

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Aug 21, 2024

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex, Virtual

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Craig Taylor
Heidi Nesbitt
Kai Hotson
Khat Vessel
Michelle Cloghesy
John Stovell
Helen Besharat
Frederica Piccone

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 455-565 Great Northern Way & 1850 Thornton St.
2. 2111 Main Street

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: 455-565 Great Northern Way & 1850 Thornton St.
Permit No.: RZ-2024-00033
Description: To rezone the subject site from CD-1 (402) (Comprehensive Development) District to a new CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 20-storey mixed-use office building with a 4-storey podium and two 35-storey mixed-use residential rental buildings with 4-storey podiums. This proposal includes: 548 rental units with 20% of the floor area for below-market rental units; commercial space on the ground floor and in the podium levels; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.41; a maximum building height of 113.7 m (373 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space and mechanical appurtenances; a publicly accessible open space integrated with the future Emily Carr SkyTrain station; a childcare facility (94 spaces) dedicated turnkey to the City; and 470 vehicle parking spaces and 1,848 bicycle spaces. This application is being considered under the Broadway Plan.

Application Status: Rezoning Application
Architect: Perkins & Will
Delegation: Ryan Bragg, Architect
Ginger Gosnell-Myers, Indigenous Advisory Committee
Jeffrey Staates, Landscape Architect

Staff: Nicholas Danford & Hamid Shayan

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 per the policy under the Broadway Plan. Nicholas concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

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 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. 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 overall buildings' arrangement in the site.
2. Please provide commentary on the quality of open spaces with particular attention to the following:
 - Pedestrian spine (Cultural Ribbon)

- Open plaza and integration to the station entrance
 - The buildings interface to the public realm.
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:

Applicant Ryan Bragg, Architect for Perkins & Will, noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Jeffrey Staates, 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. NESBITT** and seconded by **MR HOTSON** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

1. Encourage greater equitable access to the pavilion rooftop with consideration of the ramps and places for pause and congregation.
2. Recommend providing greater wayfinding to the destination restaurant at the top of the pavilion;
3. Further development of material and architectural expression, including the sun shading strategy prior to the DP submission with consideration to the orientation of the buildings;
4. Further development of the relationship between the towers and podium;
5. Encourage the development of the cultural ribbon and indigenous aspirations vertically throughout the development.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

The panel commended the applicant and the Indigenous Advisory panel for all their work on the project.

There was general support from the panel for overall height, density, and massing and the arrangement of buildings on the site.

Consider the relationship of the buildings with the podium and the daycare and how it relates back to the public.

A panelist noted to consider the amount of glass with the cladding which may cause overheating.

The panel noted support for the cultural ribbon and pedestrian spine. Consider further development prior to the development permit stage.

The ground quality around the retail frontage and grand open space is reading big and heavy, consider further development as it does not feel pedestrian friendly or welcoming. Consider warmer materials around this area.

Consider accessibility around the project and to the pavilion.

A panelist noted the pavilion feels big. The compression with the pavilion and office building could

use further consideration.

A few panelists noted the architectural expression is presently reading monotonous, heavy, and repetitive, consider weaving in more the cultural fabric.

Continue conversation with MST members when it comes to the material palette.

A panelist noted to consider wayfinding to all the different entries.

The location of the station entrance presently makes sense.

A panelist noted to consider a better connection between Emily Carr and this project.

A panelist noted to consider the north side of the building as it seems it will be a dead zone.

A panelist noted to consider a play area at the ground plane.

A panelist noted to consider further work with the shading strategy.

A panelist noted to consider the biodiversity of the project.

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

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2. Address: | 2111 Main Street |
| Permit No.: | RZ-2023-00062 |
| Description: | To rezone the subject site from IC-1 (Industrial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 24-storey and a 22-storey mixed-use rental buildings and includes: 446 units with 20% of the residential floor area for below-market rental units; commercial space on the ground floor; arts and cultural space; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 9.83; and a building height of 70.3 m (231 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Broadway Plan. |
| Application Status: | Rezoning Application |
| Architect: | MCMP Architects |
| Delegation: | Peter Odegaard, Architect Joe Fry, Landscape Architect |
| Staff: | Chee Chan & Hiroko Kobayashi |
| EVALUATION: | Support with Recommendations (6/0) |

Planner's Introduction:

Chee Chan, 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 policy under the Broadway Plan. Chee concluded the presentation with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Hiroko Kobayashi, 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. Hiroko 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:

1. the proposed form of development and massing articulation (e.g. massing breaks, voids in tower/podium) noting that:
 - a. The tower floor plate size increases from 6,500 sq. ft. to 7,800 sq. ft. to support the delivery of a cultural space.
 - b. Density increases from FSR 8.5 to 9.83.
2. The overall design of the podium and interface with the public realm including the mid-block connection of the breezeway.
3. The preliminary material palette, architectural expression to assist staff review of the future DP application.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant Peter Odegaard, Architect for MCMP, noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project followed by Joe Fry, 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. BESHARAT** and seconded by **MS. PICONNE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

4. Design development for a more appropriate expression of the cultural space;
5. Consider a more public expression and opportunities to showcase the murals;
6. Consider a greater and more intentional relationship with materiality and expression between the podiums and towers;
7. Further design development to the expressions of the commercial and retail entries along Main Street to follow the grade, natural typography and the existing context;
8. Further design development to the breezeway at the lane and more consideration to the accessible pedestrian ramp.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

There was general support for the scale, additional floorplate size and overall density.

Further design development to the massing and tower articulation and improving the relationship between podium and the towers.

The base is in the right direction with the scale and character. However, above the podium level, it comes across as a big dark mass. As a result, the balcony recesses do not read well.

A panelist noted that the balconies appear to be quite small and to reassess the functionality and

livability aspects of the balconies.

A panelist noted some of the unit layouts appear to be small and tight especially near the breezeway.

A panelist noted further consideration to the residential access, loading access and drop off spaces for the functionality uses.

Further considerations to the accessibility aspects in general throughout the development.

A panelist noted there is a lack of entryways along Main Street. There is no fine grain retail and commercial entry opportunities, they are all proposed along the breezeway, which is not very visible from the street and encourage further design development.

Further design development to the proposed materiality, the brick material is successful considering the existing context and character.

One panelist noted that the change in colour of the brick is odd when the towers are the same. They encourage a more positive relationship between the podiums and the towers without being the same.

Design development to consider further opportunities to celebrate murals and the culture of the areas.

One panelist noted that the breezeway could become a lost opportunity, and that more attention to detail and activation, possibly with murals, is needed to make the space successful.

A panelist noted the bike parking would have been more successful if it is located closer to the street interface of the building.

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