

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** April 19, 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)  
James Cheng  
David Jerke  
Yijin Wen  
Neal LaMontagne (excused by item #3,4,5)  
Nell Gasiewicz  
Amela Brudar  
Veronica Gillies (excused from item #2)  
Kim Smith  
Renee Van Halm

**REGRETS:** Meredith Anderson  
Karen Spoelstra  
Muneesh Sharma

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |                               |
|-------------------------------|
| 1. 58 W Hastings Street       |
| 2. 3701-3743 West Broadway    |
| 3. 8795-8803 Granville Street |
| 4. 619-675 W Hastings Street  |
| 5. 3365 Commercial Drive      |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Kim Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A brief business meeting took place before the presentations commenced. Housing Director Ms. Abigail Bond, referenced the project 58 W. Hastings Street, by noting the concerns from the DTES community asking that the housing project be at 100% welfare rates. Other concerns from members of the DTES community include micro unit size and gentrifying retail space. The Chair noted that these were not concerns that fall under the jurisdiction of Urban Design panel recommendations. Linda Gillan, Rezoning Planner, responded that the proposal for 58 W. Hastings meets current zoning requirements.

1. Address: **58 W Hastings Street**  
 Permit No. RZ-2017-00016  
 Description: The proposal is for a ten-story mixed-use building with retail and health care office uses at grade, health care office on floors two and three, and residential above (222 social housing units), with a building height of 32 m (105 ft.), a floor area of 19,724 m<sup>2</sup> (212,315 sq. ft), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.60, all over one level of underground parking (71 vehicle spaces and 201 bicycle spaces, along with 5 Class B loading spaces at grade). This rezoning application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the Downtown Eastside and the Downtown Eastside Community Plan.  
 Zoning: DD to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: W.T. Leung Architects (Wing Leung)  
 Owner: City of Vancouver  
 Delegation: Wing Ting Leung, W.T. Leung Architects  
 Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting  
 Staff: Linda Gillan & Pat Chan

**EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION RECOMMENDED**

**Introduction:** Rezoning Planner, Linda Gillan, introduced the project as a rezoning application for 58 West Hastings Street. The site is comprised of a single parcel on the south side of Hastings Street, mid-block between Abbott and Carrall streets.

Rezoning site has a frontage of almost 270 feet on Hastings Street, and is 132 feet deep, with a site area of just over 32,200 square feet (2,993.8 square meters).

Currently used partly for urban agriculture space, operated by Portland Hotel Society, and by a mobile medical unit, operated by Vancouver Coastal Health (no permanent structures on the site), the site is currently zoned DD, or Downtown District and located to the north and east is the Gastown Historic Area (HA-2). Surrounding development includes a mixture of commercial, office and residential uses, including non-market housing east and west of the site: the New Portland Hotel and Grand Union Hotel, respectively. The Grand Union Hotel has seven windows at the shared property line.

The application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan and Victory Square Policy Plan. Under the policy, rezoning applications may be considered for market projects, where there is a public benefit including social housing, secured market rental housing, and / or heritage building rehabilitation. Through rezoning, maximum height is 105 feet and the allowable density is based on urban design performance.

The Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings also applies for this site, requiring a minimum of LEED Gold or equivalent. The application is to rezone from DD to CD-1 to allow for a 10-storey mixed-use building, with:

- retail, health care office use at grade,
- health care office on floors two and three
- Seven floors of residential use above.

The project includes 222 social housing units, with a mixture of micro, studio, one- and two-bedroom units. The proposed density is 6.6 FSR and a height of 105 feet to the top of the roof slab.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the project by noting the building's relationship to the existing context and policy for the area. The proposed building's general massing (along the Hastings façade) is expressed as three layers (base, mid and upper). In the surrounding neighbourhood context, most buildings have narrower frontages of varying heights. The adjacent residential building has a window facing the common property line, requiring a larger setback on the west side.

With the form of development for the project, the articulation and massing recommended in the Victory Square Guidelines and the Downtown Eastside Plan call for the area's historical form and scale to be recognised through the design of building facades and modulating heights, especially for sites wider than 75'. The building's east half is relatively un-articulated. The three-storey base spans the site width and the uppermost levels are not modulated in terms of heights.

