

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 30, 2013

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Daryl Condon
Vincent Dumoulin
Veronica Gillies
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item 3, 4 & 5)
Geoff McDonell
Norm Shearing
Peter Wreglesworth

REGRETS: Alan Endall

RECORDING SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr (Item #1) and Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 155 East 37 th Avenue (Little Mountain) |
| 2. | 3427 Porter Street |
| 3. | 89 West Georgia Street/800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena - West Tower) |
| 4. | 800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena - East Tower) |
| 5. | 685 Pacific Boulevard (Rogers Arena - South Tower) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. and the Chair gave an overview of the Development Permit Board meeting on January 28, 2013 where 68 Smithe Street was presented to the Board and approved. Chair Borowski then called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 155 East 37th Avenue (Little Mountain)
 DE: 416511
 Description: Proposal for a 5-storey, 51 unit social housing project for seniors. It is proposed as the first development on the 15 acre Little Mountain Housing site, to be guided by the Little Mountain Housing Policy Statement approved by Council in June 2012. In the interests of accelerating the provision of social housing on the site, this project is proceeding in advance of the larger site rezoning and is being considered under the existing RM-3A zoning.
 Zoning: RM-3A
 Application Status: Complete
 Review: First
 Architect: Gair Williamson Architects
 Owner: Holborn Properties
 Delegation: Gair Williamson, Gair Williamson Architects
 David Long, Gair Williamson Architects
 Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative
 Staff: Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Ms. St. Michel, Senior Planner, introduced the proposal for a 5-storey fifty-three unit senior's social housing project that will be the first project to proceed on the Little Mountain Housing site. The Urban Design Panel reviewed and commented on the Little Mountain Housing policy statement guiding redevelopment of the site in a workshop in May 2012, and it was approved by Council in June 2012.

Ms. St. Michel stated that they anticipate receiving a rezoning application in the near future from James Cheng Architects on behalf of Holborn Developments, but in the interests of advancing the provision of social housing on the site are considering this proposal under the existing zoning. The RM-3A zoning allows a density of about 1.45 FSR and a height of 35 feet. As this is still one large site the density itself isn't a problem, but the height will require a relaxation request that will be considered by the Development Permit Board in April. The Little Mountain Housing Policy Plans supports a density overall of about 2.3 to 2.5 FSR over the site with building heights that range from 4 to 10 storeys typically with 12-storey maximum at the central portion on the site.

The fundamental idea of massing on the site is that it should transition down towards the edges of the site to relate to the surrounding community. Ms. St. Michael said staff are considering this in advance of the rezoning because it is a public interest project. The usual requirements for the Urban Design Panel have been waived--specifically a detailed model--but a massing model and detailed renderings were provided. Key to the organization of the site is a main street or mews that runs through from East 33rd Avenue at the top of the site connecting to Main Street at the eastern edge. As well, the trees will be

retained which reflect the memory of the site and also a reflection of the former angle of the previously existing building on the site.

Ms. St. Michel noted that the building's footprint envisioned in the Policy Statement first foresaw having an east-west oriented building in this portion of the site. Late in the process it was realized that if the building orientation was switched to be primarily north-south it could achieve better permeability into the site and a far better relationship in liveability with respect to the adjacent buildings.

The proposed building embodies the following key elements in the policy:

- permeability through the two public paths;
- enlivening streets and mews with front doors and overlook;
- a rich and varied interface along East 37th through a variety of setbacks;
- scale transitions to the neighbourhood by stepping down to 3 or 4 storeys along East 37th Avenue;
- ensuring good sunlight access to public spaces by stepping down to the future public square;
- The building's lobby and amenity space face directly onto the Village Square to provide animation and interest in the square;
- memory as reflected in the angled orientation of the building; and
- visible green: roof top gardens and supports for vertical plant growth.

Ms. St. Michel mentioned that the building was designed for temporary surface level parking and in the future it will be connected underground to a neighbouring social housing project to the east.

The rezoning for the Little Mountain Housing site will meet or exceed the city's criteria for sustainable large development planning including feasibility of low carbon energy supply, rainwater management and other elements. As well the building will achieve LEED™ Gold certification.

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

- The landscape treatment of the outdoor amenity space at grade in relation to the public walk-way. Should there be some delineation of this space from the walk?

