

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** January 25, 2017

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Helen Avini Besharat (excused from item# 1)  
Amela Brudar  
James Cheng  
Nell Gasiewicz (excused from item# 2)  
David Jerke  
Karen Spoelstra (excused from item# 1)  
Meredith Anderson  
Renee Van Halm  
Yijin Wen  
Neal LaMontagne  
Kim Smith

**REGRETS:** Veronica Gillies  
Muneesh Sharma

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                                     |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | 1715 Cook Street (220 W 1st Avenue) |
| 2. | 4238-4262 Cambie Street             |
| 3. | 469-485 W 59th Avenue               |
| 4. | 470-486 W 58th Avenue               |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Kim Smith 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: 1715 Cook Street (220 W 1st Avenue)  
 Permit No: RZ-2016-00026  
 Description: The proposal is for a 10-storey residential building comprised of 104 secured market rental units over three levels of underground parking (including 50 vehicle spaces and 130 bicycle spaces), with a building height of 30.27 m (99.31 ft.), a floor area of 5,690 m<sup>2</sup> (61,243 sq. ft.), and a proposed floor space ratio (FSR) of 5.03. This application is being considered under the Southeast False Creek Official Development Plan and Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy.  
 Zoning: M-2 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc. (Nadia Said)  
 Owner: Cressey Development  
 Delegation: Nadia Said, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.  
 Amber Pall, Durante Kreuk  
 Julian Kendall, Cressey Development  
 Staff: Rachel Harrison & Sailen Black

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

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the site as existing on the northwest corner of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Cook Street within the boundary of the Southeast False Creek (SEFC) Official Development Plan (ODP). The site is approximately 100 ft. by 122 ft. and is currently occupied by a two-storey commercial building.

To the west is the “James” development, which includes a 13-storey tower on the west end of the block and four-storey townhouses mid-block. To the north, directly across the street, is the Wilkinson Steel building. SEFC ODP has direction for this building, which notes it should be retained and street-end views should be protected. The site to the east has been approved for a 17-storey residential development. To the south across the lane is an 11-storey supportive housing development (“Marguerite Ford”).

This rezoning is coming in under three city policies: the SEFC ODP, the SEFC Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys, and the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy. The ODP sets a maximum building height of 125 ft. for this area. The Penthouse policy allows for consideration of an additional 21 ft. subject to meeting a number of performance-based design criteria. The SEFC ODP also identifies this site as having optional retail, service, office or light industrial uses at grade. The applicant has chosen residential uses on the ground floor.

The overall urban design pattern in SEFC includes lower buildings near the waterfront which step up to higher buildings between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. SEFC has high density living in mid-rise buildings, with towers located at the corners and podiums spanning mid-block. This means that an 80 ft. tower separation between buildings as seen in the downtown area is not expected. Where possible, parkade entrances are shared in order to make laneways safe and pedestrian friendly.

The Rental 100 policy requires 100% of the residential units to be rental. Under this policy sites within Official Development Plan areas can be considered for additional density appropriate to context. However, existing height limits must be adhered to.

The proposal is to rezone to allow for a 10-storey residential building with a height of 99 ft. and a density of 5.03 FSR. The building would contain 104 rental units, 25% of which will be two and three-bedroom units to meet the SEFC ODP family-unit requirement.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, continued by noting that the ODP establishes a regulatory maximum height of 125 ft., with a separate optimum height of six storeys. The Southeast False Creek Design Guidelines for Additional Penthouse Storeys allows for two additional storeys if the design of the penthouse levels meet a number of criteria, including:

- a. provision of very high quality architectural design;
- b. contributing to an interesting and engaging roofscape;
- c. reinforcing the originally-intended scale of the building in the ODP; and
- d. minimizing negative impacts on and off-site, including to neighbouring buildings, view obstructions, privacy and shadowing.

The proposal includes underground parking accessed from the “James” building via shared ramp. Proposed setbacks vary along the west side from 3.7 ft. at the southwest to 6.9 ft. at the northwest. There is a 7.1 ft. setback along Cook Street at Level 1 and Level 2, and 0 ft. to the enclosed balcony above. The penthouse levels are pulled back from the sides, and there is a landscaped amenity space at the southwest corner on a raised deck. The north and west facades have a significantly developed exterior expression.

