

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 6, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Yijin Wen
James Cheng (excused from item #1)
Meredith Anderson
Amela Brudar (excused from items #1 and 2)
Helen Avini Besharat - Acting Chair
Renee Van Halm
Veronica Gillies
David Jerke (excused from item #1)
Karen Spoelstra (excused from item #1 and 2)

REGRETS: Kim Smith
Muneesh Sharma

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | |
|----------------------------|
| 1. 5130-5170 Cambie Street |
| 2. 5190-5226 Cambie Street |
| 3. 833 W Pender |
| 4. 239 Keefer Street |
| 5. 2040 Columbia Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Acting Chair Helen Avini Besharat 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: 5130-5170 & 5190-5226 Cambie Street
 Permit No.: RZ-2017-00023 & RZ-2017-00032
 Description: 5130-5170 Cambie Street
 To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 65 market units for a total area of 5,880.5 square meters (63,297 square feet) and a maximum height of 21.4 m (70 feet), all over 98 parking stalls of underground parking. This application proposes a total floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.44.
 5190-5226 Cambie Street
 To develop a 6-storey building consisting of 59 market units all over two levels of underground parking with 101 parking stalls. The development will include a daycare facility on the ground floor with separate parking. This application proposes a total floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.41, and a building height of 20.18m (66 feet).
 Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: GBL Architects
 Owner: 1015056 LTD.
 Delegation: Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, GBL
 Amela Brudar, Architect, GBL
 Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
 Staff: Tiffany Rougeau & Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Tiffany Rougeau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the two projects as located on adjacent sites and having the same architect. However, the projects have different owners and are separate rezoning proposals. Therefore, staff presented the projects together, and the Panel was directed to provide the evaluation and recommendations for each.

The two rezoning applications are each 3 lot assemblies on the east side of Cambie mid-block between 35th and 37th Ave. The sites are zoned RS-1 and developed with single-family houses. The proposal is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan, which anticipates 6-storey residential buildings in this area with a suggested FSR range of 1.75-2.25.

Three rezonings have been approved on the block to the north, three rezonings have been approved on the block opposite, and one is under review at the corner (5110). These rezonings range between 2.40-2.60 FSR. Across the lane, sites are zoned RS-1 and are included in Cambie Corridor Phase 3 planning. CC3 policy planning is still underway and final direction for these sites has not been determined.

5130-5170 Cambie Street proposal is for:

- A 6-storey residential building with a total of 65 units over 2 levels of underground parking
- An FSR of 2.44 is proposed

5190-5226 Cambie Street proposal is for:

- A 6-storey residential building with a total of 59 units over 2 levels of underground parking
- It will include a privately operated daycare on the ground floor
- An FSR of 2.41 is proposed

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction noting that the built form guidelines recommend 6-storey buildings with 4-storey shoulders and a frontage of 150'. Both buildings are seeking frontages in excess of 150', and the Panel should consider whether there is sufficient variation in the massing to mitigate the visual impact of the longer buildings and provide sufficient open space on site, and a response to the unique site configuration along the curved portion of Cambie Street.

Both buildings provide a step in the massing at the central entry. For the north site (5130-5170 Cambie), a front setback of 31' is provided to ensure retention of 3 site trees. The buildings step forward proceeding to the north and transition to a 12' front setback at the south end which will align with the front yard for future Cambie developments to the south.

A more substantial break for open space between the two sites was recommended in consideration of the longer frontages for both buildings. The break is intended to allow for long views to Queen Elizabeth Park and provide a sense of relief to the massing as viewed from the street level. Conventionally the spacing between buildings on the corridor is 24' and the proposed separation is 35' at the front of the base expanding to 50' with a pinch point of 24' between the lower 2-storey and 4-storey portions at the rear. Common amenity space is located adjacent the space between the buildings, and a path to the lane. The outdoor play space for the daycare at 5190-5226 Cambie is located at the rear of the site.

