

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** November 18, 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  
Jennifer Marshall (did not chair on item #1)  
Chris Mramor  
Muneesh Sharma  
Roger Hughes  
Neil LaMontagne

**REGRETS:** Matthew Soules  
Arno Matis  
Julien Fagnan  
Meghan Cree-Smith

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | 4976 - 5010 Cambie Street (Milton Wong House) |
| 2. | 288 - 388 W King Edward Avenue                |
| 3. | 2395 - 2443 Kingsway                          |
| 4. | 288 E Hastings Street                         |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

The Chair advised that there was a film crew from Spain present in the room that were making a documentary on civic process, and asked permission from those present to have the proceedings filmed. All those present consented.

There being no other New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 4976 - 5010 Cambie Street (Milton Wong House)  
DE: NA  
Description: The proposal is for a seven-storey residential building, the retention and heritage designation of the Wong Residence at 5010 Cambie Street, and a laneway house at the rear of the site. The proposal is for a total of 49 dwelling 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: Shift Architecture (Cam Halkier)  
Owner: Penny-farthing Homes  
Delegation: Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture  
Michael Brown, Trillian Project Management  
Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Ltd.  
Veronica Owens, Light House  
Staff: Graham Winterbottom and Marie Linehan

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)**

- **Introduction:** Graham Winterbottom, Rezoning Planner, and Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the project as a proposed rezoning for a three lot assembly on the east side of Cambie Street. Of note is that this is a heritage retention project which aims to retain the significant heritage house at the southernmost lot in the assembly..

The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan, within the Cambie Street Queen Elizabeth Neighbourhood (section 4.3.3). The plan in this area allows for residential buildings up to six-storeys with step backs above the fourth floor, townhouses at the lane, and a density range of 1.75 - 2.25 FSR, subject to urban design performance.

Immediately north is an approved rezoning for two, six-storey, 65-unit residential buildings with townhouses on the lane and an FSR of 2.57. To the east across the lane are single family homes that are part of future planning work with the Phase III Cambie Corridor Plan, currently underway. As part of Phase III, consideration is being given to ground oriented built form options, such as townhouses and row houses, in this area. Across Cambie to the west are two approved rezonings for six-storey residential buildings.

The proposed application is to rezone three, one-family dwelling lots from RS-1 to CD-1 to develop a seven-storey residential building over two lots, while preserving the single-family home.

The home is known as the Wong Residence and is a significant example of the West Coast Modern style in Vancouver. It is significant for three defining reasons:

1. It is a compelling example of West Coast modern style, designed by Harry Lee of the firm Duncan McNab, and built in 1956.
2. Landscape design was by Cornelia Oberlander, who chose to retain the volcanic basalt rock as a natural feature and buffer in the landscape design.
3. It has been the Wong family residence for two generations. Milton Wong, was one of Vancouver's most prominent and significant businessmen and philanthropists.

This design has been developed closely with staff to achieve the heritage retention, and has resulted in a proposal which departs from the recommended six-storey form of the Cambie Plan.

The proposal is for a seven-storey, singular building form. It will include 49 residential units with a floor area of 2.46 FSR over the three lots, including the Wong Residence. The Milton Wong house will be retained as a single-family house on its own site, with a small two storey addition at the rear to provide the option for a rental laneway house. The new seven-storey residential building will be built on the remaining two lots.

During the enquiry process for this site, the significance of the Milton Wong house and landscape was identified in terms of their heritage value. At the same time, staff recognized the constraints that retention of the house placed on redevelopment of the site in strict accordance with the Cambie Corridor Plan Built Form Guidelines, noting that the house occupies a substantial portion of the rezoning site, being one-third of the site assembly.

A number of options were explored and ultimately it was decided that Planning could consider a more site-specific response in this case that could depart from the prescribed six-storey Cambie Corridor massing, in order facilitate retention of the house. Specifically, a maximum height of seven-storeys with full retention of the house could be considered. For the new building the primary seven-storey building mass is oriented to Cambie with a lower mass which steps from five to three-storeys adjacent the laneway and the Milton Wong house.

The front yard setback is 20ft. noting that the adjacent building to the north is at 12ft. with an 8ft. shoulder setback, so the main mass is located to align with the shoulder setback and higher massing at the adjacent site. The front yard steps back to 30ft. at the lower mass, to transition to 40ft. at the Milton Wong house. Side yard setbacks are 10ft. The rear yard setback to the main mass is 24ft. and 4ft. to a lower three-storey form. The seventh-storey is setback at all sides with setbacks ranging from 3ft to 6ft.

