

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, July 27, 2016

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

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

REGRETS: Meredith Anderson

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	4066 Macdonald Street & 2785 Alamein Avenue
2.	3175 Riverwalk Avenue (EFL Parcel 8A)
3.	3198 SE Marine Drive (EFL Parcel 3)
4.	3198 SE Marine Drive (EFL Parcel 5A)
5.	701 W Georgia Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Roger Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 4066 Macdonald Street & 2785 Alamein Avenue
 DE: N/A
 Description: The proposal is for one three-storey mixed-use building and one three-storey duplex over one level of underground parking, including a total of eight market residential units, three commercial units, a floor space ratio of (FSR) of 1.35, a building height of 14.1m (46ft), 21 underground parking spaces, and 21 bicycle spaces.
 Zoning: CD-1 to CD-1 Revised
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Shift Architecture (Cam Halkier)
 Owner: Trillium Developments Ltd.
 Delegation: Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture
 Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk
 Michael Brown, Trillium Developments Ltd.
 Staff: Zak Bennett & Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-5)

- **Introduction:** Rezoning Planner, Zak Bennett, introduced the project as a rezoning application composed of two parcels at the northeast corner of Macdonald Street and Alamein Avenue. The site is an existing CD-1 which allows for the use, density and form as built, developed with an auto shop garage and single-family house. The site is approximately 11,440 square feet and 122 feet along Macdonald and 93 feet along Alamein. The surrounding context is primarily single-family homes, zoned RS-1. There is a local shopping node consisting of C-1 sites to the west and south.

The proposal is for a three-storey, mixed-use building with commercial space at grade and residential on upper floors, and a duplex on the eastern side of the site, facing Alamein. The buildings would be set over one level of underground parking. An FSR of 1.35 is proposed on the site. The proposal is being considered under the Arbutus Ridge-Kerrisdale-Shaughnessy (ARKS) Community Vision that supports rezoning for existing CD-1 sites, allowing new housing on or near arterial roads, near shopping areas, and to enhance important local shopping areas. The C-1 sites would allow 1.2 FSR.

The Development Planner, Marie Linehan, continued the introduction, noting that the base zoning for local shopping areas is generally C-1 for sites at the intersection, with the surrounding neighborhood being zoned single family. The C-1 zoning is intended to provide opportunities for small scale commercial uses to serve the local neighborhood, and, opportunities to increase housing choices within neighborhoods. The low density of 1.2 FSR was intended to ensure a compatible transition to the surrounding single family neighborhood. Planning is able to consider additional density above 1.2 FSR via a rezoning process. The current proposal is at 1.35 FSR, about 1700 square feet over the base zoning.

The C-1 Design Guidelines recommend that new developments blend in with the character of the neighbourhood; provide transitions in scale and mass to be compatible with the neighbourhood; and provide ground floor commercial uses and pedestrian interest. In terms of built form, the C-1 zoning allows for heights of up to 35 feet. The anticipated form of development would be a single building with commercial units at grade oriented to the main street and two storeys of residential above. There is no stepping of the massing required under the C-1 zoning (such as under the C-2 zoning), but, due to the low density, a new C-1 development would not likely fill the 35 foot building envelope.

This proposal seeks to break the massing into two distinct buildings over a single level of underground parking. At the corner is a three-storey building with small commercial units at the ground floor. The residential units are designed as three level townhouses. Four of the units having entries off the court yard, and two units face Macdonald Street with a larger setback at the north end of the site, noting the zoning across the lane is RS 1. The courtyard between the two buildings is 24 feet wide. The duplex form and setbacks are intended to approximate an RT zoning and provide a transition from the three storey building to the single family zoning to the east.

The primary building height is 46 feet, stepping to 40 feet and 25 feet at the north end. The duplex is 36 feet in height. The permitted height and density in the adjacent RS-1 zoning is 31 feet and 0.70 FSR.

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

1. Comment on the overall form of development, height and density (1.35 FSR), in particular, the height of the mixed use building relative to the C-1 context.
 2. Is there a suitable transition to single family sites, particularly with the proposed height, setbacks and massing for the duplex?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant intended to provide a relationship to the existing neighbourhood context. The stepping down of the buildings towards the north was designed to limit overshadowing. The top floor was 'pulled back' from the east side in order to allow light into the courtyard. The pitched roof with dormers at the duplex was chosen to provide a lower roof with less shadowing for surrounding buildings. There is intended to be no overlook between properties, so the applicant removed most of the windows in between the buildings in the design.

The commercial base is probably two, maybe one commercial unit. It is a simple building that references traditional forms in the area. The roofs were brought down in height from earlier schemes to alleviate neighbor concerns.

