URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: **Wednesday, May 4, 2016**

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli
Roger Hughes
Ken Larsson
David Jerke
Neal Lamontagne
James Cheng
Muneesh Sharma
Stuart Hood
Meghan Cree-Smith

REGRETS: Jim Huffman
Derek Neale

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1495 W 8th Avenue
2	2894 E Broadway
3.	2001 W 11th Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING
Chair Roger Hughes called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1.	Address:	1495 W 8th Avenue
	Description:	The proposal is for a new four-storey building for the Vancouver Masonic Centre on W 7th Ave, connected to an 18-storey secured rental residential building on W 8th Avenue. The proposal includes 159 secured rental residential units (mix of non-market and market units), and a neighbourhood restaurant on W 7th Ave, with a floor space ratio (FSR) of 5.96.
	Zoning:	CD-1 (445) and RM-5B to CD-1 Revised
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Review:	First
	Architect:	SHAPE Architecture (Nick Sully)
	Owner:	Vancouver Masonic Centre Association
	Delegation:	Nick Sully, SHAPE Architecture David Guenter, Rob Baynes, P+A
	Staff:	Rachel Harrison and Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)

- **Introduction:** The Rezoning Planner Rachel Harrison introduced the Rezoning Policy for 1495 W 8th Avenue. The site is located mid-block between 7th and 8th Avenue, east of Granville Street. The site and surrounding context are subject to the Burrard Slopes C-3A Guidelines.

  The site is an irregular shape (pan-handle) with the existing four-storey Masonic Temple having frontage to the north along 7th Avenue and the narrower, vacant building site extending south to 8th Avenue. To the east, along 7th Avenue is a three-storey heritage residential building with a 'C' classification on the Vancouver Heritage Register. South, across 8th Avenue the streetwall is comprised of two and three-storey mixed use buildings. A lane runs north/south along the west property line separating the site from the one and two-storey commercial buildings on Granville Street. The entire block to the north along 7th Avenue is residential with building heights ranging from four to 19-storeys. In addition, adjacent to the northeast corner of the site on 7th Avenue is an 11-storey residential tower.

  The rezoning proposal is to build a four-storey building for the Vancouver Masonic Centre on the existing footprint on the front of the site at 7th Avenue, joined to an 18-storey residential tower with secured rental. There is a small CRU off of the front. The proposal includes 159 secured residential units in the tower with a mix of non-market and market housing. There is a neighbourhood restaurant at the tower that fronts onto 7th Avenue. The area is within the Burrard Slope C-3A Guidelines; the intent of the policy is primarily residential with additional non-residential uses. The policy also entails stepping the heights up from False Creek up to Broadway following the natural topography of the hill.

  The Plan also entails narrow floorplates to protect views to the north, with a maximum of 5,500 sq. ft. for the floorplates. The policy also states residential towers should be within 82 ft. or 25 meters from each other. The policy guideline for height is 30.5 meters or 100 ft.

The zoning guidelines are discretionary, so relaxations may be considered. The proposal is being considered for rezoning due to its social housing component. The tower is going to have a mixture of market rents and below market rents, with 51% of the units below market and 30% of the units are below BC Housing's Housing Income Limit (HILs), which is the City of Vancouver approval requirement for this project to fall under social housing approval for rezoning.

Development Planner Allan Moorey introduced the site as having a significant cross-fall, sloping down 12 ft. from a highpoint in the southwest to a lowpoint in the northeast corner of the site. The irregular shaped site measures 75 ft. along 8th Avenue, 240 ft. along the west property line at the lane and 125 ft. along 7th Avenue. The site area is 23,980 sq. ft. The proposed FSR is 5.96 or 143,990 sq. ft. This is approximately double the maximum C3-A base zoning of 3.0 FSR or 71,940 sq. ft.

