

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 7, 2012

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Daryl Condon (left after Item #3)
Vincent Dumoulin
Alan Endall
Veronica Gillies (missed Item #1)
David Grigg
Bruce Hemstock (missed Item #1)
Arno Matis
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #1)
Norm Shearing (left after Item #4)
Peter Wreglesworth (left after Item #3)

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	749 West 33 rd Avenue (4899 Heather Street)
2.	1396 Richards Street
3.	725 Granville Street
4.	2128 West 40 th Avenue
5.	1628 West 4 th Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Borowski called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 749 West 33rd Avenue (4899 Heather Street)
 DE: 416156
 Description: Concurrent rezoning and development to construct a social service centre including multiple dwelling (social housing) of 6,053 square meters on the southwest portion of this site.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Rezoning/Complete
 Owner: Archdiocese of Vancouver
 Architect: John Clark Architects
 Review: First
 Delegation: John Clark, John Clark Architects
 Amber Paul, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
 Tom Fletcher, Fletcher & Company
 Staff: Yardley McNeill and Sailen Black

EVALUATION: REZONING - SUPPORT (9-0) DEVELOPMENT PERMIT - SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Yardley McNeill, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a 7.5 acre site that was originally the location for St. Vincent's hospital which opened in 1939. In 2005, the hospital was closed and its services transferred to Mount St. Joseph and St. Paul's Hospitals. The site was demolished and in 2005 a seniors assisted living building was constructed in the south/east corner of the site. Ms. McNeill described the context for the area noting Children's and Women's Hospital to the north and the RCMP Barracks to the south. The surrounding area contains the RS-1 zone for single family dwellings.

Ms. McNeill mentioned that the site is regulated by the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision, which supports rezonings for the expansion of institutional uses, and for affordable housings. The Vision notes several large sites in the area, including this one and notes the need for traffic and parking management and the need for traffic analysis and mitigation measures to reduce the impact from large institutional uses onto the surrounding residential neighborhood. For this site, the Vision supports the notion of a 'Campus of Care' to support seniors aging in place and suggests limiting office and retail functions to those services in support of these uses. Further it encourages new institutional uses and suggests that large sites should seek opportunities for affordable, non-market housing. The Vision also seeks to achieve a higher level of environmental sustainability, using a variety of green strategies. The rezoning would be required to meet the Green Building Policy, which requires the project to achieve a minimum of LEED™ Gold with specific emphasis on optimizing energy performance. As well the site is required to meet Council's Green Larger Sites Policy, which would require this site to either deliver a district energy system, or hook up to a district energy system in the area.

Ms. McNeill gave some history of the site noting that it is owned by the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Vancouver, and has been leased to Providence Health Care. In 2008 Providence Health Care requested the site be rezoned to develop a "Campus of Care", which would provide a continuum of integrated services from assisted living- to- specialized complex care for seniors. The site would contain provision for ambulatory care, long term seniors assisted living, adult care facilities and a hospice.

The 2008 rezoning proposed to divide the site into 4 sub-areas, with a combined density of 1.4 FSR, and directed the height of all future buildings to a maximum of 3-6 storeys. Five buildings were initially envisaged for the site, each addressing some aspect of the "Campus of Care" philosophy. Access to the site was intended to be primarily from west 33rd avenue, with secondary access from Heather Street. An "L" shaped internal road network was proposed to connect all 5 buildings. While Council approved the 2008 rezoning, the CD-1 Bylaw has not yet been enacted. Staff anticipate this occurring prior to proceeding to Council for the proposed rezoning.

Providence Health Care has determined they are not able to proceed according to the 2008 plan at this time. The owners, Catholic Charities, are requesting an amendment to the 2008 plan to allow them to occupy one of the 4 sub-areas. The intention is to rezone to allow for an administration building, limited to a social service center for the purposes of relocating their existing facilities from 150 Robson, to this site. In addition, the rezoning would permit the construction of 9 multiple dwelling units, as secured affordable housing for retired priests.