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

1. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development including:
    - a. Height of 10 storeys overall;
    - b. Setbacks of approximately:
      - o 3.7 ft. to West
      - o 5.0 ft. to South (lane)
      - o 0.0 ft. to East (Cook St.)
      - o 10.1 ft. to North (including dedication)
    - c. Density of 5.03 FSR with total floor area of 56,149 sq. ft.
  2. Can the Panel comment on the design of the:
    - a. different interfaces presented to the west neighbour;
    - b. indoor and amenity spaces; and,
    - c. the penthouse levels.
  3. Preliminary comments on the proposed exterior treatment.
- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by noting that three factors shaped the massing of the building: street use, the adjacent James building, and the view corridors in the area.

The first and second levels were angled and setback to line-up with the adjacent building, and a careful look was taken at how the windows would relate to the view cones. The upper floors are setback from all sides by 10 ft. and thus equate about 70% of the lower floorplates.

The architectural style references the language of the area, with materials emphasized at the top of the building. Steel exit stairs are used to engage the lower and upper parts of the building, and to conform to safety guidelines. Materials include concrete and steel elements.

A shared amenity deck is being provided at Level 2 and includes urban agriculture and outdoor eating spaces. The corner elements go down to a planter, and there is greenery and trees along the edge of the lane. Plantings are used on the larger decks to help better define them and to add privacy.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

- A much better mix of units is needed;
- Move or soften the large wall on the laneway so make the 3.7 ft. setback seem less tight;
- Design development on the amenity space to add a children's play space, and to explore other locations;
- Design development on the steel to make it more robust and to visually enhance the area;
- Design development on the roofscape to show more care and thought to the visual design.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel generally had no issue with the height and form of development but noted that much could be done to improve the unit mix within the building. Currently there are too many studios, and more two or three-bedroom units are needed if this building plans to accommodate families. The commercial spaces at the ground also represent an opportunity to rent these spaces to someone interesting who caters to the bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the area.

To the east it would be nice if some of the space could be given back to the public as the current landscaping seems to square-off the space for private use. The 3.7 ft. setback to the west feels too tight, and more needs to be done to make it so that the public can get through this area. There is a lot of bulk on the ground floor with the bike storage, generators, etc. Consider moving this stuff elsewhere and opening the area to residents in a more meaningful way. One panel member thought that the building might be stronger if it were left as a private building with private space since there is no master public space plan for this area.

The northwest elevation feels uncomfortable with the big black wall down to the pathway. Do something to soften this with landscaping. Overall more robust planting is needed, and the applicants should consider trying to fit in more furniture with the landscaping features. If this building is intended for families then a children's play space also needs to be added.

Do something with the roof to add some colour and interest, perhaps with planting, or hardscape landscape. The penthouse seems like it will be very visible and presents an opportunity to develop it a bit further, so consider simplifying and making something more of it. As well, since the amenity does not provide a lot of space consider adding more amenity space for the residents at the roof.

Take the industrial theme a bit further by doing something artistic with all the steel, maybe with laser cutting. Also consider breaking up the western wall somehow with planting or materials. At the north elevation it feels a bit off; do something to improve this feeling. Overall more is needed with the visual nature of the building to have it add more to the area.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments as they were very thoughtful. The lower levels have direct access to the street so live/work units is definitely an option for these areas. The requirements for the walkway were put in place for the adjacent building and were just confirmed to for this area, so if there is more flexibility available then the lane area can be given more thought. The amenity room is located on the southwest corner at the second level in order to get the best light and to add a level of security. Finally, the design of the building is capped by cost and additional detailing on the metal might make it too expensive for renters.

