

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** March 20, 2019  
**TIME:** 3:00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall  
**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Amela Brudar  
Helen Avini Besharat  
Colette Parsons  
Derek Neale  
Jim Huffman  
Jennifer Stamp  
Matt Younger  
Grant Newfield  
Susan Ockwell  
Yinjin Wen  
Jennifer Marshall

**REGRETS:**  
Derek Neale  
Muneesh Sharma

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                               |
|----|-------------------------------|
| 1. | 2810 & 2830 Grandview Highway |
| 2. | 1940 Main Street              |
| 3. | 339 E 1st Avenue              |
| 4. | 701 W Georgia Street          |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Jim Huffman called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 2810 & 2830 Grandview Highway  
 Permit No. RZ-2018-00045  
 Description: To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building, consisting of commercial uses at grade and 57 rental residential units with 20% of the residential floor area assigned to moderate income households; all over one level of underground parking. The proposed floor area is 7,256 sq.m (78,103 sq.ft), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.12 and the building height is 21m (69 ft.). This is the first application received under Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP).  
 Zoning: C-1 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning Application  
 Review: First  
 Architect: MCM Partnership  
 Delegation: Peter Odegaard, Architect, MCM  
 Mary Chan Yip, Landscape Architect, PMG  
 Daniel Reberes, Sustainability, Kane Consulting  
 Staff: James Boldt & Kevin Spaans

**EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (5/3)**

- **Introduction:**

Development planner introduced the project as a site characterized by its close proximity to the Renfrew Sky train station to the NE and the Grandview Mixed Employment Area to the N and NE. The North side of the block is identified in the Grandview Boundary Mixed Employment Area Rezoning and Development Policies and Guidelines as falling within a Station Area Retail / Service subarea.

The city anticipates a transition from light industrial and large retail uses to higher intensity, mixed use employment uses in the mixed employment area. Even though the site falls outside of the boundaries of the mixed employment area, this and other future developments will generally influence and contribute to the high-level objectives of the neighbourhood.

The commercial block between Kaslo St and Renfrew St is comprised of a cluster of small and medium sized retail and restaurant uses, including a Pizza Hut, a garden supply yard, and a DeSerres, many with surface parking lots. Collectively they represent a more intensive commercial / service corridor than seen elsewhere in the immediate area.

Residential context is primarily single family-form typical for RS-1. Kaslo Gardens housing cooperative to the West is the largest residential development in the immediate area, comprised of 10 three-storey apartment buildings and 7 three-storey stacked townhouse form multifamily buildings.

Kelly Court, a Metro Vancouver Housing-owned property targeting residents with mobility issues to the SE is three storeys.

Per the Rental Incentives Guidelines, MIRHPP proposals in C-1 zones are permitted to meet the urban design performance criteria of a C-2 development. Whereas C-1 would permit a maximum 9.2m in height, rising up to 10.7m where the extra height accommodates a sloped roof, base C-2 zoning permits a maximum overall height of 13.8m. C-2 further anticipates a maximum building height of 4.6m for 6.1m from the rear property line and 10.7m for an additional 4.6m. Note, per the C-2 policies and

guidelines all residential uses at the rear of the site are to be located a minimum 6.1m from the property line. All other uses are permitted to have a minimum .6m setback from the rear PL.

MIRHPP provides for additional two storeys when the building is located on an arterial, as proposed here. Note, shadowing is concentrated to Grandview Hwy.

The proposal is 21.5m tall with a 6.4m tall main floor with four single storey retail units at the Grandview Hwy frontage, and four two-level residential townhouse units facing the laneway. In the proposal, this second residential floor is denoted as a Mezzanine Level. These at-grade units are set back 2.4m from the rear property line whereas the guidelines anticipate 6.1m. An overhanging "framing" component aligns with the PL.

Levels 2 through 4 are setback a total of +/- 13m from the rear PL and the uppermost two levels are set back and additional 1.8m at the front and the back.

A 5.5m setback is provided at grade along Grandview Hwy to provide for an improved public realm.

The overall building width is 40m, with the Grandview Hwy frontage divided into a 33.1m primary frontage and a 6.9m secondary frontage set back 7.6m from the front property line. Note, the roof cantilevers over this setback. Vertically, the bulk of the building has a tripartite expression with the narrower secondary frontage expressed as a full-height element. This setback also provides for the retention of a birch tree.

