

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** July 16, 2008

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
John Wall, Chair  
Tom Bunting  
Maurice Pez  
Douglas Watts  
Bill Harrison  
Martin Nielsen (Items 1, 2 & 3 only)  
Gerry Eckford (Excused Item #3 & #5)  
David Godin

**REGRETS:**  
Mark Ostry  
Albert Bicol  
Walter Francl  
Richard Henry

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1001 Canada Place
2.	1215 Bidwell Street
3.	1255 West Pender Street
4.	1372 Seymour Street
5.	1050 Expo Boulevard
6.	4453 Main Street

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Wall 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: 1001 Canada Place  
DE: 412140  
Description: To develop the water lot immediately north of the Vancouver Convention and Exhibition Centre with a Marine Terminal (Sea Plane operations) and a Marina, having 51 berths.  
  
Zoning: CD-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership  
Owner: Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project (VCCEP)  
Review: First  
Delegation: Frank Musson, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership  
Renate Solivar, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership  
Graham Clarke, Harbour Navigation  
  
Staff: Ralph Segal

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, introduced this project for the water based component which was always part of the master plan for the Convention Centre. There were a set of Guidelines put in place regarding extending the public realm as much as possible along the waterfront.

Using the context model, Mr. Segal described the project noting the stairs and elevator connection to the Convention Centre. One of the main principles of the Guidelines was to achieve as much public access to the water as possible. While the public can walk around the entire site at the main concourse level, the limitation on the public access at seawall level and to the wharfs does have some limitations. There is public access to a floating dock whereby the public can get around to both elevators. There is an office component for the private marina. A public dock and possible retail are located next to the float plane terminal. A pedestrian ferry to Coal Harbour and Stanley Park is also planned. Mr. Segal noted that in terms of its layout and the elements that are contained in the proposal there is a good response to the Guidelines.

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

- The specific architectural design and overview of the structures; and
- The architecture of the vertical circulation elements (elevators, bridges, etc).

Mr. Segal took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Frank Musson, Architect, further described the proposal noted that there are three levels. The convention centre, the convention centre loading and public access. There will be a loading bay to service the sea plane facility and the retail components and another loading bay to service the private marina. There will be a public drop-off and pick-up area on the south side of the Convention Centre which will be used by the public for access to the seaplane terminal and marina. Parking will be located in the Convention Centre's parking facility. Mr. Musson described the design for the stair elevator towers. He also described the layout and construction of the docks and structures. In noted that the seaplane terminal has been designed as a gateway building.

Mr. Musson noted that Harbour Cruises will have a pickup and drop off location at the west end of the marina. The layout of the seaplanes is sole driven by the length of the winds and manoeuvring area.

Mr. Musson took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to enhance the public realm treatment and architectural interest for the bridges, stairs and ramps that connect to the waterfront walkway and convention centre levels.
  - Provide durable and attractive cladding materials for all floating buildings.
  - Consider providing a more convenient drop off area at the parking level for arriving and departing passengers.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that the complete project has a complex set of programs and overall the new addition works well with the whole project.

The Panel thought the proposal would fit well within the existing circulation patterns for the Convention Centre. However, the Panel was very concerned with the long walk from the drop-off area to the seaplane terminal but were pleased that people would be able to walk through the upper plaza and be protected from the weather. One Panel member noted that there is a need to get people closer to the planes in an easy way adding that it didn't seem to be a priority in the design. Several Panel members asked the applicant to explore ways to bring taxis or the drop off area deeper into the building. The Panel liked the vertical circulation and stairs and thought that they had a light expression. One Panel member suggested adding a viewing platform to the east tower.

The Panel thought the workshop building was not as well developed as the other buildings and needed to be celebrated as a workshop. One Panel member suggested making the interior of the workshop visible to the public. The Panel had doubts about how the workshop building's glass roof would be detailed and were not sure how it would look as a large light box.

The Panel liked that the architecture and structures were not similar to the Convention Centre. They thought they had been dealt with in a playful way with different expressions but read as a group because of the similar materials being used. They thought the varied building expressions related well to the industrial waterfront language and setting of the harbour. The Panel liked the vertical circulation and stairwells and that they were as light as possible, however a few panel members thought that the bridges could use materials that are distinct from the convention centre so that they are celebrated as distinct structural elements and add to the pedestrian interest along the waterfront walkway One Panel member suggested adding a viewing area to the east tower. They also liked that the ramps were long noting that at high tide a longer ramp would improve access for people with limited mobility.