The landscaping is 'straightforward' according to the applicant. On Macdonald Street, there is commercial frontage, which is primarily hardscape. The duplex has a front yard patio space, and the duplex towards the back has a deck space up above. The courtyard is given to patio spaces to the main building and a circulation system with a planting buffer against the duplex so there is a 'flow through' space. There is good solar exposure in the north south direction. The existing tree is surrounded by an 'entry sequence'.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - There was concern about the height - noting that the additional height at the attic does not provide useful space;

- The forms along MacDonald Street should be better integrated, specifically the north portion of the mixed use building is not well integrated with the overall form;
 - The lane elevation does not present a good face to the neighbours and ignores the potential of a view;
 - There is potential for more common or pedestrian amenity, such as benches in a gathering space;
 - A better interface with the adjacent house should be provided by the duplex, including landscaping adjacent the drive aisle;
- **Related Commentary:** The Chair, Mr. Hughes, noted there is concern from the Panel that the package did not contain enough information specific to context and urban design considerations. The Panel generally supported the mixed use, FSR and form of development, but there were concerns about the height overage. The building could be unique in height from the other buildings in the village area, according to one panel member, but the roof space should be 'used'. One panel member emphasized only if the community supports the height increase beyond the allowable envelope.

There was commentary that the gable roof form is disconnected from the clean glass wall of the commercial below. It was suggested to extend the gable roof full depth and provide a better connection between upper and lower massing. The gable roof was noted to be a 'lost volume' and it was suggested to make better use of it as livable space.

It was noted that the north portion of the mixed use building does not relate well to the whole, and read as garage-like. In general, the forms along MacDonald should be better integrated. It was suggested to extend the commercial base, or break the north into a separate form. One member suggested the overall form or expression could be three buildings, not two. The north elevation was seen as blank and could more neighbourly by providing windows to the lane, and potential views for the development.

Some panel members noted that a more contemporary expression would solve some of the problems of height and integrated expression. It was emphasized that a particular style was not recommended, but overall design integrity was emphasized, to justify the height. There was direction to provide a better transition from the duplex to the adjacent house as well. The drive way was also noted as having an impact and landscape screening should be provided. There was commentary about providing a stronger commercial expression on the corner.

The area around the retained tree could be a gathering space for the neighbourhood, and one panel member suggested a courtyard amenity around the tree, less walkway, and in general less parking and paving on the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the panel for their consideration of the project. The initial design was a more contemporary flat roofed expression, but they met with the Kerrisdale and Shaughnessy commissions and they preferred something more traditional and less modern, although the applicant would prefer a more modern design. The lane elevation overlook onto neighbor's yard was a concern. Hence the north windows were reduced in size. The height could be brought down to make the project work better.

2. Address:	3175 Riverwalk Avenue (EFL Parcel 8A)
DE:	DP-2016-00246
Description:	To construct a multiple dwelling containing 107 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Riverwalk Avenue.
Zoning:	CD-1(499)
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture (Taizo Yamamoto)
Owner:	Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Delegation:	Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Mukhtar Latif, Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Staff:	Nicholas Standeven

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-10).

- **Introduction:** Mukhtar Latif, CEO of Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (VAHA), introduced the project with a statement on VAHA's role in providing affordable housing in Vancouver. Mr. Latif stated the agency was set up to create more affordable housing throughout the city using city lands. Their aim is to create ways to bridge the funding gap that exists in housing affordability for middle to lower income city residents. Along with Provincial and Federal funding, VAHA aims to create affordable housing projects that address the growing gap between income and rising housing costs. The cost of the building design and functionality is balanced with affordability of materials as well as operating costs. Thus the agency requested that the panel consider this, the first housing project undertaken, as part of this larger context.

Development Planner Nicholas Standeven introduced the project, a development application for Parcel 8A located in the East Fraserview Lands (EFL) Area 2 in the southwest precinct.

- Riverwalk Avenue to the south
- Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) right of way to the north
- Parcel 8B (starting construction) and a north-south Lane Mews to the east
- Parcel 7B (completed) and a north-south Pedestrian Mews to the west

The CD-1 (499) zoning allows for maximum heights of up to six-storeys. The EFL design guidelines suggest a stepped massing. There is four storey massing to the west at the adjacent lot Parcel 7B, the pedestrian mews, and future CPR crossing. The height of the site rises five storeys mid site and then to six storeys at the eastern edge of the site adjacent parcel 8B. Together Parcel 8A and 7B are intended to frame views from the northwest Precinct to the southwest Precinct.

The proposed development has been commissioned by the Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (VAHA) and consists of:

- A new multiple dwelling building (a building of three or more dwelling units) consisting of 107 units of affordable housing;
- A high percentage of two and three-bedroom units (family-oriented).

There is one level of parking and vehicle access is from the shared lane mews to the east between Parcel 8A and 8B. The above grade massing is five-storeys tall and the relatively compact form is intended to minimize vertical circulation and achieve an efficient 'surface area to volume ratio'. The massing generally mirrors the 7B site and follows the curve of Riverwalk Avenue.

The south facing elevation is articulated with:

- The use of colour and a full height recess adjacent the lobby;
- Projecting balconies;
- Horizontal upper level eave and soffit;
- Cantilevered projections.

