

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 22, 2013  
**TIME:** 4.00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall  
**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Daryl Condon  
Walter Francl (Excused Item #4)  
Joseph Fry  
Veronica Gillies (Present for Item #4 only)  
David Grigg  
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #4)  
Norm Shearing (Chair)  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:**  
Ryan Bragg  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Joseph Hruda  
Phil Mondor  
Goran Ostojic

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 1568 East King Edward Avenue (formerly 1526-1560 Kingsway) |
| 2. | 231 East Pender Street                                     |
| 3. | 445 SW Marine Drive (Marine Gardens)                       |
| 4. | 320 Granville Street                                       |
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Shearing called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1568 East King Edward Avenue (formerly 1526-1560 Kingsway)  
 DE: 416646  
 Description: Concurrent rezoning and development proposal for a 6-storey mixed-use building containing 655 m<sup>2</sup> (7,059 sq. ft.) of commercial space and 4 601 m<sup>2</sup> (49,529 sq. ft.) of residential. The proposal includes a total of 76 rental units, with a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.87, a maximum height of 23.6 m (77.5 ft.), and 47 parking stalls at grade and underground. The rezoning application is being considered under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy.  
 Zoning: C-2 to CD-1  
 Application Status: Rezoning/complete  
 Review: Second  
 Architect: GBL Architects  
 Owner: John Wong  
 Delegation: Stu Lyon, GBL Architects  
 Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Architects  
 Senga Lindsay, Senga Lindsay Landscape Architect  
 Staff: Yan Zeng and Paul Cheng

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the project noting that it is proposing a mixed-use building with 100% rental residential units under the Rental 100: Secured Market Rental Housing Policy. As part of this policy, whenever possible staff look to expedite the permitting process by having the rezoning and development permit application as a concurrent application.

Mr. Cheng mentioned that the Panel at the last review thought the overall massing, height and form was acceptable from a rezoning point of view but they were not comfortable with supporting the project given that the project was also looking for support from a development permit level. The project has come back with some design refinement. Mr. Cheng gave an overview of the context noting the zoning for the site. He went through the concerns from the Panel's last review.

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal and said they had an opportunity to design some efficient and interesting layouts for the units because of the shape of the site. The corridor has been staggered and the enclosed balconies are bigger than usually seen in rental properties.

Daniel Eisenberg, Architect, described the changes since the last review and mentioned that they have had the opportunity to address the comments from the Panel. Regarding the angle of the roof line he noted that they explored the option of a flat roof and found that they wanted to create a more dramatic corner with an angled roof line. He added that with the flat roof option, the corner seemed to get lost. As a result they have gone back to the

option of the angled roof line which they feel is appropriate. On the lane side, they have added a planter above the car ramp that channels the landscape from the second floor down to the lane. They have also contrasted the texture of the walls and created vertical windows at the lane. The amenity room has been relocated from the second floor to the ground floor facing the lane. The balconies have been broken up into shorter sections creating a more dramatic staggered pattern and color has been added to the soffits and privacy screens. Mr. Eisenberg mentioned that they have treated the party wall on the east with a combination of painted concrete and exposed architectural concrete with several reveal lines. The west party wall has been treated similarly. They have provided a series of spandrel panels along the retail frontage and a canopy to improve the scale and weather protection. He noted that they made the expression of the façade consistent around the whole building. They have also removed the eye brow so the lines of the angle of the roof have a better reading.

Senga Lindsay, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. She mentioned that they have made three layers of plantings along the lane with the top layer being edible landscaping, and then an evergreen hedge and finally a bottom layer with vines. Additional planting is proposed for the corner.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider reducing the graphic element on the façade;
  - Consider adding windows to the end walls;
  - Consider expanding the windows off the amenity space.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it had evolved since the last review.

The Panel agreed that it was an interesting design and liked the building form and thought the refinement was an improvement to the cornice line on the Kingsway elevation. Some of the Panel thought the graphic element on Kingsway wasn't helping the architectural expression. A couple of Panel members suggested adding windows on the end walls to get more light into the units.

