

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** November 13, 2024

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Webex-Virtual

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

Bob Lily  
Federica Piccone  
Jane Vorbrod  
Jon Stovell  
Reza Mousakhani  
Arno Matis  
Heidi Nesbitt  
Craig Taylor (Chair)

**REGRETS:**

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** M. Sem

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 3200 East Broadway (Enhanced Rezoning Proposal)
2. 1155 E 6th Ave

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

**1. Address:** 3200 East Broadway (Enhanced Rezoning Proposal)  
**Permit No.:** PS-2023-00201  
**Description:** Proposed development at 3200 East Broadway, 3270 East Broadway and 2625 Rupert Street (referred to as "3200 East Broadway"). x?m??k??y??m (Musqueam), S?wx?wú7mesh (Squamish), s?lilw?ta? (Tseil Waututh) (MST), in partnership with Aquilini Development, seek to rezone the site from I-2 to CD-1. This will permit a mixed-use development that offers a diverse range of housing, employment and amenity options. It will also provide a unique opportunity to revive a strong MST economy and culture on the land. The City of Vancouver is hosting a consultation process to get early feedback on this "Unique Site" in the Renfrew-Collingwood neighbourhood, concurrent with the planning process for the Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan. Unique Sites are subject to an enhanced rezoning process to provide an opportunity for feedback on proposals at an early stage due to the large scale and complexity of the site.

**Zoning:** I-2 to CD-1  
**Application:** Enhanced Rezoning (Enquiry)  
**Review:** First  
**Architect:** Chris Dikeakos Architects  
**Delegates:** Johnna Sparrow-Crawford, Aboriginal relations advisor, Aquilini Development  
Tara Sparrow-Felix, Development Coordinator, Aquilini Development  
Heidi Martin, Development Coordinator, Aquilini Developments  
Graeme Clendenan, Director of Development, Aquilini Development  
Holly Sovdi, Community Planner, RR Planning Ltd.  
Nadia Said, Architect, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.  
Chris Dikeakos, Architect, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.  
Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape

**Staff:** Tess Munro, Rezoning Planner  
Kallweit-Graham, Karen, Development Planner

---

## **EVALUATION: Non-voting session**

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

Tess Munro, 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 Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan.

Tess gave a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning process before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

---

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

1. Character, configuration, and connectivity of **public open spaces**.
2. **Mobility network** including priority on walking, rolling, and cycling, as well as vehicular connections.
3. **Approach of the built form** including typology of blocks and buildings, heights and massing, and the relationship to the surrounding open space.
4. **Proposed land use locations** including non-residential uses (retail/office/industrial) in relation to nearby uses (Central Valley Greenway, Skytrain guardrail, Rupert Station).

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant team - Johnna Sparrow-Crawford, Indigenous relations advisor, Aquilini Development, Tara Sparrow-Felix, Indigenous Development Coordinator, Aquilini Development, Heidi Martin, Indigenous Development Coordinator, Aquilini Developments, Nadia Said, Architect, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc., Holly Sovdi, Community Planner, RR Planning Ltd. reviewed the MST guiding principles and gave a general overview of the project. Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape then gave a presentation on the public realm and 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 the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

**Panel Commentary:**

Consider from an accessibility point of view how to navigate the pathways for pedestrians, children, visually impaired and people with wheelchairs.

Vehicle drop off and pick up is especially important for those with mobility challenges, facilitate places to sit and wait.

For the most part these buildings are quite tall and narrow so there will be meaningful soil to build those ecosystems on.

Refreshing to see industrial uses and some real potential for long term financial viability and employment opportunities combined right next to residential uses.

Equally attracted to both schemes, hopefully the outcome will be a hybrid of the two.

The mobility network and rolling hill is difficult to comment on without fully understanding the sections but consider how all the sloping grade will work together with an emphasis on internal permeability, internal circulation, the approach to the built form typology blocks and building heights.

The cedar scheme has more modest podiums which is more in line with the overall verticality of the schemes and the vertical nature of the landscaping.

Encourage and accommodate healthy land use mix.

Introduction of industrial is very positive although it may not be ideal for distribution facilities. Encourage integrating and mixing these light industrial uses appropriately and in the right locations around residential and other commercial uses.

Like the idea of the air, land and water driving the design and form.

With the salmon concept, reconsider, where the salmon is located. Is this really the place where you want salmon to be? It feels a bit tight with the development in close proximity to the stream. There needs to be enough space for the broad leaf maples to fall over into the stream, provide a place for the rotting woods and limit human interaction. Suggest to free up the salmon scheme design a bit to have greener, more interactivity with the public and landscape.

The way the pathways are set up and the transportation nodes running through the site are logical. They naturally break the site down into manageable parcels.

Both schemes provide a rich opportunity to animate the harder edges and massing of buildings with the landscape areas of different scales.

The podium and towers are nicely placed and spaced apart, there seems to be opportunities for a lot of light to penetrate into the site.

