
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 12, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Roger Hughes (Chair)
Patricia Campbell
James Cheng
Paul Grant
Norman Shearing (Excused for Item 4)
Sean McEwan (Excused for Item 1)
Keith Ross

REGRETS: Joe Hruda
Joe Werner
Keith Ross
Sheldon Chandler
Gilbert Raynard
Per Christofferson

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Louise Christie

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1300 West Pender
2. 980-990 Station Street
3. 1265-1267 Granville Street
4. 699 Cardero Street

1. Address: 1300 West Pender Street
DA: 404571
Use: Residential
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Preliminary
Architect: Howard Bingham Hill
Owner: Pinnacle International
Review: Second
Delegation: John Bingham, Mike Decotiis, Jim Whittle, David Rose
Staff: Ralph Segal
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4 - 1)

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Ralph Segal, introduced this preliminary application which was previously not supported by the Panel. The applicant has addressed the concerns that were expressed: There is no longer the transfer of heritage bonus density of 24,000 sq. ft.; the tower height has been lowered to 300 ft.; the grand staircase through the middle has been removed; the floor plate is smaller (from 7,800 sq. ft. to 7,200 sq. ft. approximately); and the tower has been moved to a minimum of 80 ft. away from 'The Pointe'. The tower has been reconfigured, and pulled closer to the Pender Street property line. In terms of massing of the podium on the triangular site, it is now a mix of 3-storey commercial at the westerly end and single storey on the Pender Street frontage. Five 2-storey townhouses have been introduced on the lane which can take advantage of the view between the Harbourside towers. Before, the view issues were substantive but now from the "The Pointe" plaza the view is maintained. Previously, the lobby and drop-off were focussed on the lane side but, because of the desire not to have two lobbies - one vehicular and one pedestrian, it is now proposed to move the lobby to the lower Pender Street side. This is feasible because there is an atypical conditional with the small triangular landscaped piece of property at Melville, Jervis and Pender Streets, which creates the rationale. In summary, staff feels concerns have been properly addressed but would like the Panel to comment on the revised massing, the treatment of the triangulated corner, the lowered height of the tower, the views through from Georgia Street and from 'The Pointe' plaza and the vehicular drop-off. Generally, staff are supportive.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Bingham explained that by removing the grand staircase, using a dual lobby, and bringing down the recreation amenity of the pool and lounge to the main floor, they were able to better develop the base. The residential and commercial accesses are separated. The parking entrances for the townhouses is directly off the lane to each one, and the townhouses will have private open space on top of the commercial space. Another important factor is the view corridor under the West Coast Transmission building which has been maintained, and there is glazing for natural light down to the townhouses. The building has a dark element to accentuate verticality as one comes down Pender Street and there are materials at the retail level to give strength to the commercial interface onto Pender Street. Along the lower level on Jervis Street, the masonry wraps around into the commercial area and provides differentiation from the retail space. On the Broughton Street corner, there is a double volume glazed area wrapping around the corner to make it more open so the retail will have greater impact at that point. The view line down Pender Street has a six foot drop, so the proposal is to step it around rather than greening it. There will be some tinted glass for heat retention, and darker mullions but the tone of the building is muted.

The Panel then took time to review the drawings and model.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel was generally supportive but expressed concerns about the large floor plate, which was perceived as bulky considering those of 6,500 sq. ft. in surrounding buildings. Two members pointed out that there is no unifying design and a downtown expression needs architectural unification. With simplification and more of a vertical accent, the tower could be made to look slimmer, particularly as it is very noticeable in the context of the neighbouring towers, particularly because it is not on the grid. The Panel thought the shortened building does not shadow the park and the Pender Street drop off would serve both pedestrians and vehicular traffic well. One member commented that, as there was an overall reduction in the green space and in considering the viewpoint of the neighbours, the roof of the townhouses at the level of the West Coast Transmission building needs treatment. Various members suggested enhancing the building entrance, special treatment of the prow at the triangular point, more detailing on the Jervis Street frontage, capitalizing on the angling of the building, and pedestrian reinforcement on the Pender Street elevation. For more green space, members suggested the townhouses have a green set-back off the lane. The Panel was supportive of the drop-off and entrance to parking being on Pender Street. The Panel recognized that this was a very complex and difficult site but there were also design opportunities.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant explained that on the lane, there were three commercial parking spaces to separate them from the residential but they would make an effort to make the entrances to the townhouses more pleasing by softening with green space. Also, the applicant explained that the building expression was an effort to break the scale of the tower down.

