

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 28, 2018
TIME: 3:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall
PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Colette Parsons
Derek Neale
Helen Avini Besharat
Jim Huffman
Leslie Shieh
Muneesh Sharma
Susan Ockwell
Yijin Wen

REGRETS:
Amela Brudar
David Jerke
Grant Newfield
Marie-France Venneri

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** D. Fung

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 5055 Joyce Street |
| 2. | 1535-1557 Grant Street |
| 3. | 574 E. Broadway (2525 Carolina Street) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Ms. Besharat called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: **5055 Joyce Street**
 Permit No. RZ-2018-00031
 Description: To develop a 32-storey mixed-use building consisting of commercial retail units on the ground floor and 298 market strata residential units above; all over six levels of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 23,090 sq.m (248,535 sq.ft), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 15.5 and the building height is 93m (305 ft). The application is being considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan.
 Zoning: C-2C to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Perkins & Will
 Owner: Josh Anderson, Westbank Corporation
 Delegation: Peter Busby, Perkins & Will
 Kevin Klassen, Hapa Collaborative
 Staff: Karen Wong & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS (7-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Karen Wong, introduced the site, located at the Northwest corner of Joyce St. and Vanness St., immediate North of the Joyce-Collingwood Skytrain station. The site scales down immediately to the North with the neighbour not anticipated to redevelop. The site is flanked by two lanes. The total site area is 15,977 sq. ft. (154' x 103').

Both the site and the neighbour to the North are zoned C-2C which allows a 35 ft. height (4 storeys) and 3.00 FSR (1.50 Res + 1.00 Com). There is a 30° angle required to minimize shadow to the North and transition smoothly to R zones. The 3.00 FSR is often not achievable due to site challenges and other urban design requirements.

The remainder of the block is zoned RM-4N which is a relatively flat site. It slopes down 1m towards the West. One of the potential challenges for this site includes the acoustic issues from the trains.

The proposal is for a 32-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade. There will be 298 market strata residential units with 248,500 sq ft at a density of 15.5 FSR and 197 parking stalls.

The Applicant is considered to be under the *Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan*, sub-area J1 - Joyce St @ Vanness Ave, which facilitates a mixed-use tower at this site.

There is a 12% balcony exclusion. Over 12% would require panel input. The balconies are designed to minimize thermal bridges.

The minimum frontage is 132 ft. with local serving commercial at grade and a choice of use (retail, service, office or residential) above grade. If residential, then acoustic mitigation is required to handle the noise from the road and the Skytrain to ensure liveability. There is space to allow for a grocery store where practical (7,500-10,000 sq. ft.).

Development planner Patrick Chan started with the site conditions and context, noting the site is immediately north of the Joyce-Collingwood Skytrain Station and located at Southwest corner of the Joyce-Vanness commercial hub where greater building heights are anticipated. The site is also currently zoned C-2C, which has a density allowance of 3.00 FSR and a 40 ft. height limit. In its surroundings, the site to the immediate North has been identified in the *Joyce-Collingwood Plan* as unlikely to redevelop in the near future.

After introducing the context, Mr. Chan went over the rezoning policies for the area. The main policy is the 189.5m geodetic height cap, which references the Telus Building's height east of Boundary Road. The other design parameters are: A maximum 7,000 sq. ft. floorplate with a limit of 100 ft. on each face; a general massing with distinct "base-middle-top" volumes with a top that can contribute to the area's skyline; a strong four-storey podium to define the street-wall along Joyce Street; a 20 ft. setback from the property-lines for residential portions above the fourth level; a 5.5m minimum setback from the curb along Joyce Street to achieve a widened sidewalk; a 80 ft. distance from other residential buildings; and, for commercial frontages express a human-scale.

Mr. Chan then proceeded to discuss the proposed building, noting its 93m (305 ft.) height., its 7,000 sq-ft floorplates which are 100 ft. or less in width on each face, and its four-storey podium. He then pointed out some of the setbacks for the residential tower to building-face were less than the recommended 20 ft., but they are at least 80 ft. distanced from nearby residential towers.

