

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: August 23, 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 #3)
Yijin Wen
Neal LaMontagne (excused from item #1)
James Cheng
Muneesh Sharma
Meredith Anderson
David Jerke (excused from items #4 and 5)
Amela Brudar
Helen Avini Besharat

REGRETS: Renee Van Halm
Veronica Gillies

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|--|
| 1. 860 Richards Street |
| 2. 6679 Main Street |
| 3. 177 W Pender Street |
| 4. 1837-1857 East 11th Avenue & 2631-2685 Victoria Drive |
| 5. 8378-8432 Oak Street |
-

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: **860 Richards Street**
 Permit No.: DP-2017-00566
 Description: Development Permit Application located at the intersection of Smithe and Richards Streets. The proposal includes structures for a café and maintenance building as well as for an elevated pedestrian bridge, berming, storm water features, and overhead sky frames.
 Zoning: DD
 Application Status: Complete Development Application
 Review: Second
 Architect: Dialog Architecture
 Owner: City of Vancouver Parks Board
 Delegation: Joost Bakker, Architect, Dialog
 Matthew Thomson, Landscape Architect, Dialog
 Joe McLeod, Landscape Planner, Parks Board
 Tiina Mack, Manager, Parks Board
 Staff: Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION recommended

- **Introduction:** Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project as a Development Permit Application for Smithe and Richards in particular the park structures including café, bridge, maintenance, sky frames, and earthwork. Parks do not often come before UDP, but in this case, staff is bringing it to the panel because of the significance of the structures and location. Guidance is sought from the panel on the overall design of the park but specifically with respect to the interface of the built structures with the public realm.

The policies that we would evaluate this development under include: Downtown ODP, the CBD and Downtown South. The applicable objectives of these in general include a Public Realm design to help create distinctive areas and neighbourhoods in the Downtown. Aspects to consider include the materials (paving, lighting, planting), entrances, seating, garbage storage, and loading. Streetscape should be designed to assist in the creation of distinct urban character and identity. The Public Open Space should provide varied, accessible, and, interconnected open spaces to be used by a wide range of people throughout the year.

There is a 5 meter slope down from north to south. The park has 3 zones: the Upper Terrace for a 'sense of invitation' eating lunch and small events, a Middle Terrace for kids, and a Lower terrace for a main plaza and café.

The bridge runs through the park and cantilevering partially over Smithe. It is fully accessible by wheel chairs and meets the required overhead clearance at the sidewalk. The sky frames reference the 'H' frame power poles and may be used for temporary art and lighting. The café is located at the corner of Smithe and Richards, partially beneath an earth berm facing Smithe and opening internally into the park. In addition there is a linear storm water feature running the length of the lane. Also note that child's play structure shown is a place holder for approximate scale. The final equipment design has not been determined.

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

1. Overall design and expression including massing, proportions and materials.

2. The interface at the public realm including access and permeability.
3. Response to site constraints and relationship to immediate context.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the surrounding podium tower typology as an important ingredient in the context of the park. The design is intended to interface with the surrounding buildings. The café is a retail enterprise so visibility is important and location is important. There is an expression of a strong 'roof plane' on its design.

The most programmed element is the play area. It sets up the playful nature of the park for the young population patronizing the park. There is a sense of invite to activate the plaza. There is storage, (for example ping pong tables) in order to activate the public plaza. The intention is a strong 'identity' and bold character. The site is noisy due to traffic volume coming up the site. There is berming and baffle as a response to noise mitigation at the lane.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- Recommend more visual permeability on Smithe and the laneway
 - Reconsider the café for openness to the park as well as Smithe Street
 - Reconsider the location of the café with regards to shadowing and the connection to the different park areas
 - Reconsider access to café service from Smithe Street
 - Consider simplifying the program, form and materials in the project.
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the park has too many competing elements so that it appears too 'busy' and the overall design, proportion and massing scale feels 'chunky'. The bridge/elevated walkway feels 'arbitrary'. More than half of the park seems closed off by the bridge and the berming, and should be more open and inviting. The lane should be accessible.