The Panel thought the unit layouts were interesting and although small were thoughtfully worked out.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and thought the plantings in the lane and the access to the ramp was improved with one Panel member suggested the planting be different from the rest of the ground plane. A couple of Panel members suggested revising the slot windows to something larger to allow a better view out from the amenity room. Also, adding some screening around the amenity room on the lane as well as adding a shading element was suggested.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon said they had no further comments and thanked the Panel.

---

2. Address:	231 East Pender Street
DE:	416681
Description:	To construct an 8-storey mixed-use building consisting of 1-storey of retail and 7-storeys (2nd - 8th) of dwelling units. A total of 60 dwelling units with two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the north lane.
Zoning:	Ha-1
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Bingham Hill Architects
Owner:	Porte Development
Delegation:	John Bingham, Bingham Hill Architects David Kapenic, Bingham Hill Architects Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects David Porte, Porte Development
Staff:	Paul Cheng

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-5)**

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal that has come in under the HA-1 zone that has recently been modified and gave an overview of the zoning requirements and guidelines. He added that the guidelines express very carefully about what kind of character that should be expressed for the building and talked about a need for a strong cornice line at the top of the building. As well the guidelines stress the need for a sawtooth expression that mimics or emulates the original 25 foot lot pattern of development in Chinatown. He also mentioned that currently on the site there is a historical building at the back of the site that was once used as a garage while the rest of the site is being used for surface parking. Staff asked the applicant to explore the possibility of retaining the building and they have retained some of the character of the garage in their design. As well Engineering Services paid a little bit of money to have a mural commissioned onto the side of the neighbouring building facing the surface parking lot that will now be covered when this building is developed. The City Manager has expressed that money should be derived from this application for a new mural perhaps on the building or on a notable location.

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

1. Does the proposed front façade treatment successfully emulate the “sawtooth” profile which historically resulted from incremental development of small 25 foot wide lots?
2. Does the proposed treatment of the top cornice of the streetwall component successfully achieve the visual richness that is emulated by the historical buildings in the neighbourhood?
3. Does the typical storefront design successfully reflect the Lower Street Façade elements cited in the HA-1 Design Guidelines and the Chinatown Character documents?
4. The west-facing elevation will likely be apparent from Main Street for an extended period of time. Does this elevation successfully respond to the historical character of HA-1 zoning?
5. Does the main body of the front façade successfully respond to the historical character of the neighbourhood with respect to fenestration, window detailing, brick detailing and treatment of balcony balustrades?
6. While the proposal embodies many design elements that respond to the specific physical context of Vancouver’s Chinatown, does the proposal contain any elements that could culturally resonate with citizens who are sensitive to Canadian-Chinese culture?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** John Bingham, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the design was driven by the new guidelines together with functional requirements. He mentioned that one of the first challenges was dealing with the existing gas station at the back of the site. He said they looked at how they could integrate it into the new building and decided to take a portion of the building and make it part of the development. As a result they elected to develop a strong streetwall and framing elements along the street which is typical of other buildings in Chinatown. Mr. Bingham noted that on the lane elevation they will be replicating the garage doors since they are in poor shape and can't be reused. The side elevations are solid with the use of brick and stucco on the lane sides. The cornice line doesn't project from the façade but has a solid element to provide a strong framing form. Some of the store fronts are actual replicates of some of the older store fronts. On the east elevation there is a 2-storey building which will probably be redeveloped at some time in the future. Mr. Bingham explained that in the main entrance there is some symbolism to provide a sense of history. He added that the units will be heated with a hot water system that needs to be designed to connect into a future district energy system.

Mary Chan-Yip, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans that have been developed to create an overlook in the space on the north side of the building. It has been developed to offer seasonal interest with a variety of plantings. Some of the plantings will have a shade of red to reinforce a little bit of a Chinese character.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the sawtooth expression;
  - Design development to match the front expression with the rear façade;
  - Design development to improve the west facing façade;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel noted that this was the first project to be reviewed under the new guidelines for the area. They felt there needed to be a way to interpret the sawtooth guidelines better in the architectural expression as they felt the façade treatment did not successfully emulate the sawtooth profile in a three-dimensional volumetric way. Also it was mentioned that the building had three volumes on the front façade but only two on the back and felt that both facades should match.

