

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 13, 2013

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes (Excused Item #3)
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski (Chair)
Daryl Condon
Alan Endall
Veronica Gillies (Item #4 only)
David Grigg
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #4)
Norm Shearing
Peter Wreglesworth

REGRETS:
Vincent Dumoulin
Bruce Hemstock

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	970 Union Street (Villa Cathay Care Home)
2.	401 Great Northern Way
3.	2803 West 41 st Avenue (Crofton Manor)
4.	1412-1460 Howe Street, 1410 and 1429 Granville Street, 710 Pacific Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Borowski called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief Business Meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 869 Union Street (Villa Cathay Care Home)
 DE: N/A
 Description: Amendment to the current CD-1 (505) for the purpose of renovating and adding to the existing care facility. The addition entails mainly an 11-storey new building (height 32.3m), with a floor space of 9229m² (34,356 sq. ft.)
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: RZ
 Architect: Joe Wai Architect Inc.
 Owner: Villa Cathay Care Home
 Review: First
 Delegation: Joe Wai, Joe Wai Architect Inc.
 Oi Wan, Joe Wai Architect Inc.
 Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architects
 Staff: Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning to amend the CD-1 zoning of the site to allow expansion of the existing senior care facility that has been in existence on the site since the 1970's. Ms. Zeng noted that the site was rezoned from RM-3A to CD-1 in 2009 for an upgrade and expansion. Although the by-law was enacted the actual work was never carried out. The current rezoning is again for an upgrade and expansion. Ms. Zeng indicated that the rezoning is supported by city-wide policies as well as the DTES Housing Plan which encourages the provision of senior housing including care facilities. Ms. Zeng added that the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning requires the project to be LEED™ Gold. Recognizing the project involves an existing building, Ms. Zeng stressed that the principle of advancing sustainability goals through rezoning still applies to the site and requires the project to demonstrate LEED™ Gold or equivalent or alternative sustainability measures that are suitable to this project.

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the context has mostly I-2 zoning around the site which is an industrial zone that does not permit residential use. The I-2 zone permits a maximum building height of 100 feet. This site has unique adjacencies that lend itself to the possible consideration of extra height. The proposal is for an 11-storey building that will not shadow the public park to the south. Mr. Cheng noted that the setback on Venables Street is not very large. As well, the corner of Venables and Raymur Streets is one of the main accesses to Strathcona Park.

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

1. Given the particular context and adjacencies involving a park, industrially-zoned land, and social housing projects of 3-12 storeys, are there any concerns with respect to the impacts of shadow, overlook and privacy to nearby properties or the public realm?
2. Taking into consideration that the Raymur and Venables Streets intersection acts as a major access to Strathcona Park from the neighbourhood to the north, is the proposed building setback off Venables Street appropriate for the 11-storey tower component?

Ms. Zeng and Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Joe Wai, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that the footprint is the same as was envisioned in 2009. However, there is an increase in size as the existing units have become inadequate to meet the needs of the residents. They have increased the building height to 11-storeys and the number of rooms has increased to 225 in order to make the proposal more efficient. The rationale is that they won't have to phase the reconstruction and the residents would stay in the existing building during construction. As well it is a LEED™ Gold project.

Qi Wan, Architect, described the landscape plans noting the cultural element planned on the building. A walking circle is planned for the residents exercise.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the tower's expression;
 - Design development to improve the Venables Street setback;
 - Design development to improve the loading and garbage area.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal.

Although the Panel supported the height and density, they thought the building was too close to Venables Street and was too blocky in its expression. One Panel member thought this could be remedied by increasing the yard slightly, while several other Panel members suggested adding some floors and trimming down the tower floorplate for a better fit. Also, they thought the relationship between the tower and the west low-rise could be improved. They were especially concerned with the rationale regarding the loading and the garbage on the Venables and Raymur Streets corner. They thought this was an unfortunate situation on such an important corner, and encouraged the applicant to find other planning options.

The Panel noted that it was a cost sensitive project but felt there still needed to be some work done on the vocabulary of the building to make it more cohesive. Several Panel members suggested there be a clearer relationship between the tower and the existing building.

