

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 4, 2015

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Stuart Hood
Ken Larsson (excused for item #2)
Arno Matis
Chris Mramor
Muneesh Sharma
Roger Hughes
Neil LaMontagne
Julien Fagnan

REGRETS: Matthew Soules
Meghan Cree-Smith
Jennifer Marshall

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	5189-5289 Cambie Street
2.	6507 and 6541 Main Street
3.	305 W 41st Avenue
4.	1037 W King Edward Avenue
4.	Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct

BUSINESS MEETING

Vice-Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 5189-5289 Cambie Street
 DE: N/A
 Description: To develop two six-storey residential buildings with two-storey townhouses along the lane, including 134 residential units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Ciccozzi Architecture (Karen Smith)
 Owner: Pure West Financial Holdings Group Inc.
 Delegation: Robert Ciccozzi, Ciccozzi Architecture
 Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architects
 Diana Klein, Kane Consulting
 Staff: Graham Winterbottom and Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-1)

Introduction: Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, and Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the project as a residential proposal at the south end of the Queen Elizabeth neighbourhood in the Cambie Corridor. The building contains 145 units which two levels of parking.

Two, six-story principal buildings are proposed along Cambie Street. The buildings have 8 ft. shoulder setbacks above the fourth story at the front and the rear, and transition down to a row of two story townhouses at the lane in accordance with the expectations of the Cambie Corridor Plan.

The main residential entries face Cambie Street, and the townhouses have entries at the courtyard and facing the lane. The parade is accessed at the north end of the lane. The south building turns the corner to enclose the courtyard and provide a stepped street wall along West 37th Avenue which steps from six to four to two storeys.

A 10ft setback is provided at the south at West 37th and it is taken from the SRW for bike infrastructure. A 12ft setback is provided along Cambie and at the north side property line, with the curved balcony element projecting 2ft into the front setback and 4ft into the side setback. A 30ft courtyard is provided between the principal buildings and the townhouses, which exceeds the 24ft minimum in the design guidelines. A 27 - 31ft setback is provided between the two principal buildings with shoulder setbacks of 4ft above the fourth story. A thirty foot setback is provided to the upper levels of the building returning along West 37th.

In general, a building frontage of 150ft. is recommended by the guidelines. The guidelines note that buildings should be “limited in length, both real and perceived, to allow for sunlight views and a general feeling of openness” along the corridor.

The south building width is 150ft. and the north building is at 178ft. To mitigate the apparent length of the north building, a visual break is provided at the entry lobby and above. A shift in the architectural character and balcony design for the portion of the building engages the curve of the street.

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

1. Building frontage width for north building

Does the proposed design successfully mitigate the perceived length of the building, or may be this strengthened via further articulation/shaping of the building form?

2. Spacing between the principal buildings, and setback at the north

Is sufficient open space provided, both between the buildings on the site and to the adjacent site?

3. Building return and courtyard enclosure along West 37th

Should the courtyard be enclosed, or left open to West 37th?

Does the stepped return along West 37th provide a suitable scale transition to the single-family/Phase III sites across the lane?

Is the height of the street wall appropriate at West 37th Ave?

Applicant's Introductory Comments: The applicant team noted that there is a unique quality to the site, with a curve which naturally reduces the perceived length. There is an architecturally articulated element which proceeds down Cambie Street. It has a vertical concrete composition with a layering of steel, steel framework which supports glass balconies, and metal and window-wall clad walls. This then turns into a simpler expression which wraps around the curve and pulls the building back visually. It is through the articulation of those elements, and the simplifying of the elements as it curves, that Cambie is addressed.

The gap between the buildings picks up the pattern, and creates a gateway into the courtyard. There is a 30ft courtyard which puts the density in the length of the building. While this density could be moved around, the current configuration works well in response to Cambie Street.

Purely from a physical and contextual perspective the attempt was to try to fill the site and create a narrower building to open up the courtyard. The massing balance is used to create a viable FSR.

The courtyard provides amenity space for families, and will provide a transition from the interior amenity space in the corner of the building. There are very good soil volumes for trees within the area, and an efficient irrigation system will be used. Some activity areas along Cambie Street will activate this edge.