---

2. Address:	4238-4262 Cambie Street
Permit No.	RZ-2016-00030
Description:	The proposal is for a six-storey residential building comprised of 57 residential units including five townhomes over two levels of underground parking (84 vehicle spaces and 77 bicycle spaces), with a building height of 19.5 m (64 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.75. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture (Arno Matis)
Owner:	Create Properties
Delegation:	Arno Matis, Arno Matis Architecture Paul Kibayashi, Arno Matis Architecture Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative Bruce Ma, Create Properties Diana Klein, Kane Consulting
Staff:	Michelle McGuire & Tim Potter

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-1)

- **Introduction:** Michelle McGuire, Rezoning Planner, introduced the application to rezone two parcels under the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP) from RS-1 to CD-1. The site is located on the east side of Cambie Street between 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Currently there two single family homes located on the site.

The block consists of four parcels and is located one and a half blocks from the King Edward Canada Line Station and local shopping area. It is also located close to neighbourhood amenities, including Queen Elizabeth Park and the Hillcrest Community Centre. The site size is 150 ft. deep and 134 ft. wide.

The CCP anticipates an FSR range of 2.0-2.5 and six-storey residential buildings with townhouses along the lane. It also calls for setbacks above four storeys, and for buildings to provide front doors onto the street in order to activate and enhance the adjacent lane.

The proposal is for a six-storey residential development with a total of 57 units (90% of which are two and three bedroom units) with five townhouses along the laneway. A 24 ft. courtyard exists between the principal structure and the townhouses. There are also two levels of underground parking which include 84 parking stalls and 77 bicycle stalls.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, continued by re-iterating that the proposal is to rezone this site from RS-1 to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development District) under the Cambie Corridor Plan.

The project has a proposed density of 2.75 FSR and a proposed building height of six storeys. The density range for the area is 2.0-2.5 FSR noting the FSR is an estimate and not a limit that is based on the urban design performance.

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

1. Please comment on the overall site planning and building placement in terms of the objectives of the CC Plan;
2. Please comment on the placement and function of the amenity space and related outside space.

3. Are the overall form, massing and density supportable?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by mentioning that some experimentation was done with vertical expression for this project, and that the imagery draws from the basalt rock formations in Queen Elizabeth Park. Horizontal and vertical projections are also used to help with the passive design of the building.

Materials were kept simple with concrete and glass. There is a rooftop amenity and an amenity space off of the pavilion floating over the parking entrance. The ramp configuration is one currently being used in other buildings and seems to be successful.

The units are not very large, but the target was to keep them affordable, and 70% of them are two or three-bedrooms to accommodate families.

There is a mix of large dogwoods and coniferous trees along Cambie Street which are to be retained. The intent of the Cambie Street edge is to create definition between the public and private realms with planting and alternating raised and lowered patios. Honey locust and bamboo is being used to reflect light into the sculpted spaces. A children's play space is tentatively slated for the roof area, but the location is not set in stone yet. The roof will also have urban agriculture.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design Development of the entrances to make them stronger and more legible;
  - Design development on the building to make it read more as residential;
  - Block the townhouses together and remove the middle corridor space so that outdoor space can be tacked onto the amenity building;
  - Amenity Room needs a better relationship to the courtyard.
  - Design development on the vertical elements to reduce their bulk and protrusion into the setbacks;
  - Consideration should be given to preventing and mitigating thermal bridging;
  - The sidewalk transition along Cambie Street should be better defined;
  - Increase sunlight into the courtyard and better connect it to the amenity building;
  - Simplify the roof by removing some of the bulky staircases;
  - More than one elevator is required for the proposed number of units;
  - Increase daylighting of the corner units;
  - Design development on the north and south corners to make them more visually interesting;
  - Pay special attention to the mechanical layouts at the development permit stage.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel was excited by the application as a presentation of what is possible within the Cambie Corridor Guidelines. However, they noted that the location of the elevators makes them hard to find for visitors and that one elevator is not sufficient for the number of units in the building. The building mechanical rooms do not seem to be logically placed, and more attention needs to be paid to sustainability. The corner units also seem dark and need to have better daylighting.

Consideration should be given to creating more visual connection between the large building and townhouses. Better animation of the lane is also needed, and the applicants should consider using the fins to emphasize the individuality of the townhouse units in order to accomplish this.

