

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 22, 2017

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Helen Avini Besharat
James Cheng
David Jerke (excused for item #3)
Veronica Gillies (excused for item #4)
Karen Spoelstra
Amela Brudar
Renee Van Halm
Yijin Wen
Neal LaMontagne (excused for item #2, 3 & 4)
Muneesh Sharma
Kim Smith

REGRETS: Meredith Anderson
Nell Gasiewicz

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lidia McLeod

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | 478-496 West 48 th Avenue |
| 2. | 8242 Oak Street |
| 3. | 521-525 W 8 th Avenue |
| 4. | 5050-5080 Joyce Street |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A brief business meeting took place in which it was moved by Mr. Cheng and seconded by Mr. Sharma, and was the unanimous decision of the Urban Design Panel that going forward the UDP will put forward one of the following motions voted on by the entire panel, rather than each member voting for a straight show of support or non-support.

Having reviewed the project it was moved by [NAME] and seconded by [NAME], and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

“THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project.”

or

“THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:”

or

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

The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address: | 478-496 West 48 th Avenue |
| Permit No. | RZ-2016-00048 |
| Description: | The proposal is for a ten-storey mixed-use building with 99 m ² (1,069 sq. ft.) of retail at grade and residential above (comprised of 59 secured market rental units) with a building height of 33.0 m (108 ft.) from grade, and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.87, all over two levels of underground parking (44 vehicle spaces and 74 bicycle spaces). The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan. |
| Zoning: | RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | HOTSON Architecture (Kai Hotson) |
| Owner: | South Street Development Group |
| Delegation: | Kai Hotson, HOTSON Architecture Norm Hotson, DIALOG Kristina Zalite, Jon Losee Ltd. Brent Hanson, South Street Development Group |
| Staff: | Rachel Harrison & Danielle Wiley |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a two-lot assembly at the southeast corner of 48th Avenue and Cambie Street. The site is 126 ft. by 122 ft. and exists just north of the 49th Avenue Skytrain Station.

Surrounding context includes RT-2 lots along the east side of Cambie Street and RT-1 lots along the west side, but they have the potential to be rezoned under the Cambie Corridor Plan. Recently approved rezoning project, under the Plan in the 6300 block of Cambie, include two mixed-use buildings at six storeys and eight storeys on the west side and a seven-storey mixed used development with townhouses fronting the lane on the east side. Sites east of the subject site are part of the Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Plan which is currently underway will consider three-storey, ground oriented housing.

The proposal is for a ten-storey mixed-use building with 59 secured market rental units and a unit mix which includes 80% two or three-bedroom units. Proposed density is 3.87 FSR and height is 108 ft. Also provided are 46 parking spaces accessed off the lane.

The proposal is coming in under the Cambie Corridor Plan within the Langara Neighbourhood. In this block, the Plan considers mixed-use buildings up to eight storeys, increasing up to 10-storeys towards 49th Ave., and has a suggested FSR range of 2.5 to 3.5. General forms of development have a podium, with upper floors to be stepped back and second floor job space strongly encouraged, where feasible. The project should animate and enhance the lane by providing active uses along it. The Public Realm Plan identifies this site having a mid-sized urban/station plaza and a walking connection along the east property line.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that, while the plan intends eight to ten storeys, staff has agreed to test ten storeys on this site subject to demonstration of urban design performance and noting that applicant is proposing rental.

In the public realm, there is a plaza at south-west corner which is approximately 30 ft. by 35 ft., which is intended to relate to the plaza on the station site across the lane. There is also a large setback along Cambie Street of 20ft. due to a statutory right-of-way (SRW). Per the Plan, there is a pedestrian connection along the interior property line of 10ft. (which will be mirrored when the adjacent site develops). The lane has been activated using amenity space and a small landscape setback.

At Level 1 of the building there is one retail unit fronting on the plaza, a residential entry front W 48th Ave (at the corner of Cambie St), and ground-oriented units fronting on W 48th Avenue. On the lane, there is a residential amenity room with a small patio, a bike storage room, and the parkade ramp.

The building massing has a proposed four-storey should on Cambie St. (It is noted that the Plan seeks a 5-storey streetwall expression on Cambie.) There is a proposed 3-storey shoulder at the southeast corner, to transition to the three-storey townhouses predicted for the adjacent lots under Cambie Phase III. Levels 9 and 10 have 6 ft. setbacks on all sides, and the rooftop has additional common outdoor amenity space for residents.