The landscape is made to offer a street-friendly present at the ground plane. Each ground level unit has a semi-private outdoor patio space, with a grade transition to allow some privacy between the public and private realm. Some light foliage canopy trees are proposed for the ground level units to provide some privacy from balconies above.

A continuation of landscaping provides a transition between the site and potential developments to the west. The laneway on the west of the site has a very good light level, so an edible landscape consisting of shrubs and fruit trees will be introduced in this area. The laneway also allows for excellent light into the courtyard.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The stepping on the lower façade could lead into the curve to better re-enforce the geometry
- Instead of terminating the curve at the north side, the curve could be extended committing to a stronger curved form.
- There is a lot of concrete and the thermal bridging needs to be mitigated
- More stepping would help break down the mass of the building
- The amenity should be relocated and made larger
- The central stairwell between the buildings should be relocated

Related Commentary: The Panel generally supported the longer length of the building, and showed strong support for the curved geometry of the building. It was suggested that instead of terminating the curve at the north side, that this could be extended.

The Panel supported the 30 ft. spacing between buildings, however the stairwell between the buildings is in the way, which interrupts this space. The location of these stairs should be reconsidered.

It was suggested that more attention be given to the thermal bridging of the slab extensions.

The single indoor amenity space will be difficult for one building to get to, and may create privacy concerns for adjacent units. Consider providing more walkways or an additional space in the northern building. Not a lot of social space or children's' play areas are available.

A pedestrian connection between Cambie and the lane should be considered.

The panel supported the current northern setback

Opinion regarding the stepping on the end was split; the return on the building could be addressed by a 2/4/6 stepping or a different handling of the elevation. A slight lowering of the density would allow for more flexibility in addressing these concerns and suggestions.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their feedback and noted that the exit stair will be removed. An additional amenity in the north building, or better bridging, will be looked at. Committing to the curve and reinforcing it is a good point. The balconies were made to visually extend the eye down Cambie currently; although the sharpness could be re-visited. The current density shown should not affect the ability to make the changes requested. The panel's suggestion of lowering the 4ft step at the two-storey massing at laneway is something that could also be considered.

2. Address:	6507 and 6541 Main Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a six-storey mixed-use building that includes 75 secured market rental units and commercial space at grade. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Program.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture (Taizo Yamamoto)
Owner:	Orr Development
Delegation:	Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Alex Orr, Orr Development
Staff:	Cynthia Lau and Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

Introduction: Cynthia Lau, Rezoning Planner, and Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application comprised of two parcels on the southwest corner of Main Street and 49th Avenue. It is situated in the Punjabi Market area of the Sunset Community Vision, and is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy (Rental 100).

As this site's existing zoning is C-2, the policy allows for general consideration of up to six-storeys and commensurate achievable density.

To the west are single-family properties. Along Main Street one block north and two blocks to the south are sites zoned C-2, with a vacant former gas station site to the north. Generally these sites are developed with one and two-storey buildings.

This rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from C-2 to CD-1 to allow development of a six-storey mixed-use development over two levels of underground parking with a maximum building height of 70 ft. and an FSR of 3.6. The proposed development generally adheres to the required setbacks, and exceeds in some places.

The proposal includes 75 secured market rental units, 80 parking spaces, 2 Class B loading spaces and 97 Class A bicycle parking spaces. A Public Bike Share station is requested along the north elevation on public property. This will accommodate 97 Class A bicycle spaces.

The project design is an articulated street wall that provides a four-story diadem in anticipation of future C-2 development to the south while transitioning to the additional two stories afforded by the Rental 100 Policy.

The primary residential entry is in the northwest corner of the building, off 49th Ave. Parking entry to two levels below grade is in the southwest corner off the lane.

Seventy-five rental units are provided. Of them:

- 15% (11) are studio units
- 46%(35) are one bedroom units
- 32% (24) are two bedroom units
- 7% (5) are three bedroom units

The materiality of the proposed development is characterised by the use of:

- Window wall glazing system
- Commercial storefront
- Metal siding of varied colour
- Paint-finished aluminum and tempered glass guards
- Coloured glass privacy screens
- Paint-finished concrete

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

1. While the flanking building return along 49th Ave. provides an appropriate interface with that street, could the Panel comment on the west building face, against the lane and RS-1 residential beyond, with attention given materiality and expression.
2. Does the panel support the proposed height, massing, density and form of development?

