

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 21, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Amela Brudar - Chair (excused from item 3)
Helen Avini Besharat
Yijin Wen
Muneesh Sharma
Leslie Shieh (excused from item 4)
Colette Parsons
Derek Neale
Jim Huffman
David Jerke
Grant Newfield

REGRETS: Marie-France Venneri

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 988 W 64th Avenue & 8030-8130 Oak Street
2. 119-133 W 41st Avenue
3. 3070 Kingsway
4. 3123-3141 W Broadway (Hollywood Theatre)

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.

1. Address:	988 W 64th Avenue & 8030-8130 Oak Street
Permit:	RZ-2017-00072
Description:	To develop three 6-storey residential buildings consisting of 130 market units, over two levels of underground parking with 151 vehicle stalls and 169 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 16,406 sq. m (176,600 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.50, and the maximum building height is 20.9 m (68.6 ft.). This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Arno Matis Architecture
Owner:	Jim Zhang, Owner, Ulmus Development Ltd.
Delegation:	Arno Matis, Architect, AMA
Staff:	J. Pattison, Landscape Architect, Considered Design Inc. Scott Erdman & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction: Scott Erdman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as an application to rezone 7 parcels under the Marpole Community Plan. The site is located at the SE corner of Oak St & 64th Ave.

The site is currently zoned RS-1, and each lot has a single-family dwelling. Together, the seven parcels measure approximately 350 feet wide and 116 feet deep. The site area is approximately 40,430 square feet.

The Marpole Plan anticipates residential buildings in this location, up to six-storeys, with an FSR up to 2.50, and the upper storeys set back to minimize the appearance of scale and to reduce shadow impacts. The Plan also requires mid-block connections along Oak St through blocks longer than a standard block length. This block has been identified in the Plan as a long block, and an appropriate location for a mid-block connection.

The proposal is to build 3 six-storey residential buildings, with 130 market units, at a density of 2.50 FSR. The proposal includes a contribution of half the width (12 feet) of a future mid-block connection, on the southern edge of this site. The other half would be provided by a future development to the south, (no applications have been received at this location at this time.)

Dr. Chan noted that the proposed design with three buildings on site does meet these parameters. The proposed height is 68.60' and the front setback ranges from 17.5' to 12', side setbacks are 12' on both sides; and the rear setback is 16.33'. Each building is separated by a 24' wide courtyard, and each building has its own indoor amenity room. Floor layout wise, because of the "cross" plan many units do have at least two exterior walls which can allow for better natural ventilation and lighting. All three buildings are stepped back on the fifth and sixth floors to meet the Plan's recommendation for upper-storey setbacks to minimise appearance of height and bulk.

It was also noted the parti treated the buildings as a series of boxes that are pushed-and-pulled to break up the ubiquitous "4 floor plus 2 floors" block massing expression. The projecting framed balconies accentuating this push-and-pull effect.

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

Comments regarding the following issues were sought for:

- a) Overall Massing in terms of minimising shadows and transitioning sensitively to the neighbouring lots.
- b) Interface with the mid-block connection, particularly how it relates to the building at the ground level.
- c) Inside-Outside relations with regards to how the amenity rooms relate to the outdoor space around them.
- d) Architectural variety between the three buildings, specifically how they can be different while maintaining a consistent architectural language.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant proposed to break down the scale of the building so it is sympathetic to the single family area surrounding context. There are three building types in the proposal. The applicant attempted to draw from the context of traffic in the area, light in the courtyard spaces and the lanes, with a layered approach to the landscape. The window to wall ratio on Oak Street was important. Oak Street was a challenge to make the units open, so the units were pulled around the corners and opened to the side yard. The corners were intended to be 'carved out' to reduce the width of the block and reduce the massing. The expression was meant to bring more light into the courtyard. The significant slope was considered with the step down of the buildings response. There are three amenity spaces proposed. Two amenities face Oak Street and the third amenity responds to the mid-block connection. The use of wood was attempted in the mid-scale to give a 'sense of warmth' to the residential form. The square form was treated with horizontal banding, in order to help the composition.