There are three primary components in the proposed massing. These include a new four-storey Masonic Temple, approximately within the footprint of the existing building on 7th Avenue, a five-storey residential podium oriented north south, along the west property line and a 13-storey overbuild which presents an 18-storey tower with a height of 175 ft. This exceeds the maximum base zoning height of 100 ft.. The proposed height aligns itself with the parapet of the 19-storey residential tower to the north, across 7th Avenue. The typical tower floorplate is 6200 sq. ft.

The proposed tower observes the recommended 80 ft. separation between towers to the north (19-storeys) and east (11-storeys). The proposed slab tower is oriented north/south and is situated mid-site. It is setback 30 ft. from the south property line and 90 ft. from the north. The tower overbuild straddles the podium and new Masonic Temple. A residential amenity space is provided at this location on the roof deck of the Masonic Temple. There is a common access outdoor space next to a children's play area for residents. Similarly, a rooftop amenity room and outdoor space is provided for the Masonic Temple. This span between the podium and temple creates an over-height portal entry to a landscaped mews beyond. The mews is framed by the podium and existing heritage building to the east. A mid-block connection encourages pedestrian movement across the site. In addition, the mews affords both vertical and horizontal angles of daylighting for those window openings along the west side of the heritage building.

Over four-storeys the podium maintains a distance of 40 ft. from the face of the heritage building. At Level 5, and aligned with the parapet of the heritage building, the proposed tower cantilevers east over the mews 22 ft. This results in a significant soffit condition over units in the podium and reduces the distance between the proposed tower and heritage building to approximately 20 ft. The residential entry is off the mews. Primary entry to the Masonic Temple is provided off 7th Avenue. with secondary entry from the mews. The primary entry to the mews is off 8th Avenue. Along this street the podium presents four-storeys with a roofline and scale of massing that aligns with the heritage building to the east. CRU space is proposed at grade reinforcing the continuity of use along 8th Avenue.

The shadow performance of the tower is acceptable. Morning shadows are largely confined to the lane and the intersection of Granville and 7th Avenue. Mid-day shadows fall directly on the site and 7th Avenue. Late afternoon shadows fall largely on site, over the roof of the new Masonic Temple and the neighbouring 11-storey building to the northeast. Long views west from this neighbouring building are preserved, as are views south those from the 19-storey tower to the north.

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

1) The mews, provided between the podium of the proposed development and the existing Heritage building in the east, is fundamental in addressing potential issues of livability for both buildings. This space must satisfy a sufficient measure of 'free-air' ventilation and both horizontal and vertical angles of daylighting. In addition, there is the perceived volume of this passage space for both residents and visitors to the Masonic Temple to consider. Could the Panel comment on the interface between the proposed and existing buildings?

2) Does the Panel support the proposed height, density, and form of development?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as aligning with the City of Vancouver Social Housing Policy. The owners of 1495 W 8th Avenue have partnered with BC Housing through the Community Partners Initiatives (CPI), and one of the requirements of the CPI is that there is an eighty to twenty percent residential to non-residential split for programming on site.

  The applicant addressed the conceptual aspects of the project. Refer to the Planner's comments for a specific description. The applicant discussed at length the symbolism inherent in the design of the Masonic Temple. The applicant wanted to focus on landscaping, natural light and ventilation for the tower. The pedestrian and traffic activity was placed in front of the tower. There is a mid-block 'cut' half way through the site. The intent was to allow the flow of traffic from the laneway to weave up through the mews and activate the ground floor on three or four sides of the base of the podium tower. The mews is an important connector to Granville Island.

  The balconies have been added to the proposed iteration. The lane uses are residential and commercial retail along the south edge. The proposed tower is heated with electrical baseboard.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

  - The mews is too tight, and could be improved by raising the step out to floor 6 or in other words adding floor 5 to the recessed area under the overhang
  - There are balcony overlook issues on the mews side of the building
  - There was concern about the north south access and how public the portion in the Masonic Hall would be, and whether it is a 'welcoming space'
  - The tree retention should be pursued on the east side of the building and it could resolve privacy issues between the mews and the heritage building to the east
  - The blank wall to the north of the heritage building should be improved
  - There was concern expressed regarding the liveability of the lower residential units on the lane

- **Related Commentary:** Chair Hughes made the recommendation to go forward with the design review despite the lack of information on the metrics of both horizontal and vertical angles of daylighting provided. The Chair urged more information during the next presentation. Overall, the Panel supported the height and density of the proposal. A Panelist noted more height is especially supportable if there are changes made to the southeast corner angle wall to bring in more light. The package lacked information on street elevations and views of neighbours, but the density is welcomed due to the proposed social housing.

