

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 5, 2013

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Ryan Bragg
Daryl Condon
Walter Francl
Bruce Hemstock (missed 1st Item)
Phil Mondor
Norm Shearing (Chair)

REGRETS:
Vincent Dumoulin
Joseph Fry
Veronica Gillies
David Grigg
Joseph Hruda
Goran Ostojic
Peter Wreglesworth

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	2001 West 10 th Avenue
2.	183 East Georgia Street (formerly 633 Main Street)
3.	1099 Richards Street
4.	1365 Burnaby Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Shearing called the business meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After the business meeting the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 2001 West 10th Avenue
DE: 416498
Description: To construct a new 7-storey residential building over two and a half levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. A child daycare will also be included.

Zoning: CD-1 Pending
Application Status: Complete
Review: Second
Architect: Bingham Hill Architects
Owner: Pinnacle Properties
Delegation: John Bingham, Bingham Hill Architects
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Vito DeCottis, Pinnacle Properties

Staff: Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and reminded the Panel that they had seen the application at the rezoning stage. Further the Panel had reviewed the proposal previously as a development permit application. Mr. Cheng described the concerns the Panel had at the last review. He said the main concern was the overall sense of scale of the building given its long frontage and its overall height. There was a need from the Panel's point of view for some further mitigation of the overall form, length and scale of the building by further articulation, material treatment and architectural strategies.

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

The following questions reflected the concerns of the UDP and staff from the previous UDP review:

- Has the need to mitigate the overall form, length and scale of the building with building articulation, material treatment and other architectural strategies been resolved? Are there any more design refinements that can further address these concerns?
- Are there any more design refinements that can be made to further address the proposal's sustainability strategy?
- Should a further enhancement to the use of colour be added to enliven the elevations?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** John Bingham, Architect, explained that they took the Panel's comments and looked to see how they could integrate them into their design. One of the important characteristics is the relationship of scale and how the building is perceived from the street. To mitigate the long façade they focused on the townhouse elements and extended brick up to the third level and pulled back the enclosed balconies. They also added solar protection to the south façade. They looked at adjusting the brick colour and have wrapped a different colour around the west side of the building. They changed the colour of the brick on the façade on Maple Street as well. Also the brick has

been wrapped into the daycare area and created a covered play area. Regarding sustainability, there was previously a series of horizontal concrete elements that were acting as some solar protection on the south and north side. These have since been removed and they have upgraded the material to improve the thermal performance of the walls.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. He noted that they are going through a refinement with Social Planning regarding the daycare space. They have a short list of artists for the public art component. Efforts are being concentrated on urban agriculture and the greenway. He added that the landscape plans haven't changed very much since the Panel's last review.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider stopping the brick at the second storey.
 - Consider adding more colour on the face of the building.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and congratulated the applicant in making some significant changes to the design.

The Panel supported the design but thought there were a couple of elements that could be improved. They wanted to see one colour of brick around the whole building to make it more simple and coherent. One Panel member noted that on the long elevation the brick was almost to mid-height and wanted to see the brick to the second storey only. This would make for a two storey datum and would improve the look of the building. Another Panel member noted that the base and body were similar in size making for an uncomfortable tension between them.

The Panel thought the vertical elements added a lot of depth to the building's composition but would be improved if the top storey was clear. They also noted that the colour seemed to be more playful in the rezoning model. Although there is colour on the lower floor elements and on the side of the enclosed balconies they wanted to see it more deployed on the face of the building.

Some Panel members thought the sustainability strategy could be improved with the addition of solar screening elements.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bingham mentioned that they had contemplated two and three storeys for the building and ended up at three storeys because they thought it would be stronger at the streetscape. He added that they have colour on the sides so it can be seen as by pedestrians on the sidewalk. He said they would take another look at their colour palette.

2. Address:	183 East Georgia Street (formerly 633 Main Street)
DE:	416715
Description:	15-storey mixed-use commercial and residential building with ground level commercial units and 192 residential units.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second (First as Development Permit)
Architect:	Chris Dikeakos Architecture
Owner:	Bosa Blue Sky Properties
Delegation:	Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architecture Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and gave some background for the development. He said the Panel had seen the proposal during the rezoning phase and the building has undergone a number of changes since then. He noted that the changes include form and height as well details such as storefront design and overall cornice design. The form has changed to make for a better transition to the building next door. Mr. Cheng also mentioned that discussions took place regarding the overall character of the proposal. There was some concern that the original rezoning proposal wasn't integrating with the Chinatown context. It was decided that the streetwall should be emulating the overall Chinatown context more than the tower. Mr. Cheng said that the proposal would be going through another review with the Heritage Commission and the Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee.

