surrounding neighbourhood.

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

Comments on the overall form of development, including the proposed density, height and setbacks in general, and with specific comments on:

- Height of 6-storey elements into gap;
- Effect and notability of step back at 5th storey facing the streets in reducing apparent scale;
- Location of commercial space;
- Visual scale of building return along 33rd Avenue as it relates to Queen Elizabeth Park and neighbour to East across the lane;

- Quality of indoor and outdoor common amenity spaces proposed in terms of usefulness and liveability.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tom Bell, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that it is a prominent site. It is the first of all the buildings that will continue down Cambie Street on the east side of the street. He mentioned that they have placed the entrance to the underground parking as far south as possible on the site to allow for better open spaces on the site. There is a curve to the site and when they looked at the way the houses were along the street they chose to place a building on the corner that faces West 33rd Avenue. The end of the two setbacks has been pulled forward on both buildings over slender columns that connect that overhang with the interior courtyard. It is a wedge shaped courtyard which expresses the angle on the street. They have taken the 4-storey street wall across the front to the corner, the turning the corner with the 4-storeys and stepping the building down. Mr. Bell mentioned that they wanted to animate the courtyard and have located the amenity space in Building B opening into the courtyard. As well the coffee shop is on the corner of Building A. He then described the material and colour palette. Mr. Bell added that they wanted a finer scale building that was fitting for the neighbourhood.

Joseph Fry, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the bed rock is close to the surface and so they wanted to replicate that in the courtyard space. There is a large rock outcropping that was meant to be a gesture to the foot of Little Mountain. The rock provides a focus for the space and helps to separate the uses including the café terrace and the amenity terrace. He noted that there is a public walkway through the site and there is a strong definition between the private and public spaces. They are proposing a double row of street trees along Cambie Street and as well as trees along the lane. The roof deck has a bamboo hedge to divide up the private patios.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the response of Building B to the intersection;
 - Consider moving the commercial space to the West 33rd Avenue corner;
 - Consider increasing the size of the amenity space and improving the privacy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought the design wasn't what the Cambie Corridor Plan had anticipated.

The Panel supported the scale in general and the six-storey elements facing into the courtyard gap, except for some members who were opposed to the break between the two main buildings in principle. There was broad concern that the corner of the building at West 33rd Avenue and Cambie Street was underplayed in relation to the intersection and needed a stronger architectural response.

A number of Panel members thought the commercial space was appropriate while others thought it could move to the corner of West 33rd Avenue and Cambie Street.

Most of the Panel supported the material and colour palette and as well the site landscaping. They thought they were an appropriate response to the quarry and other elements found in Queen Elizabeth Park. As well the Panel supported the landscaping plans for the roof top terraces.

Some Panel members thought the amenity space was a bit small and could have some privacy issues. There was broad concern that the passage was pinched near the lane. There was also some comments regarding the grading and stepping into the site which some Panel members thought was well handled.

- Applicant's Response: Mr. Bell said they could take out the commercial space. He added that it was their intention to make the building have a modern expression sitting on the corner and that the hinged space would offer some interesting spaces, and disagreed with many of the comments.

2. Address:	126-168 East 35 th Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 6-storey apartment building and a 1-storey building along the lane that includes 48 residential units. The application is being considered under the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	Ramsey Worden Architects
Owner:	Mosaic Homes
Delegation:	Bob Worden, Ramsey Worden Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Kristina Kovacs, Mosaic Homes
Staff:	Graham Winterbottom and Patricia St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-2)

- **Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a 6-storey building by Mosaic Properties located on East 35th Avenue at Quebec Street. He noted the surrounding context of single family homes and that the site is adjacent to the 15 acre Little Mountain site, Queen Elizabeth Park and is one kilometer from either the King Edward or the 49th Avenue Canada Line Stations. Mr. Winterbottom mentioned that the application is being considered under the context of the Little Mountain Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy that was approved by Council in February 2013. The planning work for the Policy 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. The Policy for larger sites 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 4-6 storeys along the Quebec Street lane and 4-8 storeys south of the East 35th Avenue lane. The Adjacent Area Rezoning Policy contains several principles to guide the redevelopment of the area including: a transition in scale and height; diverse and innovative housing types and connections and permeability.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that to the south is the main Little Mountain site where a community hub is envisioned. It will focus on local shopping and as well there is a neighbourhood house planned on Main Street with childcare across the lane. The proposal is for a 6-storey, wood framed building with 48 units of which 42 are two bedrooms and six are three bedroom units. This is in keeping with the policies to encourage units that are suitable for families. As well there are 60 underground parking spaces, accessed from the lane, with a driveway that will be shared in the future with the adjacent site. The proposal is organized as two smaller linked pavilion forms with an entry courtyard that maximizes the number of corner units with a lot of daylight and ventilation. The proposal is for a 6-storey building with repetition of floor plates and massing throughout the levels. To address the Guidelines re stepping back and reducing massing and shadowing, the building is sited with increased setbacks along the street and on both side yards. Also the upper level is differentiated in material and colour treatment with large roof overhangs and open balconies that contrast the framed and defined balconies on lower levels. At the ground level, units have private patios and entry gates to the street and are located essentially at grade. A single storey common amenity building and outdoor amenity area are located along the lane. Materials include brick,