Mr. Chan then focused on the building's key design feature - the light-weight balcony-frame. To provide thermal breaks, these balconies are suspended rather than extended from the floorplates. As such, this frame is both a design feature and a sustainability measure. To avoid adding bulk to the building, thus expressing "lightness", and to ensure adequate lighting and air enters the units, the balconies are staggered. The overall frame is shifted at its mid-point (by changing the balcony-depth) to provide some variation and visual interest. To maintain this degree of "lightness" as shown in the rezoning application, it is important the balcony-frame do not further bulk up with the addition of heavier structural support elements (e.g. walls and posts). Additional structural elements may also compromise the units' access to natural light and air. Mr. Chan's last point about this balcony-frame was a query on how the plantings on it may be maintained throughout the seasons.

Other concerns Mr. Chan raised pertained to whether the shared outdoor space on the rooftop is sufficient to meet City guidelines for family-living in high density developments, and the commercial retail units' ability to accommodate a wider range of uses given their shallower depths.

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

- a) Overall massing and design: Particularly the light-weight balcony-frame's appropriateness as a response to the *Joyce-Collingwood Plan's* recommended form of development limits for a 7,000 sq. ft. floorplate and 100 ft. width on any building-face. Feedback about the proposed setbacks and how well the building's base-middle-top distinctions are expressed were also asked.
- b) Liveability and usability: The ability for the residential units to receive natural light through.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The Applicant introduced the project's basic disposition of uses starting with the entrance facing the Skytrain station as an important feature. To address the movement of people, they have provided significant space on the sidewalk under rain protection to come to the front door, which is located on Joyce Street. By putting the main entrance on Joyce Street, this is good for the public but also maximizes the amount of retail space on Joyce Street of approximately 5000 sq. ft.

This is a family friendly project with 49% single BR, 51% 2BR and 3BR units. The top floor amenity features a swimming function, a children's play function. The Southwest facing wall will open up to the significant balcony and the indoor/outdoor pool. It's also triple glazed to the sky to give it an outdoor use feel even though it is a year round use.

The Applicant decided not to go the passive housing route but retained a lot of the energy efficiency of passive housing standards.

The building is built to the maximum allowed envelope but does not maintain the maximum FSR.

This will be primarily a building that has more than one occupant so larger and deeper balconies are used, providing space and solar shading and include passive housing qualities. This will vary from 5 ft. min and 10 ft. maximum.

There is a reduction of window to wall ratio, with a thickness to the wall that allows decent thermal performance.

The idea was proposed to suspend steel and concrete on outside of building with a few points of contacts, providing very little thermal bridging.

There is significant planting opportunities with rota molded bins with soil and drip feed irrigation system and the resident will have control of the landscape themselves with the developer retaining the right to come in and repair the landscape if there is deterioration.

There is expected urban farming in landscape balconies.

The colouration of the main building is 50% bronze colour finish and the balcony structure is powder coloured with paint.

Regarding visibility, the top of the building is different than the body. The swimming pool is designed to look like a beacon from a distance.

The building is designed with the neighbourhood in mind which has a lower price point. It is a more robust industrial design. It's an important building for Vancouver since it's the first building addressing the thermal envelope issues with a balcony strategy.

Landscape

The ground plane responds to the existing street scape on Joyce and the laneway across the street. The area across the street and the area around the Skytrain station are also being designed by Hapa and this will allow for a cohesive street scape. There will be a standard set back and street treatment around the Joyce side. The laneway is both the entrance and a functional City of Vancouver lane with opportunities for spill out from the café and a deck feature for the residential gateway paired with a water feature that adds some pedestrian scale and verticality and allows for an enclave that residents can occupy.

There's a buffering planted between the laneway and the BC parkway as well as connections to it.

To satisfy transit requirements restricting porosity, there is a planted buffer on the other side of the parkway.

