URBAN DESIGN PANEL AGENDA

Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020
Time: 03:00 pm
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

03:00 pm  Business

1. 03:15 pm  Address: 2336-2366 Charles Street  
Permit No.: RZ-2019-00007  
Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with 62 strata residential units and commercial uses at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 64 vehicle spaces and 119 bicycle spaces. The maximum building height is 21.2 m (69.5 ft.), the total floor area is 5,026 sq. m (54,099 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.2. This application is being considered under the Grandview Woodland Community Plan.

Zoning: RT-5 and C-1 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: Second
Staff: Kent MacDougall & Susan Chang

2. 04:15 pm  Address: 601 West Pender Street and 443 Seymour Street  
Permit No.: RZ-2019-00075  
Description: To develop a 29-storey commercial office building with retail units at grade; all over eight levels of underground parking consisting of 201 parking spaces, 5 passenger spaces, 6 Class A loading spaces, 2 Class B loading spaces, and 246 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 102.87 m (337.5 ft.), the total floor area is 40,909.85 m (440,350 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 22.9. This application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the Central Business District (CBD) and CBD Shoulder.

Zoning: DD to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates & Chris Dikeakos Architects
Staff: Thien Phan & Carl Stanford

3. 05:15 pm  Address: 750 Pacific Boulevard (NEFC Plaza of Nations)  
Permit No.: DP-2019-00571  
Description: To develop the site with a mixed-use development consisting of 3 terracing towers varying in heights of up to 30 storeys; with Commercial, Office, cultural and Residential Uses (including Social Housing, Market Rental, and Market units); a Civic Centre including, but not limited to a new Community Centre, ice rink, Child Daycare Facility; and a rooftop open space; all over 4 levels of underground parking.

Please refer to the following links for supporting materials/resources:
• Minutes from the Public Hearing https://council.vancouver.ca/20180710/documents/phea20180710min.pdf
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Second (First as DP)
Architect: James KM Cheng Architects
Staff: Patrick Chan
### EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended (8/2)

- **Introduction:**
  Rezoning Planner, Kent MacDougall began by noting the proposal is a 6-storey mixed-use development. The site is located on the **southwest corner of Nanaimo Street and Charles Street**, between Charles St and Kitchener St. The subject site is a 4-lot assembly located within the Nanaimo sub-area of Grandview-Woodland. Currently zoned C-1 & RT-5 and occupied by single-family houses. All 4 lots face north onto Charles St. and back onto a lane running parallel to Charles Street. The lane has access off Nanaimo St. and Garden St.

  Site size is approximately 1,583 sq. m. (17,039 sq. ft.). The lots have a combined frontage of approx. 37.3 m (122.4 ft.) along Nanaimo St., and a frontage of approx. 42.4 m (139.0 ft.) along Charles St. (depth).

  Immediately north of the site on the west side of Nanaimo St is a 3-storey mixed-use development (*Ground floor Commercial*), immediately east of the site on the East side of Nanaimo St is a single-storey Commercial retail development fronting Nanaimo.

  Lord Nelson Elementary School and Saint Lui Park is a ½-1 block west of the site. Templeton Secondary School and Templeton Park are located 6-7 blocks north. The site is largely surrounded currently by single family homes (largely zoned RT-5).

  The site is serviced by the number 7 (Nanaimo Station-Dunbar) bus route through downtown.

  This site is considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan (GWCP), adopted by Council in July 2016. Site is located in the Nanaimo Street Precinct; specifically in the “Shopping Nodes” area. The plan allows consideration of mixed use developments up to 6 storeys with a density of 3.2 FSR provided there is a minimum 36.6m/120 ft. frontage and the fifth and sixth floorplates do not exceed 594.6m2 / 6,400 ft2.

  Setbacks:
  - Front sufficient to achieve a minimum 5.5 m (18 ft.) sidewalk
  - Side setbacks may vary.

  The GWCP allows for:
Proposal is located within View Cone 27 which protects views of the North Shore Mountains from Trout Lake Park. Proposed development appears to comply with the view cone max height.

