

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 3, 2019

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Colette Parsons (Chair)
Derek Neale
Grant Newfield
Helen Avini Besharat
Jennifer Marshall
Jennifer Stamp
Matt Younger
Yijin Wen

REGRETS: Amela Brudar
Jim Huffman
Muneesh Sharma
Susan Ockwell

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 1290 Hornby Street |
| 2. | 2010 Harrison Street |
| 3. | 2209 - 2249 E Broadway |
| 4. | 2803-2865 W 4th Avenue |
| 5. | 1444 Alberni Street & 740 Nicola Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Ms. Parsons 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: **1290 Hornby Street**
 DE: RZ-2018-00052
 Description: To develop a 35-storey mixed-use building consisting of 159 strata residential units and 978 sq.m. (10,531 sq. ft.) of cultural amenity space on the ground, mezzanine and second levels to be owned by the City of Vancouver, all over six levels of underground parking. The proposed building has a floor area of 16,165 sq. m. (174,000 sq. ft.), a floor space ratio (FSR) of 10.28, and a building height of 106.16 m. (348 ft.).
 Zoning: DD to CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: First
 Architect: Merrick Architecture
 Owner: 1290 Hornby Street Ltd.
 Delegation: Graham Fligg, Merrick Architecture
 Louis Webb, Merrick Architecture
 Jason Horner, Merrick Architecture
 Christephen Cheng, Bunt & Associates Engineering Ltd.
 Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
 Staff: Helen Chan, Rezoning Planner
 Carl Stanford, Development Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with recommendations (4-2)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Helen Chan, began by noting this rezoning application proposes to rezone 1290 Hornby St from Downtown District (DD) to CD-1 to allow for a 35-storey mixed residential building, with 159 strata residential units and 10,531 sq. ft. (978 sq. m) of cultural amenity space

This site is located on the north-east corner of Hornby St and Drake St and comprises of 5 linked legal parcels. Located in the Hornby Slopes neighborhood of Downtown South; in Area "N" of the Downtown OPD. The site area is 14,955 sq. ft. (1,393 sq. m). The frontage on Hornby is 125 ft. (38.1 m) and frontage on Drake is 120 ft. (37 m). This site is currently developed with a three-storeys office.

This project is surrounded by construction or newly constructed buildings on three sides:

- Tate (41-storey) - across the lane (nearing end of construction);
- Burrard Place (52-storey) - across on west side of Hornby (about 1/3 up);
- Salt (31-storey) - across on the south side of Drake (completely recently);
- North side - existing residential towers and Marriott Hotel;
- Pure (15-storey) - 25 feet from the common north property line.

The Downtown ODP's land use regulation and the Downtown South Guidelines, view the Hornby Slopes neighborhood primarily as a residential area with compatible ground level uses, including retail use for corner sites. Current zoning and policy in this area permits a maximum FSR of 5.0 and height of 300 ft.

The application proposal is being considered under the Potential "Benefit Capacity" in Downtown Policy, which accommodates additional floor space in Vancouver's Downtown south to support public benefits through site-specific rezoning, while respecting current view corridor height limits. In response to the Community Amenity Contributions through Rezoning Policy - applicant has offered in-kind CAC on-site:

- 10,531 sq. ft. (978 sq. m) - on the ground, mezzanine and second levels to be owned by the City.

The application is proposing:

- FSR of 10.28;
- Floor area of 173,995 sq. ft. (16,165 sq. m);
- Residential - 163,464 sq. ft. (15,178 sq. m);
- 6 levels of underground parking;
- 105 vehicle stalls ;
- 345 Class A bicycle parking (indoor);
- 12 Class B bicycle parking (outdoor).

Carl Stanford, Development planner, noted that the Downtown ODP's land use regulation and the Downtown South Guidelines view the Hornby Slopes neighborhood primarily as a residential area with compatible ground level uses, including retail use for corner sites. Current zoning and policy in this area permits a maximum FSR of 5.0 and height of 300 ft. The 3.1 Queen Elizabeth view cone also restricts height to 375' in this location. The application proposal is being considered under the Potential "Benefit Capacity" in Downtown Policy, which accommodates additional floor space in Vancouver's Downtown South to support public benefits through site-specific rezoning while respecting current view corridor height limits. The Downtown South Goals and Policies & Downtown Guidelines recommend that the podium street enclosure should match existing building pattern and the proposal is consistent with that intention with a five-storey podium broadly continuing the prevalent street-wall datum-line. The DODP (Hornby Slopes) Area "N" does not have a minimum site size for a tower and this proposal has a relatively small floor plate varying from 4800sf to 3200 sf in the tower. The tower is ~ 60' wide by 80' deep. The required public realm setback is 6' from the property line on Hornby/ Drake St and 10' off the lane. There is a required setback of 40' to the property line to the adjoining neighbor 'Pure' tower. Tower separation of 80' has some shortfalls but is considered resolvable within process.

