

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 11, 2012

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes (Excused Item #5)
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett
Alan Endall
Walter Francl (Items #1 & #2)
Geoff McDonell (Excused Items #1 & #2)
Martin Nielsen (Items #1 & #2)
Scott Romses (Chair)
Norm Shearing
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
Jane Durante
Jim Huffman
Arno Matis

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	775 Richards Street (Telus Residential)
2.	520 West Georgia Street (Telus Office)
3.	611 Main Street
4.	273 East 6th Avenue
5.	2750 East 18th Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Romses 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:** 775 Richards Street (Telus Residential)
DE: 415285
Use: To develop this site with a 46-storey mixed-use building (retail and residential) over eight levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Richards Street.
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects
Owner: Westbank
Review: Second
 Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects
 Peter Wood, Henriquez Partners Architects
Delegation: Kelty McKinnon, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg
 Ian Gillespie, Westbank
 Juan Monterrosa, Cobalt Engineering
Staff: Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)**Introduction:**

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for just under one million square feet of a mixed-use office and residential project. She described the context for the area noting the existing Telus facility and other highrise and office buildings in the area. The development will replace the two existing parkades along Richards Street with a 21-storey office tower on West Georgia and a 46-storey residential tower and retail podium on Robson Street wrapping around Richards Street. The existing White Spot restaurant on the north end of Seymour Street will also be replaced by an extension of the office block over the lane creating a covered plaza with some retail functions oriented onto it.

The existing Telus building (William Farrell Building) on the Seymour Street frontage will be upgraded and expanded. That proposal will proceed later under a separate development application.

The lane was also reconfigured through the rezoning to divert onto Richard Street allowing for its closure at the north end at Georgia Street for an expanded plaza. The lane is also envisioned as an active pedestrian animated area with active uses as well required service functions. The Kingston Hotel, on Richards Street will remain as it is, separately owned.

This application is a development permit application following the Rezoning that Council approved at a Public Hearing last September. The Panel reviewed and supported the proposal noting a few items needing improvement.

Residential Building:

Ms. Molaro noted that the CD-1 By-law permits a height of 125.7 meters which is to the underside of the view cone. However the height can be increased to a maximum building height of 136.2 meters for a building located in Sub-area A (residential building) and if the building does not further block a view corridor approved by Council and that sits wholly within

the view shadow of the Scotia Tower. She added that this detailed assessment was to occur as part of the more detailed development application process including an expanded High Building Urban Design Panel and is the reason for two the additional Panel members present at this review.

Ms. Molaro described the aspects of the High Building Policy that applies to this site:

- Higher buildings must establish a significant and recognizable new benchmark in architectural creativity and excellence while making significant contribution to the beauty and visual power of the city's skyline; and
- Higher buildings should demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption.

Ms. Molaro noted that the rezoning condition of approval is seeking "design development to the upper portion of the building to further refine and enhance its architectural contribution to the city skyline and the public view corridor".

Ms. Molaro explained that staff have also requested that service equipment including window washing, cell tower and antenna elements are not supportable incursions into the view corridor or beyond the view shadow of the Scotia Building. The proposal is optimizing its position in front of the Scotia Tower on the upper floors by stepping to maintain and respect the view corridor height limit and to take advantage of the foreshadow of the Scotia Tower, which is an existing encroachment into the view cone.

The general massing of the tower and its relationship to other residential buildings including neighbourliness view and shadow impacts were assessed at the time of the rezoning and supported by the Panel. However the Panel did raise concerns regarding the lower units facing the existing Telus building across the lane, and there was a condition of rezoning to improve the livability and privacy for these units. The other substantive changes subsequent to the rezoning was to delete the over the street extensions for the retail podium and amenity space. As well, the residential entry was relocated off Robson Street onto Richards Street to free up the retail frontage on Robson Street.

The base podium architecture has a simplified building form but will provide visual interest through the use of random composed onyx panels. The architectural lighting strategy for the residential building has also changed. Previously there were LED lights proposed on the north side of the residential building in a long vertical strip. This raised concerns with neighbourliness to the Hermitage. The lighting strategy has been revised to place architectural lighting on the underside soffits within floating glass panel frames.