The bridge could cover part of the site instead of all of it. Provide benches for seating. Integrate the bridge with the kids play area perhaps. There are beautiful mature trees at the park, so there should be more dialogue with the trees and the bridge.

The café location conflicts with the energy of the design. The café should be relocated into a sunny area. The cafe is too busy and crowded, instead of being 'playful' it lacks tranquility and quietness that a café should offer. Simplify the design of the café and relocate it. The café should have seating facing the park and water feature. It is a tight entrance to the park, and it should be wider or more open. The hammock at the look-out point will hamper the seniors or disabled, move it to the middle so the lookout is accessible to everyone.

The park 'quietness' is appreciated due to the noisy surroundings. The lighting is appreciated. The design intent does not come through because of the conflicting messages. There is an overwhelming bridge without a destination.

This should be a place where people enjoy the park. The playground is buried in the design. The design should help define the theme for the users.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team has a concern about the phrase 'turning back' on the lane. It was a conscious decision. Smithe is an elegant presence and the lane quality is also been enhanced. It was intended also to have a 'controlled entry' to the park. The 'H' frames in the lane will be removed within a year, so it will not be a competing form with the park structures. The park will be accessible with respect to grades.

2. Address:	6679 Main Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2017- -00026
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use rental building with 28 secured market rental units under R100
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	RZ
Review:	First
Architect:	F. Adab Architects
Owner:	Rattan Bagga, Ska Development
Delegation:	Niels Wilde, Architect, F. Adab Architects Fred Adab, Architect, F. Adab Architects Ruchir Dhall, Landscape Architect, Bent Picture Creative Tim Tensley, LEED Consultant, Recollective Consulting
Staff:	Zachary Bennett & Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Zachary Bennett, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a site at the northwest corner of Main Street and 51st Avenue, within the Sunset Sub-area. The site is presently zoned C-2 and sits at the southern end of the main commercial strip for the Punjabi Market, which extends from 48th to 51st Avenues. The site is approximately 7,712 square feet with a 70 feet of frontage along Main Street and 110 feet along 51 Street

To the north, the zoning is C-2 and developed with a mix of buildings between 2-4 storeys. To the south, the zoning is RT-2 and west across the lane is zoned RS-1. These areas are developed with a mixture of duplex and single family houses.

The site is kitty-corner from Sunset Community Centre and Park and Langara College is two blocks west. A six-storey rental building, approved for 3.60 FSR, is under construction at 49 and Main Streets. Sites east of Ontario are part of Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Plan. Cambie Corridor Phase Three policy planning is still underway and final directions have not been determined.

The proposal is for a 6 storey mixed-use building over three levels of underground parking. The building includes 3,071 square feet of commercial space at grade and a total of 28 secured market rental units. An FSR of 3.62 is proposed.

The proposal is being considered under Rental 100, which for C-2 sites anticipates 6 storey buildings and a commensurate increase in density. Parking includes 28 parking stalls, 42 Class A bicycle parking, and a 70 foot building.

Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project as situated at the south extents of the Punjabi Market area which more-or-less begins at E 51st. To the south is RT-2 and the park. Therefore commercial space would not be anticipated further to the immediate south. The site is a little shallow, 110 feet deep and 70 feet wide. It is a flat site, sloping less than 1 foot in any direction

Urban design objectives proposal include:

- For C-2 buildings in this sub-area, buildings should respond to particular site conditions, such as corner locations or adjacent buildings.
- Street character should achieve pedestrian comfort and relate to the pedestrian scale.
- Reinforce or create active and engaging ground floors and retail frontages.

- Respect the anticipated 3 storey approximately 10.7 meter street wall of the base zoning.
- Development should transition down in form and massing to relate more compatibly with single family residential zones at the rear.
- The architectural and landscape treatments at the rear are as important as they are at the front.

There is retail frontage facing Main and wrapping partially onto 51st. The townhouse is at grade with a rear yard and a residential entry at the side. There is parking entry and loading at the lane. There is no Pad-Mounted-Transformer (PMT) proposed, rather the transformer will be vaulted below grade. An indoor amenity is not in the proposal but staff will seek its provision for the rezoning. There is a roof top garden with outdoor amenity proposed.

