

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Sept 19, 2018

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Amela Brudar
Helen Besharat
Colette Parsons
Jim Huffman
Derek Neale
Leslie Shieh
Marie-France Venneri
Susan Ockwell

REGRETS: Yinjin Wen
Grant Newfield
Muneesh Sharma

RECORDING

SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 3104 -3130 SE Marine Drive & 8420 Kerr Street |
| 2. | 686 E 22nd Avenue, 3811-3833 Fraser Street & 679 E 23rd Avenue |
| 3. | 1290 Homer Street |
| 4. | 688 W 41st Avenue (Oakridge Centre Buildings 3 & 4, formerly 650 W 41st Avenue) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Amela Brudar, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. A formal welcome was read by the Chair, "We acknowledge that we are on the unceded homelands of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth nations and we give thanks for their generosity and hospitality on these lands.

1. Address: 3104 -3130 SE Marine Drive & 8420 Kerr Street
- Permit No. RZ-20018-00022
- Description: To develop a 7-storey residential building consisting of 83 units; all over three levels of underground parking with 97 vehicle stalls and 116 bicycle spaces. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.54 and the building height is 25 m (82 ft.). This application is being considered under the East Fraser Lands ODP.
- Zoning: M-1B to CD-1
- Application Status: Rezoning Application
- Review: First
- Architect: DYS
- Delegation: Danek Jansen, Architect, DYS Architecture
Jocelle Smith, Landscape Architect, ETA Landscape Architect
Jason Packers, LEED Consultant, Recollective Consulting
- Owner/Developer: Jill Brimacombe, Gracorp Capital Advisors Ltd.
- Staff: Karen Wong & Danielle Wiley

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Karen Wong, described the project as a rezoning application located at the Southeast corner of Kerr Street and SE Marine Drive, in "Area 4" in the East Fraserlands Official Development Plan (ODP).

The site is zoned M1-B and consists of 3 lots. The total site area is 49,708 sq. ft., and it is a steeply sloped site with 30 ft grade change at east PL and 15ft on west PL. To the north is Everett Crowley Park [zoned RS-1]. To the east is Parcel 1, which is currently vacant, but is rezoned for affordable housing up to 6 storeys. To the south and west, there are 3 storey townhomes.

This application is being considered under the East Fraserlands ODP, which requires a max of 76,639sq ft. of floor area and the provision of at least 20% of the residential units available for affordable housing. The south portion of the site, across Pierview Crescent, will be dedicated to City to accommodate future affordable housing, to satisfy these criteria.

This application proposes a 7-storey residential building with a total of 83 market strata residential units with a total floor area of 63,611 sq. ft. and 2.7 FSR.

Development Planner, Danielle Wiley, noted that Area 4, where this parcel is located, does not have Design Guidelines, but massing diagrams for the parcel appear in Area 2 Guidelines. Staff is also using adjacent Area 2 parcels for guidance regarding urban form and fit.

EFL Guidelines: Recommended Form of Development:

- 4- to 6-storey bar building along SE Marine. The objective is to create consistent streetwall with 4 storey building to the east, then step up to the street corner;
- Stepped massing (north to south) to maintain 6-storey height as viewed from south;
- 2-storey townhouses along Pierview Crescent;
- Complete Pierview Crescent by extending it through to Kerr St;

- Dedications on SE Marine Drive and SW corner for enhanced public realm, including a bike lane on SE Marine drive.

Proposed Form of Development:

The proposed massing is simpler than what is shown in the EFL guidelines, with less terracing:

- 5-storeys are proposed on SE Marine (rather than 6), but the massing does not terrace down to south, so the building may be viewed as 8-storeys from Pierview Crescent;
- At the east side of the building, the 5th storey is stepped back to create 4-storey shoulder, to better relate to neighbouring building;
- 2-storey townhouses are located on Pierview Crescent, facing south;
- Parking access is at the South-East side.

The north and south building elevations are very long, and require careful design consideration. The north elevation (facing SE Marine) is broken down with a wrapping soffit/fin element, the 4th-storey shoulder at the west side, and changes in cladding colour. The south elevation is broken down into 3 volumes, articulated by changes in cladding and wrapping soffits).

