

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 25, 2015

TIME: 3.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood (Excused Item #3)
Roger Hughes (Chair)
Ken Larsson (Excused Item #3)
Arno Matis
Chris Mramor
Matthew Soules

REGRETS: Jennifer Marshall

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	7516-7550 Cambie Street
2.	2615 Trimble Street
3.	3000 East Broadway
4.	3289 Riverwalk Avenue (East Fraser Lands Parcel 8B)
5.	727 East 17 th Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Anita Molaro, Assistant Director, Urban Design, called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and welcomed the new Panel members. The Panel elected a new Chair and Vice Chair and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address: | 7516-7550 Cambie Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | To construct two 6-storey mixed-use buildings with commercial space at grade and 72 dwelling units above. |
| Zoning: | C-1, RT-1, RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | W.T. Leung Architects |
| Delegation: | W.T. Leung, W.T. Leung Architects |
| | Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects |
| Staff: | Michelle McGuire and Marie Linehan |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- Introduction:** Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that is made up of three parcels on Cambie Street south of West 59th Avenue. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan that contemplates 6-storey mixed-use buildings in this area. Ms. McGuire described the context for the area and noted the Pearson Hospital and Dogwood Lodge site with an approved policy statement that allows consideration for a mixed-use proposal with heights ranging from three to 28-storeys and the potential for a new Canada Line Station at West 57th Avenue. She also noted that to the east and west of Cambie Street are sites zoned RS-1 that are included in the recently approved Marpole Community Plan. To the east sites can be considered for rezoning for apartments up to 4-storeys and to the west, are proposed to remain as single family. However, there is an identified buffer area that will be revisited as part of the planning for Phase 3 of the Cambie Corridor Plan.

This rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1, RT-1 and C-1 to CD-1 to allow development of two 6-storey buildings over two levels of underground parking. The northern building includes commercial space intended to be used as a single restaurant to replace the existing restaurant that is currently located on the site. The proposal also includes 72 market residential units. As well there will be parking that includes 87 residential spaces, 41 commercial spaces and 5 residential visitor stalls.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, further described the proposal and noted that the building siting and setbacks fit with the expectations of the Cambie Corridor Plan for a site of this size and proposed uses. A two foot setback is provided at the exterior corner in light of the mixed use and commercial base, with larger setbacks provided on the residential building. A 28 foot setback is provided at the rear of the residential building with patios and landscaping. Ms. Linehan mentioned that due to the shallow lot depth of 118 feet a row of townhouse units at the lane are not required. The residential entries are at either side of the courtyard while the commercial unit turns the corner with glazing facing onto the courtyard and across the courtyard is a shared residential amenity space. Also facing onto the courtyard is a children's play space at the rear.

Ms. Linehan noted that the built form guidelines recommend a 6-storey building form with prominent 4-storey shoulder setbacks. The shoulder setbacks are broken at the exterior

corner of the mixed-use building to provide a stronger 6-storey vertical element. A 5-storey element is provided at the northwest corner of the residential building. The 4-storey shoulder setback steps down with the site grades at the south and rear elevations. She also mentioned that there is a significant grade change across the site from the high point at the exterior northwest corner to the interior southwest corner at the lane. There is also a 10 foot drop along Cambie Street and 7 foot to the rear of the site for total drop of about 17 feet. As well the building's massing steps down along Cambie Street in response to the grades, including the stepping of the main residential floor for the south building. Due to the lower grades at the lane the basement level is exposed above grade allowing a row of residential units to be provided in this location. The building is 6-storeys as viewed from Cambie Street. The uppermost levels step back at the south and lane elevations to mitigate the appearance of a 7-storey form.

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

Comments on the overall form of development relative to the Cambie Corridor Plan with particular reference to:

- Overall height and density.
- Vertical elements at the corners of both buildings relative to the 4-storey shoulder setback.
- Height, massing and setbacks as viewed from the south and lane elevations.
- Overall design of the courtyard including potential for a more public interface such as commercial patio space adjacent Cambie.