Where this proposal differs from the anticipated Form of Development is the rear step back and the corner “tower” element. Planning would normally look for a three storey expression of street wall and additional stepping on the west for levels 5 and 6. Consideration to the corner element is based on the context of the Punjabi Market and RT-2 to the south. Consideration to reducing the rear step backs is based on the shallow lot and the impact added stepping would have on unit layouts as well as shading and views.

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

1. Height, density, and massing in particular, the rear step backs and transition to RS-1, the treatment of the southeast corner, and the response to existing and potential adjacent Main Street development.
2. Architectural Expression including building articulation, streetscape character, and creation of active and engaging commercial frontage.
3. Outdoor open space design including landscape treatments at the lane, roof decks, and roof top.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the project as on the ‘edge of Punjabi market’ with a character of its own. The building is an attempt to rejuvenate the market area. The corner expression is intended to be strong with a defined edge condition. The setback is not as far as recommended because the shadows do not fall across the laneway. The upper floor should be at grade. The building is technically 7 storeys, and a mezzanine approach may be pursued instead. It is a rental 100 building intended to provide affordable housing to increase the desirability of the neighbourhood and improve the retail environment.

The amenity space is not indoors, instead it is provided on the roof area outside. The intent is to not accede the 10% of the structure on the top. The building design is compact which is effective for heat loss. The materials and colours were changed in order to create a ‘shell within a shell’ on the exterior of the building to reveal the inner core.

The opportunities for landscaping are tight, so the landscaping is meant to be softened. There is wayfinding at the entrance, surface treatment, native species are used for less consumption, and there is a social gathering area at the top. There are spots available for planters at the units and do their own planting in the lane area. There is a potential to screen with plantings for the areas.

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

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

- Strengthen the corner element, perhaps by bringing it down to the street
 - Strengthen the 51st residential entrance
 - Strengthen the commercial expression
 - Consider a door on the 51st Street side as an entry for the townhouse
 - Consider weather protection along the commercial streets
 - Enhance the laneway further
 - Recommend indoor amenity space
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the panel supports the height, density and massing of the proposal. The streetscape and retail expression should be more 'exciting'. The stucco material could use more development. Make sure that the patio spaces are more open at the townhomes so they do not feel 'caged'.

The rooftop amenity is a benefit to everyone on the project, but ensure that it is accessible year round by having weather protection. The solar gain needs more work. Add a few benches for the community to use. The service rooms need to be worked out with utility companies. The 'shear wall system' needs work.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted the LEED Gold was the goal for the project.

3. Address:	177 W Pender Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00038
Description:	To develop a 10-storey residential building containing a total of 90 units of social housing. This application proposes a total floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.93, a total floor area of 3,863.9 sq. m. (41,591 square feet), and a height of 32m (105 feet); all over one level of parking with 0 vehicle parking stalls, one Class A loading space and 68 Class A bicycle parking spaces. This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan and the Rezoning Policy for the Downtown Eastside.
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Delegation:	Dane Jansen, Architect, DYS Architecture Shaun Smakal, Landscape Architect, eta Landscape Architecture Daryl Tyacke, eta Landscape Architecture
Staff:	Linda Gillan & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Linda Gillan, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application comprised of a single lot on the north side of Pender St, between Cambie and Abbott streets.

The rezoning site has a frontage of 50 feet on Pender Street, and is 120 feet deep, with a site area of just under 6,000 square feet. The site is currently vacant. It is zoned DD, or Downtown District. Across Hastings Street to the north is the Gastown Historic Area (HA-2) and the Woodwards site, which is zoned CD-1. Victory Square and Vancouver Community College are located in the block to the west.

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 heritage building rehabilitation. Through rezoning, the 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 and the applicant team are pursuing Option B requires a low emission green building.