At the ground plane, the main entry is located on Pierview, with a secondary entry on SE Marine Drive, to give a sense of building identity and a “front door” on the major street. There is dedication and large setback on SE Marine, to accommodate a bike lane and landscaping. There are individual entries and patios for the townhouse units on Pierview Crsscent, to animate the smaller-scaled street.

There is a large common amenity room on the 5th storey, with a contiguous outdoor terrace. All units have balconies, min 5ft. depth.

The FSR on this site is 2.7

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

1. Is the overall height and massing supportable (noting that departure from the massing recommended in the EFL guidelines?)
2. Are building elevations and detailed articulation of massing successful? (Note: Consider three street frontages.)
3. Is the interface with the public realm and neighbouring property successful? And the design of the ground plane?
4. Please comment on the architectural expression & materials, to assist the applicant in a future DP application. (Note: This is a rezoning application.)

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

The steep slope of the site is one of the biggest challenges of this project. The massing is intended to emphasize the corner on Kerr St, as a gateway to the neighbourhood. The long building elevations are addressed with changes in cladding profile and colour (dark grey on the east volume, and white for the majority of the building). Vertical elements assist in breaking down the massing.

The 7th floor amenity area has a dining area with covered seating and barbeques. There is a children’s play area to the west and agricultural beds to the north. We have maximized balconies at 12% of floor area.

The EFL guidelines emphasize and enhanced pedestrian experience. Due to heavy traffic on SE Marine Drive, the landscape design strives to counter to the noise and fumes with tall, dense multilayered planting on the north side of the building. The north-east corner of the site (facing SE Marine) has a seating alcove to create a sense of space. The east side of the site has a steep 17 percent grade with an exposed parkade retaining wall; heavy planting helps anchor the building to the site. There are water features to celebrate the movement of the water to the river, and also serve as an additional storm water filtration system.

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. Venneri and seconded by Ms. Parsons 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:

- Further design development of townhouses at Pierview street to improve access and livability of the units;
- Further design development of the public realm especially along east and west elevations;
- Improve bicycle access routes.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support for the height and massing. Some panel members expressed concern about the massing as viewed from the south, as the building does not step to follow the slope. But most panel members noted that proposed "simplified" massing is calmer and lends itself better to sustainability goals. Overall, the panel stated their support for the rezoning but noted further design development will be needed for the next stage.

The North and South elevations were more successful than the East and West, due to the lack of stepping in the massing. The Marine Drive (north) elevation looks like a "rear" elevation; it should read as a façade. The roof appears heavy and over-powering. The raised corner (at the south-west corner of the roof) is not clearly expressed; it should be more prominent, or deleted. The townhouses are suitably located, but circulation needs to be reconsidered so that residents do not have to go outside from the parkade to access their units.

The building needs to be better anchored into the slope, through careful terracing, steps and landscape. Grading and pedestrian access should be friendlier and smoother. Take better advantage of the corner site, especially in the public realm design. The exit stair on the west side should be relocated. Marine Drive should be a heavily planted buffer; it is unlikely that the seating area will be used. The tall landscape walls that block the townhouses should be re-thought. The interface of the building to the public realm is tight and unsuccessful.

One panelist noted that the site is a great location for families, and urged the applicant to consider more 2 and 3 bedroom units.

The materials should be warmer. One panel member suggested using more horizontal/long profile siding. Attention should be paid to how materials and detailing can help to mitigate noise from SE Marine; in particular, the long balconies may amplify noise.

The location of the amenity room is appropriate with good solar exposure, but the children's play area should be expanded and relocated for better solar access.

Additional comments include: improving the biking experience from the ramp to encourage use' providing a minimum 6ft for patios and balconies; and using high-quality windows and envelope detailing for acoustics.

