

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday May 26, 2021

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: WebEx

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Michael Henderson
Muneesh Sharma Excused item 2&3
Adrien Rahbar
Walter Francl

REGRETS: Brittany Coughlin
Angela Enman
Karenn Krangle
Marie-Odile Marceau

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1065 Hardwood Street & 1066 Hardwood Street
2.	5055 Joyce Street
3.	601 Beach Crescent

1. Address: 1065 Hardwood Street & 1066 Hardwood Street
 Permit No. RZ-2021-00052 & RZ-2021-00051
 Description: This agenda item contains two separate and almost identical applications, separated by a lane. The rezoning is to develop two sites with two residential towers: The north site, 1065 Harwood St and 1332 Thurlow St, is 36-storeys with 288 rental housing units including 57 below market rental units and 231 market units. The second site, 1066-1078 Harwood Street, at 36 storeys with 287 rental units, including 56 below market units and 231 market units. Both building heights are 316 ft. and the floor space ratio (FSR) for both towers are 13.1. Both applications are being considered under the Criteria for 100% Secured Rental and Below-Market Rental Housing as an Alternative to Inclusionary Social Housing in the Burrard Corridor.
- Application Status: Rezoning Application
 Review: Second
 Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects
 Staff: Thien Phan & Kevin Spaans

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/8)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Thien Pham, began by noting that, while two applications are under review, they are substantially the same in massing, form, height, and density. Each project was distinguished throughout the presentations, but Panel commentary relates to both unless specifically stated. The proposal consists of a north and south site on either side of Harwood St with Thurlow St at the west side of each site. Both towers are proposed to be 36 storeys in height with 20% of the residential floor area designated for below-market rental, targeting households within a certain income bracket. The towers each have a density of 13.1 FSR, with 1065 Harwood St containing 287 housing units and 1065 Harwood St containing 288.

The applications have been submitted under the new *Rezoning Policy for the West End and 100% Secured Rental Housing Option with Below-Market Rental*, adopted by Council in 2020. This is the first application falling under this new policy to be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel.

Ms. Pham then provided a brief synopsis of the new policy, as follows:

- staff developed the policy specifically for the subareas D and E of the Burrard Corridor area of the *West End Plan* earlier in 2020, with the *Policy* being approved in November of that year;
- the intent is to provide for an increase in rental housing, including affordable rental, on the downtown peninsula;
- the *Policy* permits consideration of up to 20% additional total floor area to support the added rental housing, which may take the form of increases in floorplate size or increased number of storeys within the 300ft. height limit permitted in the *West End Plan*. Increases in floor area are subject to livability and urban design considerations including protected public views and overshadowing;
- the *West End – Tower Form, Siting and Setbacks Administration Bulletin* sets out specific tower typologies and floorplate sizes. Per this bulletin, a maximum 5,500 sq. ft.

floorplate is expected, with an additional 15% permitted between 30ft. and 60ft. in height to form a tower base;

- The *Bulletin* is also very specific about minimizing shadows on to the north sidewalk of Davie Village from 10 am to 4 pm.

The north and south sites are almost identical, except for the north site has one extra housing unit, with a tiny difference in floor area, and one extra level of underground parking. Both towers are 36 storeys and 316 ft. and an FSR of 13.1.

There are no Council-approved protected public views extending over the site, however heights are limited to *West End Plan* at 300 ft. The towers have a proposed height of 316 ft. measured from base grade to the top of the residential parapet. Outdoor rooftop amenities spaces with urban agriculture and seating, elevator overruns, and mechanical enclosures extend beyond this height.

The first level of and the rooftops of each building contain shared amenity space, with indoor multipurpose spaces and a gym. Levels 2 to 6 contain below-market rental units. Level 7 is a mix of below market and market. Remaining levels 8-34 are market.