The proposed building would be located in sub-area C adjacent to Willow Street, with a lesser density than envisaged in 2008. The proposed building is approximately 65,000 square feet and the 2008 rezoning suggested a building of approx. 98,000 square feet. Sub-area C was originally intended to contain a building with support services and patient beds in support of the larger central pavilion in sub area B, which is to contain ambulatory care facilities and related support and administration services. The notion of the Campus of Care would still proceed, however, with the use of Area C changed from a support building with patient rooms, to a social service centre containing a variety of services under the umbrella of the Archdiocese of Vancouver, which serve the greater Vancouver area, in addition to secured affordable rental housing for seniors.

Ms. McNeill noted that the proposed amendments to the 2008 By-law are:

- Addition of Office uses (limited to social service centre);
- Addition of Multiple Dwelling units, limited to secured seniors affordable housing.

The Riley Park Vision, would restrict office and multiple dwelling uses, however, as indicated, the office would be limited to social service centre, which is considered an institutional use and, the multiple dwelling units would be secured through a housing agreement for affordable seniors rental housing, which aligns with Councils housing policies.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal. He mentioned that the site was intended to accommodate a range of care related uses. In the proposed rezoning one of the changes of use would be to add administrative functions for the Roman Catholic Charities that are currently at 150 Robson Street. Another change would reduce the building from around 90,000 square feet to approximately 60,000 square feet. The building in general follows the master plan work for the site, especially the preservation of the trees at the southwest corner. Other challenges include how to deal with the interim conditions which includes a surface parking lot, trees and bushes. As well the grades are very steep across the site.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the architectural and landscape design in general, and in particular the interfaces with:

- residential building on Willow Street,
- existing grades on the site, and
- the interim conditions pending further development of the site

Ms. McNeill and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** John Clark, Architect, further described the proposal noting there are a lot of complexities to the site including access, vehicular movement and pedestrian movement. Initially they were asked by Engineering Services to cut off access to Heather Street in terms of underground parking. The access will be from Willow Street to Children's and Women's Hospital. He noted that they are accommodating future construction of the Providence plan with this proposal. They are anticipating that the parking access will be shared with a new loading access to the north. Mr. Clark described the architecture stating that the residential portion is at two storeys with vertical elements. The expression shows the different uses in the building with the elevator controls in the bell tower, and that element expressed on the clergy housing unit.

Amber Paul, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the proposal. The landscaping responds to the interior programs with a hard surface over the parking garage that will provide some outdoor plazas for seating. Along Willow Street the landscaping has been planned to create some outdoor space adjacent to the units. The pathway is an extension of the Wellness Walk that comes from Children's and Women's Hospital. There is a retention pond to collect run off from the parking area with some benches and naturalized landscaping.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Clarify the architectural expression;
 - Design development to the loading area;
 - Design development to improve the material expression;
 - Consider augmenting the pedestrian connection to West 33rd Avenue;
 - Consider programming the roof;
 - Improve the sustainability strategy by optimizing energy performance.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the form of development, density and height for the proposal.

The Panel thought the proposal had gone a long way to resolve some difficult grade conditions. They noted that there is a very simple and basic organized massing to the project that has a clear separation between the office, assembly and the residential uses. However, most of the Panel were concerned with the architectural expression and thought it needed to be clarified. They also thought the north elevation was getting too busy. They noted that it could benefit from clarification of the expression between the office and the residential, and that the bell tower seemed tacked on. A couple of Panel members thought the angles being introduced with eyebrows and slab extensions were unnecessary. Most of the Panel felt there needed to be some design development around the institutional loading area.

Several Panel members thought there wasn't enough clarity in the materials to distinguish the office and residential uses as well as the amenity spaces. A number of Panel members questioned the use of the aluminum expressed as wood. They felt a better choice would be either wood or something that didn't express wood.

The Panel thought that where the building meets the grade was well handled and they supported the retention of the trees, but thought the west garden could have some smaller walking loops, and that there needed to be a stronger pedestrian connection to West 33rd

Avenue. They also thought it was a missed opportunity that the roof was not programmed. One Panel member noted that the applicant might look at using the roof space to slow down the rainwater run off, otherwise there could be too much erosion in the swale. Another Panel member was concerned that the naturalized water course pushed up against the residential, and wasn't sure if it was public or private space.