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Williamson addressed the guiding principles and how they apply to the project. He noted that the building steps down three storeys at the front at the main street and goes back about 21 feet so there is a twenty yard setback. There will be a mews on the east side of the project which goes up to the public square. There is a path proposed that will connect between the future buildings to the west and that will connect to the square as well. Through the middle of the project at the ground floor, the building can be exited on East 37th Avenue although anybody exiting will not necessarily have to go around to the square itself. Currently there is a bikeway along West 37th Avenue. Mr. Williamson noted that eventually the temporary surface parking will be located to the east as underground parking. The building fronts on the public square and there is a mews which connects to the public square on East 37th Avenue. There are two existing trees along East 37th Avenue that will be retained however two trees will be removed because they are in poor health and are in conflict with the building. There is amenity space planned next to the mews with an outdoor space. The proposed public space off the amenity space is on the mews at the north-east corner of the building.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider increasing the openness of the outdoor amenity space.
 - Consider programming of the outdoor space in terms of its orientation and placement within the proposal.
 - Re-consider the exit route in order to emphasize the main building entry.
 - Consider barrier free access to some of the patio spaces.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was well done.

The Panel supported the response to the urban plan including the re-orientation of the building. They liked the provision of the light at the end of the corridors, the French balconies, the management of the roof garden and the floor to ceiling height of the units. The Panel agreed that there were a number of items in the project that have been well handled.

The Panel supported the landscape treatment of the outdoor amenity but some felt that it needed the barriers to be more formal between the amenity space and the public circulation path. A couple of Panel members thought it could have some openness with a modest degree of separation. A couple of Panel members asked the applicant to take every opportunity to retain the trees as they are a significant aspect of the site.

The Panel felt that it was important to program the space with perhaps a barbeque area or eating function. A couple of Panel members suggested adding a roof or other shading device to make it more useable during the day.

Most of the Panel thought there should be more clarity regarding the entrance on East 37th Avenue. One Panel member suggested developing the exit route along a barrier free path.

The Panel supported the landscape plans however a couple of Panel members suggested combining the roof decks or perhaps adding more urban agriculture beds. Combining the roof decks would allow for more social interaction between the residents.

A couple of Panel members had some concerns with respect to acoustics considering the amount of construction that will happen on the site over the next several years.

Regarding sustainability, the applicant was asked to consider more emphasis on the passive design of the building and to take the opportunity to add future solar panels on the roof.

The Panel also thought the applicant should consider locating an art piece that is visible in the amenity space that speaks to seniors' interest and culture.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Williamson thanked the Panel for their comments.

2. Address:	3427 Porter Street
DE:	416378
Description:	To construct two new multiple dwelling buildings containing a total of 10 townhouse units (4 townhouse units in the rear building and 6 townhouse units in the front building) over one level of common underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Gateway Architecture Inc.
Owner:	Boffo Homes (Porter Street) Inc.
Delegation:	Michael Cox, Gateway Architecture Inc. Senga Lindsay, Senga Landscape Architecture Jeremy Waldman, Boffo Properties
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-3)

- Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site across the street from the Trout Lake Community Centre. The zoning allows for both commercial and residential uses. Ms. Linehan described the context for the area noting the single family and duplex zonings to the north. The site is moderately sloped with a change in the grade of about 2.5 meters. The proposal is a multiple dwelling consisting of two rows of townhouse units around a central courtyard over one level of underground parking with access to the parking from the lane. A courtyard scheme was provided to better transition to the rear yard of the duplex site to the north. There is a break in the front row of units to provide a central access path to the courtyard and rear unit entries, which also have back doors on the lane. Ms. Linehan remarked that there is a slight rear yard relaxation requested by the applicant to facilitate provision of a wider courtyard. Mr. Linehan mentioned that applications seeking conditional density are expected to address the requirements of the C-2 Design Guidelines and seek a high quality building design that is: compatible with existing development and neighbourhood scale; provides a high standard of livability for new residential units; and contributes to pedestrian interest and amenity.

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

- Relationship to the adjacent site to the north, including treatment of the exposed north wall, in light of lower density zoning on that site (and further north).
- Meeting design guidelines for conditional density to 1.58 FSR (Maximum being 2.15 FSR).

