

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 19, 2014

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Greg Bellerby
Ryan Bragg (Chair)
Walter Francl
Joseph Fry
David Grigg
Jennifer Marshall
Arno Matis
Phil Mondor
Chris Mramor (left after Item #2)
Goran Ostojic (Excused Item #2 & #4)
Matthew Soules (Absent Item #1 & #2)

REGRETS:
Joseph Hruda
Maurice Pez

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 1600 Harwood Street and 1625 Harwood Street |
| 2. | 1965-1981 Main Street |
| 3. | 4175 West 29 th Avenue (St. George's Senior School) |
| 4. | 3030 East Broadway |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Bragg 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: | 1600 Harwood Street and 1625 Harwood Street |
| DE: | 418164 and 418163 |
| Description: | To construct infill rental housing adjacent to existing towers plus amenity space containing a total of 118 dwelling units on the south side of Harwood Street and four townhouse buildings containing a total of 15 dwelling units on the north side of Harwood Street. |
| Zoning: | CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Development Application |
| Review: | Third (Second as Development Application) |
| Architect: | IBI Group |
| Owner: | Beach Towers Investments Inc. |
| Delegation: | Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Group
Salim Narayana, IBI Group
Cameron Owen, IBI Group |
| Staff: | Patrick O'Sullivan |

EVALUATION: 1600 Harwood Street - SUPPORT (7-1)
1625 Harwood Street - SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Patrick O'Sullivan, Development Planner, gave an overview of the context around the site and mentioned that there are two development applications. He noted that the rezonings have already been approved for the site. There are four existing buildings on the site that were built in the 1960's and have a heritage status. One development permit consists of a 4-storey element along Beach Avenue, a 9-storey mid-rise building and an amenity building with a pool and fitness centre with a park on the corner. The other development permit involves two 3-storey buildings and 2-storey townhouses along the lane. Mr. O'Sullivan asked the Panel to comment on the items that were outstanding from the last review. He gave a description of the concerns and how they have been addressed by the applicant team.

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

1600 Harwood Street: Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to improve the legibility of the entrances;
- Design development to improve the expression of the mid-rise building;
- Consider access through the site to Beach Avenue;
- Design development to improve the amenity space and especially the park on the corner;
- Design development to the auto court cul-de-sac;
- Consider planting larger trees along Beach Avenue to reduce solar gain.

Has the applicant adequately addressed the key aspects needing improvement, listed above?

1625 Harwood Street: Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to improve the expression of the buildings around the tower;
- Design development to improve the integration between Parcel A and B;
- Design development to improve the courtyard.

Has the applicant adequately addressed the key aspects needing improvement, listed above?

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, further described the proposal as well as how they addressed the Panel's concerns from the previous review. He noted that they were encouraged to make the amenity building iconic and special. It is kind of an earth building with a green roof. He mentioned that they have enlarged the hard surface at the corner and allowed it to seamlessly meet from the public sidewalk to the private property. There will be seating opportunities at the base of the glass wall and perhaps public art. On Harwood Street they have better clarified the definition of the entries in both the new and the existing buildings. The mid-rise has an entrance off the courtyard with a canopy to identify the entrance. There is also a direct pedestrian access from the sidewalk. On the mid-rise building they have gone back to a more asymmetric expression for the Harwood and Cardero Streets façade and they have added an extra bay of stone cladding. The townhouses around the base of the tower have a lighter massing with stone clad panels and glass. There is some relationship and materiality between the two sites in how the buildings have been expressed. The internal circulation courtyard has raised patios and public access.

Cameron Owen, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that they have flanked each of the entries with a common tree. They have also used same type unit paver throughout the site in an organized pattern around the entrances. There are additional stairs on the site and places for people to gather. At the amenity there is a seating wall with a wood top and separated out from the street with tree and pavement. The trees around the back will have evergreen and native plant varieties. The auto court will have a cast in place solution with saw cut joints however the pedestrian route will have unit pavers and have separated the area with plantings and more trees. They are planting trees along Beach Avenue that will help reduce solar gain by providing shading in the summer.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - 1600 Harwood Street:**
 - Design development to improve the expression of the mid-rise building;
 - Design development to the materiality of the mid-rise building;
 - Design development to improve the west stair access;
 - Design development to the access to and across the site to address legibility and wayfinding;
 - Design development to add access to the roof the amenity building;
 - Consider further strengthening the entrance to the Douglas building;
 - Consider adding individual entrances to the ground floor units in the mid-rise and the treatment of the heritage wall;
 - Consider adding shade trees and public art to the corner parkette;
 - Consider moving the existing art pieces to a spot that makes them visible from Beach Avenue and support public access and appreciation.
 - 1645 Harwood Street:**
 - Design development to the materiality of the townhouses;
 - Consider improving privacy for the townhouses under the tower;
 - Consider using a different colour and material palette to the mid-rise tower.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported both projects and commended the applicant for a quality response to a very difficult project.

