

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 23, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Joseph Hrudá [Chair]
Patricia Campbell
Sheldon Chandler
James Cheng
Paul Grant
Gilbert Raynard
Keith Ross
Norman Shearing

REGRETS: Joe Werner
Per Christoffersen
Sean McEwan

**ACTING RECORDING
SECRETARY:** M. Penner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1253 Johnson Street

- | |
|-----------------------------------|
| 2. 550 Burrard Street [Bentall V] |
| 3. 1680 Bayshore Drive |
| 4. 1400 West Georgia Street |

1. Address: 1253 Johnson Street
DA: 404138
Zoning: FCCDD
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Hotson Bakker
Owner: Rayman Investments & Management Inc.
Review: First
Delegation: N. Hotson, D. Karim
Staff: R. Whitlock/R. Segal
-

EVALUATION: [7 - 0] - Support

- **Introduction:**

The Chair apologized to the Applicant for the delay in commencing the meeting, due to various unforeseen matters that needed the Panel's attention.

Rob Whitlock, Rezoning Planner, spoke on behalf of the Development Planner, Ralph Segal who had been pre-empted at another meeting, introduced this project. This development application involves an addition to the existing Granville Island hotel which is situated on the east end of Granville Island; this hotel currently has 54 room and with the proposed addition of 32, will result in 86 rooms in total. The location of the hotel in terms of other uses is the significant parking lot, to the west of the hotel Emily Carr, College of Arts and Science, etc. Rob detailed his involvement with the proposed Granville Island Theatre a couple of years ago, and that his primarily role was to thoroughly review and revamp the Reference Document, which is the regulatory agreement between the City and Canada Mortgage and Housing Association [CMHA] and regulates what exists on the island and to reflect the future. With reference to this application to add to the hotel, Council has already essentially agreed to amend the Reference Document to allow the FSR increase associated with this proposal and has asked that this hotel extension proposal be considered by the DPB; our involvement will be to do extended consultations with the residents in the area, specifically strata councils and housing cooperatives, giving this proposal some added process

because Council is aware of the peoples' general concerns about traffic and parking as it relates to Granville Island. These two latter issues generated the most concern during the time of the proposed Granville Island Theatre proposal.

Rob indicated that the parking for this proposed project is being provided within the limits which is an overall allocation of approximately 1,400 parking spaces provided for on Granville Island. Staff have been monitoring the development approvals against that allocation and this expansion will fit within that overall scheme. The only other significant regulatory aspect of the Reference Document was the maximum 55 ft. height limit, which this proposal now meets. This application will proceed through one of our normal Open House functions for the public on March 9th and then proceed to the DPB in early April. In summary, Rob felt this scheme in general was quite satisfactory and stated that Norm Hotson has had quite a fair amount of experience with the island and materials. Staff's only concern at this time was hotel guests privacy for those staying in those suites at the grade level near the walkway towards the northern end of the proposed extension. However, in terms of the overall scheme he felt that was the only issue staff was concerned about and would appreciate Panels comments on the overall proposed extension, how it fits with the existing hotel, and the context at the eastern end of Granville Island.

· Applicant's Opening Comments:

At the decline of the Chair question if Mr. Hotson had any additional remarks to the opening comments, the applicant proceeded to draw the Panel's attention to the drawings.

The Panel moved to view the model and the posted panels.

Mr. Hotson referred to the materials board and pointed out a number of obviously relevant issues they dealt with which was the impact this new wing might have on views from adjacent residences [referenced a number of photographs taken from the south side of False Creek, as well as some from Sea Village and noted the location what would represent the new wing. Commented on the shadow impact the new wing would present as it was very much in the shadow of the existing building, resulting in virtually no impact on views for those residents on the south side of False Creek.

Mr. Hotson referred to an earlier development permit reviewed some 4 years ago which proposed a much grander scheme in this position, including several floating hotel units which strongly opposed by the residents of False Creek. He noted that they have had strong support for this project thus far from the residents during their own Open House and that Diamond Karim has met with many residential as well, garnering tremendous support. Mr. Hotson further commented that the proposed wing will be positioned in such a way as to fit in with the rather eclectic original hotel, which is a composition of three original components, and proceeded to delve into the history of the hotel from its inception. He explained how the elevation studies and the architectural strategy would be unified by the use of corrugated cladding in white [the colour of the existing hotel], with gray window frames - and emphasized that the windows would be clear glass! Mr. Hotson also made reference the careful positioning of the hotel structure[s] and commented on his involvement of writing a set of guidelines for CMHC some 4-5 years ago related to a proposed addition at the time which resulted in moving the lane back at Johnston and Cartwright, and have located it in such a way so as it actually adds to the courtyard as it now stands. With reference to shadowing, he stressed that due to the orientation of the Island, only some late sun in the summer will impact the court yard, which will be of importance to the operators of the restaurant. Also, some of the shadow impact on that court yard is caused by the existing building.

