

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 9, 2012

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Vincent Dumoulin (Not present for 1st Item)
Alan Endall (Items #1 & #2)
Veronica Gillies
David Grigg (Items #1 & #2)
Bruce Hemstock (Item #1 & #5)
Geoff McDonell
Norm Shearing (Items #1)
Peter Wreglesworth (Items #1 & #2)

REGRETS:
Daryl Condon
Arno Matis

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	100 West 49th Avenue (Langara College)
2.	7299 Granville Street (Shannon Mews)
3.	202 West 24th Avenue
4.	3450 Commercial Street
5.	125 East 37th Avenue (Little Mountain Housing)

BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. Jim Bailey, Planner, gave a brief update on the Cambie Corridor Plan. The Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on May 7th where 189 Keefer Street was presented to the Board and approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- | | | |
|----|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Address: | 100 West 49th Avenue (Langara College) |
| | DE: | N/A |
| | Use: | Update the Langara Policy Statement to allow for a Student Services & Science building in place of the anticipated Creative Arts Centre (Phase 2), a Creative Arts Centre in place of the anticipated multipurpose classrooms (Phase 3), and a path through the site to the proposed Creative ARTs Centre, in place of the anticipated north-south connection. update the CD-1 (55) Bylaw applicable to the site to include changes to the minimum setbacks of both above and below grade buildings in relation to the north south and west property boundaries. |
| | Zoning: | CD-1 |
| | Application Status: | Rezoning |
| | Review: | Second |
| | Owner: | Langara College |
| | Architect: | Teeple Architects and Proscenium Architecture + Interiors
Steve Teeple, Teeple Architects |
| | Delegation: | Kori Chan, Proscenium Architecture + Interiors
Laurie Schmidt, Brook Pooni Associates |
| | Staff: | Farhad Mawani and Anita Molaro |

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

Farhad Mawani, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal to amend the Langara College Policy Statement which was approved by Council in March 2005. As well to amend the CD-1 (55) District Schedule, which was last amended in 2009 which is applicable to the site. The site is located on the south side of West 49th Avenue, between Ontario and Columbia Street. The site borders Langara Park to the west, Langara Golf Course to the south. There are single family homes across 49th Avenue to the North, and across Ontario to the East. The application proposes a reorganization of the site that will allow for a Student Services and Science building in place of the anticipated Creative Arts Centre (Phase 2), a Creative Arts Centre in place of the anticipated multipurpose classrooms (Phase 3), and a path through the site to the proposed Creative Arts Centre, in place of the anticipated north-south connection. Mr. Mawani noted that the CD-1 district schedule will be updated to decrease the minimum setbacks of both above and below grade buildings in relation to the north south and west property boundaries. No additional height or FSR is proposed for the site. He added that a Community Open House for the project was held in March, and no concerns related to the proposed changes were heard.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting the key pieces in addition to reallocation of uses on the site, are setback issues. The applicant is asking for some variances to change the CD-1 Bylaw. Mr. Molaro gave some context regard the site noting that the original concept under the Langara Policy Statement was based around a quadrangle

typology for a campus with the Student Union being in the centre and buildings framing that central courtyard. The other key component was a linear pedestrian link that would not only serve the campus circulation through the site but also provide a link for the neighbourhood beyond to Langara Golf Course. This was seen as an important link. Another piece that was a focus is the relationship with the Science Building and the edge condition with the existing park. As part of their facility programming the school is asking to reallocate the uses of their buildings to refocus the campus direction with the student services and science component as the signature buildings for the site. This requires changes to the policy statement and the CD-1 by-law to allow for some more flexibility in how the building(s) can be configured. She noted that they aren't looking at a building design, but rather a text amendment component that could accommodate a number of different design solutions.

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

The requested amendments to the policy statements with respect to:

- Redistribution of uses on the site;
- Reconfiguration of the south building massing to remove the linear pedestrian connection through the site.

The requested amendments to the CD-1 Bylaw setbacks to accommodate building mass.
Science and Student Services:

- Closer to the adjacent park (western property line) by reducing the setback from current requirement of 30 m to 15.6 m;
- Closer to West 49th Avenue by reducing the front yard setback from current requirement of 15.5 m to 14 m.

