

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 29, 2011

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes (Excused Item #1)
Gregory Borowski (Excused Item #4)
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett (Excused #2)
Jane Durante (Item #1 Only)
Alan Endall
Arno Matis
Geoff McDonell (Excused Item #4)
Scott Romses (Chair)
Norm Shearing
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
Jim Huffman
Helen Besharat

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--------------------------|
| 1. | 1650 Quebec Street |
| 2. | 601-650 West 41st Avenue |
| 3. | 564 Beatty Street |
| 4. | 1460 Bute Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Romses called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. **Address:** 1650 Quebec Street
DE: 414744
Use: To construct an 18-storey residential building on Quebec Street and an 8-storey building with ground floor retail uses and seven residential floors of rental housing under the STIR program on Main Street. The total floor area proposed is 224,114 square feet. The height of the proposed Quebec Street building form would increase from 15 to 18 storeys. The proposed FSR is 5.02.
Zoning: M-2 and FC-1
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Richard Henry Architects
Review: Second
Richard Henry, Richard Henry Architects
Delegation: Tom Staniszakis, Neale Staniszkis Doll Adams Architects
Carolyn Kennedy, Perry & Associates
Hermann Nuessler, Bosa Properties
Staff: Dale Morgan

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

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site located in Southeast False Creek that consists of two separate buildings at grade. He noted that the Panel had seen the application at the rezoning stage in 2008 and the Panel's comments formed the rezoning conditions. Mr. Morgan added that the proposal is a resubmission.

The project is actually two buildings with a 19-storey tower with two penthouse levels located along Quebec Street and low-rise ground oriented residential building. The other building is mixed-use with commercial at grade and STIR residential above for a total 184 market units and 90 STIR rental units. Mr. Morgan described the context for the area noting that tower heights in the area are around 15-storeys. He noted that in the previous review, the Panel supported the proposed height, density, use and form of development. There were revisions to the ODP where the heights were increased with a transcending height down from City Gate.

Mr. Morgan described the Panel's concerns from the first review and as well gave a summary of the rezoning issues and design conditions. He explained that the conditions included design development to address and strengthen the urban design relationship with the adjacent proposed building and open space to the site to the north. As well, design development to the massing transition, expression and detail of the tower to the podium and the tower to the penthouse levels. Other conditions included design development to the overall building and architectural language, design development to the landscape treatment of the roof levels and design development to enhance livability.

Regarding sustainability, Mr. Morgan noted that the proposal is targeting LEED™ Gold and the applicant has retained a sustainability consultant. Some of the sustainability features include solar shading devices, reduction in transparent glazing, energy and water efficient fixtures and connection with the location neighbourhood heat recovery system. Mr. Morgan mentioned that

another condition asked for the applicant to clarify on the drawings their proposed sustainable features.

Mr. Morgan further described the project noting the ground oriented units on three frontages. There will be a dedicated pedestrian lane with a visual connection through the site. As well there are a number of amenities being provided including a common rooftop outdoor space with a pool and children's play area and urban agriculture.

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

- Has the proposal successfully addressed the Panel's previous comments & staff's rezoning design conditions?
- Further commentary is requested on the expression and transition of tower to base and tower to penthouse.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Richard Henry, Architect, further described the proposal and indicated that Quebec Street was very much apart of the emerging Southeast False Creek fabric and that Main Street was an important historic street. He noted that they had decided to pursue a different architectural objective for the two buildings in response to their individual fabrics. They started with the Main Street buildings which is expressed by punched windows and tends to be lower scale buildings. Also, there is a lot of sawtooth massing to the streetscape, so they felt they could pick up on that yet still have a contemporary approach to the design. Mr. Henry stated that they wanted simple, clear massings that interlock with each other. He added that they used the same material palette for each building to tie them together. There is an indoor roof top amenity area and service area for the urban agriculture. There is also outdoor amenity area with a fireplace and barbeque that could be used by the residents of both buildings. Mr. Henry mentioned that they are still negotiating with the City on how they can incorporate the rail spur into the landscape. He added that they allowed the buildings to respond to the curvature of trail spur. Mr. Henry noted that on the Quebec Street tower they have eliminated the transfer slab between the podium level and the tower which freed up some space and allowed them to narrow the tower. They also shifted the mass to make for a more slender expression on the Quebec Street side. They have created interlocking podium elements to structurally pick up the exterior perimeter walls of the tower and they have been expressed at the ends of the buildings. Mr. Henry described the sustainability features noting the concrete solar shading devices on the south façade.

