

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Nov 13, 2019

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jim Huffman	
Jennifer Stamp	
Colette Parsons	
Yinjin Wen	excused from items 3 & 4
Helen Avini Besharat	excused from items 3 & 4
Susan Ockwell	
Muneesh Sharma	
Amela Brudar	excused from items 3 & 4
Derek Neale	excused from items 3 & 4
Adrian Rahbar	
Karenn Krangle	

REGRETS: Grant Newfield
Matt Younger

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 650 W 41st Ave (Oakridge DP3a)
2. 2025 E 12th Ave & 2776 Semlin Drive
3. 357-475 W 41st Avenue
4. 325-343 W 41st Avenue

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: 650 W 41st Ave) Oakridge DP3a)
 Permit No. DP-2019-00667
 Description: To develop the site with a new future Mall Entry Corridor with retail uses, a portion of the future 9-acre park, and interior/exterior alterations to the existing office tower and "Terraces" residential building. The maximum geodetic building height is 118.2 m (1,272.3 sq. ft.), with a total floor space ratio (FSR) of 0.20.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Complete Development Application
 Review: Seventh
 Architect: Henriquez Partners Architect
 Delegation: Gregory Henriquez, Architect, HPA
 Rui Nunes, Architect, HPA
 Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS
 Staff: Carl Stanford

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (10/0)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Carl Stanford noted the project went through the rezoning process in 2014, and after further design development, changes to the overall form of development was reviewed by the panel, and approved by the DPB through PDP (Pre-DP) process.

Following PDP approval, the first development permit application DP #1, 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 #2, comprising Buildings 6, 7, & 8 was reviewed by the panel and approved by the DP Board on May 13, 2019. The third DP application which 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) is currently under review and scheduled for DP board on November 25, 2019. This application is the fourth development permit application on the Oakridge site and is scheduled for DP board on December 09, 2019.

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 scope of this DP application includes consists 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.

DP-3a includes a minor portion of the proposed Transit Plaza, which will be subject to a separate development permit application DP-3b to be submitted at a later date. The public realm of DP-3a encompasses the West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street streetscapes and the western portion of the proposed Transit Plaza, located at the corner of West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street. Also included is a small, 0.35-acre piece of the nine-acre city park.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following questions.

1. Please comment on the architectural expression, and material treatment with consideration for:

- a. Does the proposal adequately demonstrate a cohesive functional & aesthetic concept with considerable architectural expression and visual variety?
 - b. Does the proposal demonstrate sufficient civic considerations, exhibited through a considered use of scale, massing, materiality and detail?
2. Please comment on the success of the public realm with consideration for:
- a. Is the at grade interface of the buildings sufficiently activated with provision for a lively public realm?
(Please Note: Consider the number and type of entries at grade, entry locations, canopy depths & canopy soffit design, building use, the amount of glazing at pedestrian level; and the public realm design.)
 - b. Does the proposal make sufficient allowance for greenery and soft landscaping and demonstrate an opportunity to effectively utilize the plaza as a gathering space in inclement weather?
3. Please comment on the accessibility and permeability provision with particular regard to the plaza and park connection:
- a. Does the proposed network of public routes across the site effectively connect public spaces and places?
 - b. Does the proposal provide an accessible public realm with provision for the less abled, ambulant disabled and older demographics?
 - c. Does the proposal adequately utilizes color & pattern as identifiers for enhancing public/user experience?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted that due to sustainability and economic reasons, they have been asked to save the existing structure of the building. The applicant noted they have renovated the existing building and tied it into the streetscape and created a graceful entrance to the park. The applicant noted that an aesthetic entry marker was generated from the seismic wall holding the existing Terraces Building from leaning. Extensive work has been done on the roof of the existing office building to make it more accessible and provide an amenity. The applicant noted there have been some budgetary constraints with the building however still happy with the end product.

The applicant noted in the past the building had big covered structures however this limited sunlight. The atrium and the canopy have been removed as a result. The applicant is looking to find a solution to buffer out noise from traffic and the Canada line station.

The applicant noted the overall goal was to make a clearer definition of the whole site, the mall entry, entryway to the park, and provide more sunlight. The applicant noted accessibility has much improved. The applicant was asked by planning staff to hold back the interior retail line as much as possible to extend the public realm as long as possible as individuals could not get to the park without entering the mall. There is a public right away from the mall through the side and to the high-street. There is an overhang added to the edge of the building on both sides, which contributes to the wayfinding to the park. There is a row of trees at the entrance to the park. An anticipated issue with the park is during events to ensure there is enough width entering the park to avoid unwanted traffic. As a result the stairs are very wide.