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

2. Address:	686 E 22nd Avenue, 3811-3833 Fraser Street & 679 E 23rd Avenue
Permit No.	RZ-2018-00013
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building consisting of retail at grade and 121 market rental units; all over two levels of underground parking with 108 parking spaces. The proposed total floor area is 9,813 m ² (105,626 sq.ft), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.28 and the building height is 21.5 m (71 ft).
Zoning:	RT-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Strand
Owner:	Riley Marl, Owner/Developer, Strand
Delegation:	Dale Staples, Architect, Integra Architecture Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, Jonathan Losee Ltd.
Staff:	Scott Erdman & Gina Lyons

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman, introduced this application to rezone 5 parcels under the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy. The site is located on the west side of Fraser St, spanning the block between 22nd and 23rd Ave Site is zoned RT-2, currently developed with 4 duplexes, and a garage and character home on the south lot. Together, 5 parcels measure approx. 264 feet wide and 122 feet deep. The site area measure to approximately 32,198 square feet

The AHC IRP allows for consideration for mid-rise forms of up to 6 storeys at this location (fronting an arterial street that is on Translink's Frequent Transit Network) and within 500 m of a local shopping area (this site is adjacent to a C-2 zone). This policy does not provide an FSR limit for density, but all projects are subject to urban design performance.

- Projects must offer a form of affordable housing tenure – in this case all units would be secured market rental
- Proposal is to build a 6-storey mixed-use building, with partial ground-floor commercial-retail space, 121 market rental units, at a density of 3.28 FSR.

Development Planner, Gina Lyons, introduced the project as the application is for a full block development on Fraser between East 22nd and East 23rd Ave. The site slopes down 6ft to the RS-1 to the west on East 23rd avenue and is relatively flat on east 22nd.

The site's base zone is RT-2 which is an outright duplex zone which expects a two and half storey development to 0.6 FSR. The application is for a 6 storey mixed use building with a proposed density of 3.28 and a height of 71ft.

The development proposes commercial at grade on the southern end of the site adjacent to the C2 zone across east 23rd avenue and residential at grade on the northern end of the site adjacent to the RT-2 zone across east 22nd, all over two levels of parking.

At the southern end at the lane the massing reads as 7 storeys. This is due to the increased floor to floor for the commercial on Fraser in combination with the slope of east 23rd which allow for two storey townhouses on the lane.

The setbacks proposed include:

- 4ft from Fraser and East 23rd for the Commercial areas;
- 15ft from Fraser for the residential;

- 12ft from east 22nd Avenue;
- 22ft for the town homes off of east 23rd to facilitate the retention of a significant tree;
- From the rear the primary massing is setback 25ft from the rear property line;
- 3 storey massing is setback 12ft from the rear property line;
- 10ft shoulder setback above the 4th level.

The parking access is at the lane aligning with the T- intersection. The amenity room is located off the lane with an associate outdoor area. The building width is 239ft, with a residential entry courtyard located on Fraser between the commercial and residential.

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

1. Does the Panel Support the overall massing, height, and density? In particular the seven storey massing at the lane and its relationship to the RS-1 to the west.
2. Has the width of the building been adequately broken down to be compatible with existing streetscape?
3. Has the development adequately responded to the anticipated 4 storey massing of the C2 streetscape to the South?
4. Please comment on the overall landscape proposal, and in particular the lane and the proposed amenity areas?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The goal for this project is to create a bridge between the stretch of commercial and single/multifamily homes. Initially this was going to be an all rental project, however after a meeting with staff and engagement with the public it was decided to add some commercial frontage.

The massing followed the city guidelines and the setbacks create a strong urban presence along the street. The commercial is pulled close to the sidewalk to engage the pedestrian realm.

There is a complex mix of unit types and sizes, including, studios, townhomes, and 1-4 bedroom units.

Along the street the massing was broken with the central entry elements, which contains a lobby on each floor as well a staircase and fire wall.

It was important to put townhomes along the lane to animate the lane and avoid a blank space. The entry aligns with the central amenity space and outdoor amenity space.

Materials used for the commercial are storefront glazing. The rest of the building is primarily fiber cement siding and a flat panel, accents in a wood tone product to give warmth to the overall character of the building.

