

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, February 25, 2026

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Teams Meeting

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Ana Maria Llanos
Allyse Li (Chair)
Scott Mitchell
Michele Cloghesy
Mariyeh Sharifisaraei
Peeroj Thakre

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. **1220 Station St**
2. **2406-2484 Renfrew Street**
3. **1926-1978 East Broadway**

1. Address:	1220 Station Street
Permit No.:	RZ-2024-00109
Description:	To rezone the subject site from FC-2 (Commercial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 36-storey and a 28-storey building including commercial, office, and residential uses with an eight-storey podium. Overall, the proposal includes: 470 units with 20% of the floor area for below market rental units; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 11.1; and a building height of 87.4 m (287 ft.) and 109.8 m (360 ft.). This application is being considered under the False Creek Flats Plan and the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy.
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Architect:	MCM Partnership
Delegation:	Mark Thompson, Architect, MCM Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durant Kreuk
Staff:	Hamid Shayan & Daniel Feeney

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Hamid Shayan, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighborhood 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 proposed height, density, and overall massing with particular attention to:

1. The proposed massing bulk and tower and podium articulation.
 - The Proposed architectural expression and orientation of the towers to ensure sufficient visual interest and openness to the sky.
 - How successfully responded to the heritage character of the Pacific Station Building.
2. Please provide commentary on the quality of public realm along Terminal Ave. & Station Street and proposed corner plaza with particular attention to the adjacency to the SkyTrain overhead rail structure.
3. Please provide any comments on preliminary materiality, and details to assist staff review of the future DP application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Mark Thompson, Architect for MCM noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. PEEROJ THAKRE** and seconded by **MR. SCOTT MITCHELL** 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. Consider improving the relationship between the podium and the towers;
2. Consider improving the relationship between the podium and the heritage building;
3. Recommend reconsidering the strategic placement of the corner plaza which is the only public realm piece offered on site.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was general support from the panel.

The panel recommended further refinement of how the podium connects to the tower. The podium feels disjointed from the tower. The massing and articulation between the podium and tower to be improved.

The heritage component of the adjacent site feels disjointed from the current proposed podium.

Materiality feels abrupt and disconnected in terms of the façade design.

The architectural expression, the transition piece is missing, there is an abrupt transition of materiality and overuse of glazing. Consider softer elements.

The residential components are not successful, they appear bulky. Recommended revising the massing.

Consider some of the units, especially the studios, which are quite tight amongst the floorplate provided and may not provide the best livability standards.

Tower orientations help with shadowing and views with one unit to another.

Looking at the overall heritage component further refinement to honor the architectural language of the Pacific station. The immediate adjacent site is ignored. There is an important connection between the building and adjacent site.

The relationship with the heritage building and the plaza needs improvement.

The plaza is trying to do a lot, however, consider the programming should create more synergy.

Reconsider the variety of amenities offered, how the building is giving back to the public realm considering the amount of density that it is asking. Some panelists also noted the way the interior programming is distributed should consider proposed residential unit mix on the site, considering the density of the project overall.

The corner plaza is generally effective to an extent, however, could benefit from being on the quieter

side of the site and away from the high-speed part of the project.

Overall, the project could improve its clarity with each element's role, this would improve the project's significance.

Panel recommend the project return at the DP stage with the inclusion of the comments.

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

2. Address: 2406-2484 Renfrew St
Permit No.: RZ-2025-00083
Description: To rezone the subject site from CD-1 (846) District to a new CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 31-storey mixed use residential building and a 6-storey mixed-use residential building, that includes: 339 rental units; commercial space on the ground floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 7.5; and a building height of 97 m (318 ft.). This application is being considered under the Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan.

Application Status: Rezoning Application
Architect: Studio One Architecture
Delegation: Mahdis Soltani, Architect, Studio One Architecture
Kristin Defer, Landscape Architect, ETA
Staff: Austin Norrie & Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support (6/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Austin Norrie, 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 Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan. Austin concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Omar Aljebouri, 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. Omar 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. Height, density and overall massing.
2. The overall approach to the public realm and landscape design.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Mahdis Soltani, Architect for Studio One Architecture, noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Kristin Defer, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. ANA MARIA LLANOS** and seconded by **MR. SCOTT MITCHELL** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **SUPPORT** to the project with the following commentary to be reviewed

by City Staff:

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel noted the overall approach is successful to the massing, density and height.

The density and height is supportable.

Overall architectural expressions is supportable.

Enhancements to the public realm can be made with better cohesion with the outdoor public space.

Look at protectional future mid-block connections on site and alignment with the lane. Look at improving how the space operates, will help with future context.

Given the extra density the amenities are lacking and can be further enhanced.

The panel encourages the applicant team to look at the retail as amenity. With all the density what are the amenities on site other than those exclusive to the residents.

Further considerations to re-examine the programming for the ground floor and second and could there be more retail CRU offered on site given the density lift of the proposed project.

Refinement and further considerations to material cohesion and design language around the elevations and consider simplifying the materiality along with façade expressions of the tower.

Overall, the project is strong and is supportable.

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

3. Address: 1926-1978 E Broadway
Permit No.: RZ-2025-00064
Description: To rezone the subject site from C-1 (Commercial Inclusive) District and RT-5 (Residential) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 33-storey mixed-use building with a 6-storey podium, and includes: 352 rental units with 20% of the floor area for below-market units; commercial space on the ground floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 13.3; and a building height of 106 m (349 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Transit-Oriented Areas Rezoning Policy in the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan area. It requests consideration of density and height in excess of the existing policy.

Application Status: Rezoning Application
Architect: Perkins & Will
Delegation: Aaron Knorr, Architect, Perkins & Will
David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, Perkins & Will
Staff: Susanne Ruhle & Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Susanne Ruhle, 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 Grandview-Woodland Community Plan Area. Susanne concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Omar Aljebouri, Development Planner gave an overview of the neighborhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built-form guidelines for this project. Omar 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. Height, density and overall massing, especially the podium corner and tower top.
2. The public realm and landscape design approach, especially the corner POPS (e.g. useability, character, etc.)
3. Additional comments (e.g. contextual fit, pedestrian interest, building interface).

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Aaron Knorr, Architect for Perkins and Will, noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Susan Ruhle, Landscape Architect presenting on the landscape design.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. SCOTT MITCHELL** and seconded by **MS. PERROJ THAKRE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend **SUPPORT** to the project with the following commentary to be reviewed by City Staff:

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel supported the project.

The project is well resolved and provides good attention to detail for the public realm and corner plaza.

Considering the complex nature and the shape of the site it is well done.

The interface with the greenway is successful.

Tower placement and interface between the podiums along with the transitions are well done.

The relationship with tower and podium is successful.

The way this project connects with its public realm is successful.

Be mindful, the front of the townhouses seems to take up a lot of public space.

Appreciate the level of sensitivity to the livability factor.

In respect to the townhouses and the pathway to and from the residential lobby and other areas such as the mailboxes consider the overall accessibility of the site.

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