

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 21, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Amela Brudar - Chair
Helen Avini Besharat
Yijin Wen
Muneesh Sharma
Leslie Shieh (excused from item 3)
Colette Parsons

REGRETS: Grant Newfield
Marie-France Venneri
David Jerke (excused from Item 1)

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1485 Davie Street
2. 3070 Kingsway
3. 5809 - 5811 Main Street
4. 3438 Sawmill Crescent (EFL, Parcel 16.2)
5. 2301 Granville Street (Burrard Slopes)

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:	1485 Davie Street
Permit:	DP-2017- 01183
Description:	To develop the site with a 22-storey and a 26-storey mixed-use building, with a 3-storey building at the rear. The proposal consists of 107 multi-family market units and 51 social housing rental units; all over three levels of underground parking with 198 vehicle stalls accessed from the lane. The proposed floor space area is 15,069 sq. m (162,197 sq. ft.) and the building height is 58 m (190 ft.).
Zoning:	RM-5D
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	W.T. Leung Architects
Owner:	1034907 BC LTD
Delegation:	Wing Ting Leung, WT Leung Architects Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, ETA Landscape Architecture Diana Klein, LEED Consultant, Kare Consulting
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project as located in the RM-5B zone and falls under the West End Area Plan. The proposed building includes 20% social housing units. The site is 198 feet wide. Under the West End Plan a site of a minimum of up to 7.0 FSR and 190 feet qualifies for a tower form. The proposal is not required under the guidelines to have ground floor retail at the lane.

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

- 1) Under the West End - Tower, Sitting and Setbacks bulletin, the maximum tower width dimension should measure no more than 80 feet, in order to reduce the overall amount of building form against Davie Street. This application proposes an appropriate building width of 93 feet.

Is the proposed tower orientation an acceptable alternative to the general siting intentions of the zoning?

- 2) Please provide commentary on the building's interface with the public realm (Davie Street, Nicola Street and the laneway), taking into consideration the steep sloping nature of the site.
- 3) Please provide commentary on the architectural expression of this proposal.
- 4) Please provide commentary on the sustainability strategy of this proposal.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the surrounding context of the site. It is a steeply sloping site, and after consultation with Planning on whether commercial was required at the edge of the site, the applicant chose not to include commercial use on the Davie side. The applicant noted the decision making rationale for the tower placement had to do with the dimensions. The proposed courtyard contains a children's play area which would receive morning sun. There is an amenity room designed to overlook the water feature. The planting scheme is inspired by Stanley Park with a native inspired scheme. There is a seating plaza proposed. There are benches planned on the mid-way point as well. Around the frontage on Nicola, there is a plant pallet and water that surrounds the first unit. On the lane, there is a similar palette proposed softening the interface with the street. The courtyard is dedicated to the social housing, designed with community gardens and children's play and sunshine. The amenity level from the tower is at the top of the podium. The community gardens are planned to be located at the back. The rooftops that are exposed are green roofs. The proposed materials are: interior insulation, cladding, insulated cantilever balconies, concrete fins with punch openings fitted with sunscreens, glaze glass panels for sustainability measures. The sustainability strategy is low carbon, with a good envelope; triple glazing and the target should meet the rezoning requirements. The sustainability rating is intended to be LEED Gold.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Parsons and seconded by Ms. Shieh and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Resubmission of the project after incorporating the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Provide adequate information on context, sustainability and public realm
- Explore further design development of the architectural expression
- Consider the solar orientation and the use of materials rather than relying on too much triple glazing to achieve sustainability measures
- Improve the public interface of the building with the street so that interaction with the street is improved
- Improve the shadowing of the amenity space at courtyard level
- Improve the materiality of the podium so that it is clearly differentiated from the rest of the tower
- Consider improving bike storage access, including considering an elevator
- Improve lane and street activation

Related Commentary: Overall, the panel concluded there was a lack of information in the proposal so it was difficult to give feedback on urban design elements. The siting and setbacks of the building were supported by the panel. When it came to the architectural expression, the panel thought there needed to be more design development. The articulation of the building should be further developed, such as introducing different materials, to avoid the need for triple glazing. There could be higher quality materials in the proposal, such as granite, and the use of Isokorb was questioned by the panel. The location of the open amenity space for social housing was questioned. The open amenity space was too dark. The livability of the courtyard units should be further developed because it will be over shadowed. Access to the townhomes from the lane was recommended.