Applicant's Introductory Comments: The strategy was to maintain a four-storey street wall along Main Street and 49th Avenue, to have more of a significant setback at the fifth and sixth levels, and to prevent shadow impacts on the adjacent site.

The residential entry will be on the west side, where the mass steps down to follow grade and create a good transition to the sidewalk along Main Street. At grade the base wall creates grounding for the elements that project off it, allowing added density at the upper levels and maintaining a wide sidewalk.

To help mitigate some of the setback encroachment on the northwest, the number of windows has been minimised. Units have also been oriented north/south to prevent overlook, and the second floor deck has been buffered with large scale planters for screening.

Then amenity is split into two areas. One is a sheltered semi-private play area with urban agriculture on the roof, while the other is a small meeting space in the southeast corner which spills out onto the patio.

The public bike share requested is 16m x 4m deep, and the goal is to screen this area somewhat from the retail. Parking is in the southwest corner.

There are two main aspects to the site; the commercial aspect and the private side. On the commercial edges, the goal is to provide an upgrade to the existing street edges. Some existing trees are being retained and some new trees on and around 49th Avenue will be incorporated.

On the backside there is a green edge to the lane which allows in light and provides buffering from the lane. Stepping down, the second level allows for more green edges in there as well. There is also some planting on the upper amenity to add green, while maintaining a functioning space.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The amenity space should be increased and reconfigured, or possibly moved to the roof;
- There was concern about the blank walls on the west elevation - design and more response to cultural context would be encouraged;
- Increasing the setback around the residential entry, and developing that corner to make it more legible and allow for more daylight into the space;

- Design development of the street front and the retail modulation - develop the canopy along 49th Avenue to facilitate both the bike parking and pedestrians;

Related Commentary: Overall the panel strongly supported the design of this project. It was commented that the building is a thoughtful design in response to the Punjabi district, which enhances the housing objectives of the City of Vancouver. The panel agreed that the height, massing and density were all supportable.

Broadly there was concern about the treatment of the west elevation, and it was suggested that additional design elements be considered. Using graphics to enhance the wall would be better than leaving it blank. There was also concern about the durability and aesthetics of using metal siding in the design.

The amenity space, particularly the exterior one, was considered a bit small. It would work better if expanded and re-configured, and possibly moved to the roof to facilitate this. These comments were also echoed in regards to the children's area.

Further design development was suggested for the residential entry to announce it more, as it was felt to be understated and hidden by the balconies. A second entrance, a courtyard, landscaping, or wrapping the lobby along the lane, could assist with this.

It was suggested that the laneway would benefit from some landscaping, and possibly greater setbacks to enhance the area.

In regards to the bike parking area, it was suggested that the expression be strengthened and respond and be informed by the bike parking along 49th Avenue. A larger canopy over the bike share would improve the area.

Applicant's Response: The applicant thanked the Panel for their feedback. In particular the Panel's comments pertaining to the west side, where improvements can definitely be made. The development of the materials will occur.

3. Address:	305 W 41st Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a six-storey mixed-use building that includes 58 residential units and a replacement church space. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	ZGF Cotter Architects Inc. (Michelle Lee-Hunt)
Owner:	Townline
Delegation:	Patrick Cotter, ZGF Cotter Architects Inc. Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architects
Staff:	Cynthia Lau and Tim Potter

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-9)

Introduction: The site for this rezoning application is comprised of a single parcel on W 41st Avenue, a block and a half east of Cambie Street. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan which contemplates residential buildings in this area up to six-storeys with an estimated density range of 2.0 to 2.5 FSR.

The site currently is home to the Oakridge United Church which is included on the ground floor of this proposal. It is located in close proximity to Oakridge Mall and the Oakridge-41st Avenue Canada Line Station. Along 41st Avenue are single-family properties that could be rezoned under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan. To the north are single-family properties that will be included in Phase 3 of Cambie Corridor.

This rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow development of a six-storey mixed-use building with church use at grade, all over two levels of underground parking with a maximum building height of 67 ft. The proposal includes 58 dwelling units at an FSR of 3.33.

Parking allowance is for 66 spaces, and bicycle parking is for 79 Class A and 6 Class B spaces.