Carolyn Kennedy, Landscape Architect, described the plans noting they are trying to use real rails or rail-like metals in the pergolas on the north and south amenity spaces. They also have the historic shoreline coming through the site and they are using this to locate the play equipment which will be near the amenity space in the main building. She described the material palette noting they will use the materials to illustrate the shoreline. Ms. Kennedy added that they are planning to add vertical green on the side of the parkade entry and at the wall around the pool.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to simplify the top of the tower;
- Design development to better integrate the tower into the podium;
- Design development to the Main Street façade regarding material selection.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the comments from the previous Panel's review had been addressed as well as the rezoning design conditions.

The Panel appreciated the level of consideration and thought it was a good back drop building and that the design strategy was the right one to take. They thought there were some areas that needed some attention especially the top two or three levels of the tower. As well how the west face of the tower meets the podium level. They thought there needed to be more glazed separation. Also there are strong horizontals on the north face of the tower podium that the Panel felt was unresolved in how it meets the podium. One Panel member thought it was a lost opportunity to not include windows in the low-rise building's corridors.

Some of the Panel members thought the framing device was a strong architectural element on the south façade and thought it could be explored on the other facades as well.

Several Panel members thought the Main Street building needed some design development regarding the expression and the intersection of materials. One Panel member suggested separating the two components with the stair well.

The Panel thought that marking the shore line in the landscaping especially around the children's play area was a nice idea. Several Panel members expressed their disappointment that the rail spur hasn't been given from in terms of integrating it into the public realm. One Panel member suggested getting an artist involved early regarding the public art piece.

The Panel thought the projected responded well to the solar shading strategy and thought the vertical fins on the west would provide some shading as well as the recessed balconies. One Panel member suggested adding solar panels to heat the swimming pool. Another Panel member thought the pool area could benefit from some shade and suggested the chairs not have their backs to the pool area.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Henry said they appreciated the Panel's comments. He agreed that it was disappointing that they have not been able to get the rail spur up to the speed of the development permit. He added that they only got their rezoning just recently and hoped that would help resolve the issue. There are all sorts of engineering concerns that will need to be dealt with regarding the rail spur.

2.	Address:	601-650 West 41st Avenue
	DE:	414795
	Use:	Interior/exterior alterations and additions to change the current cinema, restaurant and adjacent retail/service uses into one major retail store (Crate & Barrel).
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Stantec Architecture Ltd.
	Owner:	Ivanhoe Cambridge
	Delegation:	Roman Czemerys, Stantec Architecture Ltd. Jimmy Turner, Crate & Barrel Gordon Wylie, Ivanhoe Cambridge
	Staff:	Pat St. Michel

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

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a Crate and Barrel store at Oakridge Centre at West 41st Avenue and Cambie Street. It will be located at the northeast corner of the site fronting the existing plaza and the Canada Line Station. This space is currently occupied by a restaurant, several small retailers, and the Oakridge Centre Theatres.

The proposal mostly reconfigures these existing spaces, but technically represents an increase in floor space due primarily to 'filling in' the lower theatre spaces to create a single grade level retail space. The proposal is to create a 'wrap' around the existing face of the building using the signature white background and black logo of Crate and Barrel. An entry is proposed off the plaza near the main Oakridge Centre entry, as well as a mall entry. Along the plaza frontage, there are windows and display areas. The currently existing arcade is 'filled in' and it is proposed that an overhang be added above the store windows. Above the display window area the wall will continue straight up without an overhang or weather protection.

Back of house facilities are located facing Cambie Street, and servicing would be provided from an existing service and visitor parking area off Cambie Street. Ms. St. Michel described the proposed changes along Cambie Street noting the existing stair connecting to Cambie Street is proposed to be removed, and the existing glazing of the current restaurant would be replaced with a blank wall to the 'back of house' facilities.

The architectural expression reflects Crate and Barrel's recognizable company style with white brick veneer and Swiss Pearl cement board panels.

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

1. Relationship to plaza and Canada Line Station: Bringing more animation and vitality to the plaza and the Canada Line Station area is a direction for future redevelopment of Oakridge Centre. Planning asked the Panel to comment on how the proposal could contribute to the life and vitality of the plaza and to pedestrian amenity.
 2. Relationship to Cambie: One of the key policy directions for future redevelopment of Oakridge Centre is to enliven the Cambie Street frontage. Planning asked the Panel to comment on the relationship of the proposal to Cambie Street regarding the extent of glazing, visual interest, access and connectivity.
-

3. Architectural Expression in relation to the existing buildings of Oakridge Centre: Planning asked the Panel to comment on the signature style of Crate and Barrel in this location.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Jimmy Turner, Crate and Barrel, further described the plans and indicated that it will be a one level store with the exterior wrapping the space with Crate and Barrel's signature color: white. He said it was important to provide a contrast to the existing building. Also, the glazing of the displays has been pushed out into the plaza near the entry. He added that they tried to create some depth and articulation using brighter colors beside the white in the displays. There will be two entries to the store; one in the plaza and from the mall interior. As well there will be some landscape planters to soften the building at the ground plane.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development to incorporate weather protection on the façade;
- Consider ways to enliven the plaza area;
- Design development to incorporate high quality building materials;
- Design development regarding the signage; and
- Design development to incorporate more display windows on the façade.