Landscaping wise, it was a layered approach. For social gathering spaces there are bench seats that turn on their access, rubber surfacing as play surface, and the tree planting is meant to provide privacy for certain units. Oak Street is a busy street, and there were trees to break up the hard edge. There are agricultural components on either side of the proposal provide an urban farm.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma 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:

- Create a more varied architectural expression between the two buildings
- Re-locate the amenity spaces to face the courtyard
- Review window sizes and livability of the units
- Widen the courtyard
- Improve loading access to buildings to provide loading access into the core

Related Commentary: There is support for the height density and massing with a strong parti. The project parti is bold and refreshing. Some panel members supported two buildings, while some panel members supported three buildings. There is too much building envelope on the building.

Some panel members supported a larger courtyard, and other panel members supported smaller courtyards. The courtyard width is problematic due to shadowing.

The connection between indoor and outdoor spaces should be addressed. The amenity spaces should be re-located to allow direct access to the courtyard to animate them.

There could be a penthouse elevator instead of one amenity. There could be increased patio space instead of planters. It would be a better use of space. The courtyards should be animated, and be more inviting for people to gather.

There was a shortage of context information in the proposal submission.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the staff and noted the comments would be taken into consideration.

2. Address:	119-133 W 41st Avenue
Description:	To develop the site with a townhouse development consisting of a 4-storey building and a 2.5-storey building at the rear, for a total of 20 market units; all over one level of underground parking with 25 vehicle stalls and 31 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 2,410 sq. m (25,947 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.75, and the maximum building heights are 15.6 m (51.1 ft.) and 11.8 m (38.7ft.). This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
Permit No:	RZ-2017-00073
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Owner:	Harrison Han, Owner, Nexst Properties
Delegation:	Norm Chin, Architect, DYS Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Jeremy Field, LEED Consultant, E3 Eco Group
Staff:	Mateja Seaton & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Mateja Seaton, Rezoning Planner, introduced the site as a 3-lot assembly, located close to the North West corner of West 41st and Manitoba with double-fronting lots. The application is being considered under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP). The site is zoned RS-1 and occupied by single-family houses. The combined lot size is 0.35 ac with a frontage of approximately 132 feet along 41st Ave, and a depth of 112 feet along Manitoba. The site slopes by approximately 6 ft from a high point on Woodstock at the North East corner of the site to 41st Avenue at the South East corner.

The site is 3 blocks from Oakridge Centre and the Oakridge-41st Avenue Skytrain Station to the west. Under Phase 2 of the Cambie Corridor Plan, this area considers heights up to 12 storeys. Under proposed Phase 3, staff is revisiting heights within the Municipal Town Centre (MTC) area and proposing higher-density options for residential and office developments. Queen Elizabeth Park is 5 blocks to the north. Sir William Van Horne Elementary School 2 blocks to the southeast, Columbia Park 3 blocks to southwest. The site is largely surrounded by single family homes. The site is serviced by a bus route on 41st Ave which will eventually be the 41st Avenue B-Line connecting UBC to Joyce-Collingwood Station. 41st Avenue is anticipated to have complete street improvements under the proposed Phase 3 Plan.

Phase 2 of the CCP allows up to 4-storey residential buildings in this area between Columbia and Ontario Streets, and an FSR range of 1-25-1.75, in apartment form. It also allows for the same 4-storey built form across the street along 41st. The direction for this specific area has not changed in the proposed Phase 3 CCP, but it does envision 3-storey townhouses across Woodstock Avenue to the north (up to 1.2 FSR).

The applicant is proposing two rows of townhouse buildings over one level of underground parking: 4 storeys along 41st (Building A - 14 units), and 2.5 storeys along Woodstock (Building B - 6 units). There are 20 units proposed, all of which are 2 bedrooms or larger. The maximum height is 15.6 m (51 feet) / 11.8 meters (38.5 feet). The proposed FSR is 1.75. 25 parking stalls and 31 bicycle stalls. There is a knock-out panel to the adjacent development for shared parking. It is presented as the next phase of the townhouse project directly to the west (15 units), enacted in October 2017.