textured brick panels and textured metal panels and metal railings. In accordance with the Rezoning Policy, the applicant is pursuing LEED™ Gold compliance.

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

- Is there support for the proposed massing, density and height?
 - the approach to the massing, and the use of increased setbacks to address Policy that generally upper levels of buildings step back to minimize the apparent massing and increase sunlight access to the street.
 - the overall building height of approximately 68 feet to 69 feet, noting that the Policy supports approximately 65 feet.
- the design and relationship to grade of the ground floor units, noting that the policy asks for a functional entry expression and semi-private outdoor space designed for comfortable use (change of level, landscaping to entrance, privacy, etc.).

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bob Worden, Architect, further described the proposal using a Power Point presentation. He noted that the proposal consists of a 6-storey wood frame apartment building with a 1-storey amenity building located on the lane. The building mass has been divided into two forms to maximize the corner units and to modulate the scale into smaller building forms. Increased setbacks optimize the views through the site. The top floor is expressed with the use of materials and colours while the corners are stepped back.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the private patios have landscaping within the setback. The main lobby includes landscape walls, planting and lighting. The entry court includes a trellis and water feature. Fruit trees are proposed along the south laneway. The detached amenity building is adjacent to a common outdoor patio area and children's play.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development raise the ground floor up a bit and improve the relationship to grade;
 - Consider absorbing the amenity space into the mass of the building and providing better visibility and connection from the common areas;
 - Design development to improve the pedestrian experience and porosity at the lane;
 - Consider adding shading devices to the south façade.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the proposed massing, density and height of the development. Most of the Panel supported the approach of the enhanced setbacks and thought it created additional ground plane space that would be useful to the lower units.

The Panel noted that the ground floor of the building was a bit too low and should come out of the ground another foot or two above grade. As well they suggested the building could go higher than the 65 feet that is currently prescribed in the Guidelines. The panel appreciated the proposed 10 foot ceilings. They thought the ground units were too close to grade and wouldn't have an appropriate step up to the patio.

The Panel thought the amenity building was occupying prime real estate at grade and would be better incorporated into the ground floor mass at the rear of the building to permit use directly from the building while creating an opportunity to add some additional common outdoor space. The amenity space is somewhat isolated and needs more clear and direct access for residents.

The Panel thought the lane could be improved with landscaping that would still leave a space for a pedestrian path, allowing them to move safely along the lane.

The Panel was mixed around the expression of the building. Some Panel members thought the Guidelines were not being reflected in the proposed expression. It has a strong vertical expression reminiscent of some of the heritage buildings in the city. However this expression steps away from what is going to become a more common horizontal language of the neighbouring building context. Some Panel members thought it should be simplified, while others suggested some mediation between the strong vertical expression. The horizontality of a more contemporary expression should be sought. Responding to the different orientations of the building may help with this.

Some Panel members thought there could be better shading to the windows on south façade. The Panel felt for the most part that the materiality of the building, the strategy of the entry and light into the public spaces was successful.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Kovacs said they tried to follow the Guidelines noting that there isn't any reference to the style of building that can be designed. As well there isn't any information on building for the Little Mountain site.

Mr. Worden thanked the Panel for their comments.