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

1. Please comment on the design of the public realm. Consider: the corner plaza; retail frontage; and the pedestrian connection (interior PL and lane).
2. Is the massing and building expression along the street frontages (Cambie & W 48th) successful?
3. Is the interface to the neighbouring site (Cambie Phase III) successful?
4. Is the provision of indoor and outdoor common amenities successful?

5. Are the overall density, massing/setbacks, and height appropriate? (Note: Plan anticipates for 8-10 storeys; 2.5 - 3.5 FSR range. Proposal: 10 storeys; 3.87 FSR.)

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that on one side the street wall is actually four storeys instead of five. They also hope to connect the two plazas across the lane to create a more effective public space.

The applicants have worked collaboratively with the city on setbacks and have ended up with a 'wedding cake' massing, due to the constraints of the site and policy. The proposal will be a secured rental building with 79% family units.

The SRW is for underground, transit-related development, and creates further constraints on the site and building massing. At the ground floor, the retail, residential amenity and residential entry all face onto Cambie Street or the Plaza. Four ground-oriented units face onto 48th Avenue.

The massing overhangs the plaza and Cambie St setback to create a sheltered space for the retail units. The architectural expression is intended to have strength through the use of masonry, while glass and spandrel are used to break down the scale of the building. The top floor has a common outdoor space for residents, while at the ground plane lighting and benches are used to activate the public space.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. LaMontagne and seconded by Ms. Gilles, 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:

- More should be done with the massing to strengthen the building as a 'corner' building (including reconsideration of upper storey setbacks);
 - Additional consideration should be given to the relationship to the lane edge and to future development to the east;
 - Design development to activate the plaza and the mews, including provision of additional retail on the plaza;
 - Consider relocating or breaking-up the bike share to allow better design development of the residential entrance on Cambie Street;
 - Design development of the residential amenity, including children's play space;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that this contemporary building certainly fits within the envelope provided by the policy plan and seems to relate to the area well.

Consideration should be given to adding a more retail space on the plaza (i.e. replacing the amenity room) to activate the public realm. The plaza should be commercial if it can be; if not then make a direct connection to the mews in order to activate it. Consider moving the potential bike-share location closer to the Skytrain station, or even splitting it into a few chunks, in order to develop a stronger residential entry and public realm on Cambie St. The staggered trees on Cambie St do not seem successful, so give more consideration to the softscape detailing to create a much more robust landscape. There are exiting issues which will impact the ground-plane expression.

Given the complexities of the Cambie Corridor guidelines the massing has been handled quite well. However, this site deserves a 'corner' building, and more could be done in order to make that happen; perhaps by softening the upper storey setbacks, or stepping back only one storey to create a stronger form.

More could also be done to differentiate the primary façade on Cambie Street from the secondary façade on 48th Avenue, and to develop the street wall to make it feel more solid. The spandrel articulation should also be further fleshed out. Additional consideration should also be given to solar orientations and to providing more shading devices to mitigate solar gain. More could be done to acknowledge sustainability and LEED targets in general.

One panel member was concerned about the townhouses as the massing would be better shifted towards the front of the building.

If this building is going to be family-oriented, a children's amenity space should be added.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that there were some great suggestions which they supported. Beyond the massing, the amenity for kids and solar shading are important pieces which will be included going forward.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2. Address: | 8242 Oak Street |
| Permit No. | RZ-2016-00041 |
| Description: | The proposal is for an 8-storey mixed-use building comprised of 295 m ² (3,172 sq. ft.) of retail at grade, 437 m ² (4,700 sq. ft.) of office, and 50 units of market residential, with a maximum building height of 30.0 m (99 ft.) from grade, a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.0, and a public plaza, all over three levels of underground parking (104 vehicle spaces and 67 bicycle spaces). The application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan. |
| Zoning: | C-1 and RS-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | IBI Group (Jalil Azizi) |
| Owner: | Coromandel Oak Development |
| Delegation: | Martin Bruckner, IBI Group Jalil Azizi, IBI Group Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects |
| Staff: | Zak Bennett & Danielle Wiley |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Introduction:** Zak Bennett, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application at the northeast corner of Oak Street and 67th Avenue composed of two lots, one commercial and one single-family. The lots are zoned C-1 and RS-1 and the site is presently vacant. The site is approximately 18,274 sq. ft. with 159 ft. of frontage along Oak Street and 115 ft. along 67th Avenue. An FSR of 3.00 is proposed.

