

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Feb 21, 2024

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

- Craig Taylor Excused from item 3
- Catherine Lemieux Excused from item 3
- Kai Hotson
- Federica Piccone
- Jane Vorbrodt
- Heidi Nesbitt
- Stefan Aepli

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	2535 Carolina St, 557-569
2.	4545 W 10 th Ave
3.	1300 Robson St

Chair Craig Taylor called the meeting to order at 3:05pm and noted the presence of a quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 2535 Carolina St, 557-569 E10th Ave
Permit No.: RZ-2023-00052
Description: To rezone the subject site from RT-5 (Residential) to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is non-compliant with respect to the Broadway Plan. The application requests consideration of an additional tower to be permitted on this block, in the form of an 18-storey mixed-use building which includes: 150 secured rental units with 20% of the floor area secured for below market rental units (approximately 33 units); Commercial space on the ground floor; A floor space ratio (FSR) of 5.80; A building height of 62.0 m (204 ft.); and 53 vehicle parking spaces and 250 bicycle spaces.
Zoning: RT-5 to CD-1
Application: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Staff: Allison Smith (on behalf of Carly Rosenblat) and Mehdi Einifar

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Allison Smith, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as per the Broadway Plan. Allison concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Mehdi Einifar, 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. Mehdi 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:

Please comment on the following:

1. Overall Contextual Fit
2. Deeper Tower Form & Tower Design
3. Public Realm Interface & Ground Level Treatment
4. Comments on the Design to inform Future stages of the application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The Applicant noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. NESBITT** and seconded by **MS. PICCONE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations with the following recommendations:

- 1) Further consideration and refinement of the public realm through setbacks and additional mandatory accessible units.
- 2) Consider additional soft landscaping at the public realm.
- 3) The arched colonnade be further refined or reconsidered at the DP stage.
- 4) Reconsideration of the garbage area in the lane with consideration to pedestrian safety.
- 5) Applicant to address safety issues of the flagstone lane in response to CPTED principles.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel noted the massing and architectural expression is simple and restrained.

The panel supported the overall contextual fit.

Some panelists noted to consider the adjacent sites.

In general panel was in support of the proposed deeper tower form.

This proposal should comply with the setbacks required, as the proposed building is too close to Carolina Street.

A panelist noted a preference for reduced tower separation so that it meets required setbacks as it is presently a neighbourhood with low-rise forms.

The facades respond responsibly to the orientation.

In general panel was okay with the tower floor plate regarding the lane.

The materials are a positive aspect of the proposal.

The choice of the materials reinforces the parti.

There was concern with the stairs proposed to access units in the podium.

There were mixed opinions regarding the arches.

Some noted the arches were more of a disservice especially at the corner.

Some panelists noted that the colonnade has both positive and negative aspects, however greater setbacks and refinement of the public realm could remedy this.

The public realm could benefit from refinement through further consideration and setbacks. The applicant should consider additional mandatory accessible units.

Consider places for people to hang out.

The problem level is the area at grade. The street level has very little landscaping proposed for people to engage with.

Consider the walkways and access. Bring down the scale to be more humanized.

The garbage location could be improved.

Cooling should be required on all projects, especially this one.

The window to wall ratio if is a bit high.

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

2. Address:	4545 W 10th Ave
Permit No.:	RZ-2023-00060
Description:	To rezone the former West Point Grey Safeway site from C-2 (Commercial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for a mixed use development comprised of two 6-storey buildings, and a central building with a 17-storey and a 19-storey tower, and includes: 455 market rental units and 114 moderate income rental units (569 units total); Commercial space on the ground floor, including a supermarket; A floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.84; A floor area of 49,004 sq. m (527,475 sq. ft.); and 444 vehicle parking spaces and 1,107 bicycle spaces. This application is being considered under the Moderate-Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP) rezoning policy.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	David Roche, Bentall Green Oak
Delegation:	Mark Whitehead, Architect, A2 Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, A2
Staff:	Grace Jiang & Scott Erdman

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

Scott Erdman, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as per the Moderate-Income Rental Housing (MIRHPP) Pilot Program. Scott concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Grace Jiang, 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. Grace 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. Comment on the height, massing, and density, with the following considerations:
 - Existing and evolving context;
 - Transitions to the surrounding areas;
 - Impacts on pedestrian experience along the local shopping street;
2. Comment on the placement of the towers, considering the impacts to the neighbouring buildings, the character of streetscape, and solar access to open spaces.
3. Comment on the quality of the public realm design. Please consider:
 - Contribution to a vibrant neighbourhood shopping area;
 - Provision of diverse open spaces to foster neighbourhood social connection, including size and location of the public plaza, pedestrian mews;
 - Building interface and setbacks; and
 - Making space for nature.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Mark Whitehead, Architect noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect then gave a presentation on the landscape strategy.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **Mr. AEPLI** and seconded by **Ms. LEMIEUX** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations with the following recommendation:

- 1) Further Design Development required to the massing and fine grain detail along 10th Ave and the ground level.
- 2) Consider more commercial space and programming in and around the plaza and west of the site.
- 3) Consider a greater number of 3-bedroom units.
- 4) Reconsider the placement of towers to balance the density distribution across the site, minimize the shadowing to the open spaces, and contribute to the 10th Ave streetscape.
- 5) Providing small-scale retail units and fine-grained frontage design along W 10th Ave.
- 6) Increasing the width of the public pedestrian mews.
- 7) Provide greater differentiation between the architectural expressions of the two towers.
- 8) Taking the Safeway site historical features into consideration for place-making.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel generally supported the height and density.

The placement of the towers is too close to the W 10th Ave and could be reconsidered and refined with a view to minimize the shadowing to the open spaces and contribute to the 10th Ave streetscape.

Consider some readjustment of tower lobbies to help with the above.

Address the sameness of the architectural expression of the two towers.

The architecture lacks a sense of place. Consider the history of the site to create a greater sense of place and identity of the project.

The mews connection between 9th and 10th Ave could benefit from further design development and more width to enhance the pedestrian and public experience.

Not having the retail wrap around the plaza is a missed opportunity.

Consider incorporating smaller scale retail in front of the big box retail.

Consider greater number of 3-bedroom units.

A panelist noted the grocery store frontage lacks fine-grain animation.

A panelist noted the 6th floor podium is crowding 10th Ave.

A few panelists noted due to the massive scale, the project should include accessibility units.

A few panelists noted the terraced planters at the northeast corner do not appear successful. The relationship of that building to the public realm is not resolved – it is too high up above grade.

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

3. Address:	1300 Robson St
Permit No.:	DP-2023-00919
Description:	To develop on this site a new 31-storey mixed-use residential tower consisting of 126 dwelling units (Secured Market Rental), 174 Hotel rooms, and at-grade Retail use. The proposal includes the following: Height of 91.4 m; FSR of 9.61 (21,923 m²); 3 levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Rosemary Brown Lane. The application is “conditional” under existing C-6 District Schedule and West End Community Plan, and it may be permitted subject of Development Permit Board approval
Zoning:	C-6
Application:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects
Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez, HPA Vikas Tanwar, Paul Sangha Creative
Staff:	Hamid Shayan

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/0)**Planner’s Introduction:**

Hamid Shayan, 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. 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. Please comment on the quality of the public realm and building interface at Robson St, Jervis St., and Rosemary Brown Lane.
2. Please comment on the architectural expression, articulation of the massing, and material treatment with consideration of the below:
 - a. Is the massing sufficiently articulated to produce a high-quality addition to the prominent urban culture of West End area?

Applicant’s Introductory Comments:

Gregory Henriques, the Architect, noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Vikas Tanwar from Paul Sangha Creative, the Landscape Architect, then gave a presentation on the landscape strategy.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. NESBITT** and seconded by **MR. AEPLI** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations with the following recommendation:

- 1) Further development of the tower's proportion and massing, especially levels 6-10.
- 2) Consider better defining the residential entry at the lane, including for pedestrians.
- 3) Consider outdoor opportunities for the restaurant and lobby.
- 4) Consider further articulation of the east and west facades.
- 5) Consider accessibility of the hotel rooms, residential units, amenities, and site.
- 6) Further development of the landscape especially at outdoor amenities.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel has some concern with the proposed massing especially from levels 6-10.

The panel suggested that the massing portion of the building with levels 6-10 should get wider.

The panel supported the location of the tower not to provide shadowing on the Robson Village.

Some panelists noted the project is beautiful and will enhance the Robson Street area.

Many panelists noted the hotel entrance is in a good location.

Some panelists noted the east and west facades might have too much brick.

Some Panelists noted to consider more indoor/outdoor interaction between the restaurant and hotel lobby.

Some panelists suggested to consider some introduction of public art in the corner.

The panel noted to provide more seating in the ground plane.

The panel noted to consider accessibility of the site.

The panel noted to consider further development of the landscape.

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