The Panel did not have any concerns regarding the park access or shadow and impact of overlook. One Panel member thought that sound attenuation in the courtyard would be important. Some Panel members thought the transition from the sidewalk to the picket fence to the landscaping needed to provide interest to pedestrians. As well it was noted that there was a lack of landscaping on the west side of the site. Some Panel members suggested providing more direct access to the yards from the ground floor units.

One Panel member suggested getting the building solar ready for solar panels on the roof as a way to reduce long term operating costs. Also, it was suggested to consider adding triple glazing especially on the Venables Street side in order to make the units more comfortable and with better noise attenuation.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Wai said he found the comments constructive. He noted that the project was complicated to put together as it is a two phase project. They have to accommodate the residents during construction as well. He added that they will take a look again at the Venables and Raymur Streets corner. He thanked the Panel for their comments and said they would like to have a little room on the height.

2. Address:	401 Great Northern Way
DE:	416415
Description:	To construct an artist live/work development containing a total of 209 artist live/work units consisting of a 7-storey building facing East 1 st Avenue containing 135 artist live/work units and a 6-storey building facing Great Northern Way containing 74 artist live/work units all over 5 levels of common underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.
Zoning:	IC-3
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Onni Group
Review:	First
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Gerry Eckford, ETA Landscape Architects Beau Jarvis, Onni Group
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located on the north side of Great Northern Way at the western perimeter of the Great Northern Way Campus. The campus site is a joint enterprise between BCIT, Emily Carr, SFU and UBC and is governed under its own CD-1 By-law. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting that the zoning for this site permits a mix of light industrial, live arts and theater as well as residential uses.

Ms. Molaro noted that the site has evolved over time and there have been a number of adjustments made to it. Thornton Street was realigned as well as East 1st Avenue. Also, East 1st Avenue is a bikeway, with Engineering looking at an off street bikeway on the north side of the street.

Ms. Molaro explained that there is a transit right-of-way to accommodate a Millenium line extension. She added that one of the challenges is that this right-of-way may be removed and replaced in the future so structures need to be minimized in the right-of-way. Another challenge on the site is that the passage on the west side is not a lane, and the lane running parallel behind the detox center to Great Northern Way is a lane. The site as a result is a very irregular shape and is significantly challenged by the height restriction with the IC-3 zone that limits height to 60 feet. As well, there is a change in grade from Great Northern Way to East 1st Avenue of over 28 feet. Ms. Molaro stated that one of the goals they would like the applicant to achieve is to have higher floor to floor for the residential units containing artist studios. She added that another factor affecting the permitted height envelope is the use of wood frame construction.

Ms. Molaro noted that because of the challenging grade conditions, the units on both Great Northern Way and East 1st Avenue have been depressed into the grade. In other locations along the transit right-of-way, the ground floor units are above ground with no direct access.

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

Overall architectural resolution:

- Building siting and relationship to streets
- Form of development including height

- Ground floor unit's relationship to grade including opportunity to activate the frontage with artist studio (residential units)
- Architectural treatments of walls/glazing
- Landscape treatments.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal noting the sixty foot height restriction is to preserve views further up the hill. He stated that they had explored lots of different options for the site before settling on the current proposal. There are a number of restrictions around the site including a city easement (lane). As a result they needed to pull the building back from the lane, and from the Brewery Creek walkway setback. The loading will be off East 1st Avenue. He added that the site has a 26 to 30 foot drop across the site. Mr. Lyon described the architecture noting there will be 208 units in the project. Two thirds of the units will be artists' studios and one third market units. The artists' studio will be along the base of the buildings at the ground floor.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting there are some existing trees along Great Northern Way that are in conflict with the building footprint. Due to the fact that they may be damaged as a result of the improvement to the street, they will be removed and a double row of new trees will be planted. A gravel rain garden is proposed with some sitting areas as a reference to Brewery Creek. A bicycle repair module will be located in the central courtyard. He added that there are several access points along Great Northern Way to the ground floor units. A children's play area is proposed for the eastern end of the courtyard. The other element in the courtyard is a community garden with raised steel planters and benches with storage. There will be staircase access to the roof for the individual units on the top floors. Mr. Eckford described the sustainability strategy regarding the use of irrigation as well as native plants.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the grade access for the ground floor units;
 - Consider more reference to the history of the street in the architectural expression;
 - Consider a water feature to represent Brewery Creek;
 - Consider triple glazed windows for traffic noise attenuation.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was well handled for a difficult site.

