

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: August 9, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Kim Smith (Chair)
Karen Spoelstra (Excused from Item #1)
Helen Avini Besharat
Yijin Wen (excused from item #1)
Neal LaMontagne (excused from item #1)
James Cheng
Renee Van Halm
Muneesh Sharma
Veronica Gillies
Meredith Anderson
David Jerke

REGRETS: Amela Brudar

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 105 Keefer Street & 544 Columbia Street
2. 8559 Oak Street
3. 77 E Broadway
4. 138 E 8th Avenue
5. Cambie Corridor Plan - Phase 3 - Oakridge Municipal Town Centre

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: **105 Keefer Street & 544 Columbia Street**
Permit No.: DP-2017-00681
Description: To develop a 9-storey mixed use building providing 120 dwelling units and commercial uses at grade over 3 levels of underground parking.
Zoning: HA-1A
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Fourth (First as a DP application)
Architect: Merrick Architecture
Owner: Rob Fioruguto, Bernie Living
Delegation: Gregory Borowski, Architect, Merrick Architects
Paul Merrick, Architect, Merrick Architects
Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architects, PWL Partnership
Staff: Tim Potter on behalf of Danielle Wiley
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the project by reviewing the site, its context and the related zoning and sought advice from the Panel on this application sought by asking the following questions:
 1. Given the parameters of the HA-1A zone (i.e. 105 foot height; FSR based on urban design performance), is the massing appropriate for the site and context?
 2. Are the pedestrian realm and retail storefront on the street frontages successfully resolved?
 3. Please comment on the success of the atrium as an extension of the public realm, and on the functionality of the double-fronted retail.
 4. Is the composition of the building elevations, including corner expression, successful?
 5. Are the architectural articulation, material quality, and ornamentation successful and appropriate for the Chinatown context?

Mr. Potter then took questions from the panel.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the proposal was approached under zoning and acknowledged the previous iteration was not supported for a rezoning. Refinements in the proposal included reduction in height by 3 storeys, and sculpting the western façade. The cultural facilities are retained in the same location for historical, and practical, reasons. The north-south scale increment has been reinforced. The building design is broken down into portions varying in colour and material to provide enrichment and variety in the massing. The layering of patterns in the exterior elevations is also important to the design to speak to the character of Chinatown.

The awnings are designed to retract. The ground floor is organized with full circulation in order to make the double fronted retail 'work' and 'free up the ground-plane'. The cultural centre functions include Chinese opera and other traditional cultural activities.

The road is intended to become pedestrianized and provide connections to the night market. The vertical signage is intended for public art work.

The landscape is a continuation of the rezoning proposal. The entrance ways are mosaic patterned, the materiality of the sidewalk is concrete, with glass introduced. The details are a modern interpretation of the historical elements. The alley way is granite with a smooth top and the materiality of Chinatown carries throughout the project. A separation between the plaza and building face is expressed as a 'public realm'. The upper level has more 'semi-private amenity space'. The upper roof deck is connected as one with a play area and urban garden. The tree selection is a response to Sun Yet Sen and a nod to Chinatown.

The applicant team took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Avini Besharat and seconded by Mr. Sharma 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:

- Reconsider the glass top units to be more in keeping with vocabulary of the rest of the building
 - Look at the glass divider units to better address their solar orientation
 - Examine and enhance an articulation of the corner
 - Add some vibrancy to colour choice and look at the language of the ornamentation
 - Address the glass box treatment
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted the composition is very strong and the articulation and material is successful. Panel members noted the atrium should be functional. The glazing can improve in vocabulary and character. The retail space should front more on Columbia Street.

Bikes storage and removal should be studied. There should be a professional artist on board to look at the fritting, decorative panels, and public art and materials. The scale of the small patterning still has something missing. The retail side should have rain protection.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their insight and appreciated the detailed comments.

2. Address:	8559 Oak Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00021
Description:	To develop a 6-storey residential development with 36 secured market rental units, over two levels of underground parking. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.5. The application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning:	RM-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	RZ
Review:	First
Architect:	NORR Architects
Owner:	Maiway Investment Ltd.
Delegation:	Glenn Bowell, Architects, Norr Architects Kevan Tacq, Architect, Norr Architects Mary Chan-Yip, Landscape Architect, PMG Landscape Architects
Staff:	Beverley White & Susan Chang

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Beverley White, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a site at the northwest corner of Oak Street and 70th Avenue, in Marpole. The site is zoned RM-3A and currently consists of a 3-storey residential building containing 13 rental units (built 1957) with surface parking accessed off 70th Avenue. The site is approximately 12,500 sq. ft. with 100 ft. frontage on Oak Street and 125 ft. frontage on 70th. A 17 ft. dedication from the 70th Avenue property line is sought and the proposal reflects that dedication. Existing healthy trees bordering the north and south property lines are to be retained wherever possible.

