

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** February 11, 2015

**TIME:** 3.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Ryan Bragg (Chair) (Absent for Item #1)  
Joseph Fry (Left after Item #3)  
David Grigg  
Joseph Hruda  
Jennifer Marshall (Chair Item #1)  
Phil Mondor (Absent for Items #1 & #2)  
Chris Mramor  
Goran Ostojic (Absent for Items #1 & #2 - Excused item #5)

**REGRETS:**  
Walter Francl  
Arno Matis  
Matthew Soules

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 3819 Boundary Road   |
| 2. | 1229 Hornby Street (Burrard Gateway)                           |
| 3. | 970 Union Street   |
| 4. | 706 East 57 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (formerly 7350 Fraser Street) |
| 5. | 388 Skeena Street (formerly 3501 East Hastings Street)         |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Marshall 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: 3819 Boundary Road  
 DE: 416933  
 Description: Concurrent rezoning and development application to construct a 4-storey residential building including a total of 23 rental housing units. This application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.  
 Zoning: C-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Concurrent Rezoning and Development Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: W.T. Leung Architects Inc.  
 Owner: Raj Nijjar  
 Delegation: Wing Ting Leung, W.T. Leung Architects Inc.  
 Elaine Morrow, W.T. Leung Architects Inc.  
 Mia Harth, Swordfern Garden Landscape Architects  
 Stan Jang, Building Balance Consulting Inc.  
 Staff: Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng

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

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a concurrent rezoning and development permit application made under the Rental 100 program. She noted that under the Rental 100 program, an incentive that can be given is to consider a higher form of development than what is permitted under a site's existing zoning. In this case, the site is zoned C-1. The Rental Incentive Guidelines states that a form of development up to that of C-2 zoning can be considered. She explained that for C-1, the permitted conditional height is 35 feet and the permitted density is 1.2 FSR. For C-2, the allowable height is 45 feet, with setback requirements at the lane at various levels, and a possible density of 2.5 FSR. In describing the proposal Ms. Zeng noted that it is located at the southwest corner of Boundary Road and East 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, in the Renfrew Collingwood neighbourhood. The surrounding area is zoned RS-1, mostly occupied by single family homes, with the exception of the site just to the south of the subject site. This site has a church on it with associated parking. Boundary Road is a major arterial and East 22<sup>nd</sup> is a collector. There is a bus running along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (#25) but there is not a bus that runs consistently along Boundary Road. As a result, the proposal is meeting the parking By-law requirement for a secured market rental project, without the 20% discount associated with being within two blocks of an intersection where two buses run. The proposal is for a total of 23 market rental units, all will be secured as rental for 60 years or the life of the building. The proposal also includes 6 units that are two-bedroom units.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site is surrounded with a single family zoned area (RS-1) and across Boundary Road, in Burnaby are also single family homes. He noted that the site has a fairly dramatic slope and as stated in the C-2 guidelines for the form of development, the maximum height needs to follow the slope. Mr. Cheng described the context noting the existing church with an adjacent surface parking lot. He mentioned that a 10 foot setback will help to guarantee better livability for the units. Mr. Cheng asked the Panel to consider the siting, how it relates to the properties nearby and also to the public realm while taking into consideration the suburban topology in the area. He added that the Rental 100 Policy does

state that for a site like this, it can go from C-1 to C-2 building form. Mr. Cheng mentioned that the proposal meets the parking bylaw with respect to projects of this nature, it being a rental building.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Wing Ting Leung, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that access to the parking is at the rear of the site. The building is four storeys on Boundary Road and steps into the hill so when it meets the lane, it steps down to more of a two or 3-storey form which responds to the context. The building is clad in brick and most of the units have exterior balconies except for the corner units. As well the building will meet LEED™ Gold for rezoning.

Mia Harth, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted the planting on the lane and parking area with some trellis work. As well they have added a few trees along the front and the north side.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the concrete wall expression along Boundary Road;
  - Consider a lockable gate access to the lane;
  - Consider a corner store;
  - Design development to add more visual porosity into the bike storage.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a competent design.

The Panel supported the form, materials and massing and noted that Boundary Road seemed to be forgotten and poorly serviced by amenity and anything that added density would only improve the streetscape. They also thought that since the site is on a bus route that it didn't require as much parking. A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding CPTED at the parking ramp.