Development planner, Carl Stanford began by noting, the site is located within the Nanaimo sub-area of Grandview-Woodland on the southwest corner of Nanaimo Street and Charles Street. It is roughly square in shape measuring 37 m/ 122’ deep along Nanaimo and 42m /139’ along Charles Street and has a total area of 1582m2/ 17,024 sq. ft. The site is currently occupied by four single-family homes constructed in 1928. It has an approximate fall along Nanaimo St of 1.46m/ 4.8’ and is relatively level along Charles St.

The area to the south and west is zoned RT-5N/RT-5, is primarily residential and low rise consisting of single-family dwellings. The area to the east and north is zoned C-1 and consists of one-storey commercial retail and 3 storey mixed use development respectively North: C-1 zoning consisting of 3-storey mixed use development.

- North: C-1 zoning consisting of 3-storey mixed use development.
- East: C-1 zoning consisting of one-storey commercial retail.
- South: RT-5N and RT-5 zoning consisting of single-family dwellings.
- West: RT-5 zoning consisting of single-family dwellings.

Lord Nelson Elementary school and Saint Lui Park is located one block west of the subject site with Templeton secondary school located six blocks north. The immediate adjoining single family dwelling to the west will be shadowed in the morning year around.

The Grandview-Woodland Community Plan (Policy 6.6.2) allows consideration of mixed-use developments up to six storeys in this area with a 3.2 FSR, provided that there is a minimum 36.6m/ 120 ft. frontage and that the fifth- and sixth-storey floorplates don’t exceed 594.6 m2/ 6400 sq.

It recommends a provision of public realm improvements that could include increased sidewalk width, street trees and amenities such as seating, patios, bike racks, and public art. A small public plaza should be created at the southeast corner of Nanaimo and Charles Street and shadowing on the plaza space should be designed to be minimized during afternoon periods.

View cone 27.2 has a maximum height limit of 66.5m/218’ and C-1 zoning has a maximum height of 9.2m with a conditional increase of 10.7m.

The application proposes to rezone 2336-2366 Charles Street from RT-5 /C-1 to CD-1 to permit the development of a 6-storey mixed use building with 64 strata residential units and 765 m2/ 8234 sq.ft of retail. The proposal has an FSR of 3.2 of which 0.48 is dedicated to retail floor area of retail floor area and overall height of 22.4m/74’ equivalent here to 6 floors. Policy consideration is under the Grandview Woodland Community Plan (2016).

The floorplate size varies with an average of approximately from 1119m2/ 12,044sq.ft for the first 4 floors. The fifth floor measures 947m2/ 10,193sq.ft and sixth floor measures 500m2/ 5382sq.ft. The Grandview Wood plan sets a maximum floorplate at the fifth and sixth levels of 6400sq.ft. Five CRU units (two w/ mezz) are accessed off Nanaimo Street at grade with 1 bed two storey townhouses provided along Charles St and the Lane (addressed off Nanaimo). The townhouses have an inboard windowless loft bedroom at their upper level.
A two storey parkade is accessed off the lane at the western edge with the PMT located on the boundary. The parkade provides 64 parking spaces, one class B & one class A loading space, non-residential parking spaces and approximately 133 bicycle spaces on Level P1 and 4 class B bicycle spaces are proposed at grade off Nanaimo St.

52% of dwelling units in the scheme are family units (10 studio at 15%, 21 1Bed at 33%, 24 2-Bed at 38% and 9 3-Bed at 14%). Private outdoor areas are not provided for all dwelling units but this is intended to be offset by shared private open spaces.

The main residential entrance lobby is located mid-block along Charles St and leads to a level 2 podium where 2 & 3-bed townhouses are accessed on the west wing together with 1/2bed apartments on the east. The amenity room and shared outdoor space for the residential is located on Level 2 in the south western edge. Vertical circulation to level 4 is provided off level 2 with level 3 accommodating the upper floor of the west wing townhouses and the upper floor of the east wing apartments also accessed directly off L2 via front door staircases.