To the north and along Oak Street, the current zoning is RT-2, primarily developed with duplexes and single-family homes. Along 70th, sites are currently zoned RM-3A and are primarily developed with 3-storey apartment buildings. Northwest of the site, across the lane sites are zoned RM-8, which allows for townhouses up to 3-storeys and 1.2 FSR. The subject site and surrounding sites fronting Oak and 70th are in in the “Oak Neighbourhood Apartment Area” in the Marpole Plan. This allows consideration of residential buildings up to 6-storeys and density up to 2.5 FSR. Further north at Oak and 67th, the Marpole Plan allows for consideration of mixed-use buildings up to 8-storeys and up to 3 FSR.

There are two nearby rezoning applications: 8378 Oak Street, a 6-storey residential building with 38 dwelling units at 2.49 FSR; and 8242 Oak Street, an 8-storey mixed-use building with 50 residential units at 3.0 FSR.

The proposal is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan and is for a 6-storey rental residential building with a total of 36 dwelling units over two levels of underground parking. There is no lane access; parking is accessed from 70th Avenue. An FSR of 2.5 is proposed, which is the generally considered to be the upper limit for this area in the Marpole Plan.

Susan Chang, Development Planner, noted that per the Marpole Plan, a 6 storey apartment with transitional setbacks above the 4th storey is expected. The scale of the building is expected to be reduced towards the lane to minimize shadow and overlook to adjacent properties (by stepping the building form). For a standard lot depth a rear setback of 16 ft. is appropriate to provide outdoor space as well as to reduce overlook to neighbours. The proposal is for a deeper built form. To provide visual interest and variation, buildings to include individual entrances facing the street.

Marpole Plan seeks public realm improvements especially on arterial routes, to create a buffering landscaped street edge. This includes an 8 ft. sidewalk width, a row of boulevard trees towards the street and another row inside the property. This results in a minimum 26 ft. setback from curb to building face along 70th Avenue and Oak Street. There is a 17 ft. building line along 70th Avenue as well as a 15 ft. corner cut.

This is a corner lot with limited lane access. Proponents were directed to consolidate with either the west or north property, however on the north side there is a 5 ft. sewage easement and assembly was not achieved on the west side. Therefore parkade access is maintained at 70th Avenue. The building entry is at Oak Street. Amenity room and related outdoor space are located at the 6th storey.

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

1. Do you support the form/massing and density?
 - Additional comments on building massing, orientation, and shadowing impacts as it relates to the neighbouring north property.
2. Please comment on the ground floor interface with the public realm along 70th and Oak, and building entry.
3. Please comment on the landscape design's interface with public realm.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the mandate was to replace the existing rental with more rental. The form has changed due to the building line and public realm setbacks. The design had originally located amenity area at grade, and at the rear. The proposal was pushed on all sides by the setbacks that limited the options. The setbacks confined the amenity to the roof top space, and the building was pushed back which will help address this busy intersection.

Landscape design is meant to pull pedestrians away from both Oak Street and 70th Avenue. At Oak, there is an at-level-entry that opens up to a more pedestrian friendly plaza. Along 70th there is a large existing Beech tree, with an angled access that offers semi-privacy. There is a double row of street trees along Oak and 70th. Along the north property line more trees are to be retained. There is amenity space and a community roof garden (at the south edge).

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. Cheng and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **RESUBMISSION** with following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Acknowledge the hierarchy of streets. Oak Street is the main artery and should be addressed by the façade. Consider moving the entrance to 70th Avenue (more pedestrian oriented).
- Acknowledge the corner in the massing and the pedestrian pathways.
- Reconsider the glazing and the service locations on the north elevation and revisit the west façade.
- Consider passive measures for solar orientation and consider a green buffer on Oak Street to mitigate noise.