Each building contains 80% rental and 20% below market rental. Both are meeting the family mix requirement with 25% family 2-bed only for rental and 25% for below-market rental. Senior Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, reminded the Panel of the existing urban character and context, noting that the site falls in a zone of old-stock lowrise rental and strata buildings surrounded by taller residential forms on adjacent blocks. Mr. Spaans then provided an overview of the proposed site designs, outdoor amenity areas, and the public realm as follows:

- the site layouts of both 1065 and 1066 Harwood St are substantially similar in general layout, with available outdoor area at each site impacted by site slope and parking access. A public bike share facility is located at Maxine Ln behind the north tower;
- both buildings include large common roof decks with urban agriculture, seating areas, and outdoor dining areas;
- both towers are accessed off of Harwood St through outdoor corner plazas with seating and garden areas, covered by cantilevered, architecturally integral slabs;
- secondary points of access are provided off of Harwood St into each of the eastern at-grade amenity areas, denoted by round portal-like openings in a solid brick garden wall.

Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, noted the following about the form, articulation, and architectural character of the buildings:

- the towers are proposed as tower-in-the-park-type buildings as outlined in the *West End – Tower Form, Siting and Setbacks* bulletin, with a larger floorplate proposed commensurate to the extra floor area permitted by the *Policy* up to approximately 6,500 sq. ft.;
- in general terms, there is little in the way of formal building articulation, with only minor stepping in massing toward the bases of each of the towers;
- modulation in the façade is provided by way of balcony extensions with integrated planters, and profiled glazing units;
- a pronounced two-storey architectural appurtenance providing access to the rooftop amenity, and a mechanical enclosure are proposed at the uppermost roof level;

- a preliminary material palette of red brick, glass, and concrete is presented.

A series of perspective views from Vanier Park, Burrard & Harwood, Beach & Thurlow, and Davie & Thurlow were provided by the architect and were presented by Mr. Spaans.

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

1. Please comment on the performance of the proposed site design, its interface with the public realm, and its contribution to the character of the West End.
2. Please comment on the proposed form, massing, and height, with particular consideration given to:
 - a. Articulation of form from base to roof;
 - b. The contribution of the towers to the skyline of the West End;
3. Please comment on the architectural expression and the preliminary material palette to inform a future DP application review.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The architectural expression is inspired by mid-century West End towers of the 1960s and 1970s, with less glass and more solid walls with high quality materials than a typical contemporary tower.

Floors are expressed as solid horizontal bands interrupted by balconies that extend out from the façade. Overall, there is a high ratio of wall to window. The balconies shift both at the corners and middle elevation to add interest to the towers.

This architectural expression extends from the roof level down to grade, where the building blends into the landscape. The overall impression is of a tower emerging from a garden.

The design of the site provides for a gateway effect at each of the lobbies, and makes for an intimate human-scaled approach into the buildings. To supplement the at-grade outdoor amenities and the private balconies, there are roof amenity spaces provided at each building.

The inspiration of the landscape and the public realm is the notion of a building in a garden that you see a lot in the West End. The intent is to make sure the towers site themselves seamlessly and elegantly into the context. Landscape enclosure is used strategically to provide a sense of refuge in the garden while not losing the relationship with the public realm. Many opportunities for visual and physical access between the on-site landscape and the public realm are created. Carving out of solid elements is done in a very organic way, and the intersection of solid building elements and greenery is used throughout to soften the built form.

Harwood St has a very green character, and the applicant noted that they are endeavouring creatively layer structure into the wildness of the existing urban landscape. Emphasis is being placed on diverse and wild plantings, and pollinators and birds are considered throughout the design of the landscape. Small water features are used strategically to mask street noise, to add atmosphere, and to offer an escape to residents.

The staff and 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. DAVIES** and seconded by **MS. STAMP** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:

- Design Development to the building elevations with respect to materiality, rooftop mechanical massing and expression, balcony expression, and how the tower form meets the ground plain;
- Review CPTED considerations at both towers and properties;
- Continued design development of planting features, canopies and the perimeter brick wall.