Comments Relating to 1600 Harwood Street:

The Panel thought the applicant had responded to the Panel's previous concerns and that the legibility of the entrances was well done as they are more clearly defined. One Panel member thought there was still work to be done to strengthen the entrance to the Douglas building.

Some of the Panel liked the volumetric changes to the midrise tower but thought it might be a good idea to introduce individual entrances for the ground floor units. Other Panel members thought there should be a requirement to make the building work visually with the rest of the development. Panel members noted that the mid-rise building didn't feel part of the development and it felt pinched and "forced" on the site. Other Panel members mentioned that there is an opportunity to pick up on the angles of the existing building in the midrise. Although there isn't direct access to the beach, the Panel thought the sight lines were strong.

The Panel liked the expression of the amenity space from the street and suggested the applicant add access to the roof top for events such as the fireworks and parades. A couple of Panel members suggested adding trees to give some shade in summer to the seating area as well as some public art.

The Panel supported the landscape improvements and thought the connection to Beach Avenue was the biggest improvement to the site. They noted that it was these kinds of little pieces, private routes that make them more memorable and suitable to this site. Although the easterly access around Tower A works well, the west stair access is not resolved very well. It should either be deleted or come straight off the top of the townhouse with a straight run. One Panel member noted that it makes the vaulted spaces under the tower have more purpose and are being used in ways that they haven't been in the past. The Panel thought the cul-de-sac was much improved with separating the pedestrian from vehicles.

The Panel agreed that the current piece of public art was important and were glad to see it was being kept although they thought the location needed to be carefully considered as they need to be viewed from Beach Avenue. One Panel member suggested that they act as a focal point to draw pedestrians through the space.

Comments Relating to 1625 Harwood Street:

The Panel liked the improvement with the townhouses around the tower as well as the courtyard. They thought the glassiness of the townhouses was a step in the right direction. However, it was noted that the units that slide under the tower seem a little pinched. As well there was some concern about privacy and suggested a landscape response might help. They also wanted to see the landscaping tie together the other side of the street with the site.

A couple of Panel members noted that the townhouses are playing off the midrise and perhaps by shifting the palette on the midrise this would help the expression of the tower and give it its own identity.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner thanked the Panel for their good comments and said they would take them into consideration to make for a better project. Regarding the mid-rise, Mr. Bruckner said he was happy to find ways to improve the expression. As for the public art they have already had discussion but as yet don't have anything committed. Mr. Bruckner added that they will look at reshaping the plaza to accommodate any public art.

2. Address:	1965-1981 Main Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	To develop a 6-storey mixed-use building that includes 69 residential units (including two artist studios) and commercial space at grade. This application is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.
Zoning:	IC-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Studio One Architecture
Owner:	Bonnis Development Corp.
Delegation:	Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture Lucien Iribarne, Studio One Architecture Fei Xia, Studio One Architecture Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Dino Bonnis, Bonnis Development Corp. Goran Ostojic, Integral Group
Staff:	Yan Zeng and Allan Mooney

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- Introduction:** Yan Zeng, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal and mentioned that the site is located in the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood, in the Lower Main Street subarea. The application proposes to rezone from IC-2 (Light Industrial) to CD-1 and allow the development of a 6-storey mixed-use building. The proposal is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. For the Lower Main subarea, the Plan calls for a mixed-use form of development having commercial, retail, office and residential uses. For this site, the policy allows a 6-storey building. The Plan further recommends that the retail character and scale should be one of localized services with small and varied frontages. A high quality public realm is expected along with Main St. and activated laneways. An 18'-0" enhanced sidewalk (building face to curb) is expected along Main Street.