Creative Arts:

- Increase the setback along the south property line from the current requirement of 14 m to 16.3m.

Mr. Mawani and Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Steve Teeple, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the basic intention of the Master Plan has not changed. He described the architectural plans for the buildings noting that the current building is surrounded with surface parking spaces. He added that they wanted to use the architecture to set up an outdoor student space that was arranged to define a "West Court" that connects with Langara Park. The buildings have been organized to shape the outdoor spaces and to allow for pedestrian and vehicle connections to West 49th Avenue. The Science Building will be two storeys and cantilevered over the driveway which ensures views into the golf course. They decided to place the theatre lobby which is entirely glazed on axis with the link into the student quad.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to have the Creative Arts Building integrate better with the neighbourhood;
- Design development to the massing of the Science and Student Services Building to reduce shadowing.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the amendments to the Policy Statement and the CD-1 Bylaw.

The Panel supported the uses on the site as well as the south building massing with the exception of a couple of Panel members. One Panel member thought the physical and visual links needed to be reinforced. As well a couple of Panel members thought the configuration of the Creative Arts Building should be better developed in how it relates to the neighbourhood.

The Panel supported the setbacks for the Science and Student Service building and thought the applicant should have some flexibility on how the grade should be addressed. There was some concern regarding the massing with respect to shadowing and it was suggested that the applicant try to address how the shadows affect both 49th Avenue and the forecourt area in the afternoon.

There was support for the setbacks at the Creative Arts building from the south property line. Some Panel members suggested there was an opportunity to reinforce the prominence of Studio 58 with a lighting strategy for people coming to events in the evening.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Teeple said he had no comment.

2.	Address:	7299 Granville Street (Shannon Mews)
	DE:	415627
	Use:	This application is for phase one of the overall project at Shannon Mews, which includes the demolition of two existing buildings, construction of three new buildings, construction of two levels of underground parking, restoration of three designated heritage buildings and perimeter walls, restoration of heritage landscaping elements, construction of new landscape elements including a portion of a public park, replacement of an existing swimming pool and construction of a district energy system.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Second
	Owner:	Wall Financial
	Architect:	Perkins + Will Architects
	Delegation:	David Dove, Perkins + Will Architects Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architects Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
	Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-3)

Introduction:

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site at the corner of West 57th Avenue and Granville Street. The proposal is for the removal of the Massey Erickson townhouses which will be replaced with a range of buildings from three to nine storeys in height. The site coverage currently is relatively low and the proposal is to preserve the garden-like nature of the original estate. Mr. Black noted that it is the intent of the applicant to retain the trees notably a copse of three Copper Beach trees with some removal in other areas. They are also planning to retain a number of listed and unlisted heritage elements and will be improving the quality of the Rose Garden. A new public park aligned with the Italian Garden is planned. The current vehicle entry will remain off Granville Street with new parkade access from West 57th Avenue.

Mr. Black noted the site's Development Guiding Principles as approved by Council in September of 2009, which included goals to:

- Pursue best practices in sustainable design for large sites
- Use creative design to address the visual impact of development on residential neighbours
- Respect the historic values of the site and explore maximum retention and conservation
- Maintain and improve the garden character of the whole site
- Respect the various eras of the site's history while offering architectural variety and a contemporary interpretation

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

- The new opening on the south wall and the new park creates a publicly owned outdoor space and reveals a significant new view toward the Mansion. At the same time, other edges of the site are being preserved in place. Does the proposed design show how it will reinforce the hidden aspects and mystery of the site as seen from outside the property?
- Do the heights and setbacks of the perimeter buildings create a sensitive transition to the lower scale houses and streets around the edges of the site?
- Blocks A, B, and C are intended to reflect, without imitating, the Heritage elements on the site. Could the Panel comment on how effective the exterior detailing and composition of each building is in addressing this goal?
- Are the revised forms of Block D and other buildings around the Mansion successful in calming down the massing and simplifying the forms with less stepping in plan and less terracing, as recommended?
- Block C has been changed in both form and articulation to remove upper floors while preserving floor area. Is the exterior detailing and composition shown on the drawings and model sufficiently developed to create an appropriate interface onto the Park (west) and street (east)?
- The character and context facing each side of the site changes from lanes to arterial streets, and from quiet private properties to pedestrian intersections. Are the landscapes, building materials and details identified for each part of the site appropriately and well-resolved responses to these different site adjacencies?
- The site must accommodate a range of users, spaces and activities ranging from personal and private to commercial, active and public. Is the interface between the public and private landscapes clearly shown and fully developed?
- The applicant team was asked as a condition of rezoning to identify a site-wide strategy that would visually blend new, taller buildings in the landscape of the perimeter through examples such as green walls and special cladding. Is the overall strategy and specific treatments shown effective in this regard?
- Do the sustainable design features on the drawings and model show a focus on passive design, rather than mechanical or other powered systems?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