The C-2 guidelines anticipate an attractive and highly visible shared residential entry at grade. The retention of the tree coupled with the set-back character of the entry reduces the visual presence of the residential entry.

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

1. Does the Panel support the proposed form and massing of the building including the conditional additional two storeys of height permitted by the *Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP)*?
2. Does the applicant sufficiently provide for livability at the laneway-oriented residential units?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The goal is to provide a gentle density transition between the sites RS-1 position to the south. The site is generally flat but it does slope up the lane to the south.

The building is a C-2 massing adapted to a 6 storey form. Levels 2, 3 and 4 are roughly where a C-2 massing would be. Levels 5 and 6 are also setback to soften the height and the bulk of the top two floors. There is an interlocking relationship between the various massing. Materials include wood frames over concrete floor.

The ground floor was dropped to provide larger units. The front portion of the façade has been carried back. The site is capped at 6 storeys and it is capped by building code, there are 18 meters to the top floor.

The town homes are two storey, causing some to have a ground floor sunken below grade by approximately two feet.

The North ground floor has retail uses facing Grandview highway and a residential lobby on the North West corner. Levels 2 -6 are rental. Level 2 at the southwest corner there is a common amenity room that has access to a deck. The intent is to have an effective street wall.

The area wrapped behind the tree is expressed in a lighter panel. Levels 2, 3, 4 are similarly expressed to the front. The key difference in front is the balconies are inset and in the back the balconies are continuous.

Along the laneway there are 4 homes that allow to almost building a secondary street.

We have a great retail space and we have opportunity to provide a mezzanine and potentially can provide additional retail space. The parking access is located at the south east corner.

On the street façade there is composite panel and metal panel. There are no windows on the east and west façade. The solar orientation is strong at the east west access. This helps control high sun, resulting in being under the city of Vancouver sustainability targets. There is low window to wall ratio.

The goal with the landscape at the Grandview highway street frontage is a friendly presence. Currently there are some street trees, and we have been in contact with streets in engineering and parks to review the trees to see if any improvements are needed along the frontage. We may upgrade the paving. Trees will be protected during construction. Planters along the edge will have recess lights to allow for illumination. Pavers will be of a lighter color.

The project is on track with all energy and greenhouse gas intensities and limits.

The 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. Sharma and seconded by Ms. Parsons 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 of whole rear elevation for improved neighbourliness at the lane with consideration of possible relocation of the PMT;
  - Reconsider the roof cantilever at the front of the building;
  - Design development to improve the livability of rear townhouse units and their interface with the lane;  
Reconsider upper level setbacks at the Grandview Highway frontage.
- **Related Commentary:**

In general the panel supported the form and massing and found the interpretation of 6 versus 7 storeys supportable however could benefit from further clarification as it can appear confusing to the public. In general the panel supported the project at the rezoning stage.

The buildings appear to follow policy. Taking into account Grandview is a large street and this can affect the massing

The panel struggled with the idea of the townhouses being depressed; this will not be a livable type of space and suggest raising these units to meet grade. More attention needs to be paid to the expression of the retail units.

In regards to the trees that will be saved covering the entrance, ensure entrance is still functional.

The frame at the rear of building will be challenging if you want trees in front of the lane-oriented townhouse units and contributes to the mass at the laneway. Push frame back and find alternative solutions for shade.

The height of the two-storey rear townhouses results in a large "hole" for parking access facing the laneway.

Look at the setback at the lane, improve neighborliness to the lane, need to better develop lane townhouses for a better connection to the lane. Individual expression of the townhouses would be better.

No need for a setback at the north elevation.  
The street façade needs more attention, presently bland.

The city homes (rear townhouses) need a clearer parti. The upper stories appear clearer and there seems a lot going on with the city homes, more unification is needed.

The common outdoor amenity space should be shallower.

Overlook from the common outdoor amenity space to adjacent properties will be a problem and landscaping will integral to prevent this.

Consider shortening the retail space to improve depth so that it can come out to the lane.  
The height of the commercial units takes out a huge volume from the building. It would be more valuable that the commercial mezzanine is in the back.

The inset balconies can play a role of solar shading but for this project is not needed.  
The panel agreed that a rooftop amenity would be great, but understand there is are possible building code issues. Recommend exploring if this is possible as it will improve privacy issues as well.

The north side overhang, especially above the tree appears unusual and problematic.

The panel expressed concerned with the loading and that the PMT will be more exposed than shown.  
The PMT as located may not be supported by BC Hydro. When further developing the whole rear elevation take this into account.

