

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 7, 2024

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Bob Lilly
Craig Taylor (Chair)
Geoff Lister
Heidi Nesbitt
Helen Besharat (Vice- Chair)
Jane Vorbrodt
Jon Stovell

REGRETS:

RECORDING SECRETARY: M. Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1434-1456 W 8th Ave
2. 8689 River District Crossing
3. 525 Powell St

Chair Craig Taylor called the meeting to order at 3:00pm and noted the presence of quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address:	1434-1456 W 8th Ave
Permit No.:	RZ-2023-00049
Description:	To rezone the subject site from C-3A to CD-1. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 25-storey mixed-use building with a one-storey commercial podium and includes 162 secured rental units with 20% of the residential floor area secured for below market rental units above. A floor space ratio (FSR) of 8.07 and a building height of 80.8 m (265 ft.) are proposed with 93 vehicle parking spaces and 281 bicycle spaces. This application is being considered under the Broadway Plan.
Zoning:	C-3A to CD-1
Application:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey (MCM) Partnership
Delegates:	Aaron Petruic, Architect, MCM Dylan Chernoff, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Kent MacDougall, Rezoning Planner Hamid Shayan, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (7/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Kent MacDougall, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the existing policy framework as well as the anticipated urban context being considered under the Broadway Plan. Kent 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 guidelines for this project. Hamid then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

1. With due consideration given to the key principles of *Broadway Plan*, advice from the Panel is sought on the proposed Height, Density and Overall Massing with particular attention to the following: The proposed podium height & proportion and how it contributes to the future streetscape along W. 8th Ave.
2. Please provide commentary on the proposed interface with the public realm along W. 8th

Ave. as well as the proposed mid-block pedestrian pathway.

3. Please provide any comments on preliminary material pallets, architectural expression, and details to assist staff review of the future DP application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant Aaron Petruic, Architect noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Dylan Chernoff, Landscape Architect than gave a presentation on the landscape strategy.

Staff and the applicant team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **HELEN BESHARAT** and seconded by **BOB LILY** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommends **Support with recommendations** with the following recommendations:

The Chair summarized the consensus items as their design development recommendations.

Summary of Panel Consensus Comments

Panel in general supports the height, density, and massing.

To reconsider the expression of the two - four storey podium.

Recommend the drop off areas at the lane be provided separate to the loading area(s) and a provision of a safe environment for pedestrians.

Panel in general supports the mid-block connections aligned to the east of the site.

Panel recommends that the mid-block connections should have a greater level of accessibility including spaces for rest and inclusion of enhanced lighting.

Panel Commentary

Panel noted strong support for the mid-block connection with consideration to additional illumination for safety and visibility and encouraged integration of accessibility standards. Furthermore, support for mid-block to be moved eastward.

A Panelist noted further consideration to the landings. They are currently not big enough, they are the width of the ramp. If the connection area is doubled in width to consider including ramp and stairs in that area.

Panel noted the programming of amenities needs further improvement with consideration to make it accessible and inclusive to all residents.

Panel in general suggested expanding the bike area and encourage bike storage opportunities for non-standard regular bikes such as adaptive bikes or scooters for senior people. A Panelist suggested a bike elevator from P1 to Main floor or off the lane.

Panel in general encouraged the outdoor space on the rooftop amenity spaces to be fully accessible and be used in a meaningful and useful way.

A panelist noted further consideration to the play space to make it enjoyable and an accessible space.

Some Panelists noted material palette, architectural expression and retail looks “dated” and could be improved. A Panelist suggested getting inspiration from the industrial past of Granville St., Granville Island and from pre-colonial times; as well as inspiration from nature and First Nation residents would be welcomed in this project.

Some Panelists noted the tower is too busy and the building is not big enough to warrant being broken down into many pieces. Panelist encouraged a more refined and elegant and simple arrangement of material expression; suggested going with the four-storey podium and taking out the mid tower height step.

Some Panelists noted further consideration to the treatment and refinement of the podium articulation and design.

Some Panelists suggested consideration to double volume retail spaces towards achieving two floors of commercial.

A Panelist noted the four-storey built form requirement to maintain consistency in the street scape that is achievable with both residential and non-residential uses should be maintained.

A Panelist noted the tightness of the interior spaces and encouraged further design consideration to the shared areas for a larger population.

Some Panelists suggested location of the accessible parking stalls to be closer to the elevator vestibules.

Panel noted support for the drop off and pick up locations in the lane.

Native planting is encouraged with consideration to drought tolerance species.