The plaza is still under development, the key objectives include is to be a key easy movement corridor from transit to the mall to the neighbourhood. This site is also an intended informal everyday space and a place to hold events. There is a lot of sun going into to the site. The paving will be different will be series of lights and skylights a fun way to the entry, a special treatment to draw the individual in. Up at the park there is direct access to all the key features of the park.

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. Avini-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 to improve rain protection cover with particular regard to the mall entrance as well as refinement to the office projection over the upper park connector;
 - Design development to the upper level park connector, the interface with the adjoining building and connective point to the park;
 - Design development to the at-grade interface and landscape treatment adjacent the office.
- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported the project. The panel noted that considering the disparate pieces that need to work together the project has been quite successful. The site is unique enough to be distinct from the rest of project but it still ties in well to the overall context.

The panel noted the office renovation was a more calm neutral building compared to the existing building. The added rooftop space shown on the office building renovation is a great amenity which may attract more people to the office space. The renderings are well executed and the copper soffit to the overhang is quite pleasing.

The panel noted that activity on the plaza will be substantially improved when the transit plaza is built. This will also work with seasonal events well. The panel noted that accessibility provision via the elevator system works well. The use of the lights on the ground plain is quite successful especially given that lighting is beneficial to safety & CPTED concerns. Opening up and removing the existing atrium and providing the concourse is good.

The public realm is quite successful with its relationship to transit and landscape design. It opens up to the public and entire neighborhood. The plaza concourse landscaping is effective and provides for an aesthetically pleasing gathering space.

Most panel members noted that on the office building renovation the applicant should continue exploring details at grade and how it interfaces with the public realm along the 41st Avenue frontage. The panel noted some concern with the public realm along 41st Avenue as lacking opportunities for connection to the plaza concourse. It does not look like there is a way through the office building. On 41st Avenue it appears there is a driveway but no walkway, and no public realm. The panel noted the mall plaza could use more weather protection. The entry to the mall would definitely benefit from a canopy and weather protection. It is an unusual omission. The front entrance concourse should provide more information for better wayfinding. The space into the concourse is still tight.

Most panel members noted that due to congestion, there will be challenges with wayfinding, and the applicant should consider how this ties into the public realm/ accessibility with guiding of the less abled on and off the site. Some panel members noted signage with information in regards to the

history of the site or with cultural function rather than just what appears to be advertising would be preferred.

At the top of the platform where the stairs connect to the park there appears to be two blank walls, whose use is unclear. Many of the panel members noted the applicant should look at creating a more usable space, here as this is a connective piece of significant importance. The applicant should consider a planted slope where the stairs are integrated. Some panelists noted a ramp to the park would be nice. The stores underneath the stairs feel like an afterthought and loss of opportunity.

The office lobby identity should be more prominent and integrated into the plaza with the main entrance there. The applicant should consider the future use of the site, and the future modes of transportation. The applicant should consider pick-up and drop-offs locations and the public wait lines in the context of how well this integrates into the site.

Most panel members noted the applicant should consider the challenges of planting during the winter, the sloping of the park connector walkway, and the adverse effect of unintentional salting on planting. Planting adjacent to glazing is challenging to accommodate. The panel noted that the sculptural element and small canopy on the side is neglected and requires development.

Most of the panel members noted that corner the glass on the building is curved and not faceted and this should be retained.

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

2. Address:	2025 E 12th Avenue & 2776 Semlin Drive
Permit No.	RZ-2019-00038
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use residential building with 104 social housing units and religious assembly use at grade, all over one level of underground parking consisting of 43 parking spaces and 224 bicycle spaces. The building height is 19.8 m (64.96 ft.), the floor area is 7,207 sq. m (77,574 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) 2.47. This application is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application (SHORT)
Review:	First
Architect:	SHAPE Architecture
Delegation:	Loretta Kong, Architect, Shape Architecture Jason McDougall, Landscape Architecture, PTA Monte Paulsen, PF Consultant, RDH Building Science
Staff:	Carly Rosenblat & Kevin Spaans

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/4)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Carly Rosenblat, began by noting that this is a rezoning application for a single lot at 2776 Semlin Drive and 2025 East 12th Avenue, located in the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan. It is located approximately 500m south-east from the Commercial Broadway Skytrain station (9 min walk) and approximately 450m (6min walk) to the north of John Hendry Park (Trout Lake).