In terms of shadow impacts on north sidewalk, the Victory Square Policy Plan recommends that shadows cast by new developments on the south side of Hastings should not extend beyond the curb on the north sidewalk at noon at Equinox. The proposed building shadows over the north sidewalk curb.

The storefront composition and layout, within the Victory Square Guidelines, recommends 23' shop widths better to reference the area's historical store frontages. Most of the proposed CRU widths are 25' to 40', except for the wider clinic lobby.

While the Micro Dwelling Policies and Guidelines allow for Juliette balconies, open balconies can further improve liveability in terms of better access to air and sunlight. The Victory Square Guidelines recommend rear setbacks on upper floors for privacy. The two "wings" at the building's rear are setback about 9' from the rear property-line. This is about 40' from the existing and other future developments across the lane if those developments were setback similarly.

Staff took questions from the Panel. In response to a question, Housing Policy & Projects staff noted that community concerns included the rental rates of the Social Housing units and their ownership.

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

1. Will further articulating the building's east-half better respond to the historical fabric?
2. Will further articulating the 268' wide three-storey base provide better contextual fit, and a more engaging pedestrian experience?
3. Will more pronounced saw-tooth roof-line better address the policy to reference the area's modulating heights, and also shadow the north sidewalk less, thus improving the wider public realm?
4. Are the proposed shopfront widths adequately addressing the historical finer grain fabric, and providing a richer pedestrian experience?
5. Are the Juliette balconies sufficient for air and sunlight?

6. Should the wings be reduced in depth to provide more space between them and the buildings across the lane, thus also affording more privacy to residents on both sides?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting the challenge of providing enough square footage to serve the community. The proposal includes multiple entrances for different client groups. There are ambulance and police car requirements from the lane and other requirements. The presence at Hastings Street is intended to be welcoming.

The applicant intended to break the building into three pieces. The central part is expressed as the entrance to the clinic. The proposed base material is stone. The proposed clinic is 3 floors in brick masonry, and the top floors are recessed with glazing on the windows. There is a high wall to window ratio in the proposal. The design has a 23 foot grid in order to give multiple grids some entrances to respond to the 25 foot module. A saw tooth roof form is proposed.

The Grand Union Hotel windows at the shared property line require the proposal for 58 West Hastings Street to be pulled back above the second level. There are certain rules such as Juliette balconies, which could not be included, according to the applicant. The design includes a 23 foot grid to allow for effective micro suites in future. Concrete cornice expressions were included in the corners of the buildings.

The landscape architect did not attend. But, the applicant mentioned there are common areas that include a children's play area and urban agriculture. There is a nominal area for garden plots. There is no green space allowed on the roof top due to operational requirements.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Gillies and seconded by Mr. LaMontagne, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommends resubmission of the project after addressing the following concerns:

- More articulation to break up the length and mass of the building
- More articulation to speak to the community aspect of the building
- More articulation to remove the 'institutional' nature of the building
- The building should speak to the context of the neighbourhood
- The public realm needs more work

- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted the height and massing is supported but there is not enough building articulation to suit the neighbourhood. Furthermore the different programmatic aspects of the building need more work. It is too massive a building for the street. The housing should not look like a typical social housing building. Make it look like a normal residential building.

Further articulation should be on the east half according to a panel member. The brick and stone look is appreciated, but the frontage is too long. A panel member did not prefer the Juliette balconies, while another panel member suggested a combination of Juliette balconies with other balconies.

The public realm and streetscape should have more seating to make it more welcoming. There should be more to distinguish between the residential and commercial entrances. The shared spaces in the plans should have permanent seating edges rather than have moveable seating.

Overall, it could set some standards for social housing quality. The same urban design standard as the rest of Vancouver should apply to the DTES in terms of component refinements.

In response to a comment from the panel, Ms. Gillan, Rezoning Planner, clarified 105 feet is the maximum height which can be considered for a rezoning application in this area.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments but there are certain challenges that the development holds. The architects would like more time to develop the project.