There is a guideline for paving patterns and site furniture which are being followed. As the building pushes back from edge there is an opportunity to create interesting patio spaces. With the site slope, we were able to create elevated private patio spaces with small fences and rich layered planting. Amenities include seating elements and bicycle parking at the entry lobby.

Around the back, near the loading bay, which has the south west sun exposure; there are small play areas with lots of detailing, seating areas, and public plots.

The base of the building has opportunity for nice rich layered planting.

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 Ms. Parsons and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with NO recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported and found this to be an elegant project. The architecture massing and height and renderings are well handled. The massing of the two buildings is nicely broken down and was positive to see one relating to the commercial and the other to the residential.

The upper 6th and 7th level seem to push the limit a bit with the density.

The 7th floor seems about 11 o'clock on the equinox there is no shading on the neighbors which is great. A panelist commended the project for the provided unit count and type.

A panelist noted it was unclear what will happen to the single family homes to the west. When looking at transitions think about the neighborhood and its surroundings.

The entrance to the buildings and the stairs with the glazing public realm are well handled.

The retail frontage is successful. A panelist noted doesn't want to see the disappearance of small retails along Fraser Street. Understand the depth of commercial space lends to larger retail but suggest leaving the door open for smaller retails.

The proposal of the lane was successful; however some guidelines need to be included for lane animation. A panelist particularly liked the lane with townhouses and the t-bone to the parking. A suggestion to the planners was instead of duplexes there is an opportunity to do townhouses so the lane actually works. The lane to the amenity room could be further developed.

A panelist noted cannot see what will be developed with the commercial CRU, however with the right context can be done successfully. Going forward the breaking down of the streetscape could stand to be a little calmer.

There is a good balance of light and dark materials in the correct proportions.

The amenity space appears too broken down; there is insufficient space for such a large rental building. Especially with rental buildings you want to encourage socialization of neighbors. The solar shading is well done. A panelist noted the amenity space on the lane suffers from planter boxes in the middle and suggested taking them out to allow for more programming.

Consider the noise from equipment for the next stage. There is no cooling in the building however the retail will have cooling. Think about where this cooling will go so it does not end up in back lane blowing at units. Overall building appears to have a lot of glazing suggest looking at teddy numbers to ensure it all works. A suggestion was to consider using the rooftop for an amenity for expansion and this would include a great view.

An additional comment was for cyclists to use the same elevator for access and during the DP stage be sensitive to the development of design details.

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

3. Address:	1290 Homer Street
Permit No.	DP-2018-00572
Description:	To develop a 5-storey office building consisting of retail at grade. The development involves the restoration and designation of a 2-storey municipally listed heritage class C building including basement, and construction of a 3-storey building addition. The proposed total floor area is 2,624.61 m ² (28,252.2 sf.) and the building height is approximately 21.40 m(70.2 ft.).
Zoning:	HA-3
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Acton Ostry Architects
Delegation:	Mark Ostry, Architect, Acton Ostry Architects Derek Fleming, Architect, Acton Ostry Architects Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, DKC
Staff:	Gina Lyons

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner Gina Lyons began describing the site as a double fronting corner site located at the intersection of Drake and Homer in Yaletown. The HA-3 zone continues to the north. The DD downtown district is to the west across Homer. The project is otherwise surrounded by CD-1 50.5ft of frontage on Homer and Hamilton and 119.5ft on Drake.

There is a significant slope to the site; the sloping is about 1.71m down Drake. The existing building was constructed in 1910 and has been identified as having historical significance, as a good example of an early Yaletown warehouse.

This is a development permit application which involves retention and rehabilitation of the heritage warehouse building, the voluntary designation of the building, and a three storey addition.

The proposal is in general conformance with the HA-3 zone as the intent of the zone is to encourage the conversion and renovation of existing warehouse buildings.

The proposed uses are commercial at the lower and ground floor, and 4 levels of office above. The height measures 20.4m and a FSR of 4.68. The fourth floor has a 1.2m inset to distinguish between old and new.