2. Address:	980-990 Station Street
Use:	High Tech.
Zoning:	I-3
Architect:	Musson Cattell MacKey
Owner:	Schroeder Properties
Review:	First
Delegation:	Frank Musson, Mark Whitehead, Larry Sunderland, Don Wori
Staff:	Ralph Segal, Scot Hein

EVALUATION: **Workshop; no vote is taken.**

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, introduced this site east of the end of False Creek. The zoning is I-3 for an FSR of 3.0, and a height of 60 ft. outright, relaxable to 100 ft. The 3.0 FSR yields 2 million sq. ft. and if the outright height of 60 ft. is applied over the full site, then the allowable FSR would not be achievable. The Interim Rezoning Policies and Guidelines for I-3 are Grandview-Boundary area specific and see higher quality expression both for architecture and the public realm, ecologically sensitivity, and a campus-like atmosphere. This is the Trillium site, between Prior Street to the north and the Station Street and Thornton Park to the west, and the bus station to the south. All the surrounding zones are 5.0 FSR. There is the potential of new park to the east which the Park Board has discussed with residents in the surrounding areas, with monies in place from the CAC's for the development of City Gate. Major transit is available with the SkyTrain station at Main Street and the potential future Finning site Phase II SkyTrain station. The Panel is requested to comment on the series of five schemes, particularly noting the Strathcona residential area at a height of 35 ft. and City Gate with heights up to 300 ft., the potential for park and on other approaches that should be considered.

The five urban design areas that the Panel is asked to comment on are:

1. Street Patterns: should the City street grid to be extended through the site? If so, to what extent?
2. Pedestrian Circulation Patterns: What are the prevailing patterns and what new ones are created for on-site workers and pedestrians moving through the area? How are corners and edge handled? This proposal is a more gated development. City greenways through these flats is not yet planned.
3. Extent and use of open space: Identify the public realm potential.
4. Building size: What are the considerations of plate size, height, form, massing and image (mega-block)?
5. Identity: What is the planning the parti? Axial planning? edges? corners? scale? etc.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The applicant, Mr. Whitehead, explained that City Council put I-3 zoning into place to attract high tech users into the City from the suburbs. There are five heritage buildings facing on Main Street and this area is left over from industrial area built around the railway lines and is all contaminated. The City yards will be relocated here so there are City rights-of-way, for access to the yards and a sewer line, which must be left clear. Parking regulations state 2.21 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of development. The site has great transit access with the West Coast express, the sea bus, LRT, two bike routes, plus Greenways and the seawall, and is in proximity to City Gate, International Village, Strathcona, B.C. Place, the whole west end and downtown. It is framed by arterial roads: Prior Street to the north; Terminal Avenue or the tracks to the south; a future park to the east, and the Station Street lane to the west. There is a lot of open space around this site, including Strathcona Park which is 18 acres, Andy Livingstone Park, Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Chinese Classical Garden and Thornton Park, plus the seven acres being proposed. The topography is relatively flat and there is view potential from any height within the site and also north down

Gore Street, the only one that accesses the site that runs for more than a few blocks. At this time, the site is practically invisible. City Gate looks back to Seymour Mountain, and that view will not be impacted at the 70 ft. level of the podium. A full view analysis has not been done but building heights are proposed to be 30 to 40 ft. beside the residential area, with towers of approximately 100 ft., flanked by 60 ft., then tiered down to 5-storées, 3 and 2, moving toward the north. As for the built form, given the site's context and history as an industrial area, there are few keys in the surrounding area to define its form and pattern. The goals for a successful high tech 'campus' were to give a sense of place through planning and good urban design: Heights going from east to west; security (paramount); good pedestrian movement; no road connection to the neighbourhoods but good access points; and to consider the City Engineering Services' stipulation for rights-of-way. Images with 100 ft. buildings were developed that still give the feel of a campus. The zoning needs flexibility for high amenity, good views, private secure greenspace, large floor plates, high floor-to-floor heights (minimum of 14 ft to 16 ft.), and areas which can be easily altered for changing needs and expansion. The project will be phased with an initial PDP and then complete permits for individual buildings. The following schemes, with park appended to the east, developed by considering road accesses:

Scheme A started by putting all streets across the site but not connecting them to residential streets. There are too many turns and intersections with the six street pattern. It has approximately 2 million sq. ft., stepping down toward park and up toward other end. This is the most urban design with maximum streets and minimum green space. Buildings are basically 100 ft. wide and can only expand with sky bridges.

