URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 20, 2015

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood
Ken Larsson (Excused Item #1)
Jennifer Marshall (Chair)
Arno Matis
Chris Mramor (Excused Item #3)

REGRETS:
Stefan Aepli
Roger Hughes
Matthew Soules

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3063-3091 West Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4162-4188 Cambie Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 401 SW Marine Drive (Marine Gardens)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: 3063-3091 West Broadway
   Description: To construct a 5-storey mixed-use building that includes 78 secured market rental units and commercial uses at grade. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Program.
   Zoning: C-2C to CD-1
   Application Status: Rezoning Application
   Architect: Yamamoto Architecture
   Owner: Locarno Legacy Corp.
   Delegation: Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture
             David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects
             Riley Mari, Locarno Legacy Corp.
             Diana Klein, Kane Consulting (LEED™)
   Staff: Rachel Harrison and Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site at the corner of West Broadway and Balaclava Street. The site currently has a 2-storey mixed-use building that includes several retail stores including Kids Books. The proposal is to assemble four lots and to build a 5-storey, mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 77 secured market rental units above. There are eighteen studio units, thirty 1-bedroom units and twenty-nine 2-bedroom units planned. This proposal will rezone the site from C-2C to CD-1. Ms. Harrison noted that the application was being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy (Rental 100 Policy) which allows for rezonings where 100% of the units are rental. Mixed-use is allowed, but all the residential units must be rental in tenure for the duration of the life of the building or for 60 years, whichever is longer. As well the projects must be close to transit and commercial areas. The Rental 100 Policy also required 25% of the units be designed for families (which means two or more bedrooms). For proposals in the C-2C Districts, the policy allows consideration of an increase in height up to 6-storeys and commensurate achievable density. Rental 100 projects are eligible for incentives. The incentives requested for this application including parking reductions (92 parking stalls), a DCL waiver and an additional 10% in floor area above the permitted 3.0 FSR to 3.33 FSR. Ms. Harrison noted that applications made under Rental 100 are eligible for concurrent processing of rezoning and development permits however, this application is not concurrent. All rezonings are subject to the Green Building Policy which requires rezoning achieve LEED™ Gold with specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Patrick O’Sullivan, Development Planner, further described the proposal and described the context for the area noting Bosley’s and Calhoun’s to the east and Fire Hall 12 on Balaclava Street. Zoning across the lane is RT-7 (two family dwellings) and there is 1-storey retail on the south side of Broadway including the Parthenon Supermarket. The proposal is for a 5-storey building with commercial at grade with continuous weather protection at the front of the building. The proposal has 92 parking spaces (57 for the residents, 6 visitors and 29 commercial) as well as two Class B loading spaces. Mr. O’Sullivan mentioned that one of the intents of the base zoning is for new development to provide local-serving retail and to
break up the retail frontage over 50 feet with the introduction of shopping courts or pedestrian amenity spaces. This proposal addresses that requirement with an additional 8 foot setback from Broadway. He described the material and colour palette noting the use of white and darker brick as well as fibre-cement paneling.

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

- Comments on the proposal’s height, form and massing, specifically:
  - The full-width 5th storey;
  - The encroachment into the 30 degree height angle.
- Comments on the proposed qualitative value of the proposed configuration of the pedestrian amenity along Broadway (long, linear increased setback) in contrast to the shopping court approach advised in the Guidelines.
- Comments on the success of the proposal’s composition, materials and expression in reducing apparent building bulk. i.e. is the articulation, materiality and expression sufficient to achieve a level of interest for the community?
- Comments on the overall landscape design including the configuration of outdoor spaces in terms of daylight exposure, choice of materials and plant selection.

Ms. Harrison and Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they tried to bring the massing around the corner where it has less impact up against the Fire Hall. He mentioned that they met with the West Kits Residents Association and they expressed that the 4-storey scale of the street was important to them. As a result they went back to emphasizing the 4-storey line and recessing the top floor. They also mentioned that the fine grain retail was important so they have designed the retail entrances with glazing and wood doors to allow for more pedestrian interest. Mr. Yamamoto stated that as it is a fairly long site they have tried to treat it as a series of smaller buildings along with some articulation in the plan. Each element will be treated with a different brick to break up the building expression. To keep some interest on the street they have added a little plaza on the corner. The residential entry is on the northern side of the site towards the more residential neighbourhood and they are looking at doing a distinctive canopy and light fixture to mark that entry. They are also proposing skylights on the top floor to bring in some natural light.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted the existing trees along Balaclava Street and West Broadway. The ground level will be richly textured and detailed to express the larger walking area. In the rear they are respecting the neighbours through stepping, terracing and screening. They have tried to arrange the patios to get as much light as possible. There is a generous amenity space with addition screening to preserve the privacy aspect to the neighbours. The plant materials are drought tolerant and native plants.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider stepping the massing along Balaclava Street to reduce bulk and improve solar access to neighbours to the north and outdoor spaces and to provide terraced outdoor spaces;
  - Reduce height of the lane elevation and improve laneway expression and sensitivity;
  - Consider adding colour accents to the building;
  - Consider finding ways to increase the amount of livable outdoor space;
  - Consider adding shading to the south façade;
- Consider deleting, reconfiguring or relocating the “pocket park at the lane”.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported proposal and had no concerns regarding the height, form and massing from West Broadway. Some Panel members felt that the upper level of the massing along Balaclava Street should be set back further, and that terracing the Balaclava Street side massing would provide additional benefits of increased solar access.