Parking access to the new building will be through a shared driveway at the adjacent site to the north.

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

1. Does the new building height and form provide a suitable response to the retained house and the overall context?
2. Should there be further design development or shaping of the massing to respond to the adjacent approved courtyard scheme to the north?

3. Does the proposal provide an appropriate transition to the sites across the lane, currently single-family and part of Phase III?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** This is an opportunity to provide something unique along the Cambie Corridor while preserving the important heritage asset.. The proposal steps down towards the Wong House, and pulls back from the main form of the building in-line with the step at the fifth level on the neighbouring site. The form has been broken down to reflect the shape and form of the Wong House. It was important to treat the building in the round, as it is quite viable from Queen Elizabeth Park. So the same treatments found on the front are also present on the back.

From a skin point of view, this is a fairly simple structure; the box elements are probably concrete and the infill will have something a bit lighter like metal and glass spandrel. There are rooftop play areas and private decks, providing overlooks to the park and north shore area.

There is a fair amount of grade change on the site, from the southeast to the northwest, and then fairly flat across the lane. The ramp is located on the high side on the north and stepping walls are used to provide an appropriate response to the street.

There is amenity space on the ground floor and on the rooftop. A basalt-clad wall is proposed to reference the existing rock outcrop and the former quarry at Queen Elisabeth Park.

In terms of sustainability, gold certification will be targeted on the US-GBC LEED Mid-Rise Rating System scale.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel members.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The entire application needs to be considered as a coherent whole, as opposed to separate elements. Comments relating to the design of the new building and how it relates to the Wong residence, urged careful consideration as to intent
  - The form could be bolder, and both the mass and the lane house should not mimic the Wong residence, but compliment it
  - There are overshadowing and overlook problems with the courtyard Creating a stronger three-storey base might assist with this
  - Both the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces require further development. Connecting the indoor space to the lobby could aid in activation
  - Further development of the landscape is urged, particularly as it relates to the rock outcrop and courtyard. The heritage value of the rock is of particular importance and complete retention is strongly supported
  - Developing the entrance further, and dropping the floor to the front entrance to eliminate the ramp at the front, would retain the rock
- **Related Commentary:** Generally there was Panel support for how the house was being retained. The development was a suitable response to the house and context, but could be bolder when it gets around to the Wong residence. With refinement it could feel as though there's more room between the development and the residence, which feels quite tight and overcrowded. The three-storey volume looks good moving around the project, but the levels above make the building look bulky, facing the retained structure.

In terms of adjacency on the north side, the form is very close to the adjacent property, and looks a little bit too tight.

Comments varied regarding lane transition: that there was too much mass and it was aggressive on the lane; that the push and pull element handled the transition well; that the design should play up the two or three storey mass and let the top of the building fade into the fog; and that shadowing and overlook were of concern.

Most panel members advised to respect the landscaping by preserving the rock in its entirety. The floor level of the entrance lobby could be dropped and a different way of bringing the ramp into that space found. Landscape should respond better to the neighbour's property and take direction from it.

The amenities need to be played up more; they don't need to be big but they should be special, particularly the one at ground level. Shifting the mass to the north edge would play up the sunlight in the courtyard amenity space and create a more delightful garden. This garden could be moved to the southwest side and integrated with the rock.

In terms of sustainability, reduce some of the bulk and mass at the roof level and add a heat recovery system in. Consideration should be given to thermal bridging, and reducing the amount of glass

- **Applicant's Response:** The Panel were thanked for their comments, which will be taken to heart as the design panel helps to ultimately provide better architecture. All the comments will be used to take a critical look at the building.

Cutting the rock was intentional; to expose a more polished face and to assist with entry to the parkade.

Moving the laneway mass over to the north may help and will be investigated. Materiality has quite a soft focus on it at this point and there is a lot of work to go.

2. Address:	288 - 388 West King Edward Avenue
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop two four-storey residential buildings with 2-storey townhouses and an amenity building at the lane. The proposal is for a total of 56 residential units and is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Shift Architecture (Cam Halkier)
Owner:	Mosiac Homes
Delegation:	Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd. Kristina Kovacs, Mosiac Homes
Staff:	Michelle McGuire and Marie Linehan. Cynthia Lau presented on Michelle's behalf in her absence.

