

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 9, 2011

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Scott Romes (Chair)
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett (Excused Item #1)
Jane Durante (Excused Items #1 & #2)
Alan Endall
Geoff McDonell (Excused Items #1 & #2)
Arno Matis
Norm Shearing

GUEST PANEL:
Jim Hancock (Item #1)
Mark Ostry (Item #1)

REGRETS:
Alan Storey
Jim Huffman

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey
Dorothy Kerr (Item #2)

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1075 West Hastings Street
2.	1569 West 6 th Avenue
3.	3026 Arbutus Street
4.	3437 Kingsway

BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. and the Panel elected a new chair and vice-chair for 2011. Scott Romses will be the new Chair.

Chair Romses then called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1075 West Hastings Street
 DE: 414163
 Description: To develop the site with a 36-storey office tower.
 Zoning: DD
 Application Status: Complete
 Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Owner: Oxford Properties
 Review: Second
 Delegation: Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Paul Katz, Kohn Pedersen Fox
 Josh Chaiken, Kohn Pedersen Fox
 Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
 Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architects
 Staff: Garry Papers and Yardley McNeil

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Garry Papers, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that it was the second review and that there had been some significant revision to the design. He also noted that Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates had joined the design team. They are recognized for highly contextual, sustainable and expressive design and they have brought a fresh insight to the project as well as addressing the Panel's previous concerns.

Mr. Papers gave a summary of the context noting the building is immediately adjacent to the heritage Marine Building. The tower is proposed for 475 feet while the maximum height for the zoning is 450 feet. He noted that the Higher Building Policy allows for up to 600 feet with discretionary review. The proposed FSR is 12.1, which is the allowed 11.0 plus exactly the 10 % additional provided by the on-site heritage density transfer. The new design adds a fluid shape in a rectilinear context; roof equipment and elevator are fully enclosed in a new curving roof form. There will be a quiet, deferential backdrop to the Marine Building with a sophisticated and high-performance façade treatment. The design has been tested with multiple eye-level perspective views, and glass color was tested with views on both blue and overcast sky conditions. The tower will be at grade on Cordova Street, with a distinct expression and a canopy at the parking and the second entrance. The Hastings Street façade respectfully holds off the heritage bldg, but with a flared "skirt" to signify entry and give identity. The lower canopies will afford pedestrian rain protection, shade the lobby and block wind shear.

Yardley McNeil, Heritage Planner, gave a brief introduction to the proposal noting that the building was designed by Sharp and Thomson and constructed in 1929 and is a listed "B" heritage building on the Vancouver Heritage Register. She noted that the Panel had seen the project previously and endorsed the relationship between the proposed tower and the conserved portions of the University Club. She also noted that the Heritage Commission saw the proposal and voted to support the proposal. They will be bringing the proposal back to the Heritage Commission as it is a new tower design. The conservation approach is

to retain only the façade and to replicate the four storey massing to a depth of 35 feet so as to retain the present volumetric of the University Club as seen from Hastings Street. The interior will be reconfigured into two, double height floors, each containing retail uses. The application is seeking an additional 10% density over the permitted floor area. As part of the process, the applicant will be required to designate the retained façade and a restoration covenant will be applied to the site. Ms. McNeil noted that while City polices would encourage more of the original heritage building to be retained, the proforma resulted in additional density that could not be accommodated on site, given the view parameters set for this area.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following (*indented italics are the October 6, 2010 UDP minutes, "Consensus on key aspects needing improvement"*):

- 1) **Building Form & Massing:** Is the proposed form suitable in the context and creates positive relationships with adjacent buildings?
 - *Enhance the architectural integrity, presence and autonomy of the building with consideration to expressing aspects of current architectural innovation.*
 - *Design development to the top of the building with particular attention to the visibility of the of the elevator tower.*
- 2) **Materiality and Character:** Are the proposed materials, façade composition and exterior treatments well-resolved and of high quality?
 - *Design development to the east façade with particular attention to the exterior treatment of the service core.*
- 3) **Public Realm:** Are the proposed ground floor treatments, relationship with the plaza, landscape/streetscape design and materials sensitive and contribute to a dynamic public experience?
 - *Design refinement to the lower floor elevation with particular attention to the Cordova Street façade and to the relationship with the University Club building.*
 - *Design development to increase the vitality of the public realm ground plane including allowing indoor/outdoor permeability particularly with respect to the restaurant.*
- 4) Does the proposed design achieve the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building policy?

