

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** August 7, 2019

**TIME:** 3:00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

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

Helen Avini Besharat	Items 1-3
Muneesh Sharma	
Yinjin Wen	
Colette Parsons	Items 1-2
Karenn Krangle	
Derek Neale	Items 1-2
Adrien Rahbar	
Jim Huffman	

**REGRETS:** Grant Newfield  
Amela Brudar  
Susan Ockwell  
Jennifer Stamp  
Matt Younger

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** K. Cen

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                                |
|----|--------------------------------|
| 1. | 1220-1298 East Hastings Street |
| 2. | 560 Raymur Avenue              |
| 3. | 1503 Kingsway                  |
| 4. | 2542 Garden Drive              |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Jim Huffman 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: 1220-1298 East Hastings Street  
 Permit No. RZ-2018-00019  
 Description: To develop the site with two 12-storey strata residential buildings and one 8-storey social housing building with 55 social housing units and 152 strata units for a total of 207 units; all above 3 levels of underground parking with 229 vehicle parking spaces and 481 bicycle parking spaces. The building height is 37 m (120 ft.) and the total gross floor area is 17,302 sq. m (186,241 sq. ft.). The floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.0.

This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Area Plan and the Rezoning Policy for the Downtown Eastside. This application is accompanied by a concurrent rezoning application for 560 Raymur Avenue. While these are separate rezoning applications, the DTES Plan requires that rezonings for these sites deliver a minimum of 20% of all housing units to be social housing. As such, these two separate applications are proposing to consolidate their 20% social housing requirement to be delivered within one building at 1200-1298 East Hastings Street. Therefore, these two applications will be processed together with the same open house and Urban Design Panel review.

Zoning: M-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Yamamoto Architecture  
 Delegation: Taizo Yamamoto (Architect) and Jazmin Ledeno (Landscape Architect)  
 Owners: Rodney Rao, ONNI  
 Staff: Thien Phan & Miguel Castillo Ureña

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

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Thien Phan, began by noting item 1 and 2 on the agenda seeks to rezone two separate sites that are coming in under the same Plan area, the DTES Plan. These projects are unique in that the two separate sites fall under two separate sub-areas but are tied together.

Per the DTES Plan, rezoning may be considered for mixed-use buildings if 20-30% of the residential units are social housing. For this reason, the applicant has proposed two sites. The 20% social housing requirement is being consolidated into one building at 1168 E Hastings.

The 1220-1298 East Hastings site is located in the Hastings East corridor of the DTES Plan, a sub-area that stretches from Heatley to Clark. The Plan anticipates a new mixed-use

neighborhood with a range of housing types, with new social housing, local-serving retail, and a pedestrian-oriented space.

The site is 250 ft. by 120 ft. located on the SW corner of E Hastings and Clark. The site is currently occupied by five low-rise commercial buildings.

The site is zoned M-1 along E Hastings to the west, MC-1 to the east, M-1 to the north, and I-2 to the south. The E Hastings corridor is M-1, and the 1995 Industrial Lands Policies designated Hastings Street's M-1 as "let go" areas. While this is currently zoned as industrial use, other uses may be considered.

The Hastings East sub-area allows:

- Maximum height up to 120 ft.
- Density between 2.5-6.0 FSR.
- 200 ft. frontage.
- Commercial floor-to-floor of 18 ft.

Proposal:

- Floor area of 186,241 sq. ft.
- FSR of 6.0 and building height of 120 ft.
- Ground level commercial space below three buildings:
  - o Two 12-storey buildings with strata housing.
  - o One 8-storey building containing social housing from this site and 560 Raymur. For both sites, there would be a total of 207 housing units, with 20% of that total being delivered as 55 social housing units on this site.
  - o 3 levels of underground parking with 229 vehicle parking and 481 bicycle parking.

Development planner, Miguel Castillo Ureña began by noting that this project consists of a mixed-used development comprising two 120 foot towers, one located on the corner of Clark Drive and E. Hastings.