The north facing courtyard adjacent the CPR right of way contains:

- Private outdoor patio space
- Urban agriculture plots
- A children's play area

Common indoor amenity space is located in the 'hinge' space, and landscape terraces define the public realm interface on all sides.

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

1. Does the five-storey massing along with the articulation strategies described by the applicant team meet the intent of the design guidelines?
 2. Given the long frontage and resulting long internal double loaded corridor would the Panel recommend additional opportunities for further façade articulation and potential daylighting of the elevator lobby?
 3. Can the Panel comment on the quality of the ground floor indoor amenity space currently proposed for the 'hinge' space adjacent the lobby and north facing courtyard?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as one designed to both conform to the intent of the guidelines and maintain affordability for potential residents. The site is mostly flat but does slope to the north. The parking structure is complicated, requiring sloped floors and terraced planters to mitigate the foundation and retaining walls facing the north and still provide sufficient soil depth for planting around the perimeter. The concrete parkade is a complicated part of the building. The building has been designed to incorporate several cost-effective measures such as a compact massing and resultant reduction in building envelope. The roof is not accessible but is well insulated and will cost less to maintain.

'Vertical circulation' has been minimized to optimize residential rental floor area. To save costs the size of the building has been configured to avoid a firewall requirement. The building was meant to 'interlock' and 'frame' the neighbouring buildings instead of mirroring them. The simple form, punched windows, and facets that 'respond to the curve' of Riverwalk Avenue are meant to highlight key areas such as the entry lobby. The simple mass with punched windows splits at the ends of the building to create projecting floors at the upper levels. The applicant also aimed to 'dematerialize the solid wall' at the ends of the building. The cantilevered elements here are glazed and create a focal point to the park. Along the north side, the pedestrian experience along the walkway is 'highlighted by the cantilevered elements'. The cladding colours graduate from solid to light. The balcony design is intended to create more depth to the façade. The aim is to have the buildings 'dissolve' at the ends. The demising walls between the lobby and amenity spaces will be glazed.

The landscape features include: raised private patios at the sidewalk. There is a buffer between the semi-public and private outdoor spaces featuring planters and privacy hedges. The landscape materials proposed include board form concrete planter walls along the facade, which fits in with the material palette found elsewhere in the surrounding neighbourhood. Along the CPR right of way, there is a gravel pedestrian walkway spanning east west. There are sitting 'pockets' along this pedestrian corridor as well as hanging planters. The hanging plants and planters are placed along the raised wall to 'soften' it. There are open lawn spaces for recreation and lounging as well as garden plots with planters and benches. There are hose bibs provided for irrigation. There is a child play area with play equipment as well. There are private patios at the courtyard levels that overlook and spill out onto the courtyard.

Overall, the units were designed to the level of market residential livability. The units have a lot of glazing, which is special for affordable rental buildings. The materials are: hardy panel with accents of metal panel at the entry lobby. The soffits will be hardy panel.

The development uses the Built Green rating system and the required LEED Gold rating equivalency requirements are surpassed.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The articulation of the ends of the building were a problematic design element for the panel. The ends were not consistent with the economic goals of the design, did not respond to the solar orientation, and were generally about a formal idea that did not serve the urban design context or the unit plans well;
 - The 200 foot long internal double loaded corridor could be improved for better livability, possibly by creating opportunities for more light and by providing gathering nodes along the corridor for the residents;
 - There should be more variety of indoor and outdoor amenity spaces with improved solar exposure for the outside spaces due to the number of children and families who will live in the project;
 - Overall, the livability of the project must be improved and the formal expression and language of the design could be simpler and less articulated;
- **Related Commentary:** With respect to the guidelines, the Panel is not against the five-storey massing, but it was felt that the original intent of the guidelines is not addressed by the current development application. The livability and social spaces are not well developed in the proposed design. The form and massing, in particular the two ends of the building, are problematic.

The panel thought that regardless of whether the proposed development is for social or market housing there were livability issues that must be addressed and while the panel's mandate is considered to be urban design, the panel felt that unit layout and interior building planning have an impact on building elevations, articulation and massing. Consequently one panel member mentioned that the units with inboard kitchens were problematic as they limited access to light and separated the kitchens from the remainder of the living spaces. Also mentioned as inadequate for families were the three-bedroom units where all the bedrooms and a storage room had doors directly into the living room

The gradation to the ends of the building should be reconsidered. While the expressive form was interesting for some from a purely architectural perspective it was noted that it contradicts the applicant's desire for a cost-effective building and that resources could be better used elsewhere.

The facade at the middle of the building was skillfully handled, but at the ends of the building the design does not work well. Similarly, it was noted that the dematerialization described by the applicant will not be possible to achieve as the building will not simply disappear at the ends. Also, the southwest portion of the development may become even more opaque and massive if solar shading devices are provided. One panel member recommended considering the site's various solar exposures and that the applicant should consider 'all four sides of the building' in the design's articulation.