Although the Panel liked the modernist interpretation to the building and felt the rear expression worked better while the front needed some work. As well the Panel didn't think the applicant didn't need to mimic a historical cornice but could choose a modernist interpretation to provide a stronger finish to the top edge of the building. Further, the fenestration patterns needed development in order to address the window/wall ratio of historical buildings.

The Panel thought the store front expression was appropriate with it being broken up into four pieces at the ground plane. The Panel would like to see more quality materials on the front of the building and perhaps a lessor version of similar material on the back façade. Some Panel members thought the west facing elevation needed to be more robust in its expression.

Some of the Panel thought the historical reference to garage could be better reflected in the building especially on the lane. One Panel member suggested having a contemporary expression of the garage using color or another element. Another couple of Panel members thought the garage doors could be treated differently to make them stand out more and not be part of the flat façade.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but some wondered why there was only one street tree in front of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bingham noted that most of the buildings in Chinatown have a flat expression and there is a reflection of what is happening behind the building. He added that some buildings in Chinatown have 25 foot increments while others have 50 or even 75 feet.

3. Address:	445 SW Marine Drive (Marine Gardens)
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposed amendment would include 514 market residential units in two towers: one at 27 storeys (235 ft.), with a 7 storey podium, and one at 21 storeys (185 ft.), with a 6 storey podium, 70 units of affordable housing and a 37 space daycare in a 6.5 storey mid-rise; 411 underground parking spaces and an FSR (floor space ratio) of 4.27.
Zoning:	Amend CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects Inc.
Owner:	Concord
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Inc. Joey Stevens, GBL Architects Inc. Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects Peter Webb, Concord
Staff:	Dwayne Drobot and Anita Molaro

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)

- Introduction:** Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a residential development at Marine Gardens. He described the context noting the Canada Line Station to the south and the Marine Gateway development. The Policy for this area is the Cambie Corridor Plan which was adopted by Council in May 2011. At the time there wasn't any information on Marine Gardens as it wasn't being considered for redevelopment but staff did indicate that they would look at a rezoning for the site. The proposal has two towers with mid-rise podiums and a 6 ½ storey building which is proposed as a 70 unit housing project as well as a 37 space childcare facility.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, further described the proposal and mentioned that the lane that existed on the backside of the site next door has been converted into a street. One of the goals for the backside of the development was to activate with residential uses facing onto that lane. The townhouses in this proposal have grade oriented residential units to make an interesting pedestrian environment. As well they wanted to knit together the two sites with statutory right-of-ways and pedestrian connections to accommodate as much permeability as possible. There is a sewer line that will be left as a landscaped area. A number of locations were considered to accommodate the parking access but Marine Drive was chosen as it was too challenging to have it off the lane.

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

Does the Panel support the rezoning and subsequent form of development including taking into consideration the Cambie Corridor Design Principles including:

- Building siting, tower form and massing and density (4.27 FSR) and height (235 feet and 185 feet), podiums/low rise buildings of 6 and 7-storeys taking into consideration:
  - Relationship with adjacent development across Nunavut Street
  - Podium massing with existing low rise residential neighbourhood along West 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Integration of the site with adjacent development and pedestrian network:
  - Site permeability
  - Pedestrian linkages
- Neighbourliness including shadow and view impacts;
- Open space strategies;

- LEED™ Gold strategies; and
- Noting the rezoning stage of this application, does the Panel have any preliminary comments on the exterior expression and open space treatment shown?

Mr. Drobot and Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal in the Marine Landing area of the Cambie Corridor. He mentioned that there are some critical goals for them to achieve including the amount of density on the site due to the closeness of the transit station. As well a pedestrian network and comfort is important for people to find their way around and through the site. The rebuilding of the 70 units of rental housing and the daycare was needed to be included in the new development. The existing site has two storey townhouses that were built in the 1970's. The opportunity of the site is to allow for pedestrians to make their way through the site to the transit station. As well they wanted to continue the mews expression in the lane with townhouses and have maintained some of the existing trees on the perimeter of the site.