The application is to rezone from DD to CD-1 to allow for a 10-storey residential building. It includes 90 social housing units, including 82 micro units and eight studio units, five of which are accessible units. The basement level includes zero vehicle parking, 68 Class A bike parking spaces and one Class A loading space. The proposed density is 6.93 FSR and proposed height is 105 feet.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted a few considerations about the site context: The project is flanked by heritage buildings on either side and across the lane, which are likely to remain for the long term. The site is also sloped in two directions: 4 feet across the Pender Street elevation and 9 feet from the street to the lane.

Ms. Wiley further noted a policy consideration: The District Schedule and Downtown Eastside Plan allow 6.0 FSR and 105 foot height for social housing projects. The proposal is seeking a rezoning to request an additional 0.93FSR, but otherwise complies with base zoning.

On West Pender St, the 10-storey massing meets 105 foot height limit. Levels 8-10 are set back approximately 12 feet to create 70' streetwall, as is consistent with the Victory Square guidelines. The side walls will be exposed for the long term, so the proposal aims to add visual interest with surface patterns.

The lane accommodates loading, a PMT and an emergency exit. Because the site slopes 10 feet to the lane, lane-fronting units at Level 1 are raised above grade. The setback at Level 2 and above is 10 feet, less than the typical 20 feet setback for residential uses.

The Victory Square Guidelines seek minimum 30 feet depth for courtyards, whereas the proposed courtyard/lightwell is 24 feet by 24 feet. The roof of the adjacent Avalon Hotel is approximately 25 feet above the courtyard floor. Units facing courtyard are the most challenged for livability, but meet a "relaxed" standard for horizontal access to daylight.

The main entry on Pender Street is flanked by common amenity space and offices. Due to site slope, the entry is in a deep niche with a ramp and guardrail at sidewalk. The amenity space is 3 feet above the sidewalk. The storefront windows and canopy create a "commercial" appearance.

Materials and detailing include:

- Dark brick on Pender Street elevation, with horizontal metal cladding for upper levels;
- Strong cornice lines at Level 2 and Level 7;
- A simple composition of square "bays" for each unit, with large windows and Juliettes;
- A glass railing and spandrel, as modern detailing in simple masonry façade;
- "Blind" side walls are corrugated metal in a grid pattern, to echo the window bays.

Staff is seeking improvements to the amenities. The indoor amenity at L1 is oversized and requires programming and design development. The rooftop patio is approximately 1500 square feet, and does not meet guidelines. Storage is provided in lockers at Level 2.

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

1. Is the overall density and massing supportable?
2. Are the resolution of the storefront and main entry successful?
3. Is the resolution of the street elevation and "blind" side elevations successful?
4. Have issues of livability been appropriately addressed? (Consider daylighting of dwelling units, and common indoor/outdoor amenity spaces.)

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the project is within the height envelope and characteristics of the area. The goal is smaller units in the area. The implied windows reference a historic 'Chicago' style. The entry ramp is a challenge due to grades. The amenity space is as of yet undefined.

Enlarging the courtyard/light well would sacrifice units. This semi-public courtyard is intended as a quiet, contemplative space, but is also an opportunity for public art. The rooftop design has as much urban agriculture as possible, to activate the space. The landscape features include small gestures for token habitat for birds and insects.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- If supportable by the Director of Planning, explore deleting the upper storey setback, to create a full-height streetwall at West Pender Street and add space to the light well.
 - Consider the addition of intermediary amenity spaces above Level 1.
 - Provide areas with weather protection of the common rooftop patio and private roof terraces;
 - Relocate the urban agriculture to the higher roof, to create a more active social outdoor space at the lower roof.
 - Consider more vibrant detailing and colour for the façade;
 - Consider a redesign of the sidewalls, and explore opportunities for public art/murals.
 - Consider a lighter colour for the courtyard walls, to increase light into the facing units;
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the panel supported the height, massing and density of the project. The upper-storey setback is not necessary and a stronger full-height streetwall is preferred. Due to the sloping site, there is room to add density. The blind side walls require design development. The ‘pretend’ windows were not supported, and some thought that these surfaces would be an opportunity for murals or public art. The courtyard should be a lighter colour for units facing the courtyard.