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- Introduction:** The site for this rezoning application is comprised of five parcels on West King Edward Avenue near Cambie Street. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan which contemplates residential buildings in this area up to four-storeys with an estimated density range of 1.25 to 1.75 FSR.

The site is located on King Edward Ave and east of Yukon Street, and one block east of the King Edward Canada Line Station. Recent rezonings in the area include: a full-block immediately west for seniors housing, to the northwest a six-storey residential building and across to the north a four-storey residential development. Along King Edward Ave are single-family properties that could be rezoned under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan. To the south are single-family properties that will be included in Phase 3 of Cambie Corridor Plan.

This rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from RS-1 to CD-1 to allow development of a four-storey residential building and townhouses at the rear of the site, all over one level of underground parking with a maximum building height of 50 ft. The proposal includes 56 dwelling units at a floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.76.

The proposal is generally consistent with the Cambie Corridor Built Form Guidelines which allow for four-storey principal buildings along West King Edward with shoulder setbacks above the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, with a row of two-storey townhouses at the lane. The laneway buildings are intended activate and animate the lane, and provide a scale transition to single family sites across the lane.

12ft. setbacks are provided at West King Edward and Yukon Street, as well as the interior side yard. A 24ft. courtyard break is provided between the principal buildings along West King Edward. This is carried through to the lane with a 30 ft. break between the townhouses. A 24 ft. courtyard break is provided between the principal buildings and the townhouses. A 4ft. setback is provided to the townhouses at the rear.

The principal buildings comply for the maximum frontage width of 150ft. The east building being 150 ft., and the west being 81 ft. A maximum frontage of 80 ft. is recommended for laneway buildings. The west building is at 80 ft., and the east building is 97 ft., and there's a break at the second storey.

The west townhouses are two two-storey units. The east townhouses are flats, with a common amenity room located at the ground floor. This is the only common amenity space within the site and is intended to serve the whole site.

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

1. Overall height, massing and density.
2. Response to the Cambie Corridor Built Form Guidelines, in particular:
  - a. 3<sup>rd</sup> storey shoulder setbacks:
    - i. Four-storey vertical element at the exterior street corner of King Edward and Yukon.
    - ii. Jogs in fourth-storey - setbacks narrow from 8ft. to 5ft.
  - b. Laneway buildings - Overall design in terms of laneway activation, and 97 ft. building.
  - c. Material treatment - should a consistent material expression, in terms of quality and detail, be provided at all 4 sides (*advice for DP stage*).
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** This is a standard Cambie Corridor shoulder building, split into two distinct smaller buildings; one with five units, and a larger one with forty nine. Courtyards bisect the two buildings and separate the townhouses.

The general scheme is to have a well-proportioned base in brick with a subservient upper floor, using white brick and tall/thin openings and very fine detailing. The entries will be defined with steel canopies. Along the back are two townhomes, the amenity and the flats. The bridge between the two buildings is a lighter, more transparent portion. The step outs at the top floor help break that up into small façade.

It is fairly straight forward with a minimalistic façade to keep things as calm as possible. Basic Cambie Corridor patterns have been adhered to with landscape. On the outside edge of the site there are patios with individual entrances off the street. Lane homes have entrances off both the lane and the courtyard, and the main entrance is well defined. There is a connection to the courtyard off of Yukon.

There is outdoor common amenity which is associated with the ground floor amenity; with play area and urban agriculture.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - With regards to the third-story setbacks, the fourth floor needs to be expressed lightly and with delicate detailing. The renderings are quite heavy and don't reflect the design of the building.
  - The fourth-story corner expression requires further development. There is a relentless quality to the eaves line and this should be examined.
  - There are overlook concerns between the building and the laneway houses.
  - The amenity space requires more connection.
  - Further work on materiality is required. Good quality materials need to be used on all sides, and the bricks should wrap all the way around. There was some concern that the colours might be too contrasting.

- Revisit the parking entry ramp, as it seems to slice right through.
  - Further examine solar shading and handling of the south and west exposure, and elaborate on the mechanical systems.
- **Related Commentary:** The overall height, mass and density were very well received and supportable by the Panel. It was commented that overall it is a handsome building which fits well in the evolving area.