Additional comments included the policy needs to be clearer to the public. Consider lighting, seating and high quality materials.

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

2. Address:	1940 Main Street
Permit No.	RZ-2018-00064
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building, consisting of commercial uses at and below grade, 49 market residential units, and a 37-space childcare on level two; all over three levels of underground parking. The total proposed floor area is 5,987 sq.m (64,444 sq.ft), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.0 (with additional 0.7 FSR below grade), and the building height is 21.8 m (72 ft.).
Zoning:	IC-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Formosis Architecture
Owner:	Tobi Reyes, Port Living
Delegation:	Tom Brnning, Architect, Formosis Beatriz Costa Mendes, Landscape Architect, Enns Gauthier Landscape Architect
Staff:	Mateja Seaton & Ji-Taek Park

## EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Mateja Seaton, described the site as being a three-lot assembly, located at the northeast corner of Main St and 4th Ave, approximately 0.4 ac (17,424 sq. ft.) in size. The site has a combined frontage and depth of approximately 132 ft. along both Main St and E 4th. There is also approximately 8.5 ft. grade change on site, sloping downhill along Main St to the north.

The site is currently zoned IC-2 and occupied by auto-related commercial businesses, including the Tireland Auto Centre. The site is located within a 10-minute walk to Main Street-Science World SkyTrain Station and Olympic Village to the north, Guelph Park and Mount Pleasant Elementary School to the south-east, and three blocks north of Mount Pleasant Community Centre. The site is also serviced by three bus routes along Main St, and is within a few blocks of the Ontario Street and Off-Broadway bikeways.

The application is being considered under the *Mount Pleasant Community Plan* (MPCP) and *Mount Pleasant Community Plan Implementation Strategy*, which identifies the site as being in the Lower Main area (area of Main St between 2nd and 7th Avenues). At this location, the Plan allows mid-rise apartments up to 6 storeys between 3rd and 6th Avenues, with a maximum density of 3.0 FSR. The plan encourages the activation of frontages at the ground level, and a mix of uses at grade. Residential uses are permitted on the upper storeys or limited to the lane. The site is also limited in height by View Cone #22, which protects public views of the North Shore Mountains.

The application is for a six-storey mixed-use building with retail at and below grade, over three levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. The proposed height is approximately 72 ft. The proposed FSR is 3.0, with an additional 0.7 FSR of commercial use below grade (total floor area of 64,444 sq. ft.). The intent of the Plan is to regulate the anticipated building form, which is not impacted by the provision of commercial space at the lower level. There are 49 market residential units proposed - 53 % studio, 8% 1-bed, 27% 2-bed, 12% 3-bed), which meets the *Family Room: Housing Mix Policy* requirements. The applicant is also proposing a 37-space childcare on Level 2. 112 parking stalls and 77 bicycle stalls are provided.

Development Planner, Ji-Taek Park, described the project as being in the Lower Main area (as identified by the community plan), is marked by the "Threshold" at Main St & 2nd Ave, and transitioning to "Triangle Block" at Kingsway and Main, and connected by six-storey mid-rise buildings

between 3rd and 6th Ave, and is intended to create a pedestrian-oriented connection between the established upper Main Street neighbourhood and new lowland neighbourhoods in False Creek Flats. Retail frontages scaled to support the neighbourhood-serving retail environment are envisioned for Main St. It should also be noted that the MPCP seeks to create a network of active lanes, providing alternate pedestrian connectivity.

Due to sloping site conditions, the proposed building presents as a seven-storey form (with a building height of 71'-8") towards the north property line, which is above that permitted in the MPCP. The built-form is mainly sculpted to accommodate the proposed childcare on the second floor.

The building is also set back from the property line along Main Street from 4th Ave for sidewalk improvements (5.5 m & 4.5 m).

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Does the Panel support the proposed massing, height, and density?
2. How successful are the proposal's public realm interfaces?
  - a. At store frontages along Main St & 4th Ave;
  - b. At the proposed public plaza at the intersection; and
  - c. Along the Lane interface.
3. Please provide initial commentary on the overall architectural and landscape expression and materiality of the proposed development.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The concept behind the design of the building is based on its uses. The building form moves to the character of the buildings. The parti is simple. There is a stronger streetwall that happens on the Main St side; this allows distinguishing the units along the south side. There are some units along the Main Street.

