URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: **August 12, 2015**

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Arno Matis
Meghan Cree-Smith
Stuart Hood (Excused from item 2 & 3)
Ken Larsson
Jennifer Marshall
Roger Hughes
Julien Fagnan
Muneesh Sharma

REGRETS: Matthew Soules
Stefan Aepli
Chris Mramor

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	800 Robson Street – UBC Robson Square
2.	1768 Cook Street (formerly 201 W 2nd Avenue – Murphy's Yard)
3.	155 Water Street

BUSINESS MEETING
Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no new business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 800 Robson Street – UBC Robson Square
   DE: 418434
   Description: Exterior alterations to add a glass entry at both the north and south entry locations for the University of British Columbia.
   Zoning: CD-1
   Application Status: Complete Development Application
   Review: Fourth (Third as Development Application)
   Architect: Stantec Architecture
   Owner: British Columbia Buildings Corp.
   Delegation: Doug Hamming, Stanec Architecture Inc.
   Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architecture Inc.
   Gorman Lee, Province of British Columbia
   Staff: Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-3)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Assistant Director of Planning, introduced the project and summarized the key aspects from the last workshop.

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

  1. Are the proposed new entries for UBC and modifications to the existing stairwells (pagodas) a supportable urban design response into the composition of Robson Square?

  2. Are the proposed materials and resolution of the north and south entry components supportable, taking into consideration the approaches related to mechanical and electrical and maintenance in addressing how the glass volume(s) will perform under various climatic conditions?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Doug Hamming, Architect, presented the project as being responsive to the panel commentary from the last workshop. There are also five overarching principles which have influenced the project from the beginning. These include:

  - Developing a legibility profile and viability for the lower education and recreation uses in the plaza and on the street
  - Providing direct and dignified access to the lower education and recreation level
  - Increasing public participation and engagement in the formal and informal civic activities of the civic plaza through improved and welcoming access
  - Designing the interventions to make them compatible yet distinguished from the urban composition
  - Mitigating the acoustic conflicts between recreation and education

  These principles are in alignment with the objectives and consensus for Robson Square.

The current design of the site is one of a tower on its side on which everyone walks. The ideas that persisted from this tower scheme are that there needs to be extensive public plaza and gardens, the notion of grade-separated public spaces, and aspirations for a train to arrive at the location one-day once the City transit system is expanded.

Due to the 'tower on its side' motif the site contains three visible elements and two invisible elements. Justice, governance and culture are all visible, while education and recreation are not. The university represents 80,000 sq. ft. on the site and yet does not have a visible presence. Previous architects have proposed interventions to fix this issue; these have been taken into account while working through the proposal.

Robson Square has a significant amount of space one level down which creates a disconnect in some respects. To address that relative to the objectives set out, there has been a horizontal enlargement of the space, a vertical enlargement of the space, and an opening up of the below-grade elements. This creates a continuous north to south experience along the escarpment, with the interventions being viewed as a family of elements across the precinct. This family and experience has been heavily influenced by the existing architecture and commercial spaces in and around the site.

Looking closer at the escarpment piece the vertical structures emerge from the concrete below, with the horizontal elements and planters being reflective of these spaces. The resulting structure is a new form which emerges from these reflections and has an organic tree-like quality that is consistent with a harmonized landscape and architecture. Seismic forces are diverted to these columns which eliminate the need for perimeter steel bracing, and multiple connections are afforded to the roof plane which allows the roof structure to be thin. The space feels animated day and night, not unlike a garden.

The roof structure is both solid and light, and is consistent with the vision of an urban garden form. A combination of steel and wood lends the roof the strength of the steel and the materiality of the wood.

The escarpment is built up from the lower plaza in order to bring the life of the university up onto Robson Street in the form of a multi-functional learning commons and entry points. This will be a place of purposeful and casual engagement, as well a chance to bring the plaza up to the street using an elevator.

With respect to the landscaping a palate of existing hard and soft landscape materials has been maintained, merging the old and new. This presents an opportunity for the renewal of Robson Square through landscape elements.

The proposal for Robson Square is an enhancement of civic space as the accumulation of activity nodes. There is a legible experience of a family of elements within a unified locale across Robson Square with respect to materials and landscape surface transparency. It reflects the quality of a natural escarpment in the sense that, by the nature of it being a cut in the landscape, it is a revelation, a connection, and is suggestive of openness and enclosure simultaneously. The vision is for a series of structure and fixtures which seemingly emerge from the confluence of urban garden and city grid.

