DATE: May 30, 2018
TIME: 3:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall
PRESEN: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Amela Brudar – Chair (excused from item 2)
Helen Avini Besharat (Chair on item 2)
Derek Neale
Yijin Wen
Muneesh Sharma
Jim Huffman
Richard Henriquez
Jim Hancock
Susan Ockwell
Colette Parsons
Grant Newfield
David Jerke
Leslie Shieh

REGRETS: Marie-France Venneri

MINUTE TAKER: Camilla Lade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4118-4138 Cambie Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1303 Kingsway &amp; 3728 Clark Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4506 Rupert St &amp; 3309 Price Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUSINESS MEETING
Chair Amela Brudar 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. A formal welcome was read by the Chair we acknowledge we that we are on the unceded homelands of the Musqueum, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh nations and we give thanks for their generosity and hospitality on these lands.

1. Address: 4118-4138 Cambie Street
   Permit: RZ-2018-00009
   Description: To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 65 units, over two levels of underground parking with 68 vehicle stalls and 91 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.88 and the building height is 19.5 m (64 ft.). This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
   Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
   Application Status: Rezoning Application
   Review: First
   Architect: Raymond Letkeman Architects
   Owner: Kevin Hussey, Developer, E3
   Delegation: James Bussey, Architect, RLA
   Florien Fiscet, Landscape Architect, Durante Creuk
   Staff: Tiffany Rougeau & Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

• Introduction: Tiffany Rougeau, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application at 4118-4138 Cambie Street, a 2 lot assembly at the southeast corner of Cambie Street and King Edward Avenue.

  Council approved in principle a rezoning application for the single lot at 4138 Cambie Street to allow development of a 6-storey building residential building. Since acquiring the additional corner lot to the north the applicant withdrew their application for 4138 Cambie Street and submitted a new rezoning application for the 2 lot assembly.

  Both lots are currently zoned RS-1 and each is developed with a single-family home. 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 2.0-2.5

  For context, the King Edward Skytrain Station is located to the northwest and a number of approved rezonings surround the site, specifically:
  • The site to the south: 6-storey building with townhouses on the lane, with a FSR of 2.56. (under construction);
  • To the east, across the lane, this block has been rezoned for Seniors Supportive Housing with a FSR of 2.27; and, On May 1st, Council approved Phase 3 of the Cambie Corridor Plan which now allows family housing in the form of townhomes for sites across the lane.

  The proposal is for a 6-storey residential building with a total of 65 units over 2 levels of underground parking. An FSR of 2.88 is proposed.

  Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction by noting that the proposal is generally consistent with the Cambie Corridor built form guidelines which recommend a 6-storey residential building with shoulder step backs above the 4th storey.
A more vertical expression without step backs can be considered to respond to the corner of Cambie Street and West King Edward Avenue.

There is a change in grade on the site of about 10 ft. from the high point at the southwest corner at Cambie to the low point at the northeast corner at the intersection of the lane and West King Edward.

Parking access is provided via a knock out panel from the adjacent site which allows for more usable outdoor space in the rear yard. A row of townhouses was not required at the lane noting the potential impact of the parkade entry to the Seniors’ Supportive Housing directly across the lane.

The built form guidelines recommend that the main floor be no more than 3 ft. above sidewalk grades with individual patios and entry steps along the frontage to provide activation.

In this case the main floor is up to 6 ft. above the sidewalk level along West King Edward at the worst case due to the challenges with regards the site grades and the connection to the adjacent parkade. A 3 ft. planter is provided along the site edge and a common stair to access the patios, rather than individual steps. There is a bus stop directly in front of the site at West King Edward Avenue.

The Seniors’ Supportive Housing building has the main floor located at grade as that site doesn’t have the same slope, and therefore that building is lower in height although at the same number of storeys.

Under the Cambie Corridor Public Realm Policy lanes are meant to play a role in improving pedestrian connectivity. In particular, design elements such as landscape nodes and benches in lanes around Skytrain stations may be provided to enliven the lanes and improve their quality as public spaces. There are grade challenges because the lane entry from West King Edward is fairly steep, but staff would appreciate the Panel’s advice with regards to improvements to the lane interface.

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

1. Overall height, form, and density relative to the Cambie Corridor Plan and the context.
2. Corner expression.
3. Treatment of the site edges along West King Edward and the lane.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted concerns from the previous panel regarding the laneway town house at this site. The proposal now supplies a rear yard with no townhouses as an alcove for the site. The courtyard is an opportunity to provide shelter from traffic and outdoor space with an outdoor dining area. There is a landscape buffer proposed at the courtyard and at-grade planting. There is a landscape treatment at the lane to promote pedestrian traffic.

