

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 26, 2011

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden (Chair) (Excused Item #3)
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat (Excused Item #3)
Gregory Borowski (Excused Item #2 & #3)
James Cheng (left before 1st Item vote)
Jane Durante (Excused Item #3)
Alan Endall
David Godin
Jim Huffman (Excused Item #3)
Oliver Lang - Absent for 1st & 2nd Items (Chair - 3rd Item)
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #1)
Vladimir Mikler (Item #2 & #3)
Scott Romses
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
Jeff Corbett
Maurice Pez
Norm Shearing
Steve McFarlane

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1241 Harwood Street
2.	1304 Hornby Street
3.	Marine and Cambie Workshop

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Haden 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: 1241 Harwood Street
DE: 414280
Description: To relocate and restore the existing Heritage B house and construct a new 18-storey multiple dwelling over two levels of underground parking.
Zoning: RM-5A
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Bing Thom Architects
Owner: Acadia Development Inc.
Review: Second
Delegation: Michael Heaney, Bing Thom Architects
Eileen Keenan, Bing Thom Architects
Dan Du, Bing Thom Architects
Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg
Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architects Inc.
Staff: Sailen Black and Yardley McNeil

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that the site contains a listed heritage house and a large Tulip tree of heritage value. He described the built and policy context for the site, including the View Protection Guidelines and the District Schedule for this RM-5A site. He noted that the “Director of Planning can permit higher buildings upon consideration of all applicable policies and guidelines, the submission of nearby owners and residents, and the effect on views, light, privacy and open space”. He also noted that new towers over 110 feet should be separated by 400 feet from any other towers above the same height in the same block face. New buildings between 60 feet and 100 feet should be separated from other buildings in the same height range by at least 79 feet in all directions.

Mr. Black described the background on the proposal noting the preservation of the Tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), which is in excellent condition, has always been a central goal. The West End Guidelines ask to preserve existing streetscapes including significant trees, and the owner’s original proposal was to save both the house and tree. Heritage policy requires compensation for heritage retention, typically in the form of bonus density, however, transfer of density off site is not an option for this proposal. In 2010, Council determined that a bonus density could not be granted for a resource that cannot be fully secured.

Mr. Black noted that the applicant considered a variety of development options, before concluding that the optimal solution was for the 18-storey tower proposed here. Previous applications had been challenged by considerable neighbourhood concern and uncertainty over the security of the portion of the Tulip tree on the adjoining property.

Mr. Black noted that the original design was not supported by the Urban Design Panel at the July 2, 2008 meeting. They felt that the architectural expression did not respond well to the heritage building and they did not support the sustainability strategy. The current

application is for an 18-storey tower with smaller floor plates and a rounded plan and will be located as before on the west side of the site and close to the lane. The proposal is for the restoration of the house including eight rental units in exchange for a bonus density which will be used on the site. As the Tulip tree will be replaced, the bonus density is reduced when compared to the original proposal. Mr. Black described the architectural plans noting the solar shading proposed for the east façade, the vertical glass fins on the south facing façade and the terra cotta panels on the west facade. He also noted that at street level, the proposal creates a series of landscaped terraces rising to a reflecting pond.

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

- Whether the Panel's previous concerns have been met;
- The siting, massing and design of the new tower in relationship to
 - the heritage house and garden, and
 - private view impacts, shadowing and horizontal separation to neighbours;
- Treatment of the ground plane, landscape plan and streetscape created within context; and
- Architectural treatment of the exterior.

Ms. McNeil and Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Michael Heeney, Architect, further described the proposal noting the history of the project. He stated that after the previous review from the Panel they realized they had to reconfigure the building and they were about to resubmit when the City raised concerns about providing heritage compensation density for the tree. In the end it went to Council and they voted not to support providing heritage density for the tree. As result, the proposal has been resubmitted without retaining the tree but they will be keeping the heritage house. The tower is about the same height as in the previous submission. By taking down the tree they had the flexibility of considering putting the tower on the other side of the site. However from a heritage perspective there seem to be some logic in keeping the heritage house next to a house on the adjoining property. Mr. Heeney described the architecture noting some of the sustainable strategies including vertical fins on the west side to provide shading to the suites.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the structure of the existing landscape will be used as the basis for re-establishing an appropriate setting for the heritage house and the new tower. The existing Tulip tree will be replaced and as well a reflecting pool will be added to the base of the tower to reflect the heritage house and gardens.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider relocation of the parking garage entry to the lane and if that is not possible consider relocating the parking entry further west on Harwood Street.
 - Ensure high quality detailing of the parking entry.
 - Design development to minimize negative privacy aspects directly adjacent to the neighbour on the west.
 - Make a final evaluation whether the Tulip tree is possible to save and if not maximize the opportunity for a large scale Tulip tree replacement by ensuring adequate planting depth.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting the previous concerns had been met.