The Panel agreed the ground floor outdoor amenity on the north side does not work, and should be moved to the south side, or to a roof terrace or some other improved location. One panel member mentioned that the entrance to the interior amenity space should be more 'welcoming' and another noted that the current amenity space was too dark. A few commented that a roof top amenity should be considered, even though this is an affordable housing project.

It was noted that the double elevator lobby at the hinge point may become too congested in the current design proposal. One panel member suggested the elevators could be split to reduce the effective length of the corridors. Alternatively, the double elevator could be relocated to the centre of the corridor, which would reduce the amount of travel distance for the residents in the west portion of the development.

Another panel member mentioned there should be rain protection for the balconies.

The proposed material palette was questioned; as hardy panel may not weather well in the long term. Any effort to minimize energy use is recommended, such as less glazing on the southwest corner.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Latif responded to the panel comments by stating that VAHCA felt differently about the proposal. Assessment of the livability of the project should also take into consideration the 'amenity rich' context as future residents will have access to the parks and playgrounds in the EFL site. In response to making the rooftop space accessible, there are ongoing maintenance costs to consider and that these need to be balanced with keeping rent affordable. The social housing considerations are not just for low income but a mix of incomes for different needs. The amenity spaces may not be in use as much as assumed due to the resident's workday schedules

The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments. The guidelines were considered but the applicant wanted to go beyond the guidelines. The density is lost if the building were flipped around, and the way it was situated is to maximize density. The applicant suggested a working session for design early on in the process so that the use of everyone's time is maximized. The Chair concurred a workshop would have been useful

3. Address:	3198 SE Marine Drive (EFL Parcel 3)
DE:	DP-2016-00243
Description:	To construct a multiple dwelling containing 89 affordable rental dwelling units over one level of underground parking with vehicular access from Pierview Crescent.
Zoning:	CD-1 (498)
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects (Paul Goodwin)
Owner:	Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Delegation:	Paul Goodwin, GBL Architects Mukhtar Latif, Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0).

- **Introduction:** Development Planner Allan Moorey introduced the project as a complete development application to construct a multiple dwelling containing 89 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Pierview Crescent.

Parcel 3 is located in the East Fraser Lands (EFL) Area 2 in the Northwest Precinct. The most notable aspect of the site is the slope, which falls both to the south and to the east. From west to east along Marine way and the north property line the slope falls approximately 10 feet. From Marine Way down to Pierview Crescent the slope falls over 23 feet along the west property line and over 28 feet along the east property line.

Parcel 3 is 348 feet long by 126 feet wide. Parcel 3 has a site area of 43 880 square feet. The proposed FSR is 1.9 or 82 370 square feet. The proposed density is in accordance with the guidelines recommended density of 82 840 square feet.

With respect to setbacks, the guidelines recommend 4.9 meter setbacks along Marine Way and 1.8 meters along Pierview Crescent for both Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A, and 5 meters flanking either side. The project exceeds the required setbacks described in the guidelines.

A 6 meter right of way is provided between Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A for pedestrian access from Pierview Crescent up to Marine Way, and may be part of a larger system that continues across the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) Right of Way to the south. There are 5 meter setbacks on either side of the right of way, which make the perception of an expansive linear park.

With respect to massing and number of storeys, the building presents five-storeys on Marine Way and seven-storeys along Pierview. For the most part, the building is below grade on three sides. Staff support some latitude in the measure of storeys and building height given the considerable slope. Originally four to six-storeys were envisioned throughout the area, presumably a six-storey wood frame structure. The move to a two-storey concrete podium enabled a 5 storey conventional wood frame structure over the concrete podium. The partial upper storey allows for some shifting of density to compliment the desired stepping form of development that is described in the guidelines.

The building is broken into two distinct segments in the upper wood structure which further breaks down the massing. There are amenity spaces at the juncture between the two segments. Indoor and outdoor amenity spaces are located adjacent the entry off Marine and an additional outdoor amenity space is located on the storey above. There are also large areas of glazing at the lower levels, which facilitates daylight into the adjacent areas. There are through units located at the uppermost partial storey. Access to the through units is from the elevator and through the private south facing roof decks associated with those units. All of the roofdecks are characterized by generous landscaping. The partial upper storey to the west and a large four-storey shoulder to the east enhance the terracing effect down to the east.

There is a two storey townhouse podium along Pierview Crescent which steps with the slope. Vertical separation, buffer planting and individual residential entries are provided against the public realm off Pierview Crescent and off Marine Way.

Access to the underground parking is at the west end of the site at the high point of the existing grade along Pierview Crescent. The space at grade behind the lower level of townhouse units contains the main residential lobby, bike storage and back of house uses. Otherwise this area is largely unexcavated. The parking ramps up to one level of parking behind the second storey of the townhouses.

