

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 19th, 2020

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Brittany Coughlin

Alan Davies (not present for item 1 and 2)

Angela Enman

Michael Henderson

Margot Long (conflict with item 1)

Adrian Rahbar

Sydney Schwartz

Muneesh Sharma

Jennifer Stamp (conflict with item 4)

Karenn Krangle (not present for item 1 and 2)

REGRETS:

Walter Francl

Marie-Oedile Marceau

Matt Younger

RECORDING

SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1425 & 1451 E 12th Avenue
2.	8655 Granville Street
3.	5812-5844 Cambie Street
4.	3202 Riverwalk Ave (EFL Parcel 11)

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Jennifer Stamp called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1425 & 1451 E 12th Avenue
 Permit No. RZ-2019-00083
 Description: To develop two 6-storey residential buildings comprised of 157 seniors social housing over one level of underground parking consisting of 33 vehicle spaces and 162 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 20.7 m (68 ft.), the total floor area is 9.084 sq. m (97,779 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.56. This application is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
 Zoning: RM-11N to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application (SHORT)
 Review: First
 Architect: Ryder Architecture
 Delegation: Warren Schmit, Margot Long, William Azaroff
 Owners: Brightside
 Staff: Sarah Crowley & Patrick Chan

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5- 1)

- **Introduction:**

Sarah Crowley, Rezoning Planner (on behalf of Marcel Gelein, Rezoning Planner) presented this rezoning application for a seniors social housing project at 1425 and 1451 East 12th Avenue. This application was submitted on behalf of Brightside Homes, a private sector non-profit social housing provider.

Sarah began by providing an overview of the site and surrounding context as follows:

The development site is zoned RM-11N and is surrounded by single family houses developed under RM-11N to the west, south and east. An existing Brightside seniors building is located across the lane to the north as well character homes in the RT-5 zone.

- The site has a frontage of approximately 83m (272 ft.) along E. 12th and approximately 41m (134 ft.) along the lane to the east. The total site area is approximately 3,337 sq. m (35, 919 sq. ft.).
- The site is bisected in the middle by an existing Metro Vancouver right-of-way (ROW) and also on the west side of the lot.

The site is located approximately 800m south-west from the Commercial Broadway Skytrain station (10 min walk) and approximately 900m (11 min walk) to the north of John Hendry Park (Trout Lake).

The west side of the site is currently developed with a two storey building while the east portion of the lot has a three-storey building. Both buildings are owned and operated by Brightside Homes and are seniors housing buildings originally constructed in the 1962 (east) and in 1970 (west). Between the two buildings, there are currently 157 units, 72 in the west building and 85 in the east building respectfully.

Social Housing & Grandview Woodlands Community Plan

- Rezoning potential for the site is guided by the *Grandview Woodlands Community Plan* (GWCP). The site is within the Commercial-Broadway Station Precinct sub-area where the GWCP provides direction to support development of transit-oriented housing opportunities. Under section 6.7.2 of the GWCP, a four- storey apartment building is envisioned.
- However, additional height and density beyond 4 storeys can be considered for this site under section 7.1.3 of the GWCP which allows for modest increases in height and density to assist with project viability where new social housing is being proposed.

Proposal

Sarah concluded by noting that the application is proposing to rezone from RM-11N to CD-1 to permit two certified Passive House 6 storey buildings with a total of 157 social housing units targeted for seniors (tenants aged 55 years plus) . A density of 2.56 FSR and a height of 20.7m (68ft.) is being proposed. Each building includes one level of underground parking, with separate access from the lane on the north side of the property. This project has been submitted under the Social Housing or Rental Housing (SHORT) pilot program.

Development Planner Patrick Chan noted this project is situated within the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan (Station Residential Sub-Area), and is also zoned RM-11N. The Grandview Woodlands Plan and RM-11 District Schedule both support an extruded Four-Storey “T” Shaped Buildings to foster a medium density residential setting. The alphabet shaped aims to achieve the following urban design objectives:

- **Sensitive Transition:** Noting the lower scale R-zone lots around, the “leg” of the “T” is usually located at the rear of the site to minimize the bulk in the area interfacing with lots across the lane, hence maintaining some degree of openness.
- **Minimize shadow impacts:** Less mass or bulk in the interface area may also help reduce shadow impacts, particularly to any northerly lots.