The Panel was disappointed that some of the heritage density couldn't be transferred off site but they were in support of preserving the heritage building. The Panel thought the tower was in the right location and that the relationship to the heritage building worked well. They noted that moving the core had increased the separation between the tower and the heritage house and slimming the tower had decreased the amount of density. One panel member did note that the interface with the building across the lane was a bit of a concern. Another Panel member noted that shrinking the tower floor plates helped with shadow impacts on the buildings across the lane and permitted more light into the ground plane. Most of the Panel thought the architectural treatment was well done and the project would be a good addition to the neighbourhood.

The Panel felt the garage entry interrupted the streetscape and thought that it should be moved to the lane or if not possible to move to the lane then it should be moved further west. They encouraged the applicant to minimize the impact of the entry onto the street.

Several Panel members were disappointed that the heritage Tulip tree couldn't be retained with one Panel member stating that it looked like the tree would be lost because of the parking and wanted to see the parking reconfigured to save the tree. One Panel member noted that because the base of the tree is only six feet from the property line and the root ball would be of significant size, there was some concern that should the adjacent property be developed the tree would not survive. It was noted that the reflecting pool was a nice addition and that the open lawn in front of the heritage house would be a pleasant area for the residents to use.

The Panel supported the green and sustainability strategies for the proposal and acknowledged that the applicant had made efforts to mitigate solar heat gain. One Panel member urged the applicant to go for LEED™ certification rather than LEED™ equivalency.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Heaney thought the Panel's comments were helpful. He said there was a balance to get the density on the site. Mr. Heaney thought the comments regarding the garage entrance were valid and that they need to find a location that doesn't impact the street trees.

2. Address:	1304 Hornby Street
DE:	414412
Description:	To construct a new 31-storey mixed-use building on site with 193 residential units and retail on the ground floor.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Bingham Hill Architects and Richard Henry Architect Inc.
Owner:	Concert Properties
Review:	Second
Delegation:	John Bingham, Bingham Hill Architects Richard Henry, Richard Henry Architects Inc. Farouk Babul, Concert Properties Ltd. Bjorn Richt, Recollective Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, noted that the proposal is a development permit application following rezoning. The basic form of development was discussed and supported at that time. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the future context may include the Burrard gateway application. The proposal is for a 31-storey tower with 193 residential units and three commercial retail units. There will be seven levels of underground parking and the over all height of the tower will be 309 feet. The applicant is targeting LEED™ Gold certification. Molaro noted the issues that were identified by the Panel at the rezoning stage.

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

- applicants response to the previous comments raise by the panel (rezoning conditions)
- demonstration of high quality materials and detailed treatments
 - concrete (elastomeric coating);
 - brick; and
 - aluminum and glass window systems with spandrel glazing and metal panel infill.
- detailed landscaping treatments
- sustainability attributes (LEED™ Gold targeted by applicant - Note: At the time of rezoning LEED™ Silver was the minimum requirement)

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Richard Henry, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they determined the height of the building to be around 300 feet. The building is optimized for two high speed elevators and if they had added any more height they would have had to go to three elevators which would decrease the efficiency of the floor plate. They wanted to create a relatively affordable building, so the units are compact and simple in form. They also wanted to be respectful of the neighbours which they took into consideration when they designed the podium. They maintained 70 feet from the Viva tower and there is about 65 feet to Hornby Court. However there won't be any windows on that façade so there are no privacy concerns. All the bays, balconies and windows were stacked to make a vertical expression except the south west bays which are horizontal to emphasis that the central form as being more vertical. He noted that they will be hiring an artist and are working to identify a location for the art piece. Mr. Henry stated that regarding the sustainability strategy they will be LEED™ Gold registered. They incorporated as much green roof as possible while still having some area for an outdoor