Some of the Panel were disappointed that there wasn't anything in the applicant's presentation regarding public art. It was suggested that the art should be viewable by the public.

Regarding sustainability, a number of Panel members though the applicant needed to work on optimizing the energy performance and increasing all values as maintenance and energy savings will be critical to long term budgets for the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Clark thanked the Panel for their comments and said they would take them into consideration. He added that they are under an enormous time constraint as the owners need to be in the building as soon as possible.

Mr. Fletcher noted that the building will be part of a "campus of care" and that they have spent a considerable amount of time with Providence Health Care regarding an art program. They are keen on having a public art program, something that will draw people into the site.

2. Address:	1396 Richards Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a 42-storey mixed-use building with 269 residential units, of which 129 are rental units and a 37 space daycare facility. The proposal consists of a height of 410.8 feet (125.22 m), a floor space ratio (FSR) of 8.6, a residential floor area of 24,653 m ² , and a retail floor area of 163 m ² .
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Owner:	Onni Group of Companies
Architect:	Dialog
Review:	First
Delegation:	Alan Boniface, Dialog Gerry Eckford, Eckford & Associates Chris Evans, Onni Group of Companies Jamie Vaughan, Onni Group of Companies
Staff:	Karen Hoese and Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (12-0)

- Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning application for a site at the corner of Richards Street and Pacific Street. The site currently includes a 2-storey commercial building that is being used for self-storage. The rezoning application proposes to increase the density and height beyond that permitted under the current zoning, with the intent to build a 42-storey tower with a 9-storey podium. The tower would contain 139 residential/strata units, and the podium would have retail and a 37-space childcare at grade with 130 market rental units above. Ms. Hoese noted that the existing zoning is the Downtown District South (DTS) which is regulated by the Downtown Official Development Plan. The site is in the L1 or New Yaletown sub-area of the DTS. The policy in this sub-area endorses high density residential development with limited commercial uses.

Ms. Hoese noted that in 2008, as part of the Metro Core "Benefit Capacity Study", Council endorsed consideration of rezoning applications in the DTS seeking additional height and density up to the underside of approved view corridors. The intent of the policy is to support public objectives such as provision of affordable housing, heritage restoration and the development of cultural, recreational or other community facilities. All rezonings are subject to the Green Building Policy, which requires that rezonings achieve LEED™ Gold, which specific emphasis on optimized energy performance. Registration and application for certification of the project are also required.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, further described the proposal. She described the context for the area noting a number of towers including the 501 across the street, as well as the Oscar and the Grace. Ms. Molaro also mentioned that the block is unique in downtown south in that it is only 100 feet deep versus the typical depth of 120 feet. The tower has been placed within the small triangle at the southeasterly corner (Pacific and Richards Streets). As a result the tower is very slim with a floor plate under 4,200 square feet which is smaller than the guideline maximum of 6,500 square feet. As well, the DTS guidelines call for a tower separation of 80 feet to allow for access to daylight and privacy. That has been achieved in this proposal through the street width (66 feet) and the setbacks of 12 feet. Ms. Molaro also mentioned that the applicant is proposing a day care on the site at grade.

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

- does the panel support the urban design response developed for this site and its relationship within the surrounding context taking into consideration the following;
 - variants in built form from the Downtown South guidelines:
 - reduction in tower setback from 30 ft. to 10 ft. off the lane;
 - reduction in podium rear yard setback from 30 ft. to 25 ft. including additional balcony projections over play area (safety/shadowing performance);
 - increase in podium height from 70 ft. to 90 ft. (exceeds prevailing maximum podium height in neighbourhood).
 - height increase up to 410 ft. parapet and the increase in density (from 5.0 to approx. 8.615);
 - building siting, tower form and massing, podium form and massing including transition in scale from adjacent development site;
 - neighbourliness issues (shadow and view impacts with nearby existing development);
 - open space and landscape treatments; and
 - LEED™ Gold strategies.