Ms. Papers and Ms. McNeil took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Katz, Architect, noted that the developer is committed to achieving a high quality building using sustainability features and plan on using innovative mechanical and cladding systems. He said they hoped that the building would be an example of the work place of the future. The primary massing is taken from the Marine Building with the view from West Hastings. The concave form will have its own independence but the tower would be prominent as it grows up from the street. Mr. Katz noted that the climate is suitable to glass buildings. While taking into consideration sustainability, the form of the building indicates in its detailing, expression and character, the sustainable features within as well as on the perimeter.

Josh Chaiken, Architect, further described the building noting the expression is differentiated on the east façade from the south and the west and has a fairly modest north exposure. On the east side the spandrels are treated as a shadow box. On the south and the west they are proposing a ceramic frit that will cover the spandrel for a stronger horizontal expression and increase the protection from solar radiation. He noted that the wall expression of the vertical fins is slightly different on the east side as they are shallower than on the south and the west. Mr. Chaiken described the architectural details of the proposal noting they considered the building's grouping with the Shaw Tower and

the Pacific Rim Fairmont as well as its grouping with the Marine Building and Guinness Tower.

Mr. Chaiken noted that the roof has been detailed to have some interest in the skyline with the orientation at the top locking into the geometry of the Marine Building. Mr. Chaiken noted that they have created a skirt detail at the ground plane by pulling the wall away to create space above the University Club heritage façade. A commercial podium will be created on Cordova Street as well as an entry. The roof on the University Club could be an amenity for the office floor or could be an extension of the restaurant.

Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, noted that there is already an existing landscape with the Guinness Tower which was built about 40 years ago. The paving pattern on the Guinness Tower is a simple, rectilinear pattern of concrete and pavers which will extend into the lobby of the new tower. On the Cordova Street side there is a wide set of stairs that will become an active mid block connection. A green wall is proposed on the west wall of the University club. It will be constructed using a vine covered stainless steel cable structure.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consideration to increase the height of the tower, to enhance skyline variation.
 - Design development to have the skirt peel away above the heritage façade higher than shown.
 - Consideration of continuous weather protection at grade, at the northwest gap shown.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design was vastly improved since the last review and had become an elegant building.

The Panel thought the previous scheme had responded well to the Guinness Tower and the Marine Building but agreed that the curvilinear form was more sophisticated. Most of the Panel was a bit disappointed at the axial view looking west on Hastings Street because of the proximity of the Marine Building and the neighbouring towers, as the height seemed similar. They thought the tower needed more height to give it added drama.

One Panel member suggested starting the slope at the top of the tower at the height of the Fairmont Hotel. The Panel felt that the extra height would only impact the view cone slightly. They also agreed that it would increase the architectural excellence of the project, and create a more dynamic composition of building heights in relation to the Pacific Rim Fairmont and Shaw towers. The Panel liked that the building curved behind the Marine Building as it would give the heritage building the prominence it deserves. Enhancing this curve and/or starting it lower were both mentioned.

The Panel thought the skirt that peels away from the heritage needed to be a bit higher. They appreciated the finesse with the detailing but felt it needed more space in relation to the heritage facade. A couple of Panel members were disappointed that the heritage façade wasn’t being retained at 4-storeys and suggested incorporating some of the heritage into the interior of the new building, or that more of the existing interior of the heritage building be incorporated and preserved.

One panel member suggested that more differentiation in materiality and expression be explored between the curvilinear “wrapper” facades and the more planer concave east façade.

The Panel thought the landscaping was well done and liked that it continued through the lobby. They thought the public realm was very well done in terms of materiality and character although they noted that it hadn't departed too much from the previous scheme. One Panel member noted that the square paving grid of the Guinness building could be made more modern or even abstract. Most of the Panel felt there should be a continuous canopy for weather protection at the ground plane. One Panel member noted that the retail on the street would need to be relatable as it could be a challenge.