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

For both sites:

- 1) Comment on the height, density and form of development relative to the Cambie Corridor Plan with particular regard to the longer frontage.
- 2) Comment on the design and landscaping of the open space between the two buildings, including the extent and quality of outdoor amenity space.

For 5190 - 5226 Cambie:

- 1) Comment on the expression of the childcare facility as distinct from the residential use.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the distinction between the two projects and buildings. The programming is slightly different, for example, there is a daycare in one building. There is a two storey massing at the lane comparable to a townhouse massing transition for both.

The north building massing is broken up into two pieces. Half of the building was pulled backwards to retain the 3 mature trees as a street wall, which is in line with the Urban Forest Strategy. The break in the massing brings light into the building. The buildings are connected with landscape treatment.

The south site is shallower and more irregular, and the building takes up the street curve more than the north site. The entry has a recess where the building pivots in response to the street geometry. The pivot also acts to connect the two buildings. There are spaces at the rear of the building which have allowed additional amenity space and a generous back yard. A privately run daycare was a good fit in the south building to utilise the back yard and have good solar access. The upper floors and lower floors were differentiated.

The buildings appear as four distinct segments, almost as four developments. The north building is more glazed with solar overhangs, with more solidity at the south site to differentiate the two.

The intention is to provide a more pedestrianized neighbourhood with each unit oriented towards the street. While not required under the Cambie Plan, there will be a mid-block pedestrian path connecting to the lane. There is rooftop gardens proposed as well as a green roof.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Van Halm and seconded by Mr. Wen and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the projects for both 5130-5170 Cambie & 5190-5226 Cambie (with daycare) with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

For both sites:

- Refine and develop the expression of the architectural hinge
- Refine and develop the townhouse expression and the lane facades
- Consider exposure taking into account shading devices
- Consider further differentiation of the buildings, including the use of colour

For the south site 5190-5226 Cambie (with daycare):

- Consider relocating outdoor play space to improve solar access
- Consider the daycare expression, and redesign the fence and landscaping

Related Commentary: The Panel supported the height, density and form of development, and had no issue with the longer frontage. It was noted that the buildings can be understood as navigating the street curve using a 'hinge' device. For the north building, the frontage is handled well, particularly the hinge device, which is expressed at the front entry and disappears at the rear. On the south building, the hinge is unresolved on the rear. It was noted that the lane is well activated, but it could be treated as another façade with improved design development. The wider space between the two buildings and articulation of the amenity space with fenestration was appreciated. On the south site, it was suggested to relocate the inboard amenity room and the 3-bedroom unit, which is located at a very public corner adjacent the path and lane.

The intention to build daycare facilities was commended, although the panel highly recommended the improvements to the daycare expression. The language of the fencing, with columns and vertical screening, was seen to be too heavy. It was suggested to relocate the outdoor play space around the corner towards the lane to improve solar access. It was noted that a daycare may be somewhat residential in character and does not need to read as a distinct commercial space.

It was suggested that the colour palette was too subdued, and colour could be used to distinguish the buildings from each other. It was noted that the retained trees significantly improve the pedestrian experience on Cambie Street. Overall, the proposals were supported with recommendations for further refinement for the next stage.

It was noted that some of the submitted materials, including the drawings and booklets were at a scale that was difficult to read, and the model should be more precise.

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

2. Address:	833 W Pender Street
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00064
Description:	To develop a 13-storey hotel consisting of 106 units, a restaurant on the ground floor, a building height of approximately 153.7 feet, a total floor area of 63.865 square feet, and 9 underground valet parking spaces accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Studio One Architects
Owner:	FS PROPERTY INC
Delegation:	Thomas Wolf, Architect, Studio One Architecture Shoghig Tutunjian, Architect, Studio One Architecture Jonathan Losee, J.L. Ltd.
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the project as a development permit application in the Downtown District for a new 13-storey hotel with a common roof deck amenity, and noted, it is the second review by the Panel for this application.