There is an opportunity at the 10th level to add further indoor amenity space, adjacent to the rooftop patio. The rooftop amenity space needs work, and could be expanded to the upper roof. The small units are appropriate for the site.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and staff. The sidewalls could provide an opportunity for local artists. The recommendations regarding the courtyard and amenity space were appreciated.

4. Address: **1837-1857 East 11th Avenue & 2631-2685 Victoria Drive**
Permit No.: RZ-2017-00031
Description: To develop a 10-storey residential building and a 4-storey heritage house. The 10-storey residential building includes 76 secured market rental units and 67 strata units. The heritage house will include 2 strata units. This application proposes a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.59, a maximum height of 31.5m (103.4 feet.), all over 2 levels of underground parking accessed off the lane. This rezoning is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
- Zoning: RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Perkins + Will
Owner: Evan Allegretto, Intracorp Projects
Delegation: David Dove, Architect, Perkins & Will
Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff: Yardley McNeil & Susan Chang

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Yardley McNeil, Senior Rezoning Planner for the Midtown Division, introduced the project as falling within the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan (GWCP), which directs development for the site. . This site is within the ‘Station Residential’ sub-area of the Commercial Broadway Station Precinct of the GWCP which supports development up to 10-storeys and 3.6 FSR for sites over 120 feet in frontage. The GWCP provides two residential tenure options in this area: either 50% market strata and 50% secured market rental for all residential floor area or 80% market strata and 20% social housing for all residential floor area.

The applicant has chosen the 50/50 option. The GWCP also prescribes a maximum tower floor plate of 6500 square feet. This is the first project in Grandview Woodlands to be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel since the Plan was approved in 2016, and this is the first project on the GWCP Pace of Change list, which regulates the loss of existing rental to a maximum of 5 projects and 150 units, before staff are required to report back to Council on the impact of the loss of existing rental units versus the amount of new secured rental units approved. Other aspects of the proposal include tree retention and the retention, relocation and restoration of a Vancouver Heritage Register building on the “B” category, presently situated at 1853 W 11th which will be relocated to face Victoria Drive.

Susan Chang, Development Planner, introduced the project as located in the Commercial-Broadway Station Precinct Residential Area. In terms of the building form, a 6 storey podium is anticipated with a shoulder setback above the 4th storey. The portion of any building above 60’ in height should not exceed a typical floor plate of 6,500 square feet and should be spaced at least 80’ from any other building above 60’ in height. Public realm improvements are expected and ground level access is required for the first floor units. Setbacks expected are 10’ front yard, 30’ rear yard, and 7’ side yard.

This is an assembly of 8 lots, resulting in site size of 231’ by 122’ deep. The lane is at a higher elevation by 2’ relative to the front. Public realm improvements include a 4.5m SRW on 11th and 5.5m along Victoria Drive in addition to the 7’ roadway dedication.

A public bike share station (at the south end on Victoria) is accommodated, a 4 storey category B heritage house is retained (relocated to the northeast corner), and 3 on site trees retained.

A Douglas Fir centered along 11th and 2 Red Cedars at the lane. A neighbouring tree is also retained near the northwest corner.

The proposed building frontage is approximately 210' feet. To break up the scale of the massing, the more prominent masonry frame expression is contrasted with a lighter volume that is set back an additional 9' beyond the proposed 10'-6" FY setback. This setback aligns with the front yard setback of the building to the west and allows for tree retention. The height of the tree is also framed from above with the 10 storey structure. The 6 storey podium form provides a 5' setback above the 4 storeys. The structure above 60' in height meets the floor plate size noting that the balconies are exempted. There is a 7' separation from the building to the heritage building.

A building entry is located along 11th with amenity space adjacent at the ground storey. A children's play area is located at the roof deck and urban agriculture located at the podium roof deck.

