

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 12, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Kim Smith (Chair)
Karen Spoelstra
Helen Avini Besharat
Amela Brudar
David Jerke
Meredith Anderson
Yijin Wen
Neal LaMontagne
Nell Gasiewicz

REGRETS: Renee Van Halm
Veronica Gillies
Muneesh Sharma
James Cheng

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|----------------------------|
| 1. 1055 Harwood Street |
| 2. 1380-1382 Hornby Street |
| 3. 801 Pacific Street |
| 4. 2395-2443 Kingsway |
-

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.

1. Address: 1055 Harwood Street
 Permit No.: RZ-2017-00024
 Description: The proposal is to develop a 32-storey residential building with 82 market residential units and 44 social housing units; for a total floor area of 54,539 sq. m (178,974 sq. ft.) and density of 10.35 FSR; a height of 91.44 m (300 ft.); over four levels of underground parking accessed from the lane, with 156 vehicle parking stalls and 158 bicycle parking stalls.
 Zoning: RM-5A to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: NSDA Architects
 Owner: Cameron Thorn, STRAND
 Delegation: Richard Henry, Architect, Richard Henry Architect
 Tom Staniscus, NSDA
 Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk
 Jubin Jalili, Integral Group
 Staff: Linda Gillan & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Linda Gillan, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a site located on the north side of Harwood Street between Burrard and Thurlow Streets. The frontage is 132 feet on Harwood and 131 feet deep, with a site size of approximately 17,300 square feet. Currently there is a 3-storey residential building on the site. The application is being considered under the Rezoning Policy for the West End, and the West End Community Plan. The site is part of the Burrard Corridor area of the West End. For sites with a minimum frontage of 130 feet, rezoning applications can be considered for:
 - Market residential
 - With heights of up to 300 feet
 - Typical tower floor plates of 5,500 square feet
 - If 25 % of the total floor area is proposed as social housing

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 RM-5A (Multiple Dwelling) District to CD-1 to allow for a 32 storey mixed-use building, with:

- 44 social units on levels 2-8;
- 82 market residential units on levels 9 - 32;
- A proposed total floor area of just under 179,900 square feet, or 10.35 FSR; and
- A proposed height of 91.4 m (300 feet)

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project as a mid-block site, between Thurlow and Burrard Streets that slopes approximately 8 feet from the lane down to the street. Nearby towers reflect current base zoning that is RM-5A, which allows for 190 feet and 2.2 FSR, a 20-storey range. The nearby CD-1 sites are 1009 Harwood at 150 feet and 1275 Burrard at 185 feet. There is a mix of older 3- to 4- storey walk-ups at to the west along Thurlow Street.

Form of development direction is provided in the West End Plan and accompanying rezoning policy, and in the “West End Tower Form, Siting and Setbacks” administrative bulletin, including:

- A maximum 300 ft. height, for rezoning applications that include 25% of the floor space as social housing;
- A minimum 80 ft. separation between towers;
- Front and side yards equal to a minimum 12 ft. tower setback at interior property line with a minimum 40 feet;
- A “Tower in the park” typology;
- Floorplate for tower is a maximum 5,500 sq. ft.;
- A base can be up to 15% larger
- The depth of tower limited to 85 ft. (to avoid “slab” buildings);
- The tower (ie. above 60 ft.) should be sculpted to maximize “sunlight and public views”, and to provide “identity and variety” to the skyline; and
- Maximum FSR is subject to urban design performance.

Parking access is required by the City to be from lane. The proposal is to locate the parking ramp in the Northwest corner, so west side yard and a portion of the front yard are taken up by parkade ramp. It creates a 3.5 foot “wall” at the front property line.

The solution as proposed is not supported by staff. The applicant is currently working on an alternative solution that fulfills requirement to provide access from lane and provides a better public realm along Harwood Street. The panel’s constructive comments on developing the best solution are welcome.

The yards are in line with “tower in park” policy, with a 24 ft. front yard, 12 ft. east side yard, and 16 ft. rear yard.

Both entries (market and non-market housing) are located off Harwood Street:

- Market entry in the centre of the site; non-market housing entry to the east, at the side yard;
- Market outdoor amenity is in a sunken “courtyard” framed by parkade ramp, with a contiguous amenity room at grade on level 1;
- Non-market outdoor space is on the upper terrace, at the lane, with a contiguous amenity room at Level 2, due to change in grade;
- Parallel loading space is provided at grade along the lane; and
- East side yard is sunken with an 8 ft. retaining wall at the property line. It provides access from street to lane, as well as some light to non-market lobby and offices.

