

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 25, 2007

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
John Wall, Chair
Walter Francl
Tom Bunting (Present for Item 2 and 3)
Douglas Watts
Richard Henry (Excused Item 3)
Bill Harrison
Albert Bicol (Present for Item 1)
Mark Ostry (Present for Item 3)
Ann Kjerulf

REGRETS: Martin Nielsen
Maurice Pez

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1100 Granville (Chateau Granville)
2.	2750 East Hastings
3.	East Fraserlands, Phase 1 Rezoning

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Wall called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1100 Granville (Chateau Granville)
DA: 410542
Use: 2 storey addition to Plaza Area.
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Relative Form Architecture
Review: Second (First Review: August 2, 2007)
Delegation: Abdallah Jamal, Marco Ciriello, Chris Sterry
Staff: Mary Beth Rondeau

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, introduced the complete development application for a two storey addition to the Chateau Granville. Ms. Rondeau included the models from the previous proposal as well as the current proposal in her presentation. The new proposal responds to the comments from the Urban Design Panel's previous review. The proposal is for two storeys with a restaurant on the ground floor and conference rooms on the second floor. An additional glass screen has been proposed on the 2nd floor adjacent to the southern side on Granville Street.

Ms. Rondeau noted that the drop off on Helmcken Street was being reviewed by Engineering Services and that there should be a continuation of the street trees.

Ms. Rondeau took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Marco Ciriello, Architect, further described the project noting the increase in massing on the second floor and the wavy glassy frontage on the retail and restaurant areas. Mr. Ciriello noted the different expression of the canopy in the public realm, the expression of the entrance which is emphasized with a stone panel and creates an alcove to provide some cover into the hotel. There will be an outdoor seating for the restaurant. Mr. Ciriello added that there will be banquet rooms and meeting rooms on the second floor with some landscaping on the upper floor as the roof is visible from the surrounding buildings.

Chris Sterry, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping treatment noting the landscaping does not include the treatment along Granville Street as the area is being reviewed by the City. He noted that it does include the restoration of the streetscape on Helmcken Street and there will be a green roof treatment above the addition.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The wavy glass on the ground floor along Granville Street could be simplified with careful detailing of the public interface;

- Consider a single, lower canopy on Granville Street which would allow the entry canopy to be more distinctive; and
 - Materiality, such as the stone and the finer grade details of the project could be simplified;
 - Signage concept needs work and the existing concrete relief sign on the top of the building should retain its original character;
 - Possible change to the lay-by to create a drop off for the hotel function;
 - Consider increasing the patio on Granville Street.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel unanimously supported the application.

After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel congratulated the application on the new proposal for the Chateau Granville. They felt the second proposal was a better solution and gave a lot more street presence and didn't conflict with the existing building.

Most of the Panel thought the public realm could use some work and could go further with the materials in the lobby taken out to the curb. They thought the concrete pavers were inadequate and suggested upgraded the material to granite. The Panel liked the extension of the outdoor patio area but thought it could use more definition and suggested either pushing it further out into the public realm or pulling the building back. Some of the Panel thought that how the building meets the ground is going to be essential with one Panel member suggesting that the space on Helmcken Street needs to be more transparent.

Several members of the Panel had concerns about the height of the canopy above Granville Street. They felt the canopy over the seating area collides with the main entry canopy which could be more clearly self identifying.

Some of the Panel liked the large curve on the front of the building but weren't convinced about the smaller waves along Granville Street and suggested a straight façade for a cleaner public interface. Most of the Panel liked the 2nd storey screen and suggested it be the same glazing material as the windows. Most of the Panel liked the operable windows and suggested there could be more sustainable measures included in the project.

The Panel thought the vertical sign on the side of the building didn't work. Most of the Panel liked the existing recessed cut out (concrete relief) sign on the top of the building with several Panel members agreeing that it might be appropriate to use LED lights or a light source to trace the letters.

Some of the Panel felt it was critical to have the trees on Helmcken Street.

Most of the Panel would like to see a drop off area to strengthen the hotel entrance.

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

2. Address:	2750 East Hastings
DA:	411206
Use:	3 storey commercial building with ground floor retail, 2nd and 3rd floor office space (social services) with 2 levels of underground parking.
Zoning:	C-2C1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Ron Allen
Review:	First
Delegation:	Rona Allen, Damon Oriente
Staff:	Sailen Black/Paula Huber

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-3)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application for a three-storey commercial building which is a complete application for a development at Kaslo and Slocan Streets. Retail is planned for the ground floor (Shopper's Drug Mart) with two stories of social services above which will be operated by Vancouver Coastal Health for various health programs.

The site is currently occupied by Bell Funeral Home and a parking lot. The site is zoned C-2C1 which supports commercial uses serving larger neighbourhoods. The site is relatively large, with 231 feet of frontage along East Hastings Street.

There are two main issues concerning the building height and the width of the retail frontage. The maximum frontage in this district is limited to 15.3 metres (50.2 feet), which is relaxable. Similarly the height is limited to 35.1 feet outright, with a maximum height of 40 feet possible under the zoning.

A planned setback off the lane is proposed to help improve the public realm interface. There are two limited portions above 40 feet: at the northeast corner (42.5 feet) to permit nine foot ceilings inside, and at the central skylight.

The advice of the Panel was sought specifically on the following:

- Possible effects of the increased height above 35 feet on nearby buildings in terms of views, shadowing and pedestrian amenity;
- Handling of the roughly 200 foot retail frontage;
- Quality of the main entry intended to serve VCH clients who will be primarily arriving on foot.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Ron Allen, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted there will be a major retailer on the main floor (Shopper's Drug Mart) and they have created a rhythm of four elements along Hastings Street to break up the frontage. There is a possibility that they will be including one small CRU for a community policing facility.

Damien Oriente, Landscape Architect, described the landscape treatment of the proposal.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Further design refinement of the façade on East Hastings Street to better articulate the proposed massing with a stronger expression for the 2nd floor commercial entry;
 - Consider breaking up the retail frontage with CRUs or other measures;
 - Consider a less formal skylight that would provide more generous amounts of daylighting into the very deep floorplate;
 - Applicant was encouraged to consider including sustainable initiatives;
 - Consider an outdoor amenity on the roof; and
 - General concern about the loading on the lane regarding noise and truck turning clearances.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application.

After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel agreed that the height relaxation was supportable and that the building would be an improvement to the neighbourhood.

One Panel member encouraged the applicant to have more variation in the height of the building and more vertical articulation. Most of the Panel had strong concerns regarding the façade and thought there needed to be more design development on the entry court and cornice elements. Two to three feet of inset along the length of the building is still quite taut, although opinions differ on how to resolve this. There was general support for the 200 foot retail frontage but some greater variety along the storefront is needed especially at the main and second entries.

Most of the Panel thought the cornice on the building could be tied in along the top of the building. Several Panel members suggested organizing the building so that it could go to fifty foot CRUs should Shopper's Drug Mart decide to vacate the building. Several Panel members liked the idea of wrapping the CRUs to cut the frontage of the large retail. One Panel member suggested more than one entrance to the drug store. The Panel thought that Shopper's Drug Mart would be a stable long term tenant as well as the social services and that their needs should be acknowledged in the design of the building.

One Panel member thought the entrance was somewhat pinched and suggested enlarging the lobby or bringing the space forward. It was also suggested that the lobby glazing could be closer to the property line to make the entrance more dramatic. One Panel member thought the entry point should be pulled back to create a modest entry courtyard which would express the elevator, give more space for bicycle storage and bring more daylight into the building. This would also provide an opportunity to modulate the paving to assist in breaking up the ground plane. The Panel liked the subtleness of the Shopper's Drug Mart entrance.

One Panel member was concerned about the brick coming down to the ground on a sloping ground plane and would like to see a concrete base. The Panel thought that brick was the appropriate material for the building.

Most of the Panel thought the skylight should be extended and encouraged the applicant to enlarge the skylight to bring more daylight into the upper floor. One Panel member

suggested making an atrium entrance that would emphasize the entrance and also bring light into the building. One Panel member thought the truncated cone skylight would be impossible to deal with regarding the flashings as they always leak.

Some of the Panel thought the lane landscaping needed some work and thought the planting would require irrigation. The Panel was concerned that the two trees might not survive and suggested using something architectural like a bench. One Panel member would like to see brick on the rear elevation but thought a green façade would help to soften the elevation. One Panel member suggested having a rain garden on the lane to take the rain water off the roof and for storm water management. Also, it was suggested putting a curb against the end of the lane to prevent people from driving over the edge. One Panel member felt the rear elevation was unfriendly for the residents across the lane and suggested treatment to mitigate the two openings.

Several Panel members encouraged the applicant to have street loading to prevent backing up and noise that would disturb the neighbours. One Panel member encouraged the applicant to increase the temporary bike storage on Hastings Street.

Some of the Panel thought the applicant could use more sustainable initiatives and suggested using the LEEDTM checklist.

Some of the Panel suggested having Shopper's Drug Mart make a commitment to keep the windows free of posters and that the windows will have transparent glass.

One Panel member thought there could be a better disposition of the circulation flow especially regarding the stairs coming up from the parking garage.

Several members of the Panel thought there was a huge opportunity on the roof and encouraged the applicant to explore the idea for access to the roof with a roof deck or patio.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Allen said he was impressed with the comments and appreciated the attention the Panel gave the project.

-
3. Address: East Fraserlands, Phase 1 rezoning
DA: RZ
Use: Mixed-use development.
Zoning: M-2 to CD-1
Application Status: RZ
Architect: James Cheng Architects
Review: First
Delegation: James Cheng, Joyce Drohan - James KM Cheng Architects Inc.,
Chris Sterry - PWL Partnership Landscape Architect Inc., Karen
Marler - Hughes Condon Marler Architects, Norm Shearing -
Parklane Homes, Rob Barrs - Holland Barrs Planning Group Inc.,
Staff: Dan Sirois/Patricia St. Michel
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Dan Sirois, Project Planner, introduced the proposal for a rezoning to permit the first phase of a mixed use development proposed for East Fraserlands on the former Canadian White Pine Saw Mill site. The ODP was approved by Council in November last year. Parklane Homes is the owner of the land. The vision for the future development of the lands includes a diverse community which is environmentally sustainable. Phase 1 proposed to develop a retail district focused on High Street, community centre, childcare, parks, affordable housing and improvements to the foreshore of the Fraser River.

Patricia St. Michel, Urban Design Planner, further described the overall development and asked the Panel to give advice on the following areas:

Waterfront precinct - publicness of the waterfront:

- The replacement of retail at the waterfront with live-work and residential. Are there other more public uses or strategies that should be considered that would better support the waterfront as a vital public place?
- The relationship between the live-work building at the waterfront (Parcel 32) and the public riverfront walk and bikeway.

Crescent/High Street relationship:

- Comment on the relationship between retail on the Crescent and the High Street.
- What can be done in the public realm, and through other means to draw people across the tracks to south High Street and the riverfront?

Marine Way:

- Comment on Marine Way public realm section, and the liveability of residential and live-work as proposed.

Form Massing and Height:

- General comment on tower massing and height.
- The prominence and scale relationship of tower on west neighbourhood park (Parcel 26).
- Comment on massing at waterfront square, and the scale and form of the 12 storey tower on the square (Parcel 31).
- Panel comment regarding height of towers (higher than typically expected for the number of storeys indicated).

Mr. Sirois and Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Cheng, Architect, clarified the overall plan for the development including the urban design concept and sustainability measures. Mr. Cheng noted that they started with the public realm first as they wanted to create a walkable community and take advantage of the natural qualities of the site. The layout of the streets was planned to allow for views down to the river.

Rob Barrs described the sustainability initiatives planned for the entire development including rainwater management and green building technologies.

Chris Sterry, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the development noting the plans for urban agriculture.

Joyce Drohan, Architect, described housing typologies and architectural character for the development.

The applicant team took questions from the panel.

Several Panel members expressed concern regarding the scope and importance of the rezoning and the lack of time allotted for the panel's review and felt that the panel's comments may be cursory and too limited in detail.

These concerns were discussed with staff and the applicant team and it was decided that panel members would provide commentary on what the "next steps" should be for future project review by the Urban Design Panel that would allow for more detailed consideration.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects:**
 - The project is both ambitious as well as thoughtful and considerate in terms of its process;
 - Design Development of the Marine Way section, interface and uses to achieve a more fine grained detail and better integration with the neighbouring city fabric;
 - Develop a stronger design rationale for tower locations that reinforces and better relates to the ground-oriented public realm plan;
 - The waterfront building is the anchor on the water and needs to have more intense public uses to better draw people to the water's edge;
 - Consider celebrating the history of the site, water and riverfront uses to better animate the riverfront public spaces and develop the site's own unique sense of place in the city;
 - Consider a restaurant on the water and other public uses that encourage afternoon and evening activities;
 - Consider possible tower shadow impacts on the waterfront public space; and
 - Consider developing the adjacent park spaces early which would add a great amenity to the area.
- **Related Commentary:** After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported the project and agreed that it was an incredibly ambitious project for the architect team and the developer and were to be commended for all their hard work.

Most of the Panel thought the idea of live/work on the water was not very convincing and wouldn't help to animate the waterfront and felt there are other alternatives. The Panel suggested adding something that connects with the industrial use of the water front, something that would bring people down to the water. They thought this was a great opportunity for a place of celebration such as a museum, theatre, public market or other venue that would draw people. One Panel member suggested having a restaurant out over the water. One Panel member suggested a ferry that goes up river to New Westminster similar to the ones in False Creek. Also one Panel member suggested the applicant should look at the shadow impacts on the waterfront as people will want to spend sunny days and evenings there.

The Panel suggested the applicant build in enough flexibility and a little grittiness into the development for a mature look that won't create an instant village. The Panel agreed that incremental and flexible use and density needs to go all the way through the site and include the retail on High and Crescent Streets. They suggested limiting the CRU's on Crescent and having flex space for offices and keep retail to High Street. A couple of Panel members suggested having retail on Marine Way instead of residential. They also thought the success and diversity of the retail will be a key piece and would make the development more sustainable.

The panel suggested a number of strategies to help draw people across the tracks to south High Street and the riverfront including: a great retail mix, public art, iconic architecture, landscape jesters, public safety and public transit access, but noted that it was mostly dependant on the success of the riverfront program.

The Panel had some concerns about residential uses on Marine Way and suggested planting trees that would screen and buffer the street from the rest of the development. One Panel member suggested having affordable housing and setting the traffic lights to slow down the traffic. Another Panel member thought that liveability on Marine Way meant affordability and suggested smaller units. Several members of the Panel thought that the public realm wasn't adequate at 6 meters and agreed with staff's comments about a double row of trees to soften the area.

Regarding form and massing, the Panel thought there was a strong vision for the area and thought the tower massing looked better in the rezoning model which has a more random approach but the heights looked better in the ODP model. Several Panel members thought the towers didn't seem to be completely resolved in the development and encouraged the applicant to develop a stronger rationale for the composition that is understandable when viewed from the public realm. They liked the smaller tower on the park.

The Panel had no issue with the height of the towers given the scale of the development. A couple of Panel members suggested putting the community centre at the base of the tower.

The Panel commended the applicant for their plans regarding sustainable measures. The Panel also thought public art opportunities especially at the water edge were a good idea. Regarding landscaping, one Panel member suggested having as much landscaping that grows big and fast around the tracks to give a more mature look to the area. The Panel thought the public realm would be an important part of the development and would like to see more fine grained spaces between the buildings and a greater emphasis on the two public spaces.

Some of the Panel would like to see the development come back to the Panel as a workshop while other members would rather see individual parcels come back as a development permit for comments from the Panel. The panel members supported the idea suggested by Mr. Cheng that future reviews by the panel would occur on a precinct by precinct basis.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng thanked the Panel for being able to grasp such a large and complex project and said he was looking forward to coming back with one precinct at time to the Panel. Mr. Shearing said he didn't get the opportunity very often to publicly thank his consultant team. He thanked them for doing an extraordinary job in putting the project together and looked forward to seeing the results of their labours.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.