Related Commentary:

The Panel did not support the proposal but welcomed Crate and Barrel to Vancouver. They felt that the store didn't have a strong relationship to the plaza and the Canada Line Station.

The Panel noted that the proposal was a piece of architecture on a fairly prominent site in the city which guided the Panel's comments. One Panel member mentioned that it was an opportunity to rebrand Oakridge but felt that the architectural plans hadn't gone far enough. The Panel felt the proposal didn't enliven or improve the plaza which is already an inhospitable public space. The Panel suggested adding weather protection and furniture in the plaza. They felt it was a lost opportunity to really capitalize on making a strong invitational gesture to the shopping center and the plaza.

The Panel wanted to see high quality materials that were easily maintained as they felt stucco was inappropriate building material considering our weather, materials that would be easy to keep clean were recommended. They also felt the Cambie Street façade was unfortunate and wanted to see the incorporation of more display windows to enliven the façade.

In terms of architectural expression most of the Panel acknowledged that the existing building is fairly dated and that the high contrast was welcomed. They felt the white starkness was a strong contrast to the existing architecture but needed some relationship to the existing façade. They also thought such a contextual response was a great way to enliven the façade.

Some of the Panel however had problems with the fact that the addition literally consumed and covered the existing façade, and suggested more deference to the existing building. Also, they thought the Crate and Barrel signage seemed to be the primary signifier in that public space and that Oakridge Mall's signage should have the primary role in the signage hierarchy.

Some of the Panel thought the entry needed some work and suggested increasing the proposed simple blank façade to frame the entry, or perhaps moving the entry further towards the blank wall.

The Panel thought the loss of the stairs on the Cambie Street side was unfortunate and aggravated the dead end problem on the northeast corner of the plaza. Also, the planters need to move in order to allow people to flow through the area.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Czemerys explained that there aren't any plans to improve the plaza until 2014. Unfortunately the height of the north facing wall makes it dark on the plaza. He added that it was unfortunate that they are designing the store front before the plaza is updated. He said he agreed that the plaza was not a great public space and would like to have been able to integrate the transit station into the shopping center. Mr. Turner also thought it was unfortunate that the store would be created before the plaza was updated but felt it wasn't their responsibility to improve the plaza. He said he didn't want to compromise noting that they are only doing a façade treatment.

3.	Address:	564 Beatty Street
	DE:	414716
	Use:	Interior and exterior alterations and change of use of the existing Heritage "C" listed building on this site and to add five storeys of office use over the existing building.
	Zoning:	DD
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	IBI/HB Architects
	Delegation:	Jim Hancock, IBI/HB Architects Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB Architects Jon Stovell, Reliance Properties
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

Introduction:

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, described the proposal for a site located at the northeast corner of Beatty and Dunsmuir Streets along the Victory Square frontage of Beatty Street. The existing building is a backdrop of the Stadium Station and Keefer Steps entry into the International Village. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting that the Guidelines for the area were updated in 2006. The intent of these guidelines is to ensure that revitalization of the physical environment of the Victory Square area is achieved by a combination of heritage conservation and sensitive new development. They focus on conserving and retaining existing scale, form and fabric of Victory Square's heritage environment while encouraging a sensitive, creative and contemporary approach to new construction within the heritage context.

Ms. Molaro mentioned that the Victory Square Urban Design Principles for Heritage Buildings include the following:

- Additions to a heritage building should be architecturally compatible with but clearly distinguishable from the existing building. They should generally be visually subordinate to the main heritage structure.
- Generally, additions on top of heritage buildings should be limited to one storey and set back from the heritage street façade. However, additions of more than one storey may be considered:
 - Where their placement is towards the rear of the site where they will not visually intrude on the scale of the street or the heritage building; or
 - When the existing building is low-scale (one or two storeys) in comparison to adjacent buildings. In this case the addition above the heritage façade should be architecturally differentiated, with care given to the proportional relationships and façade patterning between old and new portions.