2. Address: **3701-3743 West Broadway**  
 Permit No. RZ-2016-00040  
 Description: The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use building, with retail at grade and secured market rental units on all levels (94 dwelling units), a building height of 19.5 m (64 ft.), a floor area of 7,238 m<sup>2</sup> (77,909 sq. ft.), and a proposed floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.15, over three levels of underground parking (99 vehicle spaces and 142 bicycle spaces). This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy.
- Zoning: C-2/RS-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects (Veronica Gillies)  
 Owner: Josh Anderson, Westbank  
 Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects  
 Veronica Gillies, Henriquez Partners Architects  
 Joseph Fung, Hapa  
 Daniel Roberts, Kane  
 Staff: Rachel Harrison & Patrick O’Sullivan
- 

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as located on the northwest corner of Alma and West Broadway, in West Point Grey. The proposal is coming in under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy to build a 6 storey mixed-use building with commercial on the ground-floor and 94 rental units above.

The site is approximately 188 feet by 125 feet or 24,000 square feet. The site is a 2-lot assembly and split zoned between C-2 and RS-1. C-2 lot is currently occupied by a 1-storey commercial building and surface parking. The RS-1 lot is vacant and the house was recently demolished.

On the south side is a C-2, 4-storey and 3-storey mixed-use building, then RS-1 to the west. To the north is a 3-storey rental building on the corner of Alma and 8th; two 4-storey residential (strata) buildings for the remaining block, which is zoned RM-4. The northeast includes a 1-storey Royal Canadian Legion building zoned C-2. Mid-block heights increase to 4-storeys. To the southeast is the Chevron gas station and commercial strip-mall zoned C-2. It is not anticipated that the future Broadway SkyTrain line will have a stop on this site. However engineering staff are asking for an emergency exit stairwell on the building.

The project is a 6-storey mixed-use residential building with 94 secured rental units and 36% of the units are 2 and 3 bedroom units. The 3.15 FSR has 2.5 levels of underground parking and 2 loading bays accessed off a new rear lane (it has a 10 foot City of Vancouver right-of-way and a 10 foot on the subject property).

In terms of the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy, if rental is provided, the proposal would qualify for up to: 6 storeys for the C-2 site (since it is on an arterial and in a local shopping area) and 3.5 storeys for the RS-1 site, since this site is within 100 metres of an arterial (W Broadway). *C-2 District Schedule* maximum allowable height is 45 feet with a density of 2.5 FSR.

Patrick O’Sullivan, Development Planner, introduced the project as located adjacent to the RM-4 zone to the north, an apartment zone, with RS-1 zone to the west. The project includes units at grade at the west, then an interior L-shaped amenity, a small exterior amenity patio, central entry, and a 2770 square foot CRU on the corner.

Levels 2 through 6 are residential units and the roof deck is a shared amenity space. Another CRU at grade is located along Alma, around 2300 square feet with outdoor space at the lane. Mr O'Sullivan explained the massing setbacks.

Parking and loading access is at the lane towards the west side.. A 10 foot lane dedication is taken. It is a twenty foot wide lane, except the easterly most portion, which is a 10 foot or more. Engineering has asked for another 2 feet.

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

1. Do you support the proposed:
    - a) Form
    - b) Height
    - c) Density
  2. Does the stepped massing on the west side of the proposed building provide sufficient transition to the scale of the single family zoned properties to the west?
  3. Please comment on the landscape design including:
    - a) The public realm at the ground plane, specifically the interface between the building face and the public realm on the Broadway frontage;
    - b) Roof deck and balcony design;
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that the project has gone through evolutions over time. The core is asymmetrical. The neighbourhood is a C-2 which is very prescriptive zoning. The attempt is try to make a more elegant and integral interface with RS-1.