The main entry needs to be more prominent and legible. While the basalt response to the park looks great, this vocabulary of architecture does not lend itself well to wood-frame building. Consider this aspect prior to creating a development permit application. The building also feels a bit institutional and could do more to make it represent as a residential building. If this expression is kept going forward, then pay special attention to using materials which emphasize the basalt expression and to making the fins not intrude into the setbacks. As well, the north and south elevations are a bit boring currently, so consider doing something more visually interesting at the corner which allows more light into the side spaces.

There needs to be a better rational for the internal separation break between the townhouses. Currently it is not the most efficient use of the space and does not take into account the safety of children playing in the area. Consider removing it and expanding the amenity space instead, perhaps with some covered outdoor area. Consider also adding common workspaces into the amenity to create quiet study spaces for those living in the tight domestic units. Finally, play with the internal layout of the amenity to make things more efficient.

One panel member thought that, as the landscape transition between the sidewalk and the front units is substantially wider than usual, a small protrusion into the setback is fine. However, some refinement is needed to enhance the separation and perhaps tie into the architecture better.

The stair access to the main roof amenity should be slid to the north a bit in order to make the southern portion beside it much more usable. There are a lot of staircases going up to the roof, so consider removing some of them and simplifying this space.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the great comments. They will incorporate as many of them as possible.

3. Address: 469-485 W 59th Avenue  
 Permit No. RZ-2016-00031  
 Description: The proposal is for a six-storey residential building comprised of 43 residential units over one and a half levels of underground parking (63 vehicle spaces and 60 bicycle spaces), with a building height of 21.0 m (69 ft.) from grade, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.50. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Francl Architecture (Walter Francl & Alain Prince)  
 Owner: Savage Development Management  
 Delegation: Walter Francl, Francl Architecture  
 Alain Prince, Francl Architecture  
 Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk  
 Barry Savage, Savage Development Management  
 Tim Tewsley, Recollective Consulting  
 Staff: John Chapman & Patrick O'Sullivan

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-3)

- **Introduction:** John Chapman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the projects by noting that they are being considered under the Marpole Plan which anticipates apartments of up to six-storeys and 2.5 FSR in this location. However, there is minimum 60 ft. frontage to build to six-storeys, and the upper storeys must be stepped back to minimize scale and reduce shadow impacts.

These two applications propose to rezone adjacent assemblies of three parcels each, and which are nearly identical in size (18,000 sq. ft.). Six-storey residential buildings are proposed for each site, and will provide 43 units over one and a half storeys of underground parking comprised of 63 vehicle spaces and 60 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed FSR for each building is 2.5, and the height is 69 ft. The sites are currently zoned RS-1 and are developed with a single-family home on each parcel. Adjacent parcels are also developed with single family homes.

The project location is half a block east of Cambie Street, close to the Langara Golf Course. One building fronts W 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue directly, and the other building fronts W 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is kitty-corner from Winona Park. Sexsmith Elementary School is to the east, and W 58<sup>th</sup> is a local street bikeway.

Immediately across the lane to the west the parcels fall into the Cambie Corridor Plan area. These sites can be developed with residential apartments of up to six storeys. The next block south permits six-storey mixed-use buildings. Around Winona Park the Marpole Plan permits apartments of up to four storeys. The Pearson Dogwood site is across Cambie to the west is currently undergoing rezoning, and could be developed with buildings of up to 28 storeys. The Langara Gardens project is just north of that.

The intersection of Cambie Street and 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue is one of the locations identified for a possible future Canada Line Station. Other projects nearby have already been approved under the Cambie Corridor plan at 2.93 FSR and 2.7 FSR. Just to the east, under the Marpole Plan, a rezoning at 375 W 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue has also been approved at 2.83 FSR.

Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, continued with a brief description of the Marpole Plan's Built-form guidance. The plan asks for an 8 ft. step back in massing above the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, and separate units with individual entrances facing the street, including the flanking street on corner sites. Variety is encouraged among building developments to avoid repetition and to create an interesting streetscape environment. Parking structures should not be evident above the natural grade, and natural grading should be respected.

The entry is proposed to be located on the west side at the lane. West of the entry there is an amenity at grade, and a playground to the west of that. The roof deck contains private outdoor space for the upper four units.