David Dove, Architect, explained that due to the number of materials and the complexity of the project they decided to give a brief PowerPoint presentation. He noted that the project will be in two phases with a number of different parcels. There is a park dedication, Block C is a rental building and as well in Phase 2 is the existing heritage house and market housing. In Phase 1 there are 267 units of market and rental housing. The rest of the development will include another 477 units.

Mr. Dove addressed the Panel's previous comments noting that they simplified the massing and reduced the height in some of the buildings. He explained the differences between the presentation at rezoning and their current proposal. He said they looked at opportunities to address the nature of the various portions of the site. In the northeast corner of the site there are three heritage buildings; the Mansion, the Coach House and the Gate House all of which are being retained and restored. They are looking at this portion as a heritage precinct. There are number of trees along Granville Street and West 57th Avenue as well as along the north side of the site. They have set the buildings back to protect the root balls of the trees. The trees that aren't in good shape will be removed and replaced. Adera Street has single family homes to the west so they decided on a different character along that face, with townhomes that will fit better into the context. The park space will have both public and private spaces. There are internal courtyards giving a second layer of "secret gardens" to continue the lineage of hidden

gardens. The heritage gates will be retained at the Granville Street entrance. He said there are elements of the heritage that will be illustrated through the architecture. Mr. Dove described the material and colour palette noting that they plan to use brick and to introduce a marble skirt at the bottom of the buildings to reflect the heritage. A water feature is planned to run down the face of the building on Granville Street. He noted that the balconies on Block C are a little more fun and have some colour. There are two places for retail; one in Block C and the other proposed is a coffee kiosk in the park. Mr. Dove described the sustainability strategy noting that they have focused on having a district energy system, having useable roofs with urban agriculture, capturing water for irrigation and introducing solar panels for domestic hot water. As well co-op cars are planned for the project.

Ken McKillop, Arborist, noted that most of the trees were planted at the time the Mansion was built so they are about 100 years old. There are 429 trees on the site. He said that they have looked at the viability and health of the trees and will be retaining the best of them. The trees along Granville Street will be retained and on the north side of the site they will also be retained for the most part. There are some overly mature trees poplar trees on Adera Street that probably will be removed and will have to be replaced. Mr. McKillop noted they plan to design the parking garage so there is a generous root protection around the trees. The City has asked that for the trees that are removed that they be replaced on a 1.6 to 1 ratio which means they will be adding 344 new trees.

Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that a lot has been said about a hidden garden and they are trying to keep the hidden aspects while opening the site up to some views. She noted that the Italian Garden will be restored and so will the Rose Garden. There are a number of outdoor rooms planned around the site all of which will have a different character. The only non-permeable surface is the circular piece in the park which the Park Board wanted as asphalt where children can ride their bicycles. Private areas will be gated and fenced with decorative arches covered in plantings. Ms. Durante noted that they have done a lighting plan that is very subtle with lighting on the trees and walkways. As well the buildings will be highlighted. She noted that they will exceed the City's formula for urban agriculture. There will be a couple of children's play area on the roofs. They have been able to use the original owner's plant list for their plant choices. She added that they intend to plant more street trees along Adera Street.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to architectural expression to better complement the historical aspects of the site;
- Design development to improve the clarity of public routes;
- Design development to reduce blockiness of massing;
- Consider adding an interpretive public amenity component to the site;

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had done a good job in responding to the Panel's commentary from the previous review.