Bike storage access and use of elevator for bike storage was recommended. The panel recommended higher quality materials for the landscape because the site is a gateway site to English Bay. The public realm in relation to interaction with the street needs more development.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted the laneway entrances could not be included. Granite would be used for the wall.

2. Address:	3070 Kingsway
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00066
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:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	Fifth
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Joe Carreira, Canwest
Delegation:	Roingo Cepeda, Architect, GBL Daniel Eiselberg, Architect, GBL Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Ltd Joe Carreira, Owner, Canwest Diana Klein, LEED Consultant, Kane Consulting Paul Dalby Bunl Associates
Staff:	Simon Jay & Karen Campbell

EVALUATION: No Evaluation due to lack of quorum

- **Introduction:** Simon Jay, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as 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. Kingsway is a primary arterial street. Next door to the east is the Synala Housing Co-Op (CD-1), and to the west is a proposed 6 storey, 32 unit, Rental 100 building, currently in building permit review. To the south of the lane is RS-1. Joyce Collingwood station is 1km to the NE.

The 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 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, a unit mix of 37% 2 and 3 bed family units, and commercial at grade. This application proposes an FSR of 3.27.

Karen Campbell, Development Planner, introduced the project. The proposal is 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 front yard step of 8ft back above 35ft (4.4.1(ii)), a stepping formation that decreases in height from the street to the lane (with a maximum height of 15' feet prescribed at the lane), and a rear yard setback of 20' when residential units are located at the rear of the site.

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 (west). 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 rearyard 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:** The site has two openings so the neighbouring sites were considered. The applicant wanted to propose a townhouse development and a courtyard, and the lane was considered as a transition to the back of the site. Horizontal lines were considered at the Kingsway side of the site. There is a clean geometry at Kingsway, at the back of the site the amenity space is connected to the entry of the building.

The courtyard is meant to be simple and open with a fair amount of sun and taller trees. There will be outdoor heating, garden, and ferns. There are some small kids play areas in the design. The site has energy modeling completed and under target for the rezoning at the site for sustainability. The window to wall ratio is good. Approval has been granted to remove some of the trees on the site.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:** No evaluation due to lack of quorum
- **Related Commentary:**

The concept is supported. The courtyard should work or the centre of the project is lost. The people who live there are the centre of the project. Take a closer look at the townhouse design. It is too large. Consider the east wall that is looking onto the townhouses. It is too much blank wall at the living units. Consider breaking up the blank wall. Mitigate the stairs to lighten them. Consider flipping around the living units so they overlook the amenity space. The patios on the back lane should be big enough for table and chairs. Break up the commercial spaces. The stepping down of the building is appreciated. The studio is in the wrong location.

The courtyard typology is appreciated. However, the courtyard does not need to be sacrificed for bulky units. A panel member mentioned the courtyard should be more visual to buffer between the two buildings for privacy. Consider the stairs, as they are competing in the space in the courtyard. The amenity space should be a ‘true’ amenity space considering the family housing. Make the laneway shorter if possible. The staircase could use privacy screens.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel

3. Address:	5809-5811 Main Street
Permit No.:	DP-2017-00064
Description:	To develop a 3.5-storey residential cohousing building consisting of 12 residential units, 3 vehicle parking stalls, one carshare space, and 15 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor area is 913 sq. m (9,829 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.47, and the building height is 13.9 m (46 ft.). This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy.
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Marianne Amodio Studio
Owner:	Mark Shieh, TOMO
Delegation:	Marianne Amodio, Architect, Marianne Amodio Architecture Studio Monte Paulsen, LEED Consultant, RDN Building Science Kathy Sayers, Our Urban Village Co-Housing
Staff:	Zachary Bennett & Gavin Schaefer on behalf of Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

Introduction: Zachary Bennett, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application for a duplex site on a double lot at the southwest corner of Main Street and Ontario Place, one block south of 41st Avenue. The site is currently zoned RT-2 and is developed with an existing duplex. It is approximately 6,685 sq. ft., with 66 ft. of frontage along Main Street and 102 ft. along Ontario Place. An FSR of 1.47 is proposed.

The sites at the intersection of Main Street and 41st Avenue are zoned C-2 and could be developed up to 4 storeys and 2.5 FSR. Along Main, sites are zoned RT-2 and can be generally developed with duplexes. Across the lane, sites are zoned RS-1 and developed with single-family houses. The City's Rental 100 and Affordable Housing Choices policies both apply to arterial sites in this location, allowing for building forms ranging between 3.5 to 6 storeys, depending on the location and base zoning. There is another approved rezoning application in this area, a six-storey Rental 100 project at 5679 Main proposing ground-floor commercial with 46 rental units and 3.5 FSR.

This proposal is for a 3.5 storey residential building with a total of 12 cohousing residential units. Parking is provided at the lane, including one carshare stall. The proposal is being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy, which allows for consideration of ground-oriented forms up to 3.5 storeys at this location, with a commensurate increase in FSR. Parking is 4 parking stalls (including 1 handicap, 1 carshare), 15 bicycle parking stalls, and a building of 13.9 m (46 ft.).

Gavin Schaefer, Development Planner, introduced the project as a double lot currently zoned RT-2. The zones are: RT-2 to the south, RS-1 to the west, and C-2 to the north. There is one duplex on site.

The site is within a block of an arterial street at Main Street and 41st Avenue, off Ontario Place, close to transit. The site falls under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy, considered for ground-oriented 3.5 storeys. It satisfies innovative housing model criteria for AHCIRP.

The proposal is 1.47 FSR/14,327 GFA with 12 dwelling units includings an accessible studio, and reverse plan townhouses. The primary entry is off Ontario Place, and there are three ground-

oriented units on that side. The cohousing lite model focuses on social interaction between residents, supported by an amenity room on corner with kitchen and laundry that invites community in with potential events. The ground-oriented central courtyard encourages social interaction with patio spaces, provides shading/cross-ventilation, serves as buffer between adjacent RT-2 (not facing onto windows). The applicant is requesting relaxation for one parking space, supported by traffic study from consultant.

The massing is intentionally a small scale simple gable form to meet policy's 3.5-storey expression. One unifying gable roof transitions between C-2 and RT-2 at 25 ft. typical gable height. It falls into the missing middle in terms of density between zones. The ridge height is at around 42 ft., in between C-2 and RT-2 maximum heights. Under the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning, the Passive House design uses courtyard and balconies to achieve performance. The Passive House results in a low window to wall ratio (20/80), minimal articulation, and thick walls.

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

1. Please comment on the appropriateness of use, density, and form of development for the proposed rezoning.
2. Does the proposed rezoning appropriately engage with the street and ground level?
3. Does the proposed 3.5-storey expression appropriately relate to the urban context?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the urban design principles that were used to design the project for social and environmental sustainability. The project is the 'missing middle' scale of development in the area. The L-shaped building is intended to provide access to community and nature. The L-shape allows access 'through' units, such as the entry and townhouse units off of Ontario Place, which is intended to encourage community interaction. The pedestrian scale around the corner of the building is intended to create a shared community space.

