

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 1, 2021

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: WebEx

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Michael Henderson (Chair)
Clinton Cuddington
Walter Francl
Margot Long
Geoff Lister
Reza Mousakhani
Alyssa Koehn
Jane Vorbrodt

REGRETS:

None

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 508 Drake St and 1317 Richards St
2. 304 E 1st Avenue
3. 650 W 41st Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING Chair, MR. HENDERSON, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. Address:	508 Drake Street & 1317 Richards Street
Permit No.	DP-2021-00569
	To develop a new 41-storey mixed-use building containing a place of worship and 193 secured social rental housing units all over five levels of underground parking consisting of 53 vehicle spaces and 156 bicycle spaces with vehicular access from the lane. The proposed building height is 125.2 m (411 ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 13.81. This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Policies.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status	Complete Development Application (SHORT)
Review:	Second
Architect:	DA Architects + Planners
Delegation:	Al Johnson, DA Architects + Planners Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk
Staff:	Derek Robinson, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (8/0)

Derek Robinson, Development Planner, began by providing an overview of the site and context followed by a brief summary of the proposal, noting this is a social housing project proceeding under the City's expedited SHORT program.

A brief summary of the previous UDP review during the rezoning phase was provided followed by a description of the key design development updates since rezoning, including materiality, architectural expression, the west building interface, unit livability and the public realm interface.

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

Please comment on the revisions since rezoning and the overall performance of:

- The tower expression, in particular the west elevation and the tower top
- The public realm interface, in particular the building core fronting Drake Street and the entrance experience along Richards Street; and
- The livability of the units, in particular the units located in the triangular tower

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Al Johnson began by presenting the cultural design references for the project.

Jamatkhana includes numerous secular spaces for use by the broader community.

Architectural forms and interior spaces are influenced by geometry and the desire for tranquility, balance and overall sense of stability.

Geometry - the geometric pattern being proposed was felt to be appropriate for the Cultural Religious spaces in the podium

Privacy - varying levels of privacy are required for the numerous spaces that make up the Jamatkhana. Extensive clear glass is used at the lower lobby to provide increased porosity at the public realm, while an overlay of decorative screens provide a degree of privacy important for upper level gathering spaces where required.

Cyan is being used as an accent colour for a grid of spandrel glass squares that form a secondary pattern on all tower facades and is a culturally appropriate colour for this project.

Materiality

A simple restrained palette of materials is being proposed to reflect the architectural program of the Jamatkhana and the residential units above.

High quality durable materials include metal panel wall cladding and soffits, coloured spandrel glass and decorative geometric laser cut metal screens.

Large format porcelain slab “limestone like” panel cladding on the podium serves as a counterpoint to the screen that are suspended above the main lobby.

A pattern of round coloured glass openings in the stairwell wall facing Drake St will provide further animation to the façade when lit at night from within.

Decorative screen

The revised design geometry of the decorative screen was deemed more appropriate in consultation with a specialist on Islamic geometric patterns, while also meeting client objectives in providing various levels of privacy.

The laser cut screen and diagonal braced hollow core aluminum frame at the lower podium levels are pulled away from the glass to facilitate access for cleaning; while the tower screens are a more intimate to provide a level of privacy and sense of security for the corner triangular balconies while adding depth and texture to the tower facades.

Urban Realm at Richards and Drake

The sidewalk width along Richards St has been expanded with 3 built-in benches being added at the terraced planter. A second linear planter has been included between the ramp and the lobby curtain wall glazing to create a more welcoming landscaped green arrival experience. The entry stair has been further broken down into a series of platforms providing areas for informal gathering.

Steel frame canopies with coloured glass define both the Jamatkhana entry on Richards St and the residential lobby on Drake St.

West Façade

The overall architectural expression of the tower has been further simplified to achieve a more cohesive vertical expression on all elevations with a clarity of materials. Repetitive vertical bands of metal panels are broken up by a secondary grid of windows that are punctuated by light, dark and coloured spandrel glass.

A partially recessed balcony has been added to the west facing studio unit while corner balcony sizes have been increased for enhanced livability.

Amenity Spaces

The residents of the building will have access to various proposed institutional amenity spaces located in the lower podium levels of the building. These spaces include the social hall and various meeting multi-purpose rooms. These amenities are in addition to the fitness facility, party room, outdoor play space, garden plots and roof terraces that are for the exclusive use of the residents.