With regards to the third floor setbacks, the Panel felt that the upper fourth-floor needed to be expressed lightly with delicate detailing. The roof overhang on the fourth-story is relentless and needs work. Skewing closer to the Guidelines would make it better. Concern was expressed about the overlooking adjacencies across the courtyard.

The fourth-storey element on the corner feels awkward and heavy, and stands out too much.

Panel comments suggested a more vertical expression for the laneway houses, which seem too jarring as they are horizontal while the main building is vertical. The townhouses make things seem a bit tight. The length isn't bothersome.

It was commented that the laneway activation was good. It was suggested that the amenity be located in the laneway, and that entry doors be relocated from King Edward to connect the amenity and activate the centre space.

A number of Panel comments encouraged further design development of the space between the two buildings to activate the area and make it more interesting: the treatment is straight forward and is not doing enough; it could have an entry lobby tucked in there to activate it.

The Panel felt that the amenity space required more connections. There isn't a lot of usable space in the amenities. The amenity performs ok but the outdoor amenity could be opened up more, and would perform better if it was linked with the lobby of the main building. The north/south patio needs more activation, possibly with more hard surface and connection to the street.

Attention should be paid to how the parking ramp entry is handled as it seems to slice through the site.

The Panel suggested that further work was required on materiality, and that good quality materials needed to be used on all sides. The brick façade is good and it could wrap all the way around the building. The brick could be used to tie in the laneway houses.

There was some Panel concern that the black and white scheme would be too stark, white brick and black windows make the building pop in an awkward way; it needs to be treated with great care.

In regards to sustainability, it was commented that the punched windows on the south side look good, but there needs to be a closer look at solar shading. The mechanical systems need to be revisited and the winter conditions addressed.

In keeping with the proposal, landscaping needs to be reflective of a classical or a more modern layout. The garden should be reflective of the strong expression of the building. Consider using cleaner and more rational forms.

- **Applicant's Response:** The comments are well respected and appreciated. It is strongly felt that the white and black scheme be maintained, while the comments on the brick will be taken into account, and further discussions will take place about redesigning or removing the corner element.

3. Address:	2395 - 2443 Kingsway
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop two mixed-use buildings, a 12-storey building and a four-storey building. This application includes 126 residential units, and commercial space at grade. This application is being considered under the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan.
Zoning:	C-2 and RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand (Tim Ankenman)
Owner:	Imani Development
Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Dimitar Bojadziev, Ankenman Marchand Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd. Patar Imani, Imani Development
Staff:	Joyce Lee Uyesugi and Paul Cheng

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** This is an application to rezone a site on Kingsway in the Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan area.

The site is located on the north side of Kingsway between Nanaimo and Clarendon Streets. It is a six-lot assembly currently zoned C-2 on the eastern-most lot, with the remainder zoned RT-2.

The proposal is to build a mixed use development with two buildings, one at four-storeys and the other, including a twelve-storey element over a four-storey podium.

The site falls within the Kingsway Rezoning Policy area in Norquay Village. It is one of three mid-block sites on Kingsway, where the Plan allows a height of twelve-storeys in exchange for public realm improvements, specifically, open space and mid-block pedestrian connections. The base building height along the rest of Kingsway is generally ten-storeys, with two “gateway sites” at either end of the Plan boundary allowing up to fourteen-storeys. The “heart” of the neighbourhood centre is envisioned to be on the 2400 Motel site, directly across from the subject site. There, the Plan envisions two tower elements of twelve and sixteen-storeys, along with a significant public open space, among other amenities. The permitted density on all of these sites along Kingsway, is 3.8 FSR.

Behind the subject site currently are single-family homes. Per the Plan, this area is meant to be a transition area from the taller buildings on Kingsway, to the lower scale context behind. The policy envisions four-storey apartment buildings in this transition area.

The eastern-most lot is zoned C-2 and developed with a two-storey commercial building. The rest of the lots in the assembly are zoned RT-2 and developed with single-family houses and duplexes [2395 in 2006].

The site size is approximately 31,000 sq. ft., with a 297-ft. frontage along Kingsway, and a 106-ft. lot depth. The grade drops from east to west approximately 6 feet, and the site also slopes down from the lane to street. As such a retaining wall currently exists along the front property line.