There are a lot of moving parts. The design is intended to be adaptable to the future. The site is a terminus of Broadway, and as it transitions to West Point Grey, and the design curves into a labyrinth like entry. The scale of the building design is broken down to the RS-1 building typology. It peels the ground level to match the step back of RS-1. The building is 1 storey to make the step up gradual for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. It is a terminus on one side and a threshold on the other. The back design is the same, but has a different interface. The closest interface is 88 feet. Nothing is hitting the building in terms of shadows or privacy issues. The "squiggles" in the brick pattern are part of the typology. The proposed materials are not typical. The glazed lantern of the upper two floors is to 'receive' the tower in the future. The north side is more open glaze wise in the proposal. Along Alma the height of the shoulder aligns with the building to the south.

The double row of trees will be retained. The plain trees will be integrated into the street. There is maple on the other side. The street front has special paving. The public realm 'kicks forward' to create a welcoming front door. Proposed is a hedge to define the public and private spaces. There is a definitive hedge and cherry trees to provide a foil along level 1 edge. The upper terraces have planting at the edges for privacy. The roof has a large urban agriculture proposed zone for an active social space.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Jim and seconded by Yijin, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel THAT:

the Panel **SUPPORT** the project

**Related Commentary:** The panel congratulated the applicant on an extremely sensitive, elegant and sophisticated design. The roof deck and balcony programming is well suited to the demographic.

One panel member mentioned the kitchens might be too large. On the main floor, at the amenity area, the bedroom is too close to West Broadway. There would be a curtain or shade closed for privacy. The panel member recommended turning it into an amenity space instead. The glazing area facing the Greek neighbours', should be reduced, according to one panel member. Maybe glazing should be different.

Passive measures would be a more welcome addition. The entrance to all the residents should be more clearly articulated. Another panel member mentioned it might be too early to not have parking at the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked panel and support for a new kind of building like this.



3. Address:	<b>8795-8803 Granville Street</b>
Permit No.	RZ-2016-00049
Description:	The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use building with commercial use at grade and 5 residential storeys (19 dwelling units), a building height of 20.1 m (66 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.48, over two levels of underground parking (17 automobile spaces and 25 bicycle spaces). The application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning:	RM-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. (Matthew Cheng)
Owner:	Lina Huo
Delegation:	Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. Patricia Campbell, PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.
Staff:	John Chapman & Tim Potter

#### EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION RECOMMENDED

Introduction: John Chapman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for two parcels on the west side of Granville Street, between 71st and 72nd Ave. The sites are currently zoned RM-3A and developed with one two-unit and one one-unit residential dwellings. The parcel is 6,300 square feet, with a 66 foot frontage by 95 foot deep..

Sites on this block south along both sides of Granville can be considered for rezoning of six storeys, with choice of use at grade. To date, few rezonings have been completed under the Marpole Community Plan; none yet in this sub-area.

The proposal is for a 6-storey mixed-use building over two levels of underground parking (17 automobile spaces and 25 bike spaces). An FSR of 2.48 is proposed. The Marpole Community plan proposes an FSR limit of 2.50 in this location.

All residential space is secured rental (60 years or life of the building). The building program includes a CRU at grade (2300 square feet) and 19 residential units on levels 2-6. The unit mix is 21% studio (4); 42% 1 bedrooms (8); 31% 2 bedrooms and (6); 5% 3 bedrooms (1).

**The project is considered** under the Marpole Community Plan, which anticipates **6 storey rental buildings** with choice of use at grade between 71st Avenue and South West Marine Drive with an **FSR** limit of 2.50.

- A mix of uses required at grade (retail, service, cultural and institutional, live-work or office)
- 100% rental residential required in existing RM zones
- Up to 6-storeys, up to 2.50 FSR
- Upper storeys massed/set back to minimize appearance of scale/shadow; 2-3 storey continuous street wall

Tim Potter and reviewed the physical properties of the site and its setbacks under the plan with the panel. He then sought their advice and comments on the proposed **rezoning** application as follows:

1. Please comment on the building massing and overall form of development. Does the building relate well to its context?
2. Please comment on the ground level uses and preliminary space planning;
3. At a rezoning level please offer preliminary comments on the expression of the building, material palette and their execution;

4. Please comment on the overall landscape plan and outside amenity areas;
5. In summary, is the proposal's overall massing, bulk, density, and overall building design supportable?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted the side setbacks occur only at residential levels. The front, rear and sides are also setback to increase the massing impact on the street. For amenity of the residents, there is a generous amenity room including common. There is outdoor space on the second level and a rooftop terrace proposed above the sixth floor.