In answering Staff's questions the Panel thought that the proposed design did not reinforce the aspects of mystery physically even though it did visually. They felt that opening the site to see the Mansion was effective but that getting around the site was not as successful as it could be. They felt there was more of a hidden aspect along the Granville Street frontage but not so much along West 57th Avenue. They felt the site needed to be seen as a park but that it was important to separate the private and public spaces.

Most of the Panel thought the heights and setbacks of the perimeter buildings did not create a fully sensitive transition to the lower scale houses and streets around the edges of the site. They noted that there wasn't a need for transition along Granville Street but that along West 57th Avenue and Adera Street, there needed to be some smaller moves to transition better to the residential. One Panel member noted that along Adera Street there wasn't any apparent relationship to the Mansion. Another Panel member thought the townhouses had a very rigid approach to Adera Street and needed more attention to fineness facing onto the narrowest street.

Regarding Blocks A and C the Panel thought the scale and expression weren't sensitive to the heritage aspects of the site. Several Panel members noted that it should be all about the heritage buildings and the gardens and that the new buildings needed to be sensitive without overtly referencing the historical buildings. They felt there was a need to quiet down the massing particularly along the Rose Garden frontages. As well they thought the architectural expression including the use of the frames seemed to overpower the landscape and needed to be complementary to the landscaping and the Mansion.

The Panel agreed that lowering the profile of Block C was a positive move but it was not entirely respectful to the history of the site with several Panel members noting that in reducing the height the building has become blocky.

Several Panel members were concerned with the viability of the commercial space.

Regarding the landscaping, building materials and details, the Panel had some mixed feelings about the sense of open space and publicness across the site. As well they thought there was an ambiguity between the public and private spaces and that there should be a benefit to the public which is the park. They would like to see an increase in the natural flow and a sense of invitation into the public components of the site.

A number of the Panel members were concerned with the livability of the Gate House as a private residence.

Several Panel members thought that there should be a way to honour the history of the site and that a museum or art gallery could be an addition to the project. A couple of Panel members thought the Gate House or a room in the Mansion could be used for this purpose.

The Panel was concerned with the vehicle access off and onto Granville Street thinking it might be hazardous considering the amount of fast moving traffic along that roadway. They suggested that perhaps "right in only" may be the way to go.

The Panel felt the sustainable strategy had been improved but several members thought there was a need for improvement. One Panel member hoped that the project would not have to use mechanical cooling. Another Panel member noted that Block C did not respond fully to its orientation.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Dove thanked for the Panel for their comments. He said the project was not an easy challenge considering the garden and heritage aspects of the site. He added that they wanted the new buildings to have a quiet and calm architecture with a 4-storey shoulder to blend with the heritage buildings. The buildings around the Mansion are only fifteen feet higher but some are also lower. They didn't want them to tower over the Mansion. He noted that the concern about building frames on the face of the garden were something that came out of the feedback from the public. Regarding the Granville Street entrance, Mr. Dove said he would leave that to Engineering.

Ms. Durante said their intention was to have a visual orientation at the entries of the property so that people would know where the residential units were located and how to access them. As well they wanted to have a balance between the mystery of the gardens and accessibility.

3.	Address:	202 East 24th Avenue
	DE:	415531
	Use:	To construct a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of one storey of retail/dwelling units (6 CRU's and two town homes), with three additional levels of dwelling units (37 units) and two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.
	Zoning:	C-2C
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Owner:	Bluetree Homes
	Architect:	Raymond Letkman Architects Raymond Letkman, Raymond Letkman Architects
	Delegation:	Jason Letkman, Raymond Letkman Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Deanna Grinnell, Bluetree Homes
	Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-3)**Introduction:**

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 4-storey mixed use building with a retail base and residential above. There is a residential element (townhouses) at the back at grade with a residential entry off East 24th Avenue. He noted that there are a number of setbacks and dedications sought by the City to serve future traffic needs. As well there is a bus stop in front of the building. The building generally conforms to the C-2 envelope with a couple of exceptions. Some portions of the building go beyond the recommended setbacks at the lane. He also noted that there is discretionary approval sought for a higher portion of the building at the corner of King Edward Avenue and Main Street.

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

- The proposed interface to existing houses along the east edge, including the range of heights and setbacks shown
- The materials palette and composition facing onto each side of the site
- The treatment of the Main Street public realm interface, noting the range of functions and uses along this edge

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Raymond Letkman, Architect, further described the proposal. Regarding sustainability, he noted that they will meet ASHRAE 90.1 and that they have kept the window openings to less than 40% of the building envelope. There will be some shading with over-hangs around the perimeter of the building. A light coloured roof is proposed and there will be high efficiency boilers within the residential units, high efficiency makeup air units for the corridors, ventilation and also high efficiency boilers for the commercial tenants. Together with the shading on the south facade there are some enclosed balconies. Mr. Letkman noted that they wanted to keep the Main Street character within the architecture and made the corner piece the focus of the building. Two 2-storey townhouses are proposed for the lane and as well there is a car washing facility and bike parking at the end of the parkade ramp.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He noted that along the lane a planter is proposed that will allow for vines to grow up the building to soften the façade. On the decks the planting will be held close to the perimeter to keep people back away from the edge and to allow for some privacy.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider design development on the corner element;
- Consider some weather protection in the open space for the townhouses;
- Consider some shading devices on the south façade.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal noting it is an important corner at Main Street and East King Edward Avenue.

The Panel thought the proposed interface to the existing homes was well handled and they supported all of the relaxations. They did not have any issues with respect to setbacks and height and liked the material palette and composition. They also thought that the additional height added to the character of the building.

Most of the Panel appreciated the retail and thought the continuous small shops would enrich the neighbourhood and add to the animation of the street. One Panel member thought there could be some articulation on the retail frontage to add some interest and animation to the street. Most of the Panel liked the strong element on the corner however a couple of Panel members thought it could be improved as it pinched in the corner somewhat.

A couple of Panel members thought the concrete wall on the lane needed some design development to improve the expression. They liked the townhouses on the lane and thought they would be more marketable if there was some weather protection over the open space.

One Panel member suggested adding some simple skylights or a clerestory on the top level to add light into the corridors. Another Panel member thought that the quality of the signage could add to the character of the building.

Regarding sustainability, a couple of Panel members were not convinced that all the facades addressed their orientation and thought some shading devices could be added on the south side.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Letkman said he appreciated the Panel's comments.

4.	Address:	3450 Commercial Street
	DE:	415548
	Use:	To construct a 4-storey building with commercial on the first storey and residential from the first to fourth storeys.
	Zoning:	MC-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Owner:	Cressey Homes
	Architect:	Rafii Architects Inc. Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Inc.
	Delegation:	Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Tracy Parolin, Cressey Homes
	Staff:	Ann McLean

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-5)

Introduction:

Ann McLean, Development Planner, described the proposal for the site located near the corner of Commercial Street and Victoria Diversion adjacent to the Expo line guideway. She described the context for the area noting the new construction for a 5-storey residential building on Porter Street.

The proposal is for a 4-storey building oriented around a triangular courtyard with ground level residential rental units on the north eastern wing. On the south eastern portion of the building there will be three levels of market residential over one level of commercial/retail units. In total there are 59 residential units of which 11 will be rental. As well there is one level of underground parking.

Ms. McLean described the policy for the area noting setbacks aren't required for any of the three street frontages but may be permitted to improve residential livability or as a commercial forecourt. The applicant has chosen to provide a continuous elevation at Commercial Street which results in a setback of seven feet at the south end of the site.

Non-residential use must be provided on the ground floor of this site and the Director of Planning determined that the Commercial Street frontage was best suited to commercial use, as it is compatible with the adjacent buildings.

In addition to general commentary on the building form, response to context, and proposed public realm treatment, the Panel were asked to comment on the following:

- The siting of the building with particular regard to the Commercial Street and Victoria Diversion setbacks;
- The location of the commercial units;
- The location and treatment of the residential rental units;
- The proposed elevation at Porter Street given its high visibility;
- Design development to courtyard blank wall to open it up or provide an appropriate quality interface,
- The courtyard treatment and its relationship to the residential units; and
- The architectural treatment of the building with regard to the area guidelines and character.