With respect to geometry and expression a unifying roof plane envelops, illuminates and defines new elements in the urban context. It dissolves into a lattice as a play of dappled light and shade. The wood columns emerge from the existing structural grid below, creating a new form emerging as a natural structure.

With respect to access and circulation the proposal is for a direction connection from the street to the plaza level using the north pavilion stair, south pavilion elevator, pagodas, and the Hornby Street parkade elevator entrance. There are several opportunities these create for programming at a civic level, and at a university level there are opportunities for events requiring a dual indoor/outdoor presence.

With respect to engineering the lattice is illuminated by LED fixtures which are above the structure. This light is then reflected by the patterning of the frit which lights the body of the structure with the intent being to make the structure glow. Illumination of spaces within is also done using LED. An in-slab heating and cooling system is also being used to supply air from the building HVAC system. The use of wood as a material is structural; with the wood and steel members relying on their rigid connections for out-of-plane deflection.

A comprehensive attitude has been developed for signage across the precinct. Way-finding uses a hierarchical system of place identification. This includes a family of signage elements with a material element consistent with the structure.

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

  - Design development of the columns
  - More attention to be paid to the detailing – re-examine use of wood
  - The signage is needed to give UBC presence and should form part of the architecture and this review.
  - The current sustainable approach is supportable, but the space needs to be more livable and temperate
  - No phasing – everything needs to be built at the same time to ensure cohesiveness of design is realized.

- **Related Commentary:** The panel thanked the applicant and noted that many of the previous concerns have been addressed. The proposal is mature and respectful of the site. The pavilions still have too much business with the design of the columns. The panel encourages the applicant to go further with lightening and visually opening the pavilions through development of the column feature (possibly simplifying them).

  The floating roof structure approach is quite simple and strong. Adding the pagoda structure into that family is a positive approach. They are beautiful pavilions, but the columns may not be appropriate to this special place. The elegance in the simple forms is great, but the detailing will determine success.

  While the columns may support the argument of a structure growing out of the concrete they seem a bit awkward in that they seem to fight the use of the space. Something lighter, smaller and more in keeping with the material vocabulary of the domes would be better. Something more minimal is needed

  The pavilion on Hornby attached to the courthouse/gallery doesn't seem to fit in very well – should be simpler and not fight with the context. The canopy to the elevator to the courthouse, when not seen in a larger context, seems to get lost.

  The materials that are proposed seem supportable, although the details need to be resolved. The use of wood as detailed presents challenges with regards to everyday maintenance. The wood structure is adding a weight and materiality which seems a bit foreign and needless. Wood will also not weather well and will cause problems later on. Another warm material would be better instead.

There are concerns about the tightness of the interior pavilion spaces. As a campus there needs to be spaces where people can socialize before classes, and there doesn't seem to be that luxury here. Spatially there needs to be more thought given to day-to-day use and circulation through the space.

There are still questions surrounding the edges below grade as the plan for them seems unclear. The elevator is appreciated though separating it from the stairwell is not ideal, especially if it is meant to signal occupancy at grade of the lower levels. It would be nice to have more down below to provide a connection of upper and lower spaces. This connection is seen at the elevators but could be made stronger.

Signage is integral to the project, and dealing with it as a separate piece is not the ideal solution. There are no 'eyes on the plaza' and no clear direction as to who is supposed to be in the pavilion spaces. An information point or programming guide could provide this direction. The signage should also shout distinctly UBC.

An all-glass structure presents some sustainable challenges, but there may not be a way around this. Passive measures should be exploited to the maximum, but a completely passive approach is not really reasonable for this project. Energy conservation and occupant comfort should be addressed as the priorities.

It is important to make the environment livable, and it may be possible to treat the glass to make it more habitable throughout the year. A lot of conditioning is needed to make it a semi-conditioned space, and thus comfortable for users. Consider how each season will affect the space; flushing air through the space with ventilation will not be enough. Even though it will complicate the glass box design this needs to be done.

As a final note it is important that this project should not be phased. The cohesive nature of the 4 pavilions is what makes the design work. Not building at once runs the risk of losing design intent and legibility.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel and declined to give a response.