A couple of Panel members suggested adding a social space in the tower, to better reflect the changing face of today's office work environments, that would be a benefit to the occupants and perhaps could be excluded in the FSR.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy and agreed that the different treatment to the facades was well done and as well they supported the treatment and colour of the glazing. Two panelists felt the differentiation of the façade treatments could be more strongly expressed.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Katz thanked the Panel and said that he thought most of the comments were very reasonable and hoped to integrate them as the building moved forward. Mr. Katz said he didn't know how to resolve the height but agreed that it would look better a few storeys taller.

2. Address:	1569 West 6 th Avenue
DE:	414507
Description:	To develop a 15-storey building on this site.
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Henriquez Partners
Owner:	Westbank Properties
Review:	Second (previous was rezoning)
Delegation:	
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following a rezoning. Basic form of development have been discussed and supported at the time was a density 3.74 and a height 153 ft. and the basic form of development of the tower shape and separation from the other buildings as well as the bridge and the resultant shadow impacts have not differentiated much from the rezoning and that was actually approved and supported by Council. Half of you have seen this because this was seen last year when it went through the rezoning process but just to give you a bit of context, the site is located on the north side of West 6th Avenue between Granville and Fir Streets. The site itself is quite a deep site, it's a 183 ft. deep with a frontage of 123 ft and has a slope of approximately 9 ft. from 6th Avenue to the rear property line. It is not separated by a lane with the adjacent property to the north. The policy for the area endorses a primarily residential neighbourhood environment that integrates both existing and future small scale commercial uses into the fabric of the neighbourhood. Other neighbouring buildings in the area vary from 170 ft. across Granville Street to other local buildings that range in the 100 ft. range. West of the site is the Fir Street/Granville Bridge off-ramp with a city-owned parking lot underneath. Immediately east to the site a 70 ft. high building is an artist live/work studio building. North of the site is a 4-storey residential building. Across 6th Avenue to the south are one and two storey commercial buildings.

The proposal is for a 15 storey tower (153 ft.) with non-residential uses proposed at grade. Under the rezoning the original concept was for two artist studios located at grade and under the revised DE we now have a retail unit that faces onto 6th Avenue as well as the two artist studios. Parking and loading is accessed through the adjacent development via the lane so there has been a knock-out panel in the parking structure made to accommodate access into the site. The tower separation from the bridge is still at 50 ft. which the Panel saw through the rezoning process and supported. The tower is 62 ft. wide at it's narrowest point and has an overall depth of 83 ft. It has a very small floor plate if just over 3,565 sq. ft. Rezoning policy requires a minimum LEED Silver, they are still following through on that at the DE stage.

Issues identified at the time by the Urban Design Panel at the rezoning stage were to consider developing the design strategy to respond to different potential uses and designs including possible non-park uses for the area under the bridge. With note what's happening under the bridge and it's illustrated in some of the material, there's an informal public connection that exists on private property. There are no plans at this point to formalize that public connection so the proposal has to respond to that relationship that this is a zero lot line condition with that adjacent property. It was reiterated that it is a City owned site. The Panel also recommended design development to the public realm to attract pedestrian traffic including consideration of more retail. Those were folded into

the rezoning conditions. Other rezoning conditions of the rezoning included design development to try and address the height of the parkade wall at the northwest and north edges of the site. Some concerns around location of the parkade vents and landscape treatment to maximize separation from and privacy to the neighbouring units, particularly with the building to the north. And the architectural treatments of the blank walls of the elevator/exit stair core to improve its visual interest.

The applicant has provided a summary of the changes made from the rezoning submission to the DE application. They include adding a vegetative buffer. Additional retail previously mentioned. They changed landscape treatment to improve light and ventilation especially as it affects the property to the north. Added a retail unit facing onto West 6th Avenue and reorienting of the artist studio to animate the on-site boardwalk to face away from the interior property line and informal public connection. Adjacent property is a development site and the proposal needs to respond to the potential that it could be developed in the future although there is an informal public connection today.

Proposed materials not detailed within the larger scale model are boardform concrete, spandrel panel and glazing, metal reveal panel encases the projections, wood soffit lining the projection, metal channel defining the edge of the projections.

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

- 1) Applicant's response to the previous comments raised by the Panel and rezoning conditions.
- 2) Demonstration of high quality materials and detailed treatments;
 - resolution of interior property line interface with retail/artist studios;
 - treatment of elevator core/stair.
- 3) Detailed landscaping treatments.
- 4) Sustainability attributes (LEED Silver).