The interface with the Kingston Hotel was much discussed through the rezoning process and generally the response provided is working.

Ms. Molaro stated that the applicant provided a detailed sustainability analysis along with a very clear graphic presentation on how the building design was addressed regarding achieving LEED™ Gold. She also described the proposed materials, noting the double glazed curtain wall system and spandrel, vertical laminated glass sunshades with a printed wood veneer interlayer, horizontal aluminum blades as part of the glazing system.

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

Residential Building

- does the proposed building design achieve the desired significant and recognizable new benchmark for architectural creativity and excellence, while making an enhanced architectural contribution to the city skyline and public view corridor
- does the proposed building demonstrate leadership and advances in sustainable design and energy consumption in achieving LEED Gold
- detailed material treatments of the building enclosure including vertical and horizontal shade fins, mullion details, onyx panels etc.
- livability and privacy of the lower units facing the lane across from the existing TELUS Building (note: proposed changes to the existing William Farrel Building anticipated through the rezoning process are not yet secured through a development application)
- building's architectural lighting strategy

Landscape and Public Realm Treatments

- integration of the lane with active uses as part of an expanded public realm as a connection between Robson Street and Georgia Street
- green roofs, public realm interface, landscape treatments

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Gregory Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal. He wanted the Panel to know that the client did not want to see these as two separate buildings but to see them as one united block that is a series of distinct separate elements, pavilions, components which together will read as a complete and cohesive entity. He noted that at rezoning they hadn't given as much attention to the massing of the buildings as a whole. He added that there has been a growth in the design since then. The first four storeys of the residential building were criticized at rezoning as being too blocky. They tried to break down the massing of the building and as well to have a more simple but bold expression for the base. They wanted to have a modern expression to the base using aluminum fins that support onyx laminated on glass. This will make for 40% transparency and 60% translucency in the retail which wraps the entire block on Robson Street. One of the changes was with the expression of the residential "boxes". The idea was to pick up the same glazing details used in the vertical fins on the office building, and to bring a sense of warmth with a wood screen printed on the glass fins. Mr. Henriquez stated that they worked with the owners of the Kingston Hotel to improve the interface to make sure the courtyard would not be overlooked from the residential units. In terms of lighting on the building it will have a more subtle expression using LED which will occur in the underside of soffits as used in other areas of the office building for a consistent expression across the entire site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider simplifying the colour palette perhaps by using only one colour of onyx;
- Consider how the lighting strategy might impact the residents in the residential tower;
- Consider improving the residential entry;
- Design development to the balconies and elevation treatment on Seymour Street.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a great presentation.

The Panel noted that the general massing was established at the rezoning with a minor intrusion into the view cone. The Panel thought the Robson Street corner was much improved

and acknowledged that the applicant had incorporated their previous comments into the design. The Panel was supportive of the small intrusion into the view cone.

Most of the Panel thought there were some positive moves in terms of clarifying the approach to the different elements but thought the expression could have some further design development. A couple of Panel members thought that in order for the big moves to read, the resolution needed to be simplified. However they appreciated the boldness of the tower. The Panel thought the retail podium had been well done with a couple of Panel members mentioning that they thought there should be a moment where the tower comes to grade.

Several Panel members noted that the lighting strategy had been paired back and will be more subtle which they thought was the right way to go. However a number of Panel members thought it was less playful and fun and encouraged the applicant to make it as exciting as possible. Several Panel members had some concerns with the possible impact of the lighting on the units in the building particularly those units below the illuminated soffits.

The Panel had some minor concerns especially with the proximity of residential tower across the lane to the existing Telus building, and thought the applicant needed to consider future development of that existing building. Some of the Panel was concerned with the depth of the lane but applauded the efforts to animate the lane. They agreed that the detailing would be important. Several Panel members thought some design development should be done on the balconies and general elevation composition on Seymour Street to add some richness. Perhaps the wood soffits could be brought back into the design.