- **Related Commentary:** The building should respond to the corner and the difference between 70th and Oak. Due to noise and traffic on Oak Street, entry should be located at 70th . The lobby and the driveway could be combined (similar to buildings in Kerrisdale) to celebrate the entry.

The diagonal geometry of pavement (at the corner) leads to a blank wall and patio stairs. The amount of pavement exacerbates noise conditions. Smaller pockets could be provided (facing each other) to allow more human interaction. The setbacks could allow a lush green buffer to screen traffic and noise.

The upper storey should be setback at the north side. The units oriented south/north are not working and this is a concern especially for the north facing units. The north elevation should address the amount of glazing, overlook, and shadowing impacts. The viability of retaining the existing trees on the neighbouring property was brought into question. The service uses (located in the middle of the north face), could be relocated closer to the lane.

The site plan or context information is limited. The LEED building score sheets provided should be reflected in the elevations. Solar orientation and passive measures could be better implemented.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted the entryways could be amalgamated. Entry is located at Oak due to site slope but could look at entry at 70th. LEED provisions will be better addressed.

3. Address:	77 E Broadway
Permit No.:	DP-2016-00751
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building comprised of retail and a restaurant at grade and 28 dwelling units from the 2nd to the 6th floor, all over two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Eric Law Architect
Owner:	Wilson Kwok Hing Lam
Delegation:	Eric Law, Architect, Eric Law Architect Inc Denitsa Dimitrova, Architect, PMG Landscape Architects
Staff:	Ji-Taek Park

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner, introduced the project as a development permit application being reviewed under existing C-3A zoning, Central Broadway C-3A Urban Design Guidelines (Mount Pleasant Sub Area), and under Mount Pleasant Community Plan. The site is 77 East Broadway, located at the intersection of East Broadway and Quebec Street, 1 block west of Main Street. Existing adjacent uses and zones are Industrial zone (I-1) with an existing office building to the North, and C-3A across E Broadway (mixed use residential), and Quebec Street.

The proposed development is a 6 storey mixed-use building, with retail/restaurant at grade, and 5 storeys of strata residential above, consisting of 28 residential units (22-1 bedroom, 3-1+den, 3-2 bedroom), with building height of 75 feet, and an FSR of 3.0 (maximum allowed). It provides 2 levels of underground parking accessed from lane, along with at-grade surface parking and loading for commercial use.

Under the Central Broadway C-3A design guidelines, building height is limited to 70' feet, with shoulder of 30' feet, with upper massing occupying no more than 50% of the site frontage. Due to sloping site conditions, proposed building height is above what is permitted in the design guidelines towards the rear of the property. However the upper massing is setback from the Quebec Street to provide solar access down to East 8th Ave as per the design guidelines.

The building is setback 4' from the property line along the East Broadway, providing 18' wide sidewalk, and 4' feet from the Quebec Street for sidewalk widening. The building massing is setback from the lane approximately 15.5' (25.5' from centre of lane), except the stair cases providing a separation from the commercial loading area, and an edge along the Quebec Street. It should be noted that the Mount Pleasant Community Plan identifies this area for an enhanced lane, and possible boulevard park location.

Materials proposed are 2 tone brick, and aluminium metal panel. The Central Broadway C-3A guideline encourages 'use of light colour and texture to unify the physical characteristics of the sub-area'.

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

1. Please comment on the proposed materials as it relates to the Central Broadway C-3A design guidelines.

2. Considering the existing context (pattern of development, existing adjacent uses, site's proximity to Main Street), and the Mount Pleasant Community Plan, please comment on the level of success of the design along the lane interface?
3. Please comment on the overall architectural and landscape expression and composition as they relate to the expectations of the Central Broadway C-3A Guidelines and Mount Pleasant Community Plan?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted there was no setback requirement in the zone. However the road would be widened at the ground level in future. The building can be up to 6 storeys high. The breezeway is a part of the future plans. The materials should match the bright finishes. The buildings are intended to be facing Broadway, and the windows facing the street. The restaurant and market rental units will be owned and operated by the same party.

There will be street planting of trees and there will be complementary plantings continuing around the building. There will be seasonal plantings at the façade as well as gardening activities and lounge areas.