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

1. Do you support the form/massing, height and density?
    - a. any additional comments on balcony size and orientation?
    - b. any additional general comments on built form?
  2. Considering the Marpole Plan's objective for variety in development, do you support the similarity in form and expression of the two proposals?
  3. Please comment on the landscape design including roof deck, amenity space, play space, and patios.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that a lot of consideration was given to this project. The adjacent projects at this point are hypothetical, so the building form is in response to what the anticipated form of development is for the neighbouring sites. While the buildings appear as individuals from the streets, they have a responsive relationship to each other across the lane. The unit mix includes 95% family units, and the buildings intend to cater to families specifically.

There is a dappled terracotta cladding around the building to emphasize the natural landscape colours, and darker tones at the upper floors. There is also a screen element which projects off the building. Additional trellis work will be added to announce the entry and create a relationship with the amenity and sideyard, which will allow them to be viable as children's play spaces.

An inner garden conceals the mechanical spaces and adds something extra for the upper floor tenants. There is a slope going down to the main entrance where the intent is to create a small plaza with benches and trees. Variation in planting has been used to add uniqueness to each elevation.

The amenity space compliments the entrance and outdoor space, and the children's play element will be made of robust natural wood. The patios were developed to be a comfortable space while allowing for a wide planting space which will be populated with shade trees, layered terracing and floral highlights. The intention is to have a very low outside wall which is to be concealed with evergreen planting. At the roof there are some shade trees and substantial planting spaces. There are also four substantial patio spaces with purpose lighting.

On the west side for both sites there is a 1.8 m wide condition to drain storm water on grade, but more work needs to be done with engineers to manage this. The intent is to achieve LEED certification, and this should be easily attainable.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to better relate the buildings to their specific urban context and solar orientation;
  - Provide additional shared urban space to create more connection between the buildings;
  - Design development to make the entrances stronger, more legible and more logical;
  - Consider relocating entrances to street, not off lane.
  - Should take more advantage of two lane condition but not with entrances
  - Reduce the massing of the 6<sup>th</sup> floor balconies a bit;
  - Consider developing a shared amenity space;
  - Relocate the children's play spaces;
  - De-privatize the private rooftop patios to create more public space;
  - The colour palettes could be better expressed;
  - The screens need better resolution with their expression, perhaps to add more 'fun' to them;
  - Design development of the landscape to add differentiation and have it relate better to the architecture;
  - The balconies are too narrow.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel generally showed support for the use, density and general form of development, but noted that this application meets the minimum required for these sites and much could be done to increase the quality of the project. The building entrances are in the wrong location, and the buildings should be facing 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue respectively. Consideration should also be given to traffic problems created by the location of the parking ramps directly across the lane from each other.

Currently both buildings float and do not relate well to their surroundings; there needs to be more of a difference between the buildings to acknowledge their context. The building facing the golf course should be organic, looser and in general have a different response than the other building. There are also no clear differences between the front and the lane-side, and more of a 'front door' is needed to add a sense of arrival. Consider making the street entries stronger and bolder, maybe even with landscaping. These buildings could also share more things, such as amenity spaces or ramps, in order to make them into one complex rather than two separate projects.

Attention should be paid to the balconies on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor seem to make sure they do not overpower the building massing. Some of the balconies also seem a bit narrow, which makes them more conducive to storage than usage. Consider also eliminating the private patios at the roof as this space would better serve as a communal area. Regardless of their use, consider that the west rooftop patios are going to heat up in the afternoon sun, and that it would be nice to have a green buffer in between people looking out on the roof and the rooftop material.

More logic is needed with regards to the placement of the amenity areas, and more connection is needed between the indoor and outdoor spaces. Design development of the play area on the ground floor is needed, and both the amenity and children's play spaces could be bigger.

The metal screens do not really work, and should be replaced with something having a better relationship to the building and surrounding area. Work with an artist to create something more innovated and less expected, and consider a broader colour palette in order to add more visual interest. Special attention should be paid to the material expression as the glazing choice at the top could make this area look like an air traffic control tower. As well, try bringing the sloped roof form down to street level somehow to better connect it with the rest of the building.