Ms. Hoese and Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Alan Boniface, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the site is very restrictive and they tried to push the boundaries to make the design work on the site. The site will contain market rental housing that will be retained by the Onni Group of Companies. Mr. Boniface described the architecture, noting that they strived for simplicity and to respect the context. He added that they are negotiating with an art provider with respect to filling the site with art. The slot will become a major art focus and an enticement to walk through the site. The adjacent development has an indent where their drop off is located with mature trees on the lane. Their approach to the rear of the building was to try to activate the lane with some units facing onto the lane. In addition the rental units on the upper floors will be able to see over the podium. There is a large sustainable focus on the project. The corner that faces south has the skinniest façade and the southwest side has the core to give more solidity on that façade. Mr. Boniface indicated that they have done a full energy model and are planning to qualify for LEED™ Gold certification. There is some shading from the adjacent buildings and also deck forms and a number of other features as part of the sustainability strategy. Although the proposal is a rezoning, Mr. Boniface mentioned that they have gone to some extent to detail the project in order to present all the ideas they have for it. He described the architectural design noting that they plan to treat the balconies--especially the railings--so they are an animated part of the façade. He added that they are trying to get a café or small retail component on the ground floor to give some life to the internal street.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans for the proposal which is a direct response to the architectural expression. The heritage of the neighbourhood is around the night life that was present in this part of the city. Previously the site was the Richards on Richards night club as well as a number of other clubs. Mr. Eckford mentioned that they plan to have an area that they are calling the chandelier gardens that will include an animated water feature. The podium will have some private open spaces, a landscaped buffer between those units and an urban agriculture component with a big harvest table and smaller seating areas. As well there is a swimming pool with more seating and public spaces off the amenity room. The childcare hasn't been fully resolved at this point but they tried to make sure the area gets as much light as possible. The courtyard has been animated along with a loading and drop off area at the lane. The top of the tower will have a private pool and deck for the Level 42 unit.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to manage the scale of the podium;
 - Design development to improve the units in the slot regarding privacy;
 - Design development to allow for a barrier free access though the slot area;
 - Reconsider the use of a green wall in the slot area.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was well handled.

The Panel had no concerns with the requested variances and setbacks and said they looked forward to seeing it at the development permit stage. As well, they welcomed the addition of the daycare in the project. One Panel member stated that it was a good example of how a site with unbuildable constraints can result in an exciting form of development.

A couple of Panel members were concerned with the liveability of the units that are in the slot and face each other. They thought they would be difficult to market considering the privacy issues. One Panel member suggested the applicant eliminate the slot or find another way to lessen the impact. Another Panel member thought it was important to push the idea of public art in the slot, which could turn a negative into a positive expression. As well they thought there might be some overlook issues with the staggered balconies.

The Panel thought the public art strategy was a rich and promising part of the development.

Several Panel members suggested the applicant find a way to improve the quality of the blank wall expression on the northeast façade. A couple of Panel members though the impact of the height of the podium could be improved by setting back the top two floors.

The Panel supported the landscape plans. Due to the change of grade through the slot area, some Panel members thought it should be better managed by allowing for a barrier free access. As well, they suggested the applicant rethink the use of the green wall considering the amount of shade the area will receive. They also thought there was an opportunity for public art in the plaza at the corner of Richards and Pacific Streets.

Regarding sustainability, some of the Panel thought the requirements would increase by the time the development permit was issued and encouraged the applicant to find ways to improve their sustainability strategy. They did however support the LEED™ strategies and the use of curtain wall.

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

3. Address:	725 Granville Street
DE:	416152
Description:	Interior and exterior recladding of the existing department store, from basement to level 7. Change of use from retail to office from levels 4 to 7. Interior alterations in parking levels to add elevator lobbies and pits.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Owner:	Cadillac Fairview
Architect:	James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Winston Chong, James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc. James Cheng, James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc. Chris Phillips, PFS Landscape Architects Josh Thomson, Cadillac Fairview
Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11-1)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for an extensive retrofitting of the existing Sears building involving interior and exterior recladding of the existing department store from the basement to level seven. As well the applicant is asking for a change of use from retail to office from levels four to seven and interior alterations include two atria on the office levels and the addition of elevators. Mr. Morgan described the site characteristics noting that the building is part of the Pacific Centre Mall which extends three city blocks from Robson Street northward to Pender Street. It connects with the TD Tower on the northwest corner of the site and the Canada Line Station on the plaza, with connections to the Expo Line at the lower mall level. He also described the context for the area, noting that four streets surrounding the site are important and unique streets in the downtown district.