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Michael Cox, Architect, further described the proposal. He indicated that the site was difficult to arrange the maximum amount of living space and the team had worked very hard on creating a courtyard scheme. They felt that the proposal would relate better to the neighbours than a double loaded corridor building. They have staggered the buildings to open the courtyard to allow for more natural light. Mr. Cox described the material palette and noted that they plan to use brick on the principal facades with rockdash stucco elsewhere to add texture. The inside courtyard face will also be bricked. He added that the units are liveable with three bedroom units across the rear of the site and two bedroom units and flats on the front. All the units have roof decks with a skylight stair for access.

Senga Lindsay, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and indicated that the front landscaping is a combination of ornamental plus urban agriculture. She described the various plantings that are proposed including apple trees. The interior of the courtyard will have plantings to buffer the walkways along with some trees. The alley will have plantings and as well the roof decks will have various plantings along with a fireplace and concrete pots planted with a nut tree.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider adding slot window openings and greenery to soften the north wall of the project;
 - Consider enlivening the landscape and adding a planting strip;
 - Consider sun shading to the west elevation;
 - Design development to improve the integration of materials;
 - Consider adding a lift/elevator to allow for handicap access;
 - Design development to improve the balcony expression;
 - Consider art opportunities;
 - Design development to the courtyard to allow for a gathering space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it was a difficult site but well handled.

The Panel liked the architecture and the landscape plans and thought they were thoughtfully done. They acknowledged that it was a challenge to fit everything onto the site. They agreed that the courtyard was well handled but had a couple of concerns. Several Panel members suggested softening the north wall with some vegetation for a better integration to the neighbours. Although the Panel supported the material palette, a couple of Panel members felt the brick elements were much better handled than the stucco component especially on the lane, although one Panel member thought the brick return on the north façade was not helping the expression. One Panel member suggested adding some windows on the north side for light and a sense of interest in the façade. Most of the Panel felt the colour palette was a little somber and thought it could be lightened.

There was some concern regarding the lack of an elevator on the site with one Panel member suggesting the bedroom on the south could be used for a lift to address accessibility. A couple of Panel member thought the expression on the balconies could be improved and that French balconies could be added for cross ventilation. One Panel member liked the exposed gutters and hoped the materials the applicant chooses would be copper or zinc.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but felt more could be done to improve the overlook for the neighbours. One Panel member suggested making the planters bigger to make the plantings more successful. Another Panel member thought there should be a common area in the courtyard for people to gather. The Panel was disappointed that the applicant hadn't done more regarding a sustainability strategy with one Panel member suggesting the applicant consider sun shading on the south facades. One Panel member noted that the proposal was located in an art friendly neighborhood and suggested there were opportunities for art such as adding some delight in the gutter.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cox said he appreciated the Panel's comments and looked forward to working with planning to continue improving the proposal.

3. Address:	89 West Georgia/800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena - West Tower)
DE:	416258
Description:	Interior and exterior alterations to change the office uses on the 13 th through 24 th floors to residential units.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Fourth
Architect:	B + H Architects
Owner:	Aquilini Development and Construction Inc.
Delegation:	Bruce Knapp, B + H Architects James Vasto, B + H Architects Riaan de Boer, Aquilini Development and Construction Inc.
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3-6)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and reminded the Panel that it received non-support at the last review. She described the Panel's concerns which included the top of the building and how it related to the lower part of the building as well as the expression on Gate 8. She noted that the questions that were handed out to the Panel covered the comments from the last review. These are the areas the Panel wanted to see further design development.

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

Has the proposal address the previous UDP concerns:

- Design development to improve the transition between the office and residential portions of the tower;
- Design development to improve the relationship of the top of the tower to the rest of the building;
- Design development to improve the expression of Gate 8;
- Design development to enhance the residential entry;
- Consider improving the residential unit layouts especially to the corner units;
- Consider strengthening the sustainability strategy.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Bruce Knapp, Architect, further described the proposal. He explained that they did a full evaluation on the design approach. He reminded the Panel that they felt at the last review that the building lacked a cohesion and distinction in the design that resulted from the conversion of the top floors from commercial use to residential. He mentioned that the building will be the second largest rental development in Vancouver. He added that there is a LEED™ commitment in the building. It has gone from LEED™ Silver, uncertified in the early submission to LEED™ Gold certified. Mr. Knapp said they took a step back and looked at the building as a unified whole. Mr. Knapp described the changes to the architecture and noted that they relocated some of the residential balconies and added colour to the screens for privacy. He acknowledged that additional green space at grade has been a concern. There are often 15,000 people in the area on game night so they need to keep the pedestrian/patio areas simple. He added that they have proposed a café/patio on the west corner that will add seating and life to the plaza.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider a simpler architectural expression;
 - Consider strengthening the vertical ties between the top and the bottom of the tower;
 - Design development to improve the ground plane;
 - Consider more integration of the penthouse expression to the tower;
 - Consider refining the kitchens layouts in the deep residential units;
 - Consider the addition of a neighbourhood utility as part of the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal as they thought there was room for improvement.

The Panel acknowledged that the applicant had done a lot to address the Panel's concerns from the last review but felt they were only half way measures. They thought the design did not convincingly tie the top part of the building to the bottom. As well they thought the creases at the corners didn't have a strong relationship to the residential portion of the building. One Panel member noted that the top half of the building has a much finer grain but doesn't tie into the part below. Most of the Panel felt the applicant needed to simplify the architecture.

Most of the Panel also felt that the colour palette was not well conceived and thought the coloured glass did not need to blend in with the other two new buildings. One Panel member thought the building needed to be more classic considering its location to the downtown core.

The Panel supported the changes to the design for Gate 8 but thought the graded weather protection should be removed. They also thought the residential entry had been improved. The Panel had some mixed feelings regarding the penthouse with some Panel members thinking it needed more detailing while other liked the simple expression. As well there were a couple of Panel member who thought the "top hat" on the building did not work.

Some Panel members thought the ground plane needed some work and thought it should tie into the other two buildings that will be built in the area. They noted that there needed to be some resolution at the viaduct, as most people will experience the building at ground level whether the viaducts are removed or not. One Panel member thought the ground plane could be simplified to resolve the pedestrian realm. Another Panel member thought there should be an outdoor amenity space for the residents of the building.

The Panel thought the residential unit plans worked expect for the deep units. One Panel member suggested it would be easy to make them successful by changing the shaped kitchen to a different layout.

Regarding the public art strategy, one Panel member thought there should be a master plan for the site that includes all three buildings. Another Panel member thought it would be exciting to have the public art integrated into the massing of the building. As well it was suggested that Gate 8 could be bolder in its expression to make it a piece of art.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, the Panel felt it could be improved. One Panel member noted that this was a prime opportunity for a local district energy system.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Knapp thanked the Panel for their comments. He said he appreciated what they had to say and were willing to take them into consideration.

4. Address:	800 Griffiths Way (Rogers Arena - East Tower)
DE:	416399
Description:	To construct a new 28-storey tower (East Tower) at the south east corner of the existing arena, including renovations to the existing building.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second
Architect:	Walter Francl Architecture
Owner:	Aquilini Development and Construction Inc.
Delegation:	Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architecture Scott Mitchell, Walter Francl Architecture Margot Long, PWL Landscape Architects Riaan de Boer, Aquilini Development and Construction Inc. Jason Packer, Recollective
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal. She explained that as part of the rezoning approved by Council last year, the form of development is for three towers adjacent to Rogers Arena. The massing of each tower utilizes a triangular form with broad faces oriented towards the arena. The heights of the buildings are the maximum heights permitted under the Council approved view cones and established by the CD-1 By-law.

Ms. Molaro noted that the west (89 West Georgia Street) and east tower share a similar massing but distinct design character with triangular tower forms attached and integrated into the existing arena building. Enhanced acoustical performance is a requirement of the rezoning.

Above the existing Team Store at the corner of Pacific Boulevard and Abbott Street is a mixed use building. The lower floors will continue to serve retail and Rogers Arena event uses, while the floors immediately above will provide office space. The upper 14-storeys of the building will be secured market rental residential for a total of 28-storeys.

