

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** October 23, 2024

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Joe Wai Meeting Room (110), Main Floor - City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Aik Ablimit  
Arno Matis  
Heidi Nesbitt  
Helen Besharat (Chair)  
Kai Hotson  
R. Stefan Aepli

**REGRETS:**

Michele Cloghesy

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** M. Sem

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1030-1070 E Hastings St
2. 1115-1127 E Hastings St
3. 1168-1180 E Hastings St

Chair Helen Besharat called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1030-1070 E Hastings St  
Permit No.: RZ-2024-00042  
Description: To rezone the subject site from M-1 (Industrial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 38-storey mixed use building and includes: 382 rental residential units; commercial space on the ground floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 16.1; and a building height of 105.5 m (364 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan. The application requests consideration of height and density in excess of the existing policy. This application is being processed and reviewed concurrently with the application to rezone 1115-1127 E Hastings St and 1168-1180 E Hastings St.  
Zoning: M-1 to CD-1  
Application: Rezoning Application  
Review: First  
Architect: ZGF Architects  
Delegates: Mahbod Biazi, Westbank Corporation  
Andrew Thomson, Architect, ZGF  
Adam McGlennon, Architect, ZGF  
Kyle Labow, Landscape Architect, Connect  
Staff: Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner  
Grace Jiang, Development Planner

---

## **EVALUATION: Recommend Re-submission (5/0)**

### **Planner's Introduction:**

Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project with a description of the existing site context, followed by an overview of the existing policy framework as well as the anticipated policy context being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan. Nicholas concluded with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Grace Jiang, Development Planner then gave an overview of the neighbourhood context in relation to the proposal, followed by the expectations of the built form and public realm guidelines for this project. Grace then gave a 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:****Advice Sought on East 1, 2, & 3:**

- Does the panel support the proposed height and density?
- Comment on the proposed built form, considering the impacts on streetscapes, surrounding buildings, livability, and future developments.
- Comment on the contribution to the public realm and place-making, with particular attention to public open spaces and amenities, public views, and building interface.

**Additional Advice Sought on East 1 & 2:**

- The architectural design of tall buildings, aiming for excellence in form and expression, contribution to the skyline, response to area characters, and minimized wind effects on the public realm.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant Mahbod Biaz, Westbank Corporation, Andrew Thomson, Architect, ZGF Adam McGlennon, Architect, ZGF noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Kyle Labow, Landscape Architect, Connect Landscape Architecture 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 **KAI HOTSON** and seconded by **HEIDI NESBITT** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **Recommend Re-submission** with the following recommendations summarized below.

THAT the applicant team carefully review the summary of panel consensus comments, as reflected in the meeting minutes.

**Summary of Panel Consensus Comments**

- General support from panel on height and density.
- Design development for articulation of massing, built form, amenity space, reference to history and neighbourhood.
- Re-visit Hastings plans requirements.
- Re-visit arches of the building.
- Revisit the corner of Glen Dr and Hastings to be more public and contribute to the public realm.
- Provide weather protection.
- Consider improvement to livability and adaptable design.

**Summary of Panel Commentary:**

Panel noted the following comments on indoor amenity space: for the size of the building, it is very small and suggested it be much larger than currently proposed.

Form and massing need to reflect some amount of diversity and history of neighbourhood.

Consider revisiting the massing and add articulation, diversity, vibrancy to these buildings.

A panelist noted the need to see the physical models and need to see design being done to support said intents.

The tripartite rationale is not convincing, and it is too superficial. Arches while legible at grade are not legible 30 floors up in sky.

Landscape could use more work. The tree canopy the applicant mentioned was a replacement of the street trees.

A panelist recommended an Accessibility Consultant noting the reduction in drop-off zones, bike stalls, and handicap stalls reduces accessibility for the underserved and people with mobility challenges.

A panelist noted that the buildings were described as the gateway, but the overall massing does not speak to that aspiration to justify the height and density being asked.

A panelist noted public contribution is minimal.

A panelist noted the amenity space is less than 5% of gross floor area and suggested scaling up.

Some panelists noted consideration to meet unit adaptability that may reduce the number of units.

A panelist noted the livability on the side facing CN rail needs further studies to ensure level of comfort. Another panelist does not agree with the livability of the one-bedroom units with 8ft ceilings.

Some panelists noted the streetscape is not successful and needs further articulation. The arches do not really define the base of the building.