2.	Address:	1768 Cook Street (formerly 201 W 2nd Avenue - Murphy's Yard)
	DE:	419256
	Description:	To construct a 17-storey multiple dwelling building, including 274 residential units.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	Third (First as Development Application)
	Architect:	GBL Architects (Daniel Eisenberg)
	Owner:	Concord Murphy Project Ltd. Ptr.
	Delegation:	Daniel Eisenberg, GBL Amela Brudar, GBL Margot Long, PWL Partnership Peter Webb, Concord Pacific Joe Stand, Kane Consulting
	Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the project as a complete city block bounded by 1st and 2nd Avenues, with Cook Street on the west edge. The site is located in south-east False Creek (SEFC) in the Works yard neighbourhood, with Olympic Village located to north-east. The industrial heritage of SEFC is reflected in the nearby Wilkinson Steel Building (1950) west of Cook Street. Positioned south-west is a 'hinge park', one of two major parks in SEFC.

  This is a complete development application, and the first review as a development application. This will be the first Urban Design Panel vote on the new design since it was last seen as a workshop in 2012.

  The site is zoned CD-1 which establishes maximum density and height for site. The SEFC Official Development Plan (ODP) establishes several design principles for development, including the following:

  2.1.5 Connected public open spaces and parks
  Parks and public open spaces are to be central features in organizing the community, and open spaces are to connect with adjacent areas by foot and bicycle paths to create a walking and cycling friendly neighbourhood.

  3.1.1 Energy
  Energy efficiency is to be a key design consideration for all buildings. Energy requirements are to meet the minimum standards necessary to satisfy the recommendations identified in the green building strategy.

  The goal is to establish an energy efficient greenhouse gas neutral neighbourhood based on renewable resources. The basic strategy for meeting that goal is to consist of three inter-related design approaches including:

  (a) conservation strategies such as efficient building envelope, green roofs, building orientation and configuration, unit energy metering, user controls, manual ventilation, and day-lighting;

5.2.3 Size of development
Development is to create parcel sizes similar to or smaller than the size of development parcels south of 2nd Avenue, or to employ massing and architectural treatment of building elements within larger parcels to achieve a fine grain effect.

Fig. 12: Pedestrian Routes
Establishes lane connections through the site

The proposal is for a 17-storey multiple dwelling building with 247 residential units and 11% open balcony area. All open balconies are located on north side.

There are a variety of public and private open space treatments around the site at grade, including paths, green space, water, and urban agriculture. Public passages are intended through the site as indicated in the project material.

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

1. Are there any items from previous Panel comments (in attached Minutes) that should be further addressed?

2. Design of the building exterior, including the handling of fine-grained scale on each of the street-facing elevations:

    a. 1st Avenue
    b. Cook Street (west)
    c. 2nd Avenue
    d. Columbia Street

3. Design of the open spaces, including:

    a. The proposed interface between the public and private realms on each side of the site
    b. The legibility and attractiveness of open spaces and pathways within the site that are intended for public passage

4. Design of the building in response to energy conservation, including the creation of an efficient building envelope

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by stating that there is a lot of history to the site. As the site originally was under different ownership, when the current owners took over it had already been rezoned with a very heavy proposal. The footprint of the building was much larger than the current proposal and it covered quite a bit more of the site. Since then the building has been slimmed down and the site has been opened up. In order to accomplish this, the building has been moved to create open space and provide a more pleasant outlook.

  One of the biggest strengths of the current scheme is that it provides more open space and green roofs. The previous plan really had no public space, while the current plan has a large hinge park plus a walkway all the way through the site which connects the lanes together. The hope is that this will draw the public into the space and provide more amenity space for residents on the south side of the building.

In 2012 the Urban Design Panel workshop provided some great feedback, with some panel members suggesting that the height of the building could be increased near the intersection of Columbia Street and 2nd Avenue. The step-backs of the upper floors have been eliminated to create a taller and more interesting form in light of this comment.

Another comment was that the passageway was too narrow and needed to be wider, thus the passageway was increased from an average of 15 ft. to 35 ft. by combining the pedestrian walkway and the entry to the parkade into one large opening. As this is not a typical parkade the quality of the materials is a lot higher than is usual.

The last and most important comment which triggered changes was the suggestion that the building could become something bold and uncommon. This greater potential could be reached if the building was a single mass rather than two pieces linked together. By combining those pieces into one mass the geometry and curves of the building were better emphasized which created a more interesting building.

The vertical carving on the previous proposal has been turned into a horizontal carving. As the carving is now an extension of the passageway, it brings the notion of openness and permeability to the site and stresses the importance of the related intersection. It also marks the two-storey podium which is characteristic of the neighbourhood, and generates an open amenity space with exposure to the sun and protection from the rain.