Livability of the suites

- Further defining livability of the suites
- Detailed units plans showing furniture have been provided for all units
- Cooling will be provided in all units
- Corner balconies have been enlarged Juliet balconies added
- Lower podium level units have had balconies added

Peter Kreuk presented on the landscape improvements. He noted the following:

- Lighting added to the walls and building face to increase the level of interest in the evenings.
- Seating added along the Richards St frontage to create some opportunities for socialization.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. LISTER** and seconded by **MR. FRANCL** 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:

1. Improve solar shading of residential suites particularly on the western exposure.
2. Improve legibility of residential entry on Drake St.
3. Design development to the landscape design at the Boulevard.
4. Design development to suite layout and suite mix to improve livability.
5. Consider enhanced accessibility features in all suites.

Panel Commentary

General support from the panel for the overall architectural and urban design as presented in this proposal and the changes from rezoning to DP were for the most part well received and appreciated.

General support and appreciation from most panel members on the tower form and its response to view cones, creating the most out of the geometry that's available.

General support from the panel for the simplicity and refinement of the graphic motifs of the louver.

Some panel members noted concerns around the west exposure of glass and encourage further development of sun shading devices along that exposure.

The panel noted concerns with the core as it emerges from the top of the building. Panel suggested further exploration of the core as it moves through the building.

The panel noted there has been some positive development related to the core in response to the rezoning at the ground level but as it moves through the tower, some panel members noted the challenges it creates within the suite layouts. Panel suggest further review and exploration of the opportunities a revised core might offer to both the suite layouts and how that will resolve at the roof level in terms of public realm.

A panel member noted concern within the landscape authenticity particularly at the boulevard and encouraging some innovative strategies to avoid AstroTurf if possible.

The panel noted several concerns around the livability of the suites in the tower, particularly the tight dimensions and nature of the unit mix and high number of studio units.

Livability of the tower units, particularly the sharp corners at the top results in some strange configurations in terms of the kitchen and the relationship to the dining and living spaces. However, given the restrictions of the building footprint, this difficulty is understood.

Units on the lower floors are well planned and well configured and will serve the residents well.

Panel members encourage more family-oriented units, where possible.

The panel appreciates the accessibility incorporated and encourage further exploration of additional measures that are more comprehensive.

Regarding the tower expression and response to the corridor component, the panel noted the architectural expression creates a strong delineation between podium and tower, which creates interest and works well to break up the complexity of the different programmatic uses of the building.

A Panel member noted the treatment of the core is a lost opportunity for this building. Moving the core east could eliminate the small corner spaces for bathrooms off the east sides of tower units and allow for greater consolidation of the livability of the space on the west side of the building.

A Panel member noted the location of the core is fighting with the unit layouts and livability.

Regarding the public realm, a Panel member noted the premise put forward of trying to create something discreet and minimal to differentiate between the two entrance ways.

Panel supports how landscape and seating is activated on the street.

Panelist noted the precedent of the courthouse with hanging plants that support the minimalism of the building.

Panelist not concerned with the expression of the elevator core as perhaps compared to the initial presentation, particularly the way it comes down to the Drake St frontage and presents itself to the street.

Panelist noted the differentiation of the entry for the public vs private residential entrances, and how the private entry on Drake St is a bit underwhelming, given the scale of this building and the number of residences. This entry could be amplified and raised to give a greater sense of presence on to Drake St.

The building itself and presentation to the south and west does beg for some degree of louver or solar shading to give it some protection from the solar exposure on that façade; otherwise the screening that appears elsewhere on the façade will do a beautiful job both architecturally and in terms of screening fenestration

Panelist noted the minimal artwork for this project. Encourage accommodating art that is inspired from the community.

Panelist appreciate the addition of cooling systems to make units more livable.

Panelist noted the ramp is too inviting, suggest wayfinding, making discreet signage at the bottom of the ramp so people do not go up.

A panel member encouraged the applicant to further explore the accessibility features of the accessible and universal units. The bathrooms are large in scale and are adaptable. Encourage incorporating some of the ideas from the universal design into all units.