Allan Mooney, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting a surrounding context comprised of aging low-rise service and light industrial use buildings. He pointed to a growing number of newer eight to ten storey buildings, of similar program to the proposed development, in the immediate area. He mentioned that the site has a cross-fall of 16'-0" from the southeast corner at Main/4th Ave. to the low point in the northwest corner, at the lane. The sloping aspect of the site presents some hardship for the applicant. The building presents 5-storeys along Main/4th Ave. and 6-storeys at the lane. The proposed building conforms to the 65'-0" height limit, recommended in the Plan, when considered from the lowermost point along the lane. The proposed development illustrates, at a high level of resolution, many of the design principles outlined in the Plan. Among these, an enhanced/high quality public realm which allows for gathering activity, a strong architectural corner element at Main/4th Ave. that is expressed in materiality and reinforced by use with a proposed café, an activated pedestrian laneway and articulated street-wall that provides variety in height and opening at grade. There are two artist studio units in the southwest corner (4th Ave./lane) and these are clearly articulated architecturally. To enhance the desired pedestrian activity in laneways, per the Plan, utility and service spaces located here have been internalized. Parking entry is off the lane, in the northwest corner of the site. The residential entry is off 4th Ave. and provides access to 69 proposed studio, one and two bedroom units. There is a common access roof deck having an urban agriculture component.

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

- Comments on the success of those efforts made with respect to materiality, articulated form and composition of architectural elements to achieve the desired goal of both vibrant and differential street frontages, as outlined in the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.
- Does the Panel support the proposed height, massing, density and form of development?

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Thomas Wolf, Architect, further described the proposal with a power point presentation. The proposal is to be concrete construction with a commercial component on the ground floor. The setbacks have been created to animate the passages around the site. The artist studios act as a gateway element for the lane with a reduction in the scale and a landscaped buffer. The lane has a landscaped setback with a pedestrian alley leading to a mini plaza. The ground floor amenity space opens onto the plaza. Mr. Wolf described the architecture noting the articulation of the residential portion which integrates open and enclosed private balconies. The proposal will attain LEED™ Gold certification along with other sustainable design principles including a provision for a future connection to a district energy strategy.

Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the inclusion of street trees as well as animating the lane with planters and other elements. Seating is planned in the mini plaza area along the lane. The roof top includes both intensive and extensive green roofs. There will be a covered space and places for gathering with a barbeque area and a harvest table.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the size of the balconies on the west façade;
 - Design development to create more functional studios for artists;
 - Adherence to the recommended setback outlined in the Plan, along Main Street, to ensure building alignment with future development to the north
 - Design development to improve the architectural expression along the lane;
 - Consider switching the location of the amenity space with the artist studio units.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well-handled project.

The Panel supported the proposed height, massing, density and form of development. They liked the proposal of artist studio units and thought the articulation of the balconies was inventive. The artist studios are not functional for their intended use. However one Panel member thought the balconies on the west facade might not be deep enough to be useable. As well they liked the fine scale of the CRUs along the street and thought it was an appropriate response for Main Street. The Panel agreed that the proposal met the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.

Most of the Panel supported the materiality and expression of the proposal and thought it struck an appropriate balance between a contemporary and industrial expression.

The Panel thought the response to the public realm plan was successful but felt that the setback on Main Street should match the adjacent sites. A couple of Panel members noted that the frontage for the restaurant was too small.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans but felt the lane could use some improvement. They wanted to see more animation in the lane as a viable pedestrian path and also suggested adding daylighting into the units. A couple of Panel members suggested switching the amenity space with the artist studio units. They would also like to see some gallery space in the front of the units. As well a couple of Panel members wanted to see a children's play area on the site.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Wolf thanked the Panel for their comments and said they were helpful.

-
3. Address: 4175 West 29th Avenue (St. George's Senior School)
DE: N/A
Description: The proposal is to develop a long term master plan for this existing Secondary School with three phases of redevelopment. Phase one includes a 3-storey boarding house with 120 dormitory units and the associated staff residences, as well as two 3-storey academic buildings. Phase two includes an addition to the main building. Phase three is to develop an additional 3-storey boarding house including 120 dormitory units with associated staff residences.
- Zoning: RS-5 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Fielding Nair
Owner: St. George's Senior School
Delegation: Randy Fielding, Fielding Nair
Staff: Grant Miller and Colin King
-

EVALUATION: REFUSED

4. Address:	3030 East Broadway
DE:	418321
Description:	to develop five 6-storey buildings for office and other uses with a total area of 973,351 square feet.
Zoning:	CD-1 Pending
Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second (First as Development Application)
Architect:	B+H Architects
Owner:	Bentall Kennedy (Canada) LP
Delegation:	James Vasto, B+H Architects Randy Sharp, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects
Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-6)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site on the south side of East Broadway between Lillooet and Nootka Streets. Mr. Black described the context for the area noting the single family homes to the north and the Renfrew SkyTrain station nearby. This proposal is part of the Broadway Tech Centre companion development. Mr. Black mentioned that the applicant had applied for a rezoning under the policy for the Grandview Boundary Industrial Area which was amended by Council in January 2011 to allow for office space to the maximum FSR if the development is within reasonable walking distance of a rapid transit station. The Panel reviewed the proposal at the rezoning stage on May 18, 2011. It was also approved in principle and for the overall form of development by Council in May 2013. The approval established a number of recommended conditions of approval.