Mr. Morgan described the history of the building. The architect for the site was César Pelli and was built in 1973 as an iconic building for its time and place. In 2007, Pacific Centre Mall was rezoned to CD-1 when the Canada Line Station was added to increase the permitted density. For this proposal staff have advised the applicant on the following key aspects: transparency and connectivity; public realm repair and enhancements including grade resolution; pedestrian scale and greater articulation and expression to reduce monolithic massing and blankness of the expression.

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

1. **Urban Design:** The block long site occupies a key location at the city's centre surrounded by four important streets, each with its own unique character that the building needs to respond to. Is the urban fit in this context a good one and what suggestions if any could improve it?
2. **Massing and Expression:** Does the proposed massing and material expression break down the monolithic blankness of the existing building on all four sides?
3. **Public Realm/ Urban Repair:** The existing state of the public realm that surrounds Block 52 is one of dysfunction and disrepair, lacking pedestrian amenity and interest, transparency and connectivity from the street as well as numerous physical & visual barriers that impede ease of pedestrian movement. Have these negative conditions been successfully addressed? What other aspects of the public realm could be improved?

4. **Sustainability:** The application is proposing to achieve LEED Gold. Panel comments are requested with particular regard to the proposed glazing systems and opportunities for a green roof.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Cheng, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that it was a unique project and they see it as an opportunity to do urban repair. The building is in an important location and for fifty years it has been an important façade. He said they believe that all four sides need four different responses. There are existing stairs from the parking garage that can't be changed, so they tried to strip away everything they could on the ground floor to make it more transparent. He said they feel the most sustainable part is the structure, so they are rehabilitating the building into new uses. They are keeping the existing structure as is, and replacing the skin.

Mr. Cheng noted that every street brings a different challenge to the project. Georgia Street has a lot of haphazard insertions into the plaza, so they worked with the landscape architect to help improve the plaza. The first thing they tried to do was to expand the public realm which helped them create a new entrance. The second thing they tried to do was to make an upper and lower plaza. Part of the reason for changing the rotunda was to respond to the plaza changes and to create a way to address the new office entrance and the retail space. Granville Street has a long façade and so at the corner of Robson and Granville Streets, which is a high profile corner, they created a corner piece that announces the entrance to *Nordstrom's*. A lot of work was done along Robson Street which will be completely transparent, other than one existing exit stair. They were able to create another entrance into *Nordstrom's* on the corner. Along Howe Street will be a restaurant that will be a prominent feature with a great view across to the Robson Square. Mr. Cheng said they wanted to use the interventions along Howe Street to break up the big scale of the building and express the office component. The roof will have two light wells for natural daylighting so no internal space is more than 45 feet to the glass, reducing the amount of artificial lighting. He added that they didn't touch the roof other than to repair it. They investigated adding a green roof but felt that the added weight could not be supported. Mr. Cheng described the material palette noting the colours were picked to complement the existing TD Tower.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that the Granville and Georgia Streets corner is an important space. It has great sun access but has poor pedestrian access and poor use right now. Putting the retail entry at Granville Street makes for a huge change to the nature of the plaza. The lower plaza will have seating at the edges with vegetation. Around the perimeter of the site they will be improving the paving and pulling out the driving lane on Robson Street to make a more generous size sidewalk.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design Development to further improve the public realm, in particular the northeast plaza and Howe Street;
 - Design development to improve transparency along the Howe Street façade;
 - Design development to bring added prominence to key entries;
 - Design development to the massing along Granville Street to add more vertical emphasis to offset the monolithic and horizontal massing;
 - Design development to provide more variety of expression to enliven the composition;
 - Design development to develop the roofscape in a manner consistent with sustainability objectives;

- Design development to the north plaza in terms of the office entry and the façade component;
 - Design development to the plaza area and landscaping;
 - Consider adding a lighting element in the plaza to help animate the facades;
 - Consider reviewing the bike rack location;
 - Consider the façade system in order to meet energy goals;
 - Design development to improve the roofscape;
 - Design development to increase the greenery on the Howe Street façade;
 - Design development to further enrich the ground plane.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting and challenging project.