To the east is a four-storey mixed-used building with commercial at grade and market residential on top, developed under C-2 in 1995. To the west are more houses and duplexes for the rest of the block. Across Kingsway are: the 2400 Motel site, a four-storey C-2 development with market residential, and the mixed-use development of the previous Eldorado Hotel site, including a 22-storey tower (CD-1 487). Across the lane is the Apartment Transition Zone Rezoning Area, currently developed with single family houses.

The proposal is to develop a thirteen-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade fronting Kingsway and market residential units on upper floors. Form of development consists of a four-storey podium and a thirteen-storey tower located in the mid-section of the site. Density is 3.8 FSR (120,169 sq.ft. of total floor area), with 0.37 FSR of commercial uses. 142 market residential units are proposed, with a mix of one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. Some two-level townhouse units are proposed fronting the back lane. Underground parking is provided from the lane.

A “plaza” and a pedestrian access from Kingsway to the lane are proposed, located near a proposed mid-block pedestrian-activated crossing on Kingsway, a requirement of Engineering Services. A building setback to achieve a 25 ft. wide sidewalk, as required by the Norquay Plan, has been proposed.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought with regards to general commentary on the project.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The podium expression has been broken up quite a bit and articulated. The building form has a tricky mass as it is squat and big. Window treatments will be used to give it more of a sense of verticality.

The lane-scape will have townhouses with their own gates, patios and addresses.

There is an amenity off the lobby which activates the streetscape and a CRU (a large chiropractor or the like). The treatment of Kingsway, the storefronts, the canopies, is a bit repetitive and needs some design development.

The streetscape on Kingsway has some trees and paving patters in keeping with the Guidelines. The roofs have been programmed to make more usable space.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The Panel was generally supportive of the density, height and massing but consideration should be given to slimming the tower to mitigate overshadowing in the neighbourhood.
  - Revisit the mid-block connection space with the view to creating a space; more place than passage. Look at installing seating, cafes and ways to activate and create community.
  - Carefully consider how the lane will be used and by who, and what the building will do.
  - There was concern about the loading bay interfering with the lane.
  - The Panel was generally supportive of the Kingsway setback strategy, but more space for people to gather and maybe some trees would be beneficial.
  - The bridge is an opportunity for celebration and art elements.
- **Related Commentary:** Panel comments generally supported the height, form and massing. There is good contrast between the strong horizontal and vertical; it seems to suit Kingsway in terms of movement. The podium is well done.

There was largely Panel support for a taller, skinnier building, with some comments that the building was a bit bulky, and expressing concern about overshadowing and the effect on the lane-scape and neighbourhood. Going taller and thinner would mean that things are being overshadowed for less time. More stepping of the tower could happen on the lane to help with shadow impact. The four-storey blue element is a bit heavy and functionally it takes away a lot of sunlight from the units below and creates a heavy top. It needs to be pushed back and changed in colour.

The Panel commented on the need to consider the relationship and conflicts between the commercial and public realms, particularly within the context of a large grocery store. From a sustainability perspective, a holistic approach should be taken to grocery and residential elements. The conflict between grocery loading and townhouses off lane in the same location needs to be explored further. Not knowing about what commercial tenant will use the space is problematic in terms of loading space requirements, but generally bringing the space down is a positive. The retail units need to be more pedestrian-friendly, both in height and width. Parking needs to be better resolved.

There was Panel support for the townhouses, and activation was considered good. It was commented that moving the townhomes north a bit would allow them to be expressed more clearly, and less hidden by the towering elements above; and suggested that holding them up off the lane will make them more livable and allow for backyards.

There was Panel support for the pedestrian bridge, with comments that it was unusual, could be celebrated more, and is a public art opportunity.

Regarding the throughway, it was generally felt that the area required expansion and activation. The cut-through is an opportunity for a civic space; get a café in there, open it up, pull people in with seating outside - the throughway should not just be a connector. Think of it as a space in and of itself. It would be great to see an indoor amenity to activate the midblock courtyard. Reduce the lobby to create a more flat open space.

Panel comments regarding the setback and sidewalk along Kingsway varied. The larger setback allows for more landscaping and makes it more pedestrian friendly, allowing for stores to spill out on the street (vegetable carts, displays, etc.). Creating too large a sidewalk, that wasn't big enough for patios, was cautioned. Maybe constrict this space a bit, and redistribute to create more courtyard spaces that can be activated. The sidewalk needs to be big enough for a parking lane and big trees.