The guidelines also describe 500 Beatty Street:

- This block has a well-established streetscape pattern consisting of higher massing heritage buildings that were previously used as warehouses. Several of them are converted to residential uses;
- Sun Tower at the north end of the block is a well-known landmark for the precinct and the surrounding areas; and

- A predominant feature of the street wall is the ‘saw tooth’ pattern delineated by the strong cornice lines of individual buildings.

Ms. Molaro noted that the grades on the site are very unusual given its location along the escarpment. The lane is over 40 feet lower than the Beatty Street elevation and the adjacent Keefer Steps have to make the transition between Beatty Street to the International Village (Keefer Street). She also noted that the proposed height in Victory Square is 70 feet, but can be increased to 100 feet for social or affordable housing. The applicant is proposing 100 feet to the top of parapet however on Beatty Street the actual height on the lane elevation is closer to 130 feet.

Ms. Molaro explained that given this location the proposal presents a number of opportunities in achieving a number of the City’s objectives:

- retention of heritage building
- public realm improvements - long standing desire to open up the south façade and integrating and activating the public realm connection down through the Keefer Steps
- optimization of office space in this location adjacent to transit

Ms. Molaro added that it needs to be balanced against the three main concerns that staff have:

- urban design/massing proportions
- architectural expression
- heritage retention implications

Staff agree that the site is both unique and strategic for a number of reasons. It is at the end of the Victory square context, adjacent to the transit station, across from the Central Business District (CBD) context of office buildings and an important public realm connection from the downtown core down to International Village.

Ms. Molaro stated that on this basis staff are prepared to stretch the interpretation of the guidelines that recommends a subordinate 2-storey maximum addition to perhaps up to four storeys as proposed noting that there is some anxiety amongst staff about the proportional relationship of the addition with the heritage building. The second aspect of concern from staff is the expression of the addition as an ordinary glass box and its relative transparency. Ms. Molaro asked the Panel if there was something else that the proposal could do to elevate itself from a ordinary glass box and or even perhaps as part of addressing/incorporating a sustainability response as part of the south side façade.

While building upon the historical structural framework along the south façade the proposal is departing within the heritage fabric/structure and inserting a large fritted glazing element within this historic fabric. Staff are wondering if this is the right location for this insertion or whether the treatment is an opportunity or idea that should be incorporated into the new addition, rather than the historic fabric.

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

Does the Panel support the urban design/architectural response developed for this site, noting the unique and special opportunity this location has within its particular context of Victory Square/International Village/CBD/Transit Station:

- Increase in height to 100 feet on Beatty Street and 130 feet on the lane (zoning permits height of 70 feet which can be increased to 100 feet for low cost/social housing uses) and the resultant increase in FSR from 5.0 FSR to 8.45 FSR (existing 4.80 FSR);

- The scale and proportion of the upper addition (4 floors) as it relates to the existing heritage building;
- Building's architectural response and materiality of the proposed addition;
- Compatibility with the heritage character of Victory Square and adjacent buildings;
- Landscape treatments;
- Sustainability attributes (LEED™ Gold proposed).

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Jim Hancock, Architect, remarked that the proposal is a true heritage restoration and not just a façade treatment, as they are saving the entire building. He said they wanted the character of the addition on top to be as contrasting as possible to the heritage base. There is a pinch in the middle to separate the two building forms. There will be solar shading on two sides. They are also planning to invigorate the public realm with restaurant uses at grade that will spill out into the plaza.

Jon Stovell indicated that the building will be achieving LEED™ Gold in terms of passive features with a hydronic heating system that will share heat vertically between the below grade areas of the building and the areas above. Mr. Stovell described the context for restoring a heritage building noting that the heritage transfer density program is on hold. As they could not transfer heritage density from the site they had to find a way to make the building work.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider ways to reduce the heaviness of the reveal at the top of the building;
- Consider using a glass material for the soffits.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and had no problem with the height.

The Panel commended the applicant for an interesting addition to this area of the City. They liked the simplicity of the project and commended the applicant for adding to and preserving a heritage building. They thought one of the beautiful aspects of the concept was the simple expression of the sheer core, and encouraged the applicant to keep its vocabulary and articulation minimal to keep the purity of the expression of the glass box addition.

The Panel thought the complete contrast of the heritage building with the new glass structure was a great concept and liked the setback at the first level to give the glass-box addition the impression of floating. A couple of Panel members suggested setting it back a bit more and as well to set back the upper floors to reduce the heaviness at the top. Another Panel member thought the reveal was causing the heaviness at the top of the building and suggested reducing the overhang. One Panel member suggested that the reveal could be another material, and suggested tinted glass or fritted glass.