With the massing, the intent is to get a strong corner on the renderings. The side street is the local street. There is a transition between the Main Street side street and still allows for a lot of shelter to the space below.

There is active retail space along the ground level and residential above the second floor. Retail is mostly fronting the Main St and E. 4th Ave.

The building has a colorful palette inspired by the playfulness of the other projects in the neighborhood. There is also a space left for artists and future artistic projects.

There is a plaza on the corner, an amenity area with a bar area for seating, and private roof decks. The design goal with the private roof decks is to frame views.

The daycare has open space on the second floor. The daycare is sculpted back and at a bit of an angle to allow for more sunlight. It is a 37-space daycare with elements of play such as sand and music.

The landscape concept was of a more naturalized play. There is lots of planting and jumping logs to screen the edges. There are elements for interactive music play and urban agriculture. There are paving surfaces and a bit of concrete to imprint some fun elements.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- Having reviewed the project, it was moved by Ms. Marshall and seconded by Ms. Amela and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

- THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:
  - Not to be reviewed at DP stage.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support. The proposed massing, height and density are good. The massing is subtly different from what is typically seen on Main St, which is a positive. The buildings integration to the daycare and the transition to the open space are well handled.

This is high quality architecture with a great expression of the buildings. The exploration of color and material is great.

In respect to the facades, a simple grid and having the decks recessed from the buildings is successful.

The large pieces of glass will protect from wind but still have a visibility factor.

Overall, the public realm is successful.

The corner treatment at E 4th Ave is successful. The corner plaza is a lovely addition.

The Panel agreed a common amenity space on the rooftop would be very successful.

The lane is well handled just be aware it does not lag behind and of vandalism.

The opening up below grade to retail is excellent.

The Panel supported the inclusion of the murals program. The corner treatment at E 4th Ave could be a location for a public art program.

The childcare is in a great location and the City's standards to ensure a high quality daycare is much appreciated. The Panel suggested that the family units in the building have access to spots in the daycare. The deck from the daycare is nicely visible from the street.

An element that is lacking is an outdoor amenity for the strata building and sun shading.

The Panel noted the following suggestions:

It is awkward to use planters to pick up grade at the Main St frontage. Planters under building overhangs or weather protection are not needed and never work.

Consider maintenance of the vertical fins on the west face. Look at different strategies of the south to the west for solar shading.

The North face party wall is presently a bit bland and requires a better strategy, possibly taking advantage of developing some form of art or mural.

Review the parking entry to integrate better with the project.

Review the size of the amenity space and look to see if it is possible to relocate it to the roof. The amenity space is great; however, proportioned to the building, it seems small.

When developing the details of the Main St landscape and streetscape, take advantage of the playfulness and incorporate it.

Additional built in seating will help with memorable landscaping with the grade change. In regards to the solar shading with the south elevation, be aware of not over shading.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the Panel for their comments.

3. Address:	339 E 1 <sup>st</sup> Ave
Permit No.	DP-2018-01158
Description:	To develop a 7-storey mixed-use building consisting of retail/restaurant uses at grade and office uses from level one to seven; all over two levels of underground parking providing a total of 196 parking spaces having vehicular access from E 1st Avenue.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	Michael Green Architecture
Owner:	Steven Dejonckheere, Trioinvest
Delegation:	Kevin Nyhoff, Architect, MOSA Kate Holbrook-Smith, Architect, MGA Joseph Frap, Landscape Architect, Hapa Collaboratives
Staff:	Miguel Castillo-Urena

### EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8/1)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Miguel Castillo-Urena introduced the project as a full DP application for a 7 storey office building following a rezoning application. Council approved this application on April 2018 and the panel supported with recommendations on October 2017.

Context includes: two existing 4 and 2 storey buildings (zoned IC-3) to the south. Red Truck Brewery (zoned I3-A) is located to the west. To the north is the rail line and to the east there is a CD-1 site, a mixed-use development with 4 towers, 2 live work buildings on E 1st at 135ft(13st) at the south-west corner and 150ft(15th) at the south-east corner, hotel to the rear (150ft, 15st) at the north-west corner and office building (90ft, 9) at the north-east. In between the proposal and the CD-1 site, there is also the Brewery Creek, one of Vancouver's significant watercourse.