While the recommended height is 45 ft., the Director of Planning may relax the height to 48 ft. to accommodate challenging topography and other factors. However, per the district schedule, portions of the building above the fourth level should be further setback to minimise the appearance of height and bulk, thus exercising sensitivity to the lower scale surroundings. To this point, it is important to note the RT-5 lots to the east and north contain some character houses and are unlikely to redevelop into taller, denser forms. Other urban design objectives outlined in the Grandview Woodlands Plan include, but not limited to, distinctive entry-way design, high-quality materials, activated ground plane, and tree retention. Chan also pointed out six-storey alphabet shaped apartments up to 2.40 FSR are anticipated for lots east of Woodlands Drive along 12th Avenue.

Patrick Chan then noted while the project does not present T-shaped buildings, it interprets and aims to express the T-shape’s urban design objectives to attend to the lower scale context.

- **Massing and Siting:** While this particular site-plan’s arrangement of L-shaped forms is to create a well-lit courtyard for its future residents, retain trees, and achieve the required dwelling units, the proposed footprint do attempt to minimise impacts to adjacent lots. For example, the west building’s smaller end faces the existing single-family houses to lessen overlook and the overall bulk in the interface zone. The east building has a 20 ft.

side-yard instead of a typical RM-11's 7 ft. side yard to give more volumetric relieve between the proposed building and the existing houses. Then, to avoid a six-storey wall along 12th Ave, the courtyard punctuates the frontage.

- **Character:** To give break up the appearance of bulk, a tripartite expression is used – each band's window position shifts slightly. To improve wayfinding, part of the ground floor wall-planes are recessed, and articulated with a frame.
- **Public Realm:** The south-facing courtyard is flanked by the buildings' amenity spaces to help animate it. This may improve the future character of this portion of East 12th Avenue.
- **Landscape:** The onsite trees retained along E 12th Ave can help act as natural acoustic and visual screens to the courtyard, although further acoustic studies should be conducted. Trees at the northeast corner are also retained to act as a form of screen between the subject property and adjacent houses.

Overall, the current design development results from balancing of housing unit requirements, on-site open-space programming, and other conditions such as Statutory Rights of Way and retained trees.

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

Massing, Siting + Character

- Its interpretation of the Grandview Woodland Plan's T-Shaped apartment form, and how this interpretation relates to the lower scale adjacencies, particularly to the north and east.
- Façade Composition in mitigating appearance of bulk / height, and contribution to the overall streetscape.
- Wayfinding from 12th Avenue

Public Realm + Landscape:

- Balance of privacy for the courtyard and its connectivity to 12th Avenue and the lane.
- Tree Retention Strategies

Livability:

- Privacy and quality of private outdoor spaces of units facing 12th Avenue
- Quality of outdoor space and access to natural lighting for lane-facing ground floor units.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The Applicant highlighted some constraints:

- 1) The existing Metro Vancouver sewer line is currently 6 meters deep and 3 meters on each property (6m total). The applicant has been asked to increase that to a total of 9.2 meters wide between both properties.

- 2) Sites are compact and parking is a key component. In consultation with city staff, it was agreed the best location for parking entry was along the lane.
- 3) After reviewing different forms and configurations it was decided L-shape configuration is optimal to other plans to minimize privacy concerns for the west building.
- 4) Regarding the east building the suggested L-shape form was to provide more affordable units. Applicant shoulder setback the entire lane, and additional set back on east property line allowing distance between adjacent neighbours.

The Applicant noted the intent of the configuration for the 2 buildings is to maintain a sense of community and provide a connection between this project and the Brightside project across the lane to the north. This connection would also be accessible to the public.

The Applicant noted the stress test for the energy model has been already done. The overheating risk for Passive House is 10%. For this project with its at-risk population it is, the overheating risk is 1%.

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. Henderson and Ms. Coughlin and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project and asks the applicant team to consider the comments. There are no conditions.

- **Panel Commentary:**

Massing, Siting and Character:

No issues with the massing, siting or character – the deviation from the T shape is supported

The panel has no concerns with the deviation from the T shaped given the site constraints. The T shape is a welcome departure.