The frontage is approximately 260 feet and the site slopes significantly around two meters along E Hastings and two meters up across the parcel, towards the lane and on the western property line. On the ground plane, there are retail units, two residential access, one of them for the social housing building. The third residential access is off Clark Drive. Indoor and outdoor amenities are co-located for the western residential building and additional indoor amenity space is also proposed facing the lane. Social housing has its amenities space facing the south side. The eastern tower has its indoor amenity space facing Clarke Drive at grade and an outdoor amenity space on the roof-top facing north.

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

### **Building Form, Height and Density**

1. Overall building form, scale and density:
  - Contextual fit, including response to future developments.

- Whether the proposed massing, height and form contributes to the characteristic “saw-tooth” profile as seen from E Hastings. (Please also consider the solar access to the north side of E Hastings.)
  - Whether the extended frontage (and proposed streetscape) is an appropriate response to E Hastings Street.
2. Livability, particularly with regards to the units located at the internal courtyards on the south side of the development.

### **Public Realm**

3. Overall public realm, including at Clark Drive and lane.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

The main objective for this project is to consolidate the different elements into one building to increase the overall scaling of the building. A defined sawtooth created from the setbacks on the east side and potential flat iron of 150 feet. To bring back the historic character, the building is emphasized on the vertical elements to help make the building more elegant rather than a strong podium.

Lobby spaces are scattered throughout the block.

Amenity spaces are scattered over the building to allow maximum use for residents. The lounge and gymnasium will be on ground level. There will also be roof top amenity spaces.

Social housing amenity space will be located on the south facing podium.

The main objective of the landscape design is to create a pedestrian friendly and inviting streetscape experience on the ground floor.

There will be a public plaza with seating space, buffer planting, and public art.

On level two of the social housing, there will be a variety of outdoor spaces with children’s play area, outdoor kitchen, urban agricultures, and planting buffers.

Level 7 will consist of a central social space for events and view to mountains.

Parking access is located on the mid-block.

There is split loading for the retail units.

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 Ms. Besharat 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 social housing rooftop to enhance overlook.
- Design development of the E Hasting façade to emphasize the saw-tooth profile in plan in addition to the proposed saw-tooth elevation profile.
- Design development of the corner units.
- Design development of the internal courtyard corner units to increase livability and improve privacy.
- Design development of the amenities spaces to be co-located.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support for the project, including scale and density.

Panel members supported the massing and architectural design of the project.

Panel members supported the façade design.

Panel members supported the color palate and materiality as it helps breakdown the massing of the project.

Panel members noted that the project shows good contextual fit.

Panel members supported the lane usage and design.

Panel members supported the sawtooth design.

Some panel members noted that the livability for the south east and south west units at the internal courtyard needs to improve.

Some panel members suggest further design development of the roof tops and programming of amenities.

Some panel members showed minor concerns regarding the public realm and suggest more detailing on the ground plane and streetscape.

Panel members noted that the street corner should be highlighted and further improved.

Some panel members showed concerns regarding potential issues on units privacy.

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

2. Address:	560 Raymur Avenue
Permit No.	RZ-2018-00020
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building with a manufacturing space on the ground floor and 59 strata housing units; all above 2 levels of underground parking with 97 vehicle parking spaces and 154 bicycle parking spaces. The building height is 21 m (69.55 ft.) and the total gross floor area is 7,226 sq. m (77,780 sq. ft.). The floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.94. This application is being considered under the Downtown Eastside Area Plan and the Rezoning Policy for the Downtown Eastside.
	This application is accompanied by a concurrent rezoning application for 1220-1298 East Hastings Street. While these are separate rezoning applications, the DTES Plan requires that rezonings for these sites deliver a minimum of 20% of all housing units to be social housing. As such, the applicant is proposing to consolidate their 20% social housing requirement to be delivered within one building at 1200-1298 East Hastings Street. Therefore, these two applications will be processed together with the same open house and Urban Design Panel review.
Zoning:	I-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Yamamoto Architecture
Delegation:	Taizo Yamamoto (Architect) and Jazmin Ledeno (Landscape Architect)
Owners:	Rodney Rao, ONNI
Staff:	Thien Phan & Miguel Castillo Ureña

## **EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6-1)**

### **• Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Thien Phan, began by noting that this site is located in Kiwassa West sub-area, located fronting Raymur and south of Pender with the CN rail line to the east. The site is bound by the railway line to the east, an overhead pedestrian bridge to the south, two-storey industrial building to the north, and a social housing complex (Stamps Place) to the west. The site is currently zoned I-2, with I-2 to the north and south, and RT-3 to the east.