The Panel supported the colour and material palette with one Panel member suggesting the applicant look at adding good quality railings to the balconies to improve aesthetic appeal.

They thought the ground plane and the interface with the public edges were well handled. However, they noted that there are a lot of concrete wall edges that present themselves to the street and perhaps some could be pulled in or eliminated. It was suggested that they could as well be softened with some landscaping. One Panel member suggested adding more street trees along Boundary Road for some privacy to the ground floor units. They also mentioned that since the residents are likely to access through the lane, there could be a lockable gate.

The Panel thought the site was a good location for a corner store given the number of residential properties in the area. They noted that the street level corner location did not make for a very livable unit. The Panel thought that having the amenity room and bike lockers on the ground floor was the right move and noted that more visual porosity to the bike storage should be entertained.

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

2. Address:	1229 Hornby Street (Burrard Gateway)
DE:	418686
Description:	To construct a new 54-storey mixed-use tower including one floor of retail (an auto showroom), three floors of commercial office, one floor of amenity, two floors of rental residential and 47 floors of market residential. This proposal includes a total of 490 residential units, 53 of those being rental.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Fourth (First as Development Application)
Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
Owner:	Reliance Holdings
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Architects Derek Lee, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Jon Stovell, Reliance Holdings Michael Lee Pattison, Reliance Holdings Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (3-2)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application after rezoning (CD-1). He mentioned that the building heights, form of development, building massing and distance between the towers have been approved in the CD-1 rezoning that was enacted on October 28, 2014. Mr. O'Sullivan noted that the site is divided into two sub-areas and this application is for the west sub-area site (Sub-Area A).

The application includes a 54-storey residential tower and a 7-storey podium. The east sub-area has been rezoned to accommodate a 35-storey residential tower which staff anticipate to be developed as a subsequent phase. The Burrard Street site has been rezoned to CD-1 to develop an office tower with an auto dealership on the lower levels. Mr. O'Sullivan described the context for the area noted that the site is bounded by Hornby, Drake, Davie and Burrard Streets. As well the tower location is an axial alignment with the Burrard Bridge.

The proposal is for a 54-storey residential tower with a maximum height of 550 feet to the top of the appurtenances. A pedestrian and vehicle breezeway is provided from Hornby Street and there is an extensive stone paver surface treatment in the public realm. The residential lobby is accessed from Hornby Street and is on level one in the podium. There is also a retail frontage in the podium with an area for outdoor seating. General office use is proposed at the breezeway edge and there is a vehicle dealership cornering Drake Street and the lane as well as a coffee shop space. The vehicle ramp access has been changed from the rezoning proposal and is now from the lane as opposed from the breezeway. Level 2 of the podium is for general office and an area for a residential amenity lounge. Levels 3 and 4 are also for general office and level 5 will have amenity use which includes an area for fitness and a pool, study areas, a music room, games room, meeting rooms and lounge areas as well as the bridge that connects to the Burrard Street site. Levels 6 and 7 are for 54 rental residential units. The tower includes 47 floors for market residential with 8 levels of underground parking and bike storage on levels P1 and P2.

Mr. O'Sullivan described the changes to the design since the proposal was at rezoning. This includes the following:

- top of the tower has been revised/reduced:
- Tower expression: has been calmed down; simplification/rationalization of the floor plate, glazed area has been reduced and there are vertical and horizontal shading elements added.
- Breezeway: reduced the number of parking/drop-off lay-bys and the breezeway only leads to one parking ramp as opposed to the two from the previous iteration.

Mr. O'Sullivan mentioned that the applicant is proposing an increase to the floor area with the development permit application. The floor plate has increased by 340 square feet and is currently proposed at its broadest location of 9,250 square feet. As well there have been changes to the storage area exclusion and changes to the amenity and lobby areas.

