

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** January 14, 2014

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Ryan Bragg (Chair)  
Walter Francl (left after third item)  
Joseph Fry (left after third item)  
David Grigg  
Jennifer Marshall  
Arno Matis  
Phil Mondor  
Chris Mramor

**REGRETS:**  
Joseph Hruda  
Goran Ostojic  
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                                   |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | 5648-5670 Victoria Drive          |
| 2. | 800 Robson Street (Robson Square) |
| 3. | 467-495 West King Edward Avenue   |
| 4. | 351 West King Edward 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: 5648-5670 Victoria Drive  
DE: N/A  
Description: To develop a 6-storey, mixed-use building with commercial retail space at grade and 48 residential units above. The original rezoning application was being considered under the Short Term Incentives for Rental (STIR) Program but is now submitting under the Rental 100: Secured market Rental Housing Policy.  
Zoning: C-2 to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning Application  
Review: Third (First with additional parcel)  
Architect: Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.  
Delegation: Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.  
Caelan Griffiths, PMB Landscape Architects  
Staff: Michelle Yip and Colin King

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)**

- **Introduction:** Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application located mid-block on the east side of Victoria Drive, north of East 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue. She mentioned that there was a previous application for this site. The initial application was processed concurrently for rezoning and development permit and was reviewed by the Panel in August 2012 and January 2013. That application was comprised of two parcels and proposed a 6-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 28 secured market rental units, applied for under the Short Term Incentives for Rental (STIR) program. Since then, the applicant has acquired an additional parcel to the south and has withdrawn the previous application. The new application is only for a rezoning.

The rezoning application is to rezone the site from C-2 to CD-1 to allow development of a 6-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 48 secured market rental units. The proposal is being considered under the Rental 100 policy which supports the consideration for additional height and density when 100% of the residential units will be secured as market rental for the life of the building. More specifically, the Rental 100 Guidelines supports consideration of increases up to 6-storeys with a commensurate achievable density for C-2 zones.

Colin King, Development Planner, further described the proposal. He described the context for the area noting that there is mixed-use retail along Victoria Drive with predominately 1 and 2-storey buildings while across the road are developed to 3 and 4-storeys. Across the lane is the RS-1 single family dwelling district. He mentioned that the retail on the ground floor is proposed to be a single large unit that could be broken into smaller units but there is no direct requirement for this in the base zoning. The residential units are comprised of 4 studios, 30 one-bedroom and 14 two bedrooms and are accessed from the residential lobby on Victoria Drive. There are two floors of underground parking with 36 spaces including 10 commercial spaces and 4 for visitors. Bike storage is on both parking levels.

Mr. King noted that the top floor is stepped back six feet to lessen the apparent height to the street. As well there are setbacks on the second through fifth floors so the building

exceeds the mid-rise setbacks of the C-2 form. Further setbacks to the sides are provided to transition to a future 4-storey development on the adjacent lots. At the lane there is a two foot setback at grade with some plantings and private patios. The roof will have an extensive green roof with a common patio area accessed by elevator and weather protection. Mr. King also mentioned that the external common space on the roof is a good amenity but not ideal for children's play. There is also an internal amenity room at grade proposed as a fitness room.

Mr. King described the material palette which is comprised of dark brick veneer, light fir boards breaking up the glazing and coloured hardie panel for the enclosed balcony bays. The top floor will be a lighter colour and the side elevations have less articulation than the previous proposal.

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

1. Does the Panel support the form of development of the proposed rezoning as it relates to height, use, and density?
2. Can the Panel provide commentary on the provision of common amenity areas specifically as it relates to outdoor play space for families with children?
3. Does the Panel have any advice regarding the quality and expression of external materials that may help guide any future DE application?

Ms. Yip and Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Cheng, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that because it will be a rental building they are allowed to reduce the amount of parking spaces. There will be only 22 residential parking spaces and 14 for commercial and visitors. There is also a car share program proposed for the site. He mentioned that the unit sizes are listed in the guidelines Rental 100 program and they are below the maximum size. He added that they will be pursuing LEED™ Gold.