The site is zoned RS-1 and is a triangular shaped lot with a frontage of approximately 67m (219 ft.) along Semlin Drive and 60m (196 ft.) along East 12th Avenue. The total site area is approximately 2,900 sq. m (31,380 sq. ft.). On the north side of the lot, there is an easement to provide emergency vehicle access for the adjacent Housing Co-op. The site is currently developed as a two-storey church originally constructed in 1962 and the Lakeview Daycare and Montessori child care facility.

There building and property were reviewed by City of Vancouver Heritage Planning staff who determined following extensive review that there is no historical significance to the site. There are currently no residential units on site.

Rezoning potential for the site is guided by the Grandview Woodlands Community Plan. The site is within the Commercial-Broadway Station Precinct sub-area where the Plan provides direction to support development of transit-oriented housing opportunities. Under section 6.7 of the Plan, a six storey apartment building is anticipated. Section 7.1.3 of the Plan allows for consideration for modest increases in height and density (above six storeys, 2.4 FSR) to assist with project viability where new social housing is proposed.

Neighbourhood context is an important consideration, and all projects must consider and respect transitions to surrounding areas and homes. This project meets the city's definition of Social Housing as set out in the Zoning and Development Bylaw. At least 30% of the dwelling units will be occupied by households with incomes below Housing Income Limits set out by the Province; the housing will be owned by a non-profit corporation; and a section 219 covenant will be registered on title. Should the rezoning be approved by Council, a Housing Agreement will secure the units as Social Housing for 60 years or the life of the building, whichever is greater.

The project is part of the City of Vancouver's Social Housing or Rental Housing (SHORT) program, which aims for faster production of affordable housing by reducing development approval times for high impact multi-family housing projects. Projects qualify for the SHORT program based on a

screening process which assesses affordability levels, scale of the project, funding methods, and other factors such as building emissions.

This proposal is to rezone from RS-1 to CD-1 to permit a 6 storey mixed-use building with 104 social housing units and a church space at grade. It proposes a density of 2.47 FSR and a height of 19.8m (65ft.), and includes one level of underground parking, access from an easement on the north side of the property. The applicant is proposing to attain a Passive House certification, ensuring reduce energy use (and associated energy costs)

Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, began by noting that the subject site is located adjacent a mix of up to four storey single family and multi-family development zoned RM-4N to the west, predominantly two storey single family houses zoned RM-11N to the south, and an up-to four storey multi-family co-op zoned CD-1 to the north. A single storey automotive repair shop zoned CD-1 and a gas station zoned C-1 are located further east. Mr. Spaans noted that the model inaccurately indicated the extent of the co-op housing which extends further east toward Lakewood Dr than was shown, and that a heavy bosque of mature trees at the southeast corner hadn't been included in the model. Mature trees extend along the length of the north property line terminating at the approximate location of the co-op playground;

The L-shaped six storey building proposed is generally expressed along E 12th Ave with a five storey street wall, with a 6ft step back at the uppermost level. This expression extends around the corner of E 12th Ave and Semlin Dr approximately 3/4 of the way down the west frontage, where an additional step back is proposed above the third level along with a shoulder setback at the westernmost side of the frontage. A children's play area and common outdoor amenity is provided at this location. No shoulder setbacks are proposed at the east side of the building, with the result being an increase in the shadowing of the adjacent co-op. At the rear of the site, the building is set back between approximately 25ft and 65ft from the rear property line, and no upper level setbacks are provided at the rear. The resultant shadow impacts are generally concentrated to within the property itself. Balconies and Juliette balconies are expressed across all facades as extruded apertures.