The application is not seeking any variances from the HA-3 zone. However, this application is seeking a parking relaxation on the basis that pursuing below grade parking would be detrimental to the retention and restoration of the Heritage building.

This application went to the Heritage Commission on July 16th. The commission is supportive of the project

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

1. Could the panel comment on the scale of the addition as it relates to the Heritage building.
2. Comment on the proposed cladding of the addition, material and proportion as it relates to the Heritage Building.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This project is a renovations, rehabilitation, and protections of an existing 3 storey historic building with the addition of three levels. The heritage conservation is the core of this project. The intent is to have the restaurant tenants in the first two levels. The three levels additional levels are intended for office use.

The building is currently at the edge of Yaletown known as Yaletown square. Over the years, many of the character defined elements have been removed, we intend to restore many elements that were taken out and preserve a lot of the present building. A missing feature that will be restored is the prominent overhang corneous.

The surrounding buildings range from 26-32 storeys. The site slopes down nearly a full storey from Homer to Hamilton street where there is a significant feature known as the Yaletown Dock, an elevated pedestrian promenade.

The urban response brings the overall height and massing of the site in line with the buildings of this block. It maintains the saw tooth character of the street wall. It complements the predominant color pallet of the buildings in the area and firmly anchors the end of the block with all three exposed buildings faces located at the property line. It improves the public realm adjacent to the site.

The rehabilitation work and work related to the new addition will follow Park's Canada's standards and guidelines for conservation of historical places in Canada. We are studying some cladding natural material for the renderings and elevations.

The Yaletown dock will be resurfaced as it is need of repair. Safety will be improved by continuing the railing around and in front of the building. The existing steep curve cut access point to the dock, which is currently at the corner of the building, will be relocated to the corner of the dock and replaced with a code compliant accessible ramp. This will also create a space for a restaurant sidewalk patio. There is an existing tree located at the corner that will be replaced in a new planting bed west of its current location to allow for the ramp.

Previously, reliance was on the rolling dumpsters currently on Hamilton street, these will be eliminated and the building will a have a room internally.

This project meets all applicable sustainability policies and the most notable sustainable feature is the preservation of the building and extensive green roof. The project was presented to the Vancouver Heritage Commission and there was unanimous support.

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 Ms. Ockwell 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:

- Further review of the architectural expression of the addition above the heritage building;
- Further design development of the landscape treatment of the dock at the back.

- **Related Commentary:**

There were mixed reviews for this project. Overall the panel was divided. Generally, the panel supported the intervention to the building and the restoration of the existing elements. The site was well handled in accordance with the guidelines.

The dock and ramp could benefit from further design development.

The ramp in its current location is great because one is coming at grade; a suggestion was to have the ramp right up against the building.

When changing the use of the commercial unit think about what that means. An individual with a stroller can feel blocked and deterred from going to the restaurant. Would like to see a ramp where you can still get into the front. When limiting access it is no longer a front access but a side entrance.

There were divided comments on the addition, most found the scale and how it transitions from the existing building to the addition well-handled and appropriate (i.e. recess, thin columns); the major divide amongst the panel was on the architectural expression. The building is neither contemporary nor heritage it's neither complementing nor contrasting the existing building. Most supported the elements of the existing building.

Horizontally it is quite strong and heavy sitting on top of brick buildings; think about how to make it less horizontal. Suggest thinking about the size, alignment and rhythm of the brick buildings, this needs further development. If the idea is to contrast, needs to feel lighter on top. When using pivot windows below, a hopper window above may not be the best option.

Some members found the horizontality related to the heritage. There was a suggestion to have heritage recognition.

A few panelists supported the removal of the glazed atrium spaces. The present building feels to have lost the social space aspect. Patterning on the roof was recommended as you will have a lot of people looking at it.

Most members noted they did not see a problem with changing the tree location and there was a question whether the railing was really needed.

Other divided comments included:

The recess is not successful. The exposed columns will be detracting from the appearance of the building. The proportion of glazing and solid materials does not relate to the base of the buildings, it is heavy. The proposed cladding, materiality, and glazing is not successful, these are the items that need to be looked at.