At the podium, in the setback, there's an opportunity to have a west coast forest condition viewable from the streetscape, providing the lushness and enhancing the verticality of the forest.

There will be more significant, intense planting on the roof.

Sustainability

The energy model and uses are detailed in the package. The EUI is projected to be 98, achieved through heat recovery and significant envelope and shading components on the balconies, making it a very efficient building.

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 Ms. Ockwell and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design development of the outdoor areas
- Design development of the middle of the building regarding depth and details of balconies

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel members appreciated the presentation and the quality of the package. There were lots of positive comments on the project.

The panel members showed no major concerns about the base, the middle and the top of the building and had no concerns about the massing.

The panel members supported the location of the entrance to the building.

The project was well received by the panel members.

There were comments for design development of the social areas especially on the rooftop, to allow for planting and areas for seating for the enjoyment of residents.

There were recommendations for design development to the middle of the building with respect to the depth and details of the balconies.

Mr. Wen commended the design of the balconies as a large and nice feature of the building. The balconies may block some light on certain days but on most days, would provide much comfort.

Mr. Wen hopes that the project falls into affordable housing, given the location and the neighbourhood.

Mr. Wen feels there is room for design development to provide more light.

Mr. Wen commented that the common space is limited but the building is in a nicely design neighbourhood with lots of parks.

Ms. Shieh comments that the building massing is fine but cannot see a middle section, only a base and the tower and the setback is fine.

Ms. Shieh questions whether the common amenity space programming with a library and a swimming pool will be used by the residents and how it will contribute to the sociability of the building.

Ms. Shieh liked the balcony design and commented that it is a new concept to have the developer retain the rights of the balcony design and is unsure how it will be done.

Ms. Parsons feels the balcony concept is very interesting and the thermal bridging is very supportable, in particular the concept of rigging. However, the overall framework of building gets a bit monotonous and suggests trying to break up the middle portion a bit more.

Ms. Parsons feels that the balcony frame will provide enough lighting especially with the double height but expressed concerned about the maintenance, the winter irrigation, light and growth issues of planting, in particular looking out from inside the unit.

Ms. Parsons commented that there could be a bit more common spaces for the number of units in the building. Having an indoor/outdoor capability with the pool is positive but there should be more social interaction spaces.

Ms. Ockwell finds that the building is coherent and that it isn't different for the sake of being different. The base holds its own next to the train station.

Ms. Ockwell comments that the top has loads of potential to be interesting, and the pool amenity is quite fantastic for the building.

Ms. Ockwell commented that the thermally broken approach and the care the Applicant has taken for fine tuning depths for sun shading is nice to see at this stage.

Mr. Neale commented that the top of the building is rectal linear and consistent with the graphics of the neighbourhood. It is appropriate to the top of the building relative to the bulk of the balconies. The base is very successful.

Mr. Neale suggests varying the depth of the balconies to respect the orientation of the sun and the effect on the mass will be quite dynamic.

Mr. Neale commented that privacy and community is a balancing act and while it is important to have community interactions, there should be enough barriers to provide privacy to the owners and not just planting to do that.

Mr. Neale suggests ensuring there is sufficient space for people to enjoy the pool space.

Mr. Huffman comments that this is a really unique project which challenges us to think for future projects like these.

Mr. Huffman applauded the Applicant for the strong rigour to the structure which gets repeated on filigree and gives shape to the building as well as provide privacy between units. It is a unique element for the neighbourhood.

Mr. Huffman comments that the middle is subtle but clever and suggests being a bit more delicate at the top to help with the skyline.

Mr. Huffman commented that the staggered balcony works really well and provides the privacy as well.

Mr. Huffman commented that the suites are pretty small and suggested possibly reducing the corridors to give the suites more usable volume.

Mr. Sharma commented that the skyline with the pool with lights will be something to look at. Mr. Sharma likes the amenity pool with the outdoor deck. Most buildings don't have that.

Mr. Sharma feels that the setback works well with the neighbouring building and Skytrain and the outdoor space is done well.