3. Address:	1600 Harwood Street
DE:	418164
Description:	To construct infill rental housing adjacent to existing towers plus amenity space containing a total of 118 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Beach Towers Investments Inc.
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Salim Narayana, IBI Group Cameron Owen, IBI Group
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-4)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced a proposal for a development permit following rezoning. He mentioned that the CD-1 has been enacted for the site and that the density, height and form of development are now part of the new CD-1. Mr. O'Sullivan described the Policy and mentioned that the application came in under the interim Rezoning Policy as part of the West End Community Planning process. As well the proposal is being developed under the STIR program which encourages the building of secured market rental housing. Mr. O'Sullivan described the context for the area noting the mix of mainly concrete residential rental buildings and Alexandra Park to the north. In describing the site, Mr. O'Sullivan mentioned that the existing towers were identified in the City of Vancouver's recent Landmark Inventory in the "A" category as a cultural landscape and for architectural design. The applicant has provided a Statement of Significance for the existing towers as part of the Rezoning. As well at Rezoning the site was reviewed and supported by the Vancouver Heritage Commission. Built in the 1960's, the site is among Vancouver's best known and iconic rental housing complexes with 607 rental units. The existing towers range from 19 to 21 storeys. While the application is not seeking any heritage benefits, staff and the applicant are working together to have the site added to the Heritage Register.

Mr. O'Sullivan described the proposal and mentioned that it will have 118 secured market rental units. The proposal is for a 4-storey ground-oriented building fronting Beach Avenue with a 9-storey mid-rise building, 1-storey amenity building that is partially below grade (with fitness centre and pool) and enclosure of the base of the existing towers.

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

- Comments on the success of the proposal's composition, materials and expression:
 - Generally, and how it relates to the historic context;
 - In particular, the expression of the Beach Avenue frontage.
- Comments on your level of support for the requested height relaxation on Beach Avenue frontage building.
- Comments on the livability of the residential units in general and 1651 Harwood Townhouse Unit 04 in particular.
- Comments on the overall landscape design as proposed in terms of daylight exposure, choice of materials and plant selection.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they have gone through an extensive process with both city staff and the community. The mid-rise is 9-stories and relates to the adjacent building and is landscaped around the edges. He noted that each of the three existing underground parking levels had their own entrance and so they are planning to take one out. They are retaining the crossing but the upper level parking will be removed. Mr. Bruckner described the material palette noting the window wall construction with spandrel glass and concrete balconies and slab edges. They are using prefabricated stone tile panels to give a distinctive look. The amenity space will probably be the first to get built to replace the existing pool and along with an amenity room. There is a small pocket park at the corner. The townhouse expression along Beach Avenue will replicate the current saw-tooth form of the existing parking structure. The balconies and slabs are a lighter concrete to contrast with the existing materials. The spandrels will be polished precast panels with windows built in and some are gold anodized. The ground floor townhouses are set back with individual access. The roof the townhouses will have access by stair and elevator and will be landscaped a space for the residents.

Cameron Owen, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted the pocket park on the corner of Beach Avenue and Cardero Street. They will be using pavers and providing seating benches. He described the planting and mentioned that they are trying to have a look of a seaside meadow which will also include cherry trees. The townhouses will have a private patio that is separated by a green hedge. There are two main access points that provide view corridors through the site that will have seating at the edges. Urban agriculture is also planned for the area. Children's play has been moved closer to the indoor amenity space. Mr. Owen mentioned that there is better circulation through the site that has been reinforced with plantings. Along Cardero Street is a berm with plantings to give a west coast expression. Most of the new buildings will have extensive green roofs.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the legibility of the entrances;
 - Design development to improve the expression of the mid-rise building;
 - Consider access through the site to Beach Avenue;
 - Design development to improve the amenity space and especially the park on the corner;
 - Design development to the auto court cul-de-sac;
 - Consider planting larger trees along Beach Avenue to reduce solar gain.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel said they appreciated the effort by the applicant to improve the views in the new building along Beach Avenue. They had no issue with the height relaxation for the guards on the lower level roof deck, and liked the treatment of the ground plane and how the landscaping had been handled to enhance legibility. One Panel member, however wanted to see better legibility of the building entrances. Most of the Panel supported the material and colour palette.

Some Panel members thought the mid-rise elevation was more successful in earlier plans and thought it should not retain the grades of the old parkade but rather should come down to ground at the parkade entrance to improve the grading condition relative to the context. As well one Panel member thought that the blue glass was too dark.

The Panel noted that there are some strong diagonals out to the views but dead ends with no access to the street or the beach which they found frustrating. They also wanted to see the paving patterns reinforce the cherry trees as they felt that they were a strong feature of the site.