At the intersection of Oak Street and 67th Avenue the Marpole Plan allows consideration of eight-storey mixed-use buildings up to 3.0 FSR. Along Oak Street from 64th Avenue to Marine Drive the Marpole Plan allows consideration of residential buildings up to six storeys and 2.5 FSR. Across the lane sites are zoned RM-8 which allows for townhouses of up to three storeys and 1.20 FSR.

The proposal is for an eight-storey mixed-use building with a total of 50 dwelling units. The proposal includes 3,172 sq. ft. of commercial space at grade and 4,700 sq. ft. of office space on the second level, all over three levels of underground parking. A public plaza is proposed at the southern edge of the site.

The proposal is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan, which anticipates eight-storey mixed-use buildings at this intersection with a maximum FSR of 3.0. The MCP seeks expanded public realm along Oak Street and a public plaza at the intersection, both of which the applicant is providing.

Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, continued by noting that the Marpole Plan sees this intersection as a potential “node” at the centre of the neighbourhood. The Plan thus identifies all four corners of the intersection for additional height of up to eight storeys. It aims to achieve high-quality retail/public realm with wider sidewalks, better furnishings and planting, and improved cycling/pedestrian routes. It also requires this particular site to provide a new urban plaza to establish a “sense of place”.

This mixed use development has retail at grade, office at the second level and residential units on Levels 3 to 8. Along the Oak Street retail frontage the main level slab steps down towards 67th Avenue following the drop in grade. This contributes to a finer-grained street frontage with narrower retail units.

A small plaza is provided at the corner and residential entry is located off 67th Avenue on the plaza (35ft. x 65ft.). The office entry is located on Oak Street and the main residential entry is located on 67th Ave (off the plaza). Two-level townhouses are located along the lane. A 15 ft. setback on the lane allows for private patios, landscape, and a sidewalk from 67th Avenue. Office-use at Level 2 will expand employment opportunities in the neighbourhood. The indoor residential amenity is located at this level, as well as an outdoor amenity on the rooftop of the townhouses. There is also another outdoor amenity space provided at the roof.

On Oak Street there is a 23 ft. setback from the curb to the building face at Levels 1 and 2, while residential storeys are set back 3-6 ft. for articulation.

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

1. Please comment on the design of the public realm, particularly the corner plaza and retail frontage.
 2. Are the interfaces to neighbouring properties (i.e. the adjacent lot to the north and the low-density residential properties across the lane) successful?
 3. Is the provision of indoor and outdoor common amenities successful?
 4. Are the overall massing, setbacks and height successful?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that the massing of the project is mostly set by the area plan, including the requirement for a 2000sqft plaza.

There is a wide public realm setback off of Oak Street. Along Oak Street there is a very friendly pedestrian experience, with street trees and street furniture to be provided. The plaza at the corner of Oak Street and 67th Avenue is important, and the hope is to develop it with a café or something which encourages interaction. There is also a planting bed along Oak Street to provide separation with traffic and better define the outdoor plaza space.

There are two-storey townhouses to help frame the corner by the lane, and a generous sidewalk to provide access to the townhouses. The entries to the townhouses are raised above grade.

This is a family-oriented project with over 50% of units to be two-bedroom or larger. There is a children's amenity space at Level 2, and a more adult-oriented outdoor amenity, including urban agriculture, at the rooftop.

This is a LEED gold project.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Gilles and seconded by Ms. Van Halm, 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:

- Design development on the west-facing wall of the plaza (back of townhouses) - either consider a change of use to retail to activate the plaza, or incorporate a green wall;
- Design development of the retail street to create a more distinctive, fine-grained 'Marpole' fabric and character;
- Reconsider the location and size of the office lobby (i.e. may be relocated to plaza);

- Revisit the location of the vehicle ramp, to mitigate traffic impacts on the lane;
 - Further design development of the plaza and children's play area.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that having the townhouses backing on the plaza is not ideal. Consider creating more retail which wraps around the plaza to make it livelier. Two panel members commented that a green wall could adequately activate the plaza. As well, consider relocating the parking ramp towards the opening of the lane so that cars don't have to drive past the townhouses.