In terms of landscaping, it was suggested that layered landscaping would help to counter the length of the block and to break things up a bit and that large trees are needed on Kingsway.

- **Applicant's Response:** Initially a taller, narrower tower had been proposed, but it didn't work out as it didn't respond to the Guidelines and the Norquay Plan. Revisiting taking the townhouses all the way under the tower on the lane-side will be considered.

There is an indoor amenity adjacent to the lobby, to activate the back half and the commercial across from that. The comments of the design development of the retail will be taken to heart; fine-grade detail is what it will create a more pedestrian experience.

4. Address:	288 E Hastings Street
DE:	DE419659
Description:	To develop the site with a 12-storey mixed-use building, including 104 non-market micro dwelling units and 68 market dwelling units.
Zoning:	DEOD
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Endall Elliot Associates (Malcolm Elliot)
Owner:	292 East Hastings Holdings Ltd.
Delegation:	Alan Endall, Endall Elliot Associates Malcolm Elliot, Endall Elliot Associates Jason Wegman, PWL Prtnership
Staff:	Ann McLean

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the project as an application for a twelve-storey, mixed-use building with commercial at grade, residential above, with two floors of underground parking. The site is located at Hastings and Gore Streets, which is in the Downtown-Eastside/Oppenheimer (DEOD) area.

Following amendments to the ODP in 2014, the Development Permit Board can consider a height of up to 120 ft. height and 7.0 FSR on corner sites with maximum frontage of 100 ft. The subject site has a frontage of 103 ft., and the Development Permit Board will be asked to relax this requirement due to the irregular shape.

Adjacent sites are zoned DEOD heading east and west and across the street, and those areas, under future development will be limited to a maximum of 5.0 FSR and eight-storeys. Also adjacent is Chinatown to the south, with heights of four to seven-storeys. The entire block to the south is listed as heritage, and guidelines limit future development to this existing height.

In order to achieve the 7.0 FSR in this district, applicants are required to provide a mix of housing that is very specific:

- At least 60% of the units and no less than 40% of the floor area (above 1.0 FSR) are developed as social housing; and,
- The remaining 40% of the units and no more than 60% of the floor area are market rental.

The Policy in this area for the Downtown East Side (DTES) Local Area Plan encourages smaller units for social housing, which are intended to start replacing the Single-Room Occupancies (SROs) in the area.

The social housing for the proposal includes micro-dwelling units, which have their own guidelines to direct design. These include a living space of 10 x 10 ft., in-suite storage, bulk storage, outdoor space, a private bathroom and a kitchenette.

In considering the application the Development Permit Board must consider:

- The overall design of the building;
- Its effect on the site and surrounding buildings and streets, with an emphasis on preserving and strengthening the prevailing context; and,

- Mitigating the impact on the livability of adjacent residential areas and public areas such as parks.

There is no park in the immediate vicinity. However, the guidelines do consider Gore Street as a special public space opportunity due to its off-grid angle. This development will have an increased setback on Gore Street to allow for an increased sidewalk of 15 ft.

The Downtown-Eastside/Oppenheimer Design Guidelines apply, but were not updated with the ODP. The guidelines recommend that new buildings have a height compatible with buildings in the area. It needs to be considered that the ODP has been updated to include developments of up to twelve-storeys, and the guidelines have not yet been revised. The Guidelines also speak of compatibility of details and materials, as well as cornice lines and other elements that unify the streetscape.

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

1. Comments on the overall design of the proposed building and public realm with specific consideration of:
  - a. The design approach to preserving and strengthening the prevailing context;
  - b. The pedestrian experience on Gore Street;
  - c. The design of the Micro Dwelling units, specifically those with limited outlook;
  - d. The proposed amenity spaces - both indoor and outdoor
  - e. The material expression.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The form and massing of the proposal has the 40/60 formula for market/non-market housing as a main driver. Thus this is a bit of a shoehorn exercise that focuses on the non-market units. A lot of plans were tested, with a lot of small units fighting for frontage and daylight. The final form is in an L-shape to improve livability, with only two units with reduced horizontal daylight angles, oriented due south.

Attempts were made to alleviate some of the challenges with the courtyard-facing units by using a serrated plan. An important consideration was how to alleviate the perceived scale of the building. The current approach uses three distinct building components: the Hastings Street tower uses the sawtooth pattern of Hastings; the building on the corner responds more to Gore Street and the buildings of Chinatown to the south; the upper corner building will be as neutral and light as possible.