Ms. Molaro mentioned that there are a number of rezoning conditions related to the towers and the plaza:

- The way the structure inserts into the plaza is an important component. It needs to be kept as small and slender as possible as there is a need to maximize the amount of public realm open space, particularly in the long term with the adjustment in the curb line along Pacific Boulevard with its future realignment and the possible removal of the viaducts.
- Maintain and enhance the undulating form given this strategic and highly visible location.
- Maximize the clearance to the underside of the building soffit to allow sunlight to the public plaza.
- The south tower also needs to accommodate the various road dedications, road configurations and building grade adjustments. Staff and the applicant have been working through these at a fairly detailed level to understand and manage an existing condition today that can be adjusted appropriately to an condition anticipated in the future.

- An important design change to the open plaza is the relocation of the existing loading bay. This has now been accommodated with the parking access off Griffiths Way.

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

Overall architectural expression including:

- the articulated resolution of the building including roof profile;
- transition between the office and residential portions of the tower;
- proposed materials;
- architectural resolution of the proposed “unenclosed” balconies to address the additional acoustic performance requirements.

Sustainability attributes (LEED Gold proposed)

Detailed landscape treatment including

- green wall;
- roof treatments.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that getting all of the loading and parking function off into a single area improves the site plan. He said they have also taken into account the entries to the parkade and conditions for the lobby are set at grade. The east tower has both commercial and residential uses and will be a LEED™ Gold building. Mr. Francl described the architectural expressions noting that on the east façade there are coloured vertical louvers that become shallower as they move around to the south façade. He noted that the north face it is glazed with more solid spandrel as well as double glazed enclosed balconies or enclosable balcony features that will allow them to accomplish the acoustical attenuation required. Mr. Francl noted that the building will have all rental units with an amenity space on top of the building.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that the upper level at Gate 7 will have a larger terrace to make some gathering space. If the viaducts are removed, they planned the plaza to have modular paving that could be easily adjusted. The tower doesn’t have a lot of outdoor space. The planting currently is around a circular plaza which doesn’t work very well, so they tried to open up the space. The plaza is currently at a raised elevation along Griffiths Way so it will be easier to cut across the plaza in the future. At the top of the tower there will be a green roof with urban agriculture along with a play area for children and a communal barbeque and seating area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to simplify and strengthen the architectural parti;
 - Design development to improve the resolution of the unenclosed balconies;
 - Consider a different expression for the top of the tower;
 - Consider a stronger colour palette for the tower;
 - Consider strengthening the sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

Generally the Panel felt the parti was not as strong as could be and wanted to see it strengthened in relationship to the arena and in terms of the language of the tower. They

said they appreciated the two uses in the building however there were a number of concerns. The Panel felt the integration of the office and residential portions of the tower was successful but needed some discipline and refinement. The Panel thought the expression could be improved noting that the ribbon expression had been used many times in the city. As well they thought the applicant should rethink some of the graphic patterning and overlays to make them integrate better into the tower. There was a concern with the resolution of the unenclosed balconies and the framing was a bit overdone. One Panel member suggested picking up the patterns of the balconies for the whole tower to simplify the expression and make it more cohesive.

Some of the Panel thought the building should read more strongly with one Panel member stating that the northwest elevation needed to be rationalized. Some of the Panel thought the top of the tower should have a different expression that ties in with the other three buildings that are around it. They also said they would like to see a different colour glazing system.

One Panel member remarked that since the site is a center of entertainment it should have a design that expresses this special place. The building could be distinguished using colour or visual public art.

The Panel liked the green screen but felt it needed some resolution, with one Panel member noting that a green wall would be difficult to maintain whereas a green screen would be a better solution. The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel member stating that the granite sets in the pedestrian realm might not be the best material as it could be a tripping hazard. Some Panel members would like to see the Abbott Street frontage widened.

Regarding sustainability, one Panel member suggested the building could be connected to the SEFC energy system and thought there might be a real challenge in terms of the amount of glazing particularly on the office portion of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Francl said the Panel's comments were very insightful. He said he wished that they had modeled the arena with more detail as he felt it was not well presented. He added that they will work with the comments going forward.

5. Address: 685 Pacific Boulevard (Rogers Arena - South Tower)
DE: 416437
Description: To construct a new 31-storey tower (South Tower) south of the Georgia Viaduct over five levels of underground parking, including stairs to level 100 of the arena.
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Review: Second
Architect: Walter Francl Architecture
Owner: Aquilini Development and Construction Inc.
Delegation: Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architecture
Scott Mitchell, Walter Francl Architecture
Margot Long, PWL Landscape Architects
Riaan de Boer, Aquilini Development and Construction Inc.
Jason Packer, Recollective
Staff: Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a tower at the corner of Griffiths Way and Pacific Boulevard. This building will be entirely market residential with a height of 31-storleys. Parking and loading will be accommodated off Griffiths Way.