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

- Comments on the overall architectural expression of the tower still perform relative to its role as a significant gateway building emphasizing its axial alignment with the Burrard Street Bridge.
- Comments were asked on the quality of materials and exterior detailing of the tower and podium.
- Comments regarding the design of the upper portion of the building in terms of its architectural contribution to the city skyline.
- Comments on the rationalization of the floor plate and increase in floor plate dimension associated with a shift in the floor area.
- Comments on the success of the breezeway as a pedestrian connection relative to vehicle access.
- Comments on the quality of the enhanced Public Realm, specifically with regards to:
  - Surface treatments, street furniture, water features, public areas designated for seating, bollards, planting, etc.
  - The enhanced surface treatment (stone pavers) on the lane.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, stated that they have done a lot of design development on the tower to make it work from a suite layout point of view as well as integrating the structure. The tower has been simplified without losing the exciting characteristics of a skewed form onto the Burrard Street access. As well there is a unique waffle grid that is structural concrete on the side of the tower. He added that they have done a lot of technical work to make sure they can achieve the look for the tower. The ground plane has been worked for the entire site. In terms of the lane (mews), has been opened up to the sky and the public bike share will be located in this area. The purpose of the bridge will have the ability to transport waste heat back and forth between the two sites and preheat the domestic hot water. The other purpose for the space is to provide access for both residential and office residents to access the amenity space. Mr. Bruckner mentioned that there are metal panels in three different colours on the facades and as well vertical sun screens on the office podium. He also noted that the architecture reflects how using building components provides shading for the glass.

Gwyn Vose, Architect, further described the architecture and mentioned that the building is very sculptural and is not only working environmentally but as well is visible from various parts of the city. He noted that they have been working with a lighting engineer to add channel lighting on the bridge element using LED lights that will run up the fins. The lights will be attached to a computer system so the lights can be controlled. The bridge element itself will also be lit as well as the ground oriented features.

Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that one of the key elements of the site is the ground plane. He mentioned that they are planning to define the edges with a continuous ground plane with bollards and stainless steel edges to define spaces. To accent the lobby entrances they will be adding water features. At the upper level they are maximizing the outdoor amenity space. They are planning urban agriculture, outdoor rooms for seating and a fire pit. As well there is a smaller outdoor patio on level 4. He noted that there is a slope across the property so they are planning to use seating decks that would emerge from a flush condition. As well indirect lighting illuminating out from underneath surfaces is proposed to enhance the ground plane at night.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the void on the south western façade by removing the balconies;
  - Consider a lighting strategy for the void;
  - Design development to refine the architectural language so that is more consistent and coherent around the building;
  - Design development to celebrate lantern expression and rationalize the penthouse form;
  - Design development to the breezeway to make it less oppressive and compressed;
  - Consider improving the lane expression with more plantings;
  - Design development to improve the bridge element.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an exciting project that will bring a lot of life and up market quality to this area of Burrard Street.

The Panel thought that it has the potential to be a striking building and will have a strong silhouette in the city skyline. The Panel liked the architectural expression of the tower and its form as a gateway building. It thought the void on the south western façade was a striking element but that, with the inclusion of the balconies, was not working. They noted that the removal of the balconies would be beneficial and suggested that having a lighting strategy onto that face would have a great impact on the design. As well they had some concerns regarding the loss of some of the clarity from the previous schemes. Panel encouraged greater simplification and coherence to the design. Panel supported the rationalization of the floor plate although they thought the slots and the proportions of the facade require some design development.

The Panel thought there had been a reduction in some of the moves particularly at the roof but overall the building seemed to have a number of elements that have been added and are not of the same language. They also thought that from an architectural point of view the texture of the building as it changes around the building from horizontal to the waffle grid was very successful.

Several Panel members supported the lantern expression but thought it was somewhat unresolved. They also thought that the white form that sits on top seemed to be competing with the lantern expression and encouraged the applicant to resolve those two elements and celebrate the lantern with a stronger expression.

Regarding the breezeway, the Panel thought it should have a more generous height, width or perception of the space so that it reads as a more open space. They agreed that the Hornby Street elevation was more ordered and improved since the previous review.

However, they questioned the graphic treatment of the undercroft as they thought it made the area more oppressive and compressed and required a different type of treatment. As well a number of Panel members suggested that there could be more glazing and visual porosity into the building faces that flank either side of the breezeway that would all for the breezeway to feel more open.

A couple of Panel members suggested that the applicant team take a step back and look at the overall concept of the Hornby Street elevation and how pedestrians will move through the space. They felt there were some opportunities with regards to connection that could be utilized and would make the space feel more public.