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

- In response to staff's concerns, the top edge of the streetwall component has been visually enriched. Does the proposed treatments successfully give a strong visual termination to the streetwall with respect to play of light/shadow, proportion and scale?
- Does the typical storefront design successfully reflect a design that is compatible with the historic storefronts in the area?
- Does the proposed balustrade treatment for the balconies in the streetwall component achieve compatibility with the historic buildings in the area?
- Is there a further opportunity to architecturally distinguish the proposal as a "Chinatown building", when viewed from the far distance?

Mr. Cheng took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Richard Bernstein, Architect, further described the proposal and said he thought they had captured a lot of the Chinatown character in the streetwall particularly the first two levels. Mr. Bernstein described some of the changes since the last review. He mentioned that the tower component has been lowered by one storey. In terms of the storefronts, they have recessed the entries which are reflective of other buildings in Chinatown. The canopies have been changed from glass to retractable awnings. Mr. Bernstein mentioned that the materials will include a couple of colours of brick with black frames on the streetwall component and anodized metal frames on the tower component.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. The building steps back at the corner which makes an opportunity for the retail to spill out onto the street.

The area will have a guard rail due to the slope of the street with some planters. There are two main amenity areas with one having a garden terrace with opportunities for urban agriculture and the other one will have an outdoor dining area, fireplace and kid's play. Ms. Stamp said that some of the plantings will be plants that are native to China.

Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Consultant, described the sustainability strategy. He said they are planning on having the energy system be able to tie into a future district energy system.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider a stronger band line above the retail;
- Consider a greater variety of storefronts to reflect the Chinatown context;
- Consider more variety in the balustrade detailing;
- Design development to improve the legibility of the building.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal

The Panel felt it was important that the building reference some of the distinct element of Chinatown but not to replicate Chinese elements such as pagodas or red roofs. They thought that raising the retail floor was an important improvement and as well as wrapping the retail around into the lane. They saw the proposal as a collection of buildings and thought a variety of cornice treatment would be appropriate. One Panel member stated that there needs to be a strong conviction of the project as multiple buildings and that all the details need to express that. They thought the building had a referential scale that is Chinatown through the recessed entry and awnings.

The Panel would like to see a more distinct treatment of the balustrades on the balconies with one Panel member stating that they could use more variety. One Panel member suggested the cornice line should wrap around and connect to the Georgia Street side and be brought out enough so the balconies below could be expressed as inset balconies.

The Panel would like to see the awnings to be differentiated between each street wall building. The Panel supported the height of the retail and thought there should be a stronger band line on top of the retail or a transom.

The Panel thought the colour palette was appropriate for the area with a slight nod to the Chinese heritage. They would like to see more legibility in the building by either removing the red squares or making the element stronger.

The Panel also supported the sustainability strategy with one Panel acknowledging the storm water management plans.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bernstein thanked the Panel for their comments and said he looked forward to refining the project.

3. Address:	1099 Richards Street
DE:	416775
Description:	To develop the site with a 13-storey residential building with two and a half levels of underground parking accessed from the lane. The building will contain 162 units of non-market housing.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Brenhill Development
Delegation:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Julian Pattison, Considered Design Inc. Max Kerr, Brenhill Development
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner introduced the proposal for a site under the existing zoning for social and low cost housing. He reviewed the existing policies and guidelines on built form, and noted that the horizontal separation to the closest tower portion over 70 feet tall is about 56 feet away. As well twelve foot setbacks are provided as recommended in the guidelines on Richards Street, with smaller than recommended setbacks of about nine feet on upper levels facing Helmcken Street. There will be meeting and office rooms fronting onto Richards Street, and an open loading bay and parkade ramp facing the lane with residential units above. Mr. Black described the context for the site noting the social housing building across the street and nearby market residential towers. He added that a new greenway is proposed along the north side of Helmcken Street.

Mr. Black explained the Downtown South Guidelines for the site that recommends a form of development that is intended to provide a relatively high density living while preserving access to light, view and air for the residents.

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

Comments are sought on the landscape and architectural design of development permit application in general, and in particular:

1. Taking into consideration current zoning and guidelines, does the Panel support the proposed setback (9 ft.), and density (7.12 FSR) within this neighbouring context?
2. Does the Panel have any advice on the delivery of an active public realm interface, considering the proposed program and landscape at grade and the façade design?
3. Does the Panel have any advice on the design with regard to neighbourliness, including shadow and view impacts?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stu Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal for a new non-market housing project that will contain 162 residential units. He mentioned that the exterior design of the building reflects the suites within the building and has punched windows along the north façade. Mr. Lyon described the proposed materials which include panels of frit and insulated spandrel glass. As well there is a use of masonry where windows are punched out. All parking is underground and accessed from the lane.

