

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** Wednesday, Jul 8th, 2020

**TIME:** 4pm pm

**PLACE:** WebeX

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Brittany Coughlin  
Marie-Odile Marceau  
Michael Henderson  
Margot Long  
Adrien Rahbar  
Sydney Schwartz  
Angela Enman  
Jennifer Stamp  
  
Karenn Krangle

**REGRETS:**

Alan Davies  
Walter Francl ( Conflict with item 1 )  
Muneesh Sharma  
Matt Younger

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** M.Sem

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1980 Foley Street

1. Address: 1980 Foley Street  
Permit No. DP-2020-00185  
Description: To develop a 13-storey office building with retail and restaurant uses on grade all over five levels of underground parking consisting of 810 vehicle spaces and 410 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is approximately 64.1 m (210.3 ft.); the total floor area is approximately 48,160 sq. m (518,390 sq. ft.). This application is being considered under the False Creek Flats Plan.
- Application Status: Complete Development Application  
Review: Second (First as DP)  
Architect: Francl Architecture  
Staff: Miguel Castillo Urena  
Delegation:
- Arne Emerson, Morphosis Architecture, Architect  
Kelty McKinnon, PFS Studio, Landscape Architect  
Paul Dorby, Bunt & Associates, Transportation Consultant  
Megan White, Integral, sustainability consultant  
Trevor Spaidal, Lululemon  
Robin Williams, Morphosis Architecture, Architect  
Walter Francl, Francl Architecture, Architect  
Richard Harris, Colliers

---

## EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (6/2)

### Introduction:

Development Planner, Miguel Castillo Urena, started by giving an overview of the project and noted that the Panel had reviewed the project at rezoning stage and supported it with two recommendations. The planner also noted that on January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Council approved the rezoning application subject to meeting the Urban Design conditions and listed them. He then gave a brief description of the project updates, fundamentally with regards to public realm, the east elevation and how the building meets the ground level before concluding with Staff questions for the Panel.

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

### Massing, Bulk & Expression

#### 1. How the building meets the ground level:

Do the proposed changes, including the carvings and the flattened geometry at the soffits of the first floor, contribute to the dynamic massing proposed at rezoning while adding interest at the ground plane?

Does the building meet the ground floor in a logical way in relationship with its massing above and context?

2. Updated envelope, expression and its potential contribution to the bulk of the building:

Is the updated skin consistent with the massing and bulk approved at rezoning while adding visual interest and variation?

Public Realm

3. China Creek design and its relationship with the building interface:

- Has the UDP's previous recommendation to *"Consider increasing the proximity from the interior to the exterior on the ground-plane on the east façade"* and the Urban Design rezoning condition 1.1 successfully been addressed?
- Does the Panel consider the proposed changes in the building and landscape allow for a successful (physical and visual) connectivity and integration with the future China Creek Park?

Please consider: Adjacent building uses and layout, inversion of large carving upwards, flattened geometry and soffits, proposed, blank walls and treatment, bike access, landscape design and gathering nodes, etc.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

#### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Applicant gave overview of project to date, overview of Lululemon's key aspirations, what has happened with the building massing, City of Vancouver sustainability energy project.

Project goals and aspirations - Lululemon is dedicated to creating healthy workplace for their staff. They are committed to a sustainable design to minimize their impact to the environment and community, how to have an inclusive design to integrate the community.

Regarding the building mass, because of the constraints of all 4 sides due to the easement and setbacks, they were forced to start looking at adding bulk to the building at the top.

Vancouver energy code target

Key drivers for the project:

Zero emission building plan by 2030 along with the step code which have driven all their decision from energy stand point and research

Some accelerated actions include investing in passive and active cooling systems which has driven the performance aspect of the design.

Applicant has been working with city to meet requirements sustainability certifications such as targeting Leed Platinum, well Platinum, zero carbon certification, healthy material certification.

### Design and connectivity

Applicant wants to ensure this building is well connected to Great Northern Way, to the future skytrain and to the pedestrian pathway. Great Northern Way and Foley are much more active spaces. Worked with city to remove columns to connect public spaces.

### Landscape

Public realm strategy is to activate the ground plane with seating, planting and strong relationship to the building. The west zone and south zone are meant to be highly urban; the east side is China Creek is more naturalized and passive.

The west zone is Foley St. is main entrance to the building.

The carve zone of the building extends up the façade to the main entrance of the plaza and planted with hanging plants to express front entrance.

South zone of Great Northern Way is a generous public realm featuring row of street trees, bike lane and pedestrian sidewalk with planting in-between, between the sidewalks zones are sculpted planters which provide seating opportunities. Another carve into this building façade creates a plaza activated by café and retail and built in seating surrounded by planting. At the southeast corner of building is a café with pavers which wrap around the corner framing the entrance to China Creek.

East zone is China Creek corridor which has a lot of limitations needing accommodation.

### Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Henderson and seconded by Ms. Coughlin and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT of the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design development to reconsider the undulating soffit at the base of the building.
- Improve the relationship with the China Creek in terms of porosity and interaction.

### Panel Commentary

Panel noted a lot has been a considerable amount of design resolution since presented at rezoning last year at UDP, particularly the detailing of the brise soleil and how it shifts and moves around the different facades of the building.

Panel supports the bulk, massing and expression.

Panel noted the undulating base of the building was lovely and sculptural; it did contribute to the street face. The mass floats above the glass plinth at the base of the building.

The panel felt that the skin of the building is consistent with bulk approved at the rezoning. While the detailing of the bris soleil does add bulk to the massing the panel had no concerns with this.

The envelope and the expression are more unified than the rezoning, and the transition between the different elements of the envelope are well thought out.

The carvings in the building facades help break up the bulk. The panel felt that the flipped location of the carve on the east façade facing China Creek is not as successful as the rezoning scheme.

Some panel members felt that the revised façade is not as dynamic and not as successful in breaking down the scale of the building. The panel also preferred the dynamic soffit at level 2 over the horizontal soffit on the DP drawings.

Panel acknowledged applicant team for taking further proximity to China Creek and encourage applicant to take it even further back.

Where the building meets the ground plane, some panel members noted the addition of some columns would be good and some felt it was not an issue.

Panel appreciated the materiality precedent research and design resolution of the brise soleil.

Some panel members noted the upper mass is not speaking well with the ground plane on east façade.

The panel felt that while there have been some design moves with the building to address China Creek such as the addition of the bike entry and the wrap of the restaurant at the southeast corner of the building, it does not go far enough. Many felt that the project turns its back on this green space and it is a lost opportunity. Some panel members suggested carving out more on the east façade to further activate the China Creek Corridor. One panel member suggested a visual connection between the atrium and China Creek.

Some panel members suggested the material of the brise soleil be light in colour to help with appearance rather than grey.

Panel appreciates the applicant's passive strategies and the multiple certifications being pursued.

Some panel members noted the building is too large for the site. It was suggested to do more carving out so that it relates to the site, have larger trees to mitigate the scale of the building, as well as continuous street trees.

Panel encourage applicant relocating the existing trees at the centre of the site into the new landscape.

Panel appreciates the skin and bulk. Panel noted the use of fabric on the corner reduces the bulk and appreciate the transparency of the skin.

**Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.