In terms of height - an earlier approved scheme a number of years ago was proposed at approximately 5 storeys but decided it was too high [close to existing hotel height - built in early 80s], and we planned this project to be only 3 storeys, plus a penthouse on the 4th floor. With reference to those rooms which will be located at grade, the applicant stressed these are being designed so as to operate as meeting rooms, with an adjacent space for the guest's private sleeping space - similar to a suite. Mr. Hotson briefly touched on the privacy issue for these ground level rooms, stating it could aid in the security aspect by having some people nearby on the walkway; however, he also stressed that there will be wooden shutters on the inside in each room. At this time Mr. Hotson enquired of staff and Panel if there were any questions.

A Panel member requested confirmation of the height of the Emily Carr building, the highest building on Granville Island; he was advised the annex is 55 ft+ with a skylight. Another Member wanted clarification

on the paint change and siding of the building; it was confirmed that all the buildings would be painted the same standard white, including the corrugated cladding. Panel also enquired about the height of the ground floor and that the windows at the end of the building went right down to ground level and would the applicant consider raising that ground. The applicant advised that due to the lack of floor height in this building, which could likely prove difficult to get mechanical equipment installed, etc. it would be more desirable to keep it all one level, but that it would be slightly ramped to accommodate wheel chairs.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel had a number of issues regarding privacy of grade level rooms, the shadowing on the court yard, impact on other residents on Granville island but felt the applicant had provided clear, concise responses to these concerns. Members also commented on the sensitivity shown in this proposed development as it relates to the existing hotel structure, the sea village, as well as commercial tenants and residents and noted the excellent quality of this project. In fact there were no substantive issues and the Panel gave the applicant its unanimous full support.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments and approval.

2. Address: 550 Burrard Street [Bentall 5]
DA: 404803
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Preliminary
Architect: Musson Cattell
Owner: Bentall Corporation
Review: First
Delegation: M. Cattell, A. Whitchelo, D. Wuori
Staff: R. Segal

EVALUATION: [7 - 0] - Support

- **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, introduced this preliminary application by providing the Panel with some history of this project, which is to attain a height of 450 ft., with a 50 ft. cap and provide 634 000 m² of space. This project was first approved in 1991; commencing with a transfer of density from the foot of Hornby Street; the YWCA [Y] was taken down and reconstructed; and the parking garage is in place. In 1997 the applicant amended this project to split the tower between hotel and office space. Now we are looking at a two-phased office tower, complete with curving pavilion, plaza court at the corner of Dunsmuir and Burrard, as well as temporary landscaping.

Mr. Segal noted a number of issues: the architecture of the tower [Phase 1 and 2], proposed amenity space at the corner, appropriateness of the open space, and shadowing.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Musson explained the strategy of developing this project in two phases, stating that while they are "waiting for the office market to catch up" they will proceed with Phase 1; adding Phase 2 at a later date. He confirmed the height and floor space referred to by the Development Planner, and detailed the rationale of angling this tower. Should this application be approved, the applicant would follow up with a building permit for Phase 1. Spoke in detail about the proposed food pavilion which would be highly glazed and provide amenity space for the public to enjoy.

The Panel moved to view the model and posted materials board, etc.

The applicant advised the corner of Burrard and Dunsmuir had come under scrutiny as not being good for public open space, and this proposed tower would no doubt contribute to the public realm. He delved into the pros for this project by stating numerous positive aspects of this proposal, i.e., the side wall animation, more open space, a well-defined plaza at grade, landscaped edges to the lane and back side of this site. He referred to the three-dimensional Shadow Analysis that had confirmed there would be morning sun on the

plaza till approximately noon, and then continuing on from 2:30 p.m.

Phase 2 will be setback from Burrard. Issues of the revised 'T' form, former treatment of the Dunsmuir and Burrard corner, and the plaza court yard were raised. Mr. Musson confirmed there will be pedestrian linkage off of Hornby Street.

- **Panel's Comments:**

Although various Panel Members made positive comments, i.e., that this project would provide some interest on the street; were intrigued with the proposed intent of the two-phased strategy; the curved aspect of this tower would give the impression that it is diagonal towards the city grid; the proposed plaza would be part of the series of plazas down Burrard Street; some felt Phase 1 was clean-cut and could stand alone, that it was very much in balance with the buildings around this site; pleased with the proposed curtain wall; provide reinforcement of built form along the edge on Dunsmuir; the public passage coming past the Y is well handled; and that the architectural treatment suits this project.