Related Commentary:

There was not unanimous support from the panel for height. A few panelists noted the height exceeded the policy and is not sympathetic to the West End skyline. Others noted once the design of the elevator and mechanical penthouses is resolved, issues related to height will be settled.

Some panelists noted the height is causing shading on Davie Street, and recommended that the tops of the towers should be sculpted to mitigate this.

There was general support for the massing and architectural expression, and the way the proposed design refers to the existing character of the West End. Some panelists noted that the balconies, though nice for the residents of the building, cause the tower to appear bulkier. The Panel noted that the significant grade changes were handled well in the architectural design of the building and the landscape.

A panelist recommended that further design development be considered for the form of the balconies and the shape of the windows to work more cohesively together.

There was general support across the Panel for the proposed preliminary material palette and for the plantings proposed in the design of the landscape.

The panel appreciated the attention to the ground plain and how the landscape interacts with the building, however they noted that more could be done to enhance the tower-in-the-park character of the towers by way of design development to the landscape. The diversity of the outdoor and indoor programming at the ground level was cited as being a successful part of the site design, as was the transition from the public areas to the semi public areas. Panelists noted that CPTED strategies needed further development, in consideration of common perceived security threats in open spaces, particularly when spaces may feel secluded.

Panelists noted that the landscape and the building entrances were well-defined, however the Panel encouraged further design development to the canopies to ensure that they function well as weather protection for residents. Rainwater protection strategies were also recommended at the roof levels to extend the utility of the rooftop outdoor amenity areas.

There was some commentary regarding the proposed balcony planters, with panelists noting that they appear as if they are hanging and appear architecturally integrated. There were concerns about the long-term maintenance of plants and the planters throughout the building.

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

2. Address:	5055 Joyce Street
Permit No.	DP-2021-0004
Description:	To develop a 36-storey mixed-use residential building with 360 residential units including 10 units of below-market rental housing at 20% below CMHC average rent for the neighborhood and commercial retail units on grade; all over 4 levels underground parking consisting of 97 vehicle spaces and 627 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 96.4 m (315.3 ft.), the floor area is 25,567 sq. m (275,202 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 16.1. The application is being considered under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan.
Application Status:	Complete Development Applicant
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	Perkins + Will
Staff:	Ryan Dinh

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/0)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner Ryan Dinh began by noting this is a development permit application followed the Council approved rezoning for 35-storey mixed-use building with commercial at grade under the Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan. A height of 96.1 m (316.3 ft.) and an FSR of 15.97 are proposed.

The Urban Design Panel reviewed the rezoning application in November 2018 and supported with recommendations to the design development of the outdoor areas and balconies.

Joyce-Collingwood is a transit-oriented and well-established neighbourhood with many local services and recreational amenities. The site is directly north of the Joyce-Collingwood SkyTrain station, and within 10 minutes walking distance to local parks and schools. It is one of the 3 new towers, with greater heights, which are intended to mark the station and differentiate new towers from the existing mid-rise towers in the area.

This development will introduce a new City lane to the North to improve the pedestrian and cyclist comfort along the BC Parkway, and to reduce potential conflicts between transit vehicles and vehicles in the lane. This allows an opportunity to create a pedestrian plaza at the existing lane adjacent to the project. Commercial spaces are located along Joyce Street for street activation. Access to the residential tower is from the plaza. Long benches, planting, café seating area will be provided in the pedestrian plaza and sidewalk. The indoor amenity rooms are located on level 3 and 4 and on the roof top, together with the outdoor amenity space.

The building consists of a 35-storey tower atop a four-storey podium, following the built form guidelines regarding the building hierarchy. Rooftop distinction is provided through a double-height frame design containing the indoor and outdoor amenity space and mechanical room.

The tower's design concept includes a lightweight steel frame that "floats" off the building façades, containing balconies and forming a vertical garden to provide shading for the building. The balconies are staggered and double-height to enhance the building's verticality and provide visual interest, and intended to minimize thermal bridging at the envelope.

