

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 16, 2011

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski
Jane Durante (Excused Item #1)
Alan Endall
Jim Huffman
Arno Matis
Geoff McDonell
Scott Romses (Chair)

GUEST PANEL:
Richard Henriquez

REGRETS:
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett
Norm Shearing
Alan Storey
Bing Thom (Guest Panelist)

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 1290 Burrard Street and 1281 Hornby Street |
| 2. | 1050 Expo Boulevard |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Romses called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. **Address:** 1290 Burrard Street and 1281 Hornby Street
DE: Rezoning
Use: To provide a mixed-use multi-tower development with a total FSR of 11.96 (825,500 square feet) an a maximum height of 534 feet.
Zoning: DD to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning
Review: Second
Architect: IBI/HB Architects
 Jim Hancock , IBI/HB Architects
 Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects
Delegation: Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Architects
 Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
 Jon Stovell, Reliance Holdings Ltd.
 Michael Lee, Jim Pattison Development Ltd.
Staff: Ralph Segal and Karen Hoesel

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)**Introduction:**

Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner introduced the proposal for a mixed-use tower development. He noted that there were two architectural models for the panel to view; the current scheme and the previous scheme. Mr. Segal did a recap of the previous UDP meeting and asked the Panel to comment on whether the new scheme was supportable under the High Building Policy, not only in terms of its use, density and height but also in terms of its architectural excellence and sustainability strategy. Mr. Segal also described the details of the High Building Policy noting that the Policy seeks a new benchmark for creativity, well contributing to the beauty and power of the skyline. He also noted that in terms of sustainability, the City is trying to approach carbon neutrality in new buildings with a stated goal of forty to fifty percent reduction in energy consumption from 2010 levels. He remarked that there are also some public realm objectives in the High Building Policy.

Mr. Segal stated that from a staff's perspective they are pleased that some substantive moves have been made on the design of the project. He indicated that the design of the Toyota showroom has been revised in response to the Panel's commentary, and as well, there is now an increase in the setbacks on both Burrard and Drake Streets, and a canopy has been added and certain features have been enhanced. Mr. Segal mentioned that the shorter residential tower basically took on the same expression as the landmark tower in the previous submission, and has now been revised to show a very different character and expression. Also, there have been some modifications and refinements to the landmark tower to create two different expressions to the residential towers, as well as to the office tower.

Mr. Segal indicated that the Panel had suggested that either a public plaza or stronger public connection be considered at the corner and down through the project into the lane. The applicant has provided an angled setback to the dealership on Drake Street, and in terms of the landmark tower, the concrete lattice has now been taken straight down to grade with an intervening entrance canopy. In terms of the easterly lane and the Drake Street corner, a

triangular open space has been provided and across the lane an increase in the setback to create a sense of public space on Drake Street. Mr. Segal noted that there were a number of comments from the Panel regarding the podium massing on Hornby Street and internally along the lane. There have been a number of changes, including the expression of the lower residential tower, which carries through into the podium element which has been changed to just a single breezeway at grade. Also, on the lane side, the podium facade has been canted back to get more light and air into the lane which is intended for greater pedestrian use.

Mr. Segal remarked that the top of the tower has been revised to lessen the shadow impacts on the corner of Davie and Burrard Streets. The Panel also asked for wider sidewalks and weather protection, which has been added to the revised scheme. Mr. Segal stated that the project has been registered with the Canadian Green Building Council and numerous sustainable initiatives have been taken, including solar control and capturing excess heat and distributing it through the mixed-uses of the project. He added that the applicant is also undertaking energy modeling.

Mr. Segal noted that the gallery and daycare has been removed from the project, as the City is not seeking these uses at this particular location. However, other community amenities will be added during the rezoning stage. Mr. Segal noted that a grocery store will be incorporated into the site on the Hornby Street side.

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

1. Revisions in Response to the Panel's Previous Comments:

a) Toyota Showroom:

Do the revisions achieve the design intent for this prominent corner?

b) Tower Expression:

Have the design changes to the residential towers achieved an individual identity and a "calming" of the landmark tower's expression?

c) Public Realm:

On the Drake Street, does the proposed setback of the Toyota Showroom provide a useful public space in conjunction with the triangular open space across the lane?

d) Podium Massing and Setbacks:

Have the revisions to the podium on Hornby Street and the lane achieved an improved pedestrian scale and public realm interface?

2. Does this revised scheme meet the objectives for Architectural Excellence and Sustainability set out in the High Building Policy?

Mr. Segal and Ms. Hoese took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Jim Hancock, Architect, indicated that they have tried to edit the overall scheme while keeping and strengthening the parts of the design that are rich and highly visible from the Burrard Bridge. They increased the width of the sidewalks to give more room to the public realm. He noted that the lower level of the Toyota Showroom has been brought down, and the

cars will be displayed on a ramp system that is at the same level as the sidewalk. The office tower has been edited back a bit and is not as complex a design as previously seen by the Panel. In addition, solar devices have been added for shading, and they have also changed the back elevation to give it a more solid appearance. Loading has been put below grade for the residential buildings which resulted in opening up the interior courtyard which is now more pedestrian oriented. As well, the massing has been changed to allow the towers to come right to the ground in places instead of simply on top of the podiums.