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

2. Address:	304 E 1st Avenue
Permit No.	DP-2020-00370
	To develop a 9-storey mixed-use building with a childcare facility, 96 secured market rental units, and commercial use at grade all over one level of underground parking consisting of 32 vehicle spaces and 231 bicycle spaces. The maximum building height is 30.5 m (100.1 ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 4.
Zoning:	IC-3 - Sub-Area A
Application Status	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second
Architect:	MCM Architects
Delegation:	Mark Thompson, MCM Architects
	Ken Larsson, Connect Landscape Architecture
Staff:	Kevin Spaans, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (8/0)

Senior Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, began by reminding the Panel that this is the second evaluation for this proposal being made by the Panel, and that the Panel is expected to generally limit their commentary to the applicants' response to the previous consensus recommendations. He then reminded the Panel of the regulatory framework and the context of the proposed development as being predominantly small-scale mixed-use industrial / commercial with numerous artists' spaces and medium-scale residential with large institutional uses to the east under IC-3 sub-area 'A' (Creative Campus). Existing zoning permits up to 9 storeys and 4.0 FSR, and the three proposed uses, retail, childcare, and market rental housing are all anticipated conditional uses here. Mr. Spaans further noted the importance of the Creative Campus subarea as being a place of industrial workspaces, office space, and residential uses arranged around a high functioning public realm, with the Arts Walk at the rear of the site as a major contributor.

As demonstrated in the *False Creek Flats Urban Design Policies and Guidelines for IC-3*, the Arts Walk is intended to: take advantage of the grade change between First and Second Avenues to create a "dual frontage" including galleries and restaurants; create an "arts corridor" that links from the Innovation Hub to the ECUAD and Great Northern Way Institutional Anchor and; provide infrastructure to support the display of original artworks and support the expansion of the area's street art.

Mr. Spaans then provided an overview of the previously-reviewed application as presented to the Panel on August 19, 2020, and which received a vote of Resubmission Recommended (10/0) with the following conditions:

- a. Design development to the podium and tower expression, materiality, articulation and fit with its neighbour to the east;
- b. Explore increase in building height to improve livability of units and improve access to open sky for the childcare space;
- c. Design development to the legibility of the residential and day care entries;
- d. Design development to access to open sky for the childcare;
- e. Improve activation on all frontages;
- f. Further resolution of the Art Walk design response and contribution;
- g. Design development to the roof deck to increase intensive planting, including a covered area and improve usability; also increase of indoor amenity room and reconsider its location.

Having thoroughly reviewed the updated proposal, Mr. Spaans drew the Panels consideration specifically to conditions a, c, e, and f as being the most critical for the Panels additional feedback. Mr. Spaans then presented

perspective images showing the previous proposal and the current proposal, noting generally how the building differs from the first iteration to the second.

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

Please comment on the applicants' response to each of the consensus recommendations outlined at the time of the first Urban Design Panel on August 19, 2020, with particular attention given to those highlighted in bold below:

- a. **Design development to the podium and tower expression, materiality, articulation and fit with its neighbour to the east;**
- b. Explore increase in building height to improve livability of units and improve access to open sky for the childcare space;
- c. **Design development to the legibility of the residential and day care entries;**
- d. Design development to access to open sky for the childcare;
- e. **Improve activation on all frontages;**
- f. **Further resolution of the Art Walk design response and contribution;**
- g. Design development to the roof deck to increase intensive planting, including a covered area and improve usability; also increase of indoor amenity room and reconsider its location.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The project architect, Mark Thompson, began the applicant presentation by noting that the site is bounded by Scotia St and E 1st Avenue, and is between two future Skytrain stations: to the east is the Great Northern Way station, and to the northwest is Main Street station.

In order to provide an enhanced level of activity at the lane, the applicant is proposing artwork at the lane elevation and activating the lane with lane-oriented leasable artist and / or retail spaces. Mr. Thompson noted that the significant slope from the lane toward E 1st Ave is a challenge to the objective for active frontages on all sides, but that measures have been taken to ensure that these areas are as activated as possible.

Mr. Thompson noted that the project responds significantly to the priorities of the *False Creek Area Plan* including: supporting families, providing a diversity of livability, enhancing the public realm and contributing to the creative vibrancy of the area.