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

1. Is the interface to the neighbouring sites across the lane supportable in terms of:
 - a. Visual scale and transition of scale to adjacent sites;
 - b. Proposed depth of building;
 - c. Shadow performance;
2. Please comment on the success of expression of the building in term of:
 - a. Addressing a corner condition;
 - b. Expression of the Church use and its architecture.
3. Please comment on the success of the landscape design with respect to:
 - a. Interface to public realm;
 - b. Creation of outside spaces for the use of residents and/or church parishioners.
4. Is the proposed form of development, massing and density on this site supportable?

Applicant's Introductory Comments: The applicant team introduced the project by stating that, like many inner-city churches, the congregation is becoming smaller and smaller over time. This proposal is trying to retain the church in proportion to this, but reshape it to respond to the neighbourhood and to be financially secure and viable in the longer term. The density proposed is a response to this and is a reflection of the formula that allows those two components to work together.

The challenge is to position the building on the site and articulate it in a way that allows the density to integrate into the neighbourhood. In order to mitigate some of the building mass, a horizontal expression has been introduced to allow the building to spread out on the site. The hope is to create a balance between the church and residential components of the building, without either one overwhelming the other.

The series of fins are designed to create the impression of the building stepping back and control how the mass is viewed horizontally. Additional perpendicular panels create the appearance of a solid ground-plane, with the intention of using an aesthetically pleasing pattern to bring in a reflection of the history of the existing building. On the flanking side the panels have more of a mass appearance, dematerialize the mass of the building from a perpendicular viewpoint. This allows activity from the space to be broadcast out to the street.

The original landmark bell tower on the site has been removed, and a void exists to memorialize the absence of that element. The fins on the building rise up on that corner to create a new landmark. As the design develops additional opportunities will be sought for identifying ways to link to the history of the site.

The stained glass windows facing Elizabeth Street are to be retained. The church has a very gothic expression which may conflict with some of the contemporary elements. Wrapping the church with these fins allows us to subdue this shape of the element, while still having it present.

Landscaping is used to reinforce and celebrate the entry of the church on 41st Avenue, and make it pedestrian friendly. A commemorative garden at the corner of Elizabeth Street and 41st Avenue will be redeveloped, and expanded into a plaza. A commemorative plaque and a trellis gateway will be incorporated into this.

The entry from Elizabeth Street will be enhanced to create an indoor/outdoor room, with the entry framed by canopy trees and incorporating an entry plaza.

The townhouses on Elizabeth St will be setback with outdoor patios with street frontages, large enough to allow for furniture. Landscaping will provide separation between the semi-private and public realms, and provide greenery along the ground plane.

The church will have an outdoor, plaza-like space for communal gatherings along the north edge of the building. It will be available to both the church and residents, and also functions as a loading area.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The contextual fit, transition and design are not supportable;
- The floorplate is too deep;
- The shadow performance is problematic;
- Design development to better express the church and separate it from the residential portion - pulling back the building in the north and south might help with this;
- Using the loading bay as a public open space is not supportable;

- Separate amenities are needed for the church and residential portions, and quieter spaces should not be located on 41st Avenue;
- There is not enough outdoor space;
- The step-down of the townhouses is not supportable for entry;
- Form of development is too big, deep, and high - the proposed density is not supportable;
- Design or technical solutions are needed to address thermal bridging;

Related Commentary: The Panel agreed that the project was not supportable at this stage as massing, density and form need more attention and further development. Aside from one comment supporting the transition, the Panel agreed that the transition, depth and shadow performance required further work. Design development was suggested to lower the building height and mitigate mass along the lane. It was commented that there was too much bulk over the church, and that pulling back from the second floor along 41st Avenue could make the church more prominent.

The floorplate depth at the residential levels will create challenges for the unit layouts as units can only be laid out with so much depth. Speaking to the scale of the building, it was commented that it felt more commercial than residential.

Generally it was felt that the Church and residential portions should have separate massing, with the two elements expressed boldly instead of subtlety. It was commented that the layering of church and market housing was incompatible and inappropriate. One panel member thought that the ambiguity of church and residential character may be supportable as churches are becoming more communal.

