

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 18, 2011

**TIME:** N/A

**PLACE:** N/A

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Robert Barnes  
Helen Besharat  
Gregory Borowski  
Alan Endall  
Jim Huffman  
Geoff McDonell  
Arno Matis  
Scott Romses  
Norm Shearing

**REGRETS:**  
James Cheng  
Jeff Corbett  
Jane Durante  
Alan Storey

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 4480 Oak Street (BC Children's/Women's Hospital) |
| 2. | 3030 East Broadway                               |
| 3. | 8440 Cambie Street (Marine Gateway)              |
| 4. | 4350 Oak Street                                  |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Romses called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. **Address:** 4480 Oak Street (BC Children's/Women's Hospital)
- DE:** Rezoning
- Use:** Proposal to rezone this CD-1 site to permit demolition of the A Wing of the former Shaughnessy Hospital and development of a new Children's Acute Care and Diagnostic Services building; a family-stay and respite centre; and a daycare centre; totaling an increase in floor area of 302,000 square feet; along with a long-term master plan for the remainder of the precinct.
- Zoning:** CD-1 to a new CD-1 Bylaw
- Application Status:** Rezoning
- Architect:** DYS Architecture
- Review:** First
- Ron Yuen, DYS Architecture  
David Simpson, DYS Architecture
- Delegation:** Michael Green, McFarlane Green Biggar Architecture + Design  
Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd.  
Eleanor Lee, Provincial Health Services Authority
- Staff:** Sailen Black and Yardley McNeill

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)****Introduction:**

Yardley McNeill, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a text amendment to the existing CD-1 zoning on the BC Children's and Women's Hospital site. She noted that the original text amendment application was reviewed by the Panel on November 3, 2010. The Panel at that time supported the proposal but did not support the Master Plan. Ms. McNeill added that the previous proposal is on hold until the Provincial Health Services authority confirms their plans on how to redevelop the Acute Care Facility, which is a larger 8-storey building contemplated for the site. The current application is for two buildings: a Child Care centre, and the Family Stay and Respite Care to be built by Ronald McDonald House (RMH). These buildings are to be reviewed at this UDP meeting, with the other applications to be reviewed later this year. The master plan is not part of this application, with the exception of those portions of the Wellness Walk proposed adjacent to the Child Care and RMH buildings.

Ms. McNeill noted that when the Panel had seen the previous application, the Ronald McDonald House was in the opposite corner of the site. The RMH building has now moved to Heather Street, as this portion of the site can accommodate a larger building rather than the previously considered West 32nd Avenue area.

Ms. McNeill noted that the original rezoning from 2008 required a day care to be provided prior to any further development on the site. She also noted the proposed changes to the CD-1 Bylaw:

- Addition of Community Care Facility Class "B" to the use section (RMH);
- Altering Section 4 of the CD-1 Bylaw which prescribes building height and setbacks, through removal of the "no Build" zones:
- Reduction in setback requirements on West 32 Avenue from 30 m to 16 m;
- Addition of the number of storeys allowable on Heather Street from two to four.

Ms. McNeill added that the present CD-1 Bylaw would permit a density of 0.85 FSR. The site is currently at 0.72 FSR. The application proposes to add 86,000 square feet of development, bringing the density to 0.76 FSR. The public hearing date is tentatively scheduled for October, 2011 and the Panel will be able to review the application again at the Development Permit stage.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, described the site as bounded by West 32nd and 28th Avenue, and Oak and Heather Street. It is a 45 acre site with a high point at the SE corner sloping down 62 feet to the NW corner. He also described the context for the surrounding area.

Mr. Black noted that the development is generally consistent with the master plan recently seen by the Panel. The design for the child care facility proposes to use part of the existing grassy berm to help buffer between the new building and the single family dwellings on the south side of West 32nd Avenue. Similarly, a 17 m setback is proposed to mediate between the new Family Stay and Respite building, and the Heather Street bikeway and single family dwellings to the east. Mr. Black also noted that surface parking will be located on site, as well as a vehicle drop-off area. The long term plan is to take site parking underground for the most part. A neighbourhood wellness walkway is planned around the hospital perimeter.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the proposed architectural and landscape design, in particular:

- Interface between new development and existing single-family streets
- Proposed use of a 17 m setback to the east to be used for play area, as opposed to current use of lawn by the public for recreational space
- Scale of buildings facing onto Heather Street
- Treatment and extent of modification to the berm; relation to local street activity and single-family scale

Ms. McNeill and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Ron Yuen, Architect, stated that they are looking for comments on the text amendment noting that they will be back to the Panel for the day care and the Ronald MacDonald House for development permits. Mr. Yuen noted that the proposal is a change in residential use and they are also looking for comments from the Panel on height and set back requirements at the southeast corner, and the south property line in terms of setback. He noted that originally the Ronald MacDonald was located elsewhere on the site on West 32nd Avenue. The change occurred in the last two weeks. He described the process they went through in order to locate the buildings noting how the site will be developed over time (25 years). The hospital's road access to Heather Street is planned to be closed at some time in the future.

David Simpson, Architect, noted that there are only two components to the daycare: indoor space and outdoor space. The outdoor space is programmed as well as the indoor space. He added that the most significant part of the daycare site is the berm as the site needs to be secured. He explained that there will be about 74 children at the daycare with two groups divided by ages. There are two buildings fronting the ring road as well as a wellness walk that comes through part of the site. As well there will be a drop off spot for the children. Mr. Simpson added that the berm will give a natural screen for the outdoor space at the daycare rather than having a regular fence or wall. Mr. Simpson described the architectural concept for the buildings noting that there will be about 10,000 square feet of space for the daycare. Eleanor Lee stated that a survey will be going out to hospital staff to determine the number of children including their ages that might be using the daycare.

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, described the plans noting that they have added more evergreen trees into the berm. As well they are going to articulate the edges of the Wellness Walk to pick up some of the interesting angles of the building. He noted that there are some existing trees that will be preserved. The interior courtyard will be programmed with one area for toddlers and one area for preschool children. The backside will be a retaining wall that could be used as a climbing apparatus with some soft surfaces.

Michael Green, Architect, described how a Ronald MacDonald House works, noting that the house will serve 75 families from the Yukon and BC. These will be people from anywhere other than the Lower Mainland. They will live in the house while their children are being treated at the hospital, and may be in the house for up to a year or for only short periods of time. Ronald MacDonald House will be a tenant on the site with a long term lease with the hospital. The current house exists in Shaughnessy and serves 13 families. The demand for this size house already exists. He said they wanted to keep the scale of the massing very residential to give the families a sense of being in a home. They are creating a space that will work with families of all ages, so there will be a variety of outdoor spaces. The site access and drop off area will be from the internal ring road but with a strong pedestrian and streetscape connection back to Heather Street. Mr. Green described the architectural concept for the building indicating five different homes that house fifteen families each. There will be a kitchen and living room that serves the families as well as a community garden, an adjacent play area, and a central courtyard to bring all the families together. The parking area will have 75 spaces with a drop off space from the ring road. Mr. Green described the landscape plans noting the Wellness Walk that wraps around two sides of the property which will have areas for rest and play. In order to have some security, they will be using landscape hedges, berms and sculptural fencing as a way to create a soft boundary around the site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Concern over potential for institutional appearance of RMH
- Consider integrating the landscape further with the architecture at Child Care;
- Design development on the relation between Wellness Walk and Child Care
- Design development to improve wayfinding and transparency at the Child Care
- Further development to show how the Child Care will be merged into the berm in detail

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the text amendment in terms of the use, massing, height and setbacks. The Panel thought the integration into the neighbourhood was well handled.

**Childcare:**

The Panel liked the way the berm is integrated into the building. A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding security between the building and the berm especially after hours. A couple of Panel members had some concerns regarding the somewhat hidden entry experience, especially since children will be dropped off and picked up and need to be able to see their parent. One member suggested adding a continuous canopy to help announce the entry. One Panel member suggested using a green roof to integrate the building into the landscape further. Most of the Panel suggested design development to explore the possibilities of strengthening the relationship with the building and the landscaping. A couple of Panel members thought the relationship with the Wellness Walk needed to be improved.

**Ronald MacDonald House:**

The Panel felt the density was acceptable and supported the approach to fit into the neighbourhood with a more domestic scale. They also thought the circulation was clear. A couple of Panel members thought the design looked a little institutional and needed more work. One Panel member suggested more development of the Heather Street landscaping as it seems less neighbourly at present.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Yuen and Mr. Simpson thanked the Panel for their comments.

<b>2.</b>	<b>Address:</b>	<b>3030 East Broadway</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Use:</b>	To rezone 3030 East Broadway from I-2 (Industrial) to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development District) to remove floor space restrictions on General Office Uses. The overall site density would remain consistent with the existing I-2 regulations at a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.0 or 933, 357 square feet, with a phased development of five buildings.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	I-2 Industrial to CD-1
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Review:</b>	First
	<b>Architect:</b>	B+H Bunting Coady Architects
	<b>Owner:</b>	Bentall Kennedy
	<b>Delegation:</b>	James Vasto, B+H Bunting Coady Architects Hanna Brus, B+H Bunting Coady Architects Randy Sharp, Sharp Diamond Landscape Architects
	<b>Staff:</b>	John Cordonier, Bentall Kennedy Sailen Black and Nicky Hood

## EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

### Introduction:

Nicky Hood, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located on the south side of East Broadway between Lillooet and Nootka Streets. The current zoning for the site is I-2 which permits a maximum density of 3.0 FSR, but limits General Office Use to a third of the built floor area. Ms. Hood noted that the rezoning seeks to remove all limits on the proportion and type of Office Uses allowed.

She also noted that a slight increase over the existing conditional height limit of 100 feet achievable under I-2 would be necessary under the proposed form of development at the north east corner of the site. In all other aspects, the proposal is in general accordance with the conditional regulations of the existing I-2 zoning.

Ms. Hood described the policy for the area noting that the rezoning application is being considered under the policy for the Grandview Boundary Industrial Area which was amended by Council, in January of 2011, to allow office space to the maximum FSR if the development is within reasonable walking distance of a rapid transit station. This site is located less than 350m from the Renfrew SkyTrain station on the Millennium Line and is also served by bus routes on Broadway, Renfrew and Rupert Streets. The neighbourhood to the north is single family.

Ms. Hood described the context for the area noting the existing Broadway Tech Centre which is a companion development to this proposal. The Broadway Tech Centre was originally developed in its current form under the provisions of the I-3 District Schedule but was rezoned to CD-1 in 2008 to allow for a greater amount of general office use. The by-law was later amended to remove all restrictions on the amount of general office use.

The CD-1 for Broadway Tech Centre permitted an FSR of 3.0 and a conditional height of 100', as does the proposal under review today, but the western site included re-use of a warehouse on the site. Structural load limits inherent in the re-use have limited the form of development achievable to the height and massing shown in the model and an FSR of 1.55 or thereabouts.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting there are some interesting challenges as well as opportunities on the site. The amount of open space opens up some opportunities for interesting treatment of the courtyard, its use by employees, and opportunities for public passage. There is a continuation of Virtual Way through the site, although the open spaces between buildings are not quite aligned from one site to the next. There is also public access north/south through the site. The proposal locates all vehicle movement in an underground parkade, which leaves the entire courtyard level for pedestrian use. There is a plaza at street level at the southwest corner.

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

- Architectural and landscape design in general
- Quality of pedestrian routes and open spaces East-West, including the alignment to Virtual Way
- Design of layered and punctured planes that step up from Hebb Street to East Broadway, with reference to both wayfinding and beauty
- Approach to reducing building energy consumption, noting City priorities around reducing fossil fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions
- Relationship of the proposed design to Broadway and by extension the RS-1 zoned Renfrew neighbourhood beyond, including consideration of view impacts
- The variety of uses proposed, considering the opportunity to form a more complete working community
- Proposed density, open spaces and heights, considering shadowing and open spaces below buildings among other factors

Ms. Hood and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

James Vasto, Architect, further described the proposal noting the proposal encompasses five office buildings. The buildings were oriented to allow for ample outdoor space. To maximize landscaped areas and pedestrian circulation. The entire vehicular movement onsite has been located below grade. Vehicle access, loading and temporary parking is organized around two pass-through lanes that connect Lillooet and Nootka Streets. At the drop off areas there will be a large open well to introduce light into the parkade. The majority of pedestrian traffic will be approaching the site from the SkyTrain station. The major entry point will be from the corner of Hebb and Nootka Streets. Mr. Vasto described the architectural plans noting the exterior materials and the green walls. He added that there are a number of sustainable strategies and that they are targeting LEED™ Platinum.

Randy Sharp, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the project is all about light, water and movement. There are a variety of open spaces culminating in a large central greenspace. Water will flow from East Broadway to Hebb Street with a water curtain that will be illuminated at night. Continuous canopies provide weather protection and way finding. Green roofs are planned with roof top gardens with room for amenities and urban agriculture.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to better distribute the density on the site;
- Consider adding retail to the site to increase the uses on the site;
- Design development to the courtyard beside Building E;
- Design development to allow for a better relationship between the buildings and the public realm.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal as well as the height, density and the variety of uses.

The Panel thought that the proposal had the potential to be exciting but felt that the applicant was only creating an “eight hour” facility where there was intensive use during the workday, and then on evenings and weekends, would be greatly underutilized. They encouraged the applicant to look at the ground plane where they could introduce evening or weekend facilities with retail uses such as cafes or fitness amenities.

Some Panel members thought there was a “generic suburban office park” look to the design and encouraged the applicant to depart from that look, using innovative ways to deal with passive design, and giving the development a more urban expression. They found the architectural forms somewhat blocky and thought the ground plane and landscaping was more successful than the buildings. The Panel also thought the density could be better distributed on the site.

Several Panel members thought the buildings should relate better to each other and that the heights could be more varied. Some of the Panel felt the buildings needed to be set back to respect the setbacks on Virtual Way. A couple of Panel members thought the space between Building C and E seemed to be left over space and needed to be better programmed.

One Panel member noted that there were some urban design issues at East Broadway and Nootka Street as the original phase wasn't handled well and had a hostile environment to the neighbours. It was suggested that perhaps Building A and B could be brought out more meaningfully to the street at the corners of the property to open up the width of the space between these buildings and give some relief to the East Broadway streetscape.

The Panel thought that having the vehicles out of the pedestrian realm was a good idea and would increase the pedestrian emphasis of the project. As well the Panel liked the use of light wells into the parkade as it would improve the entry sequence to the office. Several Panel members thought a formalized pedestrian crossing would be needed on Nootka Street linking Virtual Way between the existing and proposed developments.

The Panel members supported the landscape plans and liked the use of waterfalls and waterways as they will diminish the traffic noise from East Broadway. Some of the Panel felt there needed to be a larger green space area for people to use, and that a stronger legible hierarchy was brought to the open space composition. They also liked that there were direct links to transit. One Panel member was concerned that too much energy might go to the water system and suggested the applicant find ways to animate the water without using huge amounts of energy.

The Panel commended the applicant for going for LEED™ Platinum but that the buildings needed to recognize the solar angles in terms of how the various facades are expressed passively.

**Applicant's Response:**

The applicant team had no additional comments.



---

<b>3.</b>	<b>Address:</b>	<b>8440 Cambie Street (Marine Gateway)</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Use:</b>	Busby Perkins+Will Architects, on behalf of PCI Development Corp., have applied to rezone the lands adjacent to the Marine Drive Canada Line Station and bus loop (formerly the ICBC Claims Centre) from I-2 (Industrial) to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development District).
	<b>Zoning:</b>	I-2 Industrial to CD-1
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Review:</b>	Multiple
	<b>Architect:</b>	Busby Perkins+Will Architects
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Ryan Bragg, Busby Perkins+Will Architects Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
	<b>Staff:</b>	Anita Molaro

---

### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-3)

#### **Introduction:**

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a revised rezoning application. The Panel had seen the proposal several times through a series of workshops, a previously supported application, and as part of the Cambie Corridor discussion. In July 2010, the Panel supported the previous massing scheme that had a singular tower that was stepped in its form, which has now changed. The configuration and circulation of the site is essentially the same, however the office tower has also changed. Some of design development recommendations at that time were to reduce the boxiness and increase the overall architectural distinction of the office building. Design development to the actual and perceived publicness of the high street, connection through the site, design development to the retail podium and the Yukon Street elevation. More design development to the southeast corner of the west block's lower level to decrease the sense of the pinch point affecting the pedestrian flow at the lower plaza and the high street connection. Also, more design development is needed to enhance the Cambie Street pedestrian experience and improve the sidewalk width. The Panel supported the proposed height, the distribution of the uses and the density, stating that the proposal would create a new node and gateway for the city with a strong vertical marker. Following the Panel's support there was significant community concern about the development. This applicant along with the other corner site teams (Intercorp and WesGroup) began an exercise with the Planning Dept. and the community to revisit and test many aspects of the development being proposed. This exercise was also brought back to the Panel as a workshop on two occasions as a collective with the other applicant teams working in that area. Ms. Molaro noted that the commentary from those workshops and input from the public informed the urban design principles that were adopted in the Cambie Corridor Plan which received approval from Council last week. Ms. Molaro went through the Urban Design Principles adopted by Council. They are as follows:

#### **•A Place of Welcome and Introduction**

The sites will act as a place of welcome and introduction to the city and will work together to provide a south slope landmark

**•Locally Authentic**

The sites will reflect the local character and context of the area, acknowledge its unique and historical connection to the Fraser River, industrial lands and the evolving context of a surrounding residential neighbourhood (north side of Marine Drive).

**•Marking the Intersection**

Buildings are expected to take the form of high-rise towers that frame the intersection, prominently marking Cambie and Marine

**•Slimness and Vertical Emphasis**

Tower forms surrounding the intersection may be tall but they must also be slim and well separated, emphasizing a sense of verticality

**•Minimizing Apparent Scale**

Strategies will be used to offset the sense of scale in tower forms

**•Hierarchy**

Within the overall pattern of the station area - there is a general hierarchy of height and density at the four corners, with the highest tower at the station site

**•Variety**

Distinct building strategies for unique massing forms but also allowing for a coherent idea

**•Shadow performance**

Minimize adverse shadows on surrounding public space

**•Building siting**

Buildings designed to maximize privacy, livability, opportunities for public views and views from other sites

**•Transitions**

Buildings will be designed and located to provide creative and sensitive transitions in scale between the intersection hierarchy and the adjacent evolving neighbourhoods.

**•Industrial lands Protection**

New development will use distance, intervening land uses/buildings and other techniques to minimize the impact of residential complaints and expectations on surrounding industrial uses and corresponding impacts to residential livability from existing and expected expanded industrial operations. Industrial land use protection and expansion is a top priority in this area.

Council added at the approval a further urban design principle:

**•Design Performance Improvements**

The drawings that follow provide urban design detail and can be altered to improve design performance in conjunction with community concern

Ms. Molaro stated that there has always been a lot of concern regarding residential uses on the site due to potential impacts from the Vancouver City Transfer Station and other industrial activities. The design of the residential components is going to have to address that relationship. She described the history and the context for the site noting there are several significant changes in the proposal. There is a shift from the single residential tower proposal to a two tower proposal and there has been a reconfiguration of the office/retail/theatre component. The residential towers have a slim profile in the east/west direction with small floor plates. The separation between the two towers is just over fifty-one feet. The office/retail/theatre component has been re-massed to reduce its boxiness and increase its architectural distinction, and there has also been some changes with the connection at the lower plaza with the high street.

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

- Do they support this revised rezoning and subsequent form of development given the now council approved context and urban design principles set out by the now approved Cambie Corridor plan
- Including Council's additional urban design principle that the illustrative drawings can be altered to improve design performance in conjunction with community concern.
- Some of these community concerns that still remain are the height, density, number of towers, clarity of the pedestrian/transit connections, experience of the high street as a public space and plaza orientation.
- These concerns were discussed by Council in the approval of the Cambie Corridor Plan, noting also that these questions have been brought to the panel previously and that they had provided commentary to staff on these matters and had supported the directions that the proposal had taken at that time.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Ryan Bragg, Architect, further described the proposal, noting that the design derives from the Cambie Corridor Plan, of which all of the architects, landscape architects, and developers were involved in, which looks at the Cambie Corridor including down to the river. The proposal speaks better to the context of the adjacent towers and the Cambie Corridor urban design principles, to refine the design that they had previously proposed. Mr. Bragg said he felt there was a more cohesive approach to the node and as it transitions out into the neighbourhood. Mr. Bragg noted that they had previously started out with a single stepped tower and a stepped office building. The comments from the Panel in the last visit was that the office tower was seen as boxy and lacking a clear architectural definition. Mr. Bragg noted that they redesigned the towers to give more sunlight onto the play area in the nearby school yard and the public spaces on the site. The form of building and mass is a different resolution and came out of meeting with the community and the Planning staff. The office building has also been redesigned by decreasing some of the retail space in the podium and stacking the theatres. The office tower is now a much cleaner and vertical design. He noted that Cambie Street is a real concern and challenge, and has been difficult to provide a meaningful public realm. They have decided to pull out the retail space to the street to engage both sides of Cambie Street.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, further described the plans noting that the public realm has not changed with the changes to the residential and office towers.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Design development to improve the office building;
- Design development to improve the public realm;
- Design development to improve the circulation through the site;
- Design Development to the residential towers to have more distance between them.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal but felt there was still room for improvement.

The Panel supported the amount of density and height being proposed. However there was quite a bit of dialogue about distribution of density and how that density was massed out. They thought the office had not really improved much from the stepped, terraced form and was still perceived as boxy with heavy awkward proportions. A couple of Panel members suggested having a smaller floor plate. The Panel had some concerns regarding the design of the two residential towers with one Panel member suggesting that both this site and Intracorp's needed to have height variation and that a stronger hierarchy between all the towers needs to be established. Another Panel member thought the south tower could be shifted off axis to create more room, while most of the Panel suggested they be moved further apart to address privacy and outlook conflicts. Several Panel members thought the two towers overwhelmed the station side of the site especially as seen from the important approach from the south, being the arrival point into the City.

The Panel had a lot of concern regarding the ground plane and public realm. They recognized the challenges the applicant had inherited with the existing conditions that were very difficult to overcome. Still most of the Panel was concerned with recognizing how the internal street terminated at the bus loop. Some Panel members noted that the site was not the terminus to Cambie Street but should rather flow through to the riverfront. It was noted that the oblique movement through the property on the way south to the waterfront was a bit contorted with the Panel member suggesting the applicant try to develop that further as a way to strengthen the circulation through the site.

The Panel agreed that there are incredible challenges associated with the development, and that, for example, there isn't the luxury of being able to redesign the bus loop and create a nice flow and transition through the site. Improvements have been made with movement around the south end of the tower. They noted that coming down the cascading stairs was certainly better and was moving in the right direction but several Panel members suggested opening up the area even more.

Most of the Panel was concerned with the distance between the two residential towers. It doesn't seem that the layout of the towers and the units are really acknowledging the privacy issue, and what will likely be a challenging marketing issue. They thought there might be an ability to make the relationship better than it is now.

**Applicant's Response:**

The applicant team had no further comments.

---

4.	<b>Address:</b>	<b>4350 Oak Street</b>
	<b>DE:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Use:</b>	Proposed 4-storey development and addition to existing school and synagogue comprised of 4,055 square metres of total synagogue use, 10,954 square metres total school use and 4,373 square metres total community services use at proposed FSR of 1.14.
	<b>Zoning:</b>	RS-1 to CD-1
	<b>Application Status:</b>	Rezoning
	<b>Review:</b>	First
	<b>Architect:</b>	Acton Ostry Architects
	<b>Delegation:</b>	Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
	<b>Staff:</b>	Anita Molaro and Alison Higginson

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)****Introduction:**

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning for the Beth Israel Synagogue and the Talmud Torah School on Oak Street. Ms. Molaro explained the policy background noting that the site is located in the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision area. The site is comprised of two parcels and the application proposes to rezone both sites from RS-1 to CD-1. The north site is currently developed with the Talmud Torah School which has been in existence since 1947 and the south side is developed with the Beth Israel Synagogue which has been there since 1949. Both of these buildings are listed on the City's post 40's heritage inventory. Although church and school uses are permitted in RS-1 as conditional uses, the regulations of single family zoning are not appropriate for this type of institutional use and form of development. The proposal is to rezone both sites to create an integrated campus serving the Jewish community with expansion to the school and the synagogue in addition to the development of an office building on the east portion of the site. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area. She noted that there isn't a lane that separates the GF Strong site and the school's site.

The synagogue will be expanded with a two storey high addition. The school building will remain except the existing gym which will be demolished and replaced with a 4-storey addition which includes a replacement gym and additional classrooms. This joint rezoning exercise of the two sites facilitates the development of a shared courtyard of hard and soft landscaping and play areas as well as increased underground and off street parking. These vehicle servicing activities will be accessed through a new parking ramp that will connect through from West 26th Avenue to West 28th Avenue and will provide a below grade pick-up and drop-off facility.

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

- The urban design response developed for these sites and their relationship with the surrounding context;
  - Building siting, form and massing;
  - The increase in massing and height;
  - The public realm strategy including the open space and landscape ;
  - Sustainability strategy;
  - Consider whether or not the office building could handle an additional floor;
  - Any other comments from the Panel.
-

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Mark Ostry, Architect, further described the proposal noting that there is an opportunity to create a mixed-use campus. The biggest result of doing this combined rezoning is to solve a serious drop-off problem which has historically been problematic for the school along West 26th Avenue. The massing is pushed to the perimeter of the site to have as much landscape play area and courtyard gathering spaces as possible. Also they create some definition along West 28th Avenue and a new entrance to the synagogue. In terms of sustainability, Mr. Ostry noted that they will be pursuing LEED™ Gold. He added that there will be opportunities for urban agriculture as well as water and energy efficiency, and that there is a possibility of a district energy being provided in the area and for the site.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the plans for the landscaping, noting that for the school they have created a series of outdoor spaces for children with a variety of play equipment and nooks for social gatherings. A memorial orchard is planned along with urban agriculture. They have looked at using artificial turf in the play areas, and on the roof top they are planning a fenced court space. The synagogue will have a series of garden courtyards or walled gardens with mostly hardscape for gatherings.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- The Panel had no substantial concerns with this proposal.

**Related Commentary:**

The Panel supported the proposal.

The Panel supported the height, density and the additional height to the office portion noting that it was a well thought through project. One Panel member thought the retaining wall needed to respond better to the entrance condition. Another Panel member thought there could be some glazing and landscaping on the P-Level, and to consider additional light wells to get more light into the parking level. Also, one Panel member thought the driveway could come from one side with a landscape bridge over it instead of a double ended driveway.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Ostry thanked the Panel for their comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.