The Panel thought the 5-storey massing was acceptable and thought the applicant had done a good job of mitigating the impact of the building to the neighbours across the lane at the upper levels. They also supported the slight encroachment into the 30 degree height angle. However, the Panel suggested the applicant step or reduce the massing at lane elevation, and accepted the rationale for greater encroachment into the 30 degree height angle at locations across the lane from the fire hall.

The Panel supported the proposed configuration of the pedestrian amenity along West Broadway but expressed some concern over the viability of further recessing the retail edge.

The Panel supported the material and colour palette and though the applicant had chosen some high quality materials. However, they suggested the applicant might want to add some colour to the building considering how many new buildings seem to have the same palette of white and dark brick. They noted that the building would be more interesting with some detailing or colour in other elements such as signage. One Panel member suggested adding colour to mark the entrances. The Panel is looking forward to seeing improvements to the general building expression and composition of materials at the development permit stage. They generally felt that the reserved design did not evoke the open and liberal spirit of Kitsilano.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and acknowledged that there needed to be more areas that relate to livability especially for children and families. They also wanted to see urban agriculture and suggested allowing access to the roof for common outdoor space or for the top floor units. Some Panel members wanted to see an improved lane elevation have more articulation and the addition of some vertical planting. They also thought the pocket park on the corner was too small with no access from the lobby.

Some Panel members thought the main entrance to the residential on Balaclava Street needed to be distinguished. As well they thought the second floor amenity space was too small, particularly for families. A children’s play area was recommended, although they liked the relationship between the indoor and outdoor spaces. It was suggested that a covered outdoor space was also needed. Some Panel members noted that the retail patios may need to be larger for restaurant space. It was suggested that the size of the balconies could be increased to provide more useable outdoor space.

Regarding sustainability, it was suggested the applicant consider the impact of restaurant exhausts and fans on the lane and how the retail spaces will be serviced. There was some concern regarding the lack of solar shading on the south facing facades. It was suggested that the applicant look at heat recovery from the retail to be used in the building for energy.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Yamamoto thanked the Panel and said they had some good suggestions especially about stepping the lane. He added that the potential tenants will define the retail spaces.
2. Address: 4162-4188 Cambie Street
DE: N/A
Description: To construct a 6-storey residential building that includes 56 dwelling units.
Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Owner: Trillium Project Management
Delegation: Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Michael Barer, Trillium Project Management
Luke Smeaton, Light House (LEED™)
Staff: Kirsten Robinson and Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-2)

- **Introduction:** Kirsten Robinson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application that is made up of two parcels on the east side of Cambie Street, north of West 26th Avenue. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan that contemplates 6-storey residential buildings in this area. The site is located in the Queen Elizabeth Area of the Cambie Plan, three blocks north of Queen Elizabeth Park. The site across the lane to the east is zoned RS-1 which has been identified in the Cambie Corridor Phase 3 study area. A rezoning for a seniors care facility has been approved along King Edward northeast of the site. Ms. Robinson mentioned that this rezoning application proposed to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow development of a 6-storey building with townhouses on the lane, over two levels of underground parking. The proposal includes 56 market housing units: 18 one-bedroom, 34 two-bedroom, 4 three-bedroom units and parking for 66 vehicles.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the building is generally consistent with the built form Guidelines for this segment of the Cambie Corridor. A 6-storey building is provided with setbacks above 4-storeys on all sides, transitioning down to a row of 2-storey townhouses on the lane. The townhouses are intended to provide a scale transition to existing single family lots across the lane, as well as activate and enhance the character of the lane. The proposal meets the minimum recommended setbacks with a 24 foot width for the courtyard. Ms. Linehan noted that the proposal is seeking a 100 foot frontage to allow for a continuous row of townhouses and a larger side yard at the north. The primary residential entry is at West 26th Avenue and access to the courtyard is provided through a 12 foot break in the massing. The amenity room and children’s play space is located at West 26th Avenue adjacent to the access path. Ms. Linehan mentioned that there is a significant grade change with the grades dropping approximately eight feet down the lane to the north. The courtyard elevation and main floor of the townhouses meets the grade at West 26th Avenue and are about eight feet above grade at the north end. A continuous row of planters is provided at the lane edge and the second storey of the townhouses are setback at the north end to mitigate the appearance of a 3-storey massing.