The principles of sociability are gathered through the courtyard and exterior corridors that are over-scaled for places of meeting and gathering. The proposed mix is 12 units ranging from three studios to 3 bedrooms. The living rooms of each unit will be further developed. The architecture is intended to articulate the overarching principles of the site. The passive house principles are demonstrated by the lack of articulation on the building. The building is purposefully designed 'under scale' because it is meant to fit into the community context as much as possible.

The landscape is 'under-stated' and there is room for community to plant, with native plants, edibles and bird friendly plants. There is a ramp planned, and screening for the bedrooms as well as a garage door style fence proposed in the parking area. There is bike parking proposed for cargo bikes.

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 Ms. Parsons 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:

- Review window placement in light of solar orientation
- Consider the amenity room programming to allow for more uses, for example, dividing it into two areas that can be independently used
- Improve the courtyard circulation space
- Consider raising the building two feet to add access to sunlight for the sunken bedrooms

Related Commentary: It is a well thought out, unique project for the site and community in proximity of the project. The building is well articulated on a different scale with big moves that are appropriate for the site. The social aspects of the proposal are welcomed. The covered area is well located for children's play in proximity for the amenity room. The project has good social attributes and the canopies could use refinement.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and the applicant was excited about the intent of the project.

4. Address:	3438 Sawmill Crescent (EFL, Parcel 16.2)
Description:	To develop a 25-storey multiple dwelling building consisting of a residential podium and a total of 245 dwelling units; all over three and a half levels of underground parking.
Permit No:	DP-2017-01176
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins + Will
Owner:	Dean Johnson, Wesgroup
Delegation:	Hilde Heyvaerts, Architect, Perkins & Will Eli Wolpin, Architect, Perkins & Will Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, ETA Landscape G. Twyford Miles, LEED Consultant, Stantect
Staff:	Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

Introduction: Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project as a development application, following a masterplan rezoning. The site is in East Fraserlands, Area 1 (ie. “central” neighbourhood with the most density and intensity of uses, including commercial). The site is +- 305ft x170 ft. (irregular shape). It is a residential tower with a 6 storey podium and 3-storey townhouses. There are 245 units (inc. 14 live-work on street frontage) +-240 000 square feet. The floorspace is allocated to the Parcel under masterplan rezoning.

As per the usual Urban Design objectives EFL Guidelines): 25-st tower - tallest in EFL - intended to “punctuate” view, when entering neighbourhood from west (ie. demarcate High Street). The Crescent Street Podium should create a consistent, well-defined streetwall with adjacent parcels. The applicant intended Road ‘A’ to be more “urban” with tight setbacks and live-work units. The bikeway is semi-private gardens at grade, to contribute to open green space. There is a mid-block connection (with 16.1) to provide pedestrian access through a block, as well as parkade entrance, and a single ramp to serve entire parcel. Other requirements include a BC Hydro Vista at the southwest corner; a public bike share at the southeast corner.

Comments on the proposed form of development: the tower is the same location, and the proportion as laid out in the Guidelines. The strong, simple white frame with projecting balconies on north and south, inset on west and east.

The podium main entry is aligned with the corner line of the tower. The 2nd entry is at the corner intersection to give a stronger “prow” expression. There are 6-storeys rather than 5 (per the Area Guidelines) but this is consistent with the approved development on adjacent parcels, so creates a continuous streetwall. There is no upper-storey setback. The upper 4 storeys have a strong vertical expression, with metal “fins”, to emphasize a curved streetwall. “Rusted” steel is proposed to reference the industrial history. The lower 2 levels are ground-oriented townhouse units; colourful entries punctuate street elevation and give pedestrian scale. A 6 foot setback may be tight for the left side and patios. The live-work units wrap around second street frontage and a tighter setback without a patio (3.5 feet at the narrowest). Townhouses are along a bikeway, which is raised +-6ft. There is a tight setback (2 feet) issue for the left side. The intention is a more residential expression. BC Hydro Vista at southwest corner and a public bike share at the southeast corner (connected to the pedestrian mews). The courtyard is at Level 2. The Centre of the floorplate is used for storage, bike room, ramp, etc. Outdoor amenity space is proposed plus private access for upper storeys of townhouses. There is a cut-out at the southeast corner, to provide views to water. A water feature is proposed to help “anchor” courtyard to grade.