As you can see, the proposal deviates significantly from the rezoning application, specifically in two key aspects

1. **Sitting.** The building has been shifted over to the east. The form of development approved at rezoning provided approximately 27ft setback from the eastern PL. However, the proposal includes a setback of 5ft to the East. At the same time to the west, the previous proposal provided 0.9 setback whereas the new one has about 43ft setback.  
The adjacent CD-1 provides 50ft setback, including for the underground parking, from its western side
2. **Massing.** The massing of the previous proposal was broken down into two volumes to address the building depth limitation. Additionally, the number of storeys has changed while maintaining the overall height.

Further clarification on the existing sewer SRW;

The development planner then took questions from the panel, including providing additional information with regards to a 20ft sewer SRW, as follows; there is an existing sewer SRW that crosses partially the north part of the site and runs south parallel to a portion of the eastern property line on the adjacent site. The previous proposal on 339 E1st approved by Council proposed to alterate the northern part of the SRW to run it parallel on the inside of this site. The new proposal indicates that this portion of the SRW to the north is shifted and encroaches into the adjacent property

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

1. Does the Panel consider that the proposal satisfies the rezoning conditions and the previously addressed form of development issues while establishing a proper relationship with the adjacent development?

#### OPEN SPACE

2. Is there sufficient open space at the east side of the building to respect and preserve the Brewery Creek Park?
3. Please comment on the exposed vehicle functions (loading, parking, driveway and ramp) to the west.

#### MASSING

4. How successful is the revised massing and bulk?
5. Please comment on the ceiling height for office use due to increased number of storeys since rezoning.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The concept of the project was simplicity, elegance, timeless and endurance.

When designing the project we looked back at the history of this area. The building is bridging the past and present. We mediated the smaller massing of the west to the larger developments.

There was an emphasis on quality, materials and consideration of people, the intention is to be a good neighbor. It was important that we identify the importance of the connection on 1<sup>st</sup> street with the site history, the massing and the ground plain, including the landscape design, façade and materiality.

This is a timber building so structures on the inside will be exposed. This will help decrease the mass of the building.

In regards to materiality we went with a Terra Cota façade, this will make it a durable and long lasting buildings that will stand the test of time. There are low key shading demands. There is a wood vocabulary expressed from the exterior and a textural façade.

We wanted to create an urban plaza and push the face of the buildings back to allow for transitions, sunlight and an animated public space. The scale of the buildings is pushed back from the street, this allowed for a good indoor and outdoor relationship. There is a good space for a plaza that can hold small scale events.

To allow for a connection to the north of the site, we changed the approach of the connection through the center as one continuous public realm. We have also taken into account the bridge connection.

On the roof we are looking to apply a high quality roof deck with a good amenity space. There is landscape to provide a separation from the vehicular edge. The building has an extension to the landscaping. There will be a storm water treatment program.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Marshall and seconded by Mr. Muneesh 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 to slide the building over to the west and providing an additional network of pathways ;
  - Design development to extend the walkway along the creek to the north;
  - Further design development to the exposed parking area to be more pedestrian friendly;
  - Further design development to the landscaping adjacent to the red truck.

- **Related Commentary:**

In general there was support for the building expression and materiality. The majority found it was an improvement from the rezoning model in this regard.

Some panelists did feel elements such as the materials and ground plain was not of a DP quality. There is a lot of blank wall at the base of the building.

Some felt the height is a good transition from the red truck to the other buildings others noted the height is dependent on the details and there was not enough provided in the submission. It is a positive how the buildings were pulled away from red truck.

The height could be relaxed to allow for more floor to floor ratio for office space. The office has quite a deep floor space be aware of energy from usage. A panelist noted better expression of the office height is needed rather than quantity.

Some panelists noted the concern was mostly with the sitting of the building rather the building itself. It was recommended sliding the buildings over and adding an additional walkway. A panelist said that the building is turning to the creek and another that there is probably not sufficient space between buildings

Having a connection at the top would improve the circulation and establish a better relationship next door.

The wood expression is nice it keeps the building on the elegant side.

The outdoor amenity covered areas and the plaza has lots of usable areas, may want to add more pavers to welcome more foot traffic and additional seating along the creek. Extend the walkway along the creek, important to consider this will be a very popular area in the near future. The applicant was commended for introducing the plaza space as presently these are limited spaces.

The landscaping adjacent to the red truck requires more development just adding some vines may be harsh. The landscape has fallen due to the lack of explanation in the provided materials. There is potential however members emphasized it made difficult to provide commentary with the lack of information.