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

1. Comment on the success of the overall public realm and landscape design to “create a generous and comfortable space for the high volume of pedestrian activity” in this area?
2. Comment on the design development of the balcony feature.
3. Additional comments and advice for improvements

Applicant’s Introductory Comments:

The applicant noted they have responded to the right of way requirement to the north of the building. There is limited opportunity for tree planting in the pedestrian plaza as it is considered a laneway.

The applicant is ensuring high quality materials and design development to enhance the presence of the residential entry and store frontages. The retail starts at the corner with weather protection. On the right hand side, there is planting of tall bamboo to screen the wall.

The applicant noted the building has a balcony system that will aid with the building’s sustainability targets. Each balcony has a planter that is fed with a drip irrigation system. The paneling on the body itself is a copper color paint finish.

At the top of the building there are the larger amenities, there are smaller amenities within the building. The top has a wind protection feature that still protects the view to the sky.

The staff and 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. DAVIES** and seconded by **MS. LONG** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:

- Consider the use of landscape and/or architectural features to further identify the residential entry;
- Review planting and materials in the public realm with engineering to improve overall character and quality of materials;
- Review height of windscreen barrier feature at the rooftop.

Related Commentary:

There was general support for the massing and architectural expression.

The panel supported the overall colour scheme of the building; however, it was suggested to introduce an additional shade or other treatments at the base to differ the base and tower.

There was some comments noting concern with the unit sizes and livability. Some of the one-bedroom units are very small.

Consider design development in particular with planting, materiality, and removable features in the pedestrian plaza. A panelist noted it would be good to have a gathering node with landscape.

A few panelists noted concern with the amount of concrete around the building. The simplicity of the plaza design is supportable however, the landscape should reflect the quality of the architecture.

The panel appreciated the building and public realm in terms of expression of commercial to the street and the extent of commercial provided.

The panel noted the residential entry needed improvement. Consider design development with the landscape, canopies and architectural features on the ground level to better support the expression of the entry.

The balcony system and how it was expressed had support from the panel. The balconies have a delightful lightweight mechanical expression that gives the building an identity with striking colour. The panel appreciated how the craft of the balconies contributed to the sustainability. Some panelists noted the rigor that is applied to the balconies consider loosening up and providing some patterning.

The rooftop amenity could benefit from covered spaces.
A rooftop windscreen with a one-story barrier seems more appropriate.

The sustainability targets and achievements are commendable and sustainable.

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

3. Address:	601 Beach Crescent
Permit No.	DP-2021-00162
Description:	To develop a 53-storey mixed-use residential building with 303 market residential units, 152 social housing units, and commercial space at grade; all over three levels of underground parking consisting of 453 vehicle spaces and 911 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 163 m (535 ft.), the floor area is 43,732 sq. m (470,722 sq.ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 7.57.
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	GBL Architects
Staff:	Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended (6/0)

• Introduction:

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Urena, began by noting that this is a development permit application following rezoning for a 53-storey (or a 163m) mixed use building on 601 Beach Crescent.

An earlier panel saw the project you are looking at on the screen when it came in under the General Policy for Higher Building for a Rezoning application in 2018. At that time, the tower had 54 storeys and was placed to the south of the site. The application included a six-storey C-shape podium facing the Granville bridge. The Panel supported it with 11 recommendations, which are:

- Reduce the vehicular entry crossings at Beach Crescent ;
- Develop a friendlier character that is more integrated with the Seymour Mews;
- Design development of the retail facades to enhance the pedestrian experience;
- Develop ground plane landscape treatment;
- Design development to minimize shadowing of the roof amenity areas;
- Design development to improve the livability of the units facing the bridge;
- Design development of the podium to be less relentless and have a stronger base;
- Design development of the tower connection to grade and podium;
- Development of tower glazing and cladding;
- Review tower height to further differentiate from Vancouver House;
- Design development to enhance the architectural elegance of the design.