Ms. McLean took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Foad Rafii, Architects, further described the proposal, noting there are a couple of other sites in the area that have new residential buildings. The advantage of facing south allowed for the courtyard which will be in sun most of the day. They decided to leave the corridors open and make the units through units so they have ventilation from both sides and makes them more liveable. The parking and loading could only be from the corner with access to the commercial. The materials are a combination of warm colours that reflect the industrial nature of the area. They will be using some corrugated aluminum and prefabricated Ceraclad panels. The building is wood frame except for the commercial units which are concrete.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architects, described the landscape plans noting that Commercial Street is predominately paved as determined by the City. The residential street has a different feel with raised patios and the interior courtyard has been broken up into a series of different rooms. She added that they have added a green space over the roof of the parkade ramp.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to improve the location of the elevator;
- Design development on the third floor corridor to improve the privacy of the second bedroom;
- Consider improving the blank wall above the transformer;
- Design development to improve the balcony location of unit next to the future building;
- Design development on the courtyard trellis;
- Consider a better material for the canopies; and
- Design development to improve the residential entry.

Related Commentary:

There was overall support from the Panel with respect to the frontages and as well the Commercial Street and Victoria Street setbacks which make sense regarding the location of the commercial units.

The Panel supported the location and treatment of the residential units and thought that in general there was good disposition with the exception of access and the elevator which is located in a hidden corner. As well the Panel had some concerns regarding the second bedroom interface at the courtyard. On one of the levels there is a planter detail shown adjacent to the bedrooms and on the other level they seem to have been left out of the design. They felt that adding the planter box gave more privacy to that bedroom and would allow the resident to open their windows.

The Panel thought the proposed elevation for Porter Street and the prominence of the pad mounted transformer with the wall rising above was problematic and needed some treatment to the facade.

The Panel also thought there were some problems with the residential units facing the future building and needed to be resolved as the balcony will be cut off once that site is developed.

The Panel thought the courtyard treatment needed some design development with respect to the trellis component. They thought it could be lightened and that there needed to be a methodology for softening the blank wall.

The Panel thought the architectural treatment of the building with respect to the area guidelines didn't offer a sense of delight and needed to provide some order to the

compositional devices that were being explored. As well the Panel thought the concrete party wall required some treatment as it has a relentless quality to that side and needed to be treated in a way deserving of its prominence. As well some Panel members thought there needed to be some consideration regarding the change of plane with the materials to insure they had a distinct identity.

From a CPTED perspective, the Panel noted that the elevator was hidden in a corner and should be more open to the circulation areas. As well they were not in favor of the box canopies and suggested making the residential entry more prominent.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Rafii said the Panel had lots of good comments and he would try to take them under consideration.

5.	Address:	125 East 37th Avenue (Little Mountain Housing)
	DE:	N/A
	Use:	The draft Policy Statement is the result of a collaborative planning process with the Riley park community, City staff, the developer and their architects. The Policy Statement, if approved by Council, will guide future development through principles and objectives relating to density, building forms and heights, land use and affordability, public benefits, transportation, sustainability and phasing.
	Zoning:	RM-3A
	Application Status:	Workshop
	Review:	Second
	Owner:	Holborn Properties
	Architect:	James K.M. Cheng Architects
	Delegation:	James Cheng, James K.M. Cheng Architects Jim Heinmiller, James K.M. Cheng Architects Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Joo Kim Tiah, Holborn Properties
	Staff:	Patricia St. Michel

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

Introduction:

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the workshop for the Little Mountain Housing site. She noted that the purpose of the workshop was to get the Panel's comments and advice on emerging policies and plans to guide future rezoning of the Little Mountain Housing site.

She described the context of the Little Mountain site and its early history as Vancouver's first social housing project. In 2007 the Federal Government transferred ownership of Little Mountain to the Province. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between BC Housing and the City that confirmed the 224 social housing units would be replaced on-site, that existing tenants would have first opportunity to move back to the new development, and that the proceeds from the sale of the site would be used to fund social housing in Vancouver and elsewhere in the province.

The draft policies are the result of a collaborative planning process with the City, the Riley Park South Cambie community, and Holborn Properties and their design team. The team has worked extensively with a Community Advisory Group, formed out of nearby neighbours, former residents and other interested people. While there is a high degree of support for various aspects of the plan, the draft policies and recommendations do not imply consensus.