Martin Bruckner, Architect, described the architecture noting that the north side of the office tower will be a combination of stone and glass. The corner of the towers faces south, and for that reason, they have included verticals and horizontals on some of the facades that led to the development of the structural lattice expression. Mr. Bruckner added that they are also commissioning a wind study for the tower to make sure there aren't any down drafts on the face of the tower. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Bruckner, stated that they have run a preliminary computer analysis on the previous scheme and haven't been able to run one on the current scheme as yet. They want to make sure they meet the energy aspirations and the City's requirements. The previous scheme met the requirements, and they are certain that the new scheme will also. He added that they have a sustainability consultant on the project and will meet the 40-50% energy reductions over the 2010 levels. They have consulted a structural engineer regarding the slab extension of the lattice feature, and they will be able to achieve a thermal break to reduce the energy loss due to thermal bridging. Mr. Bruckner noted that they have permeability through the site from Hornby Street to Burrard Street and that there is more opportunity for pedestrians in the lane as the podium has been moved back.

Gwyn Vose, Architect, presented a video presentation using the month of June to show the shadow impacts on the streets and the intersection of Burrard and Davie Streets. Mr. Vose showed the maximum amount of shadow decrease which is a result of the sculpturing of the buildings form at the top of the towers. He added that any subsequent change to the shadow impacts would result in changing the tower floor plate.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to the architectural expression of the showroom to make it more of a glass "jewel box";
- Design development to the office tower in terms of the architectural design excellence;
- Consider improving the shadow impacts on the Burrard and Davie Street's corner.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had taken the Panel's previous comments seriously.

The Panel appreciated how the applicant had addressed the Panel's previous concerns and they thought the changes were very positive. They agreed that the massing, density, and general response to the zoning was supportable and that the disposition of the three buildings made sense.

They supported the interface with the public realm for the Toyota Showroom and how it addresses the corner and thought the design had been greatly improved. A couple of Panel members thought the Toyota Showroom should be more of a glass 'jewel-box' as they thought it read more like a podium engaged with the office tower. One Panel member suggested having the pedestrian access into the site between the office tower and the showroom instead,

if the vehicular access was removed from Burrard St., as it would help the individual expression of the Toyota Showroom as well as improve the expression of corner.

One Panel member thought the landmark tower did not benefit from expressing the change of floor plans half way up the tower, and suggested the profile have the same expression all the way up the façade.

The Panel appreciated the changes to the setbacks from the street and how the setbacks now deflect into the laneway. They thought it was a strong connection to the internal public realm of the project. A couple of Panel members thought the programming, public nature, as well as the expression of the internal environment was critical in how it addresses the public realm.

The Panel thought that a pedestrian mid-block connection on Burrard Street was important. One Panel member suggested the lane connection to Burrard Street remain to allow for two points of access to the site and suggested it be covered with perhaps a floor of second storey office space over it.

The landmark tower is now reading more strongly as an individual tower. The moves with the passive elements are greatly improved. Most of the Panel liked that it wasn't completely different from the other residential tower, and that there was a common vocabulary but still a strong difference between the two. A couple of Panel members thought the top of the landmark tower could still be improved.

Several Panel members thought there could be an interlocking between the podium façade on Hornby Street and the secondary tower. They appreciated that the tower was now coming down to grade but thought the interlocking could be an interesting dynamic to the composition of the two massing elements.

Some of the Panel members thought the office tower was still perhaps the weakest part of the project, although they thought it had improved since the previous review. They suggested pushing the innovation and being more creative and artful in the design. They liked that the other buildings were inventive and unique, but felt the office tower is somewhat conventional in its design.

Regarding the amount of public open space, one Panel member thought there could be additional open space on the lane if the office space was reduced. The space could be landscaped and animated with a restaurant which would make the animated laneway more visible. Several Panel members noted that moving the loading below grade had helped the public realm of the lane. As well, the other revisions to the lane will allow more light into the area.

Although some of Panel members agreed that the shadow impacts on the corner of Burrard and Davie Street were minimal, several Panel members thought more attention could be given to sculpting the top of the building to lessen the amount of shadow and make for a better pedestrian experience at that corner.

The Panel agreed that the sustainable features including registering for LEED™ Gold were excellent including the thermal bridging control, solar control, and heat exchange.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Stovell thanked the Panel and said he thought the input had been invaluable which has led to a better project. He added that they will be registering the project for LEED™ Gold.