Further design development and programming should also be done for the plaza. More diversity in programming is needed for the plaza to accommodate different uses in different seasons.

Although the panel appreciated that the simple massing of the building, more should be done to bring the Marpole character to the retail street frontage, and really set the bar for every project which follows. Having extra generous setbacks at the lane is great for residents.

The east setback on the 6th floor confuses the massing and should be refined. The retail and office entry expressions should also be better considered. Consider using more articulation on the lower floors, to better acknowledge individual storefronts, and include "beautiful" canopies. One Panel member thought that Oak Street appears over-articulated.

The way solar protection on the south elevation is handled is very intelligent, but the expression of glass facing the plaza is a bit too relentless and should be revisited. Consider glass protection over the top floor.

The landscape concept is weaker, and should be further developed. The landscape design at grade off the plaza creates more separation than connection, and more could be done to open it up. Consider adding art to the public plaza, though one panel member thought that the organic forms of the public realm looked nice. More active play instruments are needed in the play space.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked panel and noted that the comments about the back of the townhouses have been considered and could be perhaps mitigated through materials.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 3. Address: | 521-525 W 8 th Avenue |
| Permit No. | RZ-2016-00038 |
| Description: | The proposal is for an 8-storey office building with retail at grade, with a floor area of 5,990 m ² (64,480 sq. ft.), a building height of 29.57 m (97 ft.), and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.51, over 3.5 levels of underground parking (88 vehicle spaces, 29 Class A bicycle spaces and six Class B bicycle spaces). This application is being considered under the Metropolitan Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan. |
| Zoning: | C-3A to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Review: | First |
| Architect: | MCM Partnership (Mark Thompson) |
| Owner: | Vanlux W 8 th Inc. |
| Delegation: | Mark Thompson, MCM Partnership David Jerke, van der Zalm + associates Jason Packer, Recollective |
| Staff: | Michelle Yip & Marie Linehan |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

- Introduction: Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application located on 8th Avenue, one parcel west of Cambie Street, in the Fairview local area. The surrounding developments include a six-storey office building to the west, Crossroads at seven storeys to the south, one to one-and-a-half-storey commercial retail units (CRUs) along Cambie Street to the east, and a four-storey and an 11-storey residential building across the lane to the north and northwest.

This site is currently zoned C-3A, which permits a maximum density of 3.3 FSR. The rezoning proposal is being considered under the *Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan*, which allows for consideration for increasing commercial density within the 'Broadway: Choice-of-Use Areas' to strengthen and enhance the commercial capacity, especially in areas served by rapid transit.

The proposal is for an eight-storey office building with floorplates ranging from 6,900 sq. ft. to 9,025 sq. ft., at a height of 97 ft. and FSR of 6.51

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued by noting that this site is currently zoned C-3A and is located in the Fairview Slopes Sub-Area of Central Broadway. The permitted maximum density under the C-3A zoning is 3.3 FSR, noting that additional density can be considered through rezoning under the Metro Core Policy.

The outright height in C-3A is 30 ft. and heights up to 120 ft. can be considered under the C-3A zoning, which we see in tower development along the Broadway Corridor. However, for this area, there is a further height restriction under the C-3A Guidelines. It is expected that buildings along Fairview Slopes step down in height to preserve views to City Hall, and the prominence of City Hall on the skyline as viewed from downtown, specifically from vantage points along the False Creek seawall and the bridges crossing False Creek. Staff have reviewed that criteria and the maximum height that can be considered at this site is eight storeys, as is proposed.

In terms of the building form, it is expected that a continuous street wall be provided of approximately 30 ft. in height. In this case the street wall height is 36 ft. to align with the podium of the adjacent building to the west. The upper massing above the street wall is expected to have a narrower frontage relative to the street wall base to allow for sufficient spacing between buildings, daylighting and views. Uses and treatment of the elevation of ground floor should provide pedestrian interest, and continuous weather protection should be provided.

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

1. Comment on the overall form of development, with particular regard to:
 - a. Building massing
 - b. Density
 2. Preliminary advice on proposed architectural expression and materials for the DP application.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by noting that this is a relatively small site that will have small to medium tenancies.

The mass responds to view constraints, and the lane has been widened at the request of the City Engineering Department. At the north there is a setback context line which acknowledges the northern building and allows for solar penetration. Massing is also used to provide weather protection around the building.