Dr. Patrick Chan, Development Planner, began by noting this is a double-fronting lot with a slope getting lower toward the 41st Ave side, and this slope presented challenges to the parkade design and overall site-planning. It was also pointed out this rezoning is Phase 2 of two phases, with Phase 1 (also by the same developer) nearing issuance of a building permit. Next, Dr. Chan introduced the Cambie Corridor Plan's policies regarding height, massing envelope, and public realm, with the key points being a four-storey apartment form is recommended for the subject site so as to have greater setbacks along Woodstock Ave, and thus less shadowing on the Woodstock Ave sidewalks. It was also noted that front-yards can be treated as a semi-public space that expands the public realm's overall sense of openness. The proposed design is two rows of townhouses: the ones facing 41st Ave are stacked, and the ones facing Woodstock Ave are single; and a 24' wide courtyard separates them. Dr. Chan noted that the proposed design mostly meets these parameters: The proposed respective height is 51' for the 41st Ave facing townhouses) and 38.6' for the Woodstock Ave facing ones; the sideyard setbacks are 10' on both sides, and the respective front setbacks are 13' on 41st Ave and 10' on Woodstock Ave. Layout wise, Dr. Chan noted all units have double-exposure that provides adequate cross ventilation and lighting.

Concerns about the parkade protruding out of the ground plane due to topographical challenges were raised, especially on how that impacts the front yard spaces facing both 41st Ave and Woodstock Ave, and also neighbourly transitions to lots to the immediate east.

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

- 1) Appropriateness of the townhouse form for this lot in terms of transitioning to the surrounding lower scale fabric, since the Cambie Corridor Plan actually recommends apartment forms.
- 2) Usability of the courtyards - one between the two rows of townhouses, and the space between Phases One and Two.
- 3) Private-public interface with regards to the treatment of the front yards on both 41st and Woodstock Avenues.
- 4) General neighbourly relations, particularly how the east side yard is treated.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant started with a brief history of the application. The proposal was previously designed as a stand-alone building. It is a fairly interesting site with two fronting streets. There were some missed opportunities. The typology of two buildings at a smaller scale was considered appropriate. It is a transitioning grade across the site. The parking ramp sets the tone of the courtyard. The proposal has as many family units as possible. There is a stacked standing face typology on West 41st. There is a pedestrian access at the Woodstock side. At the west, the interface to the future project would be stepped back to minimize the sidewall interface. The vocabulary is clean, and there is conceted slab, pre-finished metal, and the building form articulation of the form to define the individual townhouses on both sides of the street. On the west 41st volume there is rooftop access to outdoor space. There are porch stairs to the sidewalk and on the Woodstock to the boulevard.

There is a stair connection to the site proposed. There is a 'normalized' public realm. There is a quite a bit of terracing along 41st, so there are meant to be sightlines to allow access to the street.

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. Wen 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 relationship of project to 41st Ave
- Lower the parking and keep the distance to 4 feet between ground floor units and the sidewalk
- Further animate the sidewalk with higher quality landscape detailing
- Further design develop the architectural expression
- Further development of the interior courtyard design; provide more usable programmed space
- Increase the private open spaces of the units facing 41st Ave
- **Related Commentary:** The panel supports the overall massing and the building typology, specifically the dual frontage of this site. The way the building addresses both 41st and Woodstock is appropriate. The shadowing is minimized and the animation of Woodstock creates a real street and regularized the street. The typography at the back should be improved by making the separation better, for example, introduce a sloping site. The architectural expression should be further elaborated from the last phase of development.

Add an elevator from the parking lot. Consider more staircases for stair lifts, and make the bathrooms more accessible. The stair that goes down to the parking should have windows to lighten the corner.

Add additional street trees, a double row. Add more colour and texture at the bottom level because right now it is too monotonous. Use high quality materials on the building, for example, avoid a concrete wall. Consider accessibility to the site.