Caelan Griffiths, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted the container plantings on the street. The roof top gardens are in response to earlier comments to provide urban agriculture opportunities. On the lane, plantings will spill over and they will be providing for vines to grow up the side of the building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to reduce the bulkiness of the podium level on the lane;
  - Design development to improve the side elevations from fourth to sixth floor level
  - Consider a continuous cornice line or resolve the bays at the proposed cornice;
  - Design development to improve daylighting into the fitness room;
  - Reconsider a colour selection;
  - Consider adding children's play on the roof along with other amenity space programming.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the height, use and density and thought it was an improvement over the C-2 form of development.

The Panel had no concerns regarding the height and use and thought but some members thought the shoulder at the fourth and sixth floor should also step back. They thought this would help reduce shadowing the on the sidewalk across Victoria Drive.

Several panel members noted that the exposure of the side elevations in medium to long term required improved architectural expression, especially from the fourth to the sixth floor level.

Several Panel members thought that off the lane the podium level was bulky and relentless. They also noted that the landscaping was minimal and suggested more plantings and a less bulky expression. A couple of Panel members thought the cornice line needed to be continuous or that the bays needed to go up to the cornice.

Most of the Panel supported the colour and material palette and thought they worked well, however a couple of Panel members thought the green was too vivid. One Panel member suggested similar colours be used to clarify parts of the building such as the entry and wayfinding.

There was some concern regarding the layout of some of the units as it was felt they might be too narrow and have trouble with light access.

The Panel was disappointed that there wasn't any defined place for children's play. As well they thought the amenity space on the ground floor didn't work and that perhaps there was an opportunity for some rearrangement of the ground floor. They noted that the room was lacking in daylighting and there was no access to the outdoors. Several Panel members thought that adding glazing into the fitness space and that there was an opportunity to add children's play on the roof.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng said he appreciated all the Panel's comments.

---

2. Address:	800 Robson Street (Robson Street)
DE:	418434
Description:	Exterior alterations to add a glass entry at both the north and south entry locations for the University of British Columbia.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Stantec Architecture
Owner:	BC Building Corporation
Delegation:	Doug Hamming, Stantec Architecture Noel Best, Stantec Architecture Cornelia Oberlander, Cornelia Hahn Oberlander Landscape Architects
Staff:	Anita Molaro

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-6)**

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for alterations to Robson Square with respect to the University of British Columbia. She noted that at the last review, the proposal introduced a new north entry stair within the public realm of Robson Square and also a smaller intervention in the south plaza. Ms. Molaro noted that the Panel did not support the proposal and they covered a number of aspects that needed to be improved or reconsidered. Those were basically in the elements of scale and height and that there needed to be a more complimentary form. As well there were some issues around circulation, particularly at the lower level and as well there were comments regarding reducing the scale of the vestibule in the south plaza and to improve the integration between the existing structure and the new elements. The Panel also wanted the applicant to consider the future design of the existing pagodas within the context of Robson Square. The Panel also had some comments regarding signage and wayfinding. Ms. Molaro said that they have removed out of the resubmission issues of signage and wayfinding as this will be a separate application process.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Doug Hamming, Architect, described the proposal and noted that they took another look at the project and as a result he felt that the project had gotten better. The applicant team gave a power point presentation and noted that the project is at the mid-block of Robson Square. He said they are proposing two multi-functional structures that are part of an ongoing improvement to the facility. Future improvements include the pagodas, revised entries and public pavilions on top of the old gallery space. The specific objectives include enhancing the status of education on site, access from Robson Street to the plaza, sound mitigation and a suitable form that is built in the spirit of the original vision for the space. Mr. Hamming mentioned that he feels the updated design is less obtrusive and is more about the context in the plaza.

Cornelia Oberlander, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the site and mentioned that there are two trees by the entrance stairs. One is a maple tree that will be kept while the other tree is dead and will be removed. Instead of the ivy in the planter box they will be replacing it with similar planting found in the plaza.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development for a more linear solution to the design and more complementary to the existing design of Robson Square;

- Greater understanding of the signage strategy and potential design of the adjacent pagodas required to adequately assess the proposal.
  - Design development to better resolve the circulation and the functional relationship to UBC's interior plan.
  - Design development to provide a better relationship of the proposed design to the adjacent historic context.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal although they thought the applicant had addressed some of the concerns from the last review.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the appropriate intervention into the plaza for the entrances to UBC. They realized that there needed to be an entry strategy that gives UBC more accessibility however, they thought there were still a number of unresolved issues with the design. They noted that the design for this site was important and will set a precedent for the project for many years to come.