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Gregory Henriquez, architect, talked about the interface because that's the big change from the previous one. We used to have glazing that opened up onto this public walkway making it embracing that public walkway. We were told by the Real Estate Department that own that they want the ability to one day even take down the Fir Street ramp or build a zero lot line building up against there. The original concept had to be abandoned so the new concept is a blank wall because this is a two hour fire separation that has to go here which is our neighbouring building and the studios turn internal which is from a studio point of view probably not as public and not as good a public in face but from the point of view of the studios are going to have more privacy. There was an effort to make the public realm as open as possible. Mr. Henriquez demonstrated something he was still not happy with and that was to pull a wall as far to the zero lot line as possible and open up the gap in the middle so it would be part of the design resolution that he would still like to do on the building. This would allow more light in the public walkway so people can go through. There has been a real desire to see a lot of retail on the frontage. The retail elements are reading really well. With the board form concrete, they have found some special panels that can do some very detailed board forms and possibly growing some vines up it as well. More vegetation buffers have been added to screen the views coming out of the residential up against the off-ramp and deleted trees in order to make sure there was more light to the building behind which was part of the idea of sculpting the building to make sure there was light in the back of those units. A children's play area is included in the landscape plans.

A panel member inquired if the building next door has an internal courtyard that the public can access and wanted to know the relationship between the two courtyards. Mr. Henriquez answered that the idea conceptually is that they are going to connect through and there is a walkway. At an open house the neighbour's indicated that it is a secure area and they did not want a connected walkway. The whole idea was the retail connected with the studios but the neighbouring building rejected the idea. A panel member inquired if that changed the nature of the public walkway along the artist studios. Mr. Henriquez said it would still be public from the other side. A panel member enquired if an aspect of the plan was active or visual and Mr. Henriquez replied it was visual for people looking out. People looking down don't want active roofs up against them, they would like a green roof to look at but not an active roof. A panel member enquired about the separation between the buildings which is 36 ft. Mr. Henriquez said that the building that had a previous DP on this site had a zero lot line and was 4 storeys high. They have taken the same density and sculpted it for a more significant set backs to create more liveability. Everyone has gotten a little more light. A panel member enquired as to what other retail is along the street. Ms. Molaro said there was retail across the street such as coffee shops, art galleries, book shop, antique shop, bike store. It's very active and even the courtyards are quasi-retail, they have artisans and people like that. It was envisioned as very much mixed use. It was not intended to be a ground oriented residential context. A panel member enquired if the blank wall on the back of the artist units is mandated by the zero lot line. Mr. Henriquez answered in the affirmative. The panel member enquired if the walls have to have no openings in them. Mr. Henriquez said they can have a little bit of an opening but not a lot. They will do a beautiful Japanese motif for the landscaping with a landscaped edge. A panel member asked for context about this under the bridge opportunities and the potential community opportunity. Ms. Molaro said there was nothing formulated in terms of future opportunities might be other than the Arbutus Corridor is a potential for a street car line. Ms. Molaro pointed out some other City owned land but did not know what the future of that would be a park or something else. But underneath the bridge, that would be a Planning undertaken that would have to be done if that was initiated by Real Estate as the owner of those properties but in the meantime, we do have a zero lot line condition. Mr. Henriquez explained that they have been doing this project for years and in the beginning had the idea of using some of the CACs for a public art project under the bridge. They explored that but Real Estate said you cannot do this as it is property they wish to retain. So that was converted into two artist studios which they then added more retail. A panel member enquired if an area of the model was City owned and was there a transformer there which was confirmed. A Panel member enquired with respect to the exterior material, on the panel you can see the detailed panels and also the concrete wall on one side has a pattern. Is the rest window wall or curtain wall depending on the prices. If they can get good material and the right price, it's curtain wall and otherwise it's window wall. A Panel member asked a background question on the assignment of CACs on this project, was it simply put into pool because the idea of having the park there. Ms. Molaro explained it's been distributed into three areas. It was decided at the rezoning with the recommended assignment, but it is not relevant to the DE application. A panel member asked about the treatment of the exterior, is it painted concrete? Mr. Henriquez said it will probably be painted concrete.