The Panel members had some concerns with some of the proposed materials. They were concerned about the durability of the proposed use of galvanized metal and thought it may not weather well in the salt water environment.

One Panel member was concerned about the public realm and hoped that the budget and time constraints didn't interfere with the quality of the public circulation space. Another Panel member noted that it would be important to add some benches and other elements to the public realm and encouraged the applicant to take another look at the detailed

design of the public realm treatment. Several panel members noted that more pedestrian scaled elements and architectural details would improve the quality of the project in this prime waterfront location and make it seem less austere.

The applicant was commended for using the inter-tidal habit skirt and thought that this would add to the public realm quality and interest. One Panel member noted that it was a missed opportunity to not put more visible sustainability features into the structures.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Musson thanked the Panel and said he appreciated their comments.

---

2. Address:	1215 Bidwell Street
DE:	RZ
Description:	To develop a 20 storey mixed residential/commercial building.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Henriquez & Partners Architects
Owner:	Millennium Properties
Review:	First
Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez & Partners Architects Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Shahram Malek, Millennium Properties Limited
Staff:	Michael Naylor/Ralph Segal

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**

- **Introduction:** Michael Naylor, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for the site at the corner of Davie and Bidwell Streets. It is currently zoned C-5 and will be rezoned to CD-1. The building is to be demolished except for the façade on the C-listed heritage structure that fronts onto Bidwell Street. The site was subject to a DE a year ago that didn't make it to an application. The design would retain the façade and part of the building with a new tower development. The proposal was put through a public consultation process and the result was that the public wasn't interested in the bonusing that was being requested for the site. Staff concurred and the proponent was instructed to consider a more generous public benefits package.

The current proposal is for 5.67 FSR and is the reason for the rezoning. The height requested is 210 feet which is the discretionary height limit under the C-5 zoning. The development includes retention of the heritage façade and a housing benefit in the form of 33 market rental units that will be within the 3-storey podium. A condominium tower will contain 50 units. The application has been through a public open house process and is one of three towers that are currently being proposed in the west end. The public reaction has been that there is support for the heritage retention as well as support for the project providing rental housing. There is currently no housing on the site so this would be a net gain of 33 rental units in the West End. The West End residents are concerned that with the addition of the tower there will be a wall of towers down by the bay that will block out views. The proposal has been to the Heritage Commission and was supported.

Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner further described the proposal. In terms of the overall composition of the proposal, there will be a podium with ground floor retail and rental units and a condominium tower. The rental units are smaller and are intended to be affordable. In terms of the proposal, it is staffs opinion that the tower will not have a huge impact on the neighbouring buildings. The proposed tower is of a smaller floor plate and has been shaped so that views are not impacted from surrounding buildings. There are three elements of the proposal; there is the heritage component; the rental housing; and the green component. The project is targeting LEED™ Gold.

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

1. Density and Form of Development:
  - Has the increased density been absorbed within an overall building massing and height so as to create an appropriate "fit" with the surrounding context?
  - Has the increased height to 210 ft been "earned"?
2. Heritage:

- Does the proposed restoration of the Mission Revival-style façade achieve a worthy integration of the heritage component within the overall proposal?
3. Architectural and Sustainability:
- The Panel's comment is sought on the overall architectural expression and the proposed LEED™ Gold target.

Mr. Naylor and Mr. Segal took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Gregory Henriquez, Architect, described the architecture for the proposal. He said they wanted to bring some of the history of the neighbourhood in to the design. In terms of the rental suites, they will stay rental in perpetuity. Mr. Henriquez noted that in terms of the sustainability program the project is almost LEED™ Platinum. There is everything from water retention, green walls, low-flush toilet, planted walls, and geo-exchange for the heating and cooling of the building. Mr. Henriquez said that saving the façade was the meaningful part of the project.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the "sky gardens" which are large patios imbedded into the side of the building. Mr. Kreuk also described the green walls that will extend up the tower and terminate at the penthouse level. Rainwater will be collected at the top of the tower and then work its way to the cistern in the underground parking level and will be used for irrigation of the gardens.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Design development to the Davie Street façade of the rental building; and
  - Design development to better integrate the heritage façade into the overall massing. Consider putting a retail use behind the heritage facade rather than the proposed residential lobby.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant for their presentation. However, the Panel would like to have seen more context plans to understand the relationships with adjacent buildings.

