

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 19, 2023

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Craig Taylor (Chair)
Jon Stovell (Vice chair)
Kai Hotson
R. Stefan Aepli
Scott Romses
Margot Long
Reza Mousakhani

REGRETS:

Amina Yasin
Brittany Coughlin
Heidi Nesbitt
Meeta Lele

RECORDING SECRETARY: M. Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 3364-3384 Vanness Ave and 3347 Clive Ave
2. VCC - 1111 E 7th Ave

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

- 1. Address:** 3364-3384 Vanness Ave and 3347 Clive Ave
Permit No.: RZ-2022-00050
Description: To rezone the subject site from CD-1(201) and CD-1(218) to a new CD-1. This proposal is non-compliant with respect to the policy noted below. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 30 (west tower) and 33 (east tower) -storey mixed use building connected with a 6-storey podium and includes: 679 secured rental units with 10% of the residential floor area secured for below market units (approximately 67 units); Commercial space on the ground floor; Dedication of floor area for a 37-space child care facility; A floor space ratio (FSR) of 11.34; A total building height of 91.4 m (300 ft.) (east tower); 214 vehicle parking spaces and 1295 bicycle parking spaces. The site is located in the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan. The application requests consideration of height and density in excess of the existing policy.
- Zoning:** CD-1
Application: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Intracorp
Applicant: Adrian Politano, Architect, AIBC, Principal Boniface Oleksiuk Politano Architects
Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
- Staff:** Ryan Dinh, Development Planner,
Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner
-

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (7/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan. Nicholas concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Ryan Dinh, 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. Ryan 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:

Noting:

- The Plan's vision related to building height transitions,
- The Plan's recommendations for tower size, podium height and building setbacks,

Please comment on the proposed height, density, and massing in terms of overall urban design performance and neighbourhood fit.

1. Comments on the success of the quality and the interface of public realm in relation to building length and height.
2. Comments on architectural expression to inform future development permit application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant Adrian Politano, Architect noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Peter Kreuk 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 **SCOTT ROMSES** and seconded by **STEFAN AEPLI** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design development of the public realm to enhance the materiality and programing.
- Design development to reinforce the architectural concept and parti, regarding fenestration and the east and west façade expression.
- Consideration to increase tower height closer to the corner and decrease the other tower height by the same amount to create more meaningful transition to the neighbouring developments.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

- Support for the height, density and massing.
- Support for the architectural concept and the interface with public realm.
- Larger floor plate may be considered to improve efficiency
- A greater asymmetry of "valley" expression should be considered to improve massing transition
- Further resolution of the connection between the "valley" and the base
- Encouraged protecting significant trees and suggested reviewing where parkades can be pulled to retain significant matures trees.

- Encouraged more indoor and outdoor amenity spaces considering the number of residential units provided.
- Encouraged sustainability features to the project.

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

2. Address: VCC - 1111 E 7th Ave

Permit No.: DP-2023-00130

Vancouver Community College has applied to the City of Vancouver for permission to develop the following on this site: An eight-storey post secondary education facility; A floor area of 28,843.85 m² (310,472.6 sq.ft.); A Floor Space Ratio of 6.32; Two levels of "conditional" so it may be permitted. However, it requires

Description: the decision of the Development Permit Board.

Zoning: CD-1

Application: Complete Development Application

Review: First

Architect: Stantec

Eleonore LeClerc, Architect AIBC, Stantec

Applicant: Brian Porter

Staff: Carl Stanford, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Re-submission Recommended (6/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Carl Stanford, Development Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context. Carl concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the development permit proposal.