Ms. Besharat appreciated the rigour of the building and the discipline with this octagonal shape.

Ms. Besharat commented that the initiative to have the balcony as free standing elements attached to the façade, reducing major thermal issues, is well handled.

Ms. Besharat suggested that success of the project will depend on the final detailing of the balconies like using sculpture elements added to the façade.

Ms. Besharat has some reservation about penetration of natural light in the units. While balconies are appreciated on the South side for solar shading, on the North side, it may make the units darker.

Ms. Besharat commented that the façade will be dynamic depending on the resident and how they will look after the balconies and vegetation which brings an element of excitement.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the panel members for their comments.

The Applicant expects the library to be a strong active social space to be used by residents for gathering as an alternative to the smaller personal units.

The Applicant commented that all the planting bins are set perpendicular to the façade so that light can penetrate and the planting will grow up in the narrow dimension of landscaping.

The Applicant explained that the balconies will be dynamic once the residents move in with furniture and planting. The Developer is not intending to police the balconies, only reserve the right to maintain an unkept area.

The Applicant commented that there will be ample space around the pool for sitting and indicated that the pool is facing the city and the mountains creating a great social space.

2. Address:	1535-1557 Grant Street
Permit No.	RZ-2017-00076
Description:	To develop a 6-storey residential building consisting of 38 secured market rental units. The proposed floor area is 2,690 sq.m (28,952 sq.ft) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.22. This application is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
Zoning:	RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	Stuart Howard Architects
Owner:	Gavin McLeod, Averka Developments
Delegation:	W. Neil Robertson, Stuart Howard Architects Damon Oriente, Damon Oriente Ltd.
Staff:	Karen Wong & Susan Chang

EVALUATION: RESUBMISSION RECOMMENDED (3-4)**• Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Karen Wong, introduced the site. Located mid-block between Woodland Dr. and Cotton Dr., it is comprised of 4 parcels on the North side of Grant St. and 1.5 blocks West of Commercial Dr. The total site area is 13,060 sq. ft.

The Application is being considered under the *Grandview Woodland Comm. Plan*, within the *Britannia-Woodland* sub-area which anticipates mixed-scale character that ranges from SF to 10-storey apartment buildings. The area is to accommodate existing and new residents in affordable market rental housing.

The surrounding area is currently zoned RM-4 and the plan allows consideration of up to 6-storey apartments containing rental.

The rental housing stock ODP limits redevelopment of existing rental housing to no more than 5 developments from 2016-2019, the first 3 years of the plan, or a max of 150 existing market rental units. This is intended to manage the demolition of existing rental housing in the area. Five applications have already been received under the pace of change policy and there is currently a waitlist. A staff report is expected to go to Council in 2020 summarizing the rate of development and the outcomes.

With this revision, proposal remains as a 6-storey market rental residential and 38 units. The FSR has been slightly reduced from 2.25 in the original submission to 2.22 FSR with the current proposal. The plan allows up to 2.4 FSR.

This is a second review of the rezoning proposal by the Panel.

Development Planner, Susan Chang, provided additional comments for the project. The site is located in the residential core of the Britannia-Woodland sub-area which is primarily an apartment area that also has detached housing and townhouses. Per the Plan, one of the Urban Design principles for this area is to allow for a variety of building heights and scale within multi-family residential areas. Zoning district is RM-4 with surrounding blocks with one CD-1 comprised of apartment building forms. However, this block is occupied predominantly by single family houses. For secured rental housing, the Plan allows up to 6 storeys and up to 2.4 FSR.

The site is a mid-block site measuring 132'x99' depth with a significant cross fall of approximately 17' to the northwest corner. The lot depth is less than the standard 122' without a lane. In terms of the setbacks, the proposal adheres to the 20' rear yard plus a 10' lane dedication. The RM-4 containment angle has been respected as well as side yards. A front yard relaxation is considered to 12' from the required 20' as front yards of the block range from 8'-12'., bearing in mind balconies are exempt.