Uses at grade are split into residential fronting Semlin Dr, and church use oriented toward E 12th Ave. The intent of orienting the church toward E 12th Ave is to afford this use a significant formal presence on the primary adjacent thoroughfare, and to present an active frontage. In the proposal, the church is delineated from the rest of the building mass by way of suggested material change, additional glazing, and vertical fin or mullion cap extrusion elements. The entrance to the church is located at a chamfer that cuts underneath the primary mass of the building at the southwestern most corner. A similar chamfer is expressed at the northeast corner, as well. The mass of the church generally shares the same vertical plane as the remainder of the building form;

The main residential entrance is located off of Semlin Dr by way of shared lobby, providing access for residents and a secondary point of entry and exit for the church program. At-grade residential units are oriented toward Semlin Dr, north of the residential entrance. Private patio spaces and hardscaped welcome mat areas are provided depending on the adjacent use along Semlin Dr and at the corner. Landscaping along W 12th Ave is generally comprised of softscaped areas extending into the statutory right of way from the 3' setback. The rear courtyard includes a walkway aligning with a secondary point of entrance / exit from the church, private patios adjacent at-grade dwelling units, a common patio area, and the aforementioned parkade access ramp. A Class B loading area is provided off of the easement adjacent a softscaped plating area. Two mature trees are being retained at the east side of the building adjacent the parkade ramp and two are retained at the northwest corner of the site.

The applicant is pursuing Passive House certification for this project. Mr. Spaans called on the application to expand on their sustainability measures, but noted the provision of sun shading devices on exterior windows, a reduction in jogs in the façade to reduce surface area, provision of balcony screening to provide additional solar shading, wood construction, and other measures.

Advice from the Panel was sought on the following:

1. The overall height, massing, and architectural character of the proposal with particular regard given to:
 - a. contextual fit;
 - b. the perceived and material impacts of the proposed massing on the adjacent co-op site, including additional shadowing, and;
 - c. the expression of the church as a distinct but integral building element;
2. The performance of the landscape design, with particular consideration given to the performance of the common and private outdoor spaces at the north side of the property;
3. The provision of design measures

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted their social housing objective is to maximize the amounts of housing units while creating a distinct identity for the church.

The overall intent of the building massing is to address the scale differentiation between the building and its context, as the site is in a residential area and be respectful to adjacent properties.

The building is designed as an L shape to create a courtyard buffer between the building and the co-op to the north.

The church is situated on East 12th Ave to increase the public exposure/identity of the church.

Shadow studies were completed and found the massing reduces impact of shadowing on adjacent properties.

The applicant noted they are aware some sides of the building have reduced solar access and looking to improve the landscape design in these areas.

Due to the setback there was increased opportunity for landscape fronting Semlin Dr.

The applicant noted they are trying to reduce the amount of articulation as much as possible and use the Passive House solar and shading devices to provide for additional modulation and expression in the façade.

The original church building's distinctive form is architecturally referenced in the design of the soffit.

Regarding passive house features, the applicant noted are trying to ensure a high-performing building massing, the percentage of openings has been carefully considered, and the intent is to come up with the best module to increase efficiency.

The Landscape design responds to the building as much as possible, with soft planting being provided along E12th Ave to provide for additional articulation at grade. The streetscape along E 12th Ave is quite busy therefore the applicant is looking to implement a boulevard to get pedestrians away from the curb as much as possible.

Moving to the corner of Semlin Dr and E 12th Ave, the idea is define the entry with a paved plaza area. The residential portion of the building includes small buffered planting and patios. At the courtyard, the intent is to make up for the lower level of direct access to sunlight and provide an intentional space for the church to look out on to. Walk-out patios are provided with small hedges for at-grade residential units oriented to the courtyard.

The applicant noted they are looking to relocate some amenity play on level 4 area and greening up the level 6 amenity space.

The applicant notes that the project balances the need for affordability, the church, and Passive House design strategies. The walls are intentionally kept plain as a means to reduce cost and the project has been designed to minimize additional setbacks beyond those needed to sympathetically integrate the building with the context, and to respond to City of Vancouver requests. Large glazed areas are intended to be high-performing triple glazed windows.

The applicant noted that there are challenges to implement a high performing mechanical in a small space, especially with height limitations posed by a view cone.

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

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project as a rezoning with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design Development of the church expression and entries;
- Design Development of the ceiling in the church sanctuary;
- Design Development rear courtyard and interface with the parkade ramp;
- Design Development of the below-grade ground level units on Semlin Dr to improve livability;
- Design Development of the residential floor plans throughout the proposal to improve livability.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel generally supported the project.

The Panel noted the project is off to a great start for a rezoning however further design development is needed.

The Panel liked the renderings and the massing at Semlin Dr, and noted that stepping in the building form breaks up the apparent mass of the building significantly.