Most of the Panel liked the creativity in the architecture with the use different materials, sun shades and the onyx. A couple of Panel members thought the applicant might want to use one colour of the onyx considering there will be more variation because of the lighting behind the glass, and within the material itself. However, other members of the Panel thought the two colours brought a richness to the façade. They also thought the colour palette was a bit subdued and suggested the applicant take another look. Some noted the Seymour Street elevation doesn't seem to have the same "punch" as the Robson Street side.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and liked the design for the public realm. One Panel member thought it was a little tight on Robson Street and thought that the excitement needed to happen between the curb and the building. Several Panel members thought that moving the Robson Street entry around the corner and making the retail continuous was a good idea, however they thought it could be further improved. One Panel member suggested that part of the tower facing the blank wall could have some greenery added to that wall. There were several Panel members who thought the public space on Georgia Street felt tight and should have more breathing room.

The Panel applauded the applicant for pursuing LEED™ Gold with several members suggesting the applicant achieve LEED™ Platinum.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for their great comments. He said they were two or three points off of making LEED™ Platinum and would be spending some time to see if they can make that instead. He added that they have some ambitious ideas for the public art.

2.	Address:	520 West Georgia Street (Telus Office)
	DE:	415286
	Use:	To develop this site with a 22-storey mixed-use building (commercial and office uses) over four levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Richards Street.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Henriquez Partners Architects
	Architect:	Westbank
	Owner:	Second Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects Peter Wood, Henriquez Partners Architects
	Delegation:	Kelty McKinnon, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Ian Gillespie, Westbank Juan Monterrosa, Cobalt Engineering
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

Introduction:

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for just under one million square feet of a mixed-use office and residential project. She described the context for the area noting the existing Telus facility and other highrise and office buildings in the area. The development will replace the two existing parkades along Richards Street with a 21-storey office tower on West Georgia and a 46-storey residential tower and retail podium on Robson Street wrapping around Richards Street. The existing White Spot restaurant on the north end of Seymour Street will also be replaced by an extension of the office block over the lane creating a covered plaza with some retail functions oriented onto it.

The existing Telus building (William Farrell Building) on the Seymour Street frontage will be upgraded and expanded. That proposal will proceed later under a separate development application.

The lane was also reconfigured through the rezoning to divert onto Richard Street allowing for its closure at the north end at Georgia Street for an expanded plaza. The lane is also envisioned as an active pedestrian animated area with active uses as well required service functions. The Kingston Hotel, on Richards Street will remain as it is, separately owned.

This application is a development permit application following the Rezoning that Council approved at a Public Hearing last September. The Panel reviewed and supported the proposal noting a few items needing improvement.

Office Building:

The office building consists of slightly more than 46,400 square meters of floor area. The ground floor uses are retail with the office lobby. There will also be below grade retail accessed via a stair and elevator in the plaza.

The height of the building is restricted by the view cone limiting the building to 289 feet. However, there is a slight incursion proposed of 7.5 feet into the view cone. The slight overage will accommodate the elevator overrun and the photovoltaic appurtenances on the

roof of the project. The by-law permits this increase in height subject to the design performance and impact this incursion may have on the view cone.

Ms. Molaro described the changes that the proposal has undergone since the rezoning. The basic composition of the tower component has been retained and is still punctuated with sky gardens. However, their design has evolved to emphasize their distinction between them and the upper tower facades and horizontal bar that penetrates through the building. The westerly sky garden has been transformed and relocated to the northwest corner of the building providing a visual presence to Georgia Street. The southerly sky garden has been moved towards the lane away from the Kingston Hotel and the residential tower.

As a condition of rezoning, there was to be an increase in the transparency and visual interest for the cantilevered spaces over city streets, including an aspect of semi-public use for them. The proposal has revised both sides of the cantilevered spaces and they have been programmed with semi private office functions. While in the rezoning the version on Richards Street contained a stair to allow for circulation between floors with vegetation including trees, it now has projecting pods of meeting rooms within the 4-storey volume. The cantilevered space over Seymour Street was four levels of general office space and now similarly, incorporates projecting pods of meeting rooms within a 4-storey volume minus the garden aspect.