In regards to the corner condition, some panel members thought that the fins were one of the more interesting aspects of the project but it was also suggested that this area needed more development.

It was commented that the project has the potential to be a good looking building, and could be very elegant and add variety to the streetscape.

The project lacked a legible interface to the public realm; the church entry is small and should have more prominence. It could also better engage the sidewalk by incorporating patios or something similar.

There was Panel consensus about the project was lacking in open space and amenity. It was commented that the loading bay is not residential open space, and that the outdoor amenity has the potential to create conflict between the residents and the church. There needs to be separation of amenity uses. It was also suggested that the plaza is too small and that the location of the church sanctuary on the corner of 41st Avenue is inappropriate as a quiet location.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team noted that integrating the proposed densities is challenging given the context of the site. The Panel's comments were appreciated and understood, and will be considered meaningfully and carefully.

4. Address:	1037 W King Edward Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To construct a four-storey residential building comprised of 36 secured rental units. This rezoning application is being considered under the Interim Rezoning Policy for Increasing Affordable Housing Choices and the Rezoning for Affordable Housing, Rental Housing and Special Needs Housing policy within the First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area General Guidelines (Schedule A of the Heritage Conservation Area Official Development Plan).
Zoning:	FSD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Shape Architecture (Nick Sully)
Owner:	Wescorp
Delegation:	Nick Sully, Shape Architecture Nathaniel Funk, Shape Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Michelle McGuire and Colin King

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

Introduction: Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, and Colin King, Development Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for one single parcel of land on King Edward directly west of Oak Street shopping area within the First Shaughnessy District. It has a C-2, four-storey, mixed-use building directly across the lane at the corner of Oak and King Edward.

The proposal is for a two to four-storey residential building with 100% of the units secured as rental. The proposal includes:

- 36 residential units;
- 36% family units;
- 1.44 FSR from FSD baseline of 0.45FSR;
- 100% rental in a MD courtyard typology;
- On a 4 lot assembly with frontages to Quebec St & 35th Ave
- Parking for 24 vehicles
- Bicycle parking for 11.

The application is being considered under the Interim Rezoning Policy for Increasing Affordable Housing Choices. This policy allows consideration of rental proposals along arterials, up to six-storeys within 500 m of identified shopping areas.

Council recently adopted the new First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area Official Development Plan which includes new guidelines. The Heritage Conservation Area includes criteria for affordable housing proposals where rezoning can be considered for sites along arterials, like the subject site. The guidelines include a rezoning policy that gives further guidance for rezoning proposals to respond to the First Shaughnessy District (FSD) context.

This application is coming in under the Interim Rezoning policy on a single FSD lot at the edge of that zone, where it meets the four-storey C-2 commercial forms of the Oak Street corridor. The lot is on the smaller end of the scale for First Shaughnessy District, which is consistent with the arterial edges of the zoning.

There is a residential lane to the north, and the commercial flanking lane to the east is the boundary line from single family use to mixed use. This is an atypical FSD condition.

Similarly scaled 'small' FSD single-family lots exist to west and north. Mixed-use commercial exists to east, with a finer grain of single-family plus institutional uses along the south side of King Edward Avenue.

As a rezoning, LEED Gold is expected.

Parking access is from the lane, and a primary pedestrian entry to the townhomes exists off of King Edward Avenue, with a secondary pedestrian entry from lane.

The initial enquiry came about before FSD had a formal rezoning policy so responded to the IRP FOD advice which is based on demonstration of good contextual fit but doesn't define any parameters for that. The IRP is intended to produce new housing models, and this typology is not widely used in Vancouver.

The sitting & massing respond to the wider context. Four-storey to four-storey, dropping to two-storey to meet FSD, a wider yard to west, stepping of the front yard, and a series of courtyards at grade travelling through the block and upper level cut-outs.

An enquiry review by FSADP yielded some design development considerations around the Shaughnessy edge, including landscape and material treatments.

In the revision of FSD zoning we now have specific form of development criteria when contemplating rezonings. These recognise the basic tension between FSD as a single-family zone that prohibits multiple dwellings, and rezoning policies that seek multiple dwellings.

Roof forms may be different but heights should be in line with relaxation provisions. Side yards and front yards should generally respect FSD regulations, but given site coverage deriving from the different use, there is more focus on intent and qualitative responses rather than quantitative. In general, there is a case by case response within a set of rules.