Panel members appreciated a level of restraint with regard to articulation of the massing, and felt that the height and density are appropriate for the location.

The panel noted the fit, impact, and contextual fit is sensitive to the current buildings to the north and appears to anticipate the future form of development in the neighbourhood. While this is a rezoning application, which does not review material palette, the Panel commended the applicant on the preliminary materiality presented.

The Panel commended the applicant for pursuing Passive House.

The Panel expressed significant concerns about the expression of the church as a distinct element. Some Panelists felt that this is where the architectural expression of the project starts to fall apart. Panelists felt that the church is a prominent building and use with a strong identity in the community, and the project as presented diminishes this completely. The panel felt that the applicant exercised too much restraint with regard to the expression of the church. Some panelists felt that it is difficult to find the residential entry and the entry to the church as neither one has a unique identity. Panelists felt that the applicant should bring back elements of the church.

Some panelists noted the ceiling in the church space presently appears awkward and unusual, with the corridor above penetrating the volume of the sanctuary.

A panelist noted spaces of worship should have powerful green spaces.

The Panel noted the loss of childcare amenity was a disappointment as the connection of a church with childcare is often a positive one.

The Panel noted the architectural expression has the potential to be successful and different.

A panelist noted the step back at the sixth floor will not contribute to Passive House performance, and requested that City staff consider whether or not a step back at the sixth level is needed on E 12th Ave.

A panelist suggested that the applicant should consider how the north façade will look from the adjacent property, noting a lack of articulation when compared to other façades.

3.	Address:	357-475 W 41 st Avenue
	Permit No.	RZ-2019-00058
	Description:	To develop a 22-storey and 14-storey mixed use building with 416 rental units and commercial space at grade; all over three levels of underground parking consisting of 377 parking spaces and 794 bicycle spaces. The building height of the West building is 75.7 m (248.4 ft.) and the East building is 48.4 m (158.7 ft.), the floor area is 27,900.6 sq. m (300,320 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.12. This application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
	Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	IBI Group
	Staff:	Karen Wong & Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning planner, Karen Wong, noted the city received two separate rezoning applications at 375-475 W 41st & 325-343 W 41st. The First application at 357-475 W 41st is referred to Area 'B' in the Cambie Corridor Plan, the west site, located near the NW corner of Cambie St & W 41 Ave. There is an 8-lot consolidation with a site area of approximately 49,000 sq. ft.

The second application at 325-343 W 41st referred to Area 'C', the east site, located 1 block east of the NW corner of W 41st Ave & Alberta St. There is a 2-lot consolidation with a site area of approx. 12,000 sq. ft.

The sites are located one block from Oakridge Mall & the transit station, which is the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre (MTC) a regional urban centre intended to serve as an activity hub for job, retail, cultural and public spaces, and a variety of housing options. As a Frequent Transit Development Area, more concentrated growth is anticipated in higher density forms. There are currently SF homes on the subject lots, sites and the surrounding area are zoned RS-1. To the west is a vacant site zoned C-2.

Area B, the west site, proposes a 22-storey & 14-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade, with a total of 416 rental units.

Area C, the east site, proposes a 10-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade and a total of 83 rental units.

The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan. While policy for this area contemplates a base density of 2.5 FSR & up to 6 storeys, additional height & density can be considered with delivery of active commercial at grade & either 100% secured rental or combination of social housing and strata.

The West site considers a 22 storey tower element at west end and 14 storeys fronting Alberta. East site considers 6-10-storeys with choice of use at grade. Both projects meet the intent of the Plan.

Development Planner, Omar Aljebouri began by highlighting the proposal's context in terms of neighboring built form as well as what is anticipated under the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP).

He then noted key features of the project such as the 6-storey podium that stepped back at the upper two floors, parking access at rear, lane-facing residential units, residential access points, and location of outdoor and indoor common amenities. He also highlighted the west lane as a Connector Lane under the Cambie Corridor Public Realm Plan.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Proposed public realm strategy, landscape and lane interface.
2. Materiality and architectural expression, especially with regards to the north building elevation.
3. Any preliminary comments for the project's development during the Development Permit stage.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted that the buildings have two different heights with similar characters. The podiums have a 4 storey setback, this allowed for breaks in the façade, and the applicant noted they created column free blocks along 41st and Alberta Street.