  The corner site is a tremendous opportunity architecturally, and many options were explored for the corner. The balconies are likely pre-cast concrete. There is soft lighting proposed to create a ‘glow’ on the corner. Each wing is meant to fold out to establish the symmetry of the building. The materials are intended to be pre-cast concrete with a U-shaped dark brick frame with punched windows at the wings. There is also wood horizontal panelling to provide a light texture and a natural West Coast feel. Hardi-paneling is used to give a light feel above the 4-storey plinth. Soffits are designed to be expressive and visually appealing. The drop in grade was a challenge. Along Cambie Street, individual patio entries are provided and well-resolved. Along W 8th there are no individual stairs, but rather shared access. The two corner units have separate access stairs and the middle units are accessed via a common stairs. There are five patios along West King Edward Avenue.
The applicant then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

  Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Wen and seconded by Ms. Parsons 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:

  - Further design development of the public realm along King Edward to reduce the height of the retaining walls and further animate the street frontage.
  - Further design development of the corner expression including consideration to re-locate balconies from the corner.
  - Further design development to the side and rear elevations to ensure clarity and consistency of architectural expression.

- **Related Commentary:** The panel was supportive of the height, form and density. The building was seen to be compliant with the guidelines of the Cambie Corridor Plan. Some panel members supported the corner balcony treatment. Some did not, noting this important intersection and entry to the city should have a stronger corner.

  There was discussion regarding materiality and it was noted that maintenance of white concrete may be a potential issue. The rear and side elevations should be of a higher quality in keeping with the street elevations and provide more brick, not fibre-cement.

  The back garden and the relationship of the massing to the lane were noted as a positive. The knock out panel for the ramp was appreciated as it allows for a more functional rear yard amenity. The pad mounted transformer may need relocation to allow more sunlight access to the rear yard, noting it is occupying the sunniest part of the yard. It was suggested to consider a rooftop amenity with unlimited solar access, and to provide a washroom area.

  It was noted that there will be significant pedestrian traffic in this location and the site edge on at King Edward is too harsh and needs further design development. The retaining walls are too high in the current proposal, noting guardrails will create additional height to 8 ft. The site edges need more interaction with the street. The granite from the existing retaining wall may be repurposed instead of concrete retaining walls. The lobby might be too undersized for social interaction and needs improved visual access from the street. The lane and sidewalk could use more benches and shrubbery.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the staff for the comments.
2. Address: 1303 Kingsway & 3728 Clark Drive
Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade and 53 secured market rental units; over two levels of underground parking with 43 vehicle stalls. The proposed floor area is 5,016 sq. m (53,992 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.77 and the building height is 22.75 m (74.64 ft.). This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy.

Permit No: RZ-2018-00010
Zoning: C2 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: GBL Architects
Owner: Tobias Slezak, Owner, Aquilini
Delegation: Amela Brudar, Architect, GBL
Mike Knauer, Architect, GBL
Caelan Griffiths, Landscape Architect, PMG
Mark Mazzoni, Aquilini
Staff: Derek Robinson & Georgina Lyons (Tim Potter in lieu of Georgina)

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

*Helen Avini Besharat Chairing

- **Introduction:** Derek Robinson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as proposing to rezone under the Rental 100 policy which allows consideration for height up to 6 storeys on C-2 zoned sites with commensurate density. There is no maximum FSR under this policy, however typical 6 storey Rental 100 projects generally fall between 3.25 and 3.5 FSR. The applicant is proposing 3.77 FSR.

It is an irregular shaped lot, located on the northeast corner of Kingsway and Clark Drive located 1 block west of Knight and Kingsway. This area of Kingsway is zoned C-2 with an RM-1 townhouse transition zone to the north and south, including an adjacent triangle of single family houses. The site is 14,300 sq ft in area and is triple fronting on Kingsway, Clark and E 21st Av. The site is occupied by the single-storey Cedar Cottage liquor store and café. There is a small pocket park on City property proposed to remain. There is an approximate 15.5 foot cross-slope from Kingsway to the lane. Because of this the building is 8 storeys at the lane.

The applicant is proposing 53 units (36% family oriented) over at grade commercial and 43 parking stalls in 2 levels of underground parking. Again, the proposed FSR is 3.77. Indoor and outdoor amenity areas are provided on level 3 fronting the lane, along with outdoor amenity on the level 7 roof. An SRW to achieve a 5.5m sidewalk along Kingsway is being provided.