The Panel supported keeping the expression of the distressed side-wall, and liked the incorporation of the proposed façade art-panel with the addition of the 'circuit board' art display. Several Panel members suggested using glass material for the soffits to make the building read even lighter. One Panel member suggested adding screens around the elevator overrun.

Some of the Panel members thought there was an opportunity for access to the roof for some treatment such as an amenity space. They also thought the roof plane should be landscaped

and it was suggested that the back stairs could have some plantings. Several Panel members noted that the existing tree and raised planter was competing with the art panel and should be removed.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Stovell said he thought the Panel had some interesting observations. He said they would look at how the comments would help to enhance the building. He added that the fire escape on the lane was going to be partially retained as a decorative historic element but not as sun shades as they have other elements for shading.

4.	Address:	1460 Bute Street
	DE:	414843
	Use:	A new 4-storey multiple dwelling containing a total of four dwelling units, one underground level containing a total of eight off-street parking spaces having vehicular access from Beach Avenue and a total FSR of 1.65 (which includes 10% heritage density imported to this site).
	Zoning:	RM-5A
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	First
	Architect:	Merrick Architects
		Greg Borowski, Merrick Architects
	Delegation:	Gina Lyons, Merrick Architects
		Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
		Nika Rohani, Beach & Bute Development Ltd.
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

Introduction:

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a site on the northeast corner of Bute Street and Beach Avenue, between Sunset Beach and the Aquatic Centre. Until recently the site contained a modest character house. The proposal is for a 4-storey multiple dwelling with four units over underground parking and includes a transfer of heritage density from 163 West Hastings Street (The Flack Block). Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the zoning emphasizes compatibility with the neighbouring developments in terms of streetscape character, open spaces, view retention, sunlight access and privacy. The outright height is limited to a maximum of 60 feet and incorporating an angled envelope. Ms. Molaro noted that the development is notably low in terms of maximum height at about 53.5 feet from Beach Avenue to the rooftop parapet. She also noted that the setbacks are generally met except on Beach Avenue where the side yard is reduced.

Ms. Molaro mentioned that the Guidelines for the area establish the zoning priorities. For example the public realm interface is described as follows:

- Traditionally the street edges of development are open grassed areas that are visual extensions of the public realm helping to create an attractive, generous streetscape. New development should maintain and offer this sense of open space along the street edge and visually extend the depth of views from the street.

Ms. Molaro stated that the development generally responds to the edge condition, with high quality materials and stepped planters. Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

- Architectural and landscape design, in general
- Proposed extra height, versus the angled envelope
- Proposed reduction in side yard, on Beach Avenue
- Parkade form, in relation to corner of Bute and Beach

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Greg Borowski, Architect, further described the proposal stating that they had a challenging site and not a lot of room due to the small site. He noted that there is a green roof with a tapestry pattern to mitigate the heat island effect and provide a beautiful overlook for the adjacent higher buildings in the area. He described the architecture noting the accentuated balconies that will provide solar heat gain mitigation. He described the materials and the colour palette and noted that a deeper colour was appropriate for the building. The heritage density adds about eleven inches around the building and is fundamental to the proforma of the building. Mr. Borowski explained that the enclosed balconies are in the middle of the building so they can be shared between the living room and the bedroom.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans and indicated the main strategy on the ground floor landscape was to mitigate the impact of the exposed parking garage along the slope. They are also planning to add some planting to the public realm as the sidewalk is narrow. There aren't any trees planned but they have talked to Engineering Services about softening the pedestrian realm up against the parking garage. The ground floor has a large patio and will have a number of plant materials. Since level two steps back, they are proposing some plantings and as well they are looking at a vegetated green roof.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider keeping the materials and colour palette less complicated;
- Consider moving the entry from the patio;
- Consider adding natural light into the stairwells.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had done a great job on a tight site.

The Panel agreed that it was a challenging site but thought the applicant had mitigated the view impacts and responded respectfully to the adjacent buildings and that they would support a relaxation. They also thought that the applicant had dealt well with the parkade exposure well.

A couple of Panel members encouraged the applicant to not make the building too complicated and suggested reducing the number of materials proposed, as the design was a little busy. One Panel member noted that the entry to the building needed to be improved and suggested moving it off the patio and putting a tree near the entrance to help screen from the adjacent property. Another Panel member thought the north wall was somewhat blank and would like to see some light wells or windows in the stairwells to animate the wall.

Most of the Panel liked the terracing and the planting along the edges and encouraged the applicant to use basalt as it would add to the quality of the project.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Borowski thanked the Panel for their comments. He said it was a challenging project but also fun and thought their comments would be helpful

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.