The tower includes social housing from Levels 2 to 8, and market housing on Levels 9 to 32. The base of the tower is 76 ft. wide and 92 ft. deep, which exceeds the 85 ft. depth in the administrative bulletin for depth at 85 ft., noting that this design was proposed before the administrative bulletin was finalized. There is a 40 ft. setback at west property line, per policy. The tower is not shaped or sculpted for views/skyline, per policy. Instead, it uses a strong orthogonal “frame” for architectural expression. Balconies are variously inset into/project from frame.

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

1. Please provide comments to assist the successful resolution of the parking access from the lane.
2. Is the remaining ground level and interface with the public realm successful?
Please consider site “edges” including the sunken area at the east property line, the entries at the front property line, and lane environment.
3. Is the shaping of the tower and “base” successful?

Consider policy objectives of: tower in the park; maximizing sunlight and public/private views; and contributing to skyline.

4. Is the provision of common indoor and outdoor successful?
For both the proposed non-market and market housing
5. Please comment on the preliminary architectural expression and sustainable design features, to assist the applicant in a future development permit application.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the contextual references to the towers. They are simple forms with a flat top. The other reference is the mid-rise buildings around the West End. The buildings create a street level scale. There are smaller floorplates and larger units for access to daylight and views proposed. There is a mix of studios up to 3 bedrooms. There are semi-enclosed balconies. The two buildings are competing with functions to a relationship at grade. The applicant commented on the interiors (which are not subject to Urban Design Panel review). The building is meant to be clean, simple and slender. The elevations represent a 47% glass wall ratio. There is triple glazing, tinted glass, deep balconies with solar shading proposed. There is a state of the art mechanical system in the design.

The ramp has been required to be removed from the City, and the proposal will be adjusted leaving a more open landscaped space. The applicant noted that connectivity to the lane would be disrupted with a required new design to relocate the parking ramp. A loading bay would be provided at the side yard instead.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Spoelstra and seconded by Ms. Anderson and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **Recommend the Resubmission** of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Re-evaluate the ramp solution in order for the panel to have adequate information to evaluate the proposed design
- Resolve parking access for a better relationship on Harwood Street to the building
- Pay more attention to passive shading elements on the building and
- Reconsider the use of tinted glass to stay within the West End tower expression

Related Commentary: Overall the panel noted that the building form, massing, and setbacks work well into the context of the West End. The height and extended floor plate are well done. The base of the building is successful.

However, the panel noted that the parking and access to the lane with regards to the ramp was unresolved. One panel mentioned the ramp can be taken into the building in a way that the public realm would be benefited.

Keep the integrity of the tower. Enhancement will be needed at the punch window base expression. The trellis feature could be developed further and be extended eastward.

The service areas will be compromised with a different solution. Revisit the slopes to reduce the incline. The two access entries should be side by side, provide perforations in the devising wall.

Consider bridge over the ground floor amenities. There is not enough amenity space, according to one panel member, but another panel member thought the amenity spaces were well laid out and generous. A panel member recommended a beautiful landscape wall.

Sustainability wise, look at shading devices on the south, east and west sides of the building. A more passive solar approach is encouraged. Review your glazing strategy. Devise a strategy with clear glazing.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted the recommendation by planning to change the ramp design was not preferred.

2. Address:	1380-1382 Hornby Street
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00305
Description:	To develop the site with a 39 storey market residential building comprising 214 dwelling units, all over 8 levels of underground parking, accessed off of the lane; and to restore the existing Heritage house (Leslie House) and convert to a commercial strata unit. For an overall FSR of 16.4.
Zoning:	CD-1 Revised
Application Status:	DP after RZ
Review:	Second
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Marc Josephson, Grosvener
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, Architect, IBI Group Maxime Frappier, Architect, ACDF Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as a relatively small site at 125' by 120 feet. While there are no minimum frontage requirements in this subarea of the downtown zoning, the applicable Design Guidelines do delineate a maximum floorplate as a function of the site frontage and the proposed tower height.

Constraints were placed on this site through requirements from Engineering's statutory right of way. For a bike lane, a left-turn bay, and also Planning's requirement for a minimum 12 feet wide sidewalk, as per policy for Pacific Street. The rezoning application also took responsibilities of the previous CD-1, which is to retain and restore the Leslie House. However, in this application, the location of the Leslie House is proposed to be facing Pacific Street instead.

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

- 1) Please provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression as a residential tower project. In particular, the north and south facades.
- 2) Does the proposal successfully integrate the Leslie House in the overall composition with respect to scale transition, direct adjacencies, landscaping and accessibility for the public?
- 3) Please provide commentary on the proposal's response to the public realm, including the proposed landscaping and the site's interface of these spaces with the public sidewalk and street.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the tower should be tailor made to the site and intended to be a landmark building. It is meant to be distinctive to the other towers in Vancouver. The proposal uses simple massing with a contrast of materiality with different facades, for example north and south facades. The intent was to integrate some 'classical components' such as columns. The design has framing strategies includes a stainless steel trim. It is a project tailored to the constraints. The second scale is the neighbouring scale. It is a good partner to the neighbouring sites. The third scale is the 5th façade which is developed balcony 'texture' and residential look. The balcony design is in a 'zig zag' shape and protruding.

