

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 2, 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  
Leslie Shieh  
Marie-France Venneri  
Derek Neale  
David Jerke  
Grant Newfield  
Yijin Wen (excused from item 1)  
Muneesh Sharma  
Jim Huffman  
Susan Ockwell

**REGRETS:** Colette Parsons

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 3435 E Hastings Street
  2. 3350 E Kent Avenue South (EFL - Parcel 26)
  3. 3350 E Kent Avenue South (EFL - Parcel 27)
-

**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 Tseil-Wauthuth nations and we give thanks for their generosity and hospitality on these lands.

1. Address: **3435 E Hastings Street**  
 Permit: RZ-2018-00004  
 Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial at grade and 45 secured market rental units, over underground parking with 28 vehicle stalls, 62 bicycle spaces and 1 Class B loading space. The proposed floor area is 3,665 sq. m (39,454 sq. ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.14, and the building height is 20.7 m (68 ft.). This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.  
 Zoning: C-2C1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Cornerstone Architecture  
 Owner: Chelsea Harding, Steiner Properties  
 Delegation: Simon Richards, Architect, Cornerstone  
 Scott Kennedy, Architect, Cornerstone  
 Bill Harrison, Landscape Architect, Forma Design Inc.  
 Staff: Derek Robinson & Susan Chang

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations**

- **Introduction:** Derek Robinson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a proposal to rezone under the Secured Market Rental Housing policy providing 100% rental housing over ground-floor commercial uses. The policy allows for consideration of rezoning proposals up to 6 storeys. The proposal is located 100 meters east of the Cassiar tunnel on the north side of East Hastings Street.

Zoning to the east is C-2 while zoning to the west and across Hastings St is C-2C1. There is RS-1 to the north and south. The site is currently occupied by a 2 storey commercial building with structured parking accessed off of Hastings Street. The applicant is proposing a 6-storey mixed-use building with 45 secured market rental units, 35% of which are family-oriented 2- and 3-bedroom units, at an overall density of 3.14 FSR. Due to a crossfall of 17 ft. down from the lane, a large portion of the ground level is dedicated to underground parking accessed off the lane. 28 parking stalls are proposed. Indoor and outdoor amenity areas are provided on the northeast corner of the 2nd level facing the lane. Future road widening is planned along this section of East Hastings, and Engineering will be seeking an SRW (statutory right of way) which aligns with the future curb line. Currently levels 2-5 encroach over the SRW up to about 5' at the southwest corner.

Susan Chang, Development Planner, introduced the project as falling under The Secured Market Rental Housing policy which can consider increases up to 6 storeys and commensurate achievable density. There is a context of C-2C1 along E Hastings. The neighbouring lot to the east is C-2 with RS-1 across the lane.

This is a challenging site. The site is an approximately 95'x110'. There is a notch at the southwest corner where the on-ramp begins to access Hwy 1. There is a combined 4.3m building line and 4.5m SRW along E. Hastings. The main storey is meeting the SRW but the upper storey was allowed to meet the building line due to the notch at the southwest corner.

There is also a cross fall from northeast to southwest corner of 17' feet and approximately 12' feet from rear to front property line.

The loading was allowed to be located parallel to the lane to allow 7'-6" height clearance for the parking entry resulting in an approximate 18' ceiling height at the main storey facing East Hastings.

All entries and most of the exiting is located at East Hastings. Amenity space is located at the second storey at the rear/ north faces about 3' above the lane. There is some softening of the façade and shading with planting at the southern face. Rear setbacks transition from the C-2C1 to C-2 form of development creating some privacy/overlook concerns between rear units.

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

1. Does the Panel support the overall massing, height, and density?
2. Can the Panel comment on the street interface in terms of providing a buffered and pedestrian experience?
  - a. Prominence and character of the residential entry?
  - b. Success of the retail frontage?
3. Can the Panel comment on the livability of the rear units in terms of privacy and overlook?
4. Please comment on the overall Landscape plan including the rear outdoor spaces

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant noted the step down to reduce overlook concerns and shadowing. The biggest impact of shadowing is the neighbouring garages. The stepping of the building is intended to create more exterior walls and windows. Privacy screens are planned. The two entries are designed at both sides of the building.