Like the simplicity of the three storey addition. It is a simple elegant box on a plain work horse of the buildings. Like the recess, it is subtle and does what it's supposed to. Approve the research of the color; keep in mind the color of glass will be very important.

This is a handsome project. The volume and massing is appropriate with everything else. Understand the use of cladding trying to make it look like the brick material. Approve thin columns in separating the elements. Suggest if the columns become bigger and chunkier project should come back to the panel.

The solar orientation, solar shading and sustainability measure are commendable. The solar heat gain is handled well through the mechanical systems

Remember to consider the proportion of windows and passive energy as this site is three additional floors on two storey. The sustainability was simple and compact.

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

4. Address:	688 W 41 st Avenue (Oakridge Centre Buildings 3 & 4, formerly 650 W 41 st Avenue
Permit No.	DP-2018-00633
Description:	To develop the site with a mixed-use development consisting of a podium with retail and office uses from level one underground to level six above ground; a 32-storey tower (Building 3) and a 42-storey tower (Building 4) containing a total of 504 dwelling units; all over three levels of underground parking, and a portion of the future 9-acre Park.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Fifth (First as DP)
Architect:	Henriquez partners
Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez, Architect, HPA Rui Nunes, Architect, HPA Peter Wood, Architect, HPA
Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Patrick O'Sullivan, described the project as heights and overall densities were established by both rezoning which was enacted and confirmed through the Preliminary DP process, PDP, approved on July 23rd. As a result, staff are interested in the panel's comments on the proposal's detailed design.

A rezoning of this site was approved in principle in 2014. Details include increasing density to 3.71 FSR, retain retail uses, add 2914 DU, 290 S.H., add 1.8m sq. ft. of office space, add 70,000 sq. ft. of civic center, and to add a park.

In April of 2017, the City received a revised proposal that proposed a number of changes from 2014. These include:

- Changes to the park design;
- one less tower;
- changes to tower form and tower shaping;
- a more prominent location for the Civic Centre;
- fewer levels of underground parking;
- but no change to the maximum heights or density;
- and no change to the proposed uses.

Since the general form of development and uses are consistent with the rezoning, the General Manager determined that the appropriate vehicle to process the review of these changes would be a PDP, pre-development permit.

The PDP process aims to capture and solidify the proposed changes since the 2014 rezoning. It allows staff to review changes, and allows the City to get feedback from the public and advisory bodies. It also allows for the revised park plan to be reviewed and processed and approved concurrently by the Park Board.

Uses include a CRU at grade level, 5 levels of office spaces, office uses front the steps to the park, there is residential above and 3 levels of underground parking. The buildings make up of 32 storeys and 42 storeys, every residential unit has a balcony or outdoor space and the tower rooftops are used for the 2 private penthouse suites.

The amenity space at level 7, at top of the podium, measures to 4700 sq. ft. and is collocated with an outdoor space of 5,500 sq. ft.

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

1. Please comment on the success of the pedestrian experience of the proposal as it addresses each of its very differing interfaces (the W 41st frontage, to the park steps, and to the park at the upper level). Consider the number and type of entries at grade, entry locations, canopy depths & canopy soffit design, building uses and the amount of glazing at pedestrian level; and the public realm design and walking surface treatments.
2. Please comment on the overall materiality and building expression and its consistency with the skin/bone and wrapping veil narratives. Consider the curved glass skin geometry (triangulated and faceted), balcony pods design, design of tower tops, and the overall material palate etc.
3. How well do the balcony pod design and the composition of balconies on the north elevation add interest to, and help to reduce the apparent building mass of, Buildings 3 & 4 as viewed from the north.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Obvious concerns are these are large buildings and how do they meet the ground. The concept of the skin and revealing of the structure building comes down and where it hits the ground plain the veil is lifted to create a more intimate experience. Goal is to create an intimate streetscape on a very busy street.

We have triple glaze capless curtain wall and structural glass behind with definitions for difference entrances. The veil itself becomes a tectonic that sculpts the streetscape and the facades behind become transparent.