As a result of the Panel's recommendations and staff review, the applicant resubmitted the rezoning application with a major change; the relocation of the tower 81 feet from the property line towards the north, changing therefore, the concept and its relationship with the surroundings as well as between tower and podium.

The applicant proposed additional changes that included a tower height increase from 535' to 558' (55 Storeys), opening up the shape of the podium towards the Seymour ramp of the bridge

A reconfiguration of the massing at the west corner and subsequently the reduction of the western plaza area as shown in the left hand side, an increase in height of the podium from 6st to 8th on Beach Crescent and the inclusion of a drop-off area with a round about to the eastern

corner. In addition to attempting addressing the Panel's recommendations, the intended outcome of the tower's relocation was to minimize the shadows impact on the May and Lorne Brown Park to the east at key hours.

As a result of the tower relocation, the applicant sought a variance to have the tower and podium encroaching into the required setbacks per the Bridgeheads Guidelines. Based on the second design, staff put forward a set of comprehensive rezoning conditions, as part of the rezoning report, that was approved in Public Hearing on September 30, 2020. In summary, these are:

- Reduction of the building height to 535';
- Significant improve of the massing with the goal to achieve architectural excellence, including;
 - how the tower meets the podium and grade;
 - enhancing the tower sculpting and curvature of forms;
 - redesigning the tower crown with further dynamism
- Improve the open space and the public and private interfaces, including:
 - enhancing the open space and interface at the south corner,
 - enhancing the Rolston Street/Beach Crescent corner area;
 - appropriate response to the Mews.
- Improve the outdoor podium rooftop spaces;
- Better address the architectural objectives of the Higher Buildings Policy;
- Demonstrate that remarkable levels of livability are achieved in accordance with the expected standards for architectural excellence; or
- Confirmation of an excellent level of the sustainability performance;

Some of the applicant's responses to these conditions for this DP application include:

- Tower reshaping, height reduction and crown redesign;
- Podium reshaping and podium height increase, including one storey to the south and floor-to-floor to accommodate a pool to the north;
- Varied encroachment into the Bridgehead setbacks:
- Driveway area redesign;
- Mews and Rolston interfaces;
- Roof-tops reconfiguration;
- Revised units' layouts.

It is worth mentioning that the triangle site is bounded by Beach Crescent to the south, the Seymour Mews to the east, Rolston Street and the Seymour ramp above to the west and Pacific Ave to the north.

Significant developments around are mostly under several CD-1, such as the 497feet tall tower and two 6-storey triangle buildings for Vancouver House to the west, or the adjacent 31 and 24 storey towers with townhouses to the east across the Seymour Mews. A 24-storey building is located to the south adjacent to a vacant site.

Additionally, two parks are located nearby, the May and Lorne Brown Park to the west and the George Wainborn Park to the south.

The site is quite steep and has a difference of grade of about 7.4 m along Rolston and the Mews.

In terms of applicable policies, the site is crossed by the View Cone from Queen Elizabeth Park on the north side, however it is not affecting the current podium height or tower.

Other significant site-specific policies worth mentioning are:

- **Bridgehead Guidelines (1997);**
- **Under the Granville Bridge Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Policies and Guidelines (2007);**
- **Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines (1999, amended up to 2002);**

The applicant pursued an encroachment into the required setbacks facing the bridge at rezoning, which is also contemplated in this DP application with some changes and subject to further evaluation in terms of livability, per rezoning conditions.

Looking into the current application, the proposed form of development still consists of a curved tower over now a 9-storey L-shape and terraced podium. Between the tower and the podium, 303 market units, 152 social housing, on levels 2 to 7 of the podium, and 11 CRU are accommodated, all above three levels of parking.

As for the ground plane, the entry for the social housing is off Beach Crescent and the market lobby off the proposed driveway, which, as a reminder, is located parallel to the existing one due to a failure to secure access to this property when the adjacent site was developed. Commercial units front almost at full perimeter, having some mechanical space and social housing facing the mews as well.