At level 4 an external perimeter corridor wraps around the buildings west facade providing access to two levels of apartments. The applicant has provided a letter from their code consultant for an alternative compliance path at BP addressing egress concerns. At level 5 townhouses are accessed above and below from an internal corridor on the east wing and the west wing has apartments accessed from the floor below with private amenity above. Only the east wing pops up to a sixth floor level for the uppermost levels of the townhouses.

**Setbacks:**
The Grandview Woodlands Plan 6.62 requires:
- Front setback of a minimum 5.5 m/ 18’ sidewalk
- Rear setback of 9.1 m/ 30’ for residential use
- Side requirements vary (~2.1m/ 7’)

For sites adjacent to R zoned sites, without an intervening lane the C2 guideline are used as a best practice model for advisable setbacks and would recommend a minimum of a 3.7m/ 12ft. setback from the rear yard to west at grade and a minimum 10.7m/ 35’ to 14.4m/47’ setback approximately above the fourth floor.

In either case 2.4m/ 8’ has been provided here at grade improving to the uppermost levels to 6.7m/ 22’ with relaxations requested respectively.

The applicant has envisioned metal cladding to the Nanaimo frontage with ‘Hardi plank type’ material elsewhere but the situation is fluid.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. **Height, Setbacks & Shadowing:**
   a. Does the proposal demonstrate a satisfactory attempt to mitigate shadowing on the adjoining context?
   b. Is the transition of scale to the west and the setbacks shown appropriate?  
      *(Please Note: Consider that although the Grandview Woodlands Plan indicates more conventional sectional treatments with larger setbacks, it does not rule out alternate proposals)*

2. **Architectural Expression and Design:**
a. Is the massing, and articulation of the proposed form of development consistent with the residential character anticipated for this area in the Grandview Woodlands Plan?  
(Please Note: Consider that the 5th floor plans exceed the maximum area in the GW plan for floorplates of 6400sq.ft by ~4000sq.ft at this level.)

b. Please comment on the proposal’s detailed design, particularly the architectural expression, and materiality?  
(Please Note: Consider the durability & quality & further that the applicant has envisioned metal cladding to the Nanaimo frontage with ‘Hardi plank type’ material elsewhere but the situation is fluid.)

3. Livability

a. Has the proposal successfully demonstrated the livability of the courtyard model outlined in their rationale?  
(Please Note: Consider private outdoor spaces such as balconies for the family-sized units, connectivity between indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, and lastly, ease of wayfinding and entrance identity.)

b. Is the inner courtyard sufficiently activated, usable and free from shadow?

4. Public Realm Interface

a. Is the public realm along Nanaimo sufficiently activated with provision for a lively public realm?  
(Please Note: Consider the number and type of entries at grade, entry locations, canopy depths & canopy soffit design, building use, the amount of glazing at pedestrian level; and the public realm design.)

• Applicant’s Introductory Comments:
The core intentions of this project are to establish traditional type streets where you walk by your neighbor’s door for improved sociability. This project aims to avoid the social isolation crises and allow solar access and ventilation. There is a site wrapping circulation strategy so neighbors are visible.

The double sided units allow for 3 bedroom units that are livable and affordable. This is a housing form that is desperately needed in this neighborhood. All units have private outdoor space and all dwelling units will get late afternoon sun shadow which is in accordance with the GWP. There are 5 townhouse units facing Charles Street and 5 facing the lane, which intended to be of ‘facing the lane concept’ type unit.

The City of Vancouver has strict guidelines regarding the Courtyards. The intent was to balance the units to the west adjacent and maximize the courtyard. We opened up the space and enclosed it up top; multiple units are accessible off the courtyard. The ends of the courtyard were left as active nodes, this allowed for the courtyard to have some lushness.

The Grandview Woodlands plans request a setback of one level up, and would like one level down to respond to view impact. Materials include zinc cladding and ‘Hardi Plank’ type color paneling but materials are still being explored.