It is a small infill site at 52' by 120'. It is in a subarea of the Downtown where residential uses are not permitted. Continuous ground floor retail or service uses are required, noting that Hotel is a service use. The permitted density is 9.0 FSR. Hotel use is encouraged with a 15% increase in the floor space ratio subject to urban design considerations. The proposal is seeking the 15% increase.

There is an existing 8-storey office building on the 52' by 120' lot to the west. The 31-storey office building to the east, the Exchange, and the 36-storey office and residential building across the lane to the north, the Jameson, were approved through rezoning. Both are upwards of 20.0 FSR.

In general, the built environment of the downtown should be of a very high quality. The Guidelines note that buildings should be sympathetic to the pedestrian environment and that tower portions should be evaluated with respect to their compatibility with surrounding structures and their contribution to the streetscape.

While the proposal is well under the permitted height, it is at the maximum density under the Downtown Official Development Plan. Planning staff recommend maintaining the proposed height which aligns with the height for commercial uses at the Jameson site to the rear, so as to reduce impact on residential uses.

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

1. Is the revised treatment of all elevations successful with a focus on the items previously noted: quality, light, solar gain, response to context and orientation, and design intent?
2. Is the revised rooftop treatment successful, with a focus on design development of the elevator core and the landscape design?
3. Is the lane servicing successful in terms of the interface with adjacent sites?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the height was discussed with planning staff prior to further design development. The façade, roof and ground floor were revised in response to previous commentary. A stronger façade design with a stone wall with punched windows was added to the design. Curtain wall glazing is proposed for the void at the corner. The intention is to provide this expression on both sides. The amount of insulated walls was increased and solar gain was improved. The proposed roof deck is a three-part composition with various functions including an outdoor kitchen, and a row of trees in pre-cast planters has been added along the side of the roof. The patio is intended to be furnished for a 'living room' feeling with additional planters to grow food for the kitchen. The lane is meant for service vehicles, with a car elevator and loading, as well as accessible entrances on the street and 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. Brudar and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Improve daylighting of rooms adjacent the notch on the east façade which may be achieved by reducing the size of the balcony, changing cladding to a lighter colour, and increasing the width of the sliding door
 - Simplify the design at the base of the building facing Pender Street, including the laser-cut screen wall which may be incorporated with the canopy
 - Consider south façade shading measures
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel noted that the project was much improved in response to previous commentary, particularly the façade design and the rooftop landscape. It was noted that the façade was simple and in-keeping with the small 'jewel-like' scale of the building. It was suggested that there could be further simplification, by deleting the glazed corner. The rear façade is treated equally to the street façade, and would be a welcome addition to the lane. The punched windows and ratio of glazing to solid wall has also improved the solar gain. It was suggested to further resolve the programming of the rear, to straighten up the exit corridor and loading into one line so that it feels more open. The bike rack could be re-arranged to make the space more usable. The architectural device of the angle should be expressed at the back. The balcony notch should be re-considered to allow more light. The balcony could be painted in a more reflective colour (rather than dark colour). The front canopies could be used for the lighting. The more simple and flexible the hotel design, the more it could evolve, and be a good long term investment.
- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and staff.

3. Address:	239 Keefer Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00703
Description:	To develop an 8-storey mixed-use building consisting of retail uses on the first storey and mezzanine above, general office uses on the second and third storeys, and 25 market dwelling units on the fourth through eight storeys; all over two levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the lane via car-elevator.
Zoning:	HA-1A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Mallen Gowing Berzins Architecture
Owner:	Brian Roche, Rendition Developments
Delegation:	Chris Gowing, Architect, MGBA Priscica Cotait, Architect, MGBA J. Pattison, Landscape Architect, Considered Design
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION Recommended

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as located in the base zone HA-1A. There are 2 zones in Vancouver's Chinatown, HA-1 and HA-1A, HA-1 being attributed to the more historic area along Pender Street, where less building height is permitted than HA-1A.

