

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 6, 2019

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

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

REGRETS: Amela Brudar
Jim Huffman

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	5931 Cambie Street (Oakridge Centre Building 6, 7 & 8, formerly 650 W.41st Avenue)
2.	1558 W 6th Avenue
3.	600 Robson Street
4.	950 Granville Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Ms. Parsons called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 5931 Cambie St
 DE: DP-2018-01029
 Description: To develop the site with a mixed-use development consisting of a 32-storey building (Building 6) and a 17-storey building (Building 7) atop commercial podium, containing a total of 413 residential units; and one 34-storey tower (Building 8) containing a total of 286 residential units; all over three levels of underground parking. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 0.95 and the maximum geodetic building height is 186.29 m (611.2 ft) for Building 6, 143.9 m (472.1 ft) for Building 7, and 191.9 m (629.6 ft) for Building 8. The proposal includes a proportion of the future 9-acre park.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Complete Development Application
 Review: Fifth
 Architect: Henriquez Partners
 Owner: Qual Real/Westbank
 Delegation: Rui Nunes, HPA
 Peter Wood, HPA
 Chris Phillips, PFS
 Kevin Leung, Integral (LEED)
 Rhianna Maberley, Westbank
 Staff: Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner
 Jordan McAuley, Parks Board Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with recommendations (8 - 0)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Patrick O'Sullivan, introduced the project by first summarizing the history of the development.

Rezoning of the site was approved in 2014 to increase the density to 3.71, to retain retail uses and to add 11 towers of residential, adding 2900 dwelling units, 290 social housing units, 290 rental units. 1.8 sq. m of office space and 70000 sq. ft. civic centre and a park.

In 2017, a revised proposal with a number of changes was given to the City. These included changes to the park design, one less tower, a more prominent location for the civic centre, fewer levels of underground parking and no changes to the maximum height or density and number of units. These changes were captured through a PDP process which included a neighbourhood notification, two open houses, and two UDP appearances, and was approved by the DP Board in July 2018.

DP1 (Bldg. 3 & 4) was approved in October 2018. This is a social housing tower which includes 22 storeys, community centre, library, fitness centre, theatre, senior centre, childcare. These are residential towers on podiums that include office and retail space at grade. There's a new street called New St. and High St. with a pedestrian street with shopping on either side.

This proposal is looking at Buildings 6, 7, & 8. There is a mall component with a mix of one, two and three storeys as well as a food hall. There is also a transit plaza.

Building 6 is 32 storeys with residential units on top of an office podium with retail at grade. There is a fitness CRU on the North end. This building includes an amenity space.

Building 7 is 17 storeys with an indoor amenity space.

Building 8 is 34 storeys with an outdoor amenity space at the North end.

The tower heights comply with approved zoning and PDP. There is large format retail at grade along with several small retail units.

There is a summer house pavilion intended for presentations, concerts and productions of various kinds. It has a green room and back of house facilities.

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

1. How successful are the park entries at grade level in making the proposed roof-top park a welcoming, accessible, visible and highly public place?
2. How successful are the public street interfaces of West 45th Avenue and Cambie Street from the perspective of pedestrian experience?
3. Please comment on the overall architectural expression and materiality.
4. Please comment on the park design.
 - i. Do the interfaces between residential uses at park level in Building 8 and the public park provide sufficient privacy and livability for residents?
 - ii. Is the Relationship of the Summer House Pavilion as a performance space?

Parks Board Representative, Jordan McAuley, introduced the project. This is the first of the Oakridge DPs to contain a major component of the park, most notably the Woodland which is a forested area. It also contains an upgraded pocket park on W. 45th Ave. and the summer house pavilion.

The Woodland was envisioned as a passive contemplative space in the park which showcases a West coast native planting palette. There's a wooden boardwalk structure, pod-like overhead trellis' that grow out of the decking and provide seating underneath as well as a direct walkway to the grand staircase.

The Woodland will spill down the slope to help engage W. 45th Ave and draw people up. There is accessible access at grade in Building 7.

The pocket park was envisioned as a mixed active and passive play space. There is an engineered wood fibre surface and natural play elements like logs to climb on and a stepped wood top seating structure. There is a paved area sloping down towards W. 45th Ave.