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

3. Address:	3070 Kingsway
Permit No.:	RZ-2017-00043
Description:	To develop the site with a 6-storey mixed-use building and 3-storey townhouses at the lane. The proposal consists of commercial at grade, 40 secured market rental units, and 24 vehicle parking spaces. The proposed floor area is 3,293 sq. m (35,447 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.27, and the building height is 18.3 m (60 ft). This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy.
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	C-2 to CD-1
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Tamara Rowland, Owner, Canwest
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, Architect, gbl architects Rodrigo Cepeda, gbl Architects Dylan Chernoff, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Simon Jay & Karen Campbell

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Simon Jay, Rezoning Planner, introduced the as a site on one midblock lot, on the south side of Kingsway between Kerr and Rupert Streets, in Renfrew Collingwood, and in the Collingwood BIA. The current zoning is C-2 and the site is currently occupied by a 1-storey commercial building. The site is a wedge shape, with an approximate area of 1000m2.

To the south of the lane is RS-1. Next door to the west is a proposed 6 storey, 32 unit, Rental 100 building, currently in building permit review. To the east is the Synala Housing Co-Op (CD-1). The Coop is considered rental housing so cannot be redeveloped under Rental 100. However it could potentially be considered for redeveloped under existing City of Vancouver pilot projects.

The rezoning proposal is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy (commonly called Rental 100), which allows for consideration up to 6 storeys on C-2 sites.

The rezoning application submitted on behalf of Conwest, is to amend the existing C-2 zoning to CD-1 to permit a 6 storey mixed use development fronting Kingsway and a 3 storey townhouse component at the rear, with one level of underground parking accessed from the lane. It includes 40 secure market rentals units and commercial at grade. This application proposes an FSR of 3.27.

Karen Campbell, Development Planner, introduced the project as on a double lot with a slight grade rise of approximately 4% along Kingsway; the site is relatively flat with approximately a 2% slope to the lane. The lot has a 75ft foot long frontage along Kingsway and is approximately 173ft deep on the longer side (east) and approximately 143ft deep on the shorter side (west).

In addition to the site context provided by Simon Jay, the Synala Housing co-op (located to the east) does not qualify for rezoning under the Rental 100 Policy and is anticipated to be a long term two storey development.

Under the Rental 100 Policy, we anticipate a height of up to 6 storeys. In the C-2 policy, we anticipate: a height up to 4 storeys (45') max height and density up to 2.50 FSR.

The C-2 guidelines anticipate commercial use at grade, but allow for some residential use on the ground floor (provided it is at the rear of the site and occupies less than 40% of the ground floor area).

The C-2 guidelines have a prescribed building formation. This formation anticipates: a 15ft max. height for the first 20ft from the lane, then steps up to a maximum 35ft height for the next 15ft before extending to full 45ft height.

The Development consists of a courtyard scheme with a 3 storey ‘townhouse’ formation at the lane and 6 storey massing along Kingsway. There is one level of underground parking, accessed from the lane. The primary residential entrance is located off Kingsway.

The townhome formation consists of 2 one bedroom units at grade and 4 two storey 3 bedroom units above. Primary access is from the courtyard. The townhomes have a rear yard setback of 4 feet from the lane. Typically in C-2 projects we anticipate a 20ft setback from lane for residential units, however, due to the depth of this site, it is not possible achieve both the typical C-2 rear-yard setbacks and the minimum 20ft courtyard separation. An indoor Amenity space on Level 1 is co-located to the courtyard.

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

1. Overall form of development (considering height, density, massing, setbacks, streetscape and context).
2. Quality of the courtyard design (considering liveability, obstructions, privacy, access to daylight, and circulation).
3. Quality of the ground floor units (considering overall livability, proximity to lane, circulation, and privacy).

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** See the previous presentation notes from February 21, 2018 UDP Minutes. Note the rezoning application status, so there is still room for more information, so the use, density and form of development advice is sought. The podium will have loading, garbage space and access to underground parking. Townhouses at the back are proposed. The transition between the neighbouring sites is meant to be seamless. The relationship to the building to Kingsway is different, with a cleaner look, than the relationship to the lane and neighbours. The building to the back is a more ‘granulated’ design with different shapes and textures. Along Kingsway there is a 5.5 meter setback from the property line.