Ms. McGuire and Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** W.T. Leung, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site has a tremendous cross fall. He noted that it presented a challenge but also presents an opportunity to have an alternate form of massing and stepping of the building. They decided to express the taller element at the corner with a cornice to call attention to the commercial component. The intention is to replace the restaurant that has been on the site since 1975. The courtyard entrance presents an opportunity to break the commercial along Cambie Street. Since the building steps, they choose the terrace the building as well so that on the southern side there are bigger setbacks. On the southwest corner is the access to the underground parking as well as for commercial and residential visitors.

Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the project and noted the street trees and patios along Cambie Street. There are also trees along the lane and urban agriculture on the corner. The courtyard will have a water wall and a simple children's play area. The roofs have private spaces and then green roofs and there are hedges between the patios for separation and privacy.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to allow for more sunlight into the courtyard;
 - Consider a continuous pedestrian connection through the site;
 - Consider allow for the outdoor amenity to be connected to the indoor amenity space;
 - Consider more of a connection for the private patios on the lane;
 - Design development to improve the landscaped edge on the lane.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it conformed to the Cambie Corridor Guidelines.

The Panel supported the form of development and thought the density was appropriate. As well they thought the courtyard helped to break up the mass and they liked how the shoulders stepped on to the south and west. Some Panel members were concerned with the lack of sunlight in the courtyard and suggested a more consistent approach for the 4-storey step up for the south facade.

Some Panel members did not support the basement units as they thought they created a sunken courtyard and that the units would not get a lot of natural light. As well it was noted that this level created a 7-storey expression along the lane which is not consistent with the Cambie Corridor Plan.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but some Panel members wanted to see a continuous pedestrian connection through the site. They liked how the amenity space spanned from the street to the lane. However they thought the shortcoming was that the amenity didn't engage the courtyard and wanted to see more patio space. As well they noted that the children's play was disconnected from the amenity. One Panel member was concerned with the stair well as they thought it took away from the courtyard space. Some Panel members thought there needed to be more of a connection from the private patios to the lane and wanted to see room for larger trees in the lane as well.

Although some Panel were not opposed to the entrance to the parkade they thought pulling back the vista switch and the garbage and having two sets of stairs would make for better access for pedestrians through the courtyard. Pulling away the vista switch would make more room for a landscaped edge rather than having it stop at the ramp.

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

2. Address:	2615 Trimble Street
DE:	418692
Description:	To construct a 5-storey mixed-use building while retaining the existing heritage building. The proposal includes the retention of the existing three retail spaces at grade with two dwelling units above in the heritage house plus an additional 19 dwelling units.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Green Oak Development
Delegation:	Amela Brudar, GBL Architects Nick Sharp, GBL Architects
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application including a proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement. The site is located in the C-2 zoning at West 10th Avenue. It is at the southwest corner of West 10th Avenue and Trimble Street. Directly adjacent to the west is a 4-storey mixed-use building which was built in 1997 under an older version of the C-2 zoning. Along West 10th Avenue is a mix of older 1, 2, and 3 storey commercial and mixed-use buildings. The zoning across the lane to the south is RS-1 single family residential.

The site is 60 feet by 120 feet and it slopes up to the rear with the lane being about 7 feet higher than the street. The existing building on the site is a Heritage C building built in 1924. It contains small commercial units on the ground floor and two residential units above. The proposal is to retain and restore the existing building and to provide a new 5-storey residential building with 19 units. A small courtyard separation is provided between the heritage building and the new building with the main residential entry in this location. Two 2-storey townhouse units are proposed at the side elevation fronting on Trimble Street. One level of underground parking is proposed with access via the lane with a car elevator due to the lane elevation.

Relaxations to the C-2 density are being sought via a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) to support preservation of the existing building. The permitted density for a mixed use building at this site would be 2.5 FSR. The proposal is at 3.18 FSR. Relaxations are also being sought to the C-2 height and setbacks to facilitate retention of the heritage building and addition of a new building on the site. The permitted height in C-2 is 45 feet.

