

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** August 14, 2013

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Ryan Bragg (Chair)  
Daryl Condon  
David Grigg  
Bruce Hemstock (Excused Item #1)  
Phil Mondor  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:**  
Vincent Dumoulin  
Walter Francl  
Joseph Fry  
Veronica Gillies  
Joseph Hruda  
Goran Ostojic  
Norm Shearing (Chair)

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	498 Drake Street
2.	1396 Richards Street

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Bragg called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. Darryl Condon represented the Urban Design Panel at the Development Permit Board on Monday, August 12, 2013. He gave a brief overview of the meeting for 1099 Richards Street and 475 Howe Street that were previously reviewed by the Panel. The Panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 498 Drake Street  
 DE: 416927  
 Description: To develop the site with a 45-storey mixed-used building over seven levels of underground parking consisting of ground floor retail uses and 268 residential units on level 2 to 45.  
 Zoning: CD-1 Pending  
 Application Status: Complete  
 Review: Second (First as Development Application)  
 Architect: DIALOG  
 Owner: 1300 Richards St Developments  
 Delegation: Norm Hotson, DIALOG  
 Don Chow, DIALOG  
 Margot Long, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects  
 Selena Schroeder, Recollective  
 Staff: Sailen Black for Anita Molaro

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

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 45-storey mixed-use building in the 1300 block of Richards Street. It is a shallow block at only 100 feet deep versus a typical downtown south block depth of 120 feet. There is a view cone across the site from Queen Elizabeth Park to the north shore limiting the building to an overall height of approximately 416 feet. Mr. Black described the context for the area and noted that the tower is relatively slim with a floor plate of less than 5,000 square feet. As well there is retail at grade. The proposal is under the Green Rezoning Policy and requires a minimum of LEED™ Gold.

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

- Has the design addressed the items noted by the previous Panel as key items needing improvement?
- Does the Panel support the exterior treatment, including colour, materials and detailing of the building?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Norm Hotson, Architect, further described the proposal and acknowledged the Panel's previous comments. He noted that they were rather heavy on balconies in their rezoning application and have now scaled them back a bit. They have also tried to maintain a signature piece at the southwest corner because they feel it adds to the strength of the project. Mr. Hotson remarked that they have spent more time on the blank part of the building so they have brought the windows around the corner to the lane and they have introduced some punched windows. They are also looking at adding some small windows into the stair wells and some of the bathrooms. As well they are looking at texturing the wall. He described the materials noting they are using spandrel

glass, aluminum window treatments and they have introduced Alucobond where there is solid paneling. Mr. Hotson explained that they are running around 35% of glass on the building to achieve as high a rating on the envelope as possible to achieve the energy requirements for LEED™ Gold. The previous Panel had suggested that there be access to the roof and he explained that they have given that space over to the penthouses.

Selena Schroeder explained some of the sustainability attributes including the addition of green roofs, storm water management, urban agriculture, reflecting roofing to reduce the heat island and the low window to wall ratio.

Margot Long, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. She explained that there is a significant setback on both Richards and Drake Streets so they have added a double row of street trees. The lane has a lot of greenery with trees and also there will be trees on the second and sixth levels of the tower. There is a barbeque area on the second and sixth level as well and an informal play area on the sixth floor.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the areas needing improvement from the last review had been resolved.

The Panel supported the exterior treatment including the colour and materials but thought the section at the corner of Richards Street still needed some design development for a stronger vertical expression. It previously read more volumetrically and now seemed more of a façade treatment. One Panel member suggested the applicant look at colour or strengthening of the verticality. Some Panel members thought the textural treatment on the elevator core was unnecessary. A couple of Panel members mentioned that the banding was strong but needed to be simplified. As well they thought there needed to be a pause at the top of the building and that the simplicity of the original penthouse design was preferred.

The Panel thought the laneway entrance had been improved and was more open. Most of the Panel wanted to see a glass canopy rather than fabric.

One Panel member thought there should be more visual connection into the bike lockers to reduce possible CPTED issues.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hotson thanked the Panel for their well-founded comments. He said he liked the fabric awnings because he was tired of seeing dirty glass canopies on buildings.