The applicant then provided an overview of the current proposal with specific focus on how it varies from the original proposal, and responds to the consensus recommendations from the Panel review on August 19, 2020. The industrial metallic expression and materiality, and the program of the podium remains much the same between iterations. Above, however, the tower was made more compact to respond to tower separation requirements, and other massing changes were made to provide for more cohesive articulation of the residential portion of the building. Balconies were also added, providing further modulation to the façades.

As the tower floorplate was reduced and shifted to comply with tower separation requirements, the previously covered outdoor play area outside of the childcare facility is not predominantly open to the sky except for those areas directly adjacent the building face. Entry locations have also been revised to provide them more prominence, with building massing further emphasizing their locations. Activating all of the frontages is achieved by relocating parking and loading infrastructure, with retail units, artists' studios, and building entries providing enhances levels of activation of the public realm. The applicant further explained that they are currently working with an artist to determine the proper locating and design of murals within the public realm.

The architectural expression of the building was revised to more closely reflect the industrial heritage of the site, with an architectural grid wrapping the podium with a simple-form tower set on top up to the allowable height

of mass timber construction. Terracing on the east side responds to tower separation requirements and provides the opportunity for outdoor space linked directly to the indoor amenity space.

The applicant then outlined the proposed sustainability strategy, noting that energy utilization is provided at very high-performance standard, the building envelope is designed to high efficiency, and there is a low window to wall ratio proposed.

Ken Larson, the project Landscape Architect, then presented the modified site and landscape design, as follows:

At E 1st Ave, the bikeway allows for a wider pedestrian sidewalk, enhanced seating, and landscape strategies to enhance lobby entrances and activating retail entrances. At the second level, the outdoor childcare play area is designed in playful modules, drawing off of Lego block patterns that clearly defines this area as separate from other outdoor amenity areas for building residences.

Common residential amenity areas at levels 7 and 8 have a simple program but with a variety of flexible spaces to provide a hub for residents to connect and engage with their neighbours.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. LONG** and seconded by **MR. LISTER** 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:

1. Consider strategies to improve the connectivity of the artist spaces from Scotia St to the lane.
2. Design development to all roof areas with particular attention given to providing a high quality, varied experience for children of different ages and abilities at the outdoor daycare space.
3. Consider increasing visual and physical permeability through the structural frame at grade to provide covered spaces and pathways.
4. Consider opportunities to link the common amenities to the Artist program.
5. Consider more 2 and 3 bedroom dwelling units to provide more housing for families, taking advantage of the proposed childcare facility on the site.

Panel Commentary

The Panel expressed general support for the revisions shown, particularly noting the improved architectural expression and much clearer interface with the neighboring context.

Panelists suggested further development of the public realm particularly at the lane where structural elements appear to impeded pedestrian flows. The Panel supported the strategies to activate the west side of the site and at Scotia St, but noted that additional moves could be made to improve their performance.

The Panel encouraged strategies to provide for passive solar shading for the residential units, and suggested that mechanical cooling be provided for the childcare facility as a part of the base building.

Panelist expressed support and appreciation for the attention given to increasing the amount of sunlight access afforded the childcare facility.

There was general support from panel on the legibility of residential and daycare entrances.

Panelists noted that further design development of the common outdoor amenity spaces is needed to improve their usability and performance, and suggested that more consideration be given to providing facilities that children of all ages and abilities can use.

The Panel suggested that the corten steel was a good addition to the material palette as it refers to the industrial character of the context but may be simplified in its application.

Panelists encouraged more family-sized units in the building.

Panel members encouraged providing large operable windows for the artist studios so that artists can be seen displaying and doing their artwork as people walk by. Panelists further recommended adding small patios in front of the artists space to encourage engagement in the public realm at all times.

Panelists noted support of the design moves intended to improve the activation of the Arts Walk, but suggested that some of the artist programming could be moved from the lane to the more formal sides of the building to further enhance the artistic nature of the building's program.

Panelists noted that the design of the outdoor children's' play area appeared sparsely finished and should be reconsidered through design development.

Panelists suggested that the developer should consider other options to identify an artist for the public art pieces on the site rather than direct-sourcing.