Both Parcel 3 and 5A share a similar palette of materials: metal panel, cementitious cladding panel, wood-grain metal panel, corrugated metal panel, painted concrete, tempered glass and metal guards.

On Parcel 3 there are 89 units, 22% are one-bedroom units, 48% are two-bedroom units and 30% are three-bedroom units.

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

1. Given that the East Fraser Lands Guidelines stress the importance of a form of development that is responsive to the sloping site and conveys the desired expression of a 'hillside town', could the Panel comment on the success with which the proposed development does so?
 2. Given the steeply sloping site condition, could the Panel comment on the manner in which each east/west building end meets the adjacent hillside.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as a steep site that is intended to be a hillside community.

It was noted that both Parcel 3 and 5A are adjacent to an existing townhouse development to the south. The massing and terracing was intended to provide views across the site and towards the River. The applicant also wanted to create a substantial built form edge along Marine Way and provide a lower scale townhouse edge along Pierview Crescent, acknowledging the existing townhouse forms to the south.

The applicant also intended to ensure permeability through the site from Marine Way to the south both from a visual and physical access point of view. Terracing was provided within the building forms to capitalize on the river views and southern exposure. The applicant attempted to tackle these issues by placing the vehicular access points at the high end of the sites along Pierview Crescent. The parking structures were set into the hillside and the habitable portions of the buildings were raised.

The floor to floor heights were increased in the parking area to further lift them up. The applicant worked with the geometries of the site and the building orientations to create more open space and to exceed the required setbacks.

The surrounding site was considered to ensure there was a good interface between patios and sidewalk. The applicant did not include stepping in the corridors of the buildings for accessibility purposes. The townhouse components were placed on the south side to screen the parking structure and reinforce the existing hillside. On Parcel 3 the stepping and terracing form went further. The applicant carved out density, and placed it on top and created more stepping along Marine Way.

The above-grade massing is articulated with metal panel clad ‘folding’ bands. These charcoal horizontal bands turn up at the building ends to bookend the buildings and frame the residential units.

There is layered terracing along Pierview Crescent that will be filled with privacy hedging and planting along the sidewalk. Parcel 3’s west boundary edge is undeveloped so there is a wall extending across level 3. Along Marine Drive, because of the crank in the slope, there are terraced retaining walls. The retaining walls are stepped at 2 foot intervals to allow space for planting, allow access to light and avoid delineation with guardrails. Further along Marine Way, the groundplane at the entrance is highlighted with porcelain tile pavers with a woodgrain finish. There are seating opportunities at the lobby entrance. At the eastern street front the private patios are raised above the sidewalk and provide linkages to the sidewalk. On the east end of the project, there are connections to the right of way and level 2 parkades. The outdoor children play area has sand and space for equipment. Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A are located in an amenity rich area and there is also a large park across the street with additional of play options. There are sunken patios with retaining walls. There is a setback to allow for future construction of the bike route. There is outdoor seating. The stairs would be staggered concrete. There would also be a sitting plaza for pedestrians.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- Given the high traffic volume along Marine Way noise mitigation was a concern for the panel. It was recommended that an acoustic study be undertaken to confirm that the proposed development can achieve the acoustic requirements without changes to the proposed design.
- The panel noted that the way the east/west building ends meet the adjacent hillside should be improved particularly at the lower levels. For example, the interior planning for the end units could be further developed to take advantage of the unique exposure available to these units.
- The livability of the suites having bedrooms with–balconies but no balcony or balcony access off the living rooms was raised as a concern.
- **Related Commentary:** There was strong support for design response to the ‘hillside character’ from the Panel. Generally, the south facing terraces, balconies and roof decks and the views afforded by the design were welcomed by the panel. The strong entry expression benefits the project, although one Panel member thought that the main entries from Pierview Crescent may have been recessed too far from the sidewalk, and that there is an opportunity to enclose some of this exterior forecourt space.

It was noted that these accessibility concerns may be addressed by splitting the outdoor children's play area into different areas or by providing an elevator from the indoor amenity space below. One Panel member also thought there should be more outdoor children's play areas. But overall it was noted that the outdoor amenity spaces on all levels were generous and had good access to sun and views.

It was noted that there was a large number of cast-in place concrete retaining walls and that it may be possible to simplify the design of the retaining walls without compromising access to light or ventilation.

The panel generally thought that the geometry of the arcing plan which creates a streetwall form along Marine was successful. Also it was noted that the approach to the building grades, with the centre of the project nominally flush with the grade at Marine Way, was very effective and was supported by the Panel.

In general, the stepping east west and north south was considered well done. One panel member mentioned that a similar upper roof deck should also be deployed on the EFL Area 2 Southwest Precinct, parcel 8, project reviewed at the same UDP meeting.

With respect to the way in which the each east/west building end meets the adjacent hillside, it was felt that there were opportunities missed due to the rigid adherence to a formal architectural language.

Some of the panel thought the band/bar expression may become dated with time, and that the proposed materials might not wear well. The black end walls on the east and west elevations were considered a little too severe and stylistic.