At podium levels, a shared market/non-market outdoor amenity space is collocated with the social housing indoor amenity space. Another indoor and outdoor amenity space is located above the northern part of the podium.

More specifically about the interface with the Seymour Mews to the east, the proposal includes a 4-storey shoulder that has been extended towards the corner while the podium has been redesigned with a horizontal expression. Noticeably, changes have been introduced in the expression/massing of the social housing units facing this multi-level mews, particularly at lower levels.

At the ends, a deep driveway referred earlier is proposed to the south, a commercial unit, and some mechanical spaces to the northern end.

Further, looking at an elevation of the mews, the podium facing Beach Crescent has been increased to nine storeys from eight at rezoning (it was six when the Panel last saw it). The same number of storeys than at rezoning is proposed for the northern portion, however, having its apparent height increased because of accommodating the rooftop pool.

Towards the bridge, the largest change has been reconfiguring the connection between the tower and the podium as well as the podium layout.

As for the landscape and the contribution to the City's network of open spaces, the fundamental updates for the DP application are the incorporation of a bike lane along Rolston St., a car lane from Beach Crescent to Granville St., a ramp wrapping around the west corner, the inclusion of

2 storey micro retail units at the west corner (14), as part of a project to include 5 of these under the bridge that Engineering and the adjacent owner are undertaking and, the removal of the round-about to the south corner for a deeper driveway.

As shown in the applicant's renderings, the west corner is formalized with a series of ramps wrapping around the retail units.

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

Massing & Expression

- Overall revised massing concept, expression, contribution to the Granville gateway and, achievement of architectural excellence.
- How the tower meets the podium, podium height and how it meets the ground level.
- Does the application respond adequately to the Seymour Mews interface, including to its character and scale?

Livability

Have the UDP's previous recommendations to "improve the livability of the units facing the bridge" and outdoor rooftop areas been addressed?

Public Realm

- Overall public realm and its contribution to the downtown network of green and plaza space;
 - Have the Panel's previous recommendations "*reduce the vehicular entry crossings at Beach Crescent*" and the Urban Design rezoning condition to "*improve the open space and the public and private interfaces*" successfully been addressed?

Does the Panel consider the project proposes a successful landscape concept and treatment, including along the Seymour Mews and at the west corner?

Sustainability, Microclimate and Biodiversity

Please comment about the building's contribution to these aspects in relationship to its anticipated architectural excellence.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant noted the design progress include a successful public hearing in the last year. The intent is to create a gateway in and out of Vancouver and stand as a contextual landmark.

Through massing and form, harmonized a form of a dynamic public realm celebrating the beach neighbourhood. The site includes 152 much-needed social housing units along with residential and retail units. The main entrances and car entrance are located on beach crescent.

One of major changes is tower relocation to the north sitting 31 m from the Beach Crescent sidewalk. This has reduced the shadowing and able to alleviate view impacts from adjacent towers. The new location of tower is much more even, compared to adjacent towers, the distances are spread-out and view cones are visible through the building. The new position allows for more sunlight access to the third floor amenity. More units can face beach crescent. Opening up of the podium on the North West corner allows for more visibility on the units.

The podium and tower relationship has improved this has allowed to develop the façade and massing so the podium and tower can become one language.

The first entrance and car entrance massing has been pushed put to match the height on the Seymour mews. The two level units match the height of the townhouses.

The massing pushing out matches the height of the beach level, which creates for a nice pedestrian experience. The CRU is matching that corner. The adjacent tower contrasts quite well creating a nice opening to the Seymour mews.

The applicant noted they tried to breakdown the frontages on Rolston St tried to break to match the grade changes.

Regarding the landscape, the starting point was to continue to respond to the flowing movement as seen in the architecture and how this can be translated to the ground plain forms and materials. The applicant noted they created a pedestrian user experience for both private and public ground floor levels. Working on an adaptive native strategy that allows for multi seasonal interest points and flow of movement changes as one passes through the site. The focus on the ground floor with respect to Rolston is permeability of the pedestrian movement.