Scheme B straightens Gore street, creating a courtyard with a one way roundabout in the centre, a focus in the site. In terms of floor plate, the biggest problem is the two megablocks. With five streets, it provides pedestrian access to the parks, but with three intersections in a short area.

Scheme C, with a four street pattern, gives some central street access to the city yards and Gore Street goes through. It takes out Dunlevey Street but the right-of-way must remain. There are three blocks with green space in the middle but the cul-de-sac is a concern. In terms of public realm, a wider street.

Both Scheme C and D create some very small blocks and high tech use likes big floor plates. The simplified pattern of a one way roundabout in Scheme D, near the park, gives pedestrian ways through site but Gore Street only enters the site and Dunlevey Street is for pedestrians from the north as far as the roundabout.

Last scheme- E - is a hybrid, with Gore Street not entering the site, and Dunlevey Street extending through. This resists traffic cutting through. The focus is within the site, and there is good internal circulation and pedestrian passage ways. The foot print. is nominally 40,000 sq. ft. and each building would have its own address.

Discussion:

A Panel member asked if there was an overriding design parti or is it left up to each protagonist. The applicant said they are building all the buildings, within the design guidelines and criteria, in a time frame of five to six years, and character is being developed with something that ties it in together to read as a complete park. The buildings will change as the PDP's come forward, given the flexibility of this development: With high tech workers moving around at odd hours, parking and traffic trips of workers in one office may effect the design of the next building. The applicant said that sustainability is a factor. Amenities like climbing walls, bocci courts and basket ball are activities for pocket parks.

Another Panel member suggested designing another option without taking the City's constraints into consideration, wondering what would be the optimum configuration for the client and their expectations. Two streets are needed for access and address, which provides the most flexibility with an established urban edge, and the current schemes are suburban. He said this is a unique opportunity with a great piece of property which has a linear grain following the railroad lines, with an already established history and vocabulary. A singular bold statement scheme was suggested, thinking of it as an island, which could be very functional with public and private planes and, by using stratification, allowing permeability through the site. For example, the streets could be kept to the outside and be 100 ft. wide with doors facing onto them. Or there could be a Parisian theme for organization with a central place with a more radial scheme. Storm water run-off and sustainability can be part of what develops.

As this was a workshop, no vote was taken.

3. Address:	1265-1267 Granville Street
DA:	404718
Use:	Social Housing
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Burrowes Huggins
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	First
Delegation:	Phillip Burrowes, Lorne Epp, Don Kroeker, Gerry Eckford, and Joffre Pomerleau
Staff:	Scot Hein

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6 - 0)

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced this application which is the first of about a dozen more such developments that will be coming forward. The site, leased for 60 years, is in downtown south in the DD district, and the proposal is for 62 low income singles units for 19 years of age and up, with a manager suite and five commercial/retail units at grade. The zoning stipulates a maximum FSR of 3.5, a height limit of 90 ft. and continuous weather protection and retail at grade. The site size is 70 by 120 ft. with a four ft. easement from floors four to seven and also with an eight ft. light well in the adjacent hotel. The proposal utilizes good quality materials for this housing project, which should bring revitalization to Granville Street. The unit size is 321 to 340 sq. ft with a unit for the disabled with a balcony on each floor, and an outdoor area to the rear off of the second floor. Staff would like the Panel's comments on the following issues: unit size and layout for livability; facade treatment and how it fits with the streetscape on Granville Street; the hard parking surface treatment for parking off the lane and soft scape; the seven storey set-back condition and how it is executed; and, finally, the extensive blank wall. Staff consider the proposal supportable.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Mr. Huggins said the design was generated from the request that the unit size remain relatively constant, at around 320 sq. ft. To consolidate all the commercial space on the ground floor, the entrance lobby for residential is at the end of the building which allows for security with the inner and outer lobby and separation from the commercial units. To follow the design guidelines, a mix of traditional materials, like brick, framed-in concrete and design elements like the cornice with articulated storefront were incorporated in the design. On the front, concrete is on the lower two floors and then above the seventh floor. The infill is either glazing or metal siding. On the lane, there is very limited space once the parking requirements have been met so usable exterior space off the back on the second floor is provided, with a visual screen to the neighbours.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel was supportive of the building which is well proportioned and designed for Granville Street with quality materials. Two members suggested that the masonry could run both around the corners and also right to the top, or otherwise it should have more of a set-back at the seventh floor. One member noted there was nothing to indicate signage or awning design which are key components to the pedestrian edge. The units were considered small but efficient and livable as permanent homes. A member suggested a light well at the end of the corridor which would bring inn natural light, allow a window into the washroom, and would also break up the long, blank wall. Members suggested that, with over 60 units, the outdoor amenity space could be increased by utilizing the roof terrace with trellised green screening. One member thought the lobby could move toward the