In the previous review, the panel had concerns with regards to massing and compatibility with the neighbouring context of detached houses. Recommendations were made to review how the building sits on the site, development of the east/west side elevations, parking entry as well as programming of the outdoor amenity space. To address the massing impacts, the building height has been reduced to 63' and FSR to 2.22 FSR. The upper 2 storeys have been carved back to read more as partial storeys. The resulting FSR is less than a 5 storey proposal which would have been more impactful given the sloping topography. The garage entry has been revised to vertical proportions along with higher quality cladding. Amenity room location has been revised to minimize massing at the fifth storey.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Does the proposed design address the key aspects the Panel identified as needing improvement?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The Applicant noted that the project is located in a multifamily zone that was determined since the 1930s and was reaffirmed in 1970 and in the recent community plan. The Applicant held open houses and met with neighbours to get an all-encompassing response to the project.

The Applicant expressed that their choices were either to put in a 6 storey below market or a 4 storey condo.

The Applicant introduced the concerns from the previous UDP.

In the previous UDP, it was determined that the massing was too horizontal. The Applicant tried to resolve the conflicting point of view.

On the Western side of the building, ACN panels and various materials and planes were used to create vertical elements with some horizontality retained. A similar approach was adopted on the Eastern side as well.

Some of the horizontality was broken up with the framing element.

To make the East and the West elevation more gracious and sensitive to neighbours, the massing was broken up by introducing more glazing with discernment to put in obscure windows where privacy is a factor. We buried materiality in planes and we emphasized warmer, softer, wood materials and introduced living landscape elements that would climb up and spill over the top.

On the amenity programming, there will be an increased amount of shared amenity deck on the 5th floor. On the Northern side of the deck, where there are city views, there will be a common dining area, a food prep area, some private tables, shared harvest tables, and a lounge area. On the Southern side of amenity deck will be some urban farming planters.

After looking at all the options available, the original proposal for the location of the PMT on the Southeast corner remains the most optimal. There will be plans to obscure it through the use of a screen and by using stickers of plants.

In order to lessen the impact on neighbours, we changed the palette and materials, allowing the building to be lighter on top and to blend into cloudy skies.

We sculpted back the 5th and 6th floors along the downhill side.

Landscape

The landscape was designed to provide an appropriate fitting to the contemporary design of the building and at the same time, give it softness. Along the sloping street, stepped planters are placed to give a natural variety that allows a contemporary approach to planting.

There are upper level planters to provide privacy and a guard giving generous green separation.

The rear walkway was lowered and changed the relationship of the building to the walkway and made the transition from the walkway to the existing right of way to the building.

There are hedges on both the East and West sides.

The gradient at the Northwest corner was challenging and with the changes to the building, the grade is now adjusted by adding conifers and vine maples providing density of planting and providing height and depth. The grade is 3:1, making it considerably more natural.

The existing trees have concrete walls holding up the grade provide root barriers so that protects the property from roots growing in.

There will be a green roof which holds over 24 mm/hour, exceeding the retention capacity of rain.

The patios in the back are on grade and most on the front, extra infiltration. Don't need catchment

Most of the plants are native inspired.

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 Mr. Neale and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel recommend **RESUBMISSION** of the project after incorporating recommendations by the panel:

- **Related Commentary:**

A number of panel members are still struggling with massing.

A number of panel members like the improvements to the sloping sites.

Mr. Huffman commented that this is a really nice neighbourhood and the zoning has been around for a long time but noted that the rental aspect is a new introduction.

Mr. Huffman commended the Applicant for everything that is done and landscaping has helped.

Mr. Sharma commented that this project has nice 3BR suites.

Mr. Sharma did not have any problem with the massing and felt it lowered the effect of grade.

Mr. Wen commended the Applicant's response to Urban Design Panel's previous comments.

Mr. Wen acknowledges that this is a very nice neighbourhood but the City needs the density and he would support the idea of rental than expensive condos.