The Panel liked the massing of the tower but were disappointed with the design of the rental building. They thought it was more typical of 1950's rental buildings. However the Panel supported the rental units noting that there is a shortage of affordable housing in the city.

The Panel thought the project was a good fit with the neighbourhood and supported the height and density with several members saying that it could go higher. One Panel member stated that the architect had minimized the impact on views from the surrounding buildings with the building's sculpted massing.

The Panel were pleased to see that the heritage façade would be retained and restored but several panel members thought some work needed to be done to fit the heritage façade into the building. They thought it should read more as a building rather than a façade against the tower element. They also thought it was unfortunate to have the facade as the private lobby entrance for the building and given the historic buildings importance to the neighbourhood they thought it should have a more public use. A few panel members suggested putting a coffee shop or other retail use behind the heritage façade.

The Panel commended the applicant for pursuing LEED™ Gold and hoped they could pull off all the sustainable features especially with the amount of glass on the west façade. One Panel member noted that this was the first project that really demonstrated green design.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for their comments stating that they will endeavour to make the design better.

---

3. Address:	1255 West Pender Street
DE:	411500
Description:	To develop this site with a 14-storey residential/office building over 4 storeys of underground parking
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	W.T. Leung Architects
Owner:	Cabmerl Industries Ltd.
Review:	Second (First review was Preliminary: Oct 24/07)
Delegation:	Barry Krause, W.T. Leung Architects Henning Knoetzele, W.T. Leung Architects Gerry Eckford, Eckford & Associates
Staff:	Ralph Segal

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, noted that proposal was previously reviewed by the Panel in October as a Preliminary Application and was supported. The application also went to the Development Permit Board and was approved. Mr. Segal noted that the restoration on the Evergreen building next door has been completed. The Evergreen building is a recent landmark heritage building. Using the context and architectural models, Mr. Segal described the surrounding developments and the form of development for the site.

Mr. Segal noted that at the previous review, the Panel commented that there was some design development needed on West Pender Street with the integration of the Evergreen Building entry and some architectural treatment on both West Pender and West Hastings Streets in terms of the façade detailing. There has been an effort to open up the ground floor on West Pender Street with respect to the entry lobby. The façade detailing has been simplified and in addition the two storey commercial has also been simplified. The amount of spandrel glass on the facing walls to the Palladio has been maximized for privacy. The Panel was concerned with the gap between the two buildings, which is a 4 foot setback on the Evergreen property, noting possible CPTED issues. There has been a discussion between the owners of the Evergreen Building and the subject site on how to resolve the CPTED issues.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Barry Krause, Architect, gave more details regarding the Panel's previous comments. He noted the entry has been simplified and matched to the plaza of the Evergreen Building to give a more open space at street level. Regarding the gap, the owner of the Evergreen Building has agreed to maintain security gates on the West Pender Street side and they will coordinate landscaping in the open plaza. On the West Hastings Street side the gap has to remain open. In terms of treatment, there isn't anything that can be done as the proposal is on the Evergreen's property line and any treatment would encroach on their property.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, noted the landscaping on the east façade had stayed the same but the green roof is no longer being considered due to the nature of the structure. The other changes are on the plaza in front of the Evergreen Building so they are seen as a single plaza. The water features has been redeveloped to bring more activity and light to the area. Also benches have been added to the corner of the plaza.



- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Attention to CPTED issues in the gap on West Hastings Street; and
  - Consider Design development to the commercial base of the building.
  - Provide additional architectural details for the roof top trellis.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and agreed that the applicant had addressed the Panel's concerns from the last review.

The Panel thought it was a nice, handsome, little building and responded well to the Evergreen Building and the Paladio.

The Panel felt it would be important how the gap was screened from West Pender Street and that it would be important that the detailing of the gate was well done. They also thought the CPTED issues needed to be taken care of from the West Hastings Street side. One Panel member suggested being able to see through the gap.

The Panel liked the entrances off West Hastings Street and liked the simplification of the building. A few Panel members thought that the upper roof top trellis needed to read as a thin element and well designed element. One Panel member didn't like the bicycle storage being on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> levels of the underground parking. A couple of Panel members were concerned with the commercial space and wasn't sure how well it would work. One Panel member thought the blank wall on West Pender Street was a bit severe.