The Panel agreed that it is a very important project and supported the notion of retaining and revitalizing the building. They also supported the applicant's approach and thought the shell and envelope of the building was a total transformation. The Panel also supported the reskinning of the building from level two up as it will enrich the building and respond to the different urban contexts.

The Panel found that there were some challenges with the ground plane. They realized that there were some things that can't be changed but could be improved. They thought that the Howe Street and Granville Street corners had been very much improved with the amount of transparency.

The plaza at the corner of West Georgia Street and Granville Street was a bit of a concern for the Panel. Although the applicant has tried to resolve the grade change it was still not an exciting and successful corner. A number of Panel members thought there could be more done with respect to public art and lighting. One Panel member wondered if the bike racks were in too prominent a location and suggested the applicant take another look. Another Panel member suggested recycling the existing cladding and creating a piece of public art that would involve lighting.

The Panel thought the office entry was a bit of a concern. It seems that the building doesn't have a good place to enter as it is not easily identifiable. They wanted to see a stronger emphasis on the entry. For the most part the Panel didn't object to the rotunda element disappearing but thought the vertical element that replaces it could be stronger. One Panel member suggested finding a Canadian stone rather than importing it from Portugal. Another suggestion from the Panel was with respect to the canopies. They thought they were an important element but lacked excitement and significance.

The Panel felt that a lot more could be done in the public realm along Howe Street. They thought more transparency could be done as well as improving the massing expression. One Panel member thought it could be dressed up with a coffee shop. Another Panel member suggested there were opportunities to use light and art to make it more exciting. One Panel member noted the difficult office entrance and department store entrance off West Georgia Street and their relationship to the plaza and thought they set up a geometry that didn't relate to anything else. He noted that there is a long walk to the elevators, and that Howe Street is almost the better entrance.

The Panel was disappointed with the sustainability strategy and felt that the energy modeling might be falling short. Although there are vertical extensions and solar shading devices on the building which will make for interesting patterning and texture, the Panel thought they would have modest effect on energy performance. They would also like to see more greenery on the building with one Panel member suggested adding planting to the

terrace at the restaurant level. A number of Panel members suggested adding a green roof or at least some interesting patterning and also adding solar panels. As well, some of the Panel thought there needed to be research done to find the right glass type for the building. One Panel member suggested using a heat recovery system considering the amount of retail and office on the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng said the Panel had given them a good perspective for the building. He said that they originally thought it should be a background building but they could push it more at the Granville and West Georgia Streets corner.

4. Address:	2128 West 40 th Avenue
DE:	416153
Description:	To construct a new 4-storey plus 2 levels of underground parking for a new mixed-use building.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Allan Diamond Architect
Owner:	722945 BC Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Allan Diamond, Allan Diamond Architect Craig Mercs, Allan Diamond Architect Damon Oriente, Damon Oriente Landscape Architect
Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-3)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 4-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade and three storeys of residential plus two levels of underground parking. The proposal is located at the corner of West 40th Avenue and West Boulevard. Mr. Morgan described the context for the area. He also described the guidelines for C-2 zoning. He noted that the building was stepped to enable daylighting and reduce shadowing on the neighbouring residential uses. Mr. Morgan described the relaxations being sought. He mentioned that weather protection seems to be sporadic as it is not a continuous treatment. As well he said the exposed wall facing the neighbours might need some enhancement. The proposed materials are cultured stone intermixed with cementitious paneling. He also mentioned that there weren't any trees proposed along West 40th Avenue. Engineering is asking to widen all major arterials starting at eighteen feet and C-2 allows for a two foot setback. Mr. Morgan stated that the sidewalk might be too narrow.