The envelope responds to the vertical surfaces, while the cutaways respond to the different solar orientations with a more sheer response. There is also 50% glazing.

Parking is below the bylaw, and the lane is given over to access for bike or car share.

There are paving patterns at the ground plane to create a welcoming and shallow space. There is also an extensive green roof at the 3rd floor and plans to collect storm water. The roof lends itself to a vertical green wall extending down to the third floor.

At grade there is infrastructure for electric vehicle charging and carpooling, as well as shower facilities for bicyclists. In general a lot of attention was paid to sustainability.

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 Besharat, 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:

- Enhance the environmental performance of the building by including passive aspects;
 - Develop the fritting on the glazing to enhance the building architecture expression;
 - Design development to better activate the corner.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that the west part of the building will constantly be in the shadow of the building to the west. As well, given the small balcony at Level 3 it would be appreciated if there was more balcony space somewhere.

The applicants should revisit the canopy expression to create something more attractive. They should also add more amenity space; perhaps at the roof. The panel supports the addition of an elevator with access to the roof in order to achieve this.

It is nice how the building is carved from a cube, but consideration should be given to making the frit photographic to make the building more contemporary through patterning. Do something with the frit to take the building to another level.

Going forward, more attention should be paid to the mechanical details and the sustainability performance. Consider taking the environmental performance up a notch.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that they have spent a lot of time discussing rooftop access, so it is good to have that acknowledged.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 4. Address: | 5050-5080 Joyce Street |
| Permit No. | DP-2017-00084 |
| Description: | To construct a 30-storey mixed-use tower with commercial at grade and residential above (256 dwelling units), over six levels of underground parking. |
| Zoning: | CD-1 Pending |
| Application Status: | Complete Development Application |
| Review: | Second |
| Architect: | Henriquez Partners Architects (Norman Huth) |
| Owner: | Westbank Projects Corp. |
| Delegation: | Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects Norman Huth, Henriquez Partners Architects Chris Boldt, Hapa Collective Joseph Fry, Hapa Collective Josh Anderson, Westbank Projects Corp. Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting |
| Staff: | Ann McLean |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

- **Introduction:** Ann McLean, Development Planner, summarized the prior panel's consensus items from the rezoning stage:
 - The pedestrian lane is too tight;
 - A stronger residential entry is needed;
 - A stronger base is needed at street level to compensate for the upper levels;
 - Consider connecting the tower to the ground plane by bringing it through the podium;
 - Design development to solve the acoustic issues with the Skytrain;
 - Consider more commercial spaces towards the Skytrain or the bus loop;
 - Consider a more distinct top to add to the skyline;
 - Design development to remove some of the metaphors as they drive the design too much, to the detriment of the building functionality;
 - Reduce the amount of balcony space to reduce the building mass;
 - Consider sustainability and thermal separation more;
 - The water feature is interesting, but a more generous public realm at grade would be better;

Ms. McLean then took questions from the panel.

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

1. Has the development responded to the Panel's comments at RZ?
 2. Livability of the units with regard to outlook and private outdoor space (balconies).
 3. Location of public art, noting that it should offer the public a free and unobstructed experience of the work with the greatest opportunity for public interaction.
 4. General comments on architectural expression and materials.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that there were a lot of thoughtful comments previously.

The tower has been brought down to create a better relationship between the tower and base, and the sizes of the balconies are better proportioned and sculpted. There is also a simplified parkade entrance with more landscaping. The roof has been worked on a lot; however, the bottom of the building is intended to be the more extravagant part of the design.

The public art idea will be a text-based piece which is built into the façade to activate the public realm and doesn't compete with the building above.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project.

- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that all of the previous commentary seems to have been addressed. However, the canopy over the residential entry still need more work and the balconies feel a bit forced in some cases²

One panel recommended that the public art be a big fish. Other panelists mentioned that the applicants should revisit the materiality to adjust to whatever the public art turns out to be. The art should be reflected in the glass and lighting. Take care that the art does not compete with the building, however.

Consideration should be given to adding something attractive on the façade facing the train for the passengers to look at. As well, if the vegetation is not kept on the Levels 3 - 5 then the balconies facing the Skytrain will not be used. Something needs to screen these spaces. There are a lot of sliding doors in the units facing the Skytrain and more consideration should be given to noise impacts. The mobile station should also be closer to the Translink property.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their helpful advice.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.