The massing is done well and sets a standard for the neighbourhood.

Consider making one building taller than the other.

The massing does shade Brightside's property across the lane (to the north).

The massing is well handled, interesting and the buildings are in the correct location.

The façade composition is good.

Like the entry treatment. Consider more articulation at the entries.

The bulk, height and performance are good. The materiality is well treated. The lighter top and dark material at grade works well. Consider the fine-ness of materials at grade.

Good use of balconies for shading.

Massing is supportable because of its energy performance.

Public Realm and Landscape:

The landscape is very well handled. The pollinator garden is great.

Hard to see the trees be removed, especially at the SE corner. The trees offer a passive house benefit. The loss of the trees reduces the livability for seniors.

Tree retention strategy is good. The team made the right choices with regards to retention and removal.

The wayfinding through the site is well handled. The ROW from 12th through the site is good, well done.

The courtyard on 12th is well done. It needs more screening or separation, something to help it be a little more private so that the public does not wander in and use it. One panel member suggested elevating it or sinking it to separate it from the walkway.

Create stronger connection to shade garden at the northwest of the site – there is no direct access/site line from a common corridor/common room.

Livability:

Resiliency and cooling: review the energy model with climate change. Consider partial cooling – 1% tolerance for heating is great for seniors

The suites are well laid out, livable, units could be a tad bigger.

There is real need for this housing.

Consider increasing the window sizes.

Review some of the units that have overlook between bedrooms and balconies.

The passive house is great. And great that it is being certified.

Great to see seniors housing as passive house.

- Panel members supported the passive house approach of the project.
- Panel members appreciate the livability and affordability of the units.
- Panel members were not concerned with massing, siting and architecture; there is support for the L-shape configuration.
- Panel noted the facade composition has helped mitigate the bulk of the mass.
- There is warmth and definitions to the entries and is appropriately located.
- Regarding landscape, some panel members encourage the retention of more established trees and other panel members were more sympathetic and understood the need to fit a building on the site and trying to achieve a certain density.
- There were some concerns with the right away being too public and not enough privacy for the units.

There are no conditions for the motion of support. Only that the applicant considers the panels comments.

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

2. Address:	8655 Granville Street
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00072
Description:	To develop an 11-storey mixed-use residential building with 55 strata-titled units, office space on the second level, and commercial retail units at grade; all over four levels of underground parking consisting of 73 vehicle spaces and 11- bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 38.33 m (125.8 ft.), the total floor area is 5,887 sq. m (63,365 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 4.10. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Buffalo Investments
Delegation:	Daniel Eisenberg (GBL Architects), Jason Doug (GBL Architects), Meredith Mitchell (M2 LA), Joanne Sawatzky (Light House)
Staff:	Scott Erdman & Karen Kallweit-Graham

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman began by noting this application proposes to rezone a site at 8655 Granville Street under the Marpole Community Plan. The site is located on the west side of Granville Street, mid-block between 70th and 71st Avenue. The site is zoned C-2, and was formerly a gas station. It is now a vacant site with a temporary community garden.

The Marpole Community Plan anticipates mixed-use buildings in this location, with ground-floor commercial uses and residential above, with second floor office space encouraged.

A maximum height of 12 storeys with a 2-3 storey podium can be considered.

Regarding density, the Plan anticipates up to 3.5 FSR, noting that this is an estimate based on intended urban design performance, and so the potential may fall above or below this figure.

The proposal before you is for an 11-storey mixed-use building, with ground floor commercial-retail uses, office space on the second floor, and 55 strata residential uses above, with a density of 4.10.

A 4-metre wide right of way for public utility purposes exists on the north side of their lot, which will be maintained and used for a public pedestrian connection.

Development Planner, Karen Kallweit-Graham began by noting that this site is located in the Granville sub-area of the Marpole Community Plan. The architectural character in the Granville area is to “recognize its role as a traditional neighbourhood shopping street, and employ a thoughtful interpretation of traditional building types and high quality natural materials. Buildings at street level should respect pedestrian scale and pace with small, robustly detailed storefronts.” In terms of context, this is a mid-block parcel, with a right-of way to the north, and a zero-lot-line condition to the south. Site is 158 ft. long x 95 ft. deep and there is north-to-south slope of approximately 4 feet.