There are no existing trees on site. There is a generous sidewalk with a 5 foot boulevard and an 8 foot zone for pedestrian passage. There are two proposed entries marked on Granville; one is residential and the other is for the restaurant. The lane has an exit stairway marked with planting. The proposed roof deck has two areas in it: a seating social area, and an open area with communal gardens.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Amela Brudar and seconded by Ms. Helen Avini Besharat, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel THAT:

the applicant **RESUBMIT** the proposal with the following recommendations:

- The building presented has too much complexity and needs to be simplified;
  - A few stronger design moves will work better given a small site;
  - The residential lobby must be more prominent; and
  - Further design development to the units is required to enhance their livability.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that it should be precedent setting building that begins a 'good dialogue' on the street. It is a challenging site with urban issues that need to be addressed. It is a small site and the massing has too many setbacks.

The canopy is not well resolved. The lobby is too convoluted. Include a nicer set of stairs to encourage residents to use stairs. Scissor stairs may help gain efficiency to the overall design. There are livability concerns with unit plans; the residential units should be more efficient.

The landscaping aspects are too segmented. The green space should be at different levels. There should be more of a green buffer along Granville. The patios need more plantings. The deck outside needs more amenity features such as a variety of uses for the residents. The rooftop is too small to warrant a stair and elevator. The penthouse could be roof access only since everyone has balconies.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel.

---

4.Address:	<b>619-675 W Hastings Street</b>
Permit No.:	RZ-2016-00028
Description:	The proposal is for a 28-storey office building with a height of 108 m (353 ft.), a floor area of 14,756 m <sup>2</sup> (158,837 sq. ft.) and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 25.5, over five levels of underground parking (67 vehicle spaces), with seismic upgrading and heritage designation of the exterior façade of the RBC Building at 675 West Hastings Street. This rezoning application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the Central Business District (CBD) and CBD Shoulder the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan and the Downtown (Except Downtown South) Design Guidelines.
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Musson Cattell MacKay Partnership (Mark Thompson)
Owner:	Permanent Enterprises Ltd.
Delegation:	Mark Thompson, MCM Daryl Tyack, ETA
Staff:	Michael Naylor & Marie Linehan

---

## EVALUATION: SUPPORT

**Introduction:** Michael Naylor, rezoning planner, introduced the location and conditions on the two legal parcels that make up the rezoning site. He provided an overview of the existing zoning and of the Metro Core Jobs & Economy policy which enables consideration of the rezoning.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, noted the rezoning application is to increase the density from the allowable 9.0 FSR under the Downtown District Official Development Plan to 25.55 FSR to develop a 28-storey office building. The Queen Elizabeth view cone limits height on this site to approximately 352 feet (as is proposed).

In the context of this block, there are approved rezoning applications for a 32-storey office building for the corner site to the north, at Granville and Cordova Streets (currently a parkade), and a 25-storey office building for the corner site to the east, at Seymour and Hastings Streets (currently a plaza). There is a 10-storey building on the adjacent lot to the east. The 18-storey Royal Bank Building, located at the adjacent site to the west, and constructed between 1929 and 1931, is a Heritage-A listed building, and is significant as the City's first banking tower. The subject site is small infill site of 52 feet by 120 feet. The site is currently vacant and under the same ownership as the Royal Bank Building.

The proposed office tower is 28 storeys with floor plates ranging from 5, 360 square feet to 6, 100 square feet. 5 levels of underground parking are accessed from car elevators at the lane, the lane being about 10 feet below the street. Common roof deck access is provided.