One panel member mentioned that the slope to the east of Parcel 3 could further improve the creation of quality natural habitat by providing more diverse species of plantings.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that their comments will be taken into consideration.

4. Address:	3198 SE Marine Drive (EFL Parcel 5A)
DE:	DP-2016-00245
Description:	To construct a multiple dwelling containing 51 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Pierview Crescent.
Zoning:	CD-1 (498)
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects (Paul Goodwin)
Owner:	Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Delegation:	Paul Goodwin, GBL Architects Mukhtar Latif, Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency
Staff:	Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Development Planner Allan Moorey introduced the project as a complete development application to construct a multiple dwelling containing 51 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Pierview Crescent.

Parcel 5A is located in the East Fraser Lands (EFL) Area 2 in the Northwest Precinct. The most notable aspect of the site is the slope, both to the south and to the east. The site falls 30 feet to the east along the north property line. Again, rising up 26 feet and rising again to 30 feet to the corner.

Parcel 5A is located in the East Fraser Lands (EFL) Area 2 in the Northwest Precinct. The most notable aspect of the site is the slope, which falls both to the south and to the east. From west to east along Marine way and the north property line the slope falls approximately 17 feet. From Marine Way down to Pierview Crescent the slope falls over 23 feet along the west property line and over 28 feet along the east property line.

Parcel 5A is 256 feet long by 115 feet wide. Parcel 5A has a site area of 29 530 square feet and the proposed FSR is 1.6 or 47 025 square feet. The proposed density is in accordance with the guidelines recommended density of 46 705 square feet.

With respect to setbacks, the guidelines recommend 4.9 meters along Marine Way and 1.8 meters along Pierview Crescent for both Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A, and 5 meters flanking either side. The project exceeds the required setbacks described in the guidelines.

A 6 meter right of way is provided between Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A for pedestrian access from Pierview Crescent up to Marine Way, and may be part of a larger system that continues across the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) Right of Way to the south. There are 5 meter setbacks on either side of the right of way, which make the perception of an expansive linear park.

With respect to massing and number of storeys, the development presents four storeys on Marine Way and six-storeys along Pierview Crescent. Only two sides are below grade in this parcel, so it adheres to a more conventional storey count. Originally 4-6 storeys were envisioned throughout the area, presumably a six-storey wood frame structure. The move to a two-storey concrete podium enabled a five-storey conventional wood frame structure over the concrete structure. The partial upper storey allows for some shifting of density to compliment the desired stepping form of development that is described in the guidelines.

There is a two storey townhouse podium along Pierview Crescent which steps with the slope. Vertical separation, buffer planting and individual residential entries are provided against the public realm off Pierview Crescent and off Marine Way.

Access to the underground parking is at the west end of the site at the high point of the existing grade along Pierview Crescent. The space at grade behind the lower level of townhouse units contains the main residential lobby and at Parcel 5A bike storage and some back-of-house services. Otherwise this area is unexcavated. From Pierview Crescent the parking ramps up to one level of parking behind the second storey of the townhouses.

There is a generous common outdoor roofdeck amenity space accessed from Level 4. This space has urban agriculture and outdoor dining areas. There is also an indoor amenity room located in large single storey volume adjacent to the linear parkway at the west edge of the site. The indoor amenity room allows for a berm condition, connection to the north-south pedestrian path, expansive play area, and outdoor amenity area on the roof. This is a signature element that will animate Pierview Crescent and the pedestrian right of way.

Both Parcel 3 and 5A share a similar palette of materials: metal panel, cementitious cladding panel, wood-grain metal panel, corrugated metal panel, painted concrete, tempered glass and metal guards.

On Parcel 5a there are 51 units, 14% are studio units, 26% are one-bedroom units, 37% are two-bedroom units, and 23% are three-bedroom units.

- Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
 1. Given that the East Fraser Lands Guidelines stress the importance of a form of development that is responsive to the sloping site and conveys the desired expression of a 'hillside town', could the Panel comment on the success with which the proposed development does so?
 2. Given the steeply sloping site condition, could the Panel comment on the manner in which each east/west building ends meet the adjacent hillside.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced the project as a steep site that is intended to be a hillside community.

It was noted that both Parcel 3 and 5A are adjacent to an existing townhouse development to the south. The massing and terracing was intended to provide views across the site and towards the River. The applicant also wanted to create a substantial built form edge along Marine Way and provide a lower scale townhouse edge along Pierview Crescent, acknowledging the existing townhouse forms to the south.

The applicant also intended to ensure permeability through the site from Marine Way to the south both from a visual and physical access point of view. Terracing was provided within the building forms to capitalize on the river views and southern exposure. The applicant attempted to tackle these items by placing the vehicular access points at the high end of the sites along Pierview Crescent. The parking structures were set into the hillside and the habitable portions of the buildings were raised. The floor to floor heights were increased in the parking area to further lift up the habitable space. The applicant worked with the geometries of the site and the building orientations to create more open space and to exceed the required setbacks.