The Plan considers podium/tower typologies for this area. For buildings higher than 8 storeys, floor plates above the podium are generally expected to be modest in size, the intention being to achieve a 'slim' tower appearance and ensure daylight to the street.

Proposal is for an 11 storey mixed-use building and generally meets the intent of the Marpole Plan in terms of height, setbacks and floor plate sizes. Retail/ commercial space occurs along Granville which is carried around the corner and along the north edge to animate the mid-block connection. The connection also serves as a pedestrian extension of Avery Street. Entrances to 2nd floor offices and residential units are from Granville. Amenity space has been provided on Level 3 at southeast corner, with associated outdoor common space.

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

1. Comment on the overall height, density and form of development as it relates to character objectives of Marpole Community Plan.
2. Comment on the public realm interface at ground plane with respect to:
 - a) Scale & character of retail frontage and entries
 - b) Animation and visibility of mid-block connection
 - c) Pedestrian experience at the lane
3. Comment on sustainability features, such as material choices, solar strategy, & green infrastructure.
4. To inform the project at the Development Permit stage, comment on the architectural expression in terms of perceived bulk, composition, elements and materiality.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

As far as the Marpole plan, applicant is left with a prescribed form which is a two storey commercial podium and an additional office space on the second floor. Left with a form that is a two storey podium with a residential tower on top; there are opportunities for shoulders to the tower on the lower floors so one shoulder is added.

Applicant received feedback from planning that the tower had to be 80 foot wide. Applicant was able to negotiate with city up to 82 foot wide.

Applicant team strived to tie the building and podium together to create cohesive architectural expression. They introduced the horizontal expression to integrate the building mass, working with balconies to create projections; extensions of the building mass that relief the building from the compact floor plan and blur the lines between exterior and interior

In response to orientation, expression of building is monolithic which allows for a lower window wall ratio at 40%. There is reduced window exposure from the west side to avoid excessive over-heating during the summer. All the units on the west are corner units, ensuring there was an allowance for cross ventilation.

The expression of the balconies allows applicant to come up with a different solution to thermal break. Applicant noted the design of the balconies is built so they create insulation of heat.

Applicant noted the building is a mid-block site, the unofficial pedestrian lane is being used and there is potential to increase the pedestrian walk way when the adjacent site develops.

From a landscape perspective, applicant tried to follow the signal of what the Architecture was doing which was a linear design. Applicant followed that through on the ground plane, specifically on the Granville St which has a linear pattern that provides striping and with that returns back into the public walkway side.

On the public walkway side there is some vegetation,

The ground plane has an extensive over hang which allows for covered seating and weather protection. On the second level there is an amenity space for residential and green space above. Applicant has done extensive IRMP calculation which has allowed applicant to add a green room on several different levels. There is no access to upper floor as it is primarily used for storm water management and for green space.

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. Coughlin and seconded by Ms. Long and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- Design Development to reduce appearance of the perceived bulk and mass of the tower.
- Design Development to level 3 roof top amenity.
- Design Development to lane character, elevation, animation and CPTED concerns.
- Design Development to the retail frontage, to provide a finer grain

- **Panel Commentary:**

Height, Density, and Form of Development:

No issues with height, density or form of development

Strong design looks cool.

Tower and podium work well together.

Compact floor plate. Consider shrinking the core.

Interesting shaped building.

Massing fits the Marpole Plan.

Thoughtful design – like the horizontality.

An elegant way to bring visual interest to the tower form/floor plate.

Appreciate the elevation studies. The linear/horizontality shows as bulky. The balcony upstand adds to the bulk.

With the exception of the west elevation, all of the elevations are well articulated. The west elevation reads flat. Also there are not shading devices. Consider adding shading devices as a way to articulate the west elevation.

Public Realm Interface at Ground Plane:

No issues with public realm.

Add more street trees

The lane needs help.

There are CPTED issues with the ramp design

The pedestrian ROW – consider more connections to retail, public art, seating. These additions will benefit the retail.

Wrap the glazing along the north elevation around to the lane and reconsider the location of the proposed vents/mechanical shafts at the northwest corner.