centre, in line with the stair well and elevator, and another suggested a lounge area in the lobby for the residents.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant said the suggestion of the light well could be incorporated and they could increase the terrace on the second floor, as elevator or stair access produced limitations.
4. Address: 699 Cardero
DA: 404701
Use: Residential (Tower D)
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Hancock Bruckner
Owner: Austerville Properties Ltd.
Review: First
Delegation: Jim Hancock and Peter Kreuk
Staff: Mike Kemble
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5 - 0)

- **Introduction:**

Mike Kemble, the Development Planner, introduced this complete application for Tower D on the Bayshore site at the northwest corner of Georgia and Cardero Streets. The site was first rezoned in 1993, with a further rezoning in 1998. About one-half the development is now built and this is the last remaining section. This 45,000 sq. ft. site will provide rental housing because of a density incentive. The tower floor plate is limited to 6,068 sq. ft. for the 26-storey tower with 126 units and a height of 243 ft. At the corner, there are both underground and above ground easements for two transit rights-of-way. The site slopes down to the north. There are two vehicular access points, one from Cardero Street which is a cul-de-sac drop-off, with the main parking access from Bayshore Drive through a centralized shared parking garage. The original 1993 design concept featured a series of distinctive gardens with different characters, including water pools, and a stepping down in tower heights along Georgia Street toward the park. Towers were intended to be raised at grade to maximize the views underneath. There are two caretaker suites provided, one the ground floor on the west side of the core, adjacent to amenity space, and the other adjacent to the exercise area on the second floor. The private open space is a sunny patio area on the west side of the building, separated by the diagonal public pathway through the site from Georgia Street to the park across Bayshore Drive.

The guidelines for the family of towers along Georgia Street encourage a consistency of materials, including concrete and glass, a light and soft colour palette and terracing of the upper storeys.

The three principal Design Development Conditions relevant to this site that were approved at the last rezoning stage and the previous concerns of the Panel were reviewed. The Panel was asked to comment on the following three issues: the tower base treatment, as residential units at the ground floor are not encouraged by the guidelines and the sense of transparency as the lobby has been raised up more than the other towers (A and B) on Georgia Street; the tower massing and materials, including how this fits in with the family of towers on Georgia Street; and finally, the open space treatments, including the entry/drop-off area, the important Georgia/Cardero Streets' corner, and the west side interface with the diagonal right-of-way.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments**

Mr. Hancock explained there are two further issues: the access for Fire Services, which have stipulated

an alternate entry directly off of Georgia Street; and the other is height. The permitted height is 74 m. and the tower is currently 73.9 m. when measured from Georgia Street which is where Towers A and B were measured from. There is approximately a one metre drop from Georgia Street, which helps preserve the views under the tower, and an alternative base-grade measurement would require lowering the building by about one metre. The floor -to-ceiling height is 8'6" for consistency with the other Georgia Street towers; and to provide air conditioning which limits possibilities for reducing the height.

The landscaping is linked block to block, with pools tumbling down from Georgia Street. The Cardero/Georgia Streets' corner area has notable signage so the whole corner feature is being developed. The future transit rights-of-way 33 ft. easements allow for an interesting entry court for the building. In the west lawn area, the sunny patio links to the activity area of the building. A transition area to Building C is being resolved. There is a strong mandate from the client for two caretakers' suites to serve as concierge, one at level one and one at level 2, stepped back so the view is maintained. The energy calculation for the tower glazing is well within the requirement.

- **Panel Comments**

The Panel complimented the applicant on a good presentation and were supportive of a high quality, elegant project which will give people renting access to living in the Bayshore development. Members supported taking the height measurement from Georgia Street: the double-height space was seen as well proportioned to the overall scale and it fits well into the concept of Bayshore Gardens; and the project evolves the family of towers and anchors this prominent corner. Fire Services' access from Georgia Street was interpreted in two ways: one positive, giving rise to further pedestrian access, and the other negative, perceiving a need for a more subtle entry, like stepping stones, which should be surrounded with greenery. Some members suggested the cul-de-sac on the east side could be better shared with pedestrians with paving to suit, and another thought that the Georgia Street sidewalk should curve around the corner at Cardero Street, in harmony with the signage, which would give better pedestrian access from Georgia Street. A member suggested a focal feature on the lawn. The project was commended.