The Panel thought the two corner treatments along Beach Avenue at the amenity building required some design development to make them more useable. They wanted to see an area that would welcome people to sit and enjoy the street. As well they thought the amenity space was rather remote and not in the most appropriate location on the site.

The Panel thought the auto court cul-de-sac was inappropriate in the context of the space and that it should be a much greener landscaped environment.

Some Panel members mentioned that since the public art has been moved into the centre of the site it can no longer be considered public art. One Panel member noted that public art should be reviewed in terms of what it can give back to the public.

From a sustainability perspective, it was suggested that larger trees be planted on Beach Avenue to provide reduction of solar gain in the summer but still allow views through to the beach in the winter. Solar shading elements could be added on the southwest facade of the mid-rise tower.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner said he appreciated the Panel's input as it will help to make a better project. He said they are working on the public art requirement for the site and will be located in a public area such as the westerly corner on the Beach Avenue frontage. He added that they didn't intend to have dark glass on the mid-rise but will be low-e glass that is pretty transparent.

4. Address:	1625 Harwood Street
DE:	418163
Description:	to construct infill rental housing consisting of four townhouse buildings containing a total of 15 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Beach Towers Investments Inc.
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Salim Narayana, IBI Group Cameron Owen, IBI Group
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-4)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced a proposal for a development permit following rezoning. He mentioned that the CD-1 has been enacted for the site and that the density, height and form of development are now part of the new CD-1. Mr. O'Sullivan described the Policy and mentioned that the application came in under the interim Rezoning Policy as part of the West End Community Planning process. As well the proposal is being developed under the STIR program which encourages the building of secured market rental housing. Mr. O'Sullivan described the context for the area noting the mix of mainly concrete residential rental buildings and Alexandra Park to the north. In describing the site, Mr. O'Sullivan mentioned that the existing towers were identified in the City of Vancouver's recent Landmark Inventory in the "A" category as a cultural landscape and for architectural design. The applicant has provided a Statement of Significance for the existing towers as part of the Rezoning. As well at Rezoning the site was reviewed and supported by the Vancouver Heritage Commission. Built in the 1960's, the site is among Vancouver's best known and iconic rental housing complexes with 607 rental units. The existing towers range from 19 to 21 storeys. While the application is not seeking any heritage benefits, staff and the applicant are working together to have the site added to the Heritage Register.

Mr. O'Sullivan described the proposal and mentioned that it is for a modest addition of two and 3-storey townhouses located to the sides and rear of the tower with 15 secured market rental units.

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

- Comments on the success of the proposal's composition, materials and expression:
 - Generally, and how it relates to the historic context;
 - In particular, the expression of the Beach Avenue frontage.
- Comments on your level of support for the requested height relaxation on Beach Avenue frontage building.
- Comments on the livability of the residential units in general and 1651 Harwood Townhouse Unit 04 in particular.
- Comments on the overall landscape design as proposed in terms of daylight exposure, choice of materials and plant selection.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, mentioned that the infill opportunities are less on this site. It is a mid-block site and will have 3-storey townhouses

flanking the existing building with a courtyard to provide outdoor space for the residents. He added that they will be building a new central heating plant on this site that will heat the entire site.

Cameron Owen, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there will be a gate out on the street to access the townhouses for privacy. In the back there will be patios with gates and there is a wall across the lane with a hedge. The existing trees will be retained and as well extensive green roofs are planned.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the expression of the buildings around the tower;
 - Design development to improve the integration between Parcel A and B;
 - Design development to improve the courtyard.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel thought the integration of the townhouses at the base of the tower was not successful. They particularly did not like the way the two smaller buildings related to the tower and noted that the buildings are of a different architectural typology than the tower. One Panel member suggested the buildings might want to reflect the original architecture. They however did agree that the livability of the units was adequate and had no concerns with the 04 unit.

The Panel thought that activating the lane was a good idea but thought there could be better integration between Parcel A and B with a more positive linkage between the two.

A couple of Panel members mentioned that the built-up planters in the courtyard make the area unlivable. The courtyard should be opened up and the intrusiveness of barriers reduced.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner said he appreciated the Panel's input as it will help to make a better project. He said they are working on the public art requirement for the site and will be located in a public area such as the westerly corner on the Beach Avenue frontage. He added that they didn't intend to have dark glass on the mid-rise but will be low-e glass that is pretty transparent.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.