Concern with vents at the lane. The lane needs more Marpole character.

Buffer the ramp so that it is not a gap/negative space along the lane – consider a screen or opaque glass.

CRU widths – provide more variation in size – it's too continuous.

The public realm needs more than just repetitive paving.

The residential/office entry creates a void in the public realm – this is not as per the Marpole Plan.

Consider relocating the lobby to the ROW at the north.

The CRU at the ROW needs a kitchen unit.

Provide a way to get from the ground plane to level 2.

Sustainability Features:

The proposed sustainability features are okay. Consider more passive strategies.

The passive strategies with the balconies are good. Consider thermally breaking the balconies. Wrapping the balconies is not as good as a thermal break.

The rectilinear form is efficient.

The west elevation has small operable windows. Consider increasing them for better cross ventilation.

Appreciate the extensive green roofs.

The 3rd floor amenity is challenging. There are privacy concerns with the amenity patio and the private patio of the unit on the southwest. Consider reworking to delete 1 unite and make it all amenity.

Consider rooftop amenity if the City allows it.

Input to Consider for Development Permit Stage:

Not sure if the horizontal banding is appropriate – it makes the tower appear wider and shorter.

The balcony shift with the same suites compromises livability – the balconies are off of bedrooms.

Heavy materiality - dark

Other:

Reconsider the use of some of the proposed plants – the are too large for the small planters.

Add resilient play surface to the children's play area. Consider a more passive piece of play equipment rather than the prefabricated piece proposed.

Add screen between patios at level 4.

Consider tree planting along the north ROW.

- Regarding the architecture, some panel members noted the horizontal lending adds bulkiness to the building. Also, the small floor plate and limited setbacks, the west façade is very flat, a serious contrast compared to the other sides. The contrast between white horizontality and darkness of the glass, adds to the bulkiness.
- Regarding the public realm, Panel member encourage applicant to speak with Engineering on the right away planting trees
- Panel noted on the north façade, the glazing does not wrap around the lane and further animate the lane. Given the pedestrian nature of the lanes in Marpole, and given what the project wants to do which is increase pedestrian connectivity at the right away on the north property line, attention should be paid to what that elevation is looking like.
- In terms of the landscape treatment, Panel encouraged the Landscape Architect to re - consider what is being proposed for the children play area. The pre-fabrication play equipment offers little value and would recommend something less concrete and more loose and naturalistic. Also, panel noted there needs to be a more resilient surface because a concrete surface is not recommended.
- Panel to ask applicant to re-consider not using Portuguese panel because it is massive and it is not the right scale for this project.
- Panel in general is supportive of the height, density and the form of development.
- Regarding the podium and tower expression, some Panel members think the horizontality works well while some Panel members think it may benefit from having the tower differentiate a bit to reduce the perceive bulk.
- Panel members in general widely supported the public realm. Some panel members suggest re-locating the one lobby off the right away
- A panel member noted the CRU widths were too continuous
- Some panel members commented on the passive strategy. They noted that thermal breaking balcony is a better strategy than wrapping them with insulation.
- Some panel members noted that along the west elevation, some of the windows were a bit small, panel is asking applicant to re-consider increasing window size for better cross ventilation.
- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.

3. Address:	5812-5844 Cambie Street
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00073
Description:	To develop the site with a 32-storey market residential tower with 257 strata-titled units and a 12-storey office tower, both on a 4-storey podium with commercial retail units at grade; all over four levels of underground parking consisting of 303 vehicle spaces and 536 bicycle spaces. This proposal also includes a 37-space public childcare facility and a youth centre. The proposed building heights for the office tower and residential tower are 45.72m (150 ft.) and 100.6m (330 ft.) respectively. The total floor area is 28,548 sq. m (307,283 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 9.85. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
Zoning:	C-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI Group
Delegation:	Jeffrey Mok, Architect, Martin Bruckner, Architect, Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, Daniel Roberts, Sustainability Consultant
Owner	Jasper Projects, Brian Martin
Staff:	Scott Erdman & Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (9-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman introduced the project with a brief description of the existing context, followed by an overview of the anticipated context as per the Cambie Corridor Plan. He then provided a summary of the Plan's specific requirements for this site, also identified as "Area F" under the Plan, which include the provision for on-site community amenity from a list of choices available to the applicant. This application is pursuing a youth centre to fulfill this requirement. The application also includes a daycare. Scott concluded his presentation with a summary of the proposal's key statistics.