There is an amenity terrace on the 3rd floor with various tapestry landscape. There are various textures inside the amenity. There are green roof elements to help with noise and sound and carious texture interlacing movement and flow. The 8th level amenity has organic features and seating and organic planting materials.

The applicant finished by presenting their sustainability objectives.

The staff and 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. DAVIES** and seconded by **MS. SHWARTZ** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **Recommend Resubmission of** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:

- Design development to the tower podium expression interface;
- Design development to the relationship between the podium and Seymour mews addressing the ramp and unique character of the Seymour mews;
- Design development to the urban realm to promote a more vibrant public space. Improve legibility accessibility and sustainability features. Ensure further resolution of grading at the west corner;
- Design development to the podium to be more responsive to the context and residential character.

Related Commentary:

The panel commended the applicant for all the work moving the tower and reshaping the podium.

There were comments that the tower form is elegant and works well with its neighbours. A panelist noted that it is not working as part of the gateway. Moving the tower to the center of the site enhances the gateway feel of the building.

The amenity to the roof deck is a big improvement from the original submission. The access to sunlight and childcare opportunity presented should be further developed.

There were many comments related to the relationship of the tower to the podium, presently the language of tower to podium and podium to the ground is unresolved and not good. A panelist noted the articulation of the tower works well in the skyline but more articulation and detail is needed when it hits the ground. There were many recommendations to integrate better the tower and podium, including through transferring some of the material elements as they are currently disconnected. Previously, the tower dissolved into the podium but not now. Larger blending needs to be done according to panelists.

The panel noted improvements regarding the north-west portion of the podium in terms of the massing however, the relationship with the entire podium and tower to the Seymour mews is still struggling.

The shaping of the tower needs to be driven by a stronger concept and not just the concept of the dress. This would be mitigated if took into account other performances issues. A few comments noted the goal should be to clearly create a distinction or unification with the tower and podium. Panelists noted the podium too big and high and that the Vancouver House has a sculptural podium, lacking here, as it is very flat.

Panelists noted the architectural expression is flat, particularly the podium expression needs a lot of work to convey residential expression, as it reads as a motel, with a very repetitive and relentless suburban expression. The architecture is unresolved and lacks of character on its own or a character that supports the project. A panelist suggested closer examination of the balcony expression and guardrail expression would be helpful.

The Seymour mews has gone backwards, the parking ramp is too deep and how it addresses the lower parking ramp the adjacency is poor and requires a lot of attention and the fact that the residential units in the middle of the mews are a metre below grade is not understanding grades or reflecting architectural excellence. There is no sufficient information at this area.

The overall public realm to the needs further design development, particularly to the mews and western corner. A panelist noted that the public realm should also contribute to the gateway experience and it is lacking of resolution and is minimal for a tower of this nature.

Public realm needs to go hand by hand with the architecture and that is not occurring.

Access to the residential market lobby through the public realm is not adequate and needs further development. This pedestrian entry to the market units is difficult and it is not clear where to come in, lacking of wayfinding. The driveway is prioritized due to its location; this is working against the project.

The relationship of the public realm to the base to the commercial units needs further design development. Panelists noted the western corner is not good, including issues with accessibility and integration with CRU units.

The treatment of the building around the ground plane should have further development as the landscape has taken over most of the public realm.

There was concerned expressed with the exposure of the third floor amenity podium.

A panelist noted uncertainty as to why there is retail use along Beach Crescent where it is all residential when going east.

The sustainability objectives noted by the applicant need to be supported by responsive gestures in the architecture; panelists asked to explore this further.

A panelist suggested if the balconies could be placed in a way that helps with building's performance, therefore having fewer balconies on the north.

Consider other measures for the energy performance of the tower.

The panel noted there is not an adequate level of design detail as presented for a development permit; the level of design resolution (architectural and landscape) is unresolved for a DP submission.

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