However, the Panel also voiced numerous concerns which need to be heeded by the applicant: the interim plaza could perhaps be simplified so as to be more unified with others on Burrard, Park Place with its beautiful honey locust trees was referred to; reference was made to the air shaft by the lane, cutting off the south view from Burrard; the need for architectural definition at the street edge along Dunsmuir; the plaza requires more details such as artwork and that artists should be onboard early for continuity as this project evolves; that the Dunsmuir Street frontage needs attention to reinforce a sense of enclosure either through more built form or a subtle defining edge structure; the public elevator for the parkade should be more prominent; the suggestion of louvres along the lane was stated by a number of members; the need for increased greenery; the need for a program to justify the amount of hard surface; a temporary pavilion is definitely required in Phase 1 and that in Phase 2 it would integrate better with the tower form; and stressed the need for solid street trees with "green" canopy.

The Chair summarized the positive comments from the Panel, with particular emphasis of how the massing has been handled of this tower relative to that early 1991 project and referred to the subtle relationship to buildings such as Park Place with respect to view impacts, the trimming back of these corners tended to improve views from Park Place. The Chair reiterated the comments heard which dealt primarily with the plaza the differences in what would be provided in the initial phase versus the final plaza design and the need for a sense of enclosure along the Dunsmuir edge. The Chair added his comments which pertained to Phase 2 and referred to the importance of creating an animated, active plaza edge in Phase 1, noting that a solution could perhaps be found which would provide the final plaza in the initial stage, with a dining pavilion which could be demountable during the Phase 2 tower construction. The public deserves to have this amenity from the outset.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Musson commented that they had received good direction and thanked the Panel for their consideration.

The Chair called for a vote and advised the applicant of the Panel's full support.

3. Address: 1680 Bayshore Drive [Tower 'C']
DA: 404803
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Downs Archambault & Partners
Owner: Bluetree Management [Canada] Ltd.
Review: First
Delegation: N. Shearing, B. Downs, M. Ehman, J. Domator
Staff: M. Kemble, L. Schmidt
-

EVALUATION: [6 - 1] - Support

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, introduced the last remaining Tower ['C'] of the Bayshore development, part of the Georgia Precinct. He noted that it was a double-fronting site along Georgia Street and Bayshore Drive and referred to the approximate 9 ft. slope down to Bayshore Drive. Measurements of the site are roughly 120' x 180', and the Tower would be generally aligned with the Bidwell Street access. Pedestrian access would be provided from the public plaza to Bayshore Drive. He referenced the notion that the towers in the Georgia Precinct should be raised up on "pilots" which would provide good public views underneath and past the base of these buildings. The guidelines limit the floor plates and the terracing of the upper tower floors is encouraged. He noted that essentially these towers are seen as a "family of buildings" with similar materials -- i.e., concrete and glass with a soft muted colour palette.

Staff generally feel this is a high-quality project and Mr. Kemble requested the Panel's comments on the following areas:

1. Tower massing materials:
 - relationship to Tower 'B'; and
 - tower height relaxation [± 2 m].
2. Base level treatment:
 - height and transparency, views under.
3. Open space treatments:
 - public plaza at Bidwell Street; and
 - interface with both neighbours.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Barry Downs reflected on the need to go back to the notion that this project was initially conceived as a

series of towers in a garden and that at the time all those gardens had names and places and characters specific to that time and that place. This project will be the transition that holds Towers 'A', 'B' and 'D' together and Tower 'C' has presented them with an opportunity to do something different in character than the other three. He emphasized that this tower will become the force of the whole project. Also noted that their alignment provides access that goes all the way through and out to the water

Mr. Ehman noted that the blend of the Georgia Street towers and open plaza spaces resulted in an asymmetrical garden. He addressed the proposed water and grass under this tower, and the development of an efficient structural system under the 2nd floor. A Panel member enquired as to the parking, drop-off and loading areas - the parking will be off Bayshore Drive, there will be a front canopied entrance to the lobby and the loading area will be adjacent to the entrance. He also stressed that public art would be incorporated in their proposed water feature.

Panel's Comments:

Members of the Panel voiced their positive views with several suggestions: they were impressed with the plans and massing for the base of the building; had no problem with the height relaxation; felt there was a family approach in the open space and the architecture; pleased with the contrast between the glazing and the concrete, as well as the transparency in this glass; the successful solution for raising the ground floor to provide views from the ground plane along West Georgia Street; felt the relationship with the neighbours and the landscaping to be an attractive scheme; liked the creativity shown in the transition in levels from West Georgia Street northbound; had no concerns with the tower massing; and felt that there should be a pedestrian link to the lobby of the building from the Bidwell Street plaza axis; consideration for partial rain cover over some of the Bidwell Street plaza. The Panel expressed divergent views on the handling of the Bidwell Street open space, some liking the meandering ramp through the garden and others feeling that this needed to have a stronger sense of importance as a public link to the central green, connected to Georgia and Bidwell Streets; perhaps some of the public space could be covered; there should be a connection up to the plaza and the water art theme; perhaps the ramp on the Bayshore side should have some cover; etc.