As part of the summer house, there is an outdoor performance space under the cantilever and this is considered part of the park. There is a green room inside to support the performers.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The Applicant introduced the project. This project continues on the design rationale of reinstating of the lost urban forest in the Oakridge area.

The buildings are intended to emerge from the park with an organic shape and create very defined street edges which are 6 storeys which relate to the Cambie Corridor.

The tectonics of Buildings 6 and 7 relate to the skin and bones metaphor of the slabs being revealed to the South and the skin on the East and West side which are pods that accentuate the skin on the outside.

Building 8 is going straight up and is more of a windswept organic expression. Since rezoning, the park level was lowered by one level in order to more gracefully interface with W. 45th Ave and connect better to the pocket park.

The summer house pavilion has a big lawn in front meant as seating for the back drop of the stage and the mixing chamber. Parking, the retail hall and the park connect vertically.

The CPTED plan for the park defines zones of visibility with low shrubbery which is not contiguous. Most of the density is above eye level. There's large retail and restaurants all around with 24 hour security which provides additional safety.

In the overall park design, the Woodland is one of six green areas of the park coming out of long consultation process with the community over the last 2 years. The Woodland is felt to be this quiet space access to nature and one of the number one priorities of the comments we got from people. The idea of an ecology in the middle of the city is a powerful idea. It has a sense of enclosure and quiet.

We reorganized the paths from the original concept to pull it away from some of the units to create more space. We used topography and landscape to provide separation to the circulation.

The summer house is a very large active space for events and day to day events.

The lighting scheme being designed with Montreal consultant, Ombrages, and is in conjunction with the Parks Board. It's a thoughtful, landscape and night sky strategy.

There is a very wide streetscape with the setback as determined by the City which includes green bikeway, double rows of trees, and large spaces in front of the retail. There are high quality finishes and various spatial arrangements wrapping around the site.

Along W. 45th Ave, the landscape through to the pocket park flows down to grade and the streetscape via stairs spreading down to the seating areas.

The materiality of the tower is broken up starting at the base of structural glazing into the retail. There are no frames for that. Some of the bigger spans have glass fins. Going up into the tower, it's broken up in the the veil and bones. The veil is triple glazed four side SSG, low iron and low heat. The bones is a curtain wall on the window and triple glazed. The two types of spato colours are charcoal and white. The soffit material will be stucco. It's a simple palette of materials since the geometry is so complex.

From the sustainability perspective, this project is meeting the most current rezoning energy requirements, even though it was rezoned in 2014.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Marshall and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Further study on the park entry relating to the amount of planting at street level and integration with public realm. Find ways to improve invitation into the park space.
- Further design development of the interaction of the building with the public realm along the Cambie frontage including the use of shade and weather protection structures
- Retain the curvilinear nature of the building forms through use of curvilinear (not faceted) glass
- Further design development of the summer pavilion related to scale and pedestrian navigation around the structure while finding relief from the rigid form.
- Further discussion with Engineering on the parkade entry and plaza to consider pedestrian safety

- **Related Commentary:**

Most Panel members supported the use of the materials.

Park Entry

Most Panel members agree that the entrance along W. 45th Ave into the park has shown a big improvement from the last presentation. Some Panel members felt the woodlands was almost too thick while some Panel members felt the entrance was appropriate and inviting. Priority needs to be put on pedestrians not cyclists.

The general architectural design of the steps into the park is successful. Several Panel members noted that at the W. 45th Ave entry, the denseness of the planting and the height of the stairs creates a daunting entry. It was recommended to break down the steps by dividing them to 4 to 5 foot landings and to provide views to the next level.

One Panel member expressed concern about safety walking into the woodlands. There were several comments from Panel members on the issue of CPTED and lighting and encouraged the Applicant to continue to develop that area of the plan.

Residential and Park Interface

Most Panel members felt the interface of the residential uses on the park was acceptable. There were several comments on the lighting, noting that it looks really dark from a marketing point of view and that lighting is crucial to the success of the design.

Summer Pavillion

There was general support for the concept of a summer pavilion and concert area with some comments on the rigidity and linear expression of the current building form did not make it feel public. Most felt it was quite large in scale and may be eclipsing the park space. One Panel member suggested breaking the massive structure of the summer house to two parts, with one section for concert and performance and the other part expressing the mall entrance to the park.