Typically a new building would be 4-storeys with a high commercial base and 3-storeys of residential above. The proposed height of the new building is 5-storeys. The height aligns with the higher portion of the C-2 building to the west. The typical C-2 envelope includes stepped setbacks at the rear. Balconies may project into these setbacks. The proposal is seeking relation to the setbacks to 6 feet.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the overall form of development including:

- Proposed height and density.
- The relationship of the new building to the existing Heritage C building.

- The relationship of the new building to the overall context, including the adjacent building and the single family sites to the rear.
- Rear setbacks and proximity of the new building to single family sites.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Amela Brudar, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that they feel this is an exciting opportunity to save the heritage building. It is one of the few remaining buildings in the neighbourhood. The building is not in very good shape so it will require some rehabilitation. The porch is an important heritage feature and will be restored to its original state. Ms. Brudar said they wanted to preserve the views of the heritage building on the corner of West 10th Avenue. She described the architectural design and noted that the building will float over the heritage. She mentioned that they were trying to minimize the impact on the existing building with their design. As well there is a proposed courtyard that would separate the new building from the existing building. Vehicle and bicycle parking is accessed from the lane. A common amenity space is proposed on the roof for the residents. Ms. Brudar described the landscape plans noting that there are a couple of existing street trees along West 10th Avenue. They are proposing to have the boulevard installed along Trimble Street to add some street trees. As well there will be some planters in the courtyard and then there are some smaller trees and planters planned for the roof. They are also proposing to put some trees along the lane.

Nick Sharp, Architect, mentioned that they had to elevate the building a little to clear the heritage building which presented an opportunity to provide universal access through an elevator to the veranda of the second storey of the heritage building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider stepping the building to improve the relationship to the single family houses to the south of the site;
 - Design development to improve the blank wall along the lane;
 - Consider shifting the upper box towards West 10th Avenue;
 - Consider adding planting in the lane;
 - Consider more activation in the courtyard as well as an indoor amenity room that opens into the space;
 - Consider adding some covered space on the roof.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a nice solution for retaining the heritage building.

Most of the Panel supported the height and density and liked how the new building was a contrast to the heritage building. Some Panel member thought the relationship to the building's context could be improved with some stepping. They also thought that the blank wall along the lane could be improved with clearstory windows to add some daylighting. Several Panel members thought the upper box could shift towards East 10th Avenue to reduce the proximity to the homes across the lane.

A couple of Panel members suggested making a large double height lobby space, deleting the glass wall and letting the old balcony system carry through. As well they thought the exit stair on the west wall could be flipped to get a better view through the courtyard and more light.

The Panel noted that the key to the project will be the expression of lightness of the form floating over the heritage building. It is also important that care be taken with the detailing of the glass to make it appear as a light glassy box. If it gets too heavy it will over-power the heritage and get lost.

Although the Panel supported the landscaping plans they wanted to see some planting in the lane that would be a buffer to the neighbours as they noted that the proximity to the single family sites was a bit abrupt with issues of overlook. They liked the courtyard and thought that it reinforced the space between the developments. However, some Panel member thought the courtyard could be better activated and some thought it was a bit small and shady. One Panel member suggested having some retail or a café. As well it was suggested that there was potential for an amenity space that opens to the courtyard. The Panel thought the roof top amenity made for a better project. One Panel member suggested adding some covered outdoor space to help its functionality.

It was suggested that it was important for the colour palette to allow the heritage building to have a presence. The Panel members did not want to see the building disappear into the new addition.

A Panel member noted that the proposal needed some work when it came to meeting energy targets and suggested the applicant look at ventilation recovery.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Brudar thanked the Panel for their great comments. She said they would help move the project forward.