Ms. Molaro noted that the applicant is proposing to go beyond what is required (LEED™ Gold) to achieve LEED™ Platinum. The applicant has provided a detailed sustainability analyses along with a very clear graphic representation on how the building design was addressed regarding achieving LEED Platinum.

The proposed materials of the office building is comprised of triple glazed curtain walls with venting windows with double glazed spandrel, vertical glass fins (east and west sides) and horizontal metal fins on the south. There will be steel structures to support the photovoltaics.

Integrated within the building are a number of landscaped roof areas and internal sky gardens. There will be an extensive green roof on the tower with corporate amenity terraces.

Treatment of the lower massing and the plaza include retail and office which has been revised to introduce a playful order of onyx panels with numerous doors opening out onto the plaza space. The plaza canopy has been lowered to float underneath the underside of the tower soffit. The spine of the plaza canopy is metal with wood Glulam beams. Water is introduced with both a waterfall and reflecting pool. The ground plane material treatment on the plaza is extended internally through the tower lobby.

As part of the building composition and technologies, the application is proposing a number of architectural lighting elements integrated into the design. The office building components are predominantly monochromatic, yet also include more vibrant elements, such as, non-programmable light elements clad with onyx panels. The programmable colour lighting components are in the roof line, soffit of the horizontal bar and the plaza water feature and skylights. A media panel is also proposed to be integrated into the upper sky garden through a separate permit.

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

Office Building:

- Is the resolution of the height incursion into the view cone supportable based on the design response to further refine and architecturally integrate the rooftop mechanical penthouse, elevator override, photovoltaic panels?

- Do the proposed materials of the office tower achieve the design performance for superior detailing and execution of detail in addition to their expected energy performance (proposing LEED Platinum)?
- Resolution of the horizontal office building cantilevered spaces (over the streets) as having increased transparency and visual interest containing an aspect of semi-public use
- Proposed additional encroachment over Georgia Street - does this element contribute to the architectural composition and to ceremonial aspect of Georgia Street.
- Proposed lighting concepts as an integrated component of the building's architecture including
 - Architectural non-color lighting
 - Architectural colored programmable lighting
- Is the special signification provided (colored lighting treatment for) the exposed soffits for the cantilevered elements(over the city streets) a supportable approach, or is there something else that should be considered for other times of the day

Plaza/Public Realm and landscape Treatments:

- design response to the rezoning condition to refine the design of the public plaza site and surrounding public realm to engage and enhance the public experience
- design resolution of the plaza treatments and canopy, including its interface with the office tower
- green roof and sky gardens landscape treatments
- integration of the lane with active uses as part of an expanded public realm as a connection between Robson Street and Georgia Street

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Gregory Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that the base of the office building will now have onyx panels and a cantilevered bridge which penetrates through the office building and which projects over the street with a series of office and meeting space and a restaurant in this area over the street. Another one of the big changes is adding natural light into the basement area. They are looking at adding a glass floor in the plaza which would allow natural light into the retail spaces below. The boxes that protrude have been adapted for their specific uses and location on the site. They also did a lot of tectonic development in terms of the way in which the building meets the ground and the sky. They have a steel vocabulary, which is the truss structure that goes sliding through the entire building, and the office tower also has a series of "legs" that allows the building to meet the ground. The entrance canopy has been made more subservient to the dominate truss structure with a west coast wood structure. In terms of the lane, the decorative paving will be brought done the lane with a series of lights to create an intimate pedestrian environment. They are planning to activate the lane with retail as well, which will be part of a separate application.