In general, panel noted there needs to be more interesting articulation, i.e., re-interpretation of arches and grids. The skylines could use more articulation as well.

The two corners of Glen Dr and Hastings need more considerations for place-making, such as how the building meets the ground, a little more relief to become a public place, not just corners of buildings.

Some panelists noted the design lacks clear intent, such as the relationship of the two towers, the heights, the base design, the public realm in relation to the ground-floor use.

A Panelist noted project could benefit from a speculative approach to transit sites, noting support for high density without the transit infrastructure.

A Panelist noted that it is schematic design and does not have adequate information to assess the built form. More developed design approach is needed for a project of this scale.

Facades are quite plain and there are no shading possibilities.

There is no articulation in the tower. Rethink the tower, such as bringing the decks forward and not recessing them into tower plates. The building will feel small and more residential. A panelist suggested incorporating passive design and elevator for bike stalls.

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

**2. Address:** 1115-1127 E Hastings

**Permit No.:** RZ-2024-00040

**Description:**

To rezone the subject site from M-1 (Industrial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 39-storey mixed-use building and includes: 385 rental residential units; commercial space on the ground floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 23.3; and a building height of 110.7 m (363 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan. The application requests consideration of height and density in excess of the existing policy. This application is being processed and reviewed concurrently with the application to rezone 1030-1070 E Hastings St and 1168-1180 E Hastings St.

**Zoning:** M-1 to CD-1

**Application:** Rezoning Application

**Review:** First

**Architect:** ZGF Architects

**Delegates:** Mahbod Biazi, Westbank Corporation

Andrew Thomson, Architect, ZGF

Adam McGlennon, Architect, ZGF

Kyle Labow, Landscape Architect, Connect

**Staff:** Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner

Grace Jiang, Development Planner

**EVALUATION: Recommend Re-submission (3/2)****Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **HEIDI NESBITT** and seconded by **ARNO MATIS** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

THAT the applicant team carefully review the summary of panel consensus comments, as reflected in the meeting minutes.

**Summary of Panel Consensus Comments:**

- General support from panel on height and density.
- Design development to articulation of massing, built form, amenity space, reference to history and neighbourhood.
- Re-visit Hastings plans requirements.
- Re-visit arches of the building.
- Revisit the corner of Glen Dr and Hastings St to be more public and contribute to the public realm.
- Provide weather protection.
- Consider increasing sustainability of tower two.
- Design development to improve unit livability of tower two.
- Justify and be mindful of tower separation on east and west side.

**Summary of Panel Commentary:**

Panel noted in addition to comments from Tower E1, the following:

Panelists noted there needs to be higher level of sustainability given the scale of the project, it can't be meeting just bare minimum.

Panelists noted more consideration to tower separation, currently separation is quite minimal.

A Panelist noted concerns with the setbacks.

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

<b>3. Address:</b>	<b>1168-1180 E Hastings St</b>
<b>Permit No.:</b>	RZ-2024-00041
<b>Description:</b>	To rezone the subject site from RT-3 (Residential) District and M-1 (Industrial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 19-storey building and includes: 157 social housing units; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 10.4; and a building height of 54.3 m (178 ft.) with additional height for rooftop amenity space. This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Plan. The application requests consideration of height and density in excess of the existing policy. This application is being processed and reviewed concurrently with the application to rezone 1030-1070 E Hastings St and 1115-1127 E Hastings St.
<b>Zoning:</b>	M-1 and RT-3 to CD-1
<b>Application:</b>	Rezoning Application
<b>Review:</b>	First
<b>Architect:</b>	ZGF Architects
<b>Delegates:</b>	Mahbod Biazzi, Westbank Corporation Andrew Thomson, Architect, ZGF Adam McGlennon, Architect, ZGF Kyle Labow, Landscape Architect, Connect
<b>Staff:</b>	Nicholas Danford, Rezoning Planner Grace Jiang, Development Planner

**EVALUATION: 1168-1180 E Hastings St RZ– Support with Recommendations. (5/0)**

**Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **KAI HOTSON** and seconded by **AIK ABLIMIT** 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. Design Development to improve the streetscape.
2. Increase amenity space.

**Summary of Panel Commentary:**

Panel in general supported the height, density and massing.

A panelist noted consideration to inclusion of family unit type units.

Panelists noted this project is sufficiently articulated relative to its scale.

Panelists noted the simple façade is more successful for this building.

A Panelist suggested adding more floors, making it taller to add more units amenity space.

A Panelist encouraged more weather protection.

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