Site size is 26,500 sq. ft., a frontage of 238 ft. along Raymur with one industrial building and exterior storage space.

The policy in Kiwassa West allows:

- Maximum height between 50-70 ft.
- Density of 2.5-3.0 FSR
- Rezoning of industrial sites may be “let go” sites for 20% social housing

Proposal:

- Net floor area of 77,481 sq. ft.

- FSR of 2.94 and building height of 69.5 ft.
- Ground level manufacturing space and 5 storeys of 59 strata housing.
- 2 levels of underground parking with 97 vehicle parking spaces and 154 bicycle parking.

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Ureña began by noting that this project is a 6-storey mix-used development in a L-shape configuration, creating a courtyard at the southeast corner. The project provides a setback of 10m from the eastern crash wall, 15 ft. to the north, 4.5m from existing back of curb on Raymur and 12 ft. from south (with a 10-foot SRW from the drip line).

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Overall form of development, land use and density.
2. Whether the overall built form creates an appropriate “fit” with the anticipated form of development to the north and south and surrounding context.
3. Livability, including adjacency to railway line and units facing north and at the internal ‘elbow’.
4. Whether the proposal contributes to the enhancement of the Public Realm and pedestrian experience in this area, including at the bridge interface and Raymur Ave.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

Applicant began by noting that due to the rail line, the building was pushed westwards. There would be a 5 meters crash wall relative to the height of the track and the building would be set back 10 meters away from the crash wall.

This building would be made from a wood frame above the concrete podium.

Loading and parking ramp will be at grade.

There would be a strong streetscape on Raymur to provide more privacy for residents.

The project provides an industrial skin with layers of metal. The metal is refined with glazing to provide texture and color to the project.

The main objective of the landscape design is to create a pedestrian friendly and inviting streetscape experience on the ground floor.

There will be a double row of trees and seating area to see the manufacturing activities and train watching.

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 Mr. Wen 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 improve the industrial character, including the ground floor.
- Design development of the crash wall to enhance views from neighbors.
- Design development to improve livability for units facing the internal balconies ('internal elbow') facing the courtyard.
- Design development to provide a bike friendly attitude to the building.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support for the project, including density and height.

Panel members noted that the project shows good use of land and fits into the area context.

Panel members supported the elegant corner design.

Panel members supported the materiality.

Many panel members showed concerns towards the privacy issues for the internal units.

Many panel members recommended further development of the public realm in line with the precedents shown and increase the number of plantations.

Panel members recommend the project to have a children's play area.

Panel members recommend further design development of the ground plane and associated manufacturing use.

Panel members recommend implementing bike amenities.

**Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and will take the comments into consideration for further improvement.



3. Address: 1503 Kingsway  
Permit No. DP-2018-00892  
Description: To develop the site with a 13-storey mixed-use building consisting of a 6-storey podium with retail uses, office spaces, and a fitness centre on levels 1 and 2, and a residential tower above. Additionally, the site contains townhouses facing Fleming and Dumfries Street as well as an extended open space fronting Kingsway. There will be 2 levels of underground parking accessed from a new lane connecting Fleming and Dumfries Street. The approximate building height is 48 m (157.5 ft.), the total number of dwelling units is 154, and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.5.
- Zoning: C-2  
Application Status: Complete Development Application  
Review: First  
Architect: RHA Architects  
Delegation: Bryce Rositch (Architect) and Alexa Gonzalez (Landscape Architect)  
Owner: Nathan Gervich, Cresey Development Group  
Staff: Miguel Castillo Ureña

---

### **EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/0)**

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Ureña, began by noting that this project is a full DP application for a mixed-use development comprised of:

- 13-storey tower and an associated 6 storeys podium with retail at grade, office and fitness center.
- 4 buildings containing townhouses to the north with an approximate 23 feet (6.95 meters) wide courtyard in between.
- New lane from Fleming Street to Dumfries Street.
- Improvements on the western side of Fleming Street.
- New open space in the form of mini-plaza on Kingsway.