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

- **Related Commentary:**

The Chair pointed out for the sake of new Panel members that this particular application is a DP that has previously come before the Panel as a rezoning so comments related to heights, density, form, shadow impacts, those kind of things, you can comment on them but they are

really something we have already addressed and signed off on. The Chair reiterated staff questions for the Panel.

A Panel member noted that the applicant responded thoroughly to previous comments. Everything is well covered in book and design. The materials and detail treatment is fine. In regards to interior property line improved with artist studios and prefer the orientation towards to property line and under the bridge. No issue with outside wall closer to property line but leave enough space to maintain a planted edge. Notwithstanding limiting distances and restricting openings, etc. have a few slot windows for daylight into those areas and provide overlook to space under bridge could be okay. The elevator treatment is fine, will give it some texture. Noted another building with the same treatment that looked really good. It is regrettable that neighbours don't want to open up that connection to the courtyard. Any persuasion that could be brought to bear to encourage that even on a temporary basis such as weekends, to really encourage that connection and experience would be good. All the sustainability issues are well covered in the book.

A panel member wanted to applaud applicant for the series of analysis, everything addressed thoroughly. Project would be great addition to the city coming off that off-ramp, it's going to finally have a sense of arrival. It's going to be a really nice experience driving off there now. As far as the changes, the bamboo screen really nice idea. There is a refreshing way of dealing with an interface. The reorientation of building with respect to the artist studios and so on, really liked the image before where you can actually see openness to the other side. The reasons are understood so if it's zero lot line, go right up to that edge. That wouldn't address the landscaping. High quality materials and detailed treatments. The elevated stair would be nice in board form concrete. The sustainability attributes, there's a sense of components being put on are that would contribute to it that are more visible such as those box balconies that protrude down, recognized that some go around to the west and some go around to the north that there's a sense that those will actually shade as the sun goes around even to the north in the summer. Applaud, however, you got that parking access if the neighbours don't want integrate the courtyard. Maybe neighbours would agree to integrate have courtyard at grade.

A panel member thought the applicant's response to the previous comments very competent and well done. With respect to demonstration of high quality materials and detailed treatment, the comment that whether it could be imported or not was not very reassuring. Having said that, the success of this building will be in the quality of materials and detailing. Would like to echo previous comments regarding the continuity of boardwalk. It's a lot opportunity that it cannot carry on and all the neighbourhood be able to experience and use it. With respect to sustainability attributes, don't like to talk about LEED. Everything is becoming very common, everybody will earn it. Try to get more energy conservation points, that will make a difference. That would be by glazing and window frames, ratio of glazing to insulated wall. Shading will really help out in summertime. Sustainability attributes at the moment can improve by earning more energy points. This is a very elegant, nice response and it will be a great addition to the neighbourhood. Maybe at the top where roof is, there is a lot going on. The roof will be seen. There's the guardrail, everything else that's unique, the mechanical, there's a lot going on, maybe it can be simplified.

The response to previous comments appears to be quite good, in particular the response to Griffin Court to the north and their views and their access to sunlight. The central walk, there was some talk about widening that corridor and that would be a benefit to the project. Disappointed in City properties requirement for zero lot line and the blank condition that precludes animation and eyes on the under the bridge area. It takes the opportunity for something really exciting and interactive to happen there. Materials and treatment need to be exceptional quality and there's an indication that that will happen. The landscape treatments,

like the forms, it looks rich. Some minor concerns with a bit of a monoculture happening especially with the sea of rhododendrons, it's great if they flourish but if the one species does fail a bit, then the whole project will be looking dowdy. Wonder at Japanese landscape, where that vernacular is coming from. Some of the lessons from lessons from Japanese landscapes might be applied but maybe there's more of an expression of the local vernacular, the West Coast landscape. Sustainability, the Silver equivalent and pushing the envelope always a positive thing to do.

With respect to materials the project developing in the right way from the previous rezoning scheme. On the shadow box, the attention to detailing and how that concrete gets finished will be important because you are looking at large overhangs. On the board form concrete fully supported. Would like it carried through to podium of the parking area particularly on the west side where there's the possibility of people walking along there. Unfortunate zero lot line situation with the City, given that it's something that may or may not happen in the future, it's a real lost opportunity and it actually creates a kind of unfriendly situation for pedestrians potentially even dangerous. To that end, to whatever development could happen with the landscaping including lighting and so to make that zone a little more friendly and not something that people would hiding in would be welcome. Sustainability comments echoed. If it's possible to push even further that would be welcomed but the effort to at least hit LEED Silver are appreciated.