Kelty McKinnon, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. She noted the over all strategy for the plaza is to bring in a sense of the west coast. There will be basalt paving across the entire site in contrast with the highly reflective thin sheet of water as well as some native plantings within the water features. There are two amenities decks on the office tower and they are meant to be seen from the street in terms of their vegetation. They are meant to be programmable from large to small gatherings. The materials will include basalt paving, crushed oyster shell and boardwalks. Raised planters with native plantings are also proposed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to the cantilevered horizontal box to make it more distinct where it joins and penetrates the tower;
- Consider additional colours to the materials to enliven the overall monochromatic palette of the building;
- Design development to the Plaza on Georgia Street.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought it had advanced since the rezoning.

The Panel though the office component was the strongest part of the project and supported the intrusion into the view cone. They liked the canopy expression but thought it might be crowding the ground plane a bit. One Panel member suggested lifting it a bit while another Panel member thought there was a pinch point on the Seymour Street side in relation to the retail behind. The Panel also thought the Georgia Street façade could use some work. One Panel member said it felt like any other office building and wanted to see something that would animate the façade such as expressing the concrete (or steel) “Y” column, to make it more powerful.

The Panel liked the cantilevered horizontal office building, but would like to have seen it move into the building more authentically as a true penetration. One Panel member suggested that the glass façade above and below the box be different for of a distinct look, while another Panel member thought that how the glazing system meets the tower should be given another look. Several Panel members thought it is a bold architectural element expressing the steel trusses. They also liked that the end of the cantilevered spaces would have some active uses.

Most of the Panel members liked the lighting strategy and thought the media screen was an important addition to the project as it will enliven the building. One Panel member suggested that the applicant ensure that the lighting elements have a refresh rate of 250 hrz for the lighting so it doesn't impact the residents in adjacent buildings.

Most of the Panel supported the materials but suggested the applicant broaden the range of grays in the colour palette. One Panel member noted that how the onyx is back lit will be important, and that those areas where furniture abuts the backside of the panels requires careful consideration.

The Panel supported the public realm treatment in the plaza but thought it was a little restricted. One Panel member noted that there wasn't any gardens (only trees), and that the basalt paving might be too dark for the area. One Panel member suggested adding some reflection and greenery. They also thought the lane would be an interesting space and thought the added retail component would help to activate the space.

It was suggested that public art was going to be an important factor to the project and will bring a delightful element. One Panel member suggested some art be added to the cantilevered boxes for a more civic presence.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy and commended the applicant for targeting LEED™ Platinum but one Panel member was concerned with the vertical sun shades on the southeast façade and thought they might be better on the west façade, or that other strategies be brought to the west façade to enliven it further.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Henriquez noted that they are supportive on the issue and comments for improved detailing of the trusses.

3.	Address:	611 Main Street
	DE:	Rezoning
	Use:	The proposal is for a 17-storey mixed-use commercial and residential development with an underground parking garage. The proposed development is comprised of 9,226.9 square feet (875.1 square meters) of ground floor retail, 16 floors of residential with 26 units of senior housing and 145 units of market housing and 1,828.9 square feet (169.9 square meters) of amenity space.
	Zoning:	HA-1A
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Review:	First
	Architect:	W.T. Leung Architects
	Owner:	Westbank
	Delegation:	Wing Ting Leung, W.T. Leung Architects Christiane Cottin, W.T. Leung Architects Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Ian Gillespie, Westbank
	Staff:	Dwayne Drobot and Garry Papers

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)**Introduction:**

Dwayne Drobot, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal and explained that there is currently a 3-storey building on the site. As well he described the context for the area. The site is part of the Historic Area Height Review that was completed in 2011. As part of the review, the applicant can apply to an increase in height up to 150 feet at a rezoning. There were guidelines set out as part of the Rezoning Policy for Chinatown in order for the increase in height.

Garry Papers, Development Planner, further described the proposal. As a rezoning, staff is seeking the Panel's comments on the overall massing, composition of the massing and response to the new guidelines. In return for the additional height enabled by the Rezoning policy, the new guidelines were crucial for the community's buy-in for additional capacity, and to have new buildings fit into the Chinatown character. These guidelines work in tandem with the already adopted HA-1A design guidelines.