The Panel noted that in terms of an urban design response the proposal was designed with rectangular pieces while the existing architecture is more linear in its design and they wanted to see the proposal better respond to that form. Several Panel members suggested the applicant design a simple form that respects the rectangular edge condition and doesn't compete with the circular pieces. One Panel member suggested that the structure would be more successful if it was a glass frame that gave more transparency to the heritage buildings. As well, the Panel was disappointed that there wasn't any information on what was being done with respect to the pagodas which they felt made their review of the proposal more difficult, some feeling it was impossible to provide comment in absence of this information.

The Panel agreed that it was an incomplete solution since there was no mention of the signage proposal. They had a number of questions that they felt they were not able to answer with respect to how the signage will look, its size and impact on the space as well as how the applicant will deal with disability access to the university. It was noted that the proposal was really about signage, architecture as signage, and therefore should have been included in this review.

The Panel supported the landscape plans for the proposal.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hamming had no further comments.

---

3. Address:	467-495 West King Edward Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 6-storey residential building and 2-storey townhouse along the lane. This proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan and includes 61 dwelling units.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Mission Group Homes Ltd.
Delegation:	Andrew Emerson, GBL Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Luke Turri, Mission Group Homes Ltd.
Staff:	Cynthia Lau and Allan Moorey

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-2)**

- **Introduction:** Cynthia Lau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposed rezoning application for a site comprised of three parcels on W. King Edward, adjacent to Cambie Street. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan which contemplates residential buildings in this location having 4/6-storeys. The Plan allows for the possibility of 6-storeys within two lots of Cambie Street. The site is located east of Cambie Street, near the King Edward Canada Line Station. To the east/west on W. King Edward and north/south on Cambie Street, single-family residential is eligible for rezoning rezoned under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan. In a limited surrounding transition zone, additional properties will be included for rezoning under Phase 3 of Cambie Corridor Plan. This rezoning application proposed to rezone the site from RS-5 to CD-1 and allow development of a 6-storey residential building with townhouses at the rear of the site, all over one level of underground parking. The proposal includes 61 dwelling units.

Allan Moorey, Development Planner, further mentioned that it is RS-1 zoning that surrounds the site. A 3-storey C-2 office building is across a flanking lane, at the corner of Cambie Street and W. King Edward. The site has a cross fall of +/-11'-0" down to the northeast. One of the most notable aspects of the massing is the two interlocking rectilinear forms. A primary 4-story form is the base for a second cantilevered box that springs west from Level 3, then rises 4-storeys to culminate in a partial 2-storey element interlocking with the primary form. The result is 6-storeys at the west end of the site, 4-storeys at the east. A 9'-0" setback is provided along the west flanking lane. This is to accommodate the design objectives of the guidelines, intended to enhance the pedestrian experience along the lane, which is identified as a 'Connector' in the Plan. The cantilever form extends 7 feet into this setback at Level 3 and up. At the east/west lane a 2'-0" setback is provided, while 4'-0" is typically recommended. There is an 8'-0" foot setback along the east property line and 10'-0" on W. King Edward. The primary building presents a 4-storey shoulder on three sides. With respect to the mews, because of the change in grade, there is a half level of parking and utility space that frames the south side of the mews. Here, the distance between the primary building face and townhouses is reduced to 20'-0", while 24'-0" is recommended in the Plan. Planters and decks further reduce this common space. Mr. Moorey mentioned that the indoor amenity space is located on the parking level while the common residential outdoor space is on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor. Access to the parking is located in the northeast corner, while the PMT is located in the northwest corner of the site, at the lane. There are 8 2-story townhouses and 61 units in the primary building (1 studio, 21 1-bedroom units, 27 2-bedroom units and 12 3-bedroom units). Private roof decks are provided on the roof of the primary

building. He described the material palette, noting the use of cementitious panel, standing seam metal panels, aluminum and tempered glass guards, painted concrete and vinyl siding.