Applicant’s Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address:	8689 River District Crossing
Permit No.:	DP-2023-00810
Description:	To develop on this site a 12-storey multiple dwelling building with 116 dwelling units and a 20-storey mixed-use building with three at-grade commercial units and 197 dwelling. The proposal includes the following: Height of 58.7 m; FSR of 6.02 (21,718 m ²); Five levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Bullrush Road and Oolichan Road. Under the site's existing CD-1 (567) zoning, the application is "conditional" so it may be permitted, however, it requires Council enactment of the amended CD-1 By-law, approval of the form of development and decision by the Director of Planning.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application:	Development application
Review:	First
Architect:	BOP Architects
Delegates:	Shane Oleksiuk, Architect, BOP Sean O'Flynn, Senior Development Manager, Wesgroup Kristin Defer, Landscape Architect, eta landscape architecture Hamed Ghasemi, Development Planner
Staff:	Lee Beaulieu, Senior Landscape Planner

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (4/3)**Planner's Introduction:**

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

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

1. Please comment on the public realm interfaces with particular interest in the proposed mid-block connection and the relationship between the approved Parcel 29 and the anticipated Community Centre.
2. Does the panel support the FOD departure of the SW building from ODP to be a 12-storey tower instead of a 6-storey building?
3. Please comment on the architectural expression of the buildings regarding articulation and materiality.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant Shane Oleksiak, Architect, BOP and Sean O'Flynn, Senior Development Manager, Wesgroup noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Kristine Defer, Landscape Architect then gave a presentation on the landscape strategy.

Staff and the applicant team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **HELEN BESHARAT** and seconded by **GEOFF LISTER** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommends **Support with recommendations** with the following recommendations:

The Chair summarized the consensus items as their design development recommendations.

Summary of Panel Consensus Comments:

General support from Panel for the 12-storey tower instead of a 6-storey building in the ODP.

General support from Panel on the architectural aspects of the project.

General support from Panel for the connection (crosswalk) to the community centre is supported at the mid-block level.

Panel recommends significant design development to the mews area and mid-block connection, particularly in relation to pedestrian safety, and the location and operation of the loading bays. Panel recommends design development to promote separation between pedestrians and loading in the area.

Panel recommends design development to the mews with consideration of a higher level of programming, and additional planting and landscape areas.

Panel Commentary

Panel in general noted support for the architectural form, noting architecture is refreshingly good, simple, easy to build, and elegant.

Panel in general noted significant concerns and further design development required for the mews area.

Some Panel members noted the integration of the amount of loading facilities will not be significant.

Some Panel members noted the integration of people and safety with visual impairment needs to be considered and suggested moving the loading bay out of the mews area. Panelists noted having

a pedestrian walkway in a loading bay is a safety concern.

Some Panel members noted a greater need for landscape in the mid-block connection (SRW area) and not just leave it entirely hard pavement.

The integration of people and safety needs greater consideration in particular people with visual impairment.

Panel in general suggested re-locating the loading bays.

Panel noted further consideration of the courtyard and mews.

A panel member suggested other colors than white for balconies due to the change of colors over time.

A panel member noted private outdoor spaces don't contribute to the mid-block connection.

A panel member suggested larger amenities near the mid-block connection and more meaningful outdoor spaces.

A panel member suggested substantial planting and trees be added for a better fit in the riverside context.

A Panel member encouraged a bike elevator assigned from P1 to main floor.

A Panel member noted the bike stalls at the entrance on both sides look nice and tidy but difficult to maneuver around. Another Panel member noted the bike station at the beginning of the mews is problematic and an eye sore.

Panel suggested re-design of outdoor space particularly at grade.

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

3. Address:	525 Powell St
Permit No.:	DP-2023-00931
Description:	To develop the following on this site: A 10-storey mixed-use building, containing 158 dwelling units, all social housing, with retail at grade; An approximate height of 31.1 m (102 ft.); A floor space ratio of 5.5 (10,902.42 m ² / 117,353 sq. ft.); A total of 36 parking spaces, having vehicular access from the lane. Under the site's existing DEOD zoning, the application is "conditional" so it may be permitted. However, it requires the decision of the Development Permit Board.
Zoning:	DEOD
Application:	Development application
Review:	First

Architect:	Stantec Architecture Ltd.
Delegates:	Colleen Dixon, Architect, Stantec Architecture Ltd. Jody Bielun, Stantec Architecture Ltd. Michael Williamson, Landscape Architect, Stantec Architecture Ltd.
Staff:	Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with no Recommendations (5/0)**Planner's Introduction:**

Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built form guidelines for this project. Ji-Taek then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

1. Does the proposed building massing meet the intended urban design as outlined in DEOD design guidelines?
2. Does the proposed building interface at-grade provide sufficient pedestrian interest for public realm, as intended by DEOD ODP?
3. Provide commentary on the livability (privacy & daylight access) of dwelling units and common amenity space.
4. Provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression and materiality.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Colleen Dixon, Architect and Jody Bielun, Stantec Architecture Ltd. noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project.

Staff and the applicant team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **GEOFF LISTER** and seconded by **JON STOVELL** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with no additional recommendations.

Panel Commentary:

Panel in general was in support of the public realm.

Panel in general support the architectural expression and materiality. Some Panel members noted the green glass could have impact on livability of units.

A Panel member suggested to review and explore further ideas regarding bed and kitchen storages to make it more accessible.

A Panel member suggested integrating a seating or landscape feature under the angular columns at the ground-level 'Pavilion' to ensure safety in that area.

Some Panelists noted they would like to see a landscape strategy that identifies plant species.

A Panel member suggested some glazing towards the corridor, making the level 2 amenity areas feel more inviting.

A Panel member noted there is opportunity to articulate the lane by putting some glazing or glass block, repeating the mural facing the lane.

A Panel member noted opportunity for the southern end units to have additional windows towards the level 2 outdoor amenity space to increase the livability.

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