Development Planner, Omar Aljebouri followed by describing the Plan's vision for the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre neighbourhood as a highly urban commercial core with dynamic public realm and engaging architecture. He then gave an overview of the Built Form Guidelines and the vision of the Cambie Corridor Public Realm Plan, which includes provision of a minor plaza. Omar highlighted some key features of the proposal with respect to massing, the plaza, public realm and points of entry.

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

1. Massing and density. Please consider the relationship of the towers and podium, as well as strategies to reduce bulk.
2. Public realm and pedestrian experience. Please consider:
 - a. Arrangement and functionality of the plaza, breezeway, entrances and lobbies;
 - b. Lane interface.
3. Design of the Youth Centre. Please consider legibility and entry.
4. Sustainability strategy and any areas for potential design development.
5. Any preliminary advice for consideration at the DP stage.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The site has four orientations- Retail entries on Cambie, at 4 storeys high, Office entry off W. 42nd Ave, office building retail will continue at grade to and around the lane corner. Vertical access to the youth centre located on level 2 and 3 which will enclose the open space but still allow it to be a major connection to the park on the east. At the Office entrance will be the entry to the day care on the podium roof. The daycare space is on the 5th floor, uncovered and inboard. In the minor plaza are the entries for the residential and secondary entrance for the office. The team's sustainability consultant presented the project's goals and design approach to address sustainability objectives.

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. Davies and seconded by Ms. Long 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 to relationship between the towers and the office podium.
- Design development to distill and simplify competing components and strengthen design concept.
- Design development to public realm along Cambie.
- Design development to strengthen the legibility of the various entries and the open spaces connected to them, including the entry to the day-care, as well as strengthening the identity of outdoor youth centre at the south plaza.

Panel Commentary:

Massing and Density:

Support for the density, height, use and general massing.

The relationship between the tower and podium adds to the appearance of bulk.

Simplify the various elements – there are many competing elements.

The differentiation of the office and tower expressions is good.

Reconsider the diagonal sunshade as it amplifies the façade/adds bulk.

Like the reference to the building to the north in the form of the sloped canopies.

The lane "tube" is not reading as such. It's just an aperture at either end.

The tower is the strongest element but it is uneasily perched on the podium. Does/should the tower expression come down to the ground.

A lot of strong gestures that are competing.

Simplify the massing.

The "L" tower and podium expression adds to the bulk – separate the office tower and office podium.

Consider squaring off the rounded corner of the office floor plate.
The short tower and podium need differentiation – having them both read the same contributes to them reading as bulky.
The “tube” doesn’t really read distinctly except for its colour.
Lane elevation is flat and reads institutional in character.

Public Realm:

The south plaza has a strong connection to the Youth Centre. The plaza needs something for the Youth Centre.
The wrap of the retail and lobbies onto the lane is well handled.
Activate the edge on Cambie – it feels like a barren sidewalk. It needs some use and program.
Consider more drop off.
CPTED concern with the Youth Centre breezeway.
Nested Entries at the south – residential, office, youth and CRU.
Consider new/big street trees to replace what is there.

Youth Centre Legibility and Entry:

The entry is disjointed.
Consider more separation between the Youth Centre entry and the residential entry.
There needs to be something in the plaza that says “youth”.
The Youth Centre needs its own identity and it needs to be played up more.
Widen the breezeway – this will address CPTED concerns and help the plaza.

Sustainability Strategies:

Great to see the energy performance of the plan.
Consider how the diagonal sunshades look for occupants inside the building.
Consider thermal bridging that is occurring at the balconies.
Consider passive cooling strategies.

Development Permit Considerations:

Differing commentary about the use of the colour orange on the building. Some panel members like it, others find it jarring.
The sunshades – don’t overstate – it forces the eye to make them feel cantilevered. The V at the corner feels like the prow of a ship.
Like the canopies as they break up the frontage.
The applicant needs to distill the proposal – pick and choose the strongest elements. Consider making the “tube” more continuous.
The south office lobby feels lost. It has no canopy to mark it. There are 3 entries crammed into 1 corner of the plaza.
The daycare lobby needs help.