There are townhomes in the back. All sides have pedestrian access; there are pedestrian walkways on the north and west.

There are occurring retail bays and the intent is to have local businesses; this will add life to 41st avenue.

Both towers have a layby outside of the lane, which will have a special paving treatment. There are outdoor and indoor amenities in addition to rooftop amenities with green roofs

The larger building on the west, along 41st avenue has an open flexible urban treatment, lots of landscape, and there is room for a potential bike lane.

There is a residential entry with some planting and seating. There is an off street circulation along all sides of the building.

The townhouses have grade separation.

From the back to the front of the site there is a 6-7ft cross fall, this allows for a high volume space for the retail.

The amenity space is proposing a program of agriculture, there is children's play, outdoor eating and cooking facilities. There are amenity decks with tall planters. There is access to the upper deck on the tall tower, there is an extensive green roof, and there will also be a storm water management system.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Stamp and seconded by Mr. Rahbar and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:
- THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:
 - Design Development of the lane elevation to enhance the residential entries;
 - At the development permit stage have a resolution for the bike lane issue;
 - Design Development to enhance the differentiation of façade along 41st;
 - Design development to the tower overrun to enhance the amenity space.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support for both projects.

The lane for both projects is a good start however loading facilities don't help.

There are elements on the eastern tower (application for 325-343 W 41st Ave, RZ-2019-00057) that made it successful that are lacking in this project.

The landscape has been well handled.

A panelist noted it is challenging to know what the public realm is when engineering is undecided about the cross-section along W 41st Ave.

A panelist noted it is nice to see amenities.

The planter on the terraces and roofs is up against the guard rail, consider leaving as is and pull up the guardrails higher.

Be mindful of the planting under the canopy on west 41st, especially when irrigation is shut off.

A panelist noted CRU's could be developed and opened up a bit more.

The project could benefit from additional weather screening and more community paces with seating, planters and food areas.

The panel noted that the project is quite dense; there is a long frontage with minimal relief. There is relentlessness to the frontage. There is not much character differentiation. Regarding the public realm, the east building (application for 325-343 W 41st Ave, RZ-2019-00057) is more successful, presently feels thin at grade. 41st is a busy street consider how you are going to create that buffer. Consider continuing the double pedestrian walkway to create a buffer. The west tower elevator overrun is very prominent. This can be addressed with a massing exercise. Also, look at adding some greenery on the lane on the north side of the west tower. This will help a lot with impact of elevation. The west tower palette feels very generic.

A comment for planning is considering all the amenities provided there should more three-bedroom units. It is a family area with family amenities.

For the outdoor amenity space in the upper levels, consider the kids place and adults where it is located in relation to the shadowing. Units on the north façade are good. Think about a relief from the entire loading bay.

A panelist noted the ground oriented units should animate the lane. The lane needs to be refined in how the loading takes place in relation to other units. Consider a stair in the interior of the units to make up for the grade change. These units may be quite dark. The lane treatment is quite stark. Units should appear less like the CRU's.

A panelist noted the residential across the lane will be there for a while therefore laneway character needs to be more residential.

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

4. Address: 325-343 W 41st Avenue
 Permit No: RZ-2019-00057
 Description: To develop a 10-storey mixed-use building with 83 rental units and commercial retail space at grade, all over three levels of underground parking consisting of 42 parking spaces and 165 bicycle spaces. The building height is 39.5 m (129.6 ft.), the floor area is 6,230 sq. m (67,059 sq. ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 5.28. The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
- Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: IBI Group
 Staff: Karen Wong & Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning planner, Karen Wong, noted the city received two separate rezoning applications at 375-475 W 41st & 325-343 W 41st. The First application at 357-475 W 41st is referred to Area 'B' in the Cambie Corridor Plan, the west site, located near the NW corner of Cambie St & W 41 Ave. There is an 8-lot consolidation with a site area of approximately 49,000 sq. ft.

The second application at 325-343 W 41st referred to Area 'C', the east site, located 1 block east of the NW corner of W 41st Ave & Alberta St. There is a 2-lot consolidation with a site area of approx. 12,000 sq. ft.