The building is set back approximately 1 meter from the front property line to allow for a wider sidewalk. The office tower has shallow steps in the massing that align with the stepped massing of the Royal Bank Building. A recess is provided in response to existing recess at the Royal Bank to create a light well. The floor levels align with those at the Royal Bank Building. The structure of the new building, including its core, shear walls and a series of horizontal struts at each floor level connecting to the Royal Bank floors, is designed to seismically restrain the Royal Bank Building. Parapet and balustrade elements are to be anchored, and the exterior is to be designated. For the new building, curtain wall cladding is proposed, with vertical fins of varying depth at the front and west side elevations.

---

Ms. Linehan then took questions from the panel.

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

Comment on the proposed height, density and form of development, in particular:

1. Does the proposed form of development provide an appropriate response to the adjacent Royal Bank Building and the overall context?
  2. Provide advice on the proposed façade design (fin elements) moving forward to Development Permit stage.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that it is rare to have a vacant site next to a heritage building. It is a unique opportunity to preserve and upgrade the heritage building without affecting the occupants.

The proposed solution is to use the structure of the new building to support the heritage building. The overall proposed design is intended to be a respectful modern response to the neighbour. The setback at grade signifies entry. The façade design responds to the stepping, and the floor levels align due to the proposed structural solution. It was noted that there is an opportunity in the future to link the floors. The vertical proportions are narrow. The elongation helps with the relationship between the two buildings. The articulation of the fins provides a response to the adjacent horizontal floor levels and fenestration.

Another major massing move is the introduction of the light well. The light well is completed with the new building. The roof is to be glazed to create a more tempered space, and to improve the thermal performance.

There is a rooftop deck proposed with two stories of glass screening. There is some vegetation and a kitchen on the roof as an amenity for office workers.

With respect to the windows shown at the property line, there is the possibility to use 2 hour fire-rated glass (preferred) or exterior sprinklers or fire shutters (not preferred).

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Yijin Wen and seconded by Mr. James Cheng, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel THAT:

The Panel **SUPPORT** the project.

**Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the minimalist, elegant design is appreciated and will be a positive contribution to new architecture in Vancouver. One panel member commented that the entry should be treated to acknowledge the entrance to the RBC building.

The preservation of the light well and recess in the new building is appreciated. The horizontality is successful. Minor comments include: the south and west elevation facing the heritage building are done well, but the east and north elevations seem neglected and require a different resolution. One panel member suggested the introduction of a discrete cantilever above the heritage building to reallocate space and create more distance between the north building and lane.

The amenity space on the rooftop is welcomed. With the high screen walls at the perimeter, the roof landscape creates a unique microclimate, so explore the type of planting appropriate to that use. There could be a more lush area, like a conservatory space.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel.

5.	Address:	3365 Commercial Drive
	Permit No.	DP-2017-00181
	Description:	To develop the site with a 6-storey and a 4-storey residential building (comprised of 111 secured market rental units) and to restore the Class C heritage house at 3365 Commercial and to create 2 new strata titled units. Also, to construct a new infill duplex (strata titled) behind the heritage house.
	Zoning:	RS-2 to CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	Second (DP after RZ)
	Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture (Taizo Yamamoto)
	Owner:	Wh-han Gurvich, Cressey Developments
	Delegation:	Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Draute Kreuk
	Staff:	Marie Linehan

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, noted this is a Development Permit application following Rezoning, which was approved by Council on June 28, 2016. Council enacted the CD-1 By-Law on November 15, 2016 which approved the use, height, and form of development, and a density of 2.55 FSR. The Urban Design Panel reviewed and supported the Rezoning Application on June 3, 2015.

The rezoning was approved under the City's Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy which allows for the consideration of projects that create affordable housing on or near arterials, in this case the provision of 111 units of secured market rental housing in the new building at this site at Commercial Drive and East 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Under the Affordable Housing Choices Policy 6 storeys may be considered on arterials, and 3.5 storeys along the non-arterial frontage.

Ms. Linehan noted that there was also a heritage component to the rezoning. An existing single family house on the north side of the site, the Myers Residence, constructed in 1911, will be retained and relocated to face East 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and to align generally with existing homes to the west.

The house will be restored, designated, and converted to contain 2 strata units with a new 2 unit strata infill at the rear. Under the CD-1 By-Law this is a separate sub-area from the rental building.