In terms of the treatment of the elevations, on the south-west façade the proposal is to create a punch-window system in combination with spandrel glass panels. The staggered pattern of this elevation is intentional, and is meant to reinforce the continuity of the curve. The material chosen for the cladding is a composite metal panel with a brushed aluminum finish, which will both weather and reflect the light well. Every unit on this elevation will also have a Juliet balcony, which will allow for greater ventilation and livability.

In contrast the north elevation is completely glazed and opens the views to False Creek. The articulation and language of the balconies has a relationship with the south façade, but is executed in a much subtler way. At the ends a sheer wall anchors the building to the ground. These concrete walls have been deliberately expressed, and a random pattern of textured panels adds more interest going up the building.

Material for the horizontal carving is a composite metal resembling copper, but is made to maintain its colour throughout the years.

The FSR of the building is consistent with that approved by council. There are 247 units in the building, with more than 40% of them being family units.

The right-of-way through the building diverts into several smaller passageways which connect into the pedestrian network of south-east False Creek. This creates a number of ways in which the public can access the site, and allows for the placement of an adventure play area.

An outdoor dog-park exists at the second level of the building, with a lounge built close by to allow for viewing of dogs and children within this area. Three terraces exist off Cook Street with small private entrances. As well, virtually the entire roof is used for amenity or environmental purposes.

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

  - Habitability is key! Reduce impact of solar exposure on all south and west facing units.
  - Strategy for the water feature to look good even when dry.
  - Dogs and children don't mix. Re-examine use of the 2nd floor roof garden.
  - Re-examine location of public outdoor amenities – provide buffer if facing 2nd Avenue.
  - Provide a more legible design for landscape on the north side of the building.
  - A bolder approach should be taken with regards to the landscape generally.

- **Related Commentary:** The panel thought that the project is a very well designed building with good detail, and the previous comments seem to be addressed. The form is bold and a good urban response.

  Liveability:
  The south-west units do not seem to be liveable as they will be too hot and require outdoor space to provide relief. More work is needed in order to get airflow and make the space liveable, as well as to detail the balconies correctly.

  This building does not really seem to be the best performing in either sustainability or liveability. The two-storey height with the three-storey glazed corridor above seems ok, and does not need to be more open. However, more solar shading should be considered. This is a very horizontal building with a lot of glass, especially on the north side. A hybrid glazing system would work much better due to the form and shape of the development.

  Landscape:
  Although it is great that the outdoor space has been doubled with the addition of the curved architecture, it seems to be too busy in comparison to the simple architectural form. There needs to be more distinction between the private and public realms.

  The curved cut to provide exterior outdoor dog/child play areas is a positive architectural move, but will need to be examined for habitability – shelter from wind will be important. Dogs should not be mixed with child play areas.

  There is a fairly narrow path through the site and it does not feel very 'public'. The indirect path may deter the public from being drawn into the space. Re-examination of the aperture through the building, its relationship to the parking entry and pedestrians is required.

  The use of water and green space is positive but needs more clarity in form. Sustainable attention should also be given to the water feature in light of the drought-like conditions recently.

  There is an abundance of room on the Cook corner to compact the programming and create a truly public space.

  Facing 2nd Avenue, the amenity spaces while generous will be compromised in their usability by their proximity to the busy street. Overall more open public space and bolder landscaping is needed to provide a more appropriate landscape response along 2nd Avenue. As well, since kids, cars and dogs do not mix consideration should be given to providing separation between the dog park, the children's play area and 2nd Avenue.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team stated that the comments were really helpful.

3.	Address:	155 Water Street
	DE:	418471
	Description:	To construct a seven-storey, mixed-use building with retail and restaurant uses at grade and offices above.
	Zoning:	HA-2
	Application Status:	Complete Development Application
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership (Mark Thompson)
	Owner:	Low Tide Properties
	Delegation:	Mark Thompson, MCM Florian Fisch, Durante Kreuk Robert Fung, Salient
	Staff:	Paul Cheng

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)

- **Introduction:** Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the site as having dimensions of approximately 99 ft. by 132 ft. The two historical buildings on this site include 155 Water Street, which is a two-storey building built in 1913, and 157 Water Street, which is a seven-storey warehouse built in 1909.

  This site is zoned HA-2, which is one of Vancouver's three Heritage zones. Historically this zone was comprised of highly mixed-use buildings, including commercial retail frontages, warehouse frontages, and hostels or hotels. It also includes the original Granville Townsite, from which the City of Vancouver developed and grew. The zoning's intent is to recognize the area's special status and to ensure the maintenance of Gastown's "Turn of the Century" historical and architectural character.