The site is dimensioned approximately 50' x 120' midblock on 200 block Keefer Street. This particular block does not contain a large number of historic heritage buildings, but the existing fabric is composed primarily of shorter 1 and 2 storey buildings. Due north is Pender Street (HA-1).

The proposal is for an 8-storey building comprising of a retail ground floor with a small mezzanine, followed by two levels of offices, and then followed by 5 levels of market residential.

The policy context for this application is clear, in that the current zoning of HA-1A does not have a maximum FSR cap, a maximum number of storeys or any use requirements above the ground floor being non-residential. As a result of this current zoning, several small-lot developments in Chinatown have tended to maximize the overall FSR by building up to 10 storeys within the 90 foot height limit, and by aiming for market residential as only use above the ground floor.

These earlier projects in turn were subject to significant neighbourhood criticism, which included the desire for higher mixed uses and building masses that would better-fit the historical context of shorter 50 foot tall buildings.

At this moment, staff has submitted a report to Council to amend the HA-1A zoning in order to better manage the expectations for future development in this neighbourhood. Changes include: a 5.35 FSR cap, a maximum allowance of 8-storeys (not including mezzanine), a requirement that a minimum 1.5FSR is relegated to non-residential uses, and a requirement that 25% of all new dwelling units be two-bedroom or larger.

While this new proposed amendments to the zoning has yet to be approved by Council, the applicant has responded by aligning as much of the project to the emerging zoning as possible. The resulting form therefore has a significant amount of negative space including upper storey setbacks for the front of the building, and a large courtyard within the middle of the floorplate. Also, there are proposed office uses for the second and third storeys.

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

- 1) Does the proposal successfully address the design guidelines for this neighbourhood? In particular:
 - a. Achieving a street-facing façade that has a formal and balanced composition, comprised of a legible cornice line, middle body, and lower storefront base;
 - b. Clear fenestration patterns and a symmetry of building elements within structural bays,
 - c. Street-activation with a strong storefront design that maximizes transparency;
- 2) Does the proposal successfully present a visually-rich experience of the building by clearly considering views of the building from the far, middle and close distances?
- 3) Could the proposed outdoor areas be re-arranged in order to better animate the street and lane-facing facades?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted that the project was originally going to Council in summer, so it began before the new zoning changes. The applicant decided to proceed with the project with new zoning incorporated in the proposal. The height of the streetwell was limited and terracing evolved from massing limitations. The lower floors are smaller units and the upper 2 floors are family units. The lower unit design incorporates a lightwell. The mass of the building was broken down in the proposal.

The carving out the back balances out the commercial square footage and gives opportunity for outdoor space and events that include the residents of the building and community. The courtyard area and the roof references textual elements. The stacked cornice line and colours and elements along the street are intended to respect the historical elements in a more contemporary interpretation of style.

Sun yet sun gardens were referenced, and the intention was not to mimic the landscape design. It is meant to be a contemporary outdoor space. The front door of the building has paving patterns that are reinterpreted and added in the design details. There is a communal roofdeck with play structures planned. There is a passive 'tranquil' garden space planned in the centre of the building. The garden space is designed with a filtered screen and bamboo at the garden.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Chen and seconded by Ms. Gillies

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

- Improve the façade at the street, office and residential elevations
- Improve the way the expression works together from one language to the other
- Improve the street activation along the storefront
- Control and evolve the facades into a simpler expression
- Improve the outdoor space amenities of the office
- Eliminate the exposed side walls
- Add more organizing elements, or 'order' and 'integrity'
- Research to improve the colour and materiality of the building
- Clarify the parti-expression as it is too busy
- Make the office and residential expressions distinct from each other

Related Commentary: The panel appreciated the risks taken with the proposal. The courtyard concept was supported by the panel, but the overall composition needs more balance. The storefront is not a welcoming street activation. It needs to be controlled and maintained and evolved further. There should be bigger office spaces rather than more outdoor spaces, according to one panel member. The two side walls should be opened up. The colour red is not successful and clichéd.