The Panel agreed that the plaza off West Pender Street had been improved as the water feature separated the entrance making it better organized.

The Panel didn't have a problem with the loss of the green roof although one Panel member was disappointed with the lack of sustainable measures in the project noting that it was a good thing it was an east façade.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Krause said he appreciated the comments noting that the last round helped improve the project and he would take the comments to heart and keep improving on the design.

---

4. Address:	1372 Seymour Street
DE:	412219
Description:	To construct a 33 storey tower residential building containing a 37 space child daycare on the ground floor of the podium level. The proposal includes a 10% heritage density transfer and a additional density for the daycare.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Preliminary
Architect:	Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden
Owner:	Onni Development (Pacific Street)
Review:	First
Delegation:	Alan Boniface, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects Brady Dunlop, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architects Mike Clark, Onni Development
Staff:	Anita Molaro

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a tower at the corner of Pacific and Seymour Streets. The proposal is a preliminary application because there is an amenity being proposed within the complex. The process is that the application starts as a Preliminary Development Permit Application and then goes to Council for an endorsement of the amenity proposal and then will come back to the Urban Design Panel as a Complete Application.

The site has 300' frontage and is immediately adjacent to the Seymour Street off-ramp. Using the context model, Ms. Molaro described the surrounding developments and the form of development for the site. The applicant is including a 10% heritage density transfer and is also requesting a bonus density for providing a daycare and some daycare offices. The building is slightly over the 300' and has a parapet of 310' and the mechanical room enclosure making the height 326'.

The daycare amenity is located on the main floor immediately adjacent to the social housing project next door. The main entry is from the street and the play area is located at the rear.

The tower is been located to fit between the view cone and respond to an 80' separation with building opposite. The typical the plate is about 6,600 square feet and is slightly more than the guideline recommendation of 6,500 square feet. Mrs. Molaro noted that the intent of the guidelines is for compact, slim towers with small floor plates to minimize shadowing and maximizing separation and views between buildings and to reduce privacy and overlook impacts. Ms. Molaro described the layout of the suites in the tower and the townhouses.

The applicant is proposing a unique orientation of the entry elements for the grade level townhouses along Seymour Street as they are on a diagonal. The also there is an internal entry within the courtyard.

The proposal has incorporated a number of sustainable features. This includes a shared outdoor space in the courtyard, single loaded corridors, roof top garden area, green wall treatments, removable shade screens, slab projections, deep balconies and horizontal shades devices.

---

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

Does the site and the proposal (form of development) support the additional height (326 ft) and density being sought - 10% heritage density and bonus density for the provision of the daycare for a total of FSR of 6.77?

Is the tower placement (separation from other buildings) and tower form (dimensional attributes and floor plate size), supportable within the context of the guidelines, in achieving a neighbourly urban design response taking into consideration privacy, views, and the intent for slim towers in Downtown South?

Other comments sought from the panel:

- Public realm/street wall response for the Seymour and Pacific Street frontages and lane interface with 501 Pacific Avenue;
- Landscape treatments; and
- Sustainability attributes.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Alan Boniface, Architect, further described the project noting the façade became the focus of the architecture. Off Seymour Street there is a slot which allows the tower to be experienced from Pacific Street. Mr. Boniface noted that they tried to respond to the Granville Bridge off-ramp with the façade treatment. They oriented the ground floor suites towards the slot and out towards the light and the view. In addition to the floating façade there are a series of screens that are galvanized moveable screens which allow for manipulation of light and western-southern sun. The courtyard which is visible from the street with gates for access during the day. Mr. Boniface noted that in terms of sustainability, the project is a targeted LEED™ Gold building with solar panels on the roof. The building will also be geothermally heated and cooled. One of the roof gardens is dedicated to growing food and is connected into a kitchen and dining amenity. The daycare was located in the area where there is the most morning and evening sun.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. He noted that water elements will be used at the entry points with a reflecting pool along the daycare area. The roof top amenity space will be used for urban agriculture and a place for barbeques and gatherings. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Stoyko noted the living green wall and rainwater capture on the green roof areas.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider mirroring the southwest side of the tower, so that the proposed west façade looks south. This is to reduce the amount of west facing glass and increase privacy for the lower tower units facing the courtyard.
  - Design development to the southwest facing tower units on levels 4-8 to reduce over-look from the common exterior walkways and improve privacy for the main living spaces of the units.
  - Consider more sustainable measures regarding rain water capture.
  - Design development to the urban agriculture to integrate better with the amenity space.
  - Design development to the preschool open outdoor area to address adjacency issues with the neighbouring social housing development.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant for their overall design approach and the level of their presentation.