3. Address:	3000 East Broadway
DE:	418321
Description:	To develop five 6-storey office buildings all over six levels of underground parking, having vehicular access from Nootka and Lillooet Streets.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Third (Second as Development Application)
Architect:	B+H Architects
Owner:	Broadway Heb Property Inc.
Delegation:	James Vasto, B+H Architects Tom Bunting, Studio B Architects David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development on the south side of East Broadway between Lillooet and Nootka Streets. He described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the north. This proposal is part of the Broadway Tech Centre development. Mr. Black gave the Panel some background regarding the site and noted that the applicant applied for rezoning under the policy for the Grandview boundary Industrial Area which was amended by Council in January of 2011 to allow office space to a maximum of 3.0 FSR if the development was within reasonable walking distance of a rapid transit station. He added that the Panel reviewed the proposal on May 18, 2011 at the rezoning stage. The rezoning was approved in principle and for the overall form of development by Council in May 2013.

Mr. Black described the policies for the site noting that the area policy is intended to increase the intensity of employment space in the form of industrial, office space and limited amounts of retail in close proximity to transit. Accordingly the CD-1 created for this site does not include a wide range of uses as would be seen in a "complete community" approach. This application will expand the amount of office space located close to rapid transit. As well the site falls under the Grandview Boundary Mixed Employment Area Rezoning & Development Policies and Guidelines.

Mr. Black mentioned that as this is a rezoning application it must meet the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning. Since the site area is greater than two acres, it also is subject to the Rezoning Policy for Greener Larger Sites. This policy was designed to achieve higher sustainability outcomes on large site developments.

The proposal is for five 6-storey buildings for office and other uses with all vehicle movement one level below. This allows for significant amounts of open space around the buildings and opportunities for landscape treatment of the courtyard. There is a plaza proposed at street level at the southwest corner and a pedestrian-only continuation of Virtual Way through the site. There is also public access north/south through the site.

Mr. Black noted that a previous design was reviewed by the Panel on November 19, 2014 and was not supported.

Comments were sought on the architectural and landscape design in general, and on the following items in particular:

- Whether the previous comments of the Urban Design Panel have been addressed successfully
- Quality of pedestrian routes and open spaces East-West, including the connection to Virtual Way
- The proposed design of the levels stepping up from Hebb Street to East Broadway, in terms of openness and the clarity of wayfinding
- Relationship of the building facades and landscape edges as they respond to the different street edges, such as Broadway vs. Hebb Avenue
- Approach to reducing building energy consumption

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Vasto, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that the proposal is to develop five office buildings that are arranged around an open plaza with space for recreation, social amenities and relaxation. The buildings will range in height from four to six storeys. There are several entrances to the buildings located from Nootka Street, Hebb Avenue and midblock on East Broadway. Mr. Vasto noted that there is no surface parking and that all vehicular traffic will be located below grade between Nootka and Lillooet Streets. He mentioned that there are a number of uses planned for this proposal and include industrial, high-tech and general office uses. Retail will be located adjacent to the SkyTrain Station. Mr. Vasto described the architecture and noted that the material palette has been simplified and will consist of cementitious board finish along with glass curtain-wall, corrugated steel panels along with concrete on the podium walls and planers.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that the whole project provides a strong network of pedestrian connections throughout the site. At each entry there is a wire mesh that provides signage opportunity and offers a breeze soleil.

Tom Bunting, Architect, gave an overview of the changes to the proposal since the last review. He noted that Building E which sits in the middle of the site has been simplified and the entrances enhanced. As well they have sharpened the curve of the building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the pedestrian access from Nootka Street;
 - Design development to enliven the building's expression;
 - Design development to improve the material palette;
 - Design development to identify the buildings;
 - Design development to improve the landscaping edge;
 - Consider adding more communal spaces in the open space;
 - Consider widening the sidewalks and relieving the pinch points.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and liked the overall concept for the site.

The Panel agreed that the applicant had made an effort to address their comments from the previous review. They thought there was a significant improvement with accessibility to the central plaza area. However they thought that pedestrian access from Nootka Street along Virtual Way could be improved. They noted that there are some constraints with the

stairs and encouraged the applicant to take another look to see if that could be improved especially for disabled access.