Julian Pattison, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that they are providing a bicycle service station along Helmcken Street. There is also a shallow reflecting

water feature at the entrance. At the 6th floor is a steel trellis system that will provide some security and some greenery. The 8th and 14th floor will have communal amenity spaces with some urban agriculture. The space is for social gathering and could be used for events. Raised planters are used to create outdoor rooms and some have seating areas.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to refine the relationship between the various exterior patterns;
 - Design development to improve the scale relationship between the brick form and the tower;
 - Design development to improve the accessibility of the landscape for people at grade;
 - Consideration be given to long-term durability and maintenance.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design was visually interesting.

The Panel commended the applicant for bringing another social housing project to the city. They thought it was a very energetic proposal especially with the use of colour. The Panel supported the design but felt that the beehive pattern didn't relate well to the egg crate pattern. As well they thought that from a material stand point the design would benefit from a little more distinction between the forms. They wanted to see more of a vertical expression to strengthen the composition of the building. They noted that the brick needed either larger window openings or a more playful design with one Panel member suggested pairing the windows to give a larger reading.

The Panel felt that there needed to be some better scale relationship between the lower brick form and the taller one. They also thought the rigour of the main elevation was lost at the corner where the frame becomes larger but the opening is the same.

The Panel noted that the landscaping was difficult considering the programming to provide a public realm interface that was fitting of the Downtown South guidelines. They thought it made for a harsh corner and suggested extending the activity through some seating such as benches. As well they thought the rest of the landscaping needed some design development. One Panel member noted that the building wasn't responding to the public realm and thought the landscaping needed to be planned so it didn't require upkeep. As well there was some concern regarding the water feature and whether it would survive.

The Panel supported the setbacks and density and didn't have any concerns regarding shadowing. With respect to neighbourliness, the Panel thought it was carefully considered on the north side. There was some concern about the amount context material provided in other areas.

Some Panel members suggested that the amount of underground development and pedestrian conflicts could be reduced if the car parking stalls were located closer to the surface.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon thanked the Panel for their comments. Regarding the parking, Mr. Lyon said that they have talked to Engineering Services about moving the cars up in the levels of the underground parking. Bicycles are generally favoured on the top level of parking but they might be able to make a change.

4. Address:	1365 Burnaby Street
DE:	416678
Description:	To construct a 6-storey residential building with 21 rental units and two levels of underground parking accessed from Burnaby Street.
Zoning:	RM-5A
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Amanet Architect
Owner:	Vanca Holdings Ltd.
Delegation:	Hossein Amanat, Amanet Architect Mia Horth, Sword Fern Garden Design
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a new 6-storey multiple dwelling with 21 units of market rental housing. He noted that the overall form is within the 60 foot maximum height and setbacks including the screens, except for the portion of the elevator core in the centre and trellis structures in the front and side yards. The building, including balconies and screens, extends above the 120 degree angle in the front yard. Mr. Black explained the guidelines for the site.

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

Comments were sought on the architectural and landscape design in general, and in particular:

- Does the Panel support the form of development in general, including the density (1.65 FSR) and height (above 120 degree angle);
- Neighbourliness of new building relative to existing residences, considering the proposed screens, windows, balconies and rooftop areas; and
- Detailing and expression of the new building.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Hossein Amanat, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that there will be 21 units proposed that will replace the units in the existing building. There are enclosed balconies on the building to create a composition for the elevations. The roof has a garden for the residents to enjoy with a hot tub and some areas to sit with a fireplace and shading element. There are two levels of parking with storage. Mr. Amanat mentioned that the screening on the front of the building is repeated on the roof.

Mia Horth, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting that the landscape responds to the modernist design of the building with lots of colour. In the entry there is a Zen garden with a bench as well as a bike rack. She described some of the plant material and mentioned that there are planters on the roof. All the trellises will have some climbing vines and the existing trees on the neighbouring property will remain.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the roof top use;
 - Design development to improve the landscaping at the ground plane;

- Consider improving sustainability strategy regarding thermal comfort.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was an interesting project.

The Panel thought the building design set a nice precedent for a rental building in the West End. They supported the density, height and the relaxation of the 120 degree angle. They agreed that it had the right neighbourliness and character for the area. One Panel member noted that the applicant had adjusted the fenestration to deal with concerns on the neighbouring property. The Panel struggled with the additional curb cut required to accommodate to parking entrance but understood this might be the only solution to get parking on the site.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but thought some design development would help to improve the roof top use. As well they wanted to see more plant material in the ground plane. One Panel member suggested removing the grass strips in the car share parking area as they wouldn't survive. Also some Panel members were worried about the existing trees and whether they would survive the construction.

There were some minor concerns regarding the sustainability strategy particularly with the amount of glass and spandrel on the building. One Panel member suggested either increasing the manner in how the spandrel is being used or to use more complementary materials.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Amanat thanked the Panel for their comments and said they would investigate different options for the car parking.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.