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

- 1) Do you support the form of development with particular regard to massing and density?
- 2) Please comment on the ground floor interface with the public realm along Victoria.
- 3) Please comment on the building relationship to the heritage building.
- 4) Please provide any additional advice that could further inform the design through the Development Permit process.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the project is located by the city centre transit and pedestrian cycling cut. The separation and podium is intended to be retained. It is 50 / 50 rental and market. The required family units are being exceeded. The existing trees are intended to be retained. A Class B heritage building is intended to be retained on the site. The tower was relocated as per request from staff. There are two entries, roof access, urban agriculture on the roof, dog walking space in the back, and other amenities planned. There are additional setbacks on the lane that are constraining the site. The public bike share location is under consideration. The sustainability goal is LEED Gold with triple glazed window system and exterior insulated walls. The materials are a brick frame and intended to be high quality.

There are private patios, outdoor dining areas and lounge areas and children's play areas planned that would be accessible for non-market and market residents.

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

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

- Reduce the bulk, by moving the frame towards the building
- Express the massing in a specific way to break up the bulk of the building
- Re-consider the massing in relationship to the trees and heritage building
- Move the bike share or design with it
- Re-examine the relationship of the heritage building with the other building
- Reconsider the parking ramp position in the lane
- Look at the liveability of the units in the heritage house
- Reconsider the frame in terms of the solar orientation of the façades

- Look at the core for sheer strength
- More attention should be paid to the streetscape to be more sensitive to the neighbourhood in particular, along Victoria.
- **Related Commentary:** Overall the panel appreciated the building design, but that it was too bulky and overpowering for the site. The tower looks too bulky because the structural frame is 'pulled out', which contributes to massing. Reconsider the framing on the north façade. Furthermore, the main building is crowding the heritage building and has overlook issues. The vocabulary is of an office building in a residential neighbourhood that has a lot of character. Colour could have been utilized especially for the heritage building.

Reconsider the tree retention. Reconsider the heritage building location. The bike share impacts livability and access to adjacent units. The brick is a good material in a modern detailing.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the feedback. Colour was not applied but it will be later on with a Vancouver heritage colour. The applicant would like to break down the massing. The ramp is a challenge and may be shortened.

5. Address: **8378-8432 Oak Street**
Permit No.: RZ-2017-00033
Description: To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 38 market residential units on levels 1 to 6, all over one and a half levels of underground parking. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning: RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Gateway Architecture
Owner: Jane Koh, Bold Properties
Delegation: Michael Cox, Architect, Gateway Architecture
David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape
Staff: Robert White & Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Robert White, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a site in Marpole on the east side of Oak Street between 67th and 70th Avenues. To the north of the site is a gas station within the neighbourhood commercial (C-1) node around 67th, and to the east/west/and south are single family homes.

The site itself is comprised of five parcels currently zoned RT-2, and measures approximately 165 feet wide by 115 feet deep (approximately 19,000 square feet). Each parcel currently contains a single family home.

Under the Marpole Community Plan, the lots across the lane to the east have been pre-zoned RM-8 to support 2½-storey townhouse developments. The Plan anticipates enhancing the neighbourhood commercial node to the north with mixed-use buildings up to 8-storeys and up to 3.0 FSR. Staff are reviewing a Rezoning Application at 8242 Oak Street for an 8-storey mixed-use building with 50 residential units at 3.0 FSR. For the rest of Oak Street between 64th and 72nd Avenues, including this site, the Plan anticipates residential buildings up to 6-storeys and up to 2.5 FSR.

In this area the Plan calls for:

- Buildings with notable setback above the fourth storey
- Building widths of approximately 100 feet
- Mid-block connections to break-up these long blocks (750 feet/230 m)
- An enhanced public realm along Oak Street with a planted boulevard, wider sidewalks, and a double row of trees.

This proposal is to rezone from RT-2 to CD-1 to permit a 6-storey market residential development with 38 dwelling units, 52 vehicle parking spaces, and 48 bicycle parking spaces. It proposes an FSR of 2.5 and a height of 22.1 m/73 feet. A mid-block pedestrian path is included at the south end of the site to connect Oak Street to the lane and ultimately through to Shaughnessy Street. The proposal includes 2 levels of underground parking, as well as 80% 2-bedroom units (30), and 20% 3-bedroom units (8).