A simple materials palette has been used, with red brick facing, cast and plate concrete, metal spandrel and a window wall. Colour will be used to differentiate the various building parts and components.

The experience on the street currently is very slim; there are no trees, the concrete is pretty worn. The hope is to be the first development to bring forward trees and landscape; street trees of varying heights. Street furniture was explored, but the social element of the neighbourhood is not conducive to a lot of street furniture however they could be brought in in the future. Street trees have been introduced on Gore St.

An attempt has been made to harmonise the two outdoor areas; the upper area being the market component and the lower being the non-market component. A lot of green has been used on the site to make it feel like a home.

There is a planting edge to separate the ground floor units from the outdoor space. At the top there is an outdoor space with a bit of a play area with views of the north-shore area. There is space here also for 37 urban agriculture plots and seating areas.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The Panel felt that this building was a bit busy with too many expressions; specifically, the glass box design portion, which really requires further design attention. Perhaps it could be more reflective or de-materialized, and less present overall.
  - The second floor needs differentiation from the residential units; it is more of a mezzanine.
  - The Chinatown aspect needs to be expressed better on the streetscape with materials. Continuing the tradition with historic brick, granite or stone thresholds at the door etc., would strengthen it.
  - Streetscape furniture is not supportable at this stage.
  - To address limited outlook, foliage could be used to off-set summer heat and create something more pleasant for people to look out at.
  - There was concern about the connectivity of all the amenity space. Further development is required to address connecting the non-market units to non-market amenity space, and the market-units and upper amenity. Possibly push amenity space to the lane to get more light and air.
  - Year-round, climatic comfort requires more work, particularly for the micro-units.
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the Panel supported the project, expressing that the rationale was great and that the design is well-resolved and strengthens the context. There is logic to the building and intelligence in the plan for it.

In terms of preserving and strengthening the prevailing context, it was suggested that incorporating a historic brick look would make it respond better to Chinatown. This context could also be integrated on Gore St, using granite, stone thresholds at the door etc.

The Panel generally agreed that the design approach and materiality as it relates to the upper glass portion of the building required further development. It was suggested that this could be resolved through materiality; possibly to unify all of the pieces or differentiate. As a separate expression it needs to be very clean; or maybe extend the brick and combine it all together. The separate volume extenuates the context though.

Differing views on the cornice-line suggested: that the cornice-line may be a bit too high for the corner and could be simplified, and that the way it made breaks in the building was good.

The Panel supported the layout and design of the Micro Dwellings.

Overlook concern was addressed partially by glazing, and by a sawtooth approach to the building, which was commented to be an elegant solution.

The Gore Street pedestrian experience was felt to be very appropriate, with wider sidewalks and the lively canopies; the awnings bring Hastings and Gore together in an intelligent way.

The Panel thought that the amenity spaces made sense, but access to the spaces was of concern. It was also commented that the indoor amenity space for the non-market units seemed like a bunker and required more light, and perhaps should be pushed up against the lane.

Other suggestions included: access near the elevator bank; that the amenity be integrated with the lobby; a courtyard space, possibly gated afterhours; for resident use would be good; integrating the indoor amenity room with the outdoor space would improve its use. There was a comment that it was a shame that there isn't the ability to do street furniture that works in the area.

In regards to the upper amenity, it was suggested that agriculture should be opened to non-market use as well and that a covered outdoor space is needed. It was commented that the project didn't appear to be hugely family-oriented space.

In terms of addressing sustainability it was commented that there is too much glass and spandrels relative to the size of the units, with too much heat loss in the winter and too much solar gain in the summer. The micro units will not be livable temperature-wise, which needs to be resolved. It was also commented that the electric baseboard does not work with the windows as they will need to be on all the time.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments; a lot of them were very helpful.

The treatment of the upper six-storeys is at a stage of design development where things need to be reduced as much as possible, and it was agreed that there's a feeling of it being overly busy along Gore. The glass portion is a bit of a left-over piece and could be more neutral or 'disappear', and will be looked at carefully.

Access issues to non-market courtyard/outdoor spaces were acknowledged, and access, connection, and light to the indoor amenity would be considered.

With regards to sustainability, there were economic challenges to making it work, and a balance is aimed for on a performance level.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.