The application proposes to rezone 1290 Hornby St from Downtown District (DD) to CD-1 to allow for a 35-storey mixed residential building, with 159 strata residential units and 10,531 sq. ft. (978 sq. m) of cultural amenity space all over a six storeys parkade accessed off the lane with an FSR for the proposal of 10.28. The CD-1 sets a maximum height of 348.3' (106.8m) equivalent here to 35 floors. Floorplate varies from ~8600sf at grade to 4800sf to 3200 sf. The residential entrance lobby is located at the corner of Drake St and the Lane, with access to the Cultural Amenity space principally off Hornby St and two secondary entrances off Drake and the lane respectively. The Cultural Amenity Space is double height in volume at grade together with a mezzanine level and occupies another storey at L2 together with a residential amenity space. There is an additional tower amenity room at level 6 with an outdoor deck. Residential use is proposed from levels 3 through 35. The six levels of underground parking accessed off the lane, provide 105 parking spaces, one class B loading space, non-residential parking spaces and approximately 345 bicycle spaces on Levels P2 and P3. 12 class B bicycle spaces and a bicycle lift are proposed at grade off Drake St. The main amenity room and shared outdoor space for the residential is located on Level 6 with an additional amenity room located off level 2. There are different shades, and types of metal cladding proposed for the material treatment of the proposal.

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

1. **Wayfinding, Public Realm Interface & Cultural Amenity Space Functionality:**
 - a. Is the definition and articulation of the entry points for the different at grade uses satisfactorily achieved?
 - b. Is the residential entry appropriate in scale and location for a tower of this size?
 - c. Does the corner exposure of the gallery satisfactorily maximize transparency on the street façade?
 - d. Is the layout of the cultural amenity space sufficiently flexible in its layout to allow a range of uses for long term viability options?
2. **Height & Shadowing:**
 - a. Does the proposal demonstrate the previously contingent negation of the additional heights, substantial impact of sunlight on streets, / private common open spaces (particularly the Burrard Gateway outdoor Amenity), and the visual privacy of those living in nearby towers?
 - b. Does this building maintain the hierarchy & prominence of Burrard Gateway?
3. **Material Selection, Massing and Design:**
 - a. Does the proposal satisfy the distinction for an effective treatment of base, middle and top?
 - b. Is the additional height from 300' to ~348' justified by the sculpting of the form at the upper levels?
 - c. Has further refinement of the form, material treatment and massing particularly on how the building is crowned been satisfactorily demonstrated.
 - d. Has the proposal addressed concerns for a cohesive material treatment appropriate to the above character? Please comment on the detailed design, particularly the architectural expression, and materiality.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The project was committed to evolve a massing that would make it look different and stand out from the other buildings in the area knowing that the project was diminutive compared to the building in the area. This building has a full floor plate of 33 floors.

Due to challenges in separation, the set back to the tower from the north property line had to be 55 feet. This impacted the available space for a tall building form making the typical floor to be about 4,800 gross square feet.

To allow proper light penetration, a parallelogram shape design was developed. The design is emphasized by vertebrae in the expression of the balconies at the corners and the roof forms.

The base of the building provides a continuous expression of an interlocking rectangular form as it forms around the corner. This exposes the various angles of the prow that flows to the ground and comes lower to the podium.

The site consists of bike parking, exciting entry to residential entry and garden, children's play area, urban agriculture plots and outdoor dining area.

The dominant residential entry point is separate and distinct from the main entry of the amenity space which completes the motor court that is across the lane.

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. Newfield 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:

- Simplification and further refinement of the base, middle and top of the building;
- Consideration of the choice of the material palette to ensure the highest quality.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was overall support from the panel with regard to the massing of the proposal but some reservations over the overwrought architectural expression and complexity of the material palette.

With regard to wayfinding most panel members agreed the entries were well handled and appropriately designated. Most panel members agreed the public realm was satisfactory but somewhat staid and required additional development in the detail of its execution to achieve a great ground plane with excellence in materials and form. Some panel members also felt additional details and development of the cultural amenity space would be beneficial.

The public realm should encourage public interaction and gathering, lending significance to the site and be well integrated with the surrounding streets and sidewalks.

Most panel members agreed that the height and shadowing were acceptable. Some panel members had questions on the affordability of the dwelling units given the additional density generated from increase in height from its original iteration.

Panel members noted the overall massing and floorplate were successful but agreed the towers architectural expression was busy and required simplification to reflect the elegant form. Some panel members felt that further refinement at the crown/roof would be beneficial given its interesting form. Some panel members also had concerns on the base of the building being too crowded and confused by the framing. Panel members had concerns regarding the choice of color and material palette. The palette was considered a bit dour for the area and the green color choice was questionable.