2. Address:	1396 Richards Street
DE:	417049
Description:	To develop a 43-storey building with a 9-storey podium, with market residential at the tower and rental units on the podium. The ground floor also consists of 5,000 square feet, 37 space daycare and small retail unit.
Zoning:	CD1- pending
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	DIALOG
Owner:	Onni
Delegation:	Brady Dunlop, DIALOG Katie Henderson, DIALOG Gerry Eckford, Eckford & Associates Landscape Architecture Inc
Staff:	Sailen Black for Anita Molaro

#### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-5)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site situated on the north-east corner of Richards and Pacific Streets. He described the context for the area noting the variety of building types ranging from small scale commercial buildings to new tower and podium developments. The site is restricted by a view cone from Queen Elizabeth Park to downtown and the North Shore mountains. As well the northerly portion of the site is restricted by another view cone, Charleson Seawall to the Lions. The proposal will have commercial/retail units on the ground level along Richards Street, with a daycare located on the ground floor of the building and adjacent outdoor play space on the lane side. As this proposal was originally a rezoning, the proposal is required to design to LEED™ Gold.

Advice from the Panel on this application was sought on the architectural and landscape design in this development permit application in general; and specifically:

- Has the design addressed the items noted by the previous Panel as key items needing improvement, especially the livability of the units facing into the slot?
- Is the design of the Richards façade of the podium portion, including the balcony expression, a good fit with the rest of the design and an appropriate response to this context?
- Does the Panel support the exterior treatment, including colour, materials and detailing of the building?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Brady Dunlop, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that the design has responded to the Panel's previous review as well as City staff and the public. He noted that the view cones limit the height of the tower to the Pacific and Richards Street corner. He stated that there aren't many changes since the rezoning but the entrance to the underground parking has been straightened in order to increase the size of the outdoor play area for the daycare. He added that one of the changes was the introduction of more water in the ground plane on the corner. The podium scale has been reduced by seven feet overall and the massing is down to the 70 foot height to maintain the street scale. The ninth floor has been stepped back on the Richards Street façade. There are two units in the slot that are amenity guest suites for the tower and the other six units are small studio spaces. Mr. Dunlop described the material palette noting

that they have tried to use more textured material on the ground plane through a brick façade wrapping the base of the building.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans. Along the Richards Street frontage they have raised the ground plane to match the rest of the street and then have dropped down to match the grade along Pacific Street. In the plaza area they have added an additional water feature as well as some vertical screens for animation and interest. With respect to the slot in the plaza they worked hard for a barrier free ramp but because of the grade change they couldn't make it work. Mr. Eckford said they have eliminated the green wall which now presents an art installation opportunity along that façade. There have been some minor modifications along the laneway in response to the changes in the architecture that will provide a much enhanced space for the daycare. The tenth floor is a private patio area and the ninth floor has a common area with a child's play area, urban agriculture and storage.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to improve the units in the slot;
  - Design development to improve the façade of the Richards Street podium;
  - Consider extending the walkway through the site.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and thought the design needed further work. The items previously identified had not been resolved.

The Panel thought the public realm and the ground plane on the site needed to match up better. As well they thought that having two parking spaces per unit was not necessary. The Panel was very much concerned with the liveability of the units in the slot and noted that the applicant had not addressed their previous concerns. They thought it was too narrow with the units being only 4 meters away from each other and they would not receive a lot of light and have privacy issues. One Panel member noted that there was a real opportunity to be creative in addressing this issue. A couple of Panel members thought the podium scale and relationship to the new project to the north didn't work since they were at different heights without a successful transition.

The Panel also thought the podium level facing Richards Street was not successful, with some members calling it relentless in expression and over-scaled. The panel also thought there was a lack of clarity between the tower and the podium on Richards. They noted that the lane façade was much more successful with one Panel member noting the playfulness of the façade made it more interesting. One Panel member was concerned with the daycare parking regarding the children's safety.

The Panel thought the walkway in the lane should be extended through the site. One Panel member thought the functional issue of shared balconies needed improving.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Dunlop thanked the Panel for their comments noting that the Richards Street expression was more challenging to work out. He explained that the two parking stalls per unit are for the top 40 units only and that there are 350 parking stalls for 260 units.

### Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.