The surrounding site was considered to ensure there was a good interface between patios and sidewalk. The applicant did not include stepping in the corridors of the buildings for accessibility purposes. The townhouse components were placed on the south side to screen the parking structure and reinforce the expression of hillside housing.

On Parcel 5A the sloping conditions are more extreme. The townhouses were stepped to have a more 'gentle' patio to sidewalk interface. There was a lot of room to create terraces and meet the density requirements. The upper building masses are setback from the townhouse face to create usable private and semi-private roofdecks.

The above-grade massing is articulated with metal panel clad 'folding' bands. These charcoal horizontal bands turn up at the building ends to bookend the buildings and frame the residential units.

There is layered terracing along Pierview Crescent that will be filled with privacy hedging and planting along the sidewalk. Along Marine Drive, because of the crank in the slope, there are terraced retaining walls. The retaining walls are stepped at 2 foot intervals to allow space for planting, allow access to light and avoid delineation with guardrails. Further along Marine Way, the groundplane at the entrance is highlighted with porcelain tile pavers with a woodgrain finish. There are seating opportunities at the lobby entrance. At the east, the private patios are raised above the sidewalk and provide linkages to the sidewalk. On the east side, there are connections to the right of way and Level 2 parkade. On Parcel 5, there is a pathway connection for circulation through to the amenity space and kids play area. The kids play area has sand and space for equipment. Parcel 3 and Parcel 5A are located in an amenity rich area and there is also a large park across the street with additional of play options. There are sunken patios with retaining walls. There is a setback to allow for future construction of the bike route. There is outdoor seating. The stairs would be staggered concrete. There would also be a sitting plaza for pedestrians.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Given the high traffic volume along Marine Way noise mitigation was a concern for the panel. It was recommended that an acoustic study be undertaken to confirm that the proposed development can achieve the acoustic requirements without changes to the proposed design;
 - The panel noted that the way the east/west building ends meet the adjacent hillside should be improved particularly at the lower levels. For example, the interior planning for the end units could be further developed to take advantage of the unique exposure available to these units;
 - The livability of the suites having only bedrooms with balconies and no balcony access from the living room was raised as a concern;
- **Related Commentary:** There was strong support for the design response to the 'hillside character' from the Panel. Generally, the south facing terraces, balconies and roof decks and the views afforded by the design were welcomed by the panel. The strong entry expression benefits the project, although one Panel member thought that the main entries from Pierview Crescent may have been recessed too far from the sidewalk, and that there is an opportunity to enclose some of this exterior forecourt space.

Several members of the panel felt that Parcel 5A's outdoor children's play area is not accessible enough, for people using strollers. It was noted that these accessibility concerns may be addressed by splitting the outdoor children play area into different areas or by providing an elevator from the indoor amenity space below. One Panel member also thought there should be more outdoor children play areas. But overall it was noted that the outdoor amenity spaces on all levels were generous and had good access to sun and views.

It was noted that there was a large number of cast-in place concrete retaining walls and that it may be possible to simplify the design of the retaining walls without compromising access to light or ventilation.

The panel generally thought that the geometry of the arcing plan which creates a streetwall form along Marine was successful. Also it was noted that the approach to the building grades, with the centre of the plan nominally flush with the grade at Marine Way, was very effective and was supported by the Panel.

In general, the stepping east west and north south was considered well done. One panel member mentioned that a similar upper roof deck should also be deployed on the EFL parcel 8a Area 2 Southwest Precinct project reviewed at the same UDP meeting.

With respect to the way in which the each east/west building ends meets the adjacent hillside, it was felt that there were opportunities missed due to the rigid adherence to a formal architectural concept.

Some of the panel thought the band/bar expression may become dated with time, and that the proposed materials might not wear well. The black end walls on the east and west elevations were considered a little too severe and stylistic.

One panel member mentioned that the slope to the east of Parcel 5A could further improve the creation of quality natural habitat by providing more diverse species of plantings.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that their comments will be taken into consideration.

5. Address:	701 W Georgia Street
DE:	DP-2016-00107
Description:	To replace the existing rotunda with a three-storey retail building at Pacific Centre Mall.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins + Will (David Dove & Peter Busby)
Owner:	Cadillac Fairview Corp. Ltd.
Delegation:	David Dove, Perkins + Will Peter Busby, Perkins + Will
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Development Planner Patrick O'Sullivan introduced the project as a development permit application under the existing CD-1 zoning. The site is located at the corner of West Georgia and Howe Streets. Technically, though the site is the entire block from West Georgia to Dunsmuir and Howe to Granville, the proposed development is an addition limited to the westerly corner of the site that currently contains the rotunda and the concrete plaza. The proposal is to demolish the rotunda and concrete deck area, and develop a three storey commercial building containing retail uses on levels one and two and a restaurant use on level 3. The proposed height is 63 feet, approximately 10 feet higher than the exiting adjacent "podium" height of the Four Seasons Hotel. The proposed square footage is a total net addition of approximately 25,000 square feet, representing a change in density from 9.3 to 9.37 FSR. The zoning CD-1 (455) permits 9.47 FSR. The surrounding buildings include: the Four Seasons, Hotel Georgia, and the Pacific Centre Tower, an 18-floor, Class A office building.