Mr. Wen commented that the project has done everything it can to fit all the policies provided by the City and is contributing to the neighbourhood.

Ms. Shieh appreciated the difficulty of this project and the policy and design parameters but is still struggling with the context and the neighbourhood fit.

Ms. Parsons commended the Applicant on the improvements with the work on the grades, the amenities space, the East and West elevation, and the garage entry.

Ms. Parsons continues to struggle with contextual fit and the challenging grades, commenting that this building is surrounded by relatively intact single family housing and the neighbourhood would have to live with this building for a long time.

Ms. Parsons commented that there was no lane and small lots surrounding the building.

Ms. Ockwell found this project was an anomaly with the character and the nature of neighbourhood block.

Ms. Ockwell appreciated that pulling the back of top two levels helped with the slope of the site but felt that a four storey building may fit in better.

Mr. Neale congratulated the Applicant on their response to the previous Urban Design Panel recommendations, noting that they addressed the UDP's concerns.

Mr. Neale noted that this is a broader discussion that goes beyond the UDP and should not hinder the Applicant's project.

Ms. Besharat commented that if the City wants to get density and affordable housing, then this project would fit into the guidelines, even though it's not a signature building.

Ms. Besharat appreciated that the Applicant went to the neighbours and tried to satisfy their concerns and commended the Applicant on their improvements.

Ms. Besharat suggested that in order to make the parti read a little stronger, the frame area can be differentiated from the background.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant noted that the client has decided to secure these units at below market rates and worked hard on affordability.

3. Address:	574 E. Broadway (2525 Carolina St)
Permit No.	DP-2018-00851
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed use building consisting of commercial at grade, 65 strata units above, and the retention of 2 heritage buildings: all over 2 levels of underground parking with 83 vehicle spaces. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.35. This application is being considered under a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA).
Zoning:	C-2C
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Studio B Architects
Owner:	Port Living
Delegation:	Tom Bunting, Studio B Architects Bryce Gauthier, Enns Gauthier Landscape Architects Venitta Lum, Port Living
Staff:	Susan Chang

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS (7-0)

- **Introduction:**

Susan Chang, development planner, introduced the Development application as located at the corner of Broadway and Carolina, one block West of Fraser in C-2C district, and measuring 132'x122'. RT-5 (duplex zone) is the context across the lane to the south. There is a crossfall of approximately 8.5' towards the Northwest corner.

This site is located in the Broadway East revitalization strategy as part of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. Although the plan envisioned higher height on the north side of Broadway, and 4 storeys on the South, it also emphasized extending the life of important older heritage and character buildings, through thoughtful re-purposing and viable integration.

The proposal includes the retention of 2 heritage buildings including a B register house relocated to the Southwest corner and maintaining the Northeast corner heritage structure. To accommodate the retention of the 2 heritage buildings, a variance in density to 3.35 FSR and height to 6 storeys are being considered through a heritage revitalization agreement. The proposal was supported by the Heritage Commission.

The use is commercial at grade along Broadway and combined artist's studio and residential along Carolina South of the residential entry. The amenity room is located at 3rd floor with contiguous outdoor area on the rooftop of the corner heritage building and below grade, double height, amenity multi-purpose room day lit from glazed exterior South wall at the lane. Materials noted, are composite aluminum metal plate panels, prefinished metal contrasting with the masonry corner store and wood frame for the heritage house.

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

1. Overall form of development including relationship to the heritage buildings.
2. Public realm interface along E Broadway and Carolina in terms of contributing to pedestrian scale and interest?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The scheme of this design evolved from taking the existing heritage house and heritage grocery store building and carving out a space between them to allow for emphasis of the public realm and to create a smaller scale piece of the new building that would sit in concert with the two heritage buildings. The heritage house best fits the scheme on the South side on the lane. Due to the poor maintenance of the back porch, it was cut back and this allows for a small retail or café space to activate the space. As well, the owner's support of the arts inspired the idea to create three artist studios to become a viable asset in the area.