  Design Guidelines were passed by Council in 2002, and were written in conjunction with the Heritage Density Transfer Program. The intended development scenario for sites encumbered with historical buildings was essentially to keep the building without additions, and any "unused" density could be banked, sold and bought for other development sites in the downtown peninsula as bonus density (allowed over and above what the zoning permitted, typically up to a maximum of 10%). Statements on this in the guidelines include:

  > "The objective that underlies this document is that appropriate design guidelines will encourage the conservation of the authentic heritage character and fabric of Gastown, and will also ensure that new development is compatible with and will contribute to that character."
  >
  > "The objective is to reinforce the original scale of Gastown and the character-defining sawtooth profile"
  >
  > "The permitted height for a heritage building is its existing height."

  Previously one single storey of addition could be considered for the historical building, on the condition that this addition would be inconspicuous. Recently though Council has frozen the Heritage Density Transfer Program, due to the lack of available receiving development sites. This leaves short historical buildings such as 155 Water highly disadvantaged, if no more than one inconspicuous storey is permitted to be developed.

As a result the planning department is considering this application, which proposes more than a single storey addition over 155 Water. The challenge is to achieve one of the primary objectives of the zoning, that being to reinforce the character and original sawtooth profiles of the historical buildings, while still achieving a larger addition than what the guidelines intended.

If the existing two-storey building cannot be kept as existing or achieve an addition that is inconspicuous, then a sensitive architectural design may help the original building be well-perceived in the viewing experience from the Water Street public realm.

As staff have had three separate proposals, all for the north side of this block of Gastown, a graphic has been supplied to depict a more holistic understanding of this very important historical block in Gastown. All three proposals look for additional height and building mass to be added to the existing historical fabric, and rather than considering each project independently it is worth being mindful of the overall possible result.

Staff's three principles for all proposals include:

1. Retain the historical buildings as much as possible. The UDP is reviewing the second design iteration for this application. The original proposal was to completely demolish 157 Water and construct a new building that looked similar, but with higher floor-to-floor dimensions. In this renewed proposal the original 157 Water elevation is being retained.

2. Leave slot view for each development site. If the site is just one building, then there should be a deep setback off the side property line for the addition. This proposal commits to an easement with the City and a neighbouring building at 165 Water Street. Planning will accept this as guarantee against any future additions on 165 Water Street.

3. Retain the sawtooth patterning to be as legible as possible. Legibility through material choice of the addition accompanied by an appropriate setback.

A height relaxation is also requested in the application. While 75 ft. is the maximum height permitted, the Director of Planning may relax this height limit. In this case a maximum height of 83 ft. is being considered because the proposal is for commercial retail and office use, and because office floors typically require higher ceilings.

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

1. Given the following statements in the HA-2 Gastown Design Guidelines:

   "The objective that underlies this document is that appropriate design guidelines will encourage the conservation of the authentic heritage character and fabric of Gastown, and will also ensure that new development is compatible with and will contribute to that character."

   "The objective is to reinforce the original scale of Gastown and the character-defining sawtooth profile."

   "The permitted height for a heritage building is its existing height."

   Does the proposed setback of the addition over 155 Water achieve the clear visual legibility of the original profile of the two-storey historical building?

2. Does the proposed materiality of the addition achieve compatibility with the existing Gastown architecture, while also helping to achieve legibility of the original two-storey historical building? What changes, if any, can be made to increase the visual prominence of the historical façade?

3. Does the proposal achieve an overall compatibility with the historical character of the Gastown neighbourhood, with respect to overall height, form, massing and architectural character?

4. Please provide commentary on the overall architecture of the proposal, with respect the various façade expressions, the detailing of storefront design, etc.

Applicant's Introductory Comments: The applicant team started by noting that their other projects have been sensitively added to the area, which was the objective with this project as well. The need that this project hopes to supply is a creative and energetic workspace for larger companies. Thus the building has a lot of character but also larger floor plates, good planning modules, good dimensions, and a good office space which smaller companies in the area can grow into.

The existing building at 157 Water Street was originally constructed in two stages, initially starting at three storeys with another four storeys being added on by a previous developer. This created a struggle around the retention of the façades as there were a lot of long, low beams on the ceilings of the additional floors. Thus, the initial proposal was to dismantle the original façade and replace it with something similar in spirit. Eventually a scheme was thought of which achieved the retention of the façades, which is much more in the spirit and interest of the neighbourhood.

The breezeway is a historic breezeway with no easement. While initially the thought was to use the full property, the proposal is to pull back to keep the heritage spirit and access to viewing the mountains through the breezeway.