On top of the buildings, the idea is to complete the folding up to give identity to the roof itself, on the top it start to open up to allow for fresh air to come in, looking to incorporate new technology that integrates right into the glazing system.

Materials for underside of the soffit is stainless steel titanium coated metal.

The veil comes all the way around the bay to the parking to different retails and units and creates another entrance to the park. The rendering has an intimidate relationship with the park.

There is an intensive green boulevard that helps bringing down the scale from 41st. A new feature is the development of pods/balconies on the outside of the buildings, wanted something that didn't compete with the veil but added another scale.

For the streetscape definition, brought a few pods down to the office area for a more intimate scale. Most units have outdoor spaces, the smaller units have the pods and there are outdoor spaces for the south-west side. The streetscape is made up of the type of band and paving depicted in the Cambie Corridor. The idea of the landscape and the buildings being integrated together is a concept of the project,

There are planters that are integrated right into the slots between the veil and terraces. There is greenery that goes all the way up that is part of the terrace. The main amenity area has children's space, urban agriculture and social space.

The park has gone through a separate approval by the Parks Board. There is an elevator that goes to the park. The frontage with the park will get resolved as the park develops.

The sustainability is meeting criteria performance for 2021.

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. Avini-Besharat and seconded by Ms. Parsons 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:

- To provide car drop off along 41st. Create sense of arrival;
- Further design development of stairs from the plaza up to the park;
- Further design development to improve porosity of the streetscape along 41st;
- Special consideration to include an entrance to the department store;
- Ensure that the curvilinear nature of the glass forms is kept through design development.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel found the project to be elegant and a level of sophistication that is rare. It is well resolved and the parti was strong from the beginning. The project was both easy and hard to review and there was a side note to the applicant to edit the design booklets to the info and drawings specific for panel review.

Panel noted this is a high cost building and the real test will be if there are cuts hope the applicant will maintain the same design integrity. They building resemble a very futuristic building of quite a futuristic scale. The experience of the canopy of the unveil is successful and the privacy of the units is well handled. The entries at grade at some of the renderings are original and nicely designed. A panelist noted the renderings are the most successful feature of the project.

The shorter building appears is deliberately intended to have the same color palette as the rest. Consider distinguishing the taller building from the rest, from a distance may look like a huge similar façade.

There are some beautiful natural forms, rounded edges, and organic curves. Suggest maintaining a natural patterning and hope the glass used can work around the rounded edges, may need to work with clear glass that is curved. Due to the amount of glass being used, experimentation and mockup of glass is very important and this is an area that should not be forgotten. Regarding the orientation of the office area, fritted glass make help with solar gain.

The public realm has a nice soffit material. The pods were positively received. There was a comment that in the renderings the pods looked whimsical and random, especially in the office area, the panel recommended to go in this direction rather than rigidity..

The stairs are a great start but needs to be developed further going up the stairs, as there is no respite, and the engagement with the public realm. Stairs should feel safe and comfortable going up, give thought to the design of the stairs to each landing. Consider how the stairs interface with the building edge and make what is coming next visible.

A panelist noted if there was any opportunity to reduce the breadth size of the lobbies on 41st to create more or larger CRUs would be beneficial. Suggest providing weather protection and solar shading; this may help infuse the randomness of the arrangement of the pods. Facing out of the plaza would allow for enough space to leave some uses of tables without covering. The public realm along 41st, there is great opportunity to create a space that will work in the future, such as a car share drop off.

The Streetscape on 41st is transparent but not porous, there are lobbies but not many entrances. Engage the public more with the storefront. Suggest celebrating the department store and retail/restaurants by providing direct access. A panelist noted it was unfortunate the City created a large number of bike lanes.

From a sustainability point of view, the building is well balanced. Detailing of mechanical grills in the curtain wall is critical considering the sophisticated expression of buildings, as well as maintaining minimal exiting and mechanical elements on the facades. Important to keep in mind, regarding the design of building, HUV's in each suite there will be slots that will break up the beautiful glazing and renderings. The project proves, with the right elements, a high standard of envelope and Leed can be done.

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