Tim Potter, Development Planner, introduced the project as a double-fronting, corner site-Kingsway/Clark/21st Ave. The frontage is 152 feet at Kingsway, 123 feet at Clark and 37 feet at East 21st Ave. The slope is a crossfall of over 15.5ft southwest to northeast.

The Base zoning is C2 which would be a (4) storey mixed-use building at 2.5 FSR. C2 asks for an 8 foot setback above 35 feet from the front property line. The proposal is for a 6 storey (along Kingsway) and 8 storey (at the lane) mixed-use building comprised of commercial at grade and residential above, all over two levels of parking. This rezoning application is seeking a floor space ratio of 3.77.

Setbacks include a ground floor commercial is setback (18 feet) 5.5m from curb to face of building, then 2 feet from the property line of Clark and East 21st Ave.
The residential at grade is setback (20 feet) 6.1M from the lane. The 5th floor is set back 8ft from the street and lane facing building face, and an 803 square feet amenity area with associated outdoor amenity.

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

1. Please comment on the overall massing strategy and in particular, how the scale transition is handled at Clark and at the lane;

2. Please comment on the design and location of the amenity space in terms of its location and potential for landscape improvements;

3. How well does the landscape address and relate to the existing public realm treatments?

4. Please comment on the approach to sustainable performance such as solar orientation, shading, urban heat island effect, or similar concerns.

5. In summary and in view of the foregoing questions, is the overall massing, height and density supportable?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The site is unique because it has a public realm to work with. The public realm was celebrated as much as possible. The corner was meant to be in line with the surrounding context. There are breaks in the façade design to signify entrances and activity. At the pocket park there is a break to signify or celebrate activity. The southwest exposure design is recessed for a nice patio that fronts the public realm so it is day lit. The vertical expression design is consistent to signify the entrance from the public pocket park. The intention is a vertical expression and active uses wrapped around the expression. At Clark and 21st there is a lively entrance proposed for the retail unit that is attractive and well used. The lane approach is stepped inward to be sensitive to the back.

There are opportunities for amenities in the building. The outdoor amenity areas are publicly available. At the lane the applicant tried to create a sense of activity with townhouse units that are raised on a plinth.

The proposed landing is soft and Park Drive pocket park is designed to be well contained. There are plantings proposed in containers to reflect the formality of the conditions. The most important landscape element proposed is the ‘bowl’ at 21st and Clark. There are at grade plantings proposed to soften the edge and activate it. The children’s play area is intended to be ‘sculptural’ and imaginative which is active and open. The proposed planting on the stepping back is on the north side which requires shade tolerant plantings. The bike parking is designed along Clark drive for better access.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Newfield and seconded by Mr. Huffman 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:

- Improve the potential of public realm along the pocket park
• Explore increased connection between commercial retail unit (CRU) and the pocket park by allowing activity to spill out onto the sidewalk by design development of the CRU glazing and openings;
• Consider relocation of the amenity room to have increased solar exposure;
• Relocate the playground to the upper floor for better sunlight for adults and children;
• Consider a better location of loading for commercial and residential uses;
• Consider a stronger corner expression; and
• Improve the location of the bike racks.

- **Related Commentary:** The two corners of the building are very dominant, and will require design development. The ratio of windows to wall is well done, but be mindful of the dark days in Vancouver. Add sun shading or passive measures for improved passive sustainability measures.

The overall design is well done on a complex site. The complexity is well translated on the massing. The massing and density and character are supported. Consider improving the retail façade at the lane. The retail facing the lane should be treated as well articulated as the front side. A few panel mentioned considering the corner massing in relation to the building being a transition to the neighbourhood.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.
EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended

- **Introduction:** Michelle Yip, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application located on the southeast side of Rupert Street and 29th Avenue in Renfrew-Collingwood. It’s surrounded by Grenfell Elementary to the south and single-family homes to the east. To the north and west is C-1 zoning, which consists of a mix of single-family homes and some commercial; a Montessori pre-school is located to the north, and to the west is a 2-storey mixed-use building.

The site consists of two lots zoned C-1 and RS-1. The C-1 zoning permits 3-storey mixed-use developments with the intent of providing local-serving, neighbourhood commercial with compatible dwelling uses. The proposal is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy (known as Rental 100), which allows for consideration of up to 4 storeys on C-1 sites. The proposal is for a 4-storey development fronting Rupert Street and 29th Avenue, consisting of retail at grade along Rupert Street, live-work units along 29th Avenue, and a total of 42 rental housing units at a density of 2.14 FSR. The RS-1 lot at the rear consists of stacked townhomes.