The garden is appreciated, but it is too busy so that it becomes a pastiche. The terraces in the back are not usable because they are too dark and not secure. A courtyard is a better idea than a covered rear terrace. The office corridor needs more light. Overall, more refinement is needed.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the feedback and noted the 50 foot lot and narrow mid-block site issues were intended to be addressed at the storefront.

4. Address: 2040 Columbia Street
Permit No.: RZ-2017-00542
Description: To restore an existing heritage site to develop a 6-storey industrial building. This application is being considered under the Heritage Revitalization Act.
Zoning: I-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: First
Architect: Brimingham & Wood
Owner: Wade & Danielle Papin, Pyrrha
Delegation: Sandra Moore, Architect, Birgham & Wood Architects
Omer Arbel, Architect, Omer Arbel Office Ltd.
Staff: Ji-Taek Park

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

- **Introduction:** Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner, introduced the project as being reviewed under existing I-1 zoning, and Heritage Revitalization Agreement (Heritage Action Plan or HRA). The site is located at 2040 Columbia Street, located at the north east corner of Columbia Street and West 5th Ave. in the Mount Pleasant Industrial area.

The proposed development is for retention of existing heritage house (which is proposed to be listed in VHR, pending Heritage Commission Review as part of this application), and a new 6 storey tower with building height of 78'-10" and overall FSR of 3.3. It provides 1 Class-A loading space at grade.

Under the existing I-1 district schedule, building height is limited to 60 feet, and FSR of 3.0. The tower portion is designed to achieve the maximum FSR of 3.3 for the project (3.0 allowed + 10% heritage retention bonus). The proposed building height of 78'-10" for the tower includes 8 feet of additional height for the top level to provide natural light for the passively lit photography studio. The proposed development also provides bike parking, end of trip facilities, as well as kitchen and dining amenity spaces for the staff over 2 levels of basement and sunken patio area.

The building is located at property line, with no setbacks being provided. Although I-1 zone typically requires 3.1m rear yard setback, rear yard relaxation and front yard encroachment are being considered as part of HRA.

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

- 1) In the context of a HRA proposal (noting that there are no design guidelines for I-1 industrial zone), please comment on the overall response and treatment of the existing heritage house by the proposed architectural and landscape design and expression.
- 2) Does the panel support the proposed increase in density and building height as part of HRA?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant introduced their business as a jewelry design company. There are 25 employees, and the property was purchased in 2009. The owners prefer the neighbourhood and expressed a desire to stay on the site due to connections with local film industry as well as bike and pedestrian accessibility and connectivity of the site.

Various options were considered for the site in order to accommodate building retention. Two full basements were designed below grade. There is one room per floor provided. Parking is not provided in the proposal. Extensive bike facilities are proposed. The new building is meant to respect the heritage house. The strategy depends on an internal courtyard design. The cladding material proposed consists of custom casted, overlapping large metal shingles. The metal shingles would take on patina overtime, and would provide organic texture and expression over time. All of the connection pieces could be done in a beautiful seamless way.

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. Gillies

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project

- **Related Commentary:** Overall, the panel commended the project and noted the proposed building was a ‘piece of jewelry itself’ and appreciated the lack of guidelines that allow for design experimentation. However, the design package was too thin for development application stage, so the panel recommended more materials be included in the proposal. One panel member suggested Planning should allow a more efficient floorplate. Perhaps lighter panels or consider view glass or shutter scheme to add dynamism to the project. Study the operable windows carefully. Experiment with light from the roof light well. A stack effect could be used behind the stair well contributing to building passive design.

Also noted, the detailed design of the sunken courtyard is missing from the landscape plan. Concerns about the mechanical engineering aspects of the design, especially vents, were noted by a few panel members.

The panel unanimously expressed that the proposed design is a beautiful addition to the neighbourhood and would be a ‘benchmark’ building.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for the input. The applicant expressed the courtyard would have indigenous, shade loving plantings. The plantings would be a combination of metallic and real plantings.

- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.