Most of the panel supported the landscape plans but thought the quality and scale of materials could be enhanced. They noted that the bollards made the space feel more like a lane. As well some Panel members thought there could be more plantings and trees within the lane space.

Although the Panel understood the need for the bridge element, they thought it could be celebrated more and made to have a richer expression. As well they thought the space was underutilized and that perhaps the roof space could be used. They wanted to see the quality of the space improved as they thought it didn't have the same architectural quality of the facades on the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner said he was gratified that the Panel was so interested in the project and he added that the Panel had some good insights for the bridge to make it better.

---

3. Address:	970 Union Street
DE:	418491
Description:	To add and alter the existing multi-level care facility to meet current Vancouver Coastal Health Guidelines and requirements.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Joe Y. Wai Architect
Owner:	Villa Cathay Care Home Society
Delegation:	Joe Wai, Joe Y. Wai Architect Qi Wan, Joe Y. Wai Architect Alyssa Semczyszyn, John Losee Landscape Architects
Staff:	Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting Paul Cheng

---

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

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following a rezoning. During the rezoning the site and its contextual fit was taken into consideration. It has some rather unique adjacencies which include a social housing development as well as some industrially zoned properties. Directly to the west is another care home. He noted that during the rezoning there was little commentary from the public regarding the increase in height. As part of the rezoning, form, height and density was already supported. He asked the Panel to take a look at the architectural expression and the choice of materials. He also asked them for comments on the need for a noise mitigation strategy with respect to the courtyard. He noted that access to the underground parking could not be accessed from Union Street as it is a bike lane. Instead it will be located off Raymur Avenue.

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Joe Wai, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they have pushed the building back from Venables Street. He mentioned that there is a pavilion and very colorful work in the courtyard. Mr. Wai mentioned that they tried to reduce the bulkiness of the building. He added that the concept of care has changed since the original building was built 37 years ago and have complied with the 2007 Vancouver Coastal Health's approach to care that involves neighbourhoods within the care home. Mr. Wai mentioned that they are enlarging the existing units by reducing the number of double rooms to single rooms. The washrooms will be wheelchair accessible and with the grouping of units, the rooms will be closer to dining and lounge areas.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that the current building has a nice mature landscape. The idea was to create something with lots of different plantings with colour for each of the seasons. They also took into consideration CPTED issues. Street trees are proposed along Venables Street and in the courtyard they have walkways with a line in the paving from the entrance to the front door. Ms. Semczyszyn mentioned that there is a noise attenuation barrier on the back of the site that will be maintained. Community gardens are proposed in the outdoor amenity area and as well there is a small water feature in the courtyard.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.



- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the architectural expression of the new addition;
  - Design development to improve the volumetric relationship between new additions and the existing building;
  - Design development to elevate the quality of the existing architecture with the new addition;
  - Design development to improve the entrance legibility;
  - Design development to improve the parking entrance;
  - Design development to improve the quality of the concrete wall;
  - Consider improving the noise mitigation strategy;
  - Consider the orientation of the shading devices on the south and west facades.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they thought the lack of connection between the existing building and the additions was a concern.

The Panel thought there was a disconnect between the three volumes that were being proposed and that design development was required in those areas. As well they thought the entrance lacked a prominence on Union Street and perhaps its function could be improved as well. The Panel thought the lack of weather protection at the entry especially when considering the aging population was troublesome. They noted that many people who will live in the building will likely be using wheelchairs and there is no protection at the moment.

The penthouse expression doesn’t seem to have any intent to it and needs some design development. At a detailed level, the motif on the elevation was something that generally was supported, although some suggested a more contemporary version could be introduced. The Panel had some concerns on how it was being used, noting that it was added to some volumes and not to others. They wanted to see greater rigor and more consistency when using the motif.

The Panel had some concerns regarding noise with some members suggesting triple glazing on the west and perhaps on the east and south as well.

The Panel thought the concrete wall should be kept but to improve it and make it more robust so that it is doing its job. As well they thought it needed to be screened for the public realm on Venables Street. Right now the interface to the street was poor from an urban point of view as it is not only an “entry” to the city for the building, but a prominent pedestrian route. There was a suggestion to add some more vegetation and trees.

Several Panel members mentioned that the applicant should ensure that the water feature works to improve the acoustics in the courtyard.