East and West building Facades

Some Panel members commented that the elevation on the East and West façade is a bit monotonous. There was a reference to the façade looking like a cruise ship.

On Cambie Street, it is more challenging on street level, with a monotonous pedestrian experience. Colored glass or fins could reduce this and also be used as solar shading and weather protection. More texture, detailing, character and animation needed beneath the undulating canopy above. There was a suggestion for a sculptural element.

There were several Panel members who expressed concern with response to solar gain and lack of shading devices. A 4 to 6 storey façade may respond more to solar gain issues.

A Panel member commented that the arrangement of the pod balconies is quite set and moving it a few metres would give it some more randomness.

Miscellaneous comments

One Panel member suggested looking into a strategy to deal with storm water.

One Panel member commented that the pool created exposure for thousands of eyes to look down on to it and expressed some privacy concern.

One Panel member recommended some more seating and weather protection and rain screening around the entrances into the park, in particular around building 8.

A Panel member suggested that the glass should go to the top of the elevator stack so that it won't look like a top hat.

While the pods design is nice and comfortable, a Panel member noted that the curves from previous renditions of the design were much better.

A Panel member noted that there was no visible drop off areas in the design package and that would further help the design for future use for ridesharing.

One Panel member felt that recommendations regarding the public realm from the previous UDP were not fully addressed or incorporated, noting items like the height of the undulating roof canopy, the drop off zones, public interaction of the building along the ground plane along W. 41st Ave and Cambie St. In addition, consideration of an incremental weather canopy along the Cambie St side is recommended.

Several Panel members directed to Staff to work with Engineering on some of the challenges at the parkade entrance - the public realm paving does not cross the vehicular entrance, there are very wide turning radius into the entrance, and a turning lane onto W. 44th Ave. that eats into the boulevard. Some traffic calming would be recommended including having an island to create a safety zone for pedestrians.

One Panel member commented that the beauty of the sinuous form introduced at rezoning has been reduced and should be highlighted more. As well, the materiality of the beautiful curvilinear glass forms should be retained using curved and not faceted glass.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

2. Address:	1558 W. 6th Avenue
DE:	DP-2018-01160
Description:	To develop an 11-storey residential building consisting of townhouse at grade and a total of 50 residential units; all over 2 levels of parking. The proposal includes a heritage density transfer.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects + Designers Inc.
Owner:	Melissa Howey, Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Delegation:	Steve McFarlane, Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects + Designers David Jerke, van der Zalm & Associates
Staff:	Brenda Clark, Development Planner

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with recommendations (8-0)**• Introduction:**

Brenda Clark, Development Planner, introduced the project as an 11 storey tower in the Broadway Slopes situated half a block from Granville St., 3 blocks North of Broadway and 2 and a half blocks to Burrard St.

This neighbourhood is mixed in scale with generally low scale buildings. This project is a C3-A site, meeting all the provisions of the C3-A district schedule. Proposed FSR is 3.3 which includes the 10% heritage density transfer. It represents 50 units and it is nicely situated in a pedestrian active area well-served by transit and near downtown. There is a pocket park with children's play nearby, the Granville Loop park close by and a major bike route on the next block.

On topography, there is no view cone. The high corner is 3 m higher than the rest of the building and a slight raise towards Granville St.

The uses in C3-A includes multiple dwellings as a conditional use. This pocket does not have retail continuity but there is commercial use all along the North.

The building responds to the C3-A guidelines, written in 1998, states "The intent is to create an attractive cohesive and primarily residential neighbourhood to enhance Granville St. and Burrard St. as important entries to downtown and ensure a high standard of livability."

The tower form has a podium extending around the base with a courtyard between the townhouses. The main building entry is at the base of the tower through an open breeze way. The breeze way is open to provide fire fighter access to the townhomes.

Some additional points on the Broadway Slopes guidelines are to provide enough residential amenities for the anticipated population, to provide clearly identified entry, and generally high quality public open space. As well, the tower should contribute to the skyline through sculpting of the upper floors.

The tower form meets all these requirements utilizing a smaller floor plate than permitted. The courtyard widths meet the minimum standards of livability of 24.5 ft. The podium forms the required street wall. This is a visually prominent site visible from many directions.