The sites are located one block from Oakridge Mall & the transit station, which is the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre (MTC) a regional urban centre intended to serve as an activity hub for job, retail, cultural and public spaces, and a variety of housing options. As a Frequent Transit Development Area, more concentrated growth is anticipated in higher density forms. There are currently SF homes on the subject lots, sites and the surrounding area are zoned RS-1. To the west is a vacant site zoned C-2.

Area B, the west site, proposes a 22-storey & 14-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade, with a total of 416 rental units.

Area C, the east site, proposes a 10-storey mixed use building with commercial at grade and a total of 83 rental units.

The application is being considered under the Cambie Corridor Plan. While policy for this area contemplates a base density of 2.5 FSR & up to 6 storeys, additional height & density can be considered with delivery of active commercial at grade & either 100% secured rental or combination of social housing and strata.

The West site considers a 22 storey tower element at west end and 14 storeys fronting Alberta. East site considers 6-10-storeys with choice of use at grade. Both projects meet the intent of the Plan.

Development Planner, Omar Aljebouri began by highlighting the proposal's context in terms of neighboring built form as well as what is anticipated under the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP). He then noted key features of the project such as the 4-storey podium, parking access at rear, residential access point, and location of outdoor and indoor common amenities.

Omar concluded the presentation by inviting the Panel to provide commentary with regards to the below, prior to answering any questions and inviting the Applicant Team to present. He also

noted that Staff acknowledge that the CCP is prescriptive in terms of height and density, and thus is not asking the Panel to speak specifically to that.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Proposed public realm strategy, landscape and lane interface.
2. Materiality and architectural expression, especially with regards to the north building elevation.
3. Any preliminary comments for the project's development during the Development Permit stage.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted this is a small site, therefore the parking is accessed from the neighbor, and there is an agreement in place. The projects have their own unique character. The large site is on the west side (application for 357-475 W 41st Ave, RZ-2019-00058).

The buildings have two different heights with similar characters. The podiums have a 4 storey setback, this allowed for breaks in the façade, and the applicant noted they created column free blocks along 41st and Alberta street.

There are occurring retail bays and the intent is to have local businesses, this will add life to 41st avenue.

There are outdoor and indoor amenities in addition to rooftop amenities with green roofs.

. The design has taken consideration of all 4 sides to make an attractive façade; there is a limited footprint and aspiration to step away from neighbor to the side.

Frontages are finished in decorative pavers in front of areas for commercial use. Patios have been setback to allow for outdoor amenity space and seating area. The frontage on 41st developed to animate the street. Alberta St is a more pedestrian residential friendly frontage. There is a very green north and south interaction.

The landscape architect is commercial on the ground plane, tie in the bike lane to the parking development. Double row street trees have been introduced and a plaza in front of the CRU to encourage social interaction.

The lobby entrance is opened up to invite people in. Outdoor seating area is set to encourage neighbors to interact. There is north edge layby drop off zone. An additional buffer of landscaping along the street edge has been added, planting provides an overlook on the eastern edge. There is an amenity space on the roof deck, with children's play area, small community plot area and a bbq area with southern exposure to good light.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Parsons and seconded by Ms. Krangle and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

- THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:
 - Design Development of Alberta and 41st ground level retail to address both streets;
 - Design Development of the lane elevation.
- **Related Commentary**

There was general support for both projects.
The lane treatment is a good start however loading facilities don't help.
There are elements on this tower (relative to application for 325-343 W 41st Ave, RZ-2019-00057) that made it successful that are lacking in the western project.
The landscape has been well handled.
A panelist noted it is nice to see amenities.
The planter on the terraces and roofs is up against the guard rail, consider leaving as is and pull up the guardrails higher. Be mindful of the planting under the canopy on west 41st, especially when irrigation is shut off.
A panelist noted CRU's could be developed and opened up a bit more.
The project could benefit from additional weather screening and more community paces with seating, planters and food areas.

The panel noted there seems to be a lot of design intent, hierarchy with strong base middle and top, the corner at Alberta needs to be addressed more.
The architectural expression and materiality is nice.
The panel noted the ground level public realm CRU at the corner should face both streets.
A panelist noted the CRU at the corner, at grade, would be nice if it had two aspects (wrapping around the corner) and landscape responded to this.
Consider social spaces as a marketing feature. Regarding the public realm think about the intersection where bikes and dogs cross.
A panelist noted due to the bike lane on the east side there is an inbound paver treatment, would be nice to see a paved space around the CRU. The Siamese connection is a little buried.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.