Joey Stevens, Architect, described the form of development. He said that one of the things they looked at was trying to preserve the existing green sanctuary so they pushed the density out to the edges to create a large central courtyard space. They wanted to create a front door on Marine Drive and a crossing that is welcoming. They were able to bring in the parking access without creating a huge ramp. There are three zones: the entry zone, courtyard space and the daycare and rental units. The daycare size has been increased and with that comes an outdoor space. There is a drop off location and access to the rental lobby on Nunavut Street. In terms of the building form, the massing complies with the guidelines and they have a sustainability strategy including vertical fins on the east and west facades.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. He said he thought the courtyard was a strong organizing element around the buildings with amenity spaces on both buildings. He said they struggled along Marine Drive since it is such a busy street but they pulled the sidewalk back to add street trees. There is a lot of animation at grade with the townhouses on the lane and they are hoping to use the rooftops as common outdoor spaces with children's play and urban agriculture.

Peter Webb said that as the developer they were approached by Social Planning and Housing with the concept of replacing the 70 rental units on the site. They were approached to look at ways through the CAC's buying power there could be a conversion of the rental into form of turnkey City owned project. That is why the rental project and the daycare is someone independent from the other part of the site to make it sub-dividable. They are currently working on the business solution with Real Estate Services to make that happen.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider making a pedestrian connection from the north across the site;
  - Design development to increase the internal courtyard by reducing the front yard along Yukon Street and move the building closer to Marine Drive;
  - Design development to increase privacy between the buildings;
  - Considering adding commercial space along Marine Drive;
  - Improve the planting edge beside the parking access to the rental building;
  - Consider a larger plaza space with less of a vehicle focus along Marine Drive.



- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported height, density and form of development and thought it was a well-considered design.

The Panel supported the general site design including the podium and podium elements as well as the tower elements. They also thought that how pedestrians would move through the site from the West was very well resolved. The Panel, however, had concerns that pedestrian movement through the site from the East need further design resolution. A number of Panel members thought the south-east tower and podium could move slightly south and closer to Yukon Street to allow for greater pedestrian movement between the rental building parking ramp and the Yukon Street building. This would also allow for a landscape buffer strip as well as improving the relationship between the rental building and the Yukon Street block. The Panel supported traffic coming off Yukon Street. A couple of Panel members thought there should be a pedestrian connection from the north across the site.

The Panel supported the location for the daycare recognizing it maximizes sun exposure. The Panel liked the alignment of the townhouses on Nunavut Lane and that it reflected podium elements of the building across the lane.

There isn't any commercial planned for the ground floor but a couple of Panel members thought there could be some in the western tower to enliven the frontage along Marine Drive.

The Panel thought the shadow impacts were well considered and appropriate for the development. It was noted that the tower placements allows for the shadow to fall across the site while minimizing their impact on the neighbours to the south.

The Panel acknowledged the Applicants goal of recreating the natural "green" environment of the original property but felt the design had not gone far enough and needed further design development. Presently the large auto court, and other hard landscape features are at odds with the landscape goal. A couple of Panel members would like to see a larger plaza space at Marine Drive and make it a green space for the neighbourhood.

In addition, the Panel noted the size of the residential lobby seemed out of proportion and needed further refinement.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon thanked the Panel for their encouraging comments. He said he looked forward to working with them as they go to the next phase of the design.