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 **RESUBMISSION** with following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Re-examine the character of the building
 - Make the expression and symmetry of the building more contemporary
 - Make the building more sustainable, including the glazing ratio and the solar orientation
 - Acknowledge the corner of the building
 - Look at the retail and street opportunities on Broadway, possibly add an outdoor patio area
 - Re-examine the Quebec façade to add more articulation and take more advantage of the views
 - Re-examine activating the lane
 - Change the staircase exiting to open up to Quebec street
 - Look at the amenity programming in the lane
 - Consider consolidating parking access in the lane with loading
 - Reconsider lateral stability by looking at stairs
 - Further develop mechanical systems for the next stage of development
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted the building design overall had missed design opportunities. A few panel members noted the design was 'too dated' for Broadway.

Stamped asphalt should be a different material. The ramp should be moved. The restaurant expression and main lobby expression needs work. The elevator core should not be the only 'lateral' element.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team clarified that the upper level size was maximized already and zoning required setbacks in the lane. An entrance on Quebec Street was avoided in order to fit the area of the building onto the site.

4. Address:	138 E 8th Avenue
Permit No.:	DP-2017- 00695
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade and 18 market dwelling units from the 2nd to the 6th floor, all over underground parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Michael Habibi, Green Oak
Delegation:	Tim Ankerman, Architect, Ankerman Marchand Taylor Fan, Architect, Ankerman Marchand
Staff:	Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project as located at 138 East 8th Avenue - 1 block north of Broadway and a ½ block west of Main and is for a 6 storey 74 foot height residences with ground level commercial retail space. This is its first appearance at UDP as a Development Permit Application under C-3A zoning and is located in the Main-Kingsway sub-area as defined by the Central Broadway C-3A Urban Design Guidelines.

The intent of C-3A is to provide for a wide range of goods and services, while preserving the character of the area, and to provide for dwelling uses designed compatibly with commercial uses.

- The Main-Kingsway Sub-area has the highest number of residential units of the C-3A zone.
- Commercial character is comprised of small locally serving retail shops.

Ground floor commercial or retail uses are required fronting the street. The surrounding context includes:

- A new 6 storey residential immediately across 8th at 133
- Heritage structures at 175 East Broadway, 156 E 8th Ave, and 2345 Main Street (all are designated as 'B')
- There is a lane located on the East side
- A possible future lane at the rear.

This proposal is pursuing the increases in achievable height and floor area that the development permit board may permit including:

- an increase to height above 9.2m (The guideline for this is to a height of 70 feet creating a street wall to match significant older buildings.)
- an increase in FSR from 1.0 up to 3.0.
- an additional increase in floor area by a maximum of 10% (up to FSR 3.3) where the increase results from a transfer of heritage density.

The evaluation of these increases are defined by the District Schedule should be based in part on:

- (a) the relationship of the development with any nearby residential areas;
- (b) the height, bulk, location and overall design of the building and its effect on the surrounding buildings, streets and views;
- (c) the effects of overall design on the general amenity of the area;
- (d) the provision for pedestrian needs;
- (e) the preservation of the character for the area; AND
- (f) the design and liveability of any dwelling uses

Per guidelines, materials are encouraged to blend with the existing colours and textures of the heritage masonry buildings in this sub-area.

The lot is 46'x122' sloping approximately 4.5 feet from rear to front. Along the lane the 'H' frame power poles present a design obstacle.

- Residential Entry, Car Elevator and Amenity Space.
- Emphasise location of retail space (it's small).
- Note rear setback of 10 feet is required and 25 feet for Residential.
- Proposes an 11 foot floor to floor with total height of 74 feet.
- 18 total units with 15 two bedrooms and 3 one bedrooms.

The anticipated future development next store would also be C-3A, approximately 6 storeys, 70 feet. There may be a party wall in future on west the west property line. This is the first appearance at the Urban Design Panel with a Development Permit Application under C-3A zoning.

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

- 1) Architectural expression - composition, elements and materiality.
- 2) Height, bulk, and massing in relation to the existing and anticipated future developments.
- 3) Public realm interface including the entries, frontage, and character.
- 4) Liveability in general and specifically dwelling units and amenity space.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the proposal as only the second stacked modular building in Vancouver. The design has been an exercise in making a stack module 'work'. The module has been made as three dimensional as possible. The entry has been celebrated by 'carving' a patio around it. The main lobby is supposed to be 'activated' and meant to provide emergency access. The amenity is more than what is typical but it is meant to be suited to the clientele. The major rooms are meant to have 'seamless indoor outdoor space'.