The water fountain and one of the columns and planters were eliminated in the iteration. The proposed materiality is minimal with brick, stone and aging friendly and the design is human scale. The landscape design was simplified with moss and simple trees, and wraps around the Leslie House.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- To re-examine the north and south façade with solar orientation reflecting more modulation in the facades
 - To improve the amenity areas
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted the project's excellent execution, great parti and handsome building. Look into the frame on Hornby Street in order to keep it pristine and simple and beautiful. Some panel members thought the north and south facades were too 'monolithic' while other members appreciated the facades.

The universal accessibility is an issue to the Leslie Building front. With respect to the amenity area, it should be programmed more, by enlarging or enhancement for families. The water feature removal is a good move. The north and south is an interesting change. The public realm and the green roof are nice.

The landscaping on the site is well handled. Panel members said tinted glass should be mitigated to add extra solar shading. With the quality of light in Vancouver, tinted glass is not a good residential solution. An energy model driving the decision is a good move.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team remarked that the Leslie House is raised for heritage reasons. The walkway down the side is for disabled person access. The fin wall on the west side in the tower plan, is designed for potential occupant discomfort in high winds.

3. Address:	801 Pacific Street
Permit No.:	DP-2017- 00497
Description:	To develop the site with a 7 storey arts and culture facility as part of the AC payable for the rezoning of 1380-1382 Hornby St. The facility will be built to a “warm shell” condition. FSR of 3.51, all over 1 level of underground parking.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	C
Review:	First
Architect:	Franc Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Marc Josephson, Grosvenor
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, Architect, IBI Group Maxine Frappier, Architect, ACDF Architect Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

Introduction: Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as a very small downtown site measuring 50’ by 120’ feet, on the northwest corner of Pacific and Howe. Located directly on Howe Street, it is situated within the unique context of the Granville Street on-ramp. Under the downtown zoning, this site would likely qualify for a similar height and density. The site was rezoned primarily for the change in use.

This project was not reviewed by the UDP during the rezoning stage, since it was generally in height and volume conforming to the downtown zoning.

As part of the community amenity contribution (CAC) from 1380 Pacific, this proposed building will be built and finished before being handed over to the City of Vancouver for public ownership, and operated by a non-profit organization to foster art and culture.

Design considerations and constraints include: a relationship with neighbour to the north and hotel with rooms and other spaces facing south. However there is an 18 foot setback from the shared property line for the hotel building. As part of the rezoning process, the applicant provided an analysis of the existing functions facing south, and staff arrived at a required minimum setback requirement for those storeys facing hotel rooms (getting a total 25 feet), while not requiring a setback for the lower levels that have lobby and washroom functions.

Further constraints were placed on this site through requirements from Engineering’s street right of way. A 13’-9” setback required off the Pacific Street property line for a bike lane and also Planning’s requirement for a minimum 12 foot wide sidewalk and for a large tree canopy as per policy for Pacific Street.

The overall resulting floorplate is rather small. The proposal is for a seven-storey building, the internal programming of which is still yet to be completely confirmed. There is an upper storey setback on the north side and a cantilevering element on the east side to maximize floor area for this cultural facility proposed.

Since it is going to be a City-owned, the building is required to meet the Passivhaus certification. This promises to be our first publicly-owned Passivhaus building.

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

- 1) Please provide commentary on the overall architectural expression for this future publicly-owned cultural facility. In particular, do the proposed facades require further nuancing for visual punctuation or sensitivity to their particular orientations?
- 2) Please comment on the materiality of the proposed exterior walls.
- 3) Please comment on the ground-floor interface with the public sidewalk.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The glazing will be triple and the window system is design for 'super-efficiency'. The passive house has been the driver for the design. The composition of the design is in '4 shades of grey'. The underside of the building volume features art pieces on the ground floor. The floor plate is meant to be flexible for the future. 55% opaque walls are proposed for installation with tall windows. The plaza design has room for temporary installation with a shared path and car stall at the back and delivery space as well as room for bikes at the front. There is a backdrop greenwall proposed. The space designed for 'BC Artscape' and is an open ended space that is designed to be a flexible space. The focus is on providing windows on the north, east and west.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- Bring in more light in into the design in a controlled way, perhaps through the roof areas
 - Re-examine the grass on the ground level to create more hardscape
 - Add some colour to the building to tie the design into Leslie House and express the art function of the building.
 - Look at the massing on the north façade and re-consider the expression
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel commented that it is a worthwhile building and an increased level of attention has been given to this project. One panel member mentioned that the building is restrained and playful at the same time.