Other:

Like the programming – great to see office use.
There are a good variety of amenities – both public and private.
The building is busy. A lot of design languages – unify architecture and landscape.

- There is general support from Panel for the mass and density of this project.
- Panel appreciates the variety of amenities for office, residential, public and neighbouring spaces in particular the south plaza and day care.

- Panel expressed some concerns with the expression and relationship between the tower and podium. The residential tower appears to “perch” on top of the podium, which creates awkward conditions, and might be better brought down to grade. The triangular bulge in the office tower appears unresolved, and a better way to achieve floor area should be explored. Overall, additional recesses might help in reducing the appearance of bulk.
- There are competing components in the building and could be distilled down and simplified. For instance, the sun-shade elements could be made more functional as they currently seem decorative and add bulk. The lane tube should be reflected better in plan. The diagonal expression seems to compete with the horizontal.
- Panel noted the plaza could be more legible. A stronger connection between the plaza and the youth centre is much desired. A more purposeful element such as a youth ping-pong area can be ingrained in the design of the plaza. The breezeway could be widened a bit more, as it currently created CPTED and usability issues. The nested and clustered entries around the plaza area creating issues of illegibility and crowding.
- Panel noted that the public realm should be further enhanced. For instance, the ground plane along Cambie is currently barren and needs more activation.
- Panel commented on the youth centre. The entry was a bit dis-jointed and needs better presence at grade, which might be in the form of an activated lobby or supplementary space. The centre should be better celebrated.
- Daycare entrance’s functionality should be improved as a meeting place with ample space for circulation and large strollers.
- Panel noted that thermal bridging in the building should be considered, and broken. Natural ventilation should be taken into consideration as well.
- The panel appreciated the façade treatment and the weather protection design.

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

4. Address: 3202 Riverwalk Ave (EFL Parcel 11)
Permit No: DP-2019-00866
Description: To develop the site with four midrise residential buildings (12-storey (Building A), 8-storey (Building B), 4-storey (Building C), 5-storey (Building D)), and a 2-storey central amenity facility; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 205 vehicle spaces and 425 bicycle spaces.
- Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Second (First as DP)
Architect: Dialog
Delegation: Alan Boniface, Architect, Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect
Owner: Wesgroup
Staff: Kevin Spaans & Kirsten Robinson
-

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/0)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner Kevin Spaans provided an introduction and description of the project, as follows:

The subject site is located within the southwest precinct of East Fraser Lands Area 2, at the north banks of the Fraser River adjacent Kinross Park South to the east and Foreshore Park to the south. The building directly to the north is a new six storey strata residential building. Parcel 10, to the west, is approved to include a residential development up to seven storeys.

The 2010 East Fraser Lands ODP and design guidelines initially anticipated two buildings on the site: an eight storey building on the east side and six storeys on the west. The EFL CD-1 was amended twice, first to relocate the taller massing to the northwest corner to minimize shadowing on public parks and site open spaces, and again to receive reallocated density from another site intended to be the location of a new community centre. This redistributed floor area results in the commensurate increase in allowable height to eight storeys and twelve storeys, as proposed.

Per the EFL design guidelines, the southwest precinct is intended to present a relaxed parklike setting complementing the adjacent naturalist parks. Furthermore, Parcel 11 is intended to:

- Mark the SW terminus of Kinross Park and provide transitions to Foreshore Park;
- Contribute to the street wall definition of Riverwalk Avenue;
- Define a shared mews with Parcel 10;
- Frame semi-public landscape space that contributes to the character of the foreshore.

The indicative design showed two buildings on either side of a central courtyard with a curved building massing tracing the line of the adjacent greenway.

The proposal is comprised of four strata residential buildings at 4, 6, 8, and 12 storeys, and a 2 storey central common amenity building ovetop two levels of underground parking. The proposed density of 2.47 FSR aligns with the CD-1 bylaw.