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

- The Cambie Corridor Plan identifies the lane to the west of the site as a “connector”. These lanes seek to animate and expand the pedestrian network around Canada Line stations. Lighting, signage, varied surface materials and planting are intended to provide an enhanced pedestrian experience and distinguish these lanes as unique. Could the Panel comment on the extent to which the proposed development’s unit orientation, outdoor space, entries and landscape (among other elements) contribute to activating the lane and reinforce those design principles expressed in the Plan?
- At present there is no specific proposal for the site at Cambie/King Edward adjacent to the lane along the west end of the site. The Plan however, anticipates a form of development having a similar lane treatment and setback to the proposed development, with a 4-storey shoulder stepping west, on an angled plane, to 7-storey. Could the Panel comment on the manner in which the proposed massing cantilevers west to the lane, from Levels 3 to 6 with respect to possible overlook issues and daylighting impact along the lane?
- The primary building entry is off West King Edward Avenue. Could the Panel comment on the entry sequence and wayfinding on the courtyard/mews beyond?
- The Plan anticipates 4-storey development having a 3-storey shoulder to the east of the site. Could the Panel comment on the proposed massing and future development to the east?
- Does the Panel support the proposed height, massing, density and form of development with respect to the Cambie Corridor guidelines?

Ms. Lau and Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Andrew Emerson, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they wanted to create an interesting form within the Cambie Corridor Guidelines that worked with the neighbouring context. They found a simple idea of achieving the setbacks that are required but at the same time creating two volumetric forms. Mr. Emerson described the architecture and noted the base component which comprises of four levels has stacked level units. There is a relatively formalized frontage along King Edward Avenue where the main entrance is located. He also noted the vertical channels and the enclosed balconies. The roof has private patios for the upper units along with the elevator overrun. The step in the shoulder offered a great opportunity for some outdoor amenity space. The courtyard is about 26 feet in width with a sizeable retaining wall that holds the bicycle storage and amenity space. The townhouses are two levels and share some of the materials that are found in the main building.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that on the shoulder of the building is the major amenity package with a common gathering space, urban agriculture and children’s play. The private roof decks are held back from the edge of the building to mitigate overlook. The entry sequence to the courtyard is off the lane and the exposed parkade wall is screened by plantings and then there are a series of outdoor patios that are associated with the townhomes. They are proposing to have private roof decks on the townhouses that are held back from the lane to reduce overlook.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the cantilevered volume against the lane for reasons of overlook and daylighting;
  - Design development to improve the west lane edge;
  - Design development to improve the east property line setback;
  - Design development to enhance the townhouse setback;
  - Design development to improve the entry sequence/way-finding for reasons of accessibility and clarity
  - Consider individual entrances and patios for the townhouses on the lane.
  - Consider improving the amenity space with the addition of outdoor space and better location as well as a children's play area;
  - Consider a lighter colour palette and a cleaner expression;
  - Consider adding a green wall or similar textural addition on the blank wall in the courtyard;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposed height, massing, density and form of development.

The Panel thought that in terms of height and massing the approach was supportable as the density is not particularly concerning; it is really how the massing is distributed around the site. The Panel had some concerns regarding the building cantilevering on the lane as it is almost at the property line and feels somewhat tight. Although they thought it was a clever approach to add more density the trees seem to be hitting the underside of the cantilever.

The Panel also thought the lane edge could be developed a bit more and that a pedestrian walkway should be added. They also had some concerns regarding the east property line noting that when the project is built next door there would only be a 12 foot separation between buildings in the courtyard condition. Some suggested the applicant increase the courtyard to 12 feet and the project to the east to have a courtyard width of 12 feet as well. As well, Panel thought the two foot setback of the townhouse units worked but thought it was a little tight primarily because the second floor is coming out almost to the property line and wanted to see the townhouses setback a little more.

With respect to the wayfinding to the mews, the Panel thought that if the lane condition was improved, then the wayfinding would also be improved. As well they thought the main lobby could be more compatible and distinguished for the front door. Some Panel members thought the amenity room was difficult to access for people in wheelchairs and they also thought the space could be pulled out to make it larger. One Panel member suggested making it a glass box.

Regarding the 3-storey shoulder on the east side of the property, the Panel felt that as long as the property on the east rises up to a 4-storey, there shouldn't be a problem with the 4-storey expression.

Although there was mostly support for the material and colour palette, some Panel members thought the upper volume with its radical colouring and uninspiring 4-storey block needed some work. One Panel member noted that the white volume was interrupted by the grey enclosed balconies and required a cleaner expression.