The building utilizes a triangular form with round corners and oversized balconies. The first floor of the building is raised above the plaza to allow for sun access while also maximizing pedestrian circulation space.

As a market residential building, one of the key concerns is the associated noise impacts from the arena. As a result there was an accommodation in the CD-1 By-law regarding the amount of open balconies and in particular a new type of balcony called unenclosed balconies, which are different from an enclosed balcony in that it is a flexible design. Ms. Molaro noted that enhanced acoustical performance is also a requirement of the rezoning.

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

- Overall architectural expression including:
 - the detailed articulated resolution of the building, particularly its undulating form given this strategic and highly visible location
 - proposed materials
 - architectural resolution of the proposed "unenclosed" balconies to address the additional acoustic performance requirements
- Sustainability attributes (LEED Gold proposed)
- Detailed landscape treatment including:
 - public realm (plaza) treatment for both the interim and future plaza design given future road configuration and grade changes
 - roof treatments

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Walter Francl, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the south tower occupies part of the plaza and is designed to give as much space to the surge public that will move in and out of the arena. He added that they decided to have less lobby space to leave more open space under the tower. The building itself has a series of projecting balcony enclosures that undulate on each of the three pods of the building so that there is an implied movement and animation that gives a lively prominence to the building. Mr. Francl said that public art has been a component and they are currently looking for an artist. The art will relate to the plaza space but should work if the viaduct is removed. The amenity spaces are on two levels so there is a south facing and east facing outdoor amenity space with attached indoor space. Mr. Francl described the material palette noting that it will have a wood grain finish. They will be using some of the same acoustical features that the east tower has including the use of double layers of walls on the north façade.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, further described the landscape plans noting the plaza stairs have been widened along with a terraced setting. They are planning to have the public art address the terraced seats or some lighting underneath the tower. They are looking at water to diminish the sounds of traffic along Pacific Boulevard. With the seating they are looking at the idea of adding some playfulness that expresses that the arena is the home of the Vancouver Canucks. There are two different terraces on the tower. Urban agriculture along with a barbeque area and children's play area are proposed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the termination of the tower;
 - Consider a stronger colour palette for the tower.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the tower would have a big impact on the city's skyline.

The Panel liked the undulating balconies and thought they added strength to the building and encouraged the applicant to keep the design simple. One Panel member thought there could be an element of fun using coloured balustrades on the balconies. A couple of Panel members thought the applicant might want to relook at how the tower terminates at the top as they felt it was a bit heavy and didn't relate well to the base of the tower. A couple of Panel members thought the colour palette should be stronger and proposed considering adding more colour to the columns.

It was noted by a number of Panel members that the detailing of the tower will be important in order to make it successful. One Panel member wanted the applicant to consider how the slab edges will show. Another Panel member mentioned that the glazing appears to be in front of the floor plate and may read as a more massive element than intended. The panelist also expressed concern that the inability to curve the glass might compromise the curved expression.

Most of the Panel supported the still expression under the tower with a couple of Panel members suggesting they be the same thickness. One Panel member suggested the applicant play with them as art masquerading as structure and structure masquerading as art. As well, one panelist suggested that the columns could be conceptualized to mimic a forest and they could be dressed up with wood. The Panel member thought the applicant should set a vision for the artist so they have some direction. Another Panel member thought the applicant needed to decide what the relationship of the circular element at

the base should be to the plaza. As well, another Panel member thought the plaza would benefit from more light under the building.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought the solution for the plaza was well done. Some Panel members noted that once the viaduct was removed it will make for better circulation space in the plaza. They liked the water element with one Panel member suggesting it should have a story. It was also suggested that the applicant rethink having pea gravel on the roof as it could be a hazard if it falls off the roof.

It was suggested that the applicant watch the glass and glazing to meet their sustainability strategy and suggested using triple glazing for energy and acoustical needs.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Francl said the Panel gave a very thorough review which he felt was helpful for the design team.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.