All the views are directed to the south to respond to concerns on overlook consideration. There is planting to address privacy concerns. The green buffer allows for privacy but still allows residents to engage with neighbors. There are street trees in front, and the intent is to break up the concrete and get some more permeability. There will also be a rain water harvesting technology incorporated into the project.
• Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:
  Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Wen and seconded by Ms. Stamp and was the
decision of the Urban Design Panel:

  THAT the Panel recommends **RESUBMISSION** of the project with the following recommendation to
be reviewed by City Staff:

  • Design development to increase the neighbourliness of the buildings on the western face by
    minimizing the overlook and scale on the western block;
  • Design development of the courtyard to maximize daylighting and use;
  • Design development to improve sociability of the amenity areas;
  • Design development to maximize daylight into the dwelling units;
  • Design development to the physical character of the building to address the finer grain of the
    neighbourhood;
  • Design development to improve overall livability and use of private exterior space;
  • Design development to improve the overall form, expression and character of the building; and,
  • Design development to better balance community and privacy;

• Related Commentary:

  Although there were overall mixed reviews expressed with regard to the proposal, the panel
appreciated the positive social attitude of the project. As such most panel members agreed the street
edge and town house at grade worked well and the idea of a courtyard centred building was a good
typology. With this in mind the panel noted their appreciation for the social community aspect
expressed in a market strata condominium building. The panel also noted in general that the
transition of private to public space was done well. Most panel members however suggested the
applicant research further the social typology versus neighbourliness to better establish a line
between privacy and social interaction with neighbour.

  Most panel members had no issues with the floorplate restrictions and one panelist noted that the
Grandview Woodland area is in need of densification however most panel members agreed the
expression and articulation of form on the western block was quite dense and transitioned poorly to
the neighbours. Most panel members noted that although the bulk of the building pulled the normal
typology apart, the expression of the buildings does not reduce this bulk, merely redistributing it within
a constricted site and as a result it is not sufficiently refined with regard to its relationship with the
surrounding housing. There needs to be a scale transition on the west side. The massing on the west
side is struggling the most. The west side is the more challenging side.

  Some panel members noted that neighbours across the lane will be impacted by shadowing and
there is no lane transition from the courtyard to these neighbours. The proposal appears to not have
attempted to mitigate the shadowing impact. The panel noted more shadow studies for the courtyard
is needed. Most panel members noted the courtyard has issues with shadowing and usability and
suggested further development. The courtyard in the middle bulks up the size of the buildings. It was
suggested that to resolve the issues previously discussed the applicant consider keeping courtyard
but rotating it.

  Some panel members noted that the saw tooth expression in the elevations although visually striking
needed a stronger rationale based on functionality. In addition some panel members expressed
concern on the extent of solid wall with small windows. Most panel members agreed that darker
materials added to the perception of mass and suggested using materials that are lighter in colour.
The elevations at levels 1, 2, 3 are monotonous compared to the rest of the building. The building
fronting Nanaimo was more successful in its architectural expression and materiality but the Western
block felt neglected. The Buildings to the west should also be at same level of quality as the Eastern
building fronting Nanaimo. The Nanaimo frontage feels a little weighty, and there is a need to examine the materiality and detailing for all facades.

Consideration should be given to a refined distinctive treatment of the base, middle and top of the building with a unifying language leveraging a cohesive high quality material palette. Changes in material expression should have a functional basis underlined by a rigorous rationale.

Some panel members noted that constructability issues at the rezoning stage will be a continuing concern as the project develops and needs further consideration and clarification. There is not enough information regarding the detail design. The floor to height ratio needs consideration. Some panel member expressed concern with how units are being stacked in a wooden frame as the 6 and 4 storey wood frame structures are quite different. The entry and exit layouts need to be looked at especially units opening to loading area. There appears to be fire separation and acoustic issues and overall code issues need to be looked at to ensure the form of development is viable. The circulation is out of the box thinking but creates issues to resolve. The ramp and loading access are not ideally located. The mechanical will be difficult to access with the concrete wall.