The building is intended to be marketable. The landscape is a response to the current conditions on the site.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

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

- Pursue design development of the public realm, residential lobby and review retail layouts to allow for future flexibility.
  - Further design development is required to the north facing units to increase privacy and mitigate overlook between the individual units.
  - Explore noise mitigation measures along East Hastings.
- **Related Commentary:** The panel supported the height massing and density as appropriate. The panel commended the provision of rental housing and passive house standards that are being achieved. The pedestrian experience could be developed and be unique to draw people in. The retail design could provide smaller units, less mullions and be further developed. The residential entry needs to be more prominent and inviting. The lobby could be treated as an amenity space. The livability and privacy and overlook of the north facing units needs work. The sun access of the north facing units needs design development.

The noise on the Hastings Street side needs to be mitigated in the units. A panel member noted there may not be enough amenities for families in the building considering the surrounding context. The bike racks behind the hedge is a CPTED concern.

Overall, the panel recognized the view of the mountains from the residential units and that the colour and vibrancy is welcome.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the staff, and noted the concerns about over-heating.

2. Address:	<b>3350 E Kent Avenue South (EFL - Parcel 26)</b>
Description:	To develop a 14-storey residential building consisting of a 5-storey residential podium and townhomes at grade; all over 2 levels of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 14,475 sq. m. (155,808 sq. ft.).
Permit No:	DP-2018-00192
Zoning:	C-2C to CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DIALOG
Owner:	Bentley Harris, Owner, Wesgroup
Delegation:	Brady Dunlop, Architect, DIALOG Daryl Tyacki, Landscape Architect, ETA
Staff:	Danielle Wiley

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that this development application follows a masterplan rezoning of Area 1, the central neighbourhood in East Fraserlands. The site is one block west of the “high” street, and has 4 active frontages: Kent Ave to the north; Jack Uppal St is located to the west; Road B to the east; and a pedestrian/bike mews to the south (on a SRW). An elementary school site is directly across street to the west.

The masterplan indicates +/-149 000 sf of floorspace, while the proposal 186 000 sf (net). The additional floorspace has been transferred from other parcels in EFL.

The EFL guidelines anticipated a 4-storey bar building on Kent Ave north, 3-storey townhouses on the mews, and 14-storey tower at the southeast corner of the site. In the proposal, the tower has been moved to northeast corner, to mitigate shadows on open space and create a stronger presence on Kent. A 5-storey podium wraps Kent Ave and Jack Uppal St, with individual entries to ground-oriented units on both frontages. Two-storey townhouses are located along the mews and Road B.

The courtyard is a primary outdoor amenity. A lobby and common amenity rooms in the north building (Levels 1 and 2) connect to and overlook the courtyard.

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

1. Is the overall massing and site planning supportable? (ie. noting the departure from the EFL guidelines)
2. Is the tower expression successfully resolved?
3. Is the interface between the podium and townhouse elements to the pedestrian realm successfully resolved?
4. Please comment on the architectural expression, materials and detailing.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The applicant addressed the relocation of the tower, which is intended to address shadowing, as well as how the additional density is distributed. The wedge-shaped site influenced the building design. The west and east elevations are designed as ‘bands’ to create an ‘elongated’ building. The dark grey panels are meant to create a contrast and interest on the building. The window to wall ratio is a sustainability measure.

The intention of the design is to create locations for interactions, for example in the lobby and courtyard. There is a BBQ, kids play area and areas for cycling in the amenity space design, and landscaping to create privacy for private patios and dwelling units. The rooftops for all the townhouses are designed with generous open spaces.