The immediate context includes:

- To the east of the project, the area is currently zoned at C-2 and RM-1 farther north.
- The area facing north of the subject site is zoned as CD-1 and occupied by a three storey building.
- To the west of the site, the area is zoned as C-1 and RM-1 farther north.
- To the south it is zoned as C-2 and CD-1 and occupied by a six storey building.

This building facing Kingsway consists of a mixed-use building with retail at grade wrapping around the mini-plaza and Dumfries Street. On the second level, there will be office space as well as fitness centre.

The entry for the residential portion is located along Dumfries Street. There is co-located indoor and outdoor amenity spaces on the second level and an additional outdoor space on the roof-top.

Loading and parking access is located on the north lane.

Mr. Castillo Ureña noted that this is the first time that such large height relaxation is being considered under C-2 zone and this consideration is based on:

- A unique large and deep C-2 site with varying flanking zones.
- The amount of open space provided, including a new lane, pedestrian mews, courtyard, improvements along Fleming Street and a mini-plaza at Kingsway

This is all in order to try to achieve a more compatible form of development in accordance with staff initial studies and recommendations to the applicant.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

#### **Building Form and Height**

- Overall building form, siting and contextual fit.
- Whether the amount of density has been successfully accommodated on this site and relate well to context.
- Has the increased building height (157.50' - 48m) been "earned" through an appropriate form of development and adequate contextual fit?

#### **Building Expression**

- Building character, expression and materiality.
- Has the design of the residential tower (and podium) achieved a clear identity and expression?
- Has a positive Kingsway streetscape been achieved, including an active and attractive pedestrian environment?
- Is the material expression of high quality and well-handled?

#### **Public Realm**

- Overall public realm, including new lane, open space at Kingsway and Fleming Street.
- Whether the proposal contributes significantly to the enhancement of the Public Realm and pedestrian environment around and through the site.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant started by clarifying that the objective of this project was to set a respectable precedent for future developments on Kingsway. This project is comprised of various retail and commercial spaces. There are amenities spaces on the north side as well as the roof top.

There are strong elements to mark the corner of the site on Kingsway and Dumfries. There are different color palates for each set of townhouses. Walkability was promoted as a factor for these residents.

Along Kingsway, there would be a new wide sidewalk to support foot traffic, and the CRU units. There would be more trees to provide the necessary shading as well as bring down the scale of the building to provide a more pedestrian friendly environment.

Along Dumfries, there would be individual access to the town houses as well as additional trees and create a friendlier public realm experience.

The mews would have paving details, lighting and landscape ballers to make this not only the loading area for the CRUs but a pedestrian access across the site.

Along Fleming, there would be street facing townhouse entries with new boulevard, street trees, and sidewalk.

The roof top amenity area comprise of an open lawn area, children's play area, urban agriculture, outdoor kitchen, and seating area.

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

THAT the Panel SUPPORT of the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design development to improve the material palette on the tower and podium façades.
- Design development of the streetscape to strengthen and clarify its expression.
- Design development on the mews to clarify the various uses.
- Design development to improve the visual quality and usability of the intermediate roof-tops.

#### **Related Commentary:**

In general the panel supported the project at the development permit stage.

Panel members supported the proposed distribution of density and the height relaxation.

Panel members supported the massing of the tower and podium and the location and configuration of the townhouses.

Many panel members supported the outdoor space and the overall building siting and configuration as it relates well to context.

Panel members recommend further design development of the Kingsway streetscape.

Panel members recommend further design development of the mews and parking area.

Panel members recommend improving the quality of the intermediate roofs.

Many panel members suggested that the project will improve the public realm.

Panel members showed concerns for the expression of the mixed-use building and recommends better overall unity.

Many panel members noted that the building expression could be simplified.

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

---

4. Address:	2542 Garden Drive (formerly 2542-2570 Garden Dr & 2309-2369 E 10th Ave)
Permit No.	DP-2019-00395
Description:	To develop a 6-storey, multiple dwelling building containing a total of 68 units; all over two levels of underground parking, providing a total of 85 parking spaces, having vehicular access from the lane to the east. The floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.65.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	RHA Architects
Delegation:	Bryce Rositch (Architect), Jocelle Smith (Architect), and Daryl Tyaca (Landscape Architect)
Owner:	Troy Anromaitil, Bucci Garden Homes Limited
Staff:	Grace Jiang

---

### **EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/0)**

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, started by noted that this is a DP project following a council-approved rezoning. It is going to DPB for approval.