Regarding the building expression, some Panel members thought the materiality and expression had a 1980's office park look while one Panel member thought it had more of a suburban topology. They wanted to see the palette cleaned up and noted that the wire mesh applied to the sun shade detailing along with the signage elements was not working well together. As well they wanted to see wrapping of the spaces around to the streets as much as possible and thought the clerestory windows didn't work. They also noted that the buildings seemed to turn their backs to the street.

They commended the applicant for the arrival experience underground with some landscaping and as well the arrival experience from the SkyTrain Station.

The Panel thought there was a better way to identify the buildings without having large letters on top of the buildings. One Panel member noted that it needed something special such as an art piece.

Although the Panel supported the landscaping plans they thought that the landscape edge was not very hospitable. They liked the amount of open space that they felt would be well used but wanted to see more retail opportunity for community uses. With respect to wayfinding, the Panel thought there were some pinch points and that some of the sidewalks were too narrow but thought the water was a nice element as it follows the grade. They also commended the applicant for the extent of green roofs.

The Panel thought the approach to energy consumption was good. The solar shading is sensible in the way it is applied on the south facades but the applicant might consider adding vertical sun shades on the west facade.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Vasto thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that there will be company signage and they have tried to maximize the retail space. Mr. Stoyko mentioned that they are trying to improve on the Broadway Tech Centre and bring some warmth down to the ground level. Mr. Cordonier explained that the roof decks are appreciated at Broadway Tech and are designed so that the interiors make the roof decks more useable. He added that they have moved much of the urban agriculture onto the south roof decks. Mr. Bunting mentioned that the shades on the east are not important as the building needs the morning sun to warm it up.

4. Address:	3289 Riverwalk Avenue (East Fraser Lands Parcel 8B)
DE:	418718
Description:	To construct a 6-storey residential building containing a total of 108 dwelling units.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Shift Architecture Inc.
Owner:	Polygon
Delegation:	Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture Inc. Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Kevin Shoemaker, Polygon
Staff:	Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-8)

- **Introduction:** Ms. St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced a proposal for Parcel 8B in East Fraser Lands, now commonly known as the "River District". She gave some background to the area noting that the topography slopes upward to several existing townhouse developments, Chaplain Heights and Everett Crowley Park. As well she described the history of the area and explained that it was formerly industrial land with the primary use being the White Pines Sawmill. There are 130 acres of land and one mile of riverfront associated with the River District. This includes over 25 acres of park, residential development, retail, a community centre, a school and several childcare centres. The area will home to approximately 13,000 residents. This proposal belongs to the Central Neighbourhood (Area One) which will be the higher density mixed-use heart of the River District. The area supports a variety of building heights and types from four to 25-storeys. The area was rezoned in 2008, and was intended to be the first phase of development, establishing a complete community from day one. However, the economic conditions of 2008 did not support the construction of the higher density mixed use developments envisioned for this area. Development began in Area Two instead.

Ms. St. Michel described the East Fraser Lands Guidelines which was approved by Council at the time of rezoning. These guidelines included direction for the design of the public realm, sustainability strategies, massing and allocation of density as well architectural expression.

Ms. St. Michel noted that the site is subject to meet LEED™ Gold equivalency or Built Green Gold with an Energuide score of 80. There is provision for a future connection a neighbourhood energy utility which was originally envisioned to use waste heat from the metro Vancouver incinerator in Burnaby.

Ms. St. Michel described the proposal and noted that the applicant has chosen to pursue a 6-storey wood-frame building rather than the guideline terraced form. The building is expressed as a series of components through colour, form and material. Rather than split the outdoor spaces between the north and south, and the difficulties associated with the multiple inside corners that creates, the design forms a south facing courtyard along Riverwalk.

Since the guidelines were written, the Flood Construction Levels (FCL) have been raised by over a metre to 4.8 which creates some challenges in transitioning in particular to the CP rail line, which unlike the adjacent roads and parks will not see the grades raised. A series of landscaped steps transitions down to this edge.

The proposal will contain 108 units and the primary materials are cementitious panel siding and horizontal corrugated metal as an industrial reference along with metal canopy elements announcing the main entry.