Most panel members noted that the units have livability issues, with the majority of them narrow with very small windows and daylight issues. Most panel members agreed that there are not enough windows and more windows allow the opportunity to open up the building.

The lower balconies will make for dark living spaces at grade level. Most panel members noted a need to have more light and access. Most panel members noted that amenities should not be read as another unit but rather have their own functional program. A panelist suggested having a large amenity at the back and on the top of building. Other suggestions included consider putting an amenity room on level 5 in the Nanaimo building. Some panel members noted that the townhouse units at the lane are at grade, and encourage them to be raised up to improve privacy.

Some panel members noted the importance of how the building hits the grade and interfaces with the public realm and that it needed additional detail. Most panel members felt continuous canopy cover along the street, additional detail on the retail strategy, and awnings/canopies over the entries was important. The public realm is good on Nanaimo, appreciate the seating area and lounge. Suggest a few benches looking towards the view on Nanaimo.

The public realm should encourage public interaction and gathering, lend significance to the site and be well integrated with the surrounding streets and sidewalks.

Overall there are issues of livability, shadowing, neighbourliness and the overlook. Tall landscaping, screening etc. on the west property line could be a solution or rotating the courtyard but in general further development is required

**Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.
601 West Pender Street and 443 Seymour Street
750 Pacific Boulevard
(NEFC Plaza of Nations)
BUSINESS MEETING
Chair Amela Brudar, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. Address: 750 Pacific Boulevard - NEFC Sub-area 6B (Plaza of Nations)
   Permit No. RZ-2017-00043
   Description: To develop the 10.28 acre site with a mixed-use development consisting of a variety of terracing buildings of up to 30 storeys with commercial and residential uses, social housing, civic facilities (community centre, ice rink, music presentation centre and childcare), and a new public plaza and seawall. This application is being considered under the Northeast False Creek Plan.

   Zoning: CD-1 Amendment
   Application Status: Rezoning Application
   Review: Third (First as Rezoning)
   Architect: James KM Cheng Architects
   Owner: Daisen Gee-Wing, Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp.
   Delegation: Alana Piche, Architect, James KM Cheng Architects
                James Cheng, Architect, James KM Cheng Architects
                Chris Philips, Landscape Architect, PFS
   Staff: Cynthia Lau & Patricia St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- Introduction:
  Cynthia Lau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the Northeast False Creek (NEFC) Plan as a very different waterfront than what has been seen before in Vancouver. This area is the last remaining undeveloped area of the downtown waterfront.

  The NEFC Plan was approved by Council on February 13, 2018. Staff were directed to consider rezoning proposals for the major development sites concurrent to the Area Planning process. The proposal being considered is for Sub-area 6B, known as the Plaza of Nations. Other development sites include Sub-area 6C (owned by Concord Pacific), Sub-area 10C (adjacent to BC Place and owned by PavCo on behalf of the provincial government), and Sub-area 6D, the City-owned Main Street blocks, which are located at the eastern terminus of the viaducts, between Quebec and Prior Streets. BC Place is to the north of the subject site.

  The panel has reviewed the overall plan for NEFC and the major development areas at two workshops, in June and December 2017, along with a voting session that supported the proposed rezoning of Sub-area 6D.

  Rezonings in NEFC will take an area-based approach to create a framework for the developments, within which individual, more detailed and refined work can occur during the development permit process and will be reviewed by the Development Permit Board; likely as site-wide preliminary development permits, and then following as individual development permits for each building or block. At this stage, the intent is not to achieve detailed designs or architecture, but to create a CD-1 by-law and design guidelines which will build upon the NEFC Plan policies. The objective is to balance certainty and flexibility and encourage creativity. The rezoning applications will establish density, height, form and massing, land use, and will ensure room for innovation and evolution within.

  Prevailing policies for this site are the NEFC Plan and the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments and the Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings.
Patricia St. Michel, Senior Urban Designer provided a recap of the key Northeast False Creek urban design principles for the new panel members.