2.	Address:	1050 Expo Boulevard
	DE:	414740
	Use:	To construct a 6-storey wood-frame building with 89 dwelling units and associated areas with surface parking at the above noted address.
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Second
	Architect:	DYS Architecture
	Owner:	City of Vancouver
	Delegation:	Dane Jansen, DYS Architecture Gerry Eckford, Eckford and Associates
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: REZONING - NON-SUPPORT (1-8)

Introduction:

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a complete application to construct a 6-storey building with surface parking. The proposal consists of six floors of subsidized rental housing (89 units) with the main floor amenity space for residents in the building. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area stating that the site is adjacent to the Cambie Street Bridge. There is a long term plan to have the streetcar run along Pacific Boulevard and so additional setbacks are required to accommodate the streetcar in the future. She also described the zoning noting the CD-1 zoning permits the development of a district with primarily residential use, in a form of development which complements and is compatible with the character of adjacent areas. Also, emphasis on enlivening the streetscape in residential areas by providing terraces, individual entries and windows and porches facing the street. Ms. Molaro explained that the parking access was originally envisioned along Pacific Boulevard and has now been moved to Expo Boulevard instead. As well Ms. Molaro noted that the applicant intends to qualify for LEED™ Gold.

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

- Overall building design/character including resolution of the elevations and their response to their various orientations given this site's special location, including;
 - view of building from the bridge
 - roof treatment
- Use and quality of the proposed materials/ including their interface relationships;
- Design of the open spaces and street edges;
 - including the proposed loading area location
- Any other comments the Panel wishes to make.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Dane Jansen, Architect, further described the proposal and indicated that the economics were important for this project with BC Housing. They have designed a more modest approach to the building and this will be the first 6-storey wood frame building in the province. He stated that the Province is going to use the project as a demonstration building, including onsite monitoring of the wood shrinkage. He noted that because of the existing pump station they are dealing with the Engineering Department and how it is to be protected. Mr. Jansen described the architecture and indicated that they have taken the fresh air and the heat recovery and utilized them in the energy system for the building. This system requires a plenum space at the top of the building and is part of the reason for the shape and sculpting of the roof. The sustainable strategy is for LEED™ Gold and the project will be registered. There are a number of sustainable features including radiant heat using a heat pump system, an enhanced envelope system with exterior insulation, and passive solar shading.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architects, described the landscape plans and explained that the broad landscaped boulevard along Pacific Boulevard is in anticipation of the future streetcar transit coming into the area. There is a bridge maintenance strip all along the edge of the bridge and is why they can't landscape that area of the site. They are showing that as a simple open space. The landscape design relates to the interior function, the amenity space with a small outdoor terrace, and a larger outdoor terrace at the east end of the site that incorporates a gazebo element and sitting walls. They are planning on using recycled products and provide a space that is programmed for the user. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Eckford noted they have hard and soft spaces for permeability and stormwater management, the use of low water tolerant landscape materials, and to prevent solar gain, they are promoting the use of trees along the south façade to provide some shading on the terrace spaces.

Mr. Jansen and Mr. Eckford took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to the building design to improve the response to the unique geometries of the site;
- Design development to better integrate the prow edge into the building's overall design;
- Design development to simplify the massing;
- Consider adding more density or other uses to the building;
- Consider a warmer colour palette for the exterior;
- Consider incorporating landscaping in the hard paved area between the entry and the bridge;
- Consider screening the equipment on the roof;
- Consider removing the fence or softening it with landscape material.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the application as they thought the building didn't fit comfortably on the site.

The Panel was generally supportive of the character and the architectural approach, but questioned the massing response to the site, and they thought it was important to keep the form simple and economical. They felt the massing of the building was not responding strong enough to the particulars of the site including the geometries and curves. They felt the prow edge to the building felt like a curved add-on, and that it should be more integrated with the rectilinear primary form of the building. They also thought there should be general simplifications to the massing with perhaps more emphasize to the low horizontal nature of the building.

Most of the Panel thought the building would be lost and somewhat out of scale with the high density area, and suggested more density could be added to the site. They thought there could be some creative mixing of uses or other ways to add density to the site, and perhaps improve the economics of the project.

A few Panel members thought the brick material went against the horizontality of the building, and some Panel members thought it was too dark and heavy looking. Several Panel members thought the palette could be warmed up. One Panel member thought the red colour feature by the entry should be strengthened by repeating it up over the next three floors of the building.

The Panel thought the front entry could be improved. They thought it was competing with the service lane area, and suggested adding more landscaping between the entry and the Cambie Street Bridge to help soften this area and create a buffer to the bridge. Several Panel members suggested screening the elevator overrun and equipment on the roof.

Most of the Panel thought there could be some temporary uses in the set back where the future streetcar will be located, with a couple of Panel members suggesting the space could be used for urban agriculture.

Most of the Panel felt the fence was an unfortunate element and suggested it be removed or be de-emphasized through incorporating landscape treatment into it, whether it was to add a berm, a hedge, or even a green wall.

The Panel appreciated LEED™ Gold and thought the roof treatment was well done, however one Panel member thought adding natural light into the hallways would add to the liveability of the building.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Jansen thought there was a lot to digest from the Panel's comments and said he thought their comments would make the project fail due to the tenuous economic viability of the project, and would result in losing 85 social housing units. He said he would take their comments to heart, and said that although they were on a tight schedule with the project, he was willing to work with the Planning Department to resolve the issues. Mr. Jansen added that they aren't able to address the green space but would have a discussion with the City's Landscape Architect on ways that area could be addressed. He said they would also take another look on how to improve the fence.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.