There are several levels of private outdoor spaces. There is a courtyard. Each unit has its own balcony.

The grading is nicely resolved noting that some of the townhouse units do step down 3 ft. below grade.

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

- 1) Is the public realm interface sufficiently developed along West 6th Ave and along the lane?
- 2) Is sufficient open space provided on site to earn conditional density (10% bonus)?
- 3) Please comment on the overall architectural expression of tower and podium, including:
 - a. Resolution of the form;
 - b. Quality and choice of materials and;
 - c. Colour scheme
- 4) Please comment on the visual prominence of the building entry and the quality of the entry sequence including the open breeze way.
- 5) Is sufficient outdoor amenity provided for the building residents?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Topographically, it's a twisted site and represents a grade change of about 10 ft. The exposure to the openness of three sides and the single party wall presented some interesting challenges.

Programmatically, it focusses on residential use, with a total of 50 suites, predominantly generous 2 and 3 bedroom suites. There is 32% is 3 BR with three typologies, double aspect townhouses at grade, single aspect townhouses in the basic podium, and 3 BR penthouses distributed throughout.

Two bedrooms constitute about 50% of the mix, ranging from 700 - 1000 sq. ft.

There are a modest 18% of 1 bedroom units and one studio unit.

The key driver for this project surrounds the complexity and having a non-repetitive suite mix for a modestly scaled building.

Through an exploratory process, it was determined that this was the best design for the site. In addition, the location of the parking ramp was determined so that the greatest degree of lane activation can be afforded.

The relationship between the tower form and the podium is a simplified massing and expresses the verticality of the project. The principal mass is resolved by using two L-shaped volumes to help break down the thickness of the tower element.

The townhouses are staggered in their massing to help navigate the topography. There is some additional stepping to get as much light into the courtyard as possible. There is a modest depression for the outdoor spaces.

The Southern townhouses have an inverted plan so that the principle spaces are on the top next to the roof deck which helps mitigate some privacy concerns within the courtyard.

The entry location has an interesting spatial sequence. It is aligned with the most vertical slot, through the security point, and through an open breeze way and the courtyard so all the residents can share in experiencing the amenity space, then through to the lobby and the enclosed envelope of the building.

There is an internal amenity space connected to a Southern outdoor amenity space which helps activate the lane and provides a sunny spot.

This is a quiet, well-behave background building within a changing neighborhood.

On the urban realm, the goal is to create as much space as possible on W. 6th Ave. and to work with the stepping of the townhomes to create a soft and green frontage and a well noticed access.

The planters are designed to create as much space as possible and stand out as a prominent entry.

There is a continuous material running from the sidewalk through the breeze way and into the courtyard to draw people into the building.

A Japanese garden curvilinear form is being used along with boulders to create landscaped areas.

The back amenity has small and large group seating along with an outdoor kitchen that connects to the indoor amenity space. There's a small community garden and built in storage space for kids play and a small play area.

On sustainability, this project is not pursuing LEED but is targeting to meet/exceed the future City Of Vancouver Building Bylaw requirements by making improvements on energy use intensity by about 25% and increasing up to 50% of the City's greenhouse gas targets.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Newfield and seconded by Ms. Besharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design development of the narrative and improve the public realm to meet the intent of the density bonus
- Design development of the public realm, lane treatment and the pedestrian flow and experience
- Increased weather protection
- Consideration of a roof top deck amenity space

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel members concluded that the public realm design has not earned the density bonus, it is lacking in quality.

This is a background building with restrained architectural expression. Detailing will be important to its success.

The applicant was commended on the larger units and the unit mix, noting that it will be a positive addition to the neighborhood.

One panel member commented on the missed opportunity to take advantage of the view of the Northshore Mountains by “liberating” the NE/NW corners of the building.

Consider the soft material from the breeze way on the balcony as well. The softness displayed in the convergence of the wall and the soffit should be carried out through the entire building.

Several panel members commented on the 2 “L” forms, suggesting simplification to the design. The detailing of the area between the two L parti is critical to the success and needs further design development.

Several panel members felt there was an opportunity to develop the sidewalk. One panel member noted that on W. 6th Ave., it seems like the sidewalk is a bit too wide and suggested using a low solid wall to create soil depth and planting of a hedge on top.