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

3. Address:	650 W 41st Avenue (Oakridge DP-6)
Permit No.	DP-2021-00512
	To develop a 28-story residential building containing 171 dwelling units on a 5-storey podium containing retail & office use, all over three levels of underground parking consisting of 556 vehicle parking spaces. Level 2 & 3 rooftops (over retail) are fully landscaped as a public park that includes public event space, a dog run and a walking/ running loop. Proposed height is 103.11 m (338.29 ft.). The floor area is 50,627.71 sq. m (544,952.15 sq. ft.).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status	Complete Development Application
Review:	Tenth
Architect:	Henriquez Partners Architects
Delegation:	Rui Nunes, Henriquez Partners Architects Chris Phillips, PFS Studio
Staff:	Carl Stanford, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (6/2)

Introduction:

Development planner Carl Stanford noted that this proposal seeks to develop a 32 story tower containing 171 market strata dwelling units on a 5 storey podium containing retail & office use, all over 3 storeys of underground parking with attendant landscaped public spaces. This development permit is a portion of a larger site wide development and is the sixth of nine (or more) development permits for phase one of a multi-phase, multi-building large development at the Oakridge Mall site. It (DP-6) forms one of the central inner portions of the proposed Oakridge scheme facing onto and including in its cope two important landscaped public spaces known as the 'Upper Green' and 'the Commons' all comprising that development.

Site & Context:

The site is located at the crossing of West 41st Avenue / Cambie Street and is situated in the Oakridge neighbourhood, which is predominantly comprised of single family residences. There are however, significant commercial and office buildings surrounding the site along Cambie Street and West 41st Avenue and the surrounding neighbourhood zoning has recently been updated in the Cambie Corridor Plan, which increases the density at this major transit node. A number of strata multi-residential units are located on both the west and south perimeters. The site is 11.4 ha (28.3 acres) and currently has approximately 57,500 m² (619,000 ft²) of retail, service, and office use. The existing structure is surrounded by uncovered parking. The main entrance to Oakridge Centre shares the northeast corner with the Canada Line Station which connects the downtown core to the airport. It is flanked by two towers that accommodate office and residential units.

In order for the mall to maintain operations during construction, the Oakridge project is proposed to be built in two phases. Phase 1 will consist of the northwest and southeast edges of the site and Phase 2 will consist of the centre and southwest portion of the site. Following PDP approval, five development permit applications have been submitted with the current application being the sixth submission within the first phase of the Oakridge development:

There is approximately 15to18 storeys projected future build context surrounding the Oakridge site. The project seeks to re-establish links to the surrounding areas with programming comprising mixed use, affordable / rental housing, and office space. There is a planned reinvigoration of the transit plaza to announce the main entrance to the proposal. The proposed high street is intended to be a re-birth of the open air mall of the 1960s and the park is intended to be a draped park.

Applicable Policy:

The Governing policy for the site includes the CD-1 (1) By-law (Oakridge), Oakridge Design Guidelines, Conditions of the Preliminary Development Permit, Cambie Corridor Plan (2011), and Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Public Realm Plan. The City of Vancouver has also prepared Oakridge Design Guidelines for the streetscape treatments of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street (& Choy Yuan Crescent). These guidelines include the delineation of pedestrian /bicycle circulation, paving materials treatments, the location of street trees and general guidance on public realm.

Oakridge is designated as a Municipal Town Centre in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy and a unique site in the Cambie Corridor Plan. It is the only one located within Vancouver outside of downtown core. Municipal Town Centres are intended to be among the region's primary focal points in terms of concentration of residential density, job space, civic/cultural facilities, and transit service. The project is broadly in lines with the requirements of all the above with no major issues related to height, density or guideline variance subject of course to a more detailed review during the development permit process.

Rezoning & PDP Process Summary:

Oakridge went through the rezoning process in 2014, and after further design development, changes to the overall form of development were reviewed by the Urban Design Panel, and approved by the DPB through the preliminary development permit (PDP) process in 2018. The current design represents a natural evolution of the design approved by Council in 2014 resulting in stronger urban connections and more vibrant active public spaces. The improved proposal went through a comprehensive public consultation process consisting of two open houses, two UDPs, and intensive review with City staff. The rooftop park was also reviewed and approved by the Park Board. It is now the development permit stage of the process:

- The first development permit application DP-2018-00633, comprising Buildings 3 & 4 was reviewed by the panel and approved by the DP Board on October 29, 2018.