The process involved four series of open houses. The Urban Design Panel reviewed and commented on site plan scenarios that were presented at the second open house series in June 2010. Key messages from the panel at the time were that it is the angled building orientation and patterning of open space that distinguished Little Mountain, and that existing trees and the open space relationship to Queen Elizabeth Park embody the memory of the previous development.

Urban design and guiding principles were developed that reflect public and Panel input. A consolidated site plan was created that drew on two of the most promising site plan scenarios. A variety of densities from 1.45 to 3.25 FSR was explored on this site plan, with building heights to 4 storeys at 1.45 FSR, 12 storeys at 2.0 FSR, and 19 storeys at 3.25 FSR. A

preliminary economic analysis found that a density of 2.25 FSR over the site was needed for a viable project that would deliver the identified amenities through CAC's and DCL's. Open houses held in July 2011 found that there was increasing concern as height and density increased.

In January 2012, a fourth series of open houses were held. The Holborn team proposed a density of 2.8 FSR which they thought necessary for the project to be viable given their arrangements with BC Housing. The footprint of buildings was increased to enable overall height to be reduced and to effect a better transition to the neighbourhood. Taller building heights were relocated to remove the intrusion of buildings into the view of Mount Baker from the top of Little Mountain. The maximum height presented was 14 storeys.

Generally, people thought the site plan, public places, connections, and building variety were working well, but many were concerned about height, density and relationship with the neighbourhood, and thought there were too many 10-12 and 13- 14 storey buildings.

Staff thinks there is significant alignment between the January 2012 Holborn proposal and the principles developed for the site, but are recommending a density of 2.3 to 2.5 FSR gross, with a maximum height of 12 storeys. Ms. St. Michel then illustrated the rationale for the recommendations based on context, views from Queen Elizabeth Park, transitions, sunlight, tree retention, and livability and permeability.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

James Cheng, Architect, noted that it was a good process to develop the plans for the site. He said that now is the time for a discussion on density and height and that they agree with staff's evaluation of a density of between 2.3 and 2.5 FSR. He added that there is one building in the middle of the site that has been identified as the only spot where they could go a little higher. Mr. Cheng asked for the Panel's comments on whether or not they should begin a study regarding a fourteen storey building in that location. He mentioned that the proposal will be back to the Panel for a full rezoning presentation at a later date. Mr. Cheng gave a Power Point presentation showing the different aspects of the site at the ground level that showed the transition into the surrounding neighbourhood.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the plans for the landscaping. He noted that during the community process and open houses that there was strong support for the ground plane and the site planning. The wedge park, the social community square and the idea of the canal allows for the community to move through the site as pedestrians and cyclists. He added that retention of the trees is important.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Related Commentary:

- The Panel supported the FSR with the 12-storey height to preserve the larger regional views as well as the views to Mount Baker;
- The Panel also supported the massing and density;
- Some Panel members were open to a 14-storey building if it was in the right location and is an iconic building;
- The Panel applauded the design team for how the social mix would be integrated around the site with the notion that they aren't separated but are just neighbours;
- There was some concern regarding the amount of water on the site while other Panel members thought it brought something interesting to the site;

- Some Panel members would like to see more greenery meeting the canal and more ways for people to get to the water's edge;
- Some Panel members would like to see a larger expression of urban agriculture;
- The Panel noted that saving the heritage trees is going to be a challenge;
- They had some concerns regarding the possible damage to the root balls of the trees which could mean the loss of them;
- The Panel agreed that it had been a successful planning study with many positive aspects;
- They thought the plan had been successful because the neighbourhood had input;
- They liked the open landscape plans, the creek, elements of public art and the social housing mix which will make for an interesting project;
- Some Panel members would like to see better pedestrian way finding around the site;
- It was also suggested that the applicant look at how accessible the space will be for people in wheelchairs;
- As well they noted that although there is a fair bit of transit on 33rd Avenue and Main Street there was potential for a new Canada Line station at 33rd Avenue and a diagonal connection across the site would become critical;
- They felt that the next step should be to look at the character of the space.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Cheng said he appreciated the Panel's comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:41p.m.