The Chair commented on the very positive feedback heard from the Panel, noting the support of the 2 m over height relaxation, the materials and colour scheme had been well handled, the handling of the base was impressive as well as the extra sense of transparency at ground level. However, the main discomfort seems to be the handling of the open space connection from Georgia down to the central green with some suggestions as to how it might be rethought, as well as possibly the need for a grander gesture re the connection of the open space from West Georgia Street to the Central open green to the north. The Panel suggested further design development to reinforce the importance of this public connection from West Georgia Street to the waterfront.

• **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant accepted the Chair's comments and responded to the Panel member's comment about his suggestions pertaining to the ramp parking between the buildings and that a solution could be to trellis it.

Panel support: 6 -1

4. Address: 1400 West Georgia Street
DA: 404752
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Musson Catell
Owner: Palladium Projects Inc.
Review: First
Delegation: F. Musson, A. Grant, J. Phillips
Staff: M. Kemble

EVALUATION: [0 - 7] - Non-support

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, introduced this complete application, stating the allowable FSR of 6 and maximum height of 300 ft. and that this project is within the Triangle West sub-areal; and noted the very detailed guidelines for treatment of the public realm on Georgia Street.

He described this project as being on a ½ block site, with an existing building, the Georgian Towers to the west of this site, currently being rehabbed under a separate development permit; noting numerous high density tower buildings in this area. Mr. Kemble referred to the steep drop of approximately 15 ft. from Alberni Street down to Georgia. He also describe the open space, proposed landscaping and that this project will require the applicant to upgrade the full Georgia Street frontage as part of this project. The townhouses will be constructed of a combination of metal panels, concrete and a certain amount of acrylic stucco, as well as glazing. The tower will be coated concrete metal panels and clear glazing with coloured accent fins in order to combine the two buildings, proposed and existing, for consistency.

Mr. Kemble requested the Panel's comments on the following areas:

1. the tower massing and materials; response to the private views in terms of the proposed massing and the relationship to the existing Georgian Towers;
2. the tower base treatment;
3. the townhouse treatment on Alberni Street; and
4. the open space treatments, landscaping, response to the Georgia Street edge treatment, how that is to be integrated with the existing building, as well as the treatment of the vehicular court and drop off area in the centre.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The applicant reiterated Mr. Kemble's description of this project - noting that this scheme had been molded to comply with the Georgian Tower's view corridor. That the entry to the court is off the street, distanced from Georgia Street and their intent to tie the proposed and existing towers together via a colour scheme.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel had a number of strong concerns with this proposal: the complexity of this project in terms of its relationship to the existing slab-form tower to the west of the site; this project completely misses the urban design opportunity to relate to the older building in a strong simple spatial way; the project could have been simpler and less expensive by playing off that existing form; entries to the two towers off the street are hidden from view; doing away with the townhouse units would free up important amenity space in the pedestrian court; the landscaping idea of bringing the "forest into the city" was not seen as the proper treatment for Georgia Street; the base treatment of the residential tower and the entry visibility from the street needs reconsideration; the project seems to lack a clear conceptual idea as to what to do with the old building; the attempt to incorporate Stanley Park-like vegetation along Georgia Street shouldn't be entertained, given the small dimensions that are available; request for simplicity to come through to match the Georgian Towers; as well as clarity of entrance and limiting the "vehicular corruption" of the site by the awkward circulation pattern of the auto court. Auto access should be reconsidered directly into parking from the adjacent north/south street rather than Alberni Street. The entry to the existing apartment building is totally inadequate and also needs reconsideration.

The Chair also commented on the serious Panel concerns with the form of development as well as the form of the townhouses seemed inappropriate, it compromises the open space usability and doesn't enhance the project. The proposed character of the landscape seemed inappropriate and required a more urban response similar to other recent projects along West Georgia Street to the east.

- **Applicant's Response**

Mr. Musson was not pleased with the Panel's comments, noting there are specific guidelines and in complying with these, the project is deemed to be unacceptable at this stage which makes it difficult to deal with. The City felt strongly about the townhouses and they cooperated with that request. He stressed that they had worked with the City long and hard on this project - the relationship with the existing tower was not an easy one and did feel it was not possible to reflect the existing slab-type structure. They had strived for consistency in materials with a colour scheme they felt would tie these two towers together. Mr. Musson raised the amenity issue - stating there is a gymnasium in the existing building and that the tenants in both buildings will share this gym, as well as the proposed amenities in the new project. He noted that they had worked closely with the City in good faith and found the Panel's comments to be counter to the direction they had been given.

Chair: The points commented on by the Panel were identified as issues by City staff on which they wished feedback and that the role of the Panel is to provide an unbiased overview.