A new double-height entry to the shopping mall entry is proposed mid-block along Georgia Street that aligns with the spine of the existing mall. There is also a Howe St. entry to the third storey. A broad metal canopy weather protection with wood soffits is proposed along the W Georgia and Howe streets frontages. The proposal also includes:

- The proposed public realm width from curb to building face is 18 feet on both West Georgia Street and Howe Street. To accomplish this, the building is proposed to be set back 10 feet at grade from the West Georgia Street property line and 5 feet from the Howe Street property line.
- Passenger and service elevators and a relocated exhaust shaft from the parking levels are accommodated along the Howe St frontage;
- Roof planter boxes;
- A new glass canopy is also proposed over the stairs down to the lower mall level along Howe St.

The Georgia Street public realm treatment is proposed on the public sidewalk and stone pavers within the property line. The proposed building materials include SSG curtain wall glazing and areas of charcoal coloured honed stone at grade level, a three-storey area of charcoal coloured honed stone on Howe St., metal clad "box walls" and translucent glass fins on the west elevation.

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

1. Considering the prominence of the site, and the existing visual connection to the rotunda entry and its clear passage, please comment on the success of the proposed entry location and identification in terms of wayfinding to the shopping mall.
 2. Please comment on the overall design approach of the Public Realm, as it relates to the frontages along W. Georgia St. and Howe St., in terms of sidewalk width, street trees/ planting, paving surfaces, canopy design, and solid-to-glazing ratio of the elevations.
 3. Please comment on the relationship of the proposal to the Four Seasons Hotel building to the east in terms of performance of the space between the two buildings.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant stated they had been studying more radical forms and some 'stronger' three dimensional "object" architectural solutions, from the outset, but ultimately felt that a more modest massing was appropriate due to the context of the existing area. The entrance to the mall was played down but simplified as a two storey 'direct line' into the mall. There is a requirement to accommodate exterior exiting, vents and air circulation along the Howe Street frontage. Regarding the deep interstitial space between the proposal and the Four Seasons hotel, the applicant suggested that safety and security may be improved by the introduction of a gate or other interventions.

The applicant explained that providing planted street trees was not an option due to the inability to dig down into existing retail spaces below grade. At the ground level, there is a possibly of one to three tenants, so three entrances are provided from Georgia. The finishes at level two are wood lined boxes with white porcelain metal, expressed as 'jewel boxes'. There is basalt stone around the entries on Georgia. The cladding is white porcelain enamel. The lower canopy is similar in materiality to the upper canopy. The restaurant patio would receive light from 11:30am-2:30 pm, and 4:30pm on. The mechanical equipment is concealed and lowered into a sunken well into the roof and is not visible either from above or from nearby buildings or public spaces.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - More open space at grade would be welcomed in the design, for example, seating could be added;
 - There should be more accommodation of the public realm in the design;
 - Design development of the Howe street Elevation to strengthen the way the building turns the corner and addresses the public realm and in particular the Art Gallery plaza;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel strongly supported the wayfinding and the connection to the existing mall entrance in the proposal. Generally the connection is considered improved because it is more legible and direct. With respect to the public realm design and approach, the loss of seating and the perception of the loss of public open space is a concern. Stronger reference and accommodation in the design of the public realm would make the design more 'iconic'. There was partial support for the single 'directionality' of the building's primary expression, giving rise to concerns by some panel members that the way the building turns the corner should be improved.

The Panel supported the solid canopy and the details, such as the wood soffit and lighting, which they thought helped to create the sense of space between the sidewalk and the canopy.

The Panel accepted the leftover upper level space between the proposal and the Four Seasons as an inevitability of the development and had no CPTED concerns.

The Panel felt that the expression of the building is skillfully handled. A few Panel members felt the basalt wall material was too 'stark' although at least one Panel member appreciated the material. Some Panel members felt that the Howe Street wall elevation was successful, but others felt it was an opportunity to create a green wall or an expression of the public realm or landscape. There was a suggestion that the entry to the restaurant and its vertical circulation could be better expressed. There was concern about the non-alignment of elements at the base of the building on Georgia Street, but it might not be a critical concern. Generally, the Panel thought the role of the building at this corner is to "hold" the corner and be a critical counterpoint to the open space of the Vancouver Art Gallery north plaza. The public space does not have to occur at grade and could happen at another level, according to one Panel member.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant appreciated the comments. The wall area will be considered for development, although it could look too 'busy'. The lobby and restaurant entry could be developed more design wise.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.