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

1. **Height:** The proposed height of 48 feet is 3 feet higher than the permitted 45 feet which may be relaxed. Is this relaxation of height supportable?
2. **Building Envelope:** The proposed massing in the rear yards projects into the zoning envelope for the 2nd to 4th floor levels. Given the C-2 adjacency across the lane is this supportable?
3. **Neighbourly interface:** Comments requested on the high blank wall, west sideyard and rear lane elevation.
4. **Materiality and Expression:** General comments requested.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Allan Diamond, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that in C-2 the building needs to be pushed up to the property line. The existing building currently has retail on the ground floor. Part of the program for the building was to make liveable spaces and to get as much light into them. They conceived the courtyard to allow more light into the units. As well, they have made the retail spaces as flexible as possible to allow for larger or smaller CRUs. He said they tried to make a substantial building that fit into Kerrisdale which is a neighbourhood of 25 foot buildings. There are some concerns from this client with respect to continuous landscaping on the decks as well as water proofing issues.

Damon Oriente, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. Although the street is narrow along West Boulevard, they have tried to have an extension of the residential feel with the grass boulevard. On West Boulevard they isn't any space to add street trees. The courtyard area which faces south will make for an outdoor space for four units. All the planting will be in metal planters that will sit on top of the roof deck. They have tried to divide up the space so that the facing units will have as much outdoor space as possible. They are using hedges with a frosted glass screen to divide up the spaces and give some privacy.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to the blank walls on the south and west property lines;
 - Consider using more contrast in the colour palette;
 - Design development to include continuous weather protection;
 - Consider recessing the loading door and the door to the underground parking;
 - Consider adding a communal space, unobstructed;
 - Consider more landscaping and trees.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and the relaxations.

The Panel thought the relaxations would not have a negative impact given the uses across the lane. However, they did feel that the blank wall could use some improvement such as introducing some openings or landscaping. One Panel member suggested having a green wall or to step the top for planters to make it more friendly. Another Panel member suggested using a mural to improve the expression. The Panel thought the architectural expression was acceptable however a couple of Panel members thought the materials could be differentiated from the base with a higher contrast of colours. It was noted that weather protection was missing and several Panel members thought there was room to recess the loading door and the door to the underground parking.

Several Panel members thought the retail façade needed to be broken up to make it more expressive. One Panel member suggested having residential townhouses along the West 40th Avenue location as they thought that retail would be less viable in that location. A couple of Panel members suggested finding a place for some common space to create some social sustainability. One Panel member suggested having some public art on West Boulevard.

Some of the Panel thought there needed to be more landscaping around the building and encouraged the applicant to add some trees along West Boulevard and West 40th Avenue. One Panel members suggested using planters and not pots for plantings.

Regarding sustainability, it was noted that the facades don't respond to their solar orientation or weather protection.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Diamond noted that his client is actually taking one of the penthouses for his own use. He said he didn't think that residential on the ground floor would work noting that there are other streets with retail on them. He said he appreciated the comments regarding the blank wall. As to the colour palette he said his client wanted a neutral palette and that it was a struggle with Engineering to include street trees in this area. He thanked the Panel for their comments.

5. Address:	1628 West 4 th Avenue
DE:	416161
Description:	To construct a mixed-use 5-storey building containing commercial on the 1 st storey and residential on the 2 nd to 5 th storeys containing 49 dwelling units over 2 levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2B
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill Architects
Owner:	Ledingham McAllister
Review:	First
Delegation:	Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architects
Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (4-5)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 5-storey mixed-use building with retail at grade and four levels of residential. The site is at the corner of West 4th Avenue and Fir Street. Mr. Morgan described the context for the area noting the site is adjacent to IC-1 industrial properties. He also described the zoning for the site noting that the maximum building height is 40 feet which may be increased to 50 feet after considering height, bulk, surrounding buildings, view impacts, the amount of open space and response from the neighbourhood. The proposal's height is five feet higher than permitted under the C-2B zoning. The Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board may permit an increase in the maximum height not to exceed 50 feet. Mr. Morgan noted that the building massing should respond to the adjacent recent development by dividing the massing into large blocks, linked by a connecting bridge to enable sunlight into the site and break up the massing. He said that staff would consider relaxation on the retail frontage as well as the height subject to a high quality architectural response, achieving good retail height and street wall definition. He said that the height was increased to permit a more generous floor to floor for the ground floor retail, to improve street presence and usability of the commercial space. Mr. Morgan described the material palette noting the timber frame detailing, metal panel and cementitious board along with fabric awnings and a 17 foot high painted concrete wall at the lane. The proposal is for 36 residential units, 12 single bedrooms, and one studio. The rest will be two bedrooms.