Opinions on the mid-point connection to the lane were differing. Some panel members thought it should be larger to let more light in from the west, and other panel members thought there should be a stronger decision on whether it was a courtyard or something else.

The tower could be moved to the north, with an overlap on the temple form allowing more light in from the south, according to some panel members. One Panel member thought the relationship between the buildings is abrupt. The overlooking balconies should be moved higher, and removed on the lower levels. The tower could be moved to the north 5 meters, which would improve the massing and proportion. The shadow studies should be more complete. One Panel member recommended a double loaded corridor scheme. The key route to Granville Island is not clear or accessible in the north direction.

One Panel member mentioned that the slab edges should be insulated. The addition of usable space is supported. Generous outdoor roof decks were supported. The Masonic Temple design was supported by a few Panel members. More connection to the street on the east side is recommended as well as more accessibility to walkways. There are some view overlook issues over the exposed mechanical units, and the acoustics of the AC units were a concern for one Panel member. The Panel felt the concept of the north/south and east/west access was strong, but it should be better illustrated going forward.

The use of an electrical heating system on the tower might not be the right direction sustainability wise. The proposed fenestration/cladding ratio was supported. Overall, the development is a great contribution to the neighbourhood.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant apologized for not having a landscape architect give a presentation. They were encouraged and thankful for the commentary, and more information will be added going forward.

2.	Address:	2894 E Broadway
	DE:	N/A
	Description:	The proposal is for a four-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade, 37 secured market rental units above, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.65. This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Program.
	Zoning:	C-1 to CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Gair Williamson Architects Inc. (Chris Knight)
	Owner:	Decorus Developments
	Delegation:	Chris Knight, Project Designer Mamur Kothary and Manjit Bhatti, Developers
	Staff:	Rachel Harrison and Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: DEFERRED

- **Introduction:** The Rezoning Planner Rachel Harrison introduced the project. The site is in Renfrew-Collingwood neighbourhood, on the southwest corner of Renfrew Street and East Broadway. The site is zoned currently zoned C-1 and is occupied by a single-storey commercial building. At the intersection, north and northeast are sites also zoned C-1 having single storey commercial buildings. To the east, across Renfrew St. is the four-storey Broadway Tech Park, zoned CD-1. Immediately adjacent to the south, is a single C-1 parcel with a two-storey commercial building. Beyond this the surrounding context is zoned RS-1 and characterized by single-family residential pattern of development. Two blocks south is the Renfrew Skytrain Station and the Grandview-Boundary mixed employment area.

  The application falls under the Secured Market Rental Policy, which allows for C-1 sites to be considered for rezoning and assume a C-2 form of development. The proposed development is for a four-storey building with commercial use on the ground level with three storeys of residential above, having 37 secured market rental units. In addition, 26% of the units provided will have two or three-bedrooms. One level of below grade parking is provided with entry access off the lane in the southwest corner of the site.

  The Development Planner, Allan Moorey introduced the site as having a significant slope with a cross-fall of 12 ft. The site measures 102 ft. by 122 ft. with a total area of 11,990 sq. ft. The proposed FSR is 2.65 or a total density of 31,820 sq. ft. This compares with the C-1 base zoning of 1.20, or 14,390 sq. ft., and is slightly over the maximum C-2 limit of 2.5 FSR.