Applicant commend for presentation. No issues with materials. Wonderful building, great punctuation for area. There has been some discussion of the extension of the boxes as having some environmental benefits for shading will offset by the extension of the floor slabs and cold bridging. While you gain on one end, you pay the price on the other in terms of what that's going to do to the environmental performance of the building. Echoed the comment regarding the heating to improve that. Certainly the improvement of going to a window wall to curtain wall a big jump.

A Panel member also commended the applicant on the application book. Dealt with issues brought up at the rezoning stage satisfactorily. A design comments on the corner retail unit pulling over to walkway, wondering if the corner should be opened up a little bit, gives a little bit of eyes down the side, down the walkway and attracts a little bit more attention to the retail unit. Like the board form, fits in well with the verticality of the elevator shaft and the way it's used on the vertical nature of the fairly long horizontal wall. Agreed with previous comment that slotted windows a good idea as long as it could be done without compromised the combination of the vertical board form and the vertical bamboo. Really narrow slotted windows might bring a bit of light into the studios and also a bit of light onto the walkway. Overall quite impressed by design. It's a fairly standard sort of form of building in that it's a 15 storey residential building, but lots of uniqueness without going over top. Like the shadow boxes and the wood paneling that suggested and the detailing around the edges of the shadow boxes very nice.

Chair asks for clarification on the comment about opening up the corner on the retail does that mean with glazing? Panel member answered affirmatively, a little bit of glazing around the corner.

Support everything that was said before and compliment package. Especially appreciate the wood lining for all those boxes sticking out. A question about the use of roof - who gets to use the roof, does the community get to use the roof? Mr. Henriquez clarifies the top three _____ Would like to stress if applicant could match grade to existing courtyard for possible future use.

Summary: Seems to be general consensus in support from the Panel that the only concerns that seem to come up were the disappointment in zero lot line condition because of the adjacent City property. Generally in terms of the overall materials everyone was generally satisfied with it. Some suggestions that quality materials and detailing will make the building. Disappointment can't unite 2 stratas or the two projects along the common property line but some good suggestions that at least matching the wall will open up the possibility in the future. Everyone generally satisfied with sustainability satisfied but perhaps it could go further primarily on energy conservation point of view related to glazing, such things as passive screens, overhangs, to alleviate that. Some comments about where the landscape should be more local vernacular in expression. The monoculture of species, taking a look at that. The treatment of core, everyone in support of the board form. The Chair liked the suggestion that perhaps that could affect the parts of the project like the zero lot line side, that could be a very beautiful treatment and unite the project a bit stronger perhaps.

Chair agrees with almost everything said. Really like the idea of pushing that wing out to open up mews, that could be quite a remarkable space in the project, a kind of an intersection space between the artists lofts and the residences that shift will definitely sculpt it a lot. The two retail bookends reading very strongly and will work really well. The residential entry looks lost. Not sure what to suggest, whether it's a sculptural canopy or something, but thinks that the residential entry could get a nudge somehow. Very much like the wood liner to shadow boxes, gives the tower a domestic warmth that you don't normally see in mid-rise residential tower. The materiality of the frame itself becomes important. Couldn't really tell in the booklet what the frame edge was but see it's a steel channel which will create a nice shadow line. And the quality of that edge, but the rest of the box, could get a nudge because that's the most memorable part of building, the play of the shadow boxes, very sculptural and will be exciting as you come across the off-ramp and experience them. With the two primary shadow boxes that meet at corners - not sure they should touch. All the other shadow boxes are isolated moments in the tower, but it's those two that come together and they are both almost exactly the same scale, perhaps either break free or one gets smaller and one gets bigger.

Support 9/0

- **Applicant's Response:**

Thank you, great comments and will work hard to include them all.