The exposed parking area needs reconsideration to be pedestrian friendly. The parking on the west side could be put underground. Some panelists mentioned that the parking ramp dominates the site and it's too long. The west should not be treated as back of house. Also that the siting needs some massaging.

A panelist mentioned that the pedestrian network is very important and that the north connection is missing. Pedestrian should dominate the site.

There was a lot of discussion with the ground level, pedestrian pathways, and the vehicular, however understand it was difficult for the buildings to be simple. Overall the site needs to be treated as a

place for the people and not a car place; therefore reviewing circulation patterns is needed. The key component is the ground level should be for pedestrians.

Planning noted the the proposal will have to meet the rezoning conditions . Planning indicated that staff are disappointed for the beautiful but abstract model that lacks of information for the panelists and apologise to the members of the Panel. However, the applicant was given the opportunity to update the model but was not done.

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

4.	Address:	701 W Georgia Street
	Description:	To develop a new 2-storey pavilion building to replace the existing Pacific Center Mall rotunda. The proposal includes a new mall entry from W Georgia Street, additional retail spaces on main and upper level, public open space improvements and upgrades to below grade areas and parkade.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	Second (First as DP with current proposal)
	Architect:	Perkins & Will
	Owner:	David Lee, Colette Fairview.
	Delegation:	David Dove, Architect, P & W Alan Russo, Architect Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS Landscape
	Staff:	Patrick O'Sullivan

#### EVALUATION: Resubmission Recommended (4/3)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Patrick O'Sullivan, described the project located at the Corner of W. Georgia St. and Howe St. Technically the site is the entire block. The proposed development is an addition limited to the westerly corner of the site that currently contains the rotunda and the concrete plaza.

Surrounding sites include the Four Seasons ,Hotel Georgia, and the Pacific Centre Tower -- 18-floor, Class A office building. There is a 4 ft. slope down to the west along W. Georgia St. A DP was issued for a previous scheme on this corner of the site in April of last year.

We now have a new development permit application under the existing CD-1 following a 2006 rezoning. Zoning: CD-1 (455). The proposal is to demolish the rotunda, concrete deck area, and the Howe St. retaining wall. Develop a three storey commercial building containing retail uses. Construct a new main entry for the mall that aligns with the existing mall run. Add a new canopy over the steps down to the stairway down to mall level from Howe St.

Height measures 63 ft., about 10 ft. higher than the exiting "podium" height. (Maximum height pertaining to the entire Pacific center site is 450 ft.). The rezoning anticipates a minimum of a two-storey infill on this site. The FSR increases from 9.3 to 9.36 (9.47 is the maximum).

A standard commercial 18 ft. clear surface right of way is provided from the curb on W. Georgia Street and 13 ft. are provided from Howe Street. The public Realm includes the standard Georgia St streetscape sidewalk treatment and stone paving within the property line.

Cadillac Fairview initiated a rezoning in 2005 to do the following:

- Consolidate blocks 32, 42 and 52;
- Increase retail density by 70,000 sq. ft. by infilling the corners of W. Georgia & Howe and W. Georgia & Granville with a minimum two-storey retail;
- Provide a Canada Line rapid transit station entrance on-site within the plaza at the south-west corner of Georgia and Granville Streets (block 52).

The Rezoning was approved in October 19, 2006, understanding that the costs of the in-plaza option be accepted by Cadillac Fairview if additional retail space can be accommodated.

In a policy Report, dated September 13, 2005, the DoP supported the enclosure of the atrium space at 777 Dunsmuir, where Holt Renfrew is located currently, to achieve public benefits of equivalent value, two options:

1. provision of a more publicly accessible atrium suitable for public gatherings at the corner of W. Georgia and Howe; and/or
2. The provision of a major high profile entrance to the Canada Line Station on Block 52

The securing of the in-plaza station entrance was selected as it was the time-sensitive and highest City priority at the time.

*Agreement in principle was recently reached between Cadillac-Fairview and Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. to pursue an in-plaza station entrance. Cadillac-Fairview is prepared to assume responsibility for significant costs which are outside of Canada Line's budget, if additional retail space can be developed in the future at Pacific Centre and if provision of an SRW for the Canada Line station entrance in the plaza at Block 52 (701 Granville Street) fulfills an obligation to replace the now-closed public atrium in Block 32 (777 Dunsmuir Street) with another public amenity.*

*Staff have concluded that the off-site impacts of additional retail floor area and the obligation to provide a replacement public amenity are adequately addressed by the property owner's offer to contribute to the development of an enhanced, high-profile, more accessible entrance to the Canada Line rapid transit station at Georgia/Granville.*

The application went to the UDP on March 26, 2008, where it received non-support, however the UDP supported the infilling of the plaza with new retail noting that the plaza had not performed well. The application went back to the panel on May 21, 2008 to get further advice. The applicant decided to withdraw their development application in November 2008.