The Panel noted that the shading devices on the west façade are the wrong orientation and should be made vertical to serve their intent.

The Panel had serious concerns regarding the parking entrance. They questioned whether it worked and commented that it looked like a large garage door on a prominent street.

The Panel felt there was a responsibility to elevate the quality of the existing architecture. They noted that it had been done in some areas but was not consistent on the whole project.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Wai- thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that Engineering did not support having the entrance to the parking on Union Street. He agreed that the site could be more connected. As well he thought they could improve the project so that it has the same vocabulary between the existing and the new addition.

---

4. Address:	706 East 57 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (formerly 7350 Fraser Street)
DE:	418603
Description:	To construct a 6-storey residential building including a total of 96 rental housing units.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	Archstone Projects Ltd.
Delegation:	Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Tim Potter

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)**

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a new purpose built rental building under the Rental 100 program ranging from 4-storeys to 5-storeys. He noted that the base zoning is RT-2 and has an existing rental building of approximately 40 years old currently on the site. Below grade parking is accessed from the lane. Mr. Potter reminded the Panel that the development application was subsequent to a rezoning application that the Panel had already reviewed.

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

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

- Comments regarding how well the Panel's previous comments have been addressed;
- Comments on the lower courtyard and its effect overall on the lane interface and the interface of adjacent units;
- Comments on the patio treatment on the southeast unit at East 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue and any opportunities to improve upon this;
- Comments on the success of the landscape plan and public realm treatments; and
- General comments on sustainability design strategies for the project.

Mr. Potter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Simon Richards, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the previous Panel's comments were positive. He said that they felt it was right to lighten up the colour palette and that the boulevard trees were always intended to be added to the proposal. He explained that it was tough to deal with a sloping site with a building that steps in nine foot increments. He added that the lane is over four feet higher than the street. Regarding the livability of the units on the lower corner, Mr. Richards mentioned that they tried to move the transformer to the other side, but Hydro insisting on having it in that location.

Scott Kennedy, Engineer, described the Passive House program. He noted that there is an independent body that is certified to approve the program. They plan on using the Passive House Academy program who will, at the design stage, review their passive house model which was created at the start of the project. It takes into account shadowing on neighbouring buildings, how the windows are mounted and thermal calculations around the edges of the windows and doors. There are other checks that they also take into consideration to make sure the project meets the Passive House standards. He added that

they are planning to put an emphasis on the type of windows, insulation in the walls and a more efficient ventilation system to meet the Passive House guidelines.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the sunken units;
  - Design development to improve the sunken amenity space and consider reversing the location of the amenity on the upper floors;
  - Consider revising the material palette;
  - Consider relocating the parkade entry to the lower end of the site.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had met the Panel's previous concerns.

The Panel thought the applicant had addressed the previous concerns well but they still had some concern regarding livability in the sunken units and thought the functionality of the patio outside the amenity space was still problematic. They weren't sure anyone would actually use the space with a couple of Panel members suggested adding more planting to soften the area. They suggested also raising the amenity space to another floor.

The Panel thought the architectural treatment could use some design development and refinement around the material palette and the manner in which it is employed.

Regarding the parkade entry, the Panel had some concern regarding how vehicles need to enter the parkade. They suggested relocating the entry to the parkade to the lowest portion of the site and might solve other issues in the proposal as well.

The Panel thought the function of exterior space at levels 5 and 6 could be reversed given there is a more active space adjacent to the roof top. They also noted that if the sunken amenity space was to remain, then perhaps could be redefined as a workshop.

The Panel thought the Passive House program was a great addition to the project but thought the applicant should also shadow the LEED™ checklist.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Richards said they were happy to take another look at the sunken amenity space and he agreed that they could add more plantings to the space. In terms of the sunken units, he noted that if they could move the transformer they would, and that the units would have a more affordable rent. Mr. Richards said that in terms of moving the parkade entrance, there would be a more lot of issues in moving it. He added that they have shadowed LEED™ and had been following LEED™ for Multi-Family projects before they decided to take on the Passive Home program. Regarding their sustainability strategy, they are looking at green houses gases, the sustainable water aspect and ways to reduce energy use.