More attention to orientation is needed with the buildings to mitigate solar exposure. Consider also using water off the roof along with the patios somehow.

The landscape is all private and completely under-developed. There needs to be additional planting and flexible public space, and the planting needs to interact with and reflect the architecture. Consider developing different children's play elements or the use of other landscape materials in order to add some differentiation as currently every side of both buildings are addressed the same. As well, the play spaces need more benches for parents to sit on. One panel member questioned whether two play spaces were actually necessary considering the proximity to the park.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that some good observations were made. This project is a challenging first foray, but there were some good comments which will help in going forward.

4. Address: 470-486 W 58th Avenue  
 Permit No. RZ-2016-00032  
 Description: The proposal is for a six-storey residential building comprised of 43 residential units over one and a half levels of underground parking (63 vehicle spaces and 60 bicycle spaces), with a building height of 21.0 m (69 ft.) from grade, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.50. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Francl Architecture (Walter Francl & Alain Prince)  
 Owner: Savage Development Management  
 Delegation: Walter Francl, Francl Architecture  
 Alain Prince, Francl Architecture  
 Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk  
 Barry Savage, Savage Development Management  
 Tim Tewsley, Recollective Consulting  
 Staff: John Chapman & Patrick O'Sullivan

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-1)

- **Introduction:** John Chapman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the projects by noting that they are being considered under the Marpole Plan which anticipates apartments of up to six-storeys and 2.5 FSR in this location. However, there is minimum 60 ft. frontage to build to six-storeys, and the upper storeys must be stepped back to minimize scale and reduce shadow impacts.

These two applications propose to rezone adjacent assemblies of three parcels each, and which are nearly identical in size (18,000 sq. ft.). Six-storey residential buildings are proposed for each site, and will provide 43 units over one and a half storeys of underground parking comprised of 63 vehicle spaces and 60 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed FSR for each building is 2.5, and the height is 69 ft. The sites are currently zoned RS-1 and are developed with a single-family home on each parcel. Adjacent parcels are also developed with single family homes.

The project location is half a block east of Cambie Street, close to the Langara Golf Course. One building fronts W 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue directly, and the other building fronts W 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is kitty-corner from Winona Park. Sexsmith Elementary School is to the east, and W 58<sup>th</sup> is a local street bikeway.

Immediately across the lane to the west the parcels fall into the Cambie Corridor Plan area. These sites can be developed with residential apartments of up to six storeys. The next block south permits six-storey mixed-use buildings. Around Winona Park the Marpole Plan permits apartments of up to four storeys. The Pearson Dogwood site is across Cambie to the west is currently undergoing rezoning, and could be developed with buildings of up to 28 storeys. The Langara Gardens project is just north of that.

The intersection of Cambie Street and 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue is one of the locations identified for a possible future Canada Line Station. Other projects nearby have already been approved under the Cambie Corridor plan at 2.93 FSR and 2.7 FSR. Just to the east, under the Marpole Plan, a rezoning at 375 W 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue has also been approved at 2.83 FSR.

Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, continued with a brief description of the Marpole Plan's Built-form guidance. The plan asks for an 8 ft. step back in massing above the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, and separate units with individual entrances facing the street, including the flanking street on corner sites. Variety is encouraged among building developments to avoid repetition and to create an interesting streetscape environment. Parking structures should not be evident above the natural grade, and natural grading should be respected.

The entry is proposed to be located on the west side at the lane. West of the entry there is an amenity at grade, and a playground to the west of that. The roof deck contains private outdoor space for the upper four units.

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

4. Do you support the form/massing, height and density?
    - c. any additional comments on balcony size and orientation?
    - d. any additional general comments on built form?
  5. Considering the Marpole Plan's objective for variety in development, do you support the similarity in form and expression of the two proposals?
  6. Please comment on the landscape design including roof deck, amenity space, play space, and patios.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that a lot of consideration was given to this project. The adjacent projects at this point are hypothetical, so the building form is in response to what the anticipated form of development is for the neighbouring sites. While the buildings appear as individuals from the streets, they have a responsive relationship to each other across the lane. The unit mix includes 95% family units, and the buildings intend to cater to families specifically.