Mr. Black described the Policies for the area noting that the proposal also falls in the Grandview Boundary Mixed Employment Area Rezoning and Development Policies and Guidelines. Advice in this Policy includes asking for windows at grade to enhance the pedestrian experience, small public open spaces, main building entries that provide generous weather protection and public right-of-ways for convenient public access.

Mr. Black described the proposal which is for five 6-storey buildings for office and other uses. All vehicle movement is one level below which allows for a significant amount of open space around the buildings and opportunities for landscape treatment of the courtyard that will be used by the employees and for public passage. There is a proposed plaza at street level in the southwest corner and a continuation of Virtual Way through the site. As well there is public access north/south through the site.

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

- Whether the previous comments of the Urban Design Panel have been addressed successfully
- Quality of pedestrian routes and open spaces East-West, including the connection to Virtual Way
- The proposed design of the levels stepping up from Hebb Street to East Broadway, in terms of openness and the clarity of wayfinding
- Relationship of the building facades and landscape edges as they respond to the different street edges, such as Broadway vs. Hebb Avenue
- Approach to reducing building energy consumption

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Vasto, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they used sun and shadow studies to determine the location of the buildings. The setback at East Broadway is 40 feet. There is an opening between Buildings A and B to allow a view through to Broadway and includes a water feature. A unique use which is warehouse flex space is proposed on Hebb Street. The start of the pedestrian access route thought the site occurs on the southwest corner from the Renfrew SkyTrain Station. Mr. Vasto noted that they wanted to break up the elevations into smaller elements with the use of warm colours and the use of metal cladding and other materials. With respect to the sustainability strategy, he mentioned that they have added sun shades that are five feet deep and are hung off the building. They are on the south and most of the west facades. The HVAC system will be reviewed to achieve maximum energy efficiency and occupant comfort.

Randy Sharp, Landscape Architect, further described the landscaping plans and mentioned that on East Broadway there is a change in the grid with good view lines through the site. The southwest corner is visible from the Renfrew SkyTrain station and has a waterfall and bicycle facilities. The major east/west spine is aligned with Virtual Way and will continue through the site to Lillooet Street. There are five building entrances and the site is interconnected with covered walkways. They wanted to create a sun pocket with a continuous water feature. The central feature is programmed for multiple activities and includes a barbeque area, outdoor tables, informal sitting areas and some games. One of the elements is a water curtain that allows the water to sparkle in the light. As well there is an area for growing food that includes an orchard and community garden with raised planters. For storm water management there are green roofs and an underground cistern as well as rain gardens. Some of the roofs have extensive green roofs to improve the overlook.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the building's expression;
 - Design development to the southwest corner;
 - Design development to the pedestrian environment along Lillooet Street;
 - Consider a lower shoulder to reduce the impact to the residential properties;
 - Consider more a clearer expression of the sustainability strategy in the exterior design;
 - Consider a warmer colour palette.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal. Concerns included the scale of buildings and how they engaged with the existing context.

Some Panel members thought the buildings will be somewhat dated and were a missed opportunity to have a more engaging expression. One Panel member noted that the buildings should be able to stand the test of time and should be lively and engaging.

The Panel had some mixed feelings about the pedestrian access through the site with some Panel members finding it restrictive. Other Panel members noted that it was a huge site and the reality is that people who are mobility challenged are probably not going to want to move through the entire site. They also thought the applicant needed to answer the question as to whether the site was a community amenity as well as a commercial venture.

The Panel felt that the applicant had broken down the edges in most cases while in other areas they have not and still required some design development. One Panel member recommended the lower shoulder be reduced to have less of an impact on the single family

homes across the street. Some Panel members thought Lillooet Street was weak as a pedestrian environment and needed considerable design development.

The Panel wanted to see the building fit better into its context and still be a pleasant environment for the people who will work there. They felt there was some design development that needed to be done on the entry in the southwest corner and that the area could be more welcoming with one Panel member suggesting the addition of a coffee shop for people coming off the SkyTrain. The Panel supported the wayfinding and realized that elevators up to Broadway were a fact of the slope of the site. They also thought the Lillooet Street frontage needed to be more transparent.

Regarding the sustainability strategy, some Panel members thought this proposal needed to set more of a benchmark. Since these are tech buildings they felt the building should be more expressive of sustainability.

Although the Panel supported the material palette in general, some members suggested the use of accent colours or an expression of warmth in the materials with the use of wood.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.