The weather protection needs exploration for both the units and the courtyard, and on the lane.

Several panel members commended the design of the open grill vestibule with the glass door, noting that it brings residents in the townhouses and the tower together. However, there was a feeling that it wasn't prominent enough and identification of the entries is needed. It was suggested some form of canopy above the entrance to the breezeway to help identify the entrance and to provide privacy for the units above the entrance.

There were several comments about a missed opportunity in not providing an amenity space on the roof deck. One panel member encouraged Staff to look for consideration for an over height access to the roof. This would help in sustainability and in liveability for the residents. Another panel member suggested putting an elevator to the top and adding a washroom to create an amazing amenity space. There was a suggestion to sacrifice unit area and place an amenity space on the Northeast corner of the top floor.

Increase the planting on the 5th floor amenity space as it is visible to pedestrians on the ground plane.

Several panel members felt there should be improvements to the area on W. 6th Ave and the lane, and increasing public space to make it more pedestrian friendly. One panel member noted that it's a missed opportunity not to have a commercial aspect to the building.

Be aware the North and South façade are treated the same although the sun and shading are different.

The scissor stairs on the façade could be made safer with the introduction of natural light and would increase usage by residents.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

3. Address:	600 Robson Street
DE:	DP-2018-01155
Description:	To develop a 13-storey commercial building with retail at grade; all over three levels of underground parking accessed through a shared access. The proposed building height is approximately 65.55 m (215 ft.) and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 5.5, including a heritage density transfer of approximately 6129.28 sq. m (65,975 sq. ft.).
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins + Will
Owner:	Boutique Development Inc.
Delegation:	Derek Newby, P + W Ryan Bragg, P + W Joe Fry, Hapa Collaborative, Landscape Architecture
Staff:	Susan Chang

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:**

Susan Chang, Development Planner, introduced the projected as located at the Southwest corner of Robson St. and Seymour St. in the Downtown District. Zoning area is C-3, also known as Central Business District Shoulder. The site borders Central Business District, located at 700 block across Robson St. Both districts are considered fundamental to meeting the long-term demand for job space as the centre of commerce. In terms of the context, adjacent site at 833 Seymour St., is a mixed use development which includes the retention and expansion of the Orpheum, and a 42 storey residential tower (Capitol Residences). Tower location and height were accepted in exchange for a significant cultural amenity package including the retention of the Orpheum. Across Seymour St. is a 13 storey mixed use/residential building and across Robson St. is a 16 storey commercial building.

The site measures 100 ft. x120 ft. As Robson St. is a major shopping street, a 7 ft. building line along Robson is required to improve the public realm for pedestrian use and a 4.5 m SRW along Seymour St. The proposal is a 13 storey commercial building with retail at grade and office space above. The density is proposed at 5.5 FSR which includes a 10% Heritage Density Transfer. Parking is accessed from Seymour St. through a shared access agreement with Capitol Residences. Two double height outdoor amenity spaces at level 2 and level 6 are proposed which provide breaks in the vertical massing. The level 6 height aligns with the adjacent building podium and outdoor space maintaining a horizontal street wall height and datum extending to the Orpheum. The podium massing is setback from the party wall approximately 19 ft. and inset approximately 39 ft. creating an interstitial space at Seymour and the lane. A plant wall is proposed at Northeast face of the party wall, at approximately 85 ft. height. Entry for the office building is located inset along Seymour St. A raised terrace flanks the entry along Seymour St. proposed as a public plaza. Retail is proposed at the corner and along Robson St. Basic maximum height allows up to 300 ft. However, per Downtown South guidelines, new developments along Seymour St. should be massed so as to minimize the shadow impact on West Granville St. sidewalks, particularly the Northwest corner of Robson St. and Granville St. Height is proposed at approximately 215 ft. and upper storey sloped to address shadowing requirements. Tower separation between residential buildings is 80 ft. per Downtown South guidelines. There is less guidance on office buildings to residential buildings. The proposal offers 60.7 ft. for the core, stepping to 72.1 ft. and 88.5 ft. at the edges.