5. Address:	388 Skeena Street (formerly 3501 East Hastings Street)
DE:	418522
Description:	To construct a 6-storey mixed-use building including 86 rental housing units with retail at grade.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	Eighth Avenue Development Group
Delegation:	Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Ed Kolic, Eighth Avenue Development Group
Staff:	Colin King

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (3-2)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for development permit application after rezoning to develop a 6-storey mixed-use development comprised of 86 dwelling units. Mr. King noted that the rezoning application had a slightly higher FSR and one more residential unit. The height and use is unchanged since the rezoning while the massing has had some alterations and the expression is significantly different.

The proposal is on the north side of East Hastings Street at the corner of Skeena Street with a lane to the rear and single family dwellings beyond. Mr. King mentioned that the surrounding context includes redeveloping of a shopping area, mixed streetscape and surface parking to the east, adjacent to a 3-storey building. The proposal is for a 6-storey building with commercial at grade along the Hastings Street frontage and wrapping the corner to Skeena Street. The widened boulevard at Skeena Street allows the development of an external commercial patio at the corner. The residential entry is on Skeena Street with a possible future public bike share development on City land. Mr. King noted that the top of the building is stepped back, gradually coming down to a 4-storey expression but as with the rezoning application, there is a significant 5-storey expression and an expression of 6-storeys at the corner. Two levels of underground parking can be accessed from the lane. Mr. King described the material palette noting the use of a mix of brick and hardie panel. The proposal is required to meet LEED™ Gold although the applicant is proposing the Passive House Design program.

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

1. Does the application satisfactorily address the previous Panel's concerns regarding:
  - expression of the southwest corner;
  - upper level massing to the lane;
  - livability of units on the 5th and 6th level with inboard bedrooms;
  - individual access for the lane units on the ground floor.
2. Commentary regarding the provision and quality of indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, particularly as it relates to play space for children.
3. Are there any concerns regarding the sustainability strategies proposed, particularly as they relate to LEED™ Gold equivalency through Passive House certification?

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Scott Kennedy, Engineer, further described the proposal and mentioned that because the proposal is a rental building they wanted to be

able to offer an amenity space on the roof. However, because it is a wood frame building, they can't put an amenity room on the roof because it would become a 7-storey building. As well the City's green roof policy requires a large amount of the space to be an intensive green roof which would not give them enough room for an amenity. As a result they added an amenity room on the bottom floor that allows for some garden space. As well they thought that was the best area for a children's play area. He noted that there is a park within a block of the site and thought the space would probably be used by younger children and the parent could sit in the amenity room to watch their children. They decided to move the children's play area out to the lane since it will get a reasonable amount of sun. In order to do that they needed to remove two parking spaces. Mr. Kennedy explained that they have dealt with the bike ramp, moving the transformer and massing the corner. As well there is a colour change to the building.

Mr. Kolic explained that they would like to add an amenity space on the roof if they could afford it. They are exploring Passive House and there are additional costs with this program that they are currently exploring. He added that the play area probably won't be used that much since there is a park close by.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the indoor amenity space;
  - Design development to improve the children's play space;
  - Design development to improve the livability of the north facing units;
  - Design development to return to the greater clarity of the previous submission;
  - Consider adding shading devices.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had made several good improvements to the building.

The Panel thought the lane had been much improved since the last review especially the relocation of the PMT and the ramp. As well the access to the units on the lane helps to activate the lane.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the location of the amenity space and thought the City's green roof policy was a bit punitive to the applicant's intent to provide an amenity space on the roof. They noted that providing an amenity space would be a benefit to the residents who will live in the building. There were a number of Panel members who thought that the unit next to the ground floor amenity space could be swapped with the amenity room to allow for more space. The Panel agreed that anything that promotes community by having an amenity space closer to the entrance or taking away a car parking space to provide amenity was supportable.

The Panel also thought that the children's play area at the lane would still not get a lot of sunlight for the majority of the year. The proposal introduced at the Panel meeting was not received very favourably.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the livability of some of the north facing units and some of the small units which were challenged both with exposure and light as well as the lack of some outdoor space.

The Panel had a preference for the expression in the previous iteration in relation to the architectural resolution. As well there were a couple of Panel members who wondered why the shade devices had been removed from the facades.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Kennedy said they would like to add the sun shades back into the design. He said it was a matter of being more concerned with the passive design of the proposal. He thanked the Panel for their comments.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.