The architectural expression does not indicate that it will be used by artists. Re-consider the north façade in order to add more art to it. Explore movable exterior partitions to reflect the function of the floor. Other recommendations include: making the windows larger, making the setback slightly smaller, and making the 2nd floor cantilevered.

The ground floor interface with the sidewalk needs to create more opportunity for people to linger around the building. The entrance along the street façade is too hard to find, according to one panel member.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team appreciated the comments from the panel. The art installation on the ground floor could use the opaque wall to use as a space for art.

4. Address:	2395-2443 Kingsway
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00056
Description:	To develop two mixed-use buildings: a 12-storey and a 5-storey residential tower with 12 units of commercial at grade over two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	RT-2 & C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	DP after RZ
Review:	Second
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Darren Traster, Imani Development
Delegation:	Tim Ankerman, Architect, AMA Dimitar Bonadlion, Architect, AMA Peter Kruek, Landscape Architect, DKL
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as an application to develop a site on Kingsway in the Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan area.

The site is located on the north side of Kingsway between Nanaimo and Clarendon Streets. It is a six-lot assembly zoned CD-1 on the eastern-most lot.

The proposal is to build a mixed use development with two buildings, one at four-storeys and the other, including a twelve-storey element over a five-storey podium.

The site falls within the Kingsway Rezoning Policy area in Norquay Village. It is one of three mid-block sites on Kingsway, where the Plan allows a height of twelve-storeys in exchange for public realm improvements, specifically, open space and mid-block pedestrian connections. The base building height along the rest of Kingsway is generally ten-storeys. The permitted density on all of these sites along Kingsway is 3.8 FSR.

To the east is a four-storey mixed-used building with commercial at grade and market residential on top, developed under C-2 in 1995. To the west are more houses and duplexes for the rest of the block. Across Kingsway there is the 2400 Motel site, a four-storey C-2 development with market residential, and the mixed-use development of the previous Eldorado Hotel site, including a 22-storey tower (CD-1 487). Across the lane is the Apartment Transition Zone, zoned for 4-storey apartments, which is currently developed with single family houses.

The site size is approximately 31,000 square feet, with a 297-foot frontage along Kingsway, and a 106-foot lot depth. The grade drops from east to west approximately 6 feet, and the site also slopes down from the lane to street, up to approximately 12 feet. As such a retaining wall currently exists along the front property line. The “plaza” and a pedestrian access from Kingsway to the lane align with a proposed mid-block pedestrian-activated crossing on Kingsway, a requirement of the Norquay Plan. Also, the building is setback to achieve a 25 foot wide Kingsway sidewalk, also required by the Plan.

The proposal is to develop a 13-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade fronting Kingsway and market residential units on upper floors. Form of development consists of a 5-storey podium and a thirteen-storey tower located in the mid-section of the site. The density is 3.8 FSR (121,157 square feet of total floor area).

142 market residential units are proposed, with a mix of one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. Some two-level townhouse units are proposed fronting the back lane. Underground parking is provided from the lane.

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

1. Does the design of the entire mid-block plaza demonstrate a successful programming of public spaces that will welcome public use through the provision of active edges and attractive landscape elements?
2. Do the proposed building designs successfully generate sufficient visual interest as seen from the adjacent sidewalk, the mid-block plaza and from a far distance?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The intention was to animate both facades and have an entrance to the mews. The applicant proposes an 'interesting' choice of materials. The previous panel enjoyed the bar around the building, so the applicant retained the band in the latest proposal.

Seating nodes are created in the centre of the space. Finally, there is an area designed for public art installation. There is a kids play space and planters proposed in the common area as well as urban agriculture.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- Add more articulation and variety to the retail level of the project
 - Look at simplifying or tying things into the buildings
 - Light the plaza well at night
 - Combine indoor and outdoor amenity spaces so they work with each other
 - Look at loading and unloading spaces for commercial retail spaces
 - Look at the solar orientation of the building
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the general composition works well and it has a potential to become a great space. One panel member thought the horizontal band is arbitrary and disconnected from the rest of the building and urged the applicant to look into the expression a bit more because the parti is not clear right now.

The mid block plaza is well done and well animated. At the north end there should be a feature that draws you through. One recommendation is to calm the residential expression and move it to the commercial level instead.

The sustainability component is not understood enough, according to one panel member. Glazing needs improvement in its orientation and passive design. The mews and landscaping is well handled.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments. In particular the comment on the monotony of the streetscape was appreciated.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.