Mr. Papers described the proposal noting it has a generous commercial ground floor on Main Street which wraps around along Keefer Street with a slight recess and a plaza. Floors three through seven have small units and two roof gardens, and floors eight through seventeen have larger units. The setback for the plaza is consistent with the Guidelines. There is a commitment to a quality masonry material palette for the base and the richness of that base is starting to emerge in the proposal.

Mr. Papers briefly described the new massing and design guidelines for the "up to 150 ft" area noting that the Panel had received a complete copy for reference. He said they expect future designs with heights of 150 feet to be proposed for the area.

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

- Does the base exhibit the verticality, modulation into increments, horizontal beltline and other policy provisions to fit and enhance the distinct context?
- Does the mid-section display compatible proportions to the height, and does it require additional or more substantial reveals, modulation, massing step-backs and/or sculpting?
- Does the tower top require more setbacks, stepping, shortened roofline length (to 66 feet) and/or material variation, to mitigate its flat, cut-off character and respect its highly visible position in the recently adopted Olympic Village view cone?

Mr. Papers took questions from the panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Mr. Leung, Architect, further described the proposal for a 17-storey mixed-use commercial and residential development with ground floor retail. There will be 173 residential units with both senior's rental apartments and market housing. He described the architecture of the building noting that the building will relate to the higher buildings in the historic Chinatown area. The residential entry will be through an ornamental gate and landscaped forecourt. Materials include brick and concrete wall forms. The parkade will be clad with terracotta panels. The top two floors of the building are stepped back.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the plans for the landscaping. She explained that there is a public realm treatment for Chinatown. It is predominately a strip of aggregate around the tree grates. There are a number of existing trees on Keefer Street which will be maintained as well on Main Street. There are two main roof decks; one on the 3rd floor that will be used by the senior's housing. It will be a quiet garden with some garden plots and seating. Up on the 8th floor is the amenity for the marketing residential units. There is a small children's play area, an outdoor dining area with barbeque, and a large amenity patio and some garden plots.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to the mid section and top of the tower.
- Add a Sustainable Strategy at the development permit stage.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal but they were unclear regarding the new Guidelines and struggled with the proposal.

The Panel supported the use and felt the 65 foot base of the building was appropriate for the Chinatown streetscape. However, they did question how a higher building would fit into Chinatown when there isn't already a precedent in this area.

The Panel had concerns with the mid section and top of the building. They felt the colour and window patterns did not mitigate the boxy massing. Several Panel members suggested the applicant find ways to further break down the upper massing and to have a clear expression at the top of the tower. It was suggested that once that has been established, then the colours and window patterning could support the basic massing moves. Another Panel member remarked that the major challenge was the top of the tower as it seemed to be struggling for an identity. Most of the Panel thought it was appropriate to match the parapet lines along the street at the 65 foot height, but a couple mentioned that stronger articulation within the base would support the guidelines better.

A couple of Panel members had some issues with the new Guidelines. They felt the north bound streets have a different role in Chinatown especially Main Street, as it is a civic street. Several also felt the lower portion of the building should respond to the surrounding heritage, but the Guidelines don't acknowledge what the tower should be in regards to heritage.

A couple of Panel members stated that they would like to see a sustainable strategy when the project comes back for a review at the development permit stage, as the applicant is going to have to meet the new energy by-law. One Panel member was disappointed to not see more exploration of massing alternatives or design options at a Rezoning review, but rather a fully detailed solution.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Leung acknowledged that it was not an easy building to design. He said he felt the height for the streetwall was appropriate for Chinatown. He added that given the Guidelines and how the setbacks should be there, there is no other opportunity for another form. He said the idea for the building was to create a simple volume similar to existing buildings in Chinatown. The heritage buildings were often built with little money.