Upon the removal of the Georgia and Dunsmuir Viaducts, the Main Street blocks will be freed up for development and a new street network will be in place to improve connections from downtown to the False Creek waterfront via a new Georgia Street extension, which will come down to meet the new two-way Pacific Boulevard. A new waterfront plaza will be located at this new prominent intersection.

The intent is to mark this new intersection as the Georgia Gateway, similar to the approach taken at the Burrard Gateway and the Granville Gateway. The NEFC Plan policy allows consideration for three buildings at this intersection to exceed the Cambie Street at 10th Avenue View Cone, which crosses the site at about 300 ft. The Georgia Gateway is located east and north of this site on the Sub-area 6C and 10C sites.

Throughout consultation during the NEFC Plan process, feedback supported a unique waterfront that is more active, public and engaging, with reasons to return again and again, in all seasons. The waterfront is to be pedestrian-focused, with areas to bring pedestrians closest to the water. Bikes will be brought further back, but will still maintain great visual access and experience of the waterfront.

Northeast False Creek is to be a unique place in the city, featuring a south facing waterfront with views to the mountains, through the narrow, historically low neck of the downtown peninsula to emphasize and accentuate this connection of water/park/mountain.

With the removal of the viaducts, there is an opportunity to connect the surrounding communities with new and renewed park areas. Further work is required to draw from Indigenous principles and to improve connectivity to Chinatown. The Dunsmuir Connection, a pedestrian- and cyclist-only connection from downtown to False Creek, will be integrated with the park, and with the buildings along its route. The park design concept is continuing to evolve, with further in-depth engagement with Indigenous communities and Chinatown.

The new Pacific Boulevard ‘Great Street’ will not be another barrier at-grade but will be a new street system with a positive experience. It is to have large setbacks to accommodate active transportation, and ample street activity to constitute a lively experience. The future Pacific Boulevard will dedicate as much space to pedestrians and cyclists as to vehicular movement. Significant trees will be given the conditions to thrive and grow to legacy scale. The street would dedicate substantial spaces for slower moving cyclists and pedestrians, with clear, safe and well-defined spaces for both, public places to sit, and large setbacks for patios and display areas.

Consultation feedback made clear the strong value of the public views to BC Place and the iconic image it represents. Prior to the stadium roof renovation, which added the spires and lights, the policy objective was to wrap the stadium as much as possible. The challenge is now to accommodate densities appropriate to this downtown site while preserving and accentuating views to the stadium.

Feedback also indicated that this is a unique place that needs a singular approach to the building typology that moves beyond the tower and podium form for which Vancouver is so well known.

The urban design principles in NEFC emphasize:

- A fine-grained fabric and high-density forms;
- ‘Sticky’ edges: uses, design and detail to create comfortable and inviting places to linger and enjoy;
- A mix of uses, with an emphasis on non-residential uses on ground and lower levels;
- Living spaces that offer sense of ground, green, and gardens on upper levels;
Greater emphasis on the social and livability of high density forms through multiple-level or multiple-exposure units, common areas and green spaces on upper levels, places to gather and meet and design that fosters spontaneous encounters; Ensuring variety and unique design through multiple architects.

The rezoning application for Sub-area 6B proposes over 2 million sq. ft. of gross floor area, including a minimum 350,000 sq. ft. of commercial spaces, approximately 108,000 sq. ft. of community/civic facilities and 1.6 million sq. ft. of residential uses, of which 20% of the floor area will be social housing.

Existing policy under the NEFC Plan allows for 1.4 million sq. ft. of residential uses. This application proposes 200,000 sq. ft. of additional residential floor area. The policy allows consideration of additional density, subject to urban design performance, delivery of public amenities and alignment with the urban design principles.

Public amenities proposed on this site include an ice rink, a community centre, childcare, a music presentation centre, public rooftop open spaces, and a central community plaza and seawall.