Consideration should be given to a refined distinctive treatment of the base, middle and top of the building with a unifying language leveraging a cohesive high quality material palette. Protuberances or changes in material expression should have a functional basis underlined by a rigorous rationale.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

2. Address:	2010 Harrison Drive
DE:	RZ-2018-00066
Description:	To replace the existing seniors care facility building with a 6-storey seniors care facility containing 163 units and develop a separate 5-storey residential building with 52 secured market rental units. The proposed seniors care facility has a floor area of 12,781 sq.m. (128,849 sq.ft.), a floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.31; and a building height of 22.9 m (75 ft.). The proposed residential building has a floor area of 3,958 sq.m (42,603 sq.ft.), a floor space ratio (FSR) of 0.38; and a building height of 16.2 m (53 ft.)
Zoning:	Amendment to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Staff:	Karen Wong, Rezoning Planner Susan Chang, Development Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with recommendations (7-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Helen Chan, began by noting that the site is located at the North East corner of Victoria Dr and SE Marine Dr. Currently on site is a German Canadian Care home which has 134 bed-capacity senior care facilities zoned at CD-1. The site slopes south to SE Marine with a grade difference of over 10m. The total site area is approximately estimated at 105,300 sq. ft.

Surrounding Context:

- North & west - single family zoned RS-1;
- South (across SE Marine Dr) - SFD zoned RS-1B;
- East (Iceland Care home) - 77 seniors supported dwgs;
 - Finnish Canadian Rental Home, 3 parcels to the east, approved at PH in Jan 2019;
 - replaced 3-storey building with 6-storey social housing building (72 seniors affordable rental housing units).

Development planner, Susan Chang, noted that this site measures approximately 440'x250' or 2.42 acres and as a result, rezoning policy for higher sustainability standards apply. Rezoning policy for larger sites requires studies and deliverables on sustainable site design, access to nature, sustainable food systems, green mobility, rainwater management, zero waste planning, affordable housing and low carbon energy supply. As noted, this site is challenged with a steep slope of approximately 10m or 30' from Harrison to Southeast Marine Drive, a 6m SRW (combined sanitary/storm sewer) through the site, bus loop terminus located at Harrison Street frontage, and a 5.5m SRW at SE Marine Dr. Context is RS-1 to the west and uphill across Harrison. To the east are, a 2-4 storey seniors rental and care facilities, with a 5 storey senior social rental building rezoned at 2230 Harrison.

Proposed is a 6 storeys seniors care facility and 5 storeys secured market rental residential building at 1.68 FSR. Existing CD-1 zoning allows .85 FSR and approximately 40' height (1993). Due to the slope and building siting, the proposal as viewed from Harrison is (see section B-B/A4.01) approximately 4 and 3 storeys, equivalent in height to residential roof peaks at the first tier of houses across Harrison. To minimize view impacts to the Fraser River, (see view study/ A0.10) the view study shows view corridors provided, including an increased east side yard allowing a separation of approx. 58' between buildings, variation

in height with lower building at adult daycare and separation between proposed buildings. Additionally both buildings are sunken below grade facing Harrison (see site sections) given the sloping topography. Parking for both buildings are accessed from Victoria (at a lower elevation), with fire access and drop-off at Harrison, (slightly west of the current crossing). Extensive tree retention buffer is provided at the perimeter of SE Marine, at the corner of Victoria and Marine, and along the shared east property line.

Care Facility:

Although height is noted as 6 storeys, the first floor is parking with 5 storeys of the care facility. Given the sloped site condition, the first 2 levels are below Harrison Drive. Entry is located at Harrison from the drop off. Adult daycare area provides an approximate 1,800 sf multi-purpose room on level 3 with covered balcony. Walking loops are provided levels 4 & 5. There are walking loops at grade facing north and south.

Rental Building:

Entry is proposed at Victoria St, with an amenity room beside the lobby and outdoor terrace.

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

1. Is the height and density supportable and in particular view impacts successfully resolved?
2. Please provide comments on the following:
 - a. Quality of the entry sequence for both buildings
 - b. Livability of lower units facing Harrison.
 - c. Quality of outdoor spaces and landscape design.
 - d. Sustainability strategy of the proposal.

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This project is for Vancouver Coastal Health to renew the health care units. These units will have the concept of a house with its independent dining, kitchen and living space. There will be a central kitchen to support the overall meal preparations.

The shape of the building was formed largely by how the trees were placed which shows a strong set of relationships both inside and outside. Almost the full perimeter of existing trees is kept on site.

There are 4 studios, 8 two-bedrooms and 40 one-bedrooms.

The residential building's primary access is from Victoria Drive, but there is a secondary entry into the upper level of the residential building. There are some urban agricultural to provide relief tucked in on the south facing side. Then a neighborhood like interface of layered landscape and plantings along the frontage.

The building provides a great source of public realm. It consists of a neighborhood which has central functions to each of the houses as you go through it.

The common spaces mirrored outside spaces. The relatively small exterior gardens, on all sides of the building, shape the existing trees and the building. They are meant for outdoor rooms flanked by seating, which are fully accessible but relatively interior looking. The rooftops are furnished with exterior spaces at grade seating and there will be a provision of a walking loop. There will be more subtle canopy and provided seating areas and transition with the bus loop which allows animation and for the seniors to come out and observe street activity.

The courtyard serves the Harrison entry for the rental building and the main care facility as a flexible accessible space. The front porch allows everyone to fill out onto the outside spaces.

The southern spaces take advantage of the filtered light from the south through the existing trees and the north takes advantage of some sunlight on the north slope of the transit loop. Heavy landscaping techniques were adopted to provide better sunlight and visual amenity.

There is a 25% window to wall ratio and the windows are high performance enveloped. There is also 80% efficiency on the HRV, centralized domestic hot water, and higher efficiency LED lighting.

Translink bus loop will not be affected.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Marshall and seconded by Mr. Younger 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 articulation to improve the light to the north courtyard;
- Further refinement of the site sustainability strategy;
- Opening up the roof deck to the south on level 4;
- Providing outdoor space on the south east corner;
- **Related Commentary:**
 - The panel members noted support towards the height and density of the project.
 - The site provides a good buffer towards the single family residences in the area.
 - Many members recommended making the houses more of a house/pod form rather than linear form wrapping around the building.
 - Panel members noted the facades of the building should be more expressive for the neighborhood.
 - Some panel members commented that the grade difference may cause potential issue.
 - Panel members noted that the landscape on this site is important.
 - There was concern for the potential shading of the building and should provide more daylight to enter the site.
- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

3. Address:	2209 - 2249 E Broadway
DE:	RZ-2018-00065
Description:	To develop a 6-storey residential building containing 87 strata units; all over two levels of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 5,988.9 sq.m (64,464 sq.ft), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 2.65 and the building height is 19.8 (65 ft.). The application is being considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Taylor Kurtz Architecture + design Delegation: Craig Taylor (Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design) Kelly Riopelle (Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design) Derek DiMartile (Epix Developments) Kristin Defer (Connect Landscape Architecture) David Stoyko (Connect Landscape Architecture)
Staff:	Kent MacDougall, Rezoning Planner Kevin Spaans, Development Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS (7-0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Kent MacDougall, began by noting that the site is a 6-lot assembly, located on the north side of E Broadway between Lakewood Dr. and Garden Dr. It is currently zoned at RS-1 and occupied by single-family houses. All 6 lots face south onto E Broadway and back onto a lane running parallel to E Broadway St. The total site size is 2,260 sq. m. (22,328 sq ft.) with a combined frontage of approximately 60 m (200 ft.) along E Broadway, and a depth of approximately 37 m (122 ft.). This site will be considered under the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan (GWCP) which was adopted by Council in July 2016. The proposed density is 2.65 FSR.

The site is approximately 4 to 5 blocks east of the Commercial-Broadway Skytrain station and a block west of the commercial node at Broadway and Nanaimo. Around the Commercial-Broadway Skytrain station are a grocery store and other services and amenities along Commercial Drive. The site is well serviced by several bus routes. Trout Lake Park is about a 10 minute walk to the south (~800 m) as well as Laura Secord Elementary School is a ½ block west. Along E Broadway at the northeast corner of E Broadway and Lakewood Dr is identified as a "Local-serving retail site." Further along E Broadway heading west, around Semlin Dr, E Broadway is identified for 6-storey apartments with "At-grade commercial" into 10 storeys apartment & office around the Sky Train Station (after the tracks). Adjacent applications are 2542-2570 Garden Dr & 2309-2369 E 10th Avenue (6-storey strata) which has been approved in early 2019 with 68 strata titled residential units and a gross floor area of 5,472 sq. m (58,899 sq. ft.). The building height of 20.1 m (66 ft.) will provide 73 underground parking spaces.

Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, noted that the building is proposed to be a six storey apartment form with a full height street wall along E Broadway. The overall building width of 184'-0" is generally split into two primary frontages divided by an inset 27'-0" wide entrance courtyard.

Setbacks at the fourth and sixth levels at the rear are provided to mitigate shadowing and apparent building mass when viewed from the lane per the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. A required 10'-0" setback is provided above the third level at the West side of the

building. A setback is provided at the northeast corner of the building while the southeast corner continues up the full six storeys, extending into the setback. At the front, there will be an 18'-0" setback anticipated from back of curb with additional 10'-0" front yard but the boulevard narrows and ultimately disappears toward Garden Dr. meaning that the entire front of the secondary mass extends into the setback a distance of between 1'-8" and 3'-4". There is a building footprint setback at the SW corner to provide for the retention of a cluster of existing trees. At-grade residential units face E Broadway and the lane at the rear where a 35'-0" setback provides for large private outdoor spaces. The site has a 6'-0" cross slope from northeast to southwest. At-grade units to the west side of the site are approximately 3'-0", as recommended by staff to provide for a sense of vertical separation for residents, but units to the northeast are approximately 3'-0" below grade.

The residential entry is located at the inset courtyard with a common amenity space with patio immediately to the east. The site will provide 87 units (proposed), with a unit mix of 35% 2+ beds (25% 2 Bedroom and 10% 3 Bedroom). The site will have 95 parking stalls and 109 bicycle stalls. In addition, the applicant is proposing plantings along the E Broadway frontage in front of outdoor patio retaining walls, coupled with space for bicycle racks at the courtyard.

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

1. The Panel is kindly asked to respond to the following questions regarding form, massing, and architectural character:
 - a. Has the applicant sufficiently broken up the East Broadway frontage in order to mitigate the apparent mass of the building?
 - b. Does the Panel support the proposed relaxation to the required 10'-0" front yard setback where the existing curb begins to recede mid-way into the length of the site?
 - c. Does the Panel support the proposed relaxation to the building envelope at the SE corner of the building?
2. Does the proposed landscape and building expression at grade sufficiently contribute to an improved sense of street character and walkability along East Broadway?

• **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

On the Broadway side, the patios were created in a more simple form following the urban expression of what is appropriate for E Broadway.

On the back side, we stepped some landscape up the building while respecting the laneway condition. There is a lot of space to bring in green and upgrade the lane into a more pedestrian and residential side lane standard.

The building is broken into two different parts to create a strong rhythm of verticality, with recesses and projections above the balconies. The E Broadway façade has been broken up to mitigate the length of the building.

The inset provides a strong relief to the length of the building as well providing amenities for the residents and a good sense of entry and a place for socialization.

The west side of the entry creates a separate form to the east side of the entry. This creates a counter point and to contrast and reinforce the rhythm of the west.

The site creates variety by the offset of the deep recess to reinforce the entry as well as the rhythm of the south side of the lane.

The pallet of color adds to the contrast, tone and texture of elements.

The building complies with the new rezoning requirement for sustainability by a series of new wall types and building envelope systems.

The site retains a number of existing trees.

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. Besharat and seconded by Ms. Ockwell 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:

- Refinement to entry plaza (re. location of ramp, amenity space interface, canopy treatment, quality of residential, transparency);
- Further design development of the East façade;
- Further consideration of East facing of the building to be more neighborly;
- Consideration of the 5 ft. relaxation;
- Consideration of moving building back 5ft for landscaping.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support by the Panel, however the Panel noted further design development is needed.

A panelist noted the contextual info is showing the future but not the existing context.

The relaxations were supported however the building appears too imposing. The project is not paying enough attention to the neighborhood. The project overall lacks a residential feel and appears more like an office building.

The Panel members noted the E Broadway frontage is most successful.

The Panel noted that the east block has an unusual rhythm; the west block is more successful.

The Panel felt the east façade feels hard up against the public realm, and recommended that consideration be given to moving the building back 5ft toward the lane to give more breathing room along E Broadway.

The Panel felt that the north side would benefit from further breaking down and modulation of massing. Modulate upper storeys to allow more light on patios was recommended.

The Panel did not support relaxations to the building envelope as proposed and recommended that the southeast corner be further developed.

Panel members found that the lane elevation could use some breaking up as it is reading long and flat as proposed.

The Panel recommended that at-grade units facing the lane should be more family- oriented instead of single bedroom units as shown.

The Panel supported how the lane has been activated with patios providing a valuable and popular space.

Some Panel members felt that the internal circulation is not working as shown. The sequence to get from wet to dry areas is difficult.

The Panel noted that the entrance and inset to lobby could provide more interest. There is opportunity to create visual statement.

A Panel member notes that the rear outdoor amenities are very large for the studio units, unusual to have outdoor space that is of similar size to the units.

As proposed some Panel members noted that the amenity room feels more like a unit, the space is isolated from view and the uses of the area, it appears difficult to add programming, and would be nice if space was opened up and was more aligned with the entry courtyard.

Some Panel members felt that the entry courtyard is not contributing much.

A panelist noted the amenity room could spill onto the lobby space if the location of the ramp got switched. This would also allow for a more usable patio.

Panel members noted some privacy issues at some of the balconies.

The panelists noted that tree retention is great and landscape is well-handled. The Panel suggested that if the building was pushed back there would be more opportunity for landscaping and consideration of the adjacent neighbor.

The Panel recommended that the applicant look for a better strategy to fit the building in the envelope anticipated in the official community plan.

Some Panel members remarked that the sustainability information is lacking and no apparent shading strategies are being employed in the proposal.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

4. Address:	2803-2865 W 4th Avenue
DE:	DP-2018-00210
Description:	To develop a 4-storey mixed-use building, consisting of retail uses at grade and mezzanine level, and residential uses with 67 units from level two to four; all over three levels of underground parking providing 168 parking spaces accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	MCM Partnership
Owner:	Mohammed Esfahani
Delegation:	Peter Odegaard, MCM Partnership
Staff:	Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: SUPPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS (6-0)**• Introduction:**

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Urena, noted that this is a full DP application for a 4 storey mixed-use building with a mezzanine and 2 and a half parking levels on the corner of W 4th Avenue at Macdonald Street. The building frontage is 266ft on W 4th Ave and 106ft at Macdonald Street. The site is currently C-2 zone, similar to others along W4th Ave across this area. There is an existing mixed-use 1-storey building to the west. To the south, there are some 1-storey buildings and another 4-storey development. There is a vacant site with urban agriculture to the east across MacDonald Street. At grade, the residential entries are located both on McDonald Street and on W 4th at the south-west corner. Large retail frontage is accommodated along W 4th Avenue. Accesses to the parking and loading areas are through the lane. The building provides private roof top for units and the only one common amenity space is located at the roof too. The project seeks a relaxation for height of around 4 feet.

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

4. The design guidelines for C-2 state that a relaxation of the 13.8 m portion of the height envelope may be considered up to a maximum of 16.8 m: (i) for sites that are exceptionally large in both depth and width, to achieve benefits such as increased neighbourliness, open space and amenity; does the Panel support the additional height?
5. How successful is the building frontage and expression?
6. Given the proposed frontage and prominent location, has enough been done for public realm?
7. Please comment on the north interface.
 - a. Is the lane interface at-grade (commercial, loading and parking accesses and its relationship to the low-scale development to the north) well handed?
 - b. Does the building massing (setback encroachments) and treatment provide sufficient privacy and liveability for residents?

• Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The design intent set out for the building is to define the W 4th corner of the street wall and transition it gently and thoroughly in a neighborly way to the residences to the north across the lane.

The retail intent is to provide an anchor for commercial and amenity that diversify the retail character of the neighborhood but also incorporates the street scape elements and activation of the public ground that you find in the finer grain retail.

Massing of the building was to utilize the 266 foot long site and breakdown the massing of the west 4th street wall frontage to 3 elements. Above grade, the massing move is a breakpoint on W 4th that corresponds to the London Drug entrances and its main storefront element.

Transitioning to the north the site steps down, we have stepped the top floor of the building back an additional 4 feet beyond the C2 zoning below.

Adjacent to the residential entrance along McDonald street frontage and around the lane, there are blue glaze tile façade with the clear storey windows. This will be the primary residential entrance. Inset portion of the rear exit door and a cast in concrete wall will provide opening to the loading zone. Beyond that is a loading opening for retail and residential uses and then the parkade access. Above the parkade access, there would be another lighter pattern panel material. Along the W 4 façade, by way of flipping units and balconies locations, there is a variety in textures of the façade. The north units are larger.

Starting at the south west corner, the site will have secondary entrance to the residential portion of the building, Both lobbies have a common corridor.

Majority of the store front is occupied on W 4th.

There will be longer linear balconies and communal stairs that access a private rooftop and patio where adjacent units share the same stair to their patios.

For public realm, there is an existing bus stop that will remain on 4th Ave. There is a break in the tree canopy. There is a receding platform adjacent to the North building façade, which provides attention to the green lane at the lane level. This will allow for friendlier neighborhood acknowledgment and more attentive green along the back side of the building. There is 30% vegetative coverage on the roof top level.

There are plans for a public bike share station.

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. Ockwell and seconded by 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:

- Improve the frontage and expression of the building for better contextual fit, through the following;
 - Exploration of modulation of weather protection;
 - Responding to the existing fine-grain components along W. 4th Avenue;

- Further differentiating of residential entries and expansion of the lobbies;
- Improve the interface with the public realm, including consideration for further configuration of the corner plaza to contribute as part of the building expression
- Improve the interface of lane, including modulating and break up the lane building form to be more considerate of neighbors;
- Reconsider the proposed gravel roof for its usability;
- Provide indoor amenity space connected to outdoor space.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported the height relaxation subject to how well the building is performing in other aspects; therefore, the building will need further refinements to fit into the neighborhood.

Some panel members commented that the residential entrances are not prominent enough and could be more elegant. The corner is an important one therefore the building expression should reflect that.

The detailing at the base is not clear; more work around the base is needed. Breaking down the building frontage to establish a finer grain is needed. There is a lot of horizontal on the building, it is relentless. Suggest more modulation and verticality.

Further modulation, articulation and use of beautiful materials are needed at the lane. The treatment at the lane should improve to fit in the neighborhood.

Be aware that the glass canopy and stores are bright there will be lots of reflective lights to residential units above.

Consider smaller CRUs in front of the main store footprint. There should be more activation along W4th (two doors for one long retail frontage is not enough). Look into the possibility of inseting the London drugs store and have a smaller, shallow CRU's fronting the main store behind.

Panel members expressed concern regarding the traffic impact of the new store in this location. Increased traffic make it difficult to get into parking. Traffic studies should be done and reviewed, as the increased traffic in the lane will affect single family homes across the lane.

- **Applicant's Response:** The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

5. Address:	1444 Alberni Street & 740 Nicola Street
DE:	DP-2018-01175
Description:	To develop the site with two residential towers, 43-storey and a 48-storey including a 6-storey podium, containing 129 rental units, 451 strata units and a 56-space child care facility; all over six levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. The proposed floor area is approximately 63,271 sq.m (681,041 sq.ft) and the maximum building height is approximately 134.7 m (442 ft.).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	MCM Partnership
Staff:	Sailen Black, Development Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations (4/3)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Sailen Black, began by noting this is a CD-1 approval in the Downtown District. The site measures 131 ft. x 330 ft. (-43,270 sq. ft.). There are 43 & 48 storeys - 406' & 443' to top of parapet with a 14.48 FSR - 626,500 sq. ft.

There are 314 Market-Strata units, 129 Market-Rental units and a 56-Space Childcare.

This was approved in principle by Council in mid-2018. The applicants have a commitment to achieving Passive House certification.

The West End Community Plan (Georgia Corridor Sub-Area) provided guidance on tower floorplate sizes (6,500 sq. ft.) and use. An average of 6,600 sq. ft. plates through tower to accommodate Passive House features.

UDP consensus items recommended more modulation of tower to better express base, middle and top at the Rezoning submission. The Downtown Guidelines advise on design goals. View Cones policy influenced how some of the height and upper-floors are sculpted. The Taller tower extends 40ft. into the QE View cone, which can be considered. The shorter tower is capped by View Cone 12.1.3.

The General Policy for Higher Buildings sets high expectations including how taller buildings contribute to the City's skyline, and achieves leadership in sustainable design.

The Panel Consensus at the Rezoning-Urban Design Panel was to review the massing and density of the building and encourage more modulation to better express the base, middle and top.

Key changes by the applicant are as follow:

Massing + Skyline

- Intended to address UDP advice;
- Mid-rise shoulders dropped to elongate the middle section;
- Revisions to top floors intended to create more distinct crown;

- Revised detailing throughout include sculptural elements and composition to enhance the sense of verticality;
- Revised details like the arched doorways, keystones, and aluminum framed balconies and bay-windows are intended to add visual interest from the ground-plane; and
- The lower level massing along Broughton Street massing should be improved/ revised to either set the tower back from the podium, or to extend the tower down to grade distinctly from the podium.

Broughton Frontage

- More distinct break of the base from the mid-rise section which was achieved by deeper stepping so as to not make the Broughton façade appear as a single unbroken surface from grade to top;
- Lowering the base's shoulders intended to ground this portion more firmly and offer better visual interest to the street-level public realm; and
- Improve the podium's west elevation and expression facing Nicola.

Nicola Frontage

- Concentrate the amenities spaces and provide more indoor and outdoor and public realm space;
- Revise flow of daycare (drop off and pick up) flow of parking and bike access to be safe and effective; and
- Improve the livability of the units facing the lane.

Livability on Lane and Amenity Connections

- Garden patios added for lane-side units;
- Daycare drop-off intended to bring some movement and life to the lane - note that lane design is to be determined with Engineering; and
- Make the podium more welcoming to the public realm on the street edge.

Townhouse Interface at Alberni

- Transition from sidewalk level to the entry-level is made less stark through revised terracing; and
- Entries are also no more than 2 ft. below grade to ensure the front portions of units can receive better natural light (especially north-facing).

Staff Concerns

- a) Models have some discrepancies compared to drawings - applicant needs to clarify:
 - how grade is depicted; and
 - floor plans show more deeply recessed balconies than large scale model - deeper would help with articulation facing Nicola.
- b) Some units on the podium levels, especially lane-facing, have columns through affecting usability; and
- c) Attention to detail could continue more to the lane-side, especially at the podium levels.

Questions

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

1. Have the revisions to massing and articulation produced:
 - i. a slimmer appearance for the towers,
 - ii. a more distinctive crown that adds to the skyline, and
 - iii. better delineated sections of the building, including the Broughton and Nicola elevations?
2. Do the new sculptural elements and composition:
 - i. complement the massing, especially in terms of accentuating the sense of verticality, and
 - ii. provide improved visual interest at the podium, including the lane?
3. Do the relocated and revised indoor and outdoor amenity spaces function well for a building in this high-density location?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

From the last UDP several aspects were recommended. The FSR has gone down to 14.1, which meant a reduction to the bulking area. The two towers have been shifted to the west, this allowed for opportunity to do some work responding to the Broughton St elevation.

A big difference is the scale has been lowered to relate nicely to the base of the building. The bay windows have been made much longer to extenuate the height of building and have a narrower appearance.

Have taken the corner loggias and group them in 3's to get a darker reading down the two sides to visually carve away more from the edges of buildings to add to the sense of slenderness and height. The Top of the buildings also has been carved away.

The shift of the buildings to the west allowed for the base of the building to be very legible. The base has been stepped up to the center allowing the tower to engage with the base now on the other side rather than have a big setback or too much of a separation. There is more of a connection now and a pull of the tower down to the ground.

On Alberni, the towers shift from each other they are not aligned. The towers have been locked down to the base and created a stepping down.