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

- Overall massing: comments and advice on the massing and the change to 6-storey wood-frame from the original 4 to 8-storey stepped and terraced form.
- Reflection of Inspiration: comments on how examples given in the package have been reflected in the design; in particular the use and patterning of colour and the composition of simple massing components.
- Scale of elements, horizontality, sun shades: The guidelines reference the scale and simplicity of industrial components, as well as emphasize horizontality in contemporary expression and terraced buildings. Provide advice with regard to the scale of horizontal elements and details, such as sunshades, extent of overhangs, balconies, etc.
- Northern edge: comments on the design of the terraced landscape edge along north side of the proposal.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Cam Halkier, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they felt it was important to break the façade down into smaller forms. It is a wood frame building so they choose to add large industrial openings at the corners. These are punctuated with understated sun screens. In describing the architecture, Mr. Halkier noted that they sculpted the frontage to embrace a south facing courtyard. This will provide the residents with both public and private open space. He added that they have included industrially inspired components on the building along with detailed fenestration patterning and metal railing elements. Mr. Halkier described the material and colour palette noting the use of masonry, composite siding and metal.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they drew inspiration from the working riverfront. This includes board-formed concrete walls, heavy timber boardwalk elements and steel structure in the landscape. The courtyard space includes urban agriculture, children's play area, outdoor BBQ and gathering patio. As well the ground floor units have patio spaces and lawn areas.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the massing including investigating further stepping of the building form;
 - Design development to improve the building's expression with greater connection to the precedent images, expression of horizontality, consideration of scale of elements, and variation;
 - Design development to introduce delight to the northern edge while maintaining its strength;
 - Design development to improve the legibility of the main entry;
 - Design development to improve the view into the mews and screen the loading area;
 - Design development to improve the overall strategy of the landscape plans.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought the quality of the massing had been lost with respect to the Master Plan. Several Panel members

remarked that the package was missing information and looked more like a rezoning package.

The Panel wanted to see a massing that better reflected the principles of the guideline massing and thought the roof line could be modulated even on a wood frame building. They noted that the building would be more successful with greater stepping, and with increased height marking the park as in the guidelines. They also agreed that deviation from the Plan was not a positive change and the quality of the previous design had been lost.

The Panel indicated that many elements go from grade to the roof with the same window pattern and the same expression. All overhangs and projections were similarly scaled. They wanted to see a more interesting façade that would break up the monotonous appearance. The guidelines call for a contemporary west coast and expression and the Panel felt this was not reflected. One Panel member noted that the building did not reflect the context for the site and could be a building found in any municipality in the Lower Mainland.

Greater horizontality is needed to modulate the building. Variation, intrigue, surprise, and delight are qualities that should be introduced. Greater regard should be given to reflecting the precedent images. Previously supported wood-frame projects in the Town Square area were referenced as precedents to look to in further design development.

Overall the Panel supported the south facing courtyard configuration of the building, however some Panel members thought the proposal would be more successful as the "I" shaped building originally envisioned in the guidelines.

Some Panel members thought the main entrance lobby canopy was not significant enough to read as the main entry. Greater clarity and legibility is needed. As well they mentioned that the building has long corridors and would benefit from a more centralized entry. One Panel member suggested adding a secondary lobby at the loading/car share area.

The Panel also did not support the landscape plans and thought there were not enough private or semi-public spaces offered in the courtyard. It was also mentioned that the amenity on the second floor didn't work and would be more successful if it was on the courtyard level and opened to that space. The panel supported the general approach to the landscaped edge along the CP corridor, but thought that elements of surprise and delight could be introduced while maintaining the strength of its expression.

Regarding sustainability, it was mentioned that the sunshades are inadequate on six foot windows allow the balconies are more effective to mitigate solar gain. It was also noted that there was no LEED™ score cord in the package.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Halkier thanked the Panel for their comments. He said they would take what was said and provide a building with more delight and more strength. He noted that he will ensure that there are sufficient overhangs to prevent water penetration.