Given the previous advice from the Director of Planning in 2007, staff advised the current applicant that the application would be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel, but subject to notification response we may or may not request that they also have an open house to get more fulsome input. We have not concluded our notification process but to date have received very little response.

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

1. Is the siting, orientation and footprint size of the retail pavilion successful in achieving:
  - i) a welcoming entry presence for the shopping centre, and
  - ii) usable outdoor space on the site surrounding the pavilion?
2. Please comment on the following aspects of the design of the Public Realm:
  - a) Is the design of the public realm including the open space at the corner, the exterior steps and integrated wood seating a fitting response for this prominent pedestrian corner?
  - b) Will the outdoor space to the south of the pavilion function well as a public space considering the configuration of this space and the solid wall character of the building elevations at this location;
  - c) How well is the outdoor space to the north of the pavilion responding to CPTED principles in preventing undesirable activity in this partially concealed corner?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

There are two major components to the architecture, the pavilion and the device of the Greenwall.

The Greenwall is used to separate from the busy clutter behind; architecturally this is the cleanest way to provide an elegant backdrop to the pavilion. In the interstation spaces, created a new front door to the mall and using the same language as other entrances, such as the Nordstrom entrance, using the same materiality and glazing system.

There is about a 20ft cantilever canopy to bring signage and presence out onto the street.

There is some interesting geometry around the left over spaces, and working with client on how to best program these spaces.

The whole urban fabric on Howe Street will be refreshed using the same palette of materials as the other entrances of the mall.

The tenant space has a simple modern palette of materials. Besides the 45 degree shift to the kiddy corner open space, the goal is transparency; there are 32ft of glass all around the front. The inside is to be connected to the outside to activate the space and encourage pedestrian movement.

The stair design is a response to the grade change.

Engineering is supporting the removal of the layby. It is a huge impingement on the public realm.

The relationship to the art gallery plaza has been an important component to the public realm and landscape. There will be high quality stones and stone steps, big wide sidewalk and many trees.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

- Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Collette and seconded by Mr. Wen and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:
- **THAT the Panel RECOMMEND RESUBMISSION of the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:**
  - Design Resolution of the pavilion to the public realm and mall background.

- **Related Commentary by Urban Design Panel members**

In general the panel found the project had improved in regards to pedestrian orientation, space and architectural expression; however the panel agreed there were still lots of room for improvement.

The architectural design is not clear and eligible, and at times the buildings appear to be on a configuration that does not work for it.

These are beautiful buildings with sculptural elements that need to be sculpted further. Make the outstanding elements elegant and the add on elements should stand out.

This is a meeting place and becomes a glass threshold when walking into the mall. When entering the mall there is no social gathering space. Understanding pedestrian patterns is important when it comes to areas where it attracts people conglomerating (i.e. the bus stop). If this will be a new entrance to the mall, there is opportunity to create a unique space, prefer an open space with minimal elements.

The connection of the blank walls with IBM will make navigating into the mall less pedestrian friendly.

Howe street frontage and the retaining wall are not pedestrian friendly. It is important to open up the visual space to Georgia.

The pavilion is an excellent space. Cutting it back on the corner would be a huge public gesture.

There is opportunity at the corner to express a jewel. Presently it is punching at the corners and appears uncomfortable.

How the corner meets the green wall and how its hits the ground plain is the real challenge. Do not see the logic and elegance of putting them together.

Attention to the retaining wall is acceptable however the green wall is not a solution could be elsewhere.

Part of the pavilion appears to be stuck on a wall. If you pull the pavilion away a bit and place a glass reveal and the green wall and pavilion had its own strength it would make more sense.

The green wall creates a curtain that has no relationship to anything and does not allow for the pavilion to fulfill its purpose. The green wall should be more of a background piece.

The plaza has a good relationship with the art gallery. The steps and seating are good and the more the better. Suggest adding a water feature to hide the noise of the area. Overall the plaza is better smaller with a better use for the public.

Concerns with the retail, it is not the thing that should be right out front and center as the main element.

Additional comments include be aware of managing drainage and the glass rotunda is dated.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.