Multiple view cones cross over the site at approximately 200 ft. and 300 ft.

Comments from the Urban Design Panel at the December 2017 workshop included:
- The Panel appreciated the general approach, and the different form and typology proposed.
- The site and form carried the proposed density well.
- Design Guidelines would be essential to ensure the final design meets the proposed intent.
- Phased development and segmentation into smaller blocks of varied scales could be very exciting.
- Architectural variety will be important and the waterfront building is a particularly great opportunity for this.
- Support for connected parking and shared loading.
- Need for activation at the upper level public spaces.
- Support for the relationship to the waterfront and the fully pedestrian environment; comments and discussion reflected interest in the possibilities that the waterfront offers.
- Concern of the tightness of the courtyard and interior corners.
- A need for a clear approach for maintenance and assurance that upper terrace plantings are set up to thrive.

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

1. Form of development: Are the overall density, height, massing, and building forms appropriate for the site?
2. The massing of the western building block, and in particular the relationship with the existing residential development to the west.
3. The relationship between the western end of the waterfront building and the central plaza on axis with the stadium.
4. Response to Panel comments from the December 13th UDP workshop.
5. Draft Design Guidelines: Directions on massing, diversity in architecture, architecture, architectural expression, etc.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.
• Applicant’s Introductory Comments:
The Plaza of Nations historically has always been a place of gathering and celebrations; therefore, the design concept is to maintain the site as highly porous and accessible and to keep the connections to the water.

The consensus from the open houses was that the public would like to have a waterfront area that is of a different character to the rest of the seawall.

Since the previous Urban Design Panel workshops, draft design guidelines have been developed, including responses to the previous panel’s concerns.

The design focuses on a fine grain, and on permeability and connectivity. A continuous site line allows one to see to the other side of the development, creating a view that connects all aspects of the site together.

The proposal includes a waterfront public space along the newly created wharf, which connects to the Georgia Plaza to the east. The western side of the waterfront promenade receives the best sun and provides great views to the creek. Two public wharfs are proposed in order to increase public activity on the water. Two small-scale floating restaurants are proposed.

The proposal includes a community centre, which has strong sightlines to the Georgia Plaza in Sub-area 6C.

Since the workshop in December 2017, changes to the proposal include:
• The waterfront mass on the western building has been further modified after removing the waterfront tower to open up the courtyard.
• The density has been decreased by 50,000 sq. ft.
  o The decrease in density creates flexibility for a ‘flex zone,’ which will allow for enclosed balconies and architectural moments to push out of the building envelope in localized areas, and overall will help to create architectural diversity in the building façades.
• All of the local streets have been widened to accommodate sidewalks and setbacks.
• Setbacks at Pacific Boulevard have been improved for a more pedestrian-focused ground plane that will pull the individual towards the central plaza.

The final design will use principles of energy conservation outlined in the rezoning application, the design guidelines, and the NEFC Plan. New typology will be built from the ground up.

The project will include enclosed balconies to help mitigate noise impacts, classic open balconies, or bay windows.

The community centre will connect to an upper-level terrace, which will have full public access, and will be co-located with an outdoor play space for the daycare. Vertical access points will be included to create a connection to the upper terraces for the public.

This wharf and waterfront is to be distinct from the rest of False Creek seawall, and will include spaces for retail frontages. It is to be designed as a place where people can stop and spend time as opposed to pass through. Large events such as the Sun Run and relationship to the stadium will be an important part of these connected spaces.

Currently the legacy forest as part of the False Creek basin has more heritage than ecological value. The legacy forest will be retained and reforested and the water’s edge will be enhanced. The building
forms have been designed to introduce opportunities for roof gardens and common areas, which will align with the proposal’s sustainability goals.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  Having reviewed the project it was moved by and seconded by Mr. Neale and Mr. Wen was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

  THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following minor recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

  - Further design development to the western edge of the western block, to further break up the massing and articulate the building;
  - Further work on design guidelines, especially with regards to the public realm;
  - Further design development to increase access to the water edge.