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

1. Overall building massing and density:
   How well does the proposal respond to the Cambie Corridor built form guidelines?
2. Design and treatment of the outdoor amenity space on site, including the impact of the
townhouse return along West 26th on the courtyard space:
   Should the access path be widened to match the width of the courtyard?

3. Height/massing of the townhouses at the north end and relationship to grade:
   Does the design successfully mitigate the appearance of a 3 storey height and provide
   suitable lane activation in this location?

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

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Ray Letkeman, Architect, further described the
  proposal and explained that they are developing two single family lots with a 6-storey
  apartment building fronting Cambie Street and a 2-storey townhouse component fronting
  the lane with a 24 foot wide landscaped courtyard space between them. He mentioned
  that the fifth and sixth floors have been set back. Mr. Letkeman described the material
  palette noting the use of brick, hardi panel and siding. The entry is located on West 26th
  Avenue with an indoor amenity space adjacent to the lobby. Parking is accessed from the
  lane with bicycle parking located on the upper level.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that they
worked to resolve the grades on the side. They have added a series of stepped walls along
the lane and Cambie Street. They landscaped the stepped walls to provide good oversight
to the public realm. The children’s play area is located off the amenity room which is the
sunniest location on the site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the quality of the courtyard;
  - Design development to better integrate the indoor amenity with the lobby;
  - Design development to improve the expression at the top of the 4th floor;
  - Consider adding more common outdoor space for children’s play and other outdoor
    activities;
  - Consider improving the expression of the main entry.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it conformed to the
  Cambie Corridor Guidelines.

The Panel supported the massing and density but there was a concern regarding the gap
between the building and the townhouses on West 26th Avenue. It is essential to make that
courtyard as useable as possible. They thought that increasing the width of the courtyard
would give more room around the townhouse and the larger blocks and would allow for
more outdoor space. As well they wanted to see the amenity and the lobby better
connected so there is flexibility to make the space more useable.

The Panel liked the scale and robustness of the main building but had some concerns with
the upper two floors. They thought there was a relentless quality to the top of the 4th
floor. They noted that it has a scale that is not residential.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans and thought the indoor amenity space was a
reasonable size but was concerned that a project of this size didn’t have more common
outdoor amenity space. They thought there should be common outdoor space to support
things such children’s play or a barbeque area. As well they wanted to see more greenery in the courtyard.

Some Panel members suggested the applicant look at the ground plane units and how they interact with the street and the arrival sequence. The Panel thought that generally the unit layout was well done.

Several Panel members wanted to see the main entrance better articulated. They also wanted the applicant to look at the side yards in relation to future development.

It was suggested the applicant look at adding solar shading on the fifth floor.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Letkeman thanked the Panel for their comments and said they will take under consideration.
3. **Address:** 401 SW Marine Drive (Marine Gardens)  
   **DE:** 418980  
   **Description:** To develop three residential buildings; two towers (21-storeys and 27-storeys) and a 7-storey rental building that includes a 37-space childcare facility. This proposal is for a total of 529 dwelling units.  
   **Zoning:** CD-1 Pending  
   **Application Status:** complete Development Application  
   **Review:** Second (First as Development Application)  
   **Architect:** GBL Architects  
   **Owner:** Concord Pacific  
   **Delegation:** Stu Lyon, GBL Architects  
   **Joey Stevens, GBL Architects**  
   **Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Landscape Architects**  
   **Peter Webb, Concord Pacific**  
   **Staff:** Allan Moorey

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

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located on the northwest corner of Yukon Street and SW Marine Drive. The site has two flanking lanes, west and north. Mr. Moorey described the site context noting Marine Gateway (34 and 24-storey towers, mixed-use) to the south, Northwest (31 and 13-storey towers, mixed-use) to the southwest and mc² (32 and 25-storey towers mixed use) adjacent, west of the site. All were rezoned CD-1 under the Cambie Corridor Plan.

He mentioned that the proposal was seen by the Panel at rezoning and is now a development permit application. Most notable is the cross-fall across the site, 5.7 meters (18.7 feet) from a high point in the northwest corner to the low point in the southeast, at Yukon and SW Marine. This slope is accommodated by terracing an internal courtyard between. A transitional courtyard space is heavily landscaped and has a significant water feature. Moreover, this interim space provides accessible movement across the site, with a combination of ramps and elevator.