- The second development permit application DP-2018-01149, comprising Buildings 6, 7, & 8 was reviewed by the panel and approved by the DP Board on May 13, 2019.
- The third DP application DP-2019-00534 comprising Building 1 & 2, as well as the new street, public plaza, Civic Park, and the grand stair (one of the main entries into the upper level park) was approved by the DP board on November 25, 2019.
- The fourth development permit application DP-2019-00667, on the Oakridge site was approved by the DP board on December 09, 2019 and consisted of the northeast corner of the site, including a portion of the Transit Plaza, the existing Northeast Office, the existing Terraces Building, the Main Mall Entry and a small portion of the interior mall
- The fifth DP application DP-2020-00759 was approved by the DP board on February 22, 2021 and consisted of four-storeys of retail (Food Hall) over three levels of underground parking, with a portion of the future 9-acre Park (Meadow Gardens).
- The sixth DP application proposed today or DP-2021-00512 consists of a 32 story tower containing 171 market strata dwelling units on a 5 storey podium containing retail & office use, all over 3 storeys of underground parking with attendant landscaped public spaces known as the 'Upper Green and 'The Commons'. It is scheduled for DPB review on October 18, 2021

Pedestrian circulation at grade into the site aligns with existing lanes and local pedestrian traffic patterns. A galleria will provide after-hours public access through the mall. This will create direct pedestrian links to the High Street and the surrounding community from the Canada Line station. This galleria will connect with other mall access points to form the main circulation loop for the ground floor of the mall. Access points to the park above provide multiple circulation options including elevator access. Site entrances at the five plazas are extended towards the project centre creating exterior retail streets that transition into the mall interior. Locations within the mall provide vertical access to the park and connect to the meandering paths through the Park. Secondary residential lobbies connect to the park pathway system to provide residents with direct access to the park, 1-km Running Loop and community gardens.

Oakridge features a nine-acre city park that is primarily located above the mall. This multilevel public park blankets the site, covering the roof of the mall and spilling down to grade surrounding the site. The park will include numerous significant public amenities, including, performance spaces, playgrounds and outdoor fitness areas, as well as natural areas including a West Coast Woodland and Pollinator gardens. It will be activated by the surrounding civic, retail, office, food, and residential uses surrounding it. The park will connect to the rest of the site with a pedestrian pathway network and will feature the characteristics of Pacific Northwest landscape. The park is divided into 6 Park Character Zones and this application includes 'The Commons' and the 'Upper Green' zones.

The scope of this application encompasses these important public spaces within the site. 'The Commons' is the central public space of the Oakridge site and contains an event plaza and performance stage flanked by a grand stairs that sweeps down from the "Upper Greens" and building 12. The food hall & retail spaces adjoin the event plaza. It is a central public outdoor hub in the site. 'The Commons' is one of the most active Park Character Zones, and has the most intensive interface including mall uses (retail, dining etc.), an outdoor stage for large performances, interactive water features, portions of the 800m running loop, parkour area, fitness area and other spaces. The 'Upper Green' is a large, lush open space for more passive recreation and public gathering, set against a backdrop of large trees. It includes a covered pavilion and an off-leash dog area

The tower is lifted above the public spaces and landscape at grade and at the rooftop Park, seeking to provide privacy while opening up views to the Park and activity below. The palette of exterior materials consists primarily of metal panels, wood, and a mix of capless curtain wall and structural glazing. A series of terraced, articulated balconies are stacked up on the east and west facades with metal planters carrying the park landscape up the tower. The podium is clad with bands of metal panel. The residential levels continue this warm palette, with the slab edges articulated with same metal panel and wood texture planks on the top and bottom surfaces of the balconies.

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

- Please comment on the architectural expression, and material treatment of the building with particular consideration for:
 - a) Does the proposal adequately demonstrate a satisfyingly executed cohesive aesthetic concept with architectural expression and visual variety appropriate to its prominence?
 - b) Does the proposal demonstrate sufficient civic considerations, exhibited through a considered use of scale, massing, materiality and detail particularly in its podium and the transition from the tower to the podium?
- Please comment on the success of the public realm interface with consideration for:
 - a) Is the at grade interface of the buildings sufficiently activated with provision for a lively public realm?
 - b) Does the proposal make sufficient allowance for effective integration and interaction with the important public spaces of 'The Commons' and the 'Upper Green'?
 - c) Is the execution of the performance space and its integration with the surrounding spaces satisfactorily achieved?