Horizontal angle of daylight studies (for the adjacent residential building) generally conforms to requirements. The office tower is oriented towards Robson St. to minimize privacy/overlook concerns. Proposed materials are curtain wall, metal cladding and cement tile.

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

1. Is the proposed interstitial space at the Seymour St. lane successfully resolved?
2. Please provide commentary on public realm interface at both street frontages, in particular the Seymour plaza as a public plaza.
3. Relationship to the adjacent residential tower and setbacks.
4. Please provide commentary on the proposed architectural expression and materiality.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The Applicant described the building as very particular and distinct from what is seen in downtown. The project tries to address a number of considerations of how office space in downtown will be used in the future.

The massing of the building was pulled to create covered and weather protected outdoor space for enjoyment of the inhabitants of the building. This also benefits the public realm by adding interest from the ground plain where pedestrians can see occupation on the upper levels of the building and it creates illuminated offices which provides some relief to the often grey climate of the downtown district. Because not all the volume is being occupied by density, the building is also pulled upwards and articulated in a way unique to downtown and provide a clean structural system.

On the public realm, the predominant face of the building on Robson St. is set further back than the 7 ft. building line imposed by the City to create the structure expression that reads all the way to the ground and creates a little more width on the sidewalk and improve footfall and continuity of the retail. The office entrance is located off Seymour St. to create an entry amenity with a three sided retail opportunity on Seymour St. and Robson St. This contribution to the corner is hopefully a welcome benefit to a neglected portion of Seymour St.

The entry off Seymour St. addresses a semi public space with retail wrapping around and an opportunity to bring people off the street and into the atrium that provides access to the stair and elevator core and bring people up and down the building. This encourages the continuation of lucrative retail on Robson St. by activating the area using more public spaces.

The choice to pull the building away from the party wall condition is driven by environmental imperatives that we believe. Daylight simulations done on the building show that the ability to daylight and natural ventilate is important to the quality of the space, given it is a small building without views.

These interstitial spaces are actually light wells and air wells. The party wall is covered with a natural growing system partially to deal with the blank façade but also to connect to nature.

Sharing the parkade entry coming off of Capital Residences allows us to spiral a ramp down and gives depth under the planting space and a viable option for a wall that is totally planted.

A lot of effort was put into creating a building with considerate massing to the dominant neighbour to the South with interesting articulation to the facing frontage. All the public function spaces is Northward facing so there will not be any privacy issues.

The scope of the landscape architecture was to articulate the courtyard space and the entry off Seymour St. and to develop a very simple and austere approach. A rich material palette, such as marble paving with different cuts and sizing, will be used to articulate entrances and plazas. This will be a very well lit, illuminated, bright space with a backdrop of green. The ramping will allow for a large soil volume to support the Parthenocissus tricuspidata or Boston Ivy that will be used on the green wall. It is a very resilient, fast growing, shade tolerant, vine that is perfectly suited for this environment.

On sustainability, motivation to do the right thing is high. The building will comply with the new step code.

The energy modelling shows that the EUI is below 130 kwh/m² and TEDI is about 28.

The building is about 40% glazed with a lot of opaque walls and allows for daylighting and natural ventilation during shoulder season.

The mechanical strategy is compartmentalized floor by floor with a VRF system with heat recovery so each floor is treated independently as its own unit.

The peeler top is shaped this way as a direct implication to the shading of the public realm on Robson St. and Granville St.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Besharat and seconded by Ms. Ockwell and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project.

- **Related Commentary:**

All panel members expressed support for the project and commented that it is a big improvement to the City.

A few panel members suggested positive contribution to the lane by moving the recycling, allowing for the powerful atrium lobby to look through to the lane or go to the lane and it would make the alley less harsh a space.

One panel member suggested considering using higher protection on the open spaces at the 2nd and 6th floor, noting that with the climate in Vancouver, this may help in getting more use out of the space.

One panel member suggested that the overlooking stairs should be obscured, rather than glazed to provide some privacy for the neighboring residents.

One panel member commented that the location of the amenity space in middle floors was well done and creates a social dynamic that is more intimate and different than if the spaces were at grade or on the roof.

One panel member suggested having the bike parking closer to grade.

A panel member commented that it is regretful that a second floor restaurant cannot be placed on the second level.

A panel member encouraged the Applicant to find modern ways to meet the ground and work on the detailing at grade.