The Panel thought the applicant had approached the project with some interesting forms and spaces on a rather challenges site. The Panel commended the applicant on their overall design approach and supported the massing and height and as well they thought the project had earned the additional FSR.

The Panel thought the project would be a dynamic tower as seen from the Granville Street Bridge. Most of the Panel encouraged the applicant to look at the west facing façade and rotate that face of tower to the south for a better passive design response to solar heat gain. They felt the façade created an interesting urban form from the bridge but that the alternate form would alleviate the long façade seen from the tower across the lane. They also noted that there weren't a lot of units getting the west view.

Although the Panel supported the daycare use they acknowledged that it was a tough adjacency to the social housing site. The Panel supported the drop-off for the daycare being in the underground parking area as there wouldn't be any place to park on Seymour Street.

The Panel felt there were some conflicts on the lower floors with living rooms looking across the courtyard into the circulation space and suggested the principle rooms should be oriented towards the lane and not into the circulation space. One Panel member was concerned with the townhouses fronting Seymour Street noting that if there was to be a streetcar stop outside it would change the experience of the corner townhouse.

The Panel liked the landscaping and noted that the applicant had gained a lot of good public realm coming off the ramp. They liked the ground plain landscaping stating that as much green should be used as possible especially against the ramp. They also thought the privacy and views had been well handled. Several Panel members suggested some design development to the urban agriculture by integrating it better into the general amenity space in the outdoor area. One Panel member suggested adding seating on the roof decks as well as a shading structure. Also it was noted that the patio for the townhouse on the corner of the lane didn't have enough privacy.

The Panel commended the applicant for the sustainable measures and targeting LEED™ Gold. One Panel member encouraged the applicant to look further at rain water capture and find a way to fit in a cistern or use the water features for water collection. One Panel member noted that the green walls needed to be thought about regarding watering adding that there is nothing worse than a dead green wall. Another Panel member suggested bumping up the acoustical level on the window wall facing the Seymour Street frontage to help the liveability of the units.

**Applicant's Response:** Mr. Boniface thanked the Panel for their comments.

---

5. Address:	1050 Expo Boulevard
DE:	412190
Description:	Social and supportive housing.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	Second (First Review: June 18, 2008)
Delegation:	Dane Jensen, DYS Architecture Gerry Eckford, Eckford & Associates Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Recollective (Sustainability)
Staff:	Anita Molaro

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)**

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for one of the 12 social housing sites that Council recently endorsed. The Panel did not support the application at the previous review. Ms. Molaro summarized their comments noting that the biggest difficulty with the design was the non-responsiveness to the particular orientations of the building particularly on the south façade. The Panel also thought there was a need for design development to the north façade. There were some concern regarding the extension of the brick wall and how it didn't express itself. Overall the Panel thought that general massing was supportable but there was an attribute that wasn't working. They felt that the integration of the amenity spaces on the ground floor and the landscaping was well done.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Dane Jensen, Architect, described the changes that had been made to the design since the previous review. He noted that the primary changes from the previous submission were really focused towards the south elevation and the comments towards offering some solar protection to the south facing units. As a large portion of the units are on the south side, the Panel had thought that the building needed to take advantage of the view and that exposure. In addition there were comments about the way the building configured itself, in response to the neighbourhood and street network. The intent of the design all along was to have the brick façade relate to Expo Boulevard and to Pacific Boulevard and in this case to extend the brick façade and use the brick structure to support the solar tubes. Mr. Jensen added that they have now done further research and found that they can get solar gain out of the solar tubes on the building and can justify the cost. On the back of the brick wall, as it extends past the building, is the structure to support the masonry wall as well as an opportunity to provide access to maintain the solar panels. The primary concern seemed to be the texture and the amount of animation related to that wall. Mr. Jensen stated that they are using colour and extending it all the way for variety. The window proportions are such to reflect Yaletown. The overall concept is for the brick to be expressed as an element that is addressing the street and peeling away to reveal the inner portion of the building. In addition, solar panels will be added to the roof to provide some interest.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider more variety in the shading devices on the south façade, in their placement relative to the top of the windows as well as their rhythm along the elevation;
  - Consider reducing the heaviness of the solar panel support; and
  - Consider improving the language of the north-east metal clad façade so that it relates better to Yaletown.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and felt that the design had been improved.