The proposed development is comprised of a 7-storey rental building with a height of 66 feet, a 27-storey tower with a 7-storey podium and a height of 245.6 feet and lastly, a 21-storey tower with a 6-storey podium and a height of 193.6 feet. Both towers accommodate market residential. The towers have been sculpted to adhere to the maximum floor plate area of 6,300 square feet recommended in the Cambie Corridor Plan. All buildings comply with required setbacks and tower separations across the site. A Daycare facility for 37 children is provided in the rental building. The parking entry for the rental units and daycare is off Yukon Street, in the northeast corner of the site, while the residential parking entry is provided through an expansive auto court off SW Marine Drive. Mr. Moorey mentioned that 70 rental units are provided, replacing those existing on the site with an additional with 459 market units, for a total of 529 units. The rental building is comprised of 2-3 bedroom units, while the market buildings have studios, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and 3-bedrooms units. Mr. Moorey characterized the a material palette as one utilizing window wall, metal panel, metal spandrel panel, painted concrete, brick masonry, glass and aluminum guards.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
- Given the significant cross fall across the site and the consideration given rezoning comments suggesting an enhanced pedestrian connection across the site, comments
were requested on the accessibility sequence/route proposed for those persons with disabilities.

• Comments were requested on the success by which materiality, articulated massing, building character and variety have served to minimize the perceived scale of the podium elements.

• Comments were requested on the proposed auto court/plaza entry off SW Marine Drive, its program adaptability and the potential interface between vehicles and pedestrians.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Panel.

• Applicant’s Introductory Comments: Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal and indicated the moves that were made since the rezoning was approved. He noted that the form of development is identical with the same density. He said that they have pulled to tower out as far as they can on Yukon Street towards the corner which gave them more space in the courtyard. This also allows more sunlight into the courtyard. Mr. Lyon noted that they moved the driveway access off the centre to the side which is less imposing on the courtyard.

Joey Stevens, Architect, mentioned that responded to the comments from the rezoning review and kept the concept which was to have a permeable sanctuary on the site. Currently the site is very green and sheltered from Marine Drive so they wanted to open that up more but also keep some of the quality of shelter from Marine Drive. He noted that there is a daycare at the upper ground level which is sited to get the most daylight. He mentioned that they moved the pedestrian access ramp to the open space in front of the daycare. There is an elevator that serves two purposes. It goes down to the bike storage which is directly below the courtyard and goes up to the higher grades on the site. Mr. Stevens said they looked at quieting the tower expression and allowing that to contrast with a rich textured base and ground plane. The townhouses and the towers have been unified with a ribbon element. They are using a metal panel with a wood look finish as an accent material which will be added to the insets and soffits and as well it will be above the two lobbies. In one of the towers it will be taken straight up the face. Mr. Stevens noted that they made more circulation for pedestrians in the courtyard space and have increased the greenery.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and noted that one of the challenges of the project was having a front door. Marine Drive doesn’t allow for cars stopping or parking. So they decided to take the access from Yukon Street and they tried to blur the connection between the pedestrian and the traffic. Mr. Phillips noted that one of the discussions around accessibility looked at ramps but they consumed a lot of the space and there were a lot of walls. They felt that the elevator better served the site and allowed for a green back drop from Marine Drive. The ground floor of the building is all amenity space which opens out to a terrace. He noted that they wanted the ability to provide security and furnishings in the space so the idea of the water was to separate the public route through the site. Mr. Phillips also mentioned that they have taken advantage of all the roof spaces to provide urban agriculture and common areas for the residents. Nunavut Lane has townhouses and is a more pedestrian friendly lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

• Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

• The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.
• **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a successful project.

The Panel thought the applicant had done a good job of addressing the Panel’s previous concerns. They also thought the applicant had managed the density well and created a positive porosity through the site. Although the Panel thought the pedestrian connection was well done, there were a couple of Panel members who had some concern regarding the use of an elevator as a solution. One Panel member suggested pulling back the ramp and the daycare to give a better route for disabled people to the north.

The Panel supported the material palette although some members were not sure about the wood, but understood why it was chosen as it provides warmth to the expression. They thought the ribbon expression was done well but noted that there are places where there seems to be a lot of white, especially on the north east corner.

Regarding the auto court, the Panel thought there was a lot of attention paid to making it work. It was noted that there was a lot of hardscape on the drawings whereas the model had a lot of landscaping. As well they mentioned that since there is no center to the turnaround the applicant might want to consider ways to control the flow of traffic. The Panel thought there could be more room for temporary parking and a drop off.

Regarding sustainability, it was mentioned that it was disappointing that all the Marine Gateway projects haven’t been interconnected with a neighbourhood energy system.

• **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Lyon said he had nothing to add and thanked the Panel for their comments.

Adjournment
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.