The site is located at the northeast corner of Garden Drive and E 10th Ave and half block away from Nanaimo St and Broadway. The site is generally flat with a frontage of 165 feet on Garden Drive and 132 feet on E 10th Ave.

The area to the east and north of the site can be rezoned to 6-storey mixed use building under Grandview Woodland community plan. The sites to the south have been pre-zoned to RM-11 in a form of 4-storey apartment building. The area to the west across Garden Drive is zoned RM-8 for 3 storey townhouse development. The area to the southwest is a duplex zone of RT-5.

The DP application is for a 6-storey residential building with a density of 2.65. The proposed height and density comply with technical requirement set out in the CD-1 bylaw. The proposal continuous an "H" shape building which is in keeping with rezoning application. The development includes 68 strata units and 85 parking over a 2 levels of underground parkade. The residential entrance is on the Garden Drive and parkade access is from the lane. Amenity room is located at ground floor connecting an outdoor amenity space in the rear yard. A second outdoor amenity space is on the roof deck of 4th floor.

At rezoning public hearing, the public raised strong concerns to the building height and the impact to the existing low density residential area to the south and west. Council approved the 6-storey building form in principle with a rezoning condition to reduce the appearance of the upper two floors and shift upper massing toward the north and east side. The DP application is required to address the council's comment and will be reviewed and approved by DPB. The public will have opportunity to attend and speak at the DPB meeting.

At previous UDP for rezoning application, the proposal was strongly supported by the Panel. There were two consensus concerns including building interface with north property line

---

particular the balconies within side yard area and the size of the overhang above balcony. Also, some members found the framed balconies and overhang added to the bulk of the building while other members liked the balcony expression.

The applicant has made the following major changes to address council and UDP's comments and rezoning conditions, including:

- Significantly shifting the massing of upper two storeys to the north and northeast ends aligning with the floors below. Consequently, it forms a 6-storey interface on the north side and a large setback on the south side.
- Deleting big glazing pop-up massing at the roof edges;
- Removing wrap-corner balconies and supporting columns;
- Removing two balconies out of the north interior side yard;
- Recessing the parkade to support substantial landscaping in the side yard

Staffs also noted that the design of balconies in DP application is varies from rezoning application in terms of the location and size. Some balconies are increased in depth which appears very deep.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Does the revised scheme provide appropriate response to council's comment and rezoning condition with regard to the reduction of apparent massing of upper two floors? And does the shifted massing on the north and northeast ends create an appropriate relationship to the adjacent future developments to the north and east?
2. Has the application addressed the Panel's previous comments including:
  - the size and location of the balconies to the north side setbacks; and
  - the size of overhang above the balconies.
3. Please comment on the overall building design, in terms of contextual fit, quality of materials and details, with particular consideration to the balcony design in terms of the perceived bulk and daylight impact to the unit.
4. Please comment on the public realm interface and quality of amenity space.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant began by noting that this project has been amended to shift the building to the north and the east and was approved by council. The project was amended from 6 units to 3 units on the north side. The building height was reduced by 4 feet to provide a better view cone.

There has been drastic improvement towards the landscape design since last UDP meeting. A children's play area was added. There are charcoal stepping pavers connected to the playhouse and more edible plantings around the site. All pavers on the ground are now permeable.

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 Mr. Wen 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 to the choice of material and colour, and quality of detailing.

**Related Commentary:**

There was general support for the project.

Panel members suggest improving the streetscape and provide additional seating area for the neighborhood.

Many panel members suggest weather protect for all the balconies.

Many panel members suggest further emphasis on the main entry to help it stand out.

Many panel members recommend reducing the height of the brick material from four floors to two.

Some panel members found the shifted massing mitigates the impact to the neighbour on the south and west side but makes tight on the north side.

Some panel members suggest simplifying the expression for the lower levels for a more coherent appearance.

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