The amenities and open space are main outdoor amenity is courtyard (with a children's play area), collocated indoor rooms. The second rooftop space (east side) (level 3), for gym (Adult-use) and another amenity room and roof terrace for urban ag at Level 7 (podium rooftop). Other rooftops are used for private patios.

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

1. Overall massing & site planning;
2. Podium expression along street frontages, including bikeway;
3. Setbacks at grade & design of the public realm; and
4. Architectural expression and detailing.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant referenced the guidelines for the site pointing to the importance of the corner as a focal point. The fins were intended to guide the sightlines and add maximum light as well as privacy screening. The industrial, metal, history of the site was referenced and the main entries have perforations in them and wood inside to reference the Fraser River. The proposed tower staggered effect was to reference a bee hive. The fins along the bay are intended to be nicely organized and simple. There are wood accents around the entrance as well. The main tower views are to the south with balconies. There is solar shading proposed on the south side of the building. The courtyard was 'maximized' to fit the dimensions around it. There are shared amenities designed to be accessed from both sides of the building.

Small patios are intended to be connected to the units. The slope is an opportunity to move water down the site. The proposed bike trail has a small planting strip with a textured wall with weathered steel railings. The courtyard is proposed with a native palette and ample opportunity for children to play. The water feature is designed in textured stone. There are private terraces outlined in seagrass plantings to blend in with the structural elements of the building. The proposed sustainability rating is LEED Gold. The overall assembly of the building and LED lighting are proposed to optimize efficiency.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Avini Beharat 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:

- Increase the patio size at ground level
- Allow for more daylight access to the courtyard
- Consider removing the green walls on the north facing courtyard
- Open up the live work units on the west facing podium so they interact with street
- Consider expressing tower to grade at one corner
- Consider design elements at the door next to the water feature
- Consider design development of the public realm between the patios and the street on the south side bike lane to allow for more vegetation

Related Commentary: The project was well received by the panel and the site planning and massing was appropriate to the site. The podium stepping was well received by the panel. The patios at the ground floor were too small and tight. On the west side, there are live work units that are too enclosed. Allow more people to benefit from the view by opening up the corner water feature. The green wall use was questioned by the panel. The proposed materials were questioned, especially the white metal panels. A rooftop amenity should be considered. Overall, consider the corner of the building more.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments, and noted some of the units are dividable and the amenity was considered.

5. Address:	2301 Granville Street (Burrard Slopes)
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.
Zoning:	C3-A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Barry Savage, Aoyvan
Delegation:	Mahin Brichen, Architect, IBI Tony Wal, Architect, IBI Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Jason Olinek

EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended

- **Introduction:** Jason Olinek, Development Planner, introduced the project as located at the corner of Granville and W 7th Avenue. This is its first appearance at UDP as a Development Permit Application under C-3A zoning and it is located in the Burrard Slopes Sub-Area.

It is pursuing the increases in achievable height and floor area including:

- an increase to height from 9.2m (30ft) up to max 25.9m (85ft)
- an increase in FSR from 1.0 up to 3.3 including a heritage density bonus transfer of 10%.
- DP Board approval is required.

A significant question will be how the proposal responds the constraints of the guidelines and view cones in height and form.

It is an 8-storey mixed-use building with a commercial retail spaces at grade, 41 dwelling units above, underground parking accessed from the lane, a privately owned on-site public open space adjacent to the intersection, currently housing the Heffel Gallery across the intersection is a 2 storey Heritage B at 2247. The building to the south may have some heritage value but the applicant has also demonstrated development potential under similar zoning none-the-less. Note also approved 8 storey MURB 1555 W 8th.

