

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 4, 2008

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
John Wall, Chair
Walter Francl (Items 1, 2 & 3)
Tom Bunting
Maurice Pez
Douglas Watts
Richard Henry
Bill Harrison (Excused Item #4)
Albert Bicol
Mark Ostry (Excused Item #3)

REGRETS: Martin Nielsen
Gerry Eckford
David Godin

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. | 288 West 1 st Avenue |
| 2. | 322 Davie Street |
| 3. | 1550 Carolina Street |
| 4. | 1102 Hornby Street |
| 5. | 1601 West 7 th Avenue |

BUSINESS MEETING

Nicole Ludwig, Public Access & Council Services, discussed the UDP Panel membership term. Also the Panel had a discussion regarding the EcoDensity program. Chair Wall gave an update on items previously seen at the Panel that went to the Development Permit Board on Monday, June 2nd. Mr. Wall called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 288 West 1st Avenue
 DE: 411938
 Description: To develop this site with a 13 storey residential building with rooftop amenity area to the west portion of the site, and four storey townhouse units to the east portion of the site all over two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Complete
 Architect: Rafii Architects
 Owner: Cressey (Cook) Development
 Review: Third (First Review was Rezoning, Second was April 9, 2008)
 Delegation: Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects
 Rene Marcott, