

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** August 31, 2005

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Larry Adams, Acting Chair  
Nigel Baldwin  
Robert Barnes  
Shahla Bozorgzadeh  
James Cheng (excused Item 1)  
Marta Garevaag (excused Item 1)  
Ronald Lea  
Margo Long  
Edward Smith  
Peter Wreglesworth  
C.C. Yao

**REGRETS:** Alan Endall

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Debbie Kempton

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1120 West Georgia Street
2.	2008 Bayswater Street

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Adams called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

1. Address: 1120 West Georgia Street  
Use: Mixed (58 storeys)  
Zoning: CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning (text amendment to add one storey in height)  
Architect: James Cheng  
Owner: KBK No. 11 Ventures Ltd.  
Review: First  
Delegation: James Cheng, Dawn Guspie  
Staff: Ralph Segal/Phil Mondor

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)**

- **Introduction:** Phil Mondor, Rezoning Planner, introduced this application. This application is returning to the Urban Design Panel with a proposal for additional floor space and an increase in building height. In view of this proposal for one of the tallest buildings in the city and the prominence on the skyline, staff thought it would be helpful to have Urban Design Panel advice given some of their questions last May. There have been further changes to the roof form since the last time this application was before the Panel.

Mr. Mondor provided some history on the application, including the rezoning of December 2003 which was further amended in December 2004 with a development permit issued in February 2005. The applicant is now proposing to add an additional live/work floor with 7 units for a total of 11,100 sq.ft. of additional floor space. There have been several moves taken to accommodate the additional floor while minimizing impact on the building height. The total proposed height increase is 6 ft. which has been accomplished by the core of the building rising higher. Mr. Mondor explained that only the mechanical penthouse has increased by 6 ft. while the curtain wall remains unchanged in height.

Mr. Mondor stated that the habitable space in the development permit reached 600 ft. and under the new proposal is 629 ft. which is a combination of the additional floor plus the conversion of some of the mechanical room to habitable space. The change to floor space ratio went from 13.2 to 13.41 and the building height from 640 ft. to 646 ft.

Mr. Segal, Development Planner, very briefly discussed the proposal. Mr. Segal stated that from a design perspective staff consider this a neutral or positive change to the top of the building. The slight manipulations at the top of the building are equal to or unperceivable from what has already been approved. Mr. Segal noted that the panel was supportive before and staff remain so.

The advice of the panel is sought on the following:

- the text amendment to add one floor.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** James Cheng, Architect, stated that he didn't have much to add after the staff presentation. Mr. Cheng said that he was open for questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The panel unanimously supports the addition of an additional floor of work / live apartments.
  - The panel unanimously supports the increase in height.
  - The panel, however, does not support the current design with the "truncated" top. The panel feels that the proportion of the current approved design is correct. As such, the panel would support a further increase in the overall height of the building to enable the applicant to achieve the correct proportions, translucency and elegance of the original application.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported this application with the provision that the proportions of the top need work. In other respects, the Panel found the proposal supportable. The Panel felt that the request for an additional floor and height was earned.

Some panel members recommend that the applicant consider taking the buttons on the glass on all the way up as on the original proposal.

---

2. Address:	2008 Bayswater Street
DE:	409471
Use:	Mixed (4-storeys, 27 units)
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Studio One
Owner:	Orca West Development Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Jonathan Losee, Tomas Wolf, Kal Bachra
Staff:	Dale Morgan

---

#### EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (9-1)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced this application in a C-2 zone at the corner of Bayswater and West 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Referring to drawings for the site context, Mr. Morgan described the buildings in the surrounding area some of which date back to the turn of the last century.

Mr. Morgan stated that the heritage issue has been a concern from the neighbours at large in terms of what is proposed and the demolition of four buildings, particularly the one on the corner. The results of the 208 letter notification mail-out were one letter of support plus 41 letters of non-support and a petition of 91 names. These buildings have cultural and historical value in the repository of memories for the neighbourhood. Mr. Morgan stated that the Vancouver Heritage Commission concluded unanimously that retention was not a viable option.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the proposal, a 4-storey development with continuous storefront wrapping around the corner to midway on site. There is a proposed painted concrete band with black 5 ft. deep awnings and an alternating rhythm of brick which comes down to the base at the corner and at the base of the residential entry.

The advice of the Panel is sought on the following:

- in light of the existing context, noting the older building two doors down that is on the heritage register (C designation), and the sensitivity of the neighbourhood to the proposed demolition Mr. Morgan asked the Panel to consider if the architectural expression is appropriate or should the applicant look at something in keeping with a more traditional scale, materials and detailing;
  - the public realm treatment, particularly at the corner and the integration of the parking entry, electrical transformer and the lane treatment interface.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tomas Wolf, Architect, spoke to the concerns about the heritage value of the buildings on site. Mr. Wolf stated that in considering how to treat the site they looked at the neighbourhood and were not able to find much to relate to in terms of historic buildings. Once the emotional attachment to the buildings became apparent through the notification process, Mr. Wolf said they decided to take elements from the old buildings and implement them into the new one. Mr. Wolf described design details such as the deep red brick, blue siding, cornice and the bay window that enable the proposed building to relate more to the context of the neighbourhood than the old building.
-

With respect to the landscape plan, the applicant said that they picked up on the theme from across the street with a curb, gutter and layby proposed. The street trees will be golden locus which the applicant feels light up the corner. The ground plain is a standard mat as allowed by the City of Vancouver with exposed aggregate between the property line. The lane will be planted with a small tree at the garage entrance and a hedge to be clipped high to buffer the garage from adjacent units.

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

- The building needs to focus on integrity of expression. It seems thin at this point as to whether the intent is a heritage or modern building design. The Panel is supportive of a design that does not refer to heritage;
- Design development is needed to the base plane at the street level;
- Consideration should be given to better integration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors as well as a better response to the single family dwelling across lane with materials;
- Design development to improve the east elevation;
- Consideration should be given to enrich the public realm (street treatment). Look at adding street trees, street furniture and acknowledging the existing mural;
- Development of a sustainable design strategy is recommended.

- **Related Commentary**

The Panel did not support this application. The Panel acknowledged the time consuming process that the applicant went through, as a result of neighbourhood comments, in trying to save the buildings even though they are not on the heritage register.

Some members of the Panel did not support the use of bright colors to articulate the building. It was suggested the applicant use a single color for the building and put more work into the patterning, form, materials and scale of the streetscape.

The Panel strongly recommended that the building be resolved at street level. There were a few details for further design development, including:

- add more greenery;
- add trees to West 4<sup>th</sup>;
- consider alternate materials to the exposed aggregate to provide interest at the ground level;
- consider treatment for the east wall to address the blank, abrupt feeling;
- consider providing green area on roof for residents to use which would improve both the livability and energy performance of the building;
- better expression of the Bayswater residential entry;
- more sympathetic design of the parking entrance in relation to the single family home across the lane.

- **Applicant's Response**

Mr. Wolfe thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed that the ground floor needs some improvement.