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

1. Does the proposal achieve a sensitive transition to the park and a harmonious contextual fit in accordance with best practice principles of urban design?
2. Does the proposal achieve a successful public realm interface on all sides of the building providing a lively, well activated, and pedestrian friendly realm?
3. Does the proposal satisfactorily address the "Cultural Ribbon" walkway concept?
4. Does the proposal achieve successful architectural expression / articulation of massing appropriate to a landmark building and consistent with the intended conceptual parti?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant, Eleonore LeClerc, Stantec Architecture noted the design objectives for the site and gave a general overview of the project. Brian Porter & Chris Mramor of PFS Studio then presented 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 **KAI HOTSON** and seconded by **STEFAN AEPLI** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommends Re-submission with the following recommendations summarized below:

- Design development on the transition and relationship to the park to be addressed by either moving building to the east or locating the cultural ribbon to the west side.
- Design development to reconsider materials such as the 'Swiss Pearl' material to better reflect the 'land' Parti metaphor.
- Design development on the public realm giving greater consideration for views into the automotive spaces and to celebrate the automotive spaces below to help animate the public realm.
- The public realm at the courtyard is considerably lacking at the south end beyond the stairs and requires design development.
- Design development to reconsider the orientation of the building onto Glen Drive.
- Design development to reinforce references to the conceptual metaphor of 'canoe', 'water', and 'land' while also reinforcing the references to innovation and clean energy.
- Design development to provide more articulation to reinforce the Parti proposed.
- Design development to reconsider the location of the cultural ribbon so it provides greater public benefit.
- Design development to consider greater sustainability initiatives.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

- In general, the Panel felt shadowing onto the China Creek North Park is an issue.
- Most Panelists felt on such a large site the building could shift eastwards improving the issues of shadowing and the insufficient public realm interface.
- Most Panelists appreciated the complexity of the project, its challenges and the density of the program described by the applicant.
- Most Panelists felt the public realm interface was unsuccessful with insufficient setbacks. The West and North side public realm in particular are not successful. They further noted the Glen Drive transition to China Creek North Park is a hard wall and disengages too much. The small fenestration there is not successful.
- Some Panelists noted you should be able to look down into automotive spaces with a glazed elevation. Visibility is a must.
- Some Panelists noted accessibility issues along north-west corner with the ground floor of the building not matching the grade of the street.
- Some Panelists noted the interior corridor breezeway is a space that needs to be connected to the park and external spaces.
- A Panelist noted the building is giving nothing back to the public apart from a minor public realm.
- Most Panelists felt the 'Cultural Ribbon' north-south connection should be widened, and enhanced. It should be more accessible meeting the sidewalk at

grade and designed to be less challenging for the mobility impaired, wheelchair users, or elderly to use.

- Some Panelists note the 'Cultural Ribbon' north-south connection may be in the wrong place on the site. The creek is on the west side of the site and not the centre of the site. Opposite the park may provide a better public open space.
- A Panelist noted wonderful 'Cultural Ribbon' landscaped courtyard just ends in a stairs which seems inadequate for such an important space.
- A Panelist noted the North south connection is undersized for the volume of anticipated pedestrian traffic. Cultural ribbon is more successful inside the building.
- Some Panelists noted the material treatment of the 'Land' Parti elements were not entirely successful and that fibre cement cladding was not a strong association with 'land' like stone cladding might be.
- Some Panelists noted the execution of its Parti concept is tenuous. It should reinforce or reconsider the Parti concept 'Land' is normally associated with rock or stone not fibre cement. The wetland shore line denotes soft or green materials. Water is fluid but the building doesn't flow and feels rectilinear. The 'Canoe' element could be more elegant and curved and that is not what we have here because of the dense and heavy program. Don't have to abandon the parti. This unique and important building should speak more to its culture and programs. The weakest moment is where the 3 parti elements interlock.
- A Panelist noted the building could reference its automotive function with contemporary elegant rectangular massing reflective of the program.
- A Panelist noted the architectural expression works well enough but the North and south facades glazed in 'canoe' portion is a little 'corporate'. The cladding could wrap north and south ends.
- A Panelist noted the building layout has problems and is too narrow.
- Some Panelists noted sustainability features are not very ambitious for a clean energy and innovation building. It is a missed opportunity for such an important building and needs to be better.
- A panelist noted that a double row of existing trees have been removed in the proposal even on the edges. There's a lot of tree removal. The best impact for climate change and resilience is to connect to green spaces and trees. This project has done the opposite.
- A Panelist noted the dead landscaped spaces on route to the main entrance.
- A Panelist noted that it is an otherwise great project.
- The Chair summarized the consensus items as their design development recommendations.

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