The landscaping plans were supported by the Panel although they thought the wall condition on the south side of the courtyard was an opportunity to add a green wall. They also wanted to see the tree canopy in the courtyard tall and thin to make the space more useable. Some

Panel member thought the townhouse units were turning their back on the lane and wanted to see individual entrances and patios with either a fence or a hedge for privacy. Most of the Panel wanted to see an outdoor amenity attached to the indoor amenity space and as well they wanted to see some children play space. One Panel member wondered if the enclosed balconies at grade made sense and thought these units should be garden suites instead.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Emerson had no further comments.

---

4. Address:	351 West King Edward Avenue
DE:	418473
Description:	To develop a 4-storey residential building with 2-storey townhouses at the lane for a total of 42 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Ramsay Worden Architects
Owner:	Trillian
Delegation:	Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects Jack Wu, Ramsay Worden Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Michael Brown, Trillium Project Management Veronica Owens, Light House (LEED™ Consultant)
Staff:	Allan Moorey

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)**

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site one block east of Cambie Street on the eastern most block of Cambie Corridor. He described the surrounding context which is zoned RS-1. The site slopes three feet to the north with a slight fall to the northeast. The setbacks along the east property line are twelve feet, along the lane are four feet and at Yukon Street as well as along King Edward Avenue, are 10 feet. The parking entry is from the lane between the townhouse units. The 3-storey shoulder complies with the Guidelines and the 4-storey corner element was developed to provide an entry element and architecture significance at the corner of Yukon Street and King Edward Avenue. There are six townhouse units proposed along the lane. As well there are 36 units in the primary building (5 studios, 9 one bedroom units, 21 two bedroom units and 1 three bedroom unit).

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

- Comments on the quality and expression of the proposed materials.
- Based on the previous comments, have these issues been addressed by the revised proposal:
  - Design development to improve the townhouse expression and materiality;
  - Design development to improve the relationship between the townhouses and the children's play area;
  - Design development to improve the primary residential entry;
  - Consider softening the colour palette;
  - Consider improving the green strategy for the proposal.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bob Worden, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they have adjusted the height of the building to be more comfortable with the neighbourhood. As well they have divided the townhouse row into two and moved the parking entrance to the middle of the site at the lane. They also took the children's play area from the back courtyard and moved it to the street edge where it will get some sunshine. The children's play area is now adjacent to the ground floor common amenity area. Mr. Worden mentioned that they have redesigned the brick façade to emphasis more of the horizontality of the openings. They have also organized the roof line to follow the massing. He mentioned that they have added four bays on the lane to enliven the lane expression. Mr. Worden described the material palette and noted that the brick has a

brown/purple expression and as well there is quite a bit of wood on the buildings. He noted that the white material is a hardi clap board with a metal trim on the corners and around the windows.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted that there are individual entrances for the townhouses on the lane. There is also an outdoor patio space. A bike lane is being added along Yukon Street and on West King Edward Avenue there will be a new row of street trees along with a bike path. The entrance to the courtyard is off Yukon Street and includes the amenity outdoor space and children's play. There will be a series of terraces in the courtyard and between the two townhouses.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the roof line;
  - Consider improving the material expression.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had resolved the issues the Panel had at the previous review.

The Panel thought the project had been significantly improved with the exception of a few areas. They thought the overlook to the townhouses could be improved. Originally there were roof decks that have been removed and they thought the rationale for the roof line particularly the sloping roof, was unresolved and a bit awkward. A couple of Panel member suggested lifting the roof and adding a clerestory to give more light into the space. One Panel member thought there was an opportunity to break up the massing by creating breaks in the roof line edge and articulately the balconies on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor.

The Panel had a couple of concerns with respect to the material expression. Panel commented they would expect a clearer rationale or logic to the material use. They thought the dark balcony rails got lost in the townhouse units and thought there should some wood treatment to the bay windows or other areas on the façade. It was also noted that the dark brick should be taken to the balconies.

The Panel thought the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces as well as the children's play all worked well together. One Panel member suggested making a sliding wall between the lobby and the amenity room to make for a larger space.

There was some concern with the depth between the townhouses and the building as some Panel members thought there might not be much light.

Regarding sustainability, Panel members wanted to see a water management plan and the Panel commented the energy component could be improved.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Worden mentioned that the storm water would be collected in a cistern under the townhouses. As for the energy component, the building will have a truss roof with continuous insulation. He said they were still looking at the rationale for the material palette. Mr. Worden thanked the Panel for their comments regarding the roof line and said it was worth looking into.

### Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.