To summarize we are looking for commentary on the success of the architectural expression of the building, its transition to the podium, the public spaces proposed, and the success of the civic interface between the two.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Rui Nunes, Henriquez Partners Architects began by presenting the architectural expression. The following were noted:

The performance space was designed such that the stage can be plug and play for performer. The Green room is beneath the stairs, greenspace is there and there is seating along the edge. During the day it can be used for other activities such as yoga, tai chi as a covered area allowing people to observe.

The food hall and restaurant are fully operable, table and dining can spill out into the space and overlook the common space.

There are two skylights on the commons level, which brings light into the mall as well as provide view from up the mall, to the planting and the landscaping.

On the sides with the most impact on shadowing, the balconies are recessed having that reduction and shadowing. Applicant noted, this will improve the public realm and lessen shadowing on the park, which is an importation contribution to the public realm.

Presented on the tower expression.

Building 12 integrates elements of the park of the facades through the generous, alternating balconies. Along the east west facades The interior spaces open up to the balconies to large sliders with wood texture flooring, extending the interior floor finish to the outside, blurring the boundaries between inside and outside. The other balconies on the sides are first recessed in shadow and alternating every three or four floors are planters changing location to provide the visual interest and to create privacy screens between adjacent units.

The family room on high street is the major entry from the north end of the high street into the mall. This location is also a major vertical circulation node with the park elevators, exterior escalators that link the high street up to the park as well as well as escalators connecting down into the parkade.

At the parkade level there's three levels of parking the lowest levels for the residential public parking levels are P1 and P2, creating an opening downward to a landscaped area on P2. It will bring light and assist with wayfinding and visual interest out in the park, drawing people to this point and then taking them up to the high street of the mall up to the park.

Chris Phillips, PFS Studios then presented the plan for the activity zones. The following was noted:

The Commons is intended to be the focus for the social and recreational activity in the park. It has the dining area that opens out south facing side overlooking at two floors. In addition, it has the performance stage.

The Green room will have all the infrastructure to support a plug in play. Applicant working with a Cultural Consultant and Park Board to ensure the stage functions extremely well.

The large Plaza has room for about 1800 people to gather.

When the stage is not in use, the intent is the floor will turn into a water feature where a water show will come out of the floor. A series of seating and game tables occupy the space to make sure it's animated when there's no performances or shows going on.

There is a fitness area next to the running track and there will be large lawn for people to play sports.

The pavilion serves as a place for various sort of sports and recreation, shelter, and could function as a larger venue for a second stage.

The large lawn areas and open lawn, which is intended to be flexible, open space with walkways and seating along the edges.

The dog park uses artificial turf with are enclosed and fenced with a double gate and all the amenities

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. FRANCL** and seconded by **MR. LISTER** 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:

1. Design development to address the inclusivity and accessibility concerns as noted in the meeting minute's record.
2. Design development to consider further appropriate technical details around the park and the landscape detailing as noted in the meeting minutes record.
3. Design development required to the glazed façades, in particular the balcony edges, and details of the building with further refinement of the high street and residential entrance.

Panel Commentary

The Panel supports the overall direction of project.

The Panel raised concerns on the physical and social accessibility within the park and how inclusivity can and will be fostered, grown and controlled. Panel members noted it is important for park to feel like a public, open space. A Panel member noted the plantings and trees going up the building needs to be resolved.

One panel member noted the importance of the performance venue and 'The Commons' park space was to this area.

There was mixed support from Panel on whether the formal architecture should be aligned with the existing approved buildings or whether the building has a bit more unique instance within the park.

The Panel appreciates the high quality design work that is represented. Some panel members noted the challenge of understanding the narrower scope of a single development permit on such a complex site. A clearer and more thorough depiction is crucial for a more complete understanding of the project.

A Panel member noted concerns with the running path crossing to get to the retail and how it has a very defined circulation. It is one of the major crossing points so a visual identification of where a marked crossing might be could help make sure the public space is really accessible to those with vision or mobility concerns so they can cross to get to that retail or maybe something that narrows a bit more to make that clear where those spots are occurring. General push to ensure there's openness and in particular safety in the central plaza entrance with the escalators so that people feel safe at all hours. Safety in this space is very important.