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. 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:

- Revisit the location and design of the loading space as well its functionality
- Further design development of the bike access path

**Related Commentary:** The overall massing and site planning is supported by the panel. Relocating the massing to the north tower is appropriate, considering the orientation of the site. The rooftop mechanical equipment screening was also very well handled. The tower expression was successfully resolved. The podium and tower are well balanced. The materials and architectural details are well chosen, but the fine detailing of the project will be important. The entry to the courtyard from Road B and the mews need design development, with particular consideration of the loading space. The rooftop amenity and the trellis on the roof need work, according to one panel member. Energy targets are well handled. Look for opportunities for in-ground trees in the mews.

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

---

3. Address:	<b>3350 E Kent Avenue South (EFL - Parcel 27)</b>
Permit No.:	DP-2018-00190
Description:	To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 119 dwelling units, all over two levels of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 8,552 sq. m. (92,056 sq. ft.). This application is being considered under the Secured Market Rental Housing (Rental 100) Policy.
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	CD-1
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill Architects
Owner:	Dean Johnson, Owner, Wesgroup
Delegation:	Bryce Rositch, Architect, RH Architects Daryl Tyacki, Landscape Architect, et al.
Staff:	Danielle Wiley

---

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations

- **Introduction:** Danielle Wiley, Development Planner, noted that this development application is for a site directly to the south of Parcel 26 (the preceding item of the agenda). The application follows a masterplan rezoning of Area 1, the central neighbourhood in East Fraserlands. The site is one block west of the “high” street, and has 4 active frontages: North Arm Ave to the south; Jack Uppal St is located to the west; Road B to the east; and a pedestrian/bike mews to the north (on a SRW). An elementary school site is across street to the west, and the community centre site is to the east.

The masterplan anticipated a development with +-76 000 square feet; this proposal is for 83 000 square feet (net). The additional density is being transferred for other parcels in EFL.

The EFL Guidelines anticipated a 4-storey bar building on North Arm Avenue and 3-storey townhouses along the mews. The current proposal has a single L-shaped building fronting on North Arm Avenue and Jack Uppal St, with an open courtyard at corner of the mews and Road B. The main residential entry is located at the street corner, where there is a more prominent height/corner expression. A public bike share is located on private property at east end of mews (in courtyard). Parkade access is off Road B. A surface loading space is in the courtyard. Amenities include a multi-purpose room and gym in the south “wing” facing onto the courtyard.

This is a secured rental building.

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

1. Is the overall height and massing supportable? (ie. one 6-storey building, rather than two 3 to 4-storey buildings, per the Guidelines)
2. Is the site planning successfully resolved? (ie. setbacks, open space design, site servicing)
3. Are the interfaces to the public realm successful? (ie. street frontages and mews)
4. Please comment on the architectural expression and detailing.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** The proposed development is affordable rental housing. The intention of the L-shape is to reinforce the connection to the neighbouring development, and create an efficient, economical building form.

The building steps down to 4-storeys at the end of both “wings”. The proposed materials are corrugated white metal and dark brick. The use of pattern and colour in the balcony privacy screens creates a sense of energy in the design.

There are generous patios and multi-layered plantings proposed along both street frontages. The courtyard and amenity rooms offer a variety of uses for all ages. The courtyard landscape design offers opportunity for storm water retention.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel Consensus:**

- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Mr. Grant 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:

- Revisit loading location and functionality
  - Develop a stronger connection between the courtyard and the mews, as well as the open areas across the street
  - Pursue design development of the building corner and exit stair elements
  - Pursue design development of the main residential entry
  - Review the courtyard design to be more interesting for children
- **Related Commentary:** There is support for the project from the panel members. The building form and additional height are supportable. The site planning and interfaces of the public realm are generally well resolved. The residential entry requires design development, in particular for the ramp. The loading space in the courtyard is a concern as it would cause conflicts with the common amenity activities; some panel members said it should be relocated. The architectural expression was generally well handled, but the corner should be strengthened; the treatment on the south face should wrap the corner. The expression of the exit stairs requires development. The interface from the courtyard to the mews and streets was an issue. Activate the mews with benches and other elements.
  - **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and noted that the fence around the courtyard is a light weight structure, intended to support fruit trees.
  - **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.