amenity space. Rainwater will be captured and stored in a cistern for irrigation. The parking has been reduced and they have included two co-op cars and as well bike storage will be included.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, noted that the City was looking for bike racks and seating along the bike lane and will be located on the Hornby Street frontage in the boulevard strip. The landscape is straight forward on the ground plane following the City standard. Mr. Hemstock described the proposed materials noting the residential entry will have planter pots that are lit from above and from below. The terrace has been broken up into three zones. The first zone is opposite the amenity area and is more of an open space with a bench, a barbeque and a fire pit. The mid zone is framed by the three benches and plantings for a social gathering spot. The third space is adjacent to the outside edge and is a more quiet space and will include urban agriculture.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to refine and simplify the tower's base material, colour palette to enhance the visual autonomy and presence of the contrasting shadow boxes.
 - Design development to simplify the tower top.
 - Design development to enhance the responses of the tower facades to sustainable considerations.
 - Design development to corner at grade. This should include consideration of weather protection and integration of art.
 - Design development to further enhance the verticality of the tower expression.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposed and thought it was a well considered building.

The Panel said they appreciated the simplicity of the building and supported the verticality in the form but encouraged the applicant to go further. They thought they could express something on the outside to express a shadow line. They liked the shadow boxes and suggested the applicant add a couple more to the tower. One Panel member noted that it would be interesting to see how the artist dealt with the relationship with the shadow boxes while a couple of other Panel members thought the shadow boxes could be playful elements and where colour could be used. It was noted that if this was not a landmark building but more of a background building that needs to fit into the fabric of the neighbourhood. A couple of Panel members noted that there was too much effort at the top of the building while several other Panel members thought there needed to be some work on the corner for some strength in the design. One Panel member suggested the corner was a good place for public art.

Several Panel members noted that the scheme had improved from moving the amenity up in the building and instead adding retail to the ground floor to animate the street. A couple of Panel members noted that the building needed rain protection and thought it could be part of the public art component.

The Panel thought the colour and materials were quite conventional and would like to see a bolder expression with a couple of Panel members stating that the colours could be more monochromatic.

A couple of Panel members wanted the applicant to be more inventive to the ground plane although most of the Panel thought the landscape treatment looked interesting. One Panel member was concerned that the private patio spaces could be over programmed.

Regarding sustainability, one Panel member would like to see the principles demonstrated in the building and that the facades were not helping with the sunlight angle. A couple of Panel members thought the south west façade might be a challenge for the energy target considering the amount of glazing.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henry said they appreciated the Panel's comments and would take them back to the drawing board.

3. Address:	Marine and Cambie Workshop
DE:	N/A
Description:	To seek input and advice as to the best options from an urban design perspective focusing on the Marine Drive and Cambie Street intersection.
Zoning:	N/A
Application Status:	Non voting workshop
Architect:	N/A
Owner:	N/A
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Peter Busby, Busby Perkins & Will Architects Ryan Bragg, Busby Perkins & Will Architects Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architects
Staff:	Scot Hein and Jim Bailey

EVALUATION: Non-Voting Workshop

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the presentation

Jim Bailey

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect,

PCI,

Intercorp

Wesgroup

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
- **Related Commentary:**

Alan - bit of sense because of the importance of the Cambie Corridor seems to be a preoccupation with the north south axis of Cambie - real challenge - look at the diagram at the marine and cambie as the sense of place - gateway - look at marine drive as a real barrier - how to deal with some of those connection challenges across marine dr - ped connections across cambie is really challenge - those challenges are taking attention away from the importance about the east west relationship to the neighbourhoods - there are four guardrants - its about strengthening the cambie connection to the waterfront - not as much thought being given to the neighbours to the east and west - without a strong sense about those connections - at street level those east west connections need to be reinforced - east west feeders -

hopefully the cambie corridor can become the heart of this community - that is challenged by the Canada line - fences along cambie -

Arno - feeling positive about the direction - breaking down the massing - slenderness of the towers are positive moves - setting the bldg back from the street on the incorp site - softening the ped - good moves - share concerns with the east west connections - would be interesting to put more weight on marine dr - interesting views that Walter put up - study in plan - interesting for the next level - views down the arteries and how to address them in a three dimensional way - how the Canada line cuts over cambie as it gets to the river - like the sequential parks - sympathetic to the residents in the area - could be good - height - prominent area - more prominent than langara gardens - emphasis the prominence of this intersection