The building has a 100 foot front face, with two 15 foot wings set back on both sides. The total width of the building is approximately 130 feet. There is a notable building setback above 4th storey of at least 8 feet.

Public Realm features include: sidewalks with a planted boulevard of at least 6 feet and sidewalk of 8 feet, a row of trees on the City boulevard, and a row of trees on the private property edge.

The proposal includes a mid-block crossing of a minimum of 4 feet for a usable path, and once an adjacent property develops it can extend to a minimum of 6 feet.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the project as falling within an area with built form guidelines that recommend 6-storey buildings with setbacks above the 4th storey to provide a transition to adjacent lower buildings as the Marpole Plan develops, including future townhouse sites across the lane. In some areas of the Plan, a row of 2-storey townhouses is required at the lane to provide a further transition, but on this block due to the shorter lot depth of 115 feet, that is not required. The shoulder and 16 feet rear yard setback is expected to provide the transition.

The recommended building frontage width is approximately 100 feet, which is intended to provide consistency with the scale of apartment buildings in the Marpole area. For this site, a single building is proposed with a width of 130 feet and notching of the form at the corners to provide a 100 foot frontage. The single building allows for larger side yard setbacks than the minimum 8 feet required under the Plan with 18 feet at the north end adjacent the mixed-use site and 12 feet at the south end in addition to a 12 feet right-of-way.

The mixed-use site to the north may be rezoned to 8-storeys with a 2 to 3-storey podium, under the Plan. The setback at the interior property line to the podium can be 6 feet, so with an 18 foot setback on the subject site, there will be a 24 foot separation between the podium and the proposed building.

This site is required to provide a 12 foot right-of-way for half of the mid-block pedestrian connection with the remainder required of the adjacent site when it redevelops. An additional 12 foot setback is provided to the building proper with patios. The site to the south would mirror this requirement. Ground floors adjacent mid-block connections should have an active edge with entrances and windows facing the pedestrian path. To that end, staff has recommended that the applicant explore relocating the parkade entry north and away from the edge of the pedestrian path, and the applicant has shown that option for the Panel to review, as well as the original application.

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

- 1) Comment on the overall height, density and form of development relative to the Marpole Plan Built Form Guidelines.
- 2) Does the form provide an appropriate transition to surrounding sites?
- 3) Comment on the two options for the design of the south edge adjacent the pedestrian connection, in terms of meeting the objective to provide an active, pedestrian-friendly edge condition.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the bedroom location and units. The massing and articulation call for a 4-storey podium with an 8 foot setback which is actually 10 feet. It is a symmetrical building design with shoulders setback on the ends on the north and south. There is a punch window appearance is on the lower storeys in the proposal.

There are tapered balconies on the corners and tapered fins that form frames in the design. The frames would alternate on different floors. The roof would be used by the top floor suites accessible by stairs. The building would be air conditioned. There is a machine room proposed. The amenity would be next to the public connection at the corner in one option. The other scheme has the amenity in the centre. The building is intended to be LEED Gold sustainability rating.

The large setbacks allow for nice layering and generous spaces for the laneway and front. Trees with scale are possible. The amenity space in the lane could activate the lane. Concrete metal panels are planned for materiality.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Lamontagne and seconded by Mr. Cheng

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

- Move the amenity to the southeast corner
 - Move the parkade entry ramp north
 - More attention to creating a public porch, especially on Oak Street, perhaps by reducing the private patio spaces
 - Look at more shading depending on solar aspects
 - Keep the architectural expression simplified in the next stage
- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel supported the density height and massing of the proposal. The transition to the surrounding sites is nice, and the generous size of the family units was appreciated.

Use the door at the street to access the ground units. The two main floor units on the east and west sides in front of two bedrooms are a pathway which is 'uncomfortable', and a relocation of the pathway is recommended. It is a simple elegant refined building design.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the input.
- **Adjournment**
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.