4.	Address:	273 East 6th Avenue
	DE:	415160
	Use:	To construct a mixed use building containing a retail unit, 33 multiple dwelling units and 60 artist studios with associated residential units over three levels of underground parking.
	Zoning:	IC-3
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Shift Architecture
	Owner:	Imani Development
	Delegation:	Cam Halfier, Shift Architecture Peter Buchanan, Shift Architecture David Thompson, Ron Rule Consultants Payam Imani, Imani Development
	Staff:	Garry Papers

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)**Introduction:**

Garry Papers, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located on East 6th Avenue near Scotia Street, a block off Main Street. The project is proposing a mix of studios and dwelling units. There are four studio units along the ground floor fronting 6th, and a small CRU at the corner, wrapping around to two more studio units along Scotia, and then a common workshop at the lane. There are split level parking entrances off the lane to take advantage of the slope and as well loading and 2 car share spaces. There will be a total of 93 units in the building. The guidelines in IC-3 ask for a consistent building line streetwall definition at the 6th avenue property line. This has been maintained, but the applicant has layered the ground level to provide a reasonable amount of buffering to the studios. Mr. Papers noted that staff support several aspects of the proposal: including the way the corner lightens up and changes character with a step back in massing in response to the RM zone across the intersection. Also, the range of roof types, the useable roofs, the green roof, and the lane treatment which has planters along portions of the parking that incorporates vertical modulation with trellis elements to activate the lane. Staff also supports the overall material palette, especially the terracotta that is proposed.

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

- The depth and materiality of the primary south wall;
- The landscape interface at the public realm.

Mr. Papers took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Peter Buchanan, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the nature of the building at the street has architectural concrete as framing members and reflects a more urban façade. The back wall will have vibrant colours with an aluminum louvre over a bright green background cladding that will reflect the sunlight. The name of the building will be "Shine", and Mr. Buchanan said he hoped the nature of the façade would be lively. The roof decks are developed as urban agriculture, with extensive green roofs around it and intensive green roofs for both the public and private areas.

David Thompson, Landscape Architect, noted that the studios are right on the street and they are planning to buffer them with taller plantings that climb up the screens, or possibly tall grasses or bamboo. There are communal planters on the roof areas, and they are working to have a good program of public/private communal use of these amenity areas, with moveable and fixed seating. They are also planning some buffered screen hedging and gates for the private balconies.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider not wrapping the white material around to the party wall;
- Consider deleting the white panel drop-down portion of the façade facing 6th;
- Consider NOT including tall landscaping along 6th.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well-composed building and great neighbourhood fit.

The Panel thought the project had nice proportions and remarked that there was a lot of fun to the design. They also commended the application for a creative project.

The Panel supported the use of the artist's studios and thought the workshop space was a great addition to the streetscape.

The Panel liked the gesture of the super graphic and thought it was intriguing. Several Panel members suggested that it wasn't necessary to wrap the white materials around to the party wall as it might ruin the purity of the form language.

The Panel thought the landscaping was a good response to the site with lots of useable space. One Panel member noted that there are a lot of plantings under the overhangs and suggested the applicant consider adding irrigation to these areas. On level 6, the common and private decks are beside each other, and it was suggested that there be more space given to the common deck. One Panel member noted that there wasn't any mention of streetscape design (sidewalks and planting boulevard) in the package, and trusted that it would be the typical neighbourhood standard.

One Panel member suggested the applicant consider more articulation and greenery to the north façade. As well, a couple of Panel members thought the landscaping on East 6th Avenue shouldn't be tall adjacent to the building. A couple of Panel members suggested that the screens in front of the bedroom area could be sliding as they tie them in with the soffits above, and thought that low plantings would be sufficient.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Buchanan thanked the Panel for their support and added that it was appreciated. They will continue working to improve the project.