Most panel members noted that the accessibility, safety and CPTED balance are very important to achieve. They agreed that the considerations for the delineation between public space and running track with crossing points for different users had not been demonstrably considered.

A Panel member noted the importance of performance venues in the city and appreciates that it was integrated into this park.

Some Panel members noted the form and material are well suited at the higher levels.

Some Panel members noted the building edges are well activated and stage is well integrated.

A Panel member noted concerns with raised planters on pavement in the Park, which requires structural soil cells under the pavement, and the landscape should be predominantly at grade and not raised planters. They further noted concern over the extensive hard surface in a park setting. They noted there should be structural soil with landscape at grade so there is a robustness to the proposals park spaces. More green and less hard pavement would be welcome.

A Panel member noted disappointment there was no passive access to the upper areas.

Some Panel members noted that the running track should be more inclusive so everyone can use it. They suggested differentiating materials so that someone using a cane knows they are entering a higher speed zone.

Panel members noted issues on the vertical circulation zones. There should be consistent and clear language throughout the site for seeing into the distance and assist with trip planning i.e. you are in the middle of the park and you can't remember where you parked, you can see in the distance to find direction.

Panel members noted the pathways are very broad and suggested narrowing it down to have a larger green footprint on the public realm, with a little bit more green and a little less hard surface pavement.

Panel members noted the programming and public functioning of the performance space is well handled.

Some panel members noted that the expansion of seating in 'The Commons' park space where there is no defined line can encroach in to public space. The detailing and consideration of the space should more clearly demonstrate an understanding of this issue. They further noted the need to address and fully illustrate an understanding of CPTED issue that may prevail.

One panel member noted that the building lacked cohesion with the rest of the project and the nuances of the conceptual design strategy did not appear clearly articulated. They further indicated that although it is an incredibly exciting project overall, the building in this application has neither sufficient commonality nor difference to be quite successful.

One panel member noted that from the outset in Oakridge there was a goal for nodal entry point buildings and others for landscape buildings that melded with the park and the shift in this buildings articulation doesn't feel a deliberately chosen design strategy in keeping with that framework.

One panel member noted concern that the Cambie Street stairs doesn't appear to have an accompanying elevator as with other stair access points to the park. Evacuation for people with disabilities during a large performance should be clearly delineated.

One panel member felt the proposed variation of programming and performance space was really well handled.

Most panel members felt the announcement of the building was defined poorly and the at-grade interface particularly on the high street could use improvement. The language articulated between different uses and different places should be more clearly distinguished.

Some panel members noted the homogenous planar quality of the main body could be relieved with a use of a kind banding or relief similar to the use of the balconies particularly on the north and south facades. The building needs to be more responsive and lacks the considered expression and conceptual discussion of past development permits for this site. To understand what's driving the architecture of the building. It could be more responsive.

Most panel member felt the continuous glazed facade required additional solar relief and consideration similar to the parametric modeling to optimize shadowing performance should be utilized. The applicant should consider solar performance as a design mechanism to be addressed.

Panel members noted the announcement of the entrance to the building is poorly defined in terms of the entrance of the tower to grade from the high street. Panel members suggest looking for a stronger definition of the entrance to the tower and subsequent towers, which are fronting onto high street.

Concerning the expression of the building, some Panel members appreciates the alternating balcony format presented on the east and west facades of the building.

Panel members recommended further development of the fin expression on the glazed façades of the north and south facades for solar shading and further articulation of the balcony theme that is expressed on the east and west facades.

Panel members noted in previous meetings this tower was proposed to be a unique anchor tower (along with some of the other towers). This tower should have its own character and be more expressive. This was supported by the UDP in the past and Panel member still support this direction. The expression has missed some of the conceptual discussion at previous UDP meetings.

Panel members noted at the south elevation it's primarily glass with some overhangs on the other elevation. It could be more responsive and it seems the applicant has put most energy into modeling a response to a shadow condition only. It seems some of that energy could also go into modeling conditions around solar performance as well.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team noted they appreciate the comments of the panel with regard to the nuance and challenges of the building being different while relating to the rest of the project. The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.