  The proposed building is four-storeys and generally complies with the C-2 maximum height limit of 45 ft. The proposed development adheres to the required C-2 setbacks with the exception of a partial relaxation of the uppermost 15 ft. rear yard setback, at Level 4. This was afforded because of the north/south building orientation and the resulting shadow performance on adjacent RS-1 residential across the lane. Morning shadows are generally confined to the lane, midday Broadway and late afternoon, to the intersection of Broadway and Renfrew St. The Level 4 setback at the northwest building corner would have no enhanced effect. However, the full setback is observed at the south building end to align with the anticipated profile of future C-1 development, to the south, along the lane.

Three CRU's are proposed at grade and these are of the desired 'fine grain' in size. The primary residential entry is located mid-building along Renfrew Street. Loading and utility service spaces are located off the lane in the northwest corner of the site. Common access outdoor space, having southwest exposure is collocated with an amenity room on Level 2. This outdoor space is supplemented by limited access, private roof decks on Level 4.

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

1. Does the Panel support the proposed height, density, and form of development?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as having a frontage on the steeply sloping Renfrew Street side, which is the reason for complex setbacks and geometry on the development. Due to the steep slope, the building had to be stepped and the applicant had to add setbacks at the rear portion of the site. The parkade access and parking as well as how to have internal organization at the ground level to facilitate the commercial units to have access to loading, garbage, as well as an entryway. One of the commercial units at the lowest point is 12 ft. lower than the top portion of the site.

  There is an intermediate level, with a lower ceiling height, which is the resident's entry. The floorplate was stepped to allow CRUs above, which allows the internal units to have access to the loading and other levels. The lane has parking and loading access. There is a shared outdoor amenity space connected to the indoor space located on the second level, instead of the roof, due to concerns about overlook to neighbours. There is rooftop outdoor space that is setback far enough from the parapets and eaves that there is no direct overlook. A few of the balconies do have overlook, but balcony guards with side panels and frosted windows were proposed for light and privacy.

  The layout of the units includes single floor two-bedroom and single floor studio apartments, two-storey loft style apartments, and family units with outdoor space on the rooftop to accommodate a broad range of market types. The parkade provides parking more for the Rental 100 Hundred Program, and there is a lift proposed in the lobby for parking stalls used for visitors. There is a lack of parking in the neighbourhood, so parking was implemented. There is a transformer vault located on the site, as well as a 50 ft. blank wall. The intention was to have the elevation continuous to the floor plane.

  A concrete plinth would be at the base of the building, and the street face would be brick. The rest would be composite siding wrapping the top level at the laneway face. A lighter colour is proposed on the laneway side, and metal cornice and a glass canopy is proposed. The density should be moving east over time due to the Skytrain development. There should be pedestrian life on the Broadway area. There is no new Community Plan planned for the Broadway area at the site, and there is nothing under the rezoning plan specific to higher density.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

  - The concept should have a stronger relationship to the context and demonstrate livability and sustainability of design on main arterials
  - The massing concept needs development to achieve clarity
  - The penthouses should have a stronger expression even if it means small intrusions into the height envelope
  - Common amenity on the roof should be considered with elevator access (accepting the over-height elevator run).

- Exploration of massing alternatives (single block, double block) to respond to the corner site of the existing context
- Development of the materiality and tectonics of the building to suit residential/mixed use on a corner site on an arterial
- Development of the retail and residential entry with a stronger, more inviting street presence
- Development of the service area, parking entry and common amenity areas off the lane to mitigate the impact on the adjacent single family houses
- More extensive use of brick to soften the corner mass, lane elevation, and bunker image at grade.

- **Related Commentary:** Overall the Panel supported the height and density for the proposal. The area requires new rentals in the future, so the development is welcomed. There is a lack of policy context for a bigger change, but it is difficult to provide due to the lack of policy, furthermore there should be a city wide strategy on C-1s for rental developments. The loft form for rentals and other different forms of residential are supported. The presentation was lacking contextual information to support a rezoning. The rationale for the building expression and massing concept was unresolved.