The Panel thought there had been good improvement to the south façade and liked the curve of the building and the way it expresses itself along Pacific Boulevard. The Panel thought that adding solar shading had helped with the language and expressiveness of the project by adding more character and depth. One Panel member thought the shading devices would be more effective located on the upper mullion of the windows and should be more continuous across the south facade. A panel member noted that when you move down the building to the lower elevation there are tree canopies that will provide shading and maybe the shading can move up to the top of the window heads.

The Panel liked the extension of the wall and using it for solar heaters as they made for a nice addition regarding visible sustainability. They however, thought the backing support was too heavy. One Panel member suggested the solar tubes be more vertical in keeping with the vertical language of the building.

The Panel suggested the applicant look for possible CPTED issues on the site.

The Panel supported the new direction for the north façade, but generally thought more work needed to be done. One Panel member thought it didn't go far enough and another Panel member did not like the black patch on the north façade and suggested it needed some colour refinement. One Panel member noted that the façade still didn't have the language of Yaletown and it should have a stronger relationship to the existing urban fabric.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Jansen thanked the Panel for letting them come back for a second review in such a short time so that they could keep with their schedule. He added that there was still a lot of work to be done.

---

6. Address:	4453 Main Street
DE:	412086
Description:	To add a 4 storey addition with 1 level of underground parking. The addition will be comprised of commercial on the ground floor and 3 floors of residential containing 28 dwelling units.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Kevington Building Corp Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Tom Bell, GBL Architects Amela Brudar, GBL Architects
Staff:	Bob Adair

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced the proposal to construct a major addition to an existing building on the site to the north. The existing C-2 building was constructed in 2006. Mr. Adair described the context for the area. The original building has ground floor retail with 51 rental units on the top three floors. The proposal will continue the retail on the ground floor and the liquor store will relocate into the ground floor and as well there will be an additional 28 rental units on the upper three floors. The building will share circulation and parking and the main residential entry will remain. The parking is accessed from the lane.

The building will be of non-combustible construction; four floors of concrete. The original building was wood frame above a concrete base. As it is a long site, a different architectural expression for the addition has been created by the architects. The upper level façade treatment consists of a painted concrete frame with glass and spandrel panel infill system. There are coloured glass balcony guards of different colour but the same type of material as in the original building. On the street façade the main glazing wall of the building has been pulled back two feet from the normal build-to line and at ground level there is a steel and glass canopy system partially supported on posts.

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

- design expression of the project as a whole noting with the consolidated site this project will take up two thirds of the block on Main Street;
- the general expression of the building;
- the handling of the canopy system with the posts coming down to grade;
- any other aspects of the building.

Mr. Adair took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tom Bell, Architect, further described the proposal and noted that the building was different from the original building as they tried to express the difference with a concrete frame. As a termination of the streetscape they introduced an indent in the building to create another break along the facade. The balconies are intended to be a complimentary colour to the grey of the exterior of the building. The envelope carves the back of the building and creates individual patios for the units. There is a gardening club in the building and the gardening area will be extended with the new addition.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - The Panel had no substantial concerns with this proposal.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a wonderful addition to the existing building. The panel thought it was a great project with crisp and precise architectural details.

The Panel thought the building met the ground well and liked the simplicity of the design. They also supported the indent on the front façade with the canopy and the metal columns adding that they added another level of detail to the building.

The Panel were pleased that more rental housing would be available.

The Panel supported the materials and the colours on the project and thought they would complement the existing building.

The Panel thought it was a great idea to extend the gardening area at the rear of the building. A few Panel members were concerned about the steps down to the private patio and suggested expanding the planter for a narrow width of the stairs.

A couple of Panel members commented that they would like to see the C-2 zoning revised as they felt not being able to use the roof was a lost opportunity.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bell was happy to hear the Panel's comments on C-2 stating that this type of building could be even better.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.