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

1. Single family development in First Shaughnessy emphasizes the transition from the street to the house by defining the front yard as a semi-enclosed space defined by the arrangement of trees, hedges, walls or other landscaping devices. With this intent in mind, staff are seeking advice from the Panel as it relates to the West King Edward Ave frontage as follows:
 - a. Does the proposed development successfully transition in scale from the commercial development of Oak St. to the single family scale of FSD?
 - b. Can the panel comment on the success of the proposed setbacks, massing and landscape to the West King Edward Ave. frontage as they relate to balancing the intent of front yard layering in FSD with multiple family use?
2. Single family development in First Shaughnessy typically requires large side yards to create a buffer between the new development and adjacent sites. Can the panel comment on the success of massing and landscape proposals to the west side yard as it relates to contextual fit with adjacent single family development?
3. Does the panel have any concerns around the four-storey massing to the commercial lane and potential overlook to adjacent residential development along Oak Street?

4. Is the panel satisfied that the courtyard typology proposed provides sufficient daylight penetration to ensure livability of units?
5. Does the panel support the proposed form of development as it relates to height and massing?

Applicant's Introductory Comments: This project offers to be the transition that steps down the commercial massing to the east, to a more residential massing along the west. The east facing of this site is akin to the mews housing you would see in London.

The main entrance point has been brought to the southwest, with an access along that side to the vertical cores. Vertical cores are important to the form and environmental performance of the building. Going vertical brings people up to the units, provides natural ventilation, and cuts down the amount of gross area as a result.

Spreading the mass throughout the site brings in light and air, and allows for social interaction through landscape and passive design principals. There has been extensive modeling of light levels during different times of the years, to ensure daylight factors are appropriate to the spaces.

Landscaping is one of the things which distinguishes Shaughnessy from other districts. Shaughnessy yards have a lot of layering with vegetation and walls, which peek-a-boo glimpses into grand old houses. A lot of those features are being incorporated into this project.

There is a lot of layering of vegetation, low garden walls and evergreen box hedges. Landscape walls play up the entry, and mature magnolias are to be relocated to the front of the site to add filigree and provide the kind of antechamber space found in Shaughnessy. The west path has been chicaned, so you don't get the straight sightline through to the back of the lane.

The building has been pulled back a lot along the western property line from its original design. This was to create a more livable cross section along the line, and to provide screening and buffering with additional vegetation. Of particular note is the retention of the four large Spruce trees; mature vegetation being one of the other defining features of Shaughnessy.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Quality of materials will be critical; stone walls would give more of a First Shaughnessy feel
- More landscaping is needed along the west side
- Lighter materials would assist in lighting the courtyard spaces
- Enrich the courtyards with details or water features to create a better experience
- Better daylighting of the covered spaces
- Switch the ramp in one of the courtyards to make it more pedestrian oriented
- An indoor amenity would benefit the units
- Consideration should be given to pushing this to passive house
- Some units would benefit from east-facing windows

Related Commentary: The panel feels this is an innovative project with a welcome new housing typography. It speaks to intent and performs well.

With respect to the transition, the Panel agreed that it successfully transitions in scale to adjacent sites.

There is good layering on King Edward Avenue. A cautionary comment was provided about the quality of materials, but a stone wall would allow the project to better fit into First Shaughnessy.

The west side context and the stepped-down massing were well supported, as they are complimentary of First Shaughnessy without mimicking it. The side yard buffers the development to the west successfully. With respect to the four-storey mass on the east, the Panel felt this was in keeping with other developments along the lane. It is unexpected and interesting.

There was some concern about the courtyard typology. The courtyards are covered spaces, and getting light into these spaces is going to be paramount. There was further comment that the feeling and livability of the courtyards is going to be dependent upon materials and detailing, and that the current materials seem quite dark. It was recommended that lighter materials be considered.

More continuity should be created between open spaces and would assist in activating the courtyards. This could be done by perhaps by linking the entry walkway into a bigger courtyard. It was commented that an indoor amenity space would benefit the project.

Some overlook and acoustic issues were identified between the bedrooms and parking ramps. These can be handled in design development.