Entrances for buildings A and B are located parallel Riverwalk Avenue, accessed from a central pedestrian walk. Building B is proposed to include at-grade residential units with access from the adjacent sidewalk, and Building A is presented with a common amenity room with patio oriented toward the street. Aside from these building program elements, the interface with Riverwalk Avenue is generally defined by substantial planting areas.

The main entrances for Buildings C and D are located facing the central semi-public outdoor space, again generally accessed from the central pedestrian walk off of Riverwalk Avenue. Both Buildings C and D include at-grade residential units with direct access off of adjacent walks.

Parking and loading is accessed off of a shared mews at the west side of the site, which is also intended to act as a pedestrian through-connection from Riverwalk Avenue to the Foreshore Park greenway.

Per the Guidelines, landscape design at the site is anticipated to relate strongly to the proposed architectural expression, while serving as important social and ecological areas. As proposed, the landscape design is comprised of a series of walking paths providing access to the buildings and the waterside walking path; water features; and common outdoor amenity areas off of the central amenity building. All four buildings are proposed to have accessible private roof decks, and the central amenity building is proposed to have an extensive green roof.

In terms of architectural expression, the guidelines prioritize ground-oriented dwelling units as a means to provide for passive security and activity at grade; exploration of stepped building forms to reduce apparent mass and relate to the topography and waterside context; transparency and legibility; and expanded balconies to enhance solar shading, livability, and usability.

Tower forms are anticipated to be simple and legible, with articulation provided by establishing relationships between punched windows, solid planes, and larger glazing units. Proposed are rectilinear buildings with modulation provided in the form of window and balcony perforations, and intermittent expressed slab edges. Material palettes in EFL are expected to symbolically marry the built form either to the industrial heritage of the site or the natural surrounds, or may otherwise align the building generally with the west coast contemporary design. In this case, the material palette includes dark grey brick, prefinished metal, and glass.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This site is unique within the East Fraser Lands as it addresses the water in a unique way. The proposed massing is an opportunity to reinterpret what had been shown in the indicative design, and reconsider the interface between the built form and the environment of the riverside. A stronger relationship with the community was also a major focus of the reinterpretation of the building form. Centrally, a community building that is visible and

accessible from all streets is provided. The approach to the design of the public realm was to the maximize permeability and access to the public realm. The arrangement of buildings is such that it opens the site up to the street. For this site, there was a need for more permeability visually and from landscape point of view. The site's water feature is a unique play on the surrounding natural landscape; it will also add a lot to the East Fraser Lands context and public realm. The renderings more clearly show the effect of these water features. There are some unique adjacencies at the ground level units, and also a unique recessed amenity space which takes advantage of the site grade and underground parking. The massing of doorways and relationships of entry ways are being carefully considered. To address the esthetics and materiality, the applicant took the idea of the wood that was on site and simplified that as a form of a rugged brick material that will be reminiscent of that.

The proposed planting scheme within the site references the natural surroundings of the nearby park. This semi-public green space links to the Fraser River and park sites. The proposal maximizes on the amount of roof space by providing green roofs or private rooftop amenity areas, where possible. The common amenity building has good southern exposure with opportunities for outdoor social spaces, including a gathering space that fronts onto the park.

Regarding sustainability, the applicant is pursuing LEED Gold certification as per the provisions of the East Fraser Lands ODP.

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. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Schwartz 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 to explore increase sustainability performance opportunities whether active or passive;
- Design development to create more flexible and usable spaces on ground plane.

Panel Commentary:

- The Panel was generally supportive of the proposal, overall.
- The Panel noted an appreciation for the transition between spaces and buildings, and the project's integration with the natural setting.
- Panelists noted an appreciation for the strong massing and strong parts.
- Panelists appreciated the material selection and attention to materiality.
- Some Panelists encouraged the applicant to consider a more rigorous approach to sustainability, beyond than the LEED Gold standard anticipated by the CD-1 Bylaw and the East Fraser Lands Official Development Plan.

- Some Panelists noted that the expressed concrete slab extensions may result in building envelope performance issues and / or may impact user comfort, and recommended more consideration at these locations.
- Some Panelists noted that the ground plane lacks detailed planting / seeding information, and that the outdoor areas could use more versatility (i.e. more benches / programmed areas).

Applicant's Response:

The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.