The Panel supported the form of development including the height. They also supported the building siting and relationship to the street edges. The Panel felt the grade access to the ground floor units could be improved. A couple of Panel members thought the overall building form and massing could also be improved. One Panel member noted that there weren't clear cues for the streetwall pattern. They also supported the industrial vocabulary but thought the balconies could have a more industrial expression.

The Panel supported the material and colour palette although a couple of Panel members thought the buildings should be different in their color expression. A couple of Panel member were disappointed that there wasn't any reference to the history of the street. One Panel member suggested that the blank concrete wall could be featured or textured in some way.

The Panel commended the applicant for the landscape treatment, with a couple of Panel members suggesting the applicant could introduce a water feature to represent Brewery Creek in the southwest corner of the site. Some Panel members worried that the courtyard was going to be in shadow for a large portion of the day. One Panel member thought there could be more urban agriculture and that there should be better access to the roof for maintenance.

Regarding sustainability, it was suggested that triple glazed windows could be added on the Great Northern Way frontage to mitigate traffic noise and that the gravel roof could have reflective material.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon thanked the Panel for their comments and added that they will continue to work on the project.

3. Address:	2803 West 41 st Avenue (Crofton Manor)
DE:	416371
Description:	To construct a new 6-storey Senior's Supportive Assisted Housing building with 76 residential units (facing West 41 st Avenue).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Number TEN Architectural Group
Owner:	Revera Inc.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Barry Cosgrave, Number TEN Architectural Group Mark Anthony, Number TEN Architectural Group Bev Windjack, LADR Landscape Architects Rudi Harel, Revera Inc.
Staff:	Laurie Schmidt, Brook Pooni Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-6)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 6-storey supportive housing building. He described the context for the area noting the Kerrisdale Presbyterian Church to the east and the 3-storey multiple dwelling to the west. He noted that the previous CD-1 allowed three storeys at the central residential block. The amended form of development was approved in principle in 2010 to allow a 6-storey central block. Mr. Black mentioned that the roof and base design were modified from the rezoning to address design advice from the Panel in April 2010.

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

- Resolution of the issues previously identified by the Panel in 2010,
- Resolution of the expression and roof form chosen for this building, and
- Design of outdoor terraces and pond at grade to the south of the new block.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Anthony, Architect, further described the proposal. He mentioned that the proposal will be replacing the existing central building. The ground floor is mostly amenity and support space and provides 76 units on the second to sixth floor and there is an underground parkade. He described the design team's response to the changes on the site. The overall composition of the mass is made up of a base, body and the roof. The base will provide shelter for pedestrians and car drop off and contain amenity space. There is an existing courtyard at the back of the site that will be maintained. The body has a horizontal expression with recessed balconies. The roof form is taken as an abstraction of some of the roof forms on larger residential homes around the neighbourhood. The sixth floor has dormers on the ends and there is a veranda expression along the south face. There is a ground floor terrace area at the front that is surrounded by a water feature that allows for a transparent connection between the residents and the street. Mr. Anthony noted that the materials and the colour palette reflect the recent renovation to the building.

Bev Windjack, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans and explained that the rezoning document established the intent for the landscape. The landscape plans need to contribute to sustainability and livability. As well, the landscape needs to maintain the well treed frontage along West 41st Avenue and to supplement the planting. The amenity area on site needs to have some relationship to the interior of the building. She noted that

the landscape strategy has three areas: the west courtyard, the streetscape and the east landscape. The west courtyard is designed as an informal space with a reflecting pool and terrace. Ms. Windjack mentioned that they are adding four red maple trees in the streetscape along West 41st Avenue. Bike parking is proposed west of the main entrance and a rain garden is planned on the east side of the entrance.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the overall architectural expression;
 - Design development to improve the roof design;
 - Consider improving the quality of the materials;
 - Design development to increase the bistro seating area;
 - Consider a stronger sustainability strategy.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

Most of the Panel thought the project had been improved from the rezoning but felt there was a lack of integrity on the lower levels. They thought the roof was not resolved enough as it is such a dominant element on the building. One Panel member mentioned that the gables were lopsided. As well several Panel members found the whole buildings so massive in character that it was out of context with the surrounding area. They felt the building needed to be broken down more distinctly on the West 41st Avenue elevation. One Panel member mentioned that the strong horizontal line at the sixth level was too strong and cuts the roof form from the rest of the building.