  The amenity space should be on the roof according to the Panel, even at the expense of bedrooms and or an over-height elevator shaft. The amenity space provided is not usable, and rental building amenity space is important. Furthermore, the amenity space has a view across the lane, which causes overlook issues. The expression of the balconies on Broadway is not appropriate to this busy arterial road context, and also another Panel member thought the balconies in the front should be more private.

  The scale of the building is a 'two box design', and it could be articulated better to bring it down to the neighbourhood scale. The services (loading bay, parking entry, etc.) are next to the single family house in the lane, and the treatment of the service area in that location should be re-considered. The commercial addition is supported. There should be rooftop decks if possible, for residents on the north or south sides of the penthouse. A Panel member recommended building benches or seating outside. The lobby has a convoluted plan at the ground floor. The northwest corner needs improvement. The Broadway edge has been neglected according to a Panel member. The penthouse expression was underwhelming, according to another Panel member and should take on a more integrated wall and roof form even if it projects slightly through the height envelope.

  A Panel member suggested the massing concept should be one block instead of two blocks. A Panel member suggested concrete buildings look unfinished, and recommended considering more brick. In particular, the use of brick around the lane is recommended. A Panel member did not support the design of the west elevation wall because it is facing the single family neighbor's house. Details around the base of the building could have an unexpected quirkiness to enhance the pedestrian/people friendly quality of the building at street[s] level. The materiality should be more modern, with more articulation, and the scale considered.

  The 'neighbourliness' should continue to the lane. The pedestrian realm should be refined because it is not 'friendly'. There should be more streetscape character, such as benching or banding to break up the space. Sustainability standards are satisfied.

The Panel noted the absence of a registered architect during the presentation. Registered architects are required during architectural presentations due to professional AIBC By-Laws. The Panel discussed abstaining from a vote of support or non-support. The panel decided they could not go forward with a vote, and decided instead to defer their vote until the next presentation when an architect would be present.

- **Applicant's Response:** the applicant thanked the Panel and mentioned he would pass on the message to his firm regarding the requirement for a registered architect to be present.

3.	Address:	2001 W 11th Avenue
	DE:	DE419817
	Description:	To construct a new seven-storey residential building while restoring and converting the existing retail building to multiple dwelling. The proposal is for a total of ten dwelling units.
	Zoning:	CD-1 (435) and DD to CD-1 Revised
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Architect:	Ankenman Marchand (Afshin Banafsheh)
	Owner:	Maple Mews Development Co.
	Delegation:	Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Peter Kreuk, Durante Kruek Liam Murray, Maple Mews Development Co. Eoghian Hayes, Ions Engineering Ltd.
	Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-2)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the second appearance of the development permit application for 2001 W 11th Avenue. The zone is a C-7. The intent of this Schedule is to encourage the transition of a predominantly industrial and commercial area into a mixed-use community with a strong residential component, while respecting the needs of existing development. Emphasis is placed on well-designed all-residential or mixed residential and commercial buildings.

  The proposal is seven storeys, plus a roof garden. There are five two-storey townhouse units, five units in the mid-rise, and one per floor, which is 10 units total. The mid-rise portion has 1744 sq. ft. floorplates. Front and side yards comply with existing zoning, and the heritage building is left in place. The parking complies with existing zoning with 13 stalls required and 18 provided in the proposal. Changes were made to the proposal such as: the heritage building is more of a complimentary contrast and the mechanical penthouse has been removed. Also, the expression was simplified, the second level cornice removed, the cladding materials were changed with the introduction of limestone at the base two levels, brick, metal panel system, green wall, as well as the deletion of the exterior shear column. The landscaping is also more open at the corner than the previous design.

  Mr. O'Sullivan informed the Panel of the zone's height parameters, particularly that base maximum height is 40 ft. and that height may be increased to 80 ft. to facilitate the retention of heritage structures. The proposed height is 79 ft. to the top of the covered roof access stair and the proposed density is 2.44 FSR. The Director of Planning has stipulated the heritage building be retained. Otherwise outright density would be enforced.