On the side elevations a series of balconies have been added to create a sense of base, upper elements and articulated building.

At the base of the building, at a larger scale, there are clear figures at the center of the tower. Additionally there are loggias to add a sense of scale and variety.

The metal detailing will work well with the stone (lime stone). The two materials will help break down the buildings. The metal detailing will be good at creating a residential quality.

The entrance of condominium in the center has been further articulated. There is now a fluting added to the base of the building which wraps around. The fluting is clearer in the renderings.

Due to the slope of street there is one residence that is above the street. There are two entrances. There is a wall in front and stairs that go down and these units will have a nice terrace area.

The amenity elements have been redesigned. The Amenity at level 1, which is at grade, Has access by grand stairs to the lobby. There is an outside space associated with this amenity.

Level 7 have an amenity room with access to outdoor terraces and agriculture on the south side. The rental portion has its own amenity with associated outdoor space on the Nicola corner.

The daycare is also on level 7 which is an amenity for the whole community.

We are working with a public art work consultant.

In regards to the landscape for the public realm, the concept was to tie in to a proper Alberni street frontage. The terraces have been modulated to limit the depth below grade. The pattern and cadence consists of layered planting, piers, gateways low fence wall, are a consistent expression through the two edge massing sections framing the main entry to central court which is the balance of the interior and exterior. The central court has been refined with planting and placement of ornamental trees.

All the existing street trees have been retained. There is a second row provided on Alberni. The town house garden provides a buffer of private spaces of townhouse and the exterior walkways of the street. Tucking a layer of planting on the recess of the building and there is focus on the daycare entry. The podium level carries a green edge around.

Urban agriculture on the amenity terrace on the south east corner, there is opportunity to embed this on the south west corner of the daycare.

This is a passive house design. The concept is a new energy paradigm. We did air tight connections on all the buildings. The Energy is going to be close to natural.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Wen and seconded by Mr. Rahbar 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:

- Address the materiality and contextual response; and
- Consider location and size of the additional amenity space.

- **Related Commentary:**

Of general consideration, the panel noted the project submission was not consistent with the standard for Development Permit submissions.

The panel noted there have been moderate improvements from the previous submission at UDP. It is a high quality building. The Passive house is the most positive aspect of the project.

The main issue the panel struggled with is the contextual issue and materiality.

Improvements from the Rezoning included:

- The buildings being slimmer;
- The crown shows some improvement; and
- There is improvement to the massing.

Other comments included:

Contextural fit.

- The panel felt the project had a difficult relationship to the West End. At rezoning-UDP a number of panelists expressed difficulty with how this building sits in the West End and still have this difficulty.
- Some panels members felt strongly that the building was not a contextural fit with Vancouver due to materials and character.
- The buildings presented are not from the West End. Appreciate the design quality however a “New York” styled building should not be in Vancouver. The history of West End is not respected.
- Most felt the buildings are very monolithic and monotonous both from the base and skyline. The base is all the same on the entire City block.
- This is a sensible building therefore choosing materials should be sensible, would like to see this building grow from local Vancouver materials. There is an unrelenting quality to the materials presently used. Limestone is not a material that is used in this area.

Broughton Street Elevation and Frontage

- Broughton side is still very flat and needs further design development. The Broughton tower still feels hard up against the property line.
- The studio units on Broughton feel tight.

Nicola Street Elevation and Frontage

- The Nicola Street frontage is unfortunate, would be nice if it had more presence to the street and interaction to the units. Concerned with the livability of the units on this side, the balcony spaces are tight.

Amenity Spaces

- The Amenities appear small in comparison to the scale of the building.
- The amenities should have a detailed program designed for successful use by families.
- The Amenity below grade needs more access to light.
- The amenity next to the daycare, on level 7, is not appropriate or supportable to have the strata patio wrap around in front of the nap room in the daycare.
- Porosity for children is really important and the fritted glass along with the daycare fence will keep the children from observing beautiful views.
- The double fence at the daycare with the planting is odd.
- Greenery location on levels 5 and level 7 is problematic as the guard rail is on a parapet and the planter is climbable. Consider relocating the guard rail inside of the planter wall.

Detailing

- There is a robustness to building yet some of the detailing (i.e. railings and gates) appear flimsy in comparison to the building. Detailing of public realm and planting needs to be robust as well.
- The raised walls on the model make the below grade units feel very enclosed. In terms of livability of units suggest looking at using plant material or greenery to increase porosity on the unit side.
- The columns of the building do not coordinate well with the remainder of the building.
- All the 4 sides were treated as a façade which is a positive however would encourage differentiating the joint of the towers.
- The 2 ft. grade change between the townhouse to street is fine, yet not a significant impact on the units.

Public Art

- Additional comments include there are a few logical spots for artwork; ensure it is in a high visibility location so that it can be publicly enjoyed by the whole neighborhood.

Lighting

- In regards to lighting at night, encourage down lighting and not lighting up into the sky as a strategy.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.