-
3. Address: 3026 Arbutus Street
DE: 414295
Description: to construct a new 4-storey mixed use commercial/residential building.
Zoning: C-2
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Matthew Cheng Architects
Owner: Freshdawn Enterprise Ltd.
Review: First
Delegation:
Staff: Bob Adair
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (0-10)

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for C-2 zoned site on the east side of Arbutus Street between West 14th and West 15th Avenues. Mr. Adair described the context for the area noting that the surrounding area is mostly residential. The proposal is for a 4-storey mixed use building with commercial on the ground floor and three storeys of residential above. Two levels of underground parking with loading will be accessed from the lane to the south. The main residential entry will be from Arbutus Street.

The building complies with the C-2 setbacks along Arbutus Street. At the rear, facing the rail line, staff are recommending that the applicant follow the setback pattern used by several C-8 zoned developments further to the north. This would mean a two foot setback at the main floor and a consistent twelve foot setback for the second, third and fourth floors. This is in place of the more progressive stepping required under C-2 which is meant to respond to single family development which is typically found across the lane. The proposed rear setbacks are seen to be an adequate response to the neighbourhood to the east and also allow more efficient development of the site given its shallow depth.

Mr. Adair described the materials noting that rough finish granite cladding is proposed for the main floor level with Arriscraft on the second and third floors and Hardi-panel on the fourth floor façade. On the east façade, facing the rail line, the ground floor level will be poured in place concrete, with the upper three floors clad predominately in Hardi-panel.

Mr. Adair noted that staff are supportive of the general form of the development, however they have some concerns regarding the depth of the fourth floor roof overhang, both along Arbutus Street and along the rear elevation. He noted that they would also like the applicant to explore the best expression for the rear façade given its high visibility from the low density residential neighbourhood to the east. Careful detailing of the proposed materials will be necessary in terms of reveals, material joints, window sills and head details to make sure the final appearance of the building makes the best of the materials chosen. Mr. Adair also noted that the expression along the lane (south elevation) at grade which includes parking, loading and the transformer area could be improved given their closeness to Arbutus Street. He said that they are also looking at the height of the weather protection along Arbutus Street and whether stepping the canopy would improve the appearance and function of the building along the street.

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

- Advice on expression, materials, and detailing, in particular the treatment of the rear elevation, the extent of roof overhangs on all facades, and any comments on material and detailing issues.

Mr. Adair took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Cheng, Architect, noted the overhang is needed because the building is facing west and south. The canopy treatment is designed to break down the mass.

Allison Good, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that there will be bench seating and a bike rack. On the rear lane, edible plant species are proposed for urban agriculture and they are taking opportunities in the boulevard area for community gardening. Street trees are the main streets on the site and there are some container plantings planned on the second floor at the back of the building. As well small planters are proposed between the private patios for privacy.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the architectural expression especially on the east façade;
 - Design development to improve the colour, materials and detailing of the building;
 - Consider plant material on the lane to enhance the architectural expression;
 - Consider adding light to the exit stair;
 - Design development to the parking garage to make it more useable; and
 - Consider adding some screening around the loading and transformer area;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal.

The Panel was disappointed with the architectural expression of the building and thought that although the setbacks made sense some of the members thought the overhang was too deep while several Panel members suggested it was more about the detailing. Most of the Panel members thought the building design looked cheap and that the quality of detailing needed to be equal or better than the surrounding buildings. Several Panel members commented that the bay windows looked like they were tacked onto the façade and thought they should look more substantial.

Some panel members stressed the importance of the roof soffit material and detailing, since it will be highly visible from pedestrian view. One panel member said the roof overhang issue isn't a matter of depth, but rather, detailing.

One panel member was concerned about the viability of the retail in this less busy portion of Arbutus, and stressed that the applicant should look closely at the high quality retail located in Arbutus Village, as a precedent and indicator of the quality and detailing that this project will require to attract commercial vendors.

The Panel thought the building needed more color. Several Panel members couldn't see why there were different materials for the front and then different materials proposed for the back of the building. They also thought the canopies along Arbutus Street needed some attention with one Panel member suggesting they be continuous but break them up at the front entry.

The Panel did not support using edible plants in the lane and suggested the applicant use plant material that would help the architectural expression. One Panel member thought a third tree could be added on the roof and that the community planting should be rethought on Arbutus Street to make it permeable to pedestrians parking at curbside. They also

thought the east elevation needed some work and that lighting and windows should be added on the exit stair. One Panel member noted that the stairs might be used more than the elevator. Another Panel member was concerned about the lack of privacy between the units on the second floor decks.