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

1. **Height:** Height increase above 50 feet up to 55.5 feet have been proposed and a relaxation of the 30 degree building envelope measuring 24 feet above street level. Does the Panel support these height relaxations?
2. **Density:** Residential density has been increased from 1.5 to 1.74 FSR to meet the maximum density of 2.5 FSR (2.49 FSR). Is this density increase sufficiently earned to be supportable?
3. **Retail Frontage:** Retail frontage width can be relaxed beyond the 50 feet limit, providing a courtyard, resting place or pedestrian amenity has been maintained. Has this been achieved to support this relaxation?
4. **Massing & Expression:** Should there be a stronger/higher street wall along West 4th Avenue. Is the circular corner and timber expression appropriate for the context? Does the building provide a good fit to the context?
5. **Landscape Treatment:** Comments requested on ease of access to the common outdoor amenity space and the depth of the growing medium for the proposed trees?
6. **Street Setback:** There is a provision in the C-2B District Schedule to not permit a front yard setback, relaxable under Section 5.0. City engineering is currently requesting an

18 foot setback on all arterials, as measured from the curb to be negotiated with the Director of Planning. The recent C-2B (Mantra) has a 2 foot setback along West 4th Avenue and a 5 foot setback along Pine Street, achieving 11 feet measured from the curb. Would a similar setback be appropriate and or greater one, as recommended by Engineering?

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Keith Hemphill, Architects, further described the proposal. He said that the circular forms in the area inspired them to design a building with a circular element at the corner. There is no setback on the commercial level but the building has been set back on the floors above to help to bring more daylight onto the sidewalk. To break up the length of the building they pulled it back with a substantial notch at the top floor and located the residential entry at the ground floor. He noted that there are some two bedroom units proposed. The area above the commercial will have a green roof. The retail has a 17 foot floor to floor slab which reflects the kind of commercial in the area. On the north facing side of the building are two storey units with substantial outdoor space.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the generous outdoor space for the upper units as well as a common space. The soils will be built up to allow for planting of some trees. The streetscape proposes street trees and a treatment that will include circular elements to the property line.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Simplify massing and strengthen streetwall;
 - Expression should and have a contemporary character in keeping with the existing and emerging context;
 - Building setback to match the adjacent building along 4th Ave and adjacent side street;
 - Design development to ensure an indoor amenity space next to the common outdoor space and to improve access;
 - Design development to mitigate the exposed blank walls.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal

The Panel supported the height and the density. However, the Panel had an issue with the length of the retail frontage. As well, they thought the retail frontage was weak and they weren't sure what amenity had been provided that would warrant a relaxation of the 50 foot length limit. Also, they said that in order to earn the relaxation the setback should match the building to the west.

Although there weren't any concerns regarding the residential entry, one Panel member thought there should be a seating element that is part of the building's expression. Some Panel members thought the expression didn't fit into the neighbourhood considering other buildings have a more contemporary expression. Some Panel members thought the project would benefit from a rethink in terms of cleaning up the busy articulation of the overall form.

The Panel had some concerns regarding access to the common amenity space. They also suggested the applicant consider an interior amenity room attached to the outdoor space.

Some of the Panel suggested mitigating the blank wall expression on the lane with the use of vines or other elements.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel member suggesting the applicant look at the soil depth for the street trees. They also suggested widening the sidewalks slightly to get some street trees.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hemphill said his client wanted to create a visual link to Granville Island with the expression of the building. Regarding the architecture, he said he believed that individual expression makes for a neighbourhood that doesn't look like it was all built at the same time. Regarding energy performance on the building, they are planning to use a punched window expression along with a metal panel system on a wood frame building. Mr. Hemphill said he appreciated the comments regarding calming the expression. He added that they will continue to refine the design.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.