There are potted plants at the front, and planters are planned around the perimeters of decks.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- Consider the sunken garden amenity with a cover over the hot tub area
 - Consider the laneway and animating it with perhaps graphics or something else
 - Re-consider the V column and the canopy over the entrance of the retail
 - Look at bike storage for visitors to the retail
 - Consider another entrance way other than the coffee shop for accessibility purposes
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the panel appreciated the innovative and 'experimental' design of the project. The composition and materiality is supported. A panel member had concerns for the laneway being 'graffitied', so recommended the applicant 'take charge' of the art in the laneway.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team is excited about the project and will incorporate the comments.

5. Address: **Cambie Corridor Plan - Phase 3 - Oakridge Municipal Town Centre**
Permit No.: DP-2017-00566
Description: A workshop to seek panel members' input on the proposed concepts for the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre (MTC) which covers the area around Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue, and is part of Phase 3 of the Cambie Corridor Planning Program. Project staff will provide a brief presentation on the program objectives, timeline and overview of the three concepts before seeking input on the urban design aspects of the area from the panel through prepared questions and open discussion.
- Application Status: Workshop
Review: First
Staff: Jessie Gresley-Jones & Ann Mclean

NON-EVALUATION WORKSHOP

- **Introduction:** Ann Mclean, Development Planner, introduced the proposed concepts for the proposed Oakridge Municipal Town Centre. This planning program is part of the larger Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Planning program. The Phase 3 program began in April 2015 with a focus on providing ground-oriented housing as a transition from the 6-storey buildings on Cambie and around transit and large sites. The Phase 3 program is also providing a Public Benefit strategy and a Public Realm Plan.

With the escalating need for affordable housing in the city we are taking a fresh look at the area around Oakridge Centre at Cambie and 41st Avenue. Ms. Mclean presented the options and concepts that were presented to the public in June. Ms. Mclean asked for comments focusing on the 3 built form options for the area including the arterials, as well as input on other key ideas that will make this area a success.

Jessie Gresley-Jones, Planner, provided a Powerpoint presentation with visual map representations outlining the 3 built form options for the area.

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

- 1) The 3 area concepts locate height and density differently in the MTC.
 - Which of the 3 is the most successful?
 - What modifications would you make to your preferred option?
- 2) On the Cambie and West 41st arterials three built form compositions are proposed. Keeping in mind the future plazas (at Cambie and W 41st and W 43rd) and the approved Oakridge development proposal, which concept best defines the Municipal Town Centre?
- 3) Commercial will continue to be required at grade on Cambie Street, and encouraged on floors above. Should the commercial area expand on to West 41st, or on to other off-arterial streets (e.g. West 43rd Ave, or Heather Street)?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Related Commentary:** Overall feedback from the panel included:

There will be active uses at grade. There is concern for the heights are not high enough in the area for Oakridge Town Centre (OTC). The separation between the towers is quite 'tight'.

Rethink the sites to look more like Oakridge. The separation between the towers makes the proportions seem 'blocky'.

The evolution of townhomes will be slow over time, mingled with single family homes mixed in. There is a missing middle typology in the proposal. Most of the area will be higher density. There is market, social housing and non-market. This is great opportunity to create new housing types. Maintain variety, diversity, flexibility and creativity of form.

The concept of 'Happy City' design and other elements need to inform the development of the neighbourhood. There are a lot of new urban design ideas that reflect new values of the city. Have a variety of building forms and plans throughout each block to avoid monotony. However, a panel member supported more towers to accommodate density.

Office space demand is being studied, according to the Planners. It seems like a favourable place for office space to be accommodated. There will be higher density through planning programming. There are a lot of social amenities in the area. Push the commercial typology on 43rd Ave, starting with one building so it spreads. Put some metrics in to the design plans.

Support the height and density with more podium presence. Podiums need to be 5-6 storeys. If you want to introduce density and penetration from block to block, if you increase the podium level and height it will increase the penetrations.

Look at what is livable for community living, and more than commodification. Do careful light studies to look at livability on the streets. Look at community oriented development.

The sunlight transitions are good. The arterial form along Cambie Street is good.

The greenspace has to work as hard as the bus stops. The parks need to be considered. Consider the facilities and amenities for future density and population growth. Parks need to be 'nice'.

Overall, a panel member concluded by stating the panel supported 'urbanity not uniformity'.

- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.