Geoff - echo the previous panel members - support the density - marine dr - public access - hard stop at Kent st at the rail tracks - helpful to have some access and public amenities - getting across marine and dev cambie corridor is an issue - otherwise the support height density and scaling up and trying to dev as a node as a visual entry into Vancouver - could be an interesting spot -

Robert - framework - diagrams are strong and illustrate a permeability that could be achieved - the cambie corridor moving thru this precinct and terminating at the river - see it in plan but don't see it in model - overhead guideway into the grade, narrow street below marine - cambie corridor - suggest maybe its time to look at the solutions and see how some of those problems could be healed in an interesting way - could be more interesting than the heritage boulevard - strongly encourage to look beyond the diagrams and look at it in cross section - the other thing seems to be a reluctance to dog leg to the west instead of going all the way to water - would like to see cambie go straight on the cambie - pci site is turning its back on cambie - should be one more look to see if it could better engage cambie st - attempt with art walk to heal that - focus on the corner - the wesgroup site - think there needs to be some intermediate transition to the residential - the bldg could step down and meet the park - tower and hierarchy on the corner - the pci site is the dominate site and the way it is stepping down makes sense - agree they should be taller than bldgs at 52nd - not sure what the heights should be but generally support the height

David - can't divorce the corridor from the intersection - taking the cross town scale (a better Broadway) and have that be a different north south - impossible to look at this intersection excluding what would come about in the 2nd and 3rd phase - the heights and the ground uses - in light of the illustrations showing the different aspects - land use at grade doesn't tie into the best practice - is this a corridor with nodes or a nodal corridor - the massing is appropriate - don't think what is proposed for the cambie corridor - use close to station not the best - space between station not the best - this is becoming a primary street - the small details fade in the background - the much larger moves - something goes down to the river - cambie continues to downtown - the arbitrary nature of this first phase - has to be bigger - what has been proposed is responding to a valid concerns with over shadowing, having connections to the street - better intersections - think of this as a vibrant ped and cyclist street - valid - sidewalk width beside the station

Alan - agree one of the big problems is marine drive - east west crossing - ped crossing - how difficult that is to deal with - busy street - important - running corridor right down to the water - public and social space - because of transit - whole other piece of fabric - nice that a cinema theatre is going in there - other cultural amenities could be planned in to it -

Scott - finely great to see the 3 entities come together and see it on the model - can see what this node might want to be - big picture - what is Marpole - what is going to set it to be different - hard to image what that would be - abstract at the moment - this is a two node scheme - important need to create a heart of some kind at the waters edge - unique identity of

this part of the city - industrial heritage of the area - its about the intersection - another node at the waterfront - need to create a strong connection - then it plugs into the cambie corridor - appreciate all the diagrams - like the idea that there would be a series of green space - expanding the green space is essential - something that could make this different - social amenity - this corridor could be an interplay of hard space and strong commercial that reinforces the corridor - the westgroup project was a nice idea - taking a significant amenity and making it a prominent part of the project on the park - think from a social and urban sense there needs to be a stronger sense of public amenity through the other parcels and the whole corridor - challenging corridor - the intercrop site maybe started to set up a right approach to cambie - created a breathing space - ped bike spine - unfortunate why the bldgs didn't support that - could hold that new ped spine in a strong commercial way - how that idea could lead through the pci site - should the ped connection to the river go through the pci site or thru the station - would like to see that idea explored - would put emphasis back on the pci site - fine on the pci site - don't like the dog leg and terminating into the bus loop - idea of bridging to the water edge is unfortunate - maybe there is another way to do that - height and density - no problem height - still uncomfortable with the density - look at the 3 projects together - 1 tower on the pci that transition to a mid block along Cambie might be a better transition - cross roads anchored by 3 towers could be an elegant - tall blgs that replicate out doesn't feel right yet

Vlad - supportable of its height and density - pci seems dominate on its own but adding the other projects it fits better - create the heart - if you take the Canada line this is the last think you see before you go into the tunnel - important how it is handled - relationship between the sites - the three teams work together - solution - don't have to be identical but there is a form of connection between them - the impact of the Marine dr - highway - how it intersects in this element - want it to be a - considered some ped over pass - might be one of the practical solutions - over come barrier and get some connectivity

Oliver - Issue of topology is not resolved - how they meet ground and how the transition into the adjacent neighbourhood - social part of the community - largely undefined - great opportunity - see how they can transition - terrace into the neighbourhoods - nodal relationship

- **Applicant's Response:**

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.