The courtyard has a perimeter landscape and could be used as an outdoor dining area.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

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

- Consider the transformer and utility spaces at the back
- Consider the balance and proportion of the commercial and residential units to improve the courtyard
- Eliminate stairs where possible
- Improve the east wall with art and /or materiality and / or landscaping
- Consider the residential entry experience with regards to CPTED

- **Related Commentary:** The massing is appreciated, height and density and use. The form of development and lower massing is appreciated. Some of the units are very deep and there are no privacy issues. The typology is very positive. It is a unique type of project. The townhouse addition is a good precedence. Consider trying to eliminate the stairs. Improve the entry experience. Consider the entry to the commercial space, including signage, lighting etc. Consider the horizontal angles of daylight. Improve the daylight access by tweaking the dimensions of the massing. Try to get more light into the courtyard perhaps by adjusting the townhome height.
- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel.

4. Address:	3123-3141 W Broadway (Hollywood Theatre)
Description:	To develop an 8-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial retail spaces at grade and 41 dwelling units above, with underground parking accessed from the lane. The proposal is seeking a 10% heritage density transfer.
Permit No:	DP-2018-00039
Zoning:	C3-A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Marianne Amodio Architecture
Owner:	Dimitri Bonnis, Owner, Bonnis Dex
Delegation:	Marianne Amodio, Architect, Maastudio Harley Grusko, Architect, Maastudio Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, Jon Losee Ltd. Mean S Tessier, LEED Consultant, Integral Donald Luxton, Heritage Consultant, Donald Luxton & Associates
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as being under consideration for several years. The intention is to retain the existing use of the theatre in the current proposal, while being reconditioned to allow live performances.

This application proposes to retain the entire heritage building, not just the façade, and its historic use as a culture and arts venue, while also introducing a six-storey mixed use building on the adjacent lot to the west. To integrate the juxtaposition of these two elements, the proposal aims to establish a strong visual contrast between the historic and new façades, with strategic setbacks and additional sidewalk space. As part of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement, the application requests an increase in overall density and height above the typical allowances under the C-2C zoning.

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

- 1) Please provide commentary on the proposed siting and architecture of the new development, in context with the retained theatre's art deco building, but also in the context of the existing fine-grained development fabric in this portion of West Broadway.
- 2) Is the proposal to cantilever the new building over the theatre an appropriate response in spirit and scale?
- 3) Does the proposed form and massing unduly impact the surrounding public and private properties?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant pointed out the intent to keep the use and the heritage revitalization agreement. The retention of the Hollywood theatre has allowed an FSR increase on the site due to the heritage restoration. The goal was to restore, retain, and respect streetscape, and West Broadway is of note due to the vibrant streetscape. It is a full heritage restoration of the exterior and rehabilitation of the use.

The neighbouring building was meant to draw from the pattern, shape of the art deco style of the theatre as well as the inextricable link of the building and the theatre.

The façade was pushed back to create a public realm of four retail units to allow the retailers to have a public street. The existing streetscape was expanded. The setback was maintained under the current zoning. The proposal intends to remove more of the volume of the 6th floor, and make it cantilevered. There should be a dialogue between the two buildings. There are extended linear balconies and non-tinted glass proposed. The intent is horizontal fine grain detail. The proposed bedrooms have connections to balcony and living space. The balcony upstand is designed as a buffer from below and is meant to deter overlook to the residential neighbour.

The proposed plinth of the building has opportunities to open to the street. On the second floor, because of the overlook, the planting is meant to screen from the neighbours. The lane was not an option for planting. On the roof there are private and public patios as well as a setback to keep the overlook reduced. Donald Luxton expressed the significance of retaining the theatre. The proposed additional building does not impact the heritage building.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Neale and Mr. Huffman was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

- THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project after incorporating the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:
 - Review the necessity of cantilevering the building and the balconies over the theatre
 - Explore adding additional massing to the 6th floor and partial 7th floor
 - Further design development of the ground floor to feature the existing wall of the theatre for heritage value
 - Consider reviewing loading location for joint use of the theatre and commercial spaces
- **Related Commentary:** There is a lot of support from the panel for the retention of the theatre. The big moves were considered. The panel encourages going one step further to improve the project. There is a lot of space to re-design the units, take the density, and fill in the 6th floor, or add a partial floor. Add a gap between the buildings while retaining the cantilever. Consider the adjacency to the theatre. Consider the potential of a snowdrift. Consider quality materials.
- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and noted the care and consideration paid to the project.
- **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.