Seymour Health Centre is to the west and the associated 12 storey residential tower. Important note: the DP Board Report for this development included the creation of a privately owned on-site public open space on the corner, a connecting ‘green walk’ on 7th and suggesting a consideration for a corresponding open space on the corner of Granville. The intent for the privately owned on-site public open space is to act as public amenity as well as function for queuing for the bus stop on Granville. The form generators for this development are in large part view cone 20, Figures 18 and 19 (from guidelines), and retail continuity/streetwall on Granville. Residential entry is on 7th with amenity just inside the lobby. Staff will be seeking a larger more useable indoor amenity space with immediate connection to an outdoor space. The lane, locate on the west, is 20 feet wide and T’s mid-block. Parking entrance is off of the lane. Materials include polished stone and metal panels, window wall and glazed balconies.

Objectives also include preserving the character of Burrard Slopes on Granville while providing for compatible dwelling uses. Specifically:

- a strong role as a specialty retail street,
- to emphasize a coherent integrated neighbourhood character and,

- express small scale individualized shops.

Per the regulations please also give consideration to:

- (a) impact on nearby residences;
- (b) height, bulk, location and massing;
- (c) the effects on the general amenity of the area;
- (d) the provision for pedestrian needs;
- (e) the preservation of the character; AND
- (f) liveability of dwelling uses

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

- 1) Height, bulk, and massing - generally and specifically in relation to the regulatory framework, streetscape and existing and anticipated developments.
- 2) Architectural expression and character - composition, elements and materiality.
- 3) Open space and public realm interface - including landscape, on-site public open space, entries, and frontage.
- 4) Liveability - in general and specifically dwelling units and amenity space.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the view as the driving force for the site due to view cone regulations. The proposed form is somewhat unique, and there are clearly three volumes on the building. At the base there is a finer grain store front proposed that is not too wide that are related to the existing retail along Granville. The hallway leads to the elevator to allow access to views along the front of the building. The metal expression wraps around the corner. There is a requirement for the lane setback, and proposed windows at the corridor of the lobby. The proposed wall to window ratio is low, due to code, but as the building is more detailed and there is more flexibility for fenestration design. The applicant noted that shading concerns are not a significant.

There is landscaping proposed along the front of the lane. The trees are mature and aligning the front. There is a wide concrete band sidewalk designed with a cobble material for textural colour differences. The front is intended to be a café with tables and chairs. The proposed paving is natural stone material for a textural experience. There is 'richness' in terms of benches and added tree plantings. There are evergreen hedges planned at the patio. There is ornamental detailing in the design to make the second story and roof more interesting.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Parsons and seconded by Ms. Avini Besharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Resubmission of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Improve building massing and articulation along the lane
- Improve the architectural expression and materiality to better fit Granville Street's character and fit as a gateway to downtown

- Reconsider the design and location of public plaza with respect to commercial / retail continuity on Granville St.
- Reconsider locating the balconies on the corner of Granville and 7th Ave
- Recommend removal of public bike share
- Recommend removal of the hedges in the plaza
- Provide lighting and signage strategy to the proposed development

Related Commentary: The panel supported the height, bulk and general massing of the project. There were no issues with the livability of the proposed units. However, there were concerns about the architectural expression and character as well as the open space and public realm. The panel does not feel the proposed corner fits the in the location at 7th and Granville, recommended continuing the retail along 7th avenue, and removing the public bike share on W 7th. The panel also recommended further articulating the lobby along 7th Ave. The regularity framework has created a dynamic massing but there is a lost opportunity because there are three very distinct volumes being expressed. Better materiality could be used to express the volumes.

Consider continued rain covering at the court yard. Further design development and articulation is needed at the lane. The benches are supported. Consider rooftop access for amenity. Overall, the material and architectural expression was felt to be alien to Granville street character.

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

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.