Most of the Panel wanted to see sustainable features included in the proposal with one Panel member suggesting roughing in for future solar panels on the roof.

It was noted by several Panel members that the parking ramp was on the high end of the site and that it would be difficult to maneuver a car once inside the parking garage. Several Panel members thought the parking entry needed to be opened up with openings in the solid wall to allow for light penetration into the entry tunnel. They suggested adding some screening around the loading and transformer areas with one Panel member suggesting adding a light at the ramp to control traffic. Another Panel member noted that the parking garage access would be most of the resident's day to day 'front door' and deserved as much attention as the front of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng had nothing to add.

4. Address:	3437 Kingsway
DE:	414344
Description:	To develop this site with a new 4-storey commercial/residential building with eight dwelling units.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Matthew Cheng Architects
Owner:	0864115 BC Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architects Allison Good, DMG Landscape Architect
Staff:	Bob Adair

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (5-6)

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a four storey mixed use building with commercial use at street level and eight residential units above. The site is located in the Collingwood neighbourhood between Joyce Avenue and Boundary Road on the north side of Kingsway. Mr. Adair noted that four storeys is the maximum height for the street and as required by C-2 zoning the fourth storey is set back from the property line by eight feet. The heights and setbacks at the lane, which are adjacent to a single family residential zone, are compliant with zoning, although the building does not extend within two feet of the lane as is permitted at the ground level. The street facing elevation will be faced with brick and the weather protection will be a steel and glass canopy. Enclosed balconies are proposed in the units facing the street. There are significant side walls exposed to the street due to the low development of the adjacent buildings.

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

- General comments on the overall quality of the materials and details both on the street elevation and on the sidewalls
- Comments on the lanescape and enclosed balcony expression.

Mr. Adair took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Cheng, Architect, noted that he could have the enclosed balconies protrude into the two foot setback but thought it might be too close to the trees. He also noted that the underground parking is only one level.

Allison Good, Landscape Architect, noted that the landscaping is modest and will include the existing street trees. The balconies will have moveable planters with evergreen plantings. Ms. Good noted that there isn't a lot of opportunity for landscaping at the lane because of the parking spaces and the hydro kiosk.

The applicant team took questions from the applicant.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to simplify the façade;
 - Additional treatment to the side walls;
 - Consider using stronger materials such as brick;
 - Design development to define the residential entry from the retail;

- Design development to the rear façade;
 - Consider moving out the first floor to the lane perhaps by extending the roof deck over the loading bay;
 - Consider using better materials on the rear elevation;
 - Strengthen the terracing of the third floor to strengthen the design;
 - Consider simplifying and toning down (less contrast) the colour palette.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the application.

The Panel would like to see the façade simplified noting that there were too many contrasting materials being proposed. They would also like to see careful attention to the detailing of the building. Several Panel members suggested using more substantial materials such as brick to give more depth to the façade while a couple of Panel members thought the façade could be set back on the top floor. Also, several Panel members noted that the front and back seemed to be two different buildings. Several panel members stressed careful attention to making the front facade brick look less two-dimensional by wrapping it at least partially on side walls will help improve the solidity and integrity of the brick expression.

Several Panel members noted that the residential entry had no definition from the retail with one Panel member suggesting it be treated as a traditional building front. A couple of Panel members suggested extending the roof top deck over the loading bay so that the area could be used by the martial arts club and that some screening be done around the area for privacy. A couple of Panel members suggested having the back setback so that all the units have equal size decks.

Some of the Panel thought the color palette needed some work with one Panel member suggesting it needed to be discreet. A couple of Panel members were concerned with the east and west blank walls and thought it needed some articulation. Another Panel member noted that the applicant should anticipate the future buildings on either side that will fill the allowable envelope so that there isn't another wall next to the decks.

Some of the Panel thought there was an issue with the planters on the deck as they posed a climbing risk and residents might be able to climb onto them and over the railings (bringing the planters up to Building Code height would prevent this). One Panel member thought the guard rail needed to be simpler to unify the architectural language between the front and back of the building.

The Panel was disappointed with the lack of a sustainability strategy with one Panel member suggesting the addition of a green roof.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheng had no comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.