The existing site is significantly treed. A stand of five 50 foot Lawson Cypress trees is to be retained at the corner, and a 75 foot Western Hemlock at the middle of the site. Immediately to the north of the site is a 2 storey apartment building built. To the west are primarily single family homes. It is noted that the grade rises fairly sharply to the west along East 18<sup>th</sup>. The zoning along the Victoria Diversion is generally mixed use MC-1 and C-2, as well as some CD-1 rezoning sites, with a range in heights from 4 to 6 storeys.

The Skytrain Guideway runs along Commercial Drive on the east side.

Ms. Linehan outlined changes to the form of development in response to the conditions of the rezoning, as well as previous advice of the Panel.

Ms. Linehan then took questions from the panel.

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

- Has the proposal provided a suitable response to the key issues raised by the review of the Urban Design Panel at the rezoning stage, as follows:
  - Design development to improve the grade conditions around the predate dwelling and existing adjacent development;
  - Design development to better integrate the infill building with the predate dwelling and give more space to predate dwelling;
  - Design development to improve the massing and expression of the 6-storey block;
  - Design development of Commercial Streetscape to be more pedestrian friendly and to buffer vehicular traffic;
  - Design development to improve the bridging element by radically reducing its mass;
  - Consider an accessible roof on the 4-storey block;
  - Re-examine site circulation to minimize paving;
  - Consider revising 4-storey ground floor units to 2-storey townhouses on bottom.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted the heritage house is situated to maintain the original entry porch height above grade. The lower grade and west retaining wall provides a private enclosure for the courtyard at the infill site. The reorientation of the infill with entries facing the courtyard is proposed create a 'dialogue' to the heritage house.

With the six storey building, it is a struggle with the geometry of the building to read as a single form. There is a series of brick walls as organising elements, and a sawtooth massing proposed along 18<sup>th</sup> to better relate to the retained trees. At the Commercial Drive façade, the proposed punched windows and individual balconies provide a more residential scale. It is a much quieter approach than the previous iteration. It was noted that the street trees had to be placed at the inner boulevard at Commercial Drive.

The bridge design was a significant improvement because it brings more light into the corridor. It more clearly separates the building into two wings. For the 4 storey building, two storey units were located at the top of the building. This allowed reduction to the massing of upper level. Roof access was not provided noting concerns about overlook. The parkade entrance was flipped to allow a more compact form.

Paving was reduced by re-configuring the lobby and the lobby was pulled forward for a clearer entry sequence. The amenity garden was rearranged to retain the trees in the proposal. The amount of existing trees lost was of significant concern to the neighbourhood, so it is proposed planting a second row of street trees at the front yard along East 18th. The lower patios also have a more positive relationship with the play area in the latest design.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Yijin and seconded by Mr. Cheng, and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations:

- The duplex expression should be re-examined to relate better to the overall architectural expression.
  - Delete artificial turf.
  - Improve the main entry canopy expression.
  - The green roof may not be worthwhile as it is high maintenance.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the proposal responds well to the challenging site geometry and to the key issues raised by the review of the Urban Design Panel at the rezoning stage. It was noted that the design is much better in response to the previous commentary.

Some further comments were that the front roofline should be simplified at the corner. Some members preferred the linear balconies from the rezoning stage to the segmented balconies. The front setback to the 6<sup>th</sup> floor was noted as uncomfortable: it should either be increased to be functional, or deleted. Weather protection should be added to all top balconies. Many members noted that the infill should be more modern and honest in its expression, rather than ‘faux’ heritage, while it was noted that the reorientation was an improvement. It was noted that the main entry canopy feels ‘outdated’ and heavy.

The amenity room could have more sun exposure in a different location. It was recommended to eliminate some hardscape and replace the artificial turf. The space under the tree could be a wood chip dog-park, and additional play space provided in the current dog-park location. It was acknowledged that the side pathway between the subareas is a required exit from the courtyard, but suggested it could read as more of a ‘landscape’ treatment than paved surface.

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

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.