Several Panel members thought the quality of materials was poor given the importance of the building and its location in Kerrisdale. A couple of Panel members noted that the stucco cladding and faux wood finish seemed too cheap and the balcony guard rails needed more detailing. Some Panel member thought the front canopy expression didn't match the architectural expression.

Although the Panel supported the landscape plans they thought the bistro seating element and the water element was out of proportion. They thought there needed to be more terrace and less water.

The Panel was disappointed in the sustainability strategy. One Panel member was concerned that the applicant wouldn't meet the City's building bylaw when it came time for the building permit. Another Panel member thought there should be some sun shading on the south façade.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Anthony said they are planning to build to ASHRAE 90.1 2007 and the guidelines for Green for Larger Sites which includes green mobility, water diversion, and reducing greenhouse gases. He said they would look at more extensive sustainability approaches to the project.

4. Address:	1412-1460 Howe Street, 1410 and 1429 Granville Street, 710 Pacific Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	Revised proposal for a mixed-use development including: on the Howe Street site, identified under the General Policy for Higher Buildings as a location for a higher building, a 52-storey (497 feet) residential tower with a 10-storey podium containing retail and residential (market rental) uses; and on the Granville and Pacific Streets sites, 6-storey (up to 106 feet) buildings providing retail and office uses).
Zoning:	BCPED and FCCDD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	BIG and DIALOG
Owner:	Westbank Projects Corp.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Thomas Christoffersen, BIG Melissa Bauld, BIG Bruce Haden, DIALOG Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Vladimir Mikler, Cobalt Engineering Ian Gillespie, Westbank Projects Corp.
Staff:	Anita Molaro and Karen Hoesle

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a mixed-use development that was reviewed by the Panel last year. Ms. Molaro stated that the Panel supported the previous version with a number of comments for further design development. In addition to the rezoning policies for green buildings, there are two specific policies applicable to this proposal: Higher Building Policy and the Under the Granville Street Bridge Policy.

The Higher Building Policy has several criteria for earning the additional height:

- That the buildings must establish a significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city's skyline.
- The building must significantly demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy and advance the city's objective for carbon neutrality - achieving a 40- 50% reduction in energy consumption from 2010 levels.
- In addition to community benefits the development should provide on-site open space that represents a significant contribution to the down network of green and plaza space.

The Under the Granville Street Bridge Policy's criteria:

- Looks to develop a 'local serving' shopping area, with a grocery store and retail and office uses in addition a high level of quality in the design of both the public realm and building architecture.

Ms. Molaro stated that under the High Building Policy the site was identified for a 425 foot high tower, however, when the Panel saw the proposal last year a number of different tower heights were presented and a tower height of 493 feet was endorsed at that time as the preferred tower height. Further work was needed as well to improve the building's overall proportions.

The application has been revised with a 496 foot tower along with modification to the proportions of the overall tower including a reduction in the upper tower floor plate.

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

Tower Refinements:

- Height (increased from 493 to 497 feet)
- Proportion
 - Uppermost floorplate reduced from 11,800 square feet to 11,625 square feet
 - Overall dimensions of reduced from 135 feet by 100 feet to 129.5 feet by 100 feet
- Balconies added to the southwest façade
- Overlap with Pomaria building reduced from 27 feet 10 inches to 22 feet 7 inches

Podium Buildings Refinements:

- Overall massing strategy - street views
- Light access to the street level public realm
- Elevated courtyards
- Interface of the rental building with the bridge structure and tower
- Provision of a local serving shopping area (grocery store, retail and office uses)

Public realm refinements:

- Interface of the ground plane with the adjacent retail including approach to provide level spaces for active uses
- Connectivity of the bridges through the elevated courtyards with the streets
- Treatments to the underside of the bridge
- Landscape treatments

Sustainability Revisions:

- LEED™ Gold and sustainability targets have been increased

Does the proposal continue to satisfy the High Building Policy criteria:

- For architectural excellence and significant contribution to the skyline?
- Demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption?
- For the provision on-site open space that represents a significant contribution of the downtown network of green and plaza space?
- Inclusion of activities and uses of community significance?
- Minimization of adverse shadowing and view impacts on the public realm.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Thomas Christoffersen, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they have played with the proportions on the tower. They have added a little bit of width in the east/west direction and reduced the floor plate in the north/south direction. It is now a slimmer tower but keeps the same density and roughly the same height. This will reduce the overlap between the neighbouring building by approximately five feet. As well balconies have been added to the south façade to improve the solar shading. Mr. Christoffersen mentioned that the podium adjacent to the tower now has a roof tilted towards the west. He explained that they want to cantilever a portion of the building over the lane to maintain the triangular volume of the building. It is a public lane that allows access to the site south of the tower. The roof planes of all the podium buildings have been improved by exposing the green roofs and gardens. The façade facing Granville Street has been tilted with access to the retail along this street front. The inner courtyard has been raised both under the tower but also the courtyard between the podiums to allow for more sunlight. The daycare will not be included in this development, so the program has changed and another level of retail has been added. As well, the gym has been made bigger and an outdoor pool has been added.

Mr. Christoffersen described the architecture and stated that they have changed the modulation of the tower somewhat. The southwest corner is resolved in the same manner as the southeast corner to create a bit of symmetry on the south façade. The façade of the podium buildings takes on some of the characteristics of the tower. The podiums have different natures and different uses.

Bruce Haden, Architect, stated that they are further along in the design than is normal for a rezoning. Largely this is a design development issue with fairly important massing shifts mostly at the podium level. The integrity of tower from a structural perspective has been important to enhance.

Ian Gillespie, Developer, noted that there has been a lot of effort in getting the programming right for the project. He added that the success of this development will be measured by how successful the retail is for the neighbourhood.

Vladimir Mikler, Engineer, briefly described the sustainability strategy noting that the project will target LEED™ Platinum certification.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. He noted there are a number of challenges including the 7% slope in the public realm. They have explored a number of options for the public realm particularly around the slope. There were four options that they explored. First the option is to maintain the 7% slope as a sloped street and a plaza condition. The second option was to introduce benching or terracing that could occupy the edge of the space. Another option is to take a large series of terraces coming down the centre of Granville Street with a central drive court. This sets up a series of level benches. They also looked at closing off the area to traffic which won't work as there needs to be functioning traffic through the area. Mr. Phillips said they feel the complete street from Pacific Boulevard to the water should be considered as one special project. He said they also feel this is a special street as it is about both vehicles and pedestrians, and could be closed for special events. The streetscape needs to have a strong identity with special lighting, furniture and consideration for the transformative nature of public art. He added that they have decided to keep the existing slope and feel it will be a great place for special events.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the public realm;
 - Consider adding weather protection to the edge of the buildings;
 - Consider design development to improve the top of the tower.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the project was still satisfying the High Building Policy.

The Panel supported the tower and thought it was a promising venture, but had some concerns with the public realm. One Panel member mentioned that there needed to be design control over the ground floor especially under the bridge. The Panel didn't have any issues with the cantilevered portion over the lane and the two way circulation. Although the Panel didn't have any concerns with respect to the 7% slope, they did note that there was a challenge with it in the public realm. One Panel member noted that the key to making the slope work was how much control was accomplished in treating the surfaces. As well, it was suggested that a complete surface be continued down to the

water. Another Panel member thought it was important that those spaces were accessible to the disabled.

Most of the Panel thought the slope on the roof of the buildings in the courtyard was better as they set a green foil against the tower. As well, they thought the layout of the courtyards was much improved especially the canting of the facades on either side of the bridge to let in more light. They also liked the carved balconies on the podium pieces. One Panel member noted that on the west side there is only one carved piece and it loses its relationship to the tower. Another Panel member thought one of the courtyards could open up more into the public realm to make it more accessible. The Panel noted that the bridge made for natural weather protection in protecting the parking areas, but there needed to be some weather protection up against the building for pedestrians.

Several Panel members thought the top of the tower was unresolved and needed more to create a distinctive terminus in the skyline.

The Panel supported the landscape plans with one Panel member suggesting there could be more greenery on the edges of the site.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy and hoped a district energy facility would be approved.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Gillespie thanked the Panel for their comments. He added that it was nice to get some positive input especially around some issues that they have been struggling with for months.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.