

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, January 28, 2026

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: WebEx (Teams)

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Aaron Petruic

Allyse Li

Aya Abdelfatah

Mariyeh Sharifisaraei

Michele Cloghesy

Scott Mitchell (excused from item # 2)

Tony Osborn (Chair)

Tracey Mactavish

RECORDING SECRETARY: M. Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. **950 W 41st – Jewish Community Centre**
 2. **395 West Broadway**
-

Chair Tony Osborn called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- 1. Address:** **950 W 41st – Jewish Community Centre**
- Description:** The City of Vancouver has received an application to amend the CD-1 (285) (Comprehensive Development). The amendment includes: increases density from 4.49 to 5.77 FSR; increases total floor area from 60,737.1 sq. m to 78,090 sq. m; increases maximum height from 88.0 m to 136.0 m; increases tower heights from 26 and 24 storeys to 39 and 37 storeys, and amends tower location; changes residential tenure from social housing to rental with 10% at below market rate; and increases housing units from 299 to 630. This application is being considered under the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy.
- Zoning:** Amendment to CD-1 (285)
- Application Status:** Rezoning Application
- Review:** First
- Architect:** Acton Ostry Architects
- Delegates:** Mark Ostry, Architect, Acton Ostry Architects Inc
Margot Long, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership
Landscape Architects Inc.
Kevin Welsh, Sustainability Advisor, Introba
- Staff:** Simon Jay, Rezoning Planner
Karen Kallweit-Graham, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (8/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Simon Jay, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the existing policy framework as well as the anticipated policy context being considered under the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy. Simon concluded with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Karen Kallweit-Graham, Development Planner then gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built form and public realm guidelines for this project. Karen then gave a description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Mark Ostry, Architect, Acton Ostry Architects Inc., noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Margot Long, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc. Kevin Welsh, Sustainability Advisor, Introba, gave an overview of the sustainability strategy.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:**

Please provide advice on the following relative the Policy statement and emerging context:

- Treatment of the public realm interface and site porosity
- Height, density and overall form of development
- Any additional design development considerations at the DP phase

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Tony Osborn** and seconded by **Tracey Mactavish** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **Support with recommendations** to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Further consideration to the distance between the residential tower and the school.
 - 2) Further consideration to the division of the vertical masses of the towers.
 - 3) Further consideration to the housing mix within the towers specifically to push for the return of the family size units.
 - 4) Further study of the pedestrian realm especially at the interface with W 41st Ave. for more opportunity for porosity at that edge and adding greater visual interest.
 - 5) Reconsider the height of the tower to the south and its adjacency to the south property line and adjacent to residential properties.
 - 6) Further study of shadowing on outdoor spaces on the site particularly spaces between the towers, the day-care area and the outdoor playing fields.
-

Panel Commentary

Consider how the space is being used between the decoupled commercial or the Community Center building and the residential tower. Panelist noted it is too narrow.

Design development to the percentage of floor space allocation for child-care space as an amenity for on-site residents.

Further design and articulation to the edges of the project to make it more exciting (frontage of the school W 41st Ave looks dull, the western edge for bike parking does not feel like a place to hangout, service lane feels heavy handed)

Further shadow studies cast by south tower

The patio space for the residents on the northern tower would benefit from moving to the south. It will be more pleasant experience looking into the podium space and the central open space.

Consider having part of the rooftop above the childcare space as part for residential units and part for childcare with a landscape feature between for visual buffer. so childcare space has more access to sunlight.

Mixed reviews on the eighty foot separation. Some Panelists noted it is very tight and could be more functional. Some Panelists noted the separation is generous compared to other urban dense centres.

Design development to the entrance experience for the community centre and school. Panelist noted concerns with the main entrance to the school, community centre and parkade are all the in the same junction will cause too much congestion. Explore addressing that in the current location or relocating the school entrance.

Design development to the west mews, in particular more detail around the grid changes in the pedestrian interface and impact to the pedestrian experience.

Relocate the generator so it's not directly in the pedestrian pathway.

Encourage more family three-bedroom family size units.