Dr. Patrick Chan, Development Planner, introduced the policies guiding rezonings for existing C-1 sites; in this case the policy recommends using the C-2 form as a parameter. It was noted that the proposed main building’s height, massing and setbacks largely conforms to the C-2 massing envelope. A further upper-storey setback at the main building’s northeast corner is provided to further reduce shadowing, overlook, reduce appearance of upper-bulk, and transition better to the lower scale fabric. After outlining the policy framework, the project’s site planning was discussed. In particularly, how the main building’s footprint is a response to the site’s geometry. To capture the void space at the site’s rear area, a set of separate four stacked townhouses are placed along Price Street. They are separate from the main building because there was the intention for them to be more similar typologically to the ubiquitous single-family house. A 12 ft. sideyard is provided along the east property-line to offer more “breathing space” between the proposed buildings and the existing fabric. This wider sideyard also presents a good opportunity for some more substantial planting that can act as screening.

Other than these residential structures, the parking-ramp also enters at the middle of the courtyard as this is an alignment that forms the most direct route from the east-west running lane. The development’s amenity room is placed above this parking-ramp. Design language wise, the building seem to use a series of red and white boxes and planes that are pushed and pulled to break away from the standard 3+1 ratio, and to break down some of its horizontality. A different material is used at the “elbow” of Rupert and 29th Ave to define the building’s focal / entry point.
The development planner’s presentation concluded with some concerns about the courtyard being “pressed from all sides” by the buildings and other structures. This conclusion then opened up to a series of questions querying how bettering the site-planning and locations of programs can be pursued.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
1) The courtyard’s usability with regards to movement to and within it.
2) Accessibility of the amenity-room from all units, as well as connection between the amenity-room and potential outdoor amenity-space (other than the at-grade courtyard).
3) Liveability in fulfilling the outlook and horizontal angle of daylight requirements for some units.
4) General massing and character to produce a finer grain appearance.
5) General safety issues with regards to the narrow passages between various structures.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The architectural concept is two points with the columns as an entrance. There is green wall proposed on the building. There is a rental office and amenity proposed that can be combined to increase the courtyard space.

The pocket park is included in the design, and the Rupert side would have more plantings. Along the Price Street elevation there is a “typical” townhouse and metal fencing suggested. The planting is proposed on the street side and the entry ways. The landscape response to the interface is to plant as much resilient evergreen as possible. The courtyard has a bar belled shape design. There is paving proposed on the ground plane to emphasize the feeling of exposure. The bicycle parking is designed along 29th and Price Street.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

  THAT the Panel Recommend Resubmission of the project with the following recommendations after incorporating the panel’s comments:
  - Simplify the overall scheme and explore the single building option
  - Integrate the parking ramp to the building and work with engineering to reduce the parking ramp width to 12 feet in order to increase the courtyard area
  - Enlarge the court yard
  - Integrate amenity space into the building
  - Simplify the loading by combing commercial and residential loading bays

- **Related Commentary:** The project is located on two arterial streets and it is an interesting, challenging site. The building does fit the surrounding context and the project does give “a nod” to the neighbourhood. The mix of uses that is very rich that would make the building very livable. The site needs improvement through simplification of the overall scheme. Integrate the parking access and amenity into the building.

  The height of the building is supported by the panel and the single family stepping form is supported. The front yard townhouse setback could be reduced to provide more space for the courtyard, which needs more usable space. The double up of patio space is not needed, consider deleting the back patios. Add privacy screenings to avoid overlook issues. Take the retail expression to the next level of resolution of design to make it small retail character. Perhaps access the courtyard from the lobby, by
Putting in glass walls, to generate awareness of the courtyard. The parking entrance has CPTED issues.
Consider changing the office space as an amenity room that could spill out onto the roof and receive some sunlight. Perhaps take the townhouse volume and add to the building stepping into a double loaded corridor configuration to simplify the building. It would resolve many of the issues that have been pointed out.

Consider converting to more planting. Along Rupert could use less lawn and more hardscape so it is more usable. The parking scheme needs to be simplified to avoid accidents. The parklet could use something more interactive.
Overall, simplify the programming, reduce the number of buildings and integrate the parking access with the building amenity space and the building.

Reduce the number of buildings improve parking access.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and said the comments were inspiring.
- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.