There is a dappled terracotta cladding around the building to emphasize the natural landscape colours, and darker tones at the upper floors. There is also a screen element which projects off the building. Additional trellis work will be added to announce the entry and create a relationship with the amenity and sideyard, which will allow them to be viable as children's play spaces.

An inner garden conceals the mechanical spaces and adds something extra for the upper floor tenants. There is a slope going down to the main entrance where the intent is to create a small plaza with benches and trees. Variation in planting has been used to add uniqueness to each elevation.

The amenity space compliments the entrance and outdoor space, and the children's play element will be made of robust natural wood. The patios were developed to be a comfortable space while allowing for a wide planting space which will be populated with shade trees, layered terracing and floral highlights. The intention is to have a very low outside wall which is to be concealed with evergreen planting. At the roof there are some shade trees and substantial planting spaces. There are also four substantial patio spaces with purpose lighting.

On the west side for both sites there is a 1.8 m wide condition to drain storm water on grade, but more work needs to be done with engineers to manage this. The intent is to achieve LEED certification, and this should be easily attainable.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to better relate the buildings to their specific urban context and solar orientation;
  - Provide additional shared urban space to create more connection between the buildings;
  - Design development to make the entrances stronger, more legible and more logical;
  - Consider relocating entrances to street, not off lane.
  - Should take more advantage of two lane condition but not with entrances
  - Reduce the massing of the 6<sup>th</sup> floor balconies a bit;
  - Consider developing a shared amenity space;
  - Relocate the children's play spaces;
  - De-privatize the private rooftop patios to create more public space;
  - The colour palettes could be better expressed;
  - The screens need better resolution with their expression, perhaps to add more 'fun' to them;
  - Design development of the landscape to add differentiation and have it relate better to the architecture;
  - The balconies are too narrow.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel generally showed support for the use, density and general form of development, but noted that this application meets the minimum required for these sites and much could be done to increase the quality of the project. The building entrances are in the wrong location, and the buildings should be facing 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue respectively. Consideration should also be given to traffic problems created by the location of the parking ramps directly across the lane from each other.

Currently both buildings float and do not relate well to their surroundings; there needs to be more of a difference between the buildings to acknowledge their context. The building facing the golf course should be organic, looser and in general have a different response than the other building. There are also no clear differences between the front and the lane-side, and more of a 'front door' is needed to add a sense of arrival. Consider making the street entries stronger and bolder, maybe even with landscaping. These buildings could also share more things, such as amenity spaces or ramps, in order to make them into one complex rather than two separate projects.

Attention should be paid to the balconies on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor seem to make sure they do not overpower the building massing. Some of the balconies also seem a bit narrow, which makes them more conducive to storage than usage. Consider also eliminating the private patios at the roof as this space would better serve as a communal area. Regardless of their use, consider that the west rooftop patios are going to heat up in the afternoon sun, and that it would be nice to have a green buffer in between people looking out on the roof and the rooftop material.

More logic is needed with regards to the placement of the amenity areas, and more connection is needed between the indoor and outdoor spaces. Design development of the play area on the ground floor is needed, and both the amenity and children's play spaces could be bigger.

The metal screens do not really work, and should be replaced with something having a better relationship to the building and surrounding area. Work with an artist to create something more innovated and less expected, and consider a broader colour palette in order to add more visual interest. Special attention should be paid to the material expression as the glazing choice at the top could make this area look like an air traffic control tower. As well, try bringing the sloped roof form down to street level somehow to better connect it with the rest of the building.

More attention to orientation is needed with the buildings to mitigate solar exposure. Consider also using water off the roof along with the patios somehow.

The landscape is all private and completely under-developed. There needs to be additional planting and flexible public space, and the planting needs to interact with and reflect the architecture. Consider developing different children's play elements or the use of other landscape materials in order to add some differentiation as currently every side of both buildings are addressed the same. As well, the play spaces need more benches for parents to sit on. One panel member questioned whether two play spaces were actually necessary considering the proximity to the park.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that some good observations were made. This project is a challenging first foray, but there were some good comments which will help in going forward.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.