Some Panelists noted 80-foot tower separation is very liveable. Example is Olympic Village, there is a lot of success to these kinds of proximity and low-rise buildings particularly where there are courtyard conditions or in this case mid-block connection.

A Panelist noted design development consideration of the tower; breaking the towers into three masses makes them look too bulky. The verticality of the tower should be emphasised, so they look less bulky in the skyline.

Design development to the crowns of the building because these are going to be visible in the skyline.

The division between the phases, between the school, the residential towers, and the daycare playground can be improved.

Staff's Response: The Staff team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address:	395 West Broadway
Description:	The City of Vancouver has received an application to rezone the subject site from C-3A (Commercial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 32-storey mixed-use rental building and includes: 176 units; commercial space on the ground floor; office space on the second floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 20.7; and a building height of 94.1 m (309 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Broadway Plan.
Zoning:	C-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins & Will
Delegates:	Aik Ablimit, Architect, Perkins & Will Ryan Bragg, Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS Studio Christoph Cheng, Traffic Consultant, Bunt & Associates
Staff:	Andrew Misiak, Rezoning Planner Hamid Shayan, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendation (6/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Andrew Misiak, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the existing policy framework as well as the anticipated policy context being considered under the Broadway Plan. Andrew concluded with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Hamid Shayan, Development Planner then gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built form and public realm guidelines for this project. Hamid then gave a description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Aik Ablimit, Architect, Perkins&Will noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS Studios presented on the landscape strategy.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.**Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:**

1. Advice from the Panel is sought on the proposed Height, Density and Overall Massing with particular attention to:
 - The proposed massing bulk and its impacts on the existing and future urban context with consideration of the site dimensions/ shallow site conditions.
 - The proposed architectural expression provides sufficient visual interest giving the wider building wall profile.
2. Please provide commentary on the quality of public realm along W. Broadway & Yukon St. with particular attention to the proposed corner plaza.
3. Please provide any comments on preliminary materiality, architectural expression, and details to assist staff review of the future DP application.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Tony Osborn** and seconded by **Allyse Li** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **Support with recommendations** to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Further consideration to access from the loading stalls on the lane to the residential elevators as well access from the lane to the bicycle parking.
-

Panel Commentary:

General support from panel on the height, density and massing.

Consideration to path of accessibility at the corner of Yukon and W. Broadway for easy and clear maneuvering. Also consider accessibility to the mezzanine for the second floor.

Encourage making the POP more welcoming through high quality landscape components.

Consider opportunities to provide some light into the corridor.

Strong support from panel for the juliette balconies.

Panel noted appreciation to the amount of open space on upper levels, roof top.

Consider how the building might soften if the light changes during the day and suggest something a bit more reflective even through weathering.

Panel in general supports the minor reduction in family units and lack of three bedrooms.

Consider relaxing the sixty-foot separation for future development to have less impact on them.

Explore having a double high opening above the plaza, currently it feels dark and un-inviting.

A Panelist noted the six-foot setback on Broadway is not a functional public space. Consider extending the column grid down into the six-foot setback to reinforce the structural grid at the ground floor pedestrian realm.

A Panelist noted the floating mass that's created by the setback is a bit unsettling when walking down the street. Having that grid expression at grade, would help the overall legibility of the massing.

Encourage applicant to consider opportunities for access to bike parking from the lane and to the residential elevators from the class b loading bay. There is opportunity for front and rear elevator access to one of the residential elevators from the lane in case they need to be used for bikes.

Consider a more functional relationship between the loading zones and access to the residential elevators for folks who are moving in and out.

A Panelist noted the six-foot setback on Broadway is quite nice on the south facing façade for protection from the rain and for biking parking.

Panel noted concerns with accessibility to amenity floors by shuttle elevator. Consider reducing the tower by one floor or allow view cone intrusion. It will be expected there will be a lot of people using the amenity because of the lack of balconies on the studio and the one bedroom, it would do a great service to the project to allow the residential elevators to access the amenity floor directly.

A Panelist noted the landscape under the cantilever portion is a bit generic compared to how bold and confident the rest of the project is; Panelist suggested it could be a bit more daring and offer something we haven't seen before.

Staff's Response: The Staff team thanked the panel for their comments.