---

4. Address:	320 Granville Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	A 32-storey office tower with a commercial on grade with an FSR of 25.5 and a maximum height of 367 feet.
Zoning:	DD to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	Second
Architect:	VIA Architecture Inc.
Delegation:	Graham McGarva, VIA Architecture Inc. Derek Lee, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
Staff:	Karen Hoese and Sailen Black

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)**

- **Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a revised rezoning application located at Granville and Cordova Streets immediate across from Waterfront Station. The intent of the rezoning application is to increase density beyond that permitted under the current zoning. The application proposes a 32-storey office tower with a bicycle mobility centre fronting Cordova Street at grade with retail space above. Ms. Hoese described the policy for the Downtown District noting that it includes the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land use Plan as well as the Central Waterfront HUB framework which emphasizes non-residential uses and the creation of job space close transit. She added that the application was subject to the Green Buildings Policy which requires that rezonings apply for LEED™ Gold certification, with specific emphasis on optimized energy performance.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal for a 32-storey office tower with commercial at grade and a maximum height of 367 feet. He described the context for the area noting the RBC building to the south and the Sinclair Centre to the west. The site has an existing building that is an old above grade parking structure and is not on the Heritage Register although it is the oldest free-standing parkade in the downtown core. Mr. Black mentioned that there are view cones over the site which limits the height to about 368 feet. As well the Downtown Guidelines note the importance of good open spaces, and recommend that new structure in an area of older buildings should respect the scale, window rhythms and general façade treatments. Mr. Black also mentioned that the proposal had been reviewed previously by the Panel and noted some of the changes made to the exterior design since that review.

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

1. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development in general, including approximately 24 FSR and 367 feet in height, as designed?
2. Does the Panel support the design of the uppermost levels as a part of the Vancouver skyline?
3. Does the massing respond well to its specific context, considering its relationship to the waterfront, nearby neighbours, shadowing, and other impacts to the public realm?
4. Noting the rezoning stage of this application, does the Panel have any preliminary comments on the exterior expression and open space treatment shown?

In addition, comments were invited on the general landscape and architectural design, and whether the previous items raised by the Panel had been addressed.

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

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Graham McGarva, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that it was about the human experience of the building including having the bicycle station out in front. The whole project was conceived and considered with the future development of the Transportation HUB in mind. He said they had a challenge on how to place the right sculpting of a building form into the context. Mr. McGarva described the architecture of the building noting the blank facades on the party walls and on the lower levels to the Royal Bank building. They are looking at limestone bands to pick up the masonry of the adjacent context. They wanted to open up the corner for a view to Waterfront Station and so they pulled the building back. They picked a couple of pivot points to create a “tulip vase” outward form of the building. He added they have provided the residential liveability standards for openness for the occupied office space. It is important that some measure of outlook be preserved for the adjacent buildings. Regarding sustainability, Mr. McGarva said they will be using operable windows to allow for fresh air. As well they are planning a geo-exchange system to provide heat sources for the building.

Derek Lee, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping and said they wanted to use the landscaping to celebrate the grade change on the site. They looked at integrating the landscape through into the interior with a terraced seating area. He added that they wanted to find creative ways to integrate bike racks within seating in the public realm.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to the podium level;
  - Consider simplifying the facades regarding sustainability;
  - Design development on how the building meets the ground;
  - Consider weather protection around the building.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had put a lot of effort into improving the design since the last review.

The Panel supported the height and density as well as the form of development. They thought the tower would have a great presence in the skyline provided the resolution of the form was well done. They found the folding and twisting of the form a very compelling idea and admired the applicant’s attempt at the overall expression of the tower. However, they felt there still needed to be some design development at the podium level. One Panel member noted that the scheme would require careful detailing and careful selection of the glass to make it a successful project.

A couple of Panel member thought the bends and folds should do more as they seemed a little imperceptible. One Panel member thought the waistline should be more obvious on the tower. There was also some concern on how having a solar response to the facades would affect the look of the building. A couple of Panel members thought the building could be simplified especially when it came to the sustainability strategy.

A couple of Panel members had some concern as to how the building leans over Granville Street. They thought it might interfere with the street end view being that Granville Street is an important promenade to the mountains.

The Panel liked the completion of the top of the building around the mechanical penthouse. One Panel member suggested adding a secret garden element as a way to resolve the top of the tower. Another Panel member suggested there was an opportunity to

create an infinity edge that looked back at the city. However they felt a little more work needed to be done on how the lower levels meet the ground.

A couple of Panel members thought there were some issues regarding weather protection around the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. McGarva thought the Panel had some great comments.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.