The tower locations and the tall towers as markers are successful, suggest making one of the three towers taller to provide variation.

The salmon scheme had the play space located adjacent to the greenhouse and viewing platform. There would be a real benefit to condensing all these features in one bigger space rather than distributing them out.

With regard to the towers on parcel 4-5, suggest in the next iteration there could be more attention to the views between the towers and self shading, but at a glance it looks like the cedar scheme eliminates some self shading compared to the salmon scheme in those two specific parcels.

Like the way the guiding principles that MST have outlined started to translate very much in the landscape.

Drawn to the cedar scheme because of its permeability and the ideas of reducing the bulk of the podiums, being cognizant of shadowing, allowing greater access to the ground plane and service for pedestrians. It also contributes to the mobility network and permeability throughout the site.

Like the idea of limited and calmed traffic into these areas, being mindful of safety.

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

**2. Address:** 1155 E 6th Ave  
**Permit No.:** RZ-2024-00063

**Description:** To rezone the subject site from I-2 and I-3 (Industrial) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 19-storey office building (west tower) and two 35-storey mixed-use rental buildings (centre and east towers) and includes: 600 rental units with 20% of the floor area for below-market units; commercial and industrial uses within the podium, including a grocery store and a privately owned childcare facility; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 8.67; and includes partial road closure northwest of the site. This application is being considered under the Broadway Plan.

**Zoning:** I-2 & I-3 to CD-1

**Application:** Rezoning Application

**Review:** First

**Architect:** MCM

**Delegates:** Peter Odegaard, Architect, MCM Architects  
Ginger Gosnell-Myers, Indigenous Advisory Committee  
Grant Brumpton, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape

**Staff:** Helen Chan, Rezoning Planner  
Hamid Shayan, Development Planner

**EVALUATION:** Support with Recommendations (7/0)

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

Helen Chan, 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 Broadway Plan. Helen concluded with a description of the site and a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Hamid Shayan, 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. Hamid 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:**

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 *Creative District* and how the proposal addressed it.
2. Please provide commentary on the quantity and quality of open spaces and the quality of landscape design with particular attention to the following:

- Social nodes and their contribution to the public life and activity
  - Pedestrian interest, activity, and flow around the buildings (through east & west streets and lane makers)
  
  - Contribution to the Cultural Ribbon
  - The buildings interface to the public realm at entire frontage (emphasizing the Urban Edges)
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:**

The applicant Peter Odegaard, Architect, MCM Architects and Ginger Gosnell-Myers, Indigenous Advisory Committee noted the objectives and gave a general overview of the project. Grant Brumpton, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape 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 **HEIDI NESBITT** and seconded by **BOB LILY** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **Support with Recommendations** with the following recommendations summarized below:

1. Further consider the entry of the residential central tower to be more equitable, accessible, and intuitive.
2. Further design development to investigate and reconsider the materiality and fenestration to unify the differing project elements.
  
3. Explore the celebration of the serpentine canopy.
4. Explore a more unified expression at the ground plane on East 6th Ave.

### **Panel Commentary:**

General support for the height, density and massing.

General support for the quality and quantity of the open space.

General support for the contribution to the cultural ribbon.

General support for contribution to the public realm.

General support for the extension of the surface treatment beyond property line.

A Panelist suggested making the marker lane more permeable, noting the base of the building feels closed. Panelist suggested creating visual interest to help animate the area at the bottom.

A Panelist suggested the elevator near the grocery store needs to be obvious and close.

Panelists encouraged accessible parking options next to the elevator vestibules; equitable experience of those spaces should be experienced equally by those who can and cannot navigate elevators, escalators, or stairs.

Panelists noted reflective material on the office building next to the residential tower might cause glare for people living there.

A Panelist noted concern for – the highly reflective and future look of the office building compared to the more organic natural character of the residential towers just doesn't seem to be quite there yet.

Panelists noted appreciation to the level of consideration and landscape design.

Panelist suggested connecting the skytrain at that upper level into the lobby space. And then furthermore, connecting the upper level over to VCC across East 6th and avoid some of the at-grade crossing issues.

Panelists suggested having one tower, possibly the eastern tower closer to the station come up higher.

Panelist noted at development permit stage, certain concepts get more concentrated in areas around the building and other areas between storefronts, commercial edges can be a little quieter, accent points where the stairs go up with their detailed canopy and then parts in between can get more quiet; same for the towers.

Panelists noted further consideration to the lobby for the mid block towers to residential towers. It is a long way to walk and not appealing to residence experience.

Panelist noted further explore the monolithic white model, its warm texture is unifying the other two towers rather than be hyper slick and spacey.

Panelist noted There is a conscious push and pull which is detracting and diluting unification of the three different towers and it will enable a slightly different expression for the office tower to be more effectively unified with the entire development, so to simplify and, quiet down that expression on the lower levels towards E.6<sup>th</sup> Ave would be positive.