- **Related Commentary:**
  The Panel supported the overall massing and the terracing roof forms, and the departure from the typical tower and podium typology in Vancouver. The panel was excited to bring something new to Vancouver, particularly on the waterfront. The Panel recognized the opportunity to create a unique waterfront with public spaces that are more successful than what has been done to date.

  There was general support that all the big moves are on the right track, overall massing is where it should be. The approach to solar access and the stepping of the building and green roof terraces were well received. The panel appreciated the retention of the views to the stadium. It was noted that the new typology is not tried and tested, and there will be challenges with respect to privacy, overlook, and internal circulation to address in the architectural design. Detailing will be very important, and the design guidelines will need to be well-developed and defined, without being too prescriptive. Precedents that better reflect the scale of the proposed development should be sought.

  It was commented that the proposal carries a lot of density in three buildings, and that it is important to understand the massing in the context of the stadium which can skew perception of scale. The Panel agreed that the western building, particularly along the western edge, is massive and needs more intentional consideration and moves to break up the massing, such as cutting sections out and creating holes. Further thought also needs to be given to the pedestrian experience and to breaking down the scale along Pacific Boulevard.

  The Panel suggested adding more height to the tallest elements of the buildings above the view cones to allow density to be redistributed. Staff noted that the Georgia Gateway projection through the view cone is strategic and limited to mark the new intersection of Georgia Street and Pacific Boulevard, and further projections into the view cone are not supported beyond that immediate location.

  It was noted that there was not a lot of information provided on the public realm, and the relationship between the buildings and the public realm. More information was sought on the interface between the buildings and Pacific Boulevard, the central plaza, and the waterfront, and to incorporate façade design and articulation. It was noted that it will be important to ensure this information is in the design guidelines.

  The design guidelines need to be well-developed and defined to allow control over the development, but also not too prescriptive so design development is allowed. Diversity in architecture is important, as is detailing. Flexibility with architecture is beneficial to the design team in general.
From a sustainability perspective, this area should have an integrated rain water management plan in the design guidelines, and stepping forms, overhangs, and window to wall ratios should be used as opportunities for great solutions.

The Panel was supportive of the site plan and development being organized around the central plaza and the view to the stadium. In general, the panel thought that there could be more flow and connection between the central plaza and the waterfront, with more thought to how the two plazas can connect for larger events. Another panel member appreciated the way the waterfront building captures the central plaza space. Consideration should be given to expanding the waterfront plaza area by pulling the waterfront building back, as this is the sunniest place on the site as well as being at the water where people will want to gather. It was suggested that this should be the location of the much-needed heart of the development, and that this would be a good place for the music presentation centre.

Programming of commercial spaces and design that will accommodate a variety of events will be important to the central plaza as it may not typically be a major pedestrian thoroughfare. It was suggested that there is no need to have permanent roof structures in this space, and that temporary structures are ideal. The panel was supportive of the commercial uses in relation to the plaza and thought restaurants and activities on upper levels would be an exciting part of the area. It was also noted that some of the commercial spaces are quite deep and may be challenging to make work. Double-fronting retail on the waterfront may be difficult to service without negatively impacting the street. One panel member thought the proposed community centre should be located more centrally, and be on fewer levels. The community centre adjacency and relationship to the rooftop terrace was seen as a positive evolution since the workshops.

The panel recognized the potential for a new waterfront experience, and encouraged the team to keep working on the design to make it more unique, activated and welcoming. The Panel was supportive of moving bikes off of the waterfront to create fully pedestrian areas. It was noted that public access to the water is very important, and needs to be balanced with restaurants, marinas, and other uses at the edge and on the water. It was suggested that on-water restaurants, marinas and other uses be located in a way that prioritizes public access to the waterfront in the new inlet and other key locations.

While not part of this application, it was noted that Georgia Plaza as the terminus of Georgia Street is a huge opportunity and should be bigger. The Georgia Wharf is successful as a continuation of the plaza.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.