Susan Chang commented that the preference would be for a second floor restaurant but is unfortunate that the FSR does not allow for it.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments.

4. Address:	950 Granville Street
DE:	DP- 2018-01166
Description:	To develop a 4-storey commercial building consisting of retail and office uses; all over three levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Perkins + Will
Owner:	Mohammed Esfahani
Delegation:	M Brinckman, IBI Tony Wai, IBI Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Jason Packer, Recollection
Staff:	Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Urena, introduced the project as located on Granville Street between Smithe and Nelson Streets in the Downtown district.

The proposed building frontage is 175 feet and the building depth is at 120 feet.

Surrounding context includes; a heritage building, the Siesta Room, category C to the north that is Single Room Accommodation. A 5-storey heritage building and one and 2-storey commercial buildings across Granville Street. To the south, there is a 2-storey commercial building.

The project proposes commercial use on the first three levels and office use on the top level. The entrance to main large retail unit, which occupies the middle levels, is at the north end and the entry to the office is located to the south. There are four retail spaces at grade. At the rear, loading and parking functions are accessed from the lane. Garbage enclosure is also accommodated at this location.

The proposal complies with the maximum height permitted, however the applicant is seeking a relaxation of the height envelope at the rear due to the grade difference.

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

1. Overall massing and contextual response.
Please consider: bulk, Granville St. saw-tooth pattern and heritage adjacencies.
 2. Does the Panel support the architectural expression and character, particularly the proposed streetscape?
Please consider: materiality, frontage, blade signs, screens, retail rhythms, side walls.
 3. At-grade interface (indoor-outdoor relationship) on Granville St.
Please consider: entrances, pavement, and weather protection.
 4. Please comment on the proposed height envelope encroachment at the lane.
Please consider: mix-use development across, lane edge and treatment.
-

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The building was driven by a rhythm and structural logic and a layering of the building that speaks to the idea of the saw tooth.

The rhythm is a 17 ½ foot bay. With the smaller rhythm, it provides a more natural delineation on Granville Street. The unit is able to have more doors and flexibility within the retail space.

Through the set back of the fourth floor, the unit will achieve a composition point of view and have a corneous line of the Vogue and the Roxy Theatres adjacent to the unit. This set back will create depth and layering on Granville Street. The magnitude of the building is similar to the existing Tom Lee building across the street.

There is retail space on the first to third floors. The top floor will be office space uses.

On the rear lane, there is a need for relaxation in the height due to the proposed topography installation. The installation creates a rezoning envelope that provides two floors at the rear. This request creates better visual affect as well as provides a useable space on the second floor.

There are terra cotta solid panels located in the forefront of the building.

The building will have canopies and signage to mirror the history of Granville St. The opaque canopies installed will protect the public realm on the street. Through the installation, the rhythm of the canopies can provide a warm and welcoming frontage along the street.

The building is sustainable; vision glass was used that provides little glazing. The project has a high performing enclosure. The EUI of the building is 20 below the average of 145 in the neighborhood.

With the use of LEDs, it will achieve the historic effect as well as keeping it sustainable.

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

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Ockwell and seconded by Mr. Wen and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Further design development and detailing of the lane frontage;
- Reconsider the sign blades to not compete with other heritage landmark signage in the area;
- Reconsider the use the 4th floor roof space for building users;
- Consider the alignment and planting of the 2nd story to improve its useability.

- **Related Commentary:**

Panel members showed positive comments regarding the simple fabric building which not only provides aesthetic looks but retail and office space as well.

Most panel members reacted positively towards the Granville façade and support additional height on the lane side as well as the appreciated effort in heritage timeline.

Panel members commented that the site had good delicate texture and the setback on fourth floor was a positive.

Some panel members show concern regarding the full vertical sign blade as it competes with the existing buildings.

Panel members noted that the lane seems unfinished and unconsidered, recommends providing additional improvements to the lane façade, including breaking up its frontage. Improvements should also include further treatments (in-and-outs, texture, detailing etc)

Panel members noted that the roof top should be used as it is currently a missed opportunity.

Many panel members showed concerns regarding the sustainability of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked the Panel members for their comments and noted that they tried to adhere to the guidelines of the sign bylaw.

Adjournment

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