Preserving the two facades is critical, as one of the goals of the Gastown guidelines is to preserve existing heritage. The challenges of the floor-to-floor height required that the floors of the office space be held back from the front façade. A ladder-frame steel structure will support the façade on the two side-walls, which will create a mini-atrium with a second layer of glass on the backside of the three-foot step. This will allow for light and air into the office floors, and will isolate the heritage façade as a defining heritage characteristic of the building. The area is top-lit and well-ventilated, and forms the major design idea for that part of the building.

Individual character has also been created for each of the individual two pieces. Thus the building at 155 Water Street has a different character and massing than the building at 157 Water Street.

A lot of thought was given to the setbacks and how they would create the sawtooth effect. By using massing, elevation and sectioning the sawtooth profile is created using layers. The materiality enforces this by creating three distinct layers. These include punched-window and facades as the heritage layer, a combination of terracotta with an offset grid of metal elements as the second layer, and lighter metal and glass pieces on top as the third layer. The building becomes lighter in general as your eyes travel up the building from grade.

The building is not just a glass box; it is an industrialized glass box with exposed metal detailing. The goal being to break the scale of the two components down into masses which embody the Gastown character. The secondary grid allows for a ceiling which comes in at 9ft in some areas, but allows for the removal of the suspended ceilings if a company so chooses.

The building at 157 Water Street will retain the wall between the two buildings, as well as the front elevation. Reclaimed brick from this building will be reused in other brick elements as well as the penthouse on the top. Middle windows have been incised with a negative reveal in order to echo the idea of sill and head that is seen in other heritage buildings.

Screen elements are used to create privacy between the two buildings that they separate. These will incorporate images screened onto glass that recall either the source images on the sides of Gastown buildings in the past, or images of the streetscape which evoke the historic context of the area.

This is a LEED Gold office project. The mechanical system is a high-level heat recovery system which works across all the elements. There are windows which open across all four facades, and the architectural ideas on the south façade allow for some passive solar control. Punch windows are used to reduce the solar gain.

In terms of landscape there are four trees at street level which are to be retained. There also is the opportunity to animate the streetscape in relation to the retail units, possibly using street furniture or allowing for a restaurant patio. On the roof the main focus was to provide a visually attractive landscape and usable space for the tenants. The more active areas of use are towards Water Street, and the more passive areas exist on the north side with a view towards the mountains. The guardrail is set back 10 ft. on Water Street and 5 ft. on all other sides. This provides for low-scale planting to be used as a landscape buffer.

The applicant team then took questions from the board and panel.

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

  - The proposed Water Street elevation is excessively complex; simplifying would provide more strength and elegance
  - The rooftop gardens should be meaningful and more consolidated
  - The side passage should be activated and have more integration with the building
  - Create more honesty about the façade; having the opportunity to see beyond it could be exciting

- **Related Commentary:**
  The massing as proposed fits in with the surrounding area.

  Reconsider the front façade element setbacks. A few members thought that a 20 ft. setback may be too deep, while others felt the proposed setback was insufficient. Pushing the middle part back and pulling the upper floor forward would better emphasize the sawtooth effect.

  The offset of the grids seems to compromise the sawtooth character of the original façade. The challenge with the proposed materiality is with the tripartite expression on the addition. The misalignment does not seem to work well, possibly because of the triple-stack approach along with the square patterning. The whole scheme looks a bit disquieting, but could be made better if the penthouse and the middle were merged and related more

to the material down below. Ultimately there is too much happening here, but the wedding-cake style top pieces could work with the right treatment.

The colours seem sensitive to the context of the area, and the historic nature of the original building. Making the terracotta a darker colour might allow the heritage aspects to pop more, and making the setback a darker colour would help differentiate it better.

There is a lot of thought and detail in the building, but it uses two strategies to create differentiation and it does not necessarily need both. Committing to one strategy using a simpler approach would let the buildings pop out more and express the innovation. A bit more of something is needed to provide a stronger delineation between the old and the new.

The breezeway needs to be activated and engaged by the interior spaces of the proposed building. It needs to be treated properly and could grow into an amenity along with the functional use of the building. It has the capacity to help enliven the lane with increased porosity and pedestrian traffic. Gastown has a strong aspiration to develop the lane as a greenway in future. Putting a gate on it and leaving it empty should not be an option.

In terms of sustainability, a water use collection system should be considered if it is feasible.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thought that the ideas were all great, and stated that they had already discussed a lot of them.

Adjournment
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.