The substantial setbacks create a 4 storey street wall along E. Broadway and do not affect the shadowing on the street.

There are lots of opportunities for the public realm. 50% of the lane has some kind of interest with the CRU unit, the glazing, and the planting that buffers the heritage house, the addition of the Coniker building with the porch and the special space where the building is setback and bookended by the two heritage structures.

There will be lots of light coming into this vibrant subterranean space. There's a lot of movement through the space, with bike parking, a café, and building access. We also tried to represent the heritage defining elements by using black and white on the simple ground plain by changing the saw cutting pattern and the sand blasting pattern to get the darker and light strips in the facades of the buildings and matching it to the slab.

In the upper areas, the amenity deck is open and simple. The planters will be used as the guard rails and setting it back a bit. There's a lot of planting to make the space feel like a true rooftop garden. There are slightly higher privacy dividers and planters on either side of it. We have been able to green the space and preserve views.

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 Ms. Parsons and seconded by Mr. Wen and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design development with the selection of plank materials and the lawn area
- Design development to privacy elements for rooftop dividers and in between units

- **Related Commentary:**

There was a lot of support for the incorporation of both the residential and commercial heritage buildings into the project.

The public realm is very successful and there were positive comments on the material palette.

Overall, it is a very successful project.

Ms. Parsons shared concern around the plaza and artist space being privatized by the adjacent space, rather than staying public.

Ms. Parsons suggested as a consideration texture or treatment of the West elevation as it is quite blank and tall and will be there long time.

Ms. Parsons felt that the project has gone a long way on improvements to the lane and is taking cues from the heritage building.

Ms. Parsons commended the improved weather protection with recessed doors and feels that the landscape is very supportable.

Ms. Parsons commented that the planting on the edge of Carolina St feels incongruous with the heritage context. Ms. Parsons also noted that having a lawn is very challenging and water intensive on a busy urban street.

Ms. Parsons commented that in the fantastic roof spaces, there should be more transparency in the dividers in between.

Ms. Shieh liked the overall development, especially the relationship to the heritage building.

Ms. Shieh feels the public realm has been done very well with the smaller retail space along E. Broadway.

Ms. Shieh commented that the 3rd floor plan has a generous outdoor area for both the units and the amenity space and wonders if the proposed cantilever would require a beam or post.

Mr. Wen appreciated the architect's choice to make the building fit to context. The project is modern but very respectful to the site.

Mr. Sharma felt that the project didn't add anything to the heritage although it did incorporate it nicely.

Mr. Sharma commented that the project is giving up plaza space to add to building.

Mr. Sharma feels there are lots of studios suites.

Mr. Sharma liked that the coffee and retail is part of public realm.

Mr. Huffman complimented the project for combining the heritage pieces with modern aspects, in particular having the house raised and floating on glass windows and having the backside corner lined with glass windows for the retail.

Mr. Huffman commented that the North and South elevations are less dramatic.

Mr. Neale agrees that it is a very successful geometric composition and a wonderful incorporation of a heritage building.

Mr. Neale expressed a slight concern about the artist studio facing the lane, noting it feels a bit exposed on the lane and suggested putting them on the sidewalk and selling the units.

Mr. Neale liked the inset of roof deck on building.

Ms. Ockwell commented on how well the heritage building has been incorporated and made into a very welcoming street scape with a material palette that ties nicely with the heritage. The laneway step back looks purposeful and there is lots of potential on the roof deck.

Ms. Besharat commented that the most successful aspect of the project is the public realm and the space along Carolina. The building is not respectful of orientation with shading devices.

Ms. Besharat commented that there would be potential issues with privacy with the side by side studios with balconies right next to one another and with limited privacy.

Ms. Besharat suggests the addition of some canopies which will be beneficial to the residents to use the outdoor spaces more frequently and will provide weather protection for the building envelope. Addition of weather protection at the top floor would be beneficial to the building.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their response.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.