It was suggested to consider pushing this to the passive house stage of sustainability. With this in mind, orientation of units will be key. Some units would benefit from having east windows, not just north.

Applicant's Response: Sometimes amenity spaces are added because private amenity is limited; however, in this project every unit has generous private amenity space and the social spaces in between the units are charged. Thus chance exchange between people serves as the amenity. Providing amenity space off the courtyards would add to this, but density might make this difficult. Additional amenity will still be considered if possible.

5. Address:	Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct
DE:	N/A
Description:	Workshop to discuss options for land use, building forms and heights, and improved connections within the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct.
Zoning:	Varies
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	N/A
Staff:	Ann McLean and Paula Huber

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

Introduction: Ann McLean, Development Planner, and Paula Huber, Rezoning Planner, noted that this development focuses on the area around Joyce-Collingwood station. It exists between Wellington Avenue and Euclid Avenue, and goes from the station west to Rupert Street. The primary focus is on Joyce Street and along Vanness Avenue.

The panel is asked to comment on land use, density, building form, connections, public spaces, and amenities needed to support growth.

To that end, three options are proposed, with all options proposing towers on all corners of Joyce and Vanness Streets. A 16-storey tower currently exists at the south corner.

The three additional sites have different suitability for accommodating towers, based on:

- site size;
- adjacencies and
- shadowing considerations.

It is believed that the west site can accommodate the highest tower as it is the largest site and its shadows lie primarily across the tracks. The north corner is the next largest site, with existing towers to the north. The east corner is the smallest site and has an existing context of single family dwellings.

Option 1 proposes change to 6 storeys and townhouses to accommodate higher buildings on Joyce. From an urban design point of view, a stepping/varied skyline was desirable. Heights of buildings were separated by three-storeys; similar to the approach at Cambie and Marine Drive.

Option 1

The heights proposed in Option 1 are similar to those in Collingwood Village - 20-23-26:

- Joyce Street - 6 storeys (currently 4 storey zones) - with some higher midrise to 12 storeys
- Vanness Street - 6 storeys (current 3-4 storey CD-1 zones)
- Transition areas - primarily townhouse, with 4 - 6 storeys adjacent to higher buildings

Option 2

- Explores higher towers at corner - 24-27-30
 - Lower towers introduced on Joyce and Vanness
 - Transition area 2 - 4 storey apartment buildings
-

Option 3

- Looks at tower heights similar to more recently proposed transit oriented development 29-32-35
- Incorporates the proposed height of a rezoning application received for 5050 Joyce St
- Lower towers are introduced into Transition area 3

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

1. Does the scale of the towers proposed respond to the:
 - a. City-wide context of transit-orientated development?
 - b. Surrounding area context?
2. In consideration of the scale of the towers proposed, a focus on mid-rise, are the scales and types of buildings proposed in the transition areas appropriate?
3. Are the proposed public realm improvements and enhanced connections appropriate to achieve an active and vibrant station area?

Discussion Points: In considering the first question, further research into what is working on other transit-oriented and non-transit-oriented developments was recommended. Are they successful and if so, why? This will provide some clues as to what approach would be best here.

There was varied opinion in terms of transitional forms. Suggestions included:

- Less transition and an increase in the number of taller buildings along Vanness Avenue;
- A high-rise at the tower but a mid-rise as it spreads out along the street;
- High-rises along the tracks; and,
- A comment that high-rises might not be the answer.

It was also suggested that an epicenter of energy be created around the station and along Joyce. This might be achieved with the buildings surrounding the station, and possibly with four buildings of equal height creating a square around the station. The Panel agreed that having a variety of heights and different designs is interesting and preferred.

Creating a sense of place was strongly agreed to be paramount to the development, and a challenge to be explored further. It was felt that Joyce needs to be developed and beautified as a street to create a walkable neighbourhood. Suggestions included exploring a location for a town square, widening the street and creating a greenway.

Due to the proximity of Kingsway, and the variety of shops available, neighbours tended to shop there and at Metrotown. It was felt that creating a retail hub, which included cafes and a supermarket, would assist in creating community and activate the street. The challenge was to get the right density to attract retailers.

Other challenges identified included development of the bus interchange, and identifying what the space under the guideway could be used for.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.