5.	Address:	2750 East 18th Avenue
	DE:	Rezoning
	Use:	Amend the existing CD-1 (356) for the site to enable construction of the Pacific Family Autism Centre. The facility will comprise of a research, information, learning, assessment, treatment and support centre for individuals and their families suffering from Autism Specturm Disorder.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects
	Owner:	Pacific Family Autism Centre Larry Adams, Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects Garth Ramsey, Neal Staniszki Doll Adams Architects
	Delegation:	Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates Gwyn Symmons, CitySpaces Consulting Kate Lambert, CitySpaces Consulting
	Staff:	Farhad Mawani and Pat St. Michel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

Introduction:

Farhad Mawani, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for an application to amend the existing CD-1 for the site located at 2750 East 18th Avenue, to allow for the development of the Pacific Autism Family Centre. The facility will comprise of a research, information, learning, assessment, treatment and support centre for individuals and their families affected by Autism Spectrum Disorder.

Mr. Mawani explained that the Children's Foundation currently occupies the entire 10,713 square metre site. The Children's Foundation is housed in a number of detached buildings interspersed with green-space. The site for the Centre is located on the same lands as The Children's Foundation lands. Although the two organizations will share the site, they will operate independently.

Mr. Mawani described the context for the area and noted that the site is bounded by Kaslo Street to the east, a lane to the west, East 18th Avenue to the north and a property line to the south. The topography slopes down from the south property line towards the north with a grade change of approximately 5 metres. The site is located within 1 km of three SkyTrain stations and is easily accessible to major transit routes. A number of parks are close to the site, and a community centre and library are located at Renfrew Park.

The site for the Centre falls within the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision. With a few exceptions, the area is predominately residential consisting of single family detached dwellings.

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, further described the proposal which is a 2-storey wood-frame building of approximately 84,000 square feet over a single level of underground parking. The main entry and drop-off is oriented to Kaslo Street, with the access to the underground parking leading from the drop-off area. Houses across the street side onto Kaslo Street, and the parking ramp is screened from the street by a row of existing mature cedars. An auditorium space is located off the main entry and behind the parking access.

Ms. St. Michel noted that the building is organized around a series of courtyards to facilitate access to daylighting. One of the courtyards is completed with the existing buildings of the Children's Foundation, and features several existing trees which will be retained. South facing courtyard spaces along the shared property line provide secure play and outdoor seating areas.

A 3-storey residential component for temporary family accommodation is oriented to the East 18th Avenue frontage. The effective height of the residential block is reduced by the lower level being set into grade with sunken outdoor play areas in the setback area.

As a rezoning, the project will meet LEED™ Gold and a geothermal ground source system is proposed for the facility. As a Wood First building there is extensive use of wood as siding, panels, louvers, columns, beams, and other detailing.

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

- The treatment of the auditorium wall facing Kaslo Street;
- The extent and expression of the residential components fronting East 18th Avenue.

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

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Larry Adams, Architect, further described the proposal and explained they wanted to design a simple expression for a complex program. It is City owned property, and two buildings and a trailer will be taken down in order to construct the new building. The building components of the project, such as the gymnasium and the auditorium, have been pulled further into the slope to mitigate any effect on the neighbourhood. Mr. Adams described the architecture noting that it will be a post and beam structure with cross laminated timber floors, with radiant heating and cooling. He added that it will be a green LEED™ building and they are working through a geo-thermal system with heat recovery. The site will be fenced to help with privacy for the children, as well as for their protection.

Rob Barnes, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping noting that there are a lot of existing trees that will be retained where possible. There are a number of outdoor gardens planned, including one in the courtyard off the cafeteria. It will feature a central lawn panel and a small play structure for children. As well, there is an outdoor play garden located off the Treatment Centre which will have materials to help with rehabilitation. The family accommodation will include a loosely programmed garden space with moveable furniture. There are a couple of roof top patios, and there will be additional greening at the lane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal

The Panel supported the density, use and form of development. They didn't have any concerns with the treatment of the gym wall, especially given the heavy existing vegetation screening. They noted that the lower suites are a bit below grade but since it is short term living they thought it was supportable. One Panel member noted that the bedroom windows seemed narrow and suggested they be enlarged since they face north and there might not be a lot of daylight into the rooms.

The Panel supported the landscape plans noting that the way the building is sited with courtyards and very few long facades combined with the street trees, it will fit well into the neighbourhood.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Adams said he appreciated the Panels comments.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.