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

  1) Does the revised design satisfactorily address the above consensus items needing improvement identified by the Panel at the first appearance?

  2) An item identified by a few Panel members at the first appearance was the proximity relationship of the new development to the on-site heritage building. Has this relationship been satisfactorily addressed?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant stated they have made refinements to make the building more interesting. On the heritage building, they moved the living space uses up to top floor to celebrate the building more. They have wrapped windows around the lane, taken the Bay windows and roof and wrapped it around the mews. They created an airlock vestibule, which allowed the façade to be pulled out more. The base became simpler without a cornice; instead they used a heavy stone base and lighter materials, such as brick, metal panels, and glass. There are still green walls in one area.

  Around the streetscape there is more celebration by removing private realm and creating more public realm with benches and a water fountain. Street interest was created with 'L' shaped exposed concrete entry structures that celebrate the entry to the townhomes and around the parkade there is exposed 'C channels'. They took galvanized I-Beams to grow ivy over with guy wires so the residents are not looking down into the entry ramp. The bike room and garbage has been located next to the lane. The fencing is cantilevered galvanized angle iron that creates a modern fence. The mews was made wider with front entry doors brought to the end of the mews for direct street views.

  The private patio has a short hedge for privacy. The green wall on the back side of the building has a significant planter that overhangs the walkway with cables that run up the back side of the building to grow vines in order to create a seven-storey green wall. There is a planter that sits on the parkade wall.

  The materials, such as bricks, are selected to fit the context of the other buildings in the neighbourhood. The corner expression has a node for corner celebration. The seating was pulled away, and a drinking fountain added. There are no rooftop amenities on the building because elevator access stops at each floor. There is a lot of park and outdoor access in the area, so there was no communal roof top space used. The heritage building has live work space to make it a more interesting addition to the neighbourhood.

  Sustainability wise, the suites have energy star rated appliances, low flow water closets and shower heads. There is a cooling unit in the electrical transformer. ECM heating in the suites and energy efficient lighting in the parkade were also used. Ventilation is controlled by CO^2 sensors. The applicant hopes the energy efficient features will compensate for energy loss.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

  - The colour palette was too subdued; the Panel recommends a brighter palette
  - The expression is vastly improved, but some Panel members advised the design could be further simplified and stronger

- **Related Commentary:** The Chair noted that comments would be made only on the advice sought, and not the height and density which were addressed in the previous submission.

  Overall the panel felt the expression and relationship to the heritage building issues were addressed. The expression is vastly improved, but some felt it could be further simplified in form to contrast with the heritage building. The colour palette might be too subdued, with too much differentiation for the two buildings. The materials used in the new design were appreciated. The heritage and main building separation work better now, with the heritage building forming one side of the entry mews. There is a good contrast between the buildings. The retention of the heritage building as a live work use is welcomed. The mews is developed well.

One panelist thought there still needs another step forward in terms of further expression of a clean stronger simpler building. The live work character building is supported as well as its proximity to the other building, and the planning at the corner of the site could be improved. One panelist thought the base to the midrise could be even closer to the other building. The form should be more compact and simple, and the relationship could be increased between the buildings according to one panelist.

The modern approach to the entrances was well done. In particular the west wall, facing the armory, was improved. There are still too many elements, with different materials and tectonic elements, and they should be calmed down more, according to one panelist, by deducting a number of elements. The Panel generally felt that the colours are too muted, and could be brighter and friendlier. The colour of the heritage building should be more complimentary to the main building. The heritage building windows that wrap around have been well handled. The wrapping around of the heritage mews fits better with the open area. The parkade transitions, overlook and adjacencies have been well handled. Sustainability issues have been addressed. The landscape edges to the patios to the ground floor are improved, and there could be an opportunity to further enhance it. The edge landscaping should be improved in the public realm. The landscape vine treatment should have more details.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thought the colour palette was a struggle. The colour palette should be softly muted yellow in colonial style with a red roof, and they aimed to make it subordinate to the other building. The applicant thanked the Panel.

Adjournment
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.