5. Address:	737 East 17 th Avenue
DE:	418762
Description:	To construct a 4-storey mixed-use building with commercial and residential at grade and residential above. The proposal includes a total of 29 dwelling units.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	Mangat Property Group Ltd.
Delegation:	Merrick Hunter, Cornerstone Architecture Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture Patricia Campbell, PMG Landscape Architects
Staff:	Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development at the corner of East 17th Avenue and Fraser Street. The proposal is for a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of 29 residential units and commercial space at grade along Fraser Street and turning the corner to East 17th Avenue. Mr. King noted that as this is an application under the zoning, there is no requirement for LEED™ Gold. The building is setback at the rear to deal with issues of direct overlook adjacent to the single family dwellings.

Mr. King explained that the Fraser Street frontage comprises of continual retail use with fourteen foot ceilings and weather protection against a widened commercial sidewalk. As well the retail uses turns the corner to East 17th Avenue. The East 17th Avenue frontage includes development of the public realm, individually accessed townhome units, and communal entry to the balance of the 29 residential units above the retail. Residential units are a mix of one, two and three bedrooms with all the units having access to private open space. A common amenity space is on the third floor and is attached to an outdoor deck. At grade on the lane is loading and parkade access with bike storage provided in the parkade level. Mr. King mentioned that the applicant is seeking a slight height relaxation on the Fraser Street elevation to make the commercial heights work. He described the architecture noting that the retail is predominantly glazed with ground faced white brick piers which carry through to the perimeter walls and elevator shaft on the residential frontage. In describing the material and colour palette, he noted that the upper levels are hardie planks with bays expressed in burnt orange panel.

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

- Setbacks proposed to residential floors at upper levels along the lane frontage.
- At grade expression and activation of the lane frontage, particularly as it relates to potential CPTED concerns.
- Massing and material expression, specifically as it relates to the corner expressions.

Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Scott Kennedy, Engineer, further described the proposal and mentioned that the site is triangular in shape and although they have approached the owner of the adjacent site, they have been unsuccessful in assembling it into the parcel. The building has been designed with smaller ground floor retail units along Fraser Street and features a continuous canopy along the street. The fourth floor is stepped

back on Fraser Street and the ground floor has been set back off the property line for a wider sidewalk. The residential entry is on East 17th Avenue and there are four residential units along the ground floor at street level. Parking and loading are accessed off the commercial lane through a common security door and commercial parking is provided in a separated area in the parkade. As well there are two stalls plus a disability stall. Mr. Kennedy noted that the amenity room on the third floor allows access to a sunny common room and generous deck with southern exposure.

Patricia Campbell, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned they are proposing a greened landscape screen along the lane edge.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the concrete wall in the lane;
 - Consider finding another expression rather than a bracket expression on the north/west corner;
 - Consider removing the grass strip at the retail frontage on East 17th Avenue.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a fairly well done C-2 project.

The Panel agreed that the setbacks were supportable and some of the Panel had no concerns regarding CPTED in the loading bay although some Panel members thought the concrete wall could get messy and covered with graffiti. One Panel member suggested adding brick veneer to break up the monotony of the concrete wall. As well they found the massing and material expression was supportable although one Panel member thought the quality of the materials on Fraser Street could be improved. It was also mentioned that the lane could get some front elevation consideration.

Some Panel members thought there were some interesting shapes on the building but thought the bracket expression on the north/west corner needed to be revisited as it doesn't work with the other forms and geometry of the design. As well they thought that the screen wall seemed tacked on and looked awkward.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that the applicant didn't provide any information and it was suggested that if the applicant sees the benefit of passive house that they might take that into consideration.

Although the Panel supported the landscaping plans, some members thought the grass strip at the retail frontage on East 17th Avenue could be removed and let the retail wrap around the corner. One Panel member suggested finding room in the lane for some trees to break up the scale. Some Panel members thought the amenity should be on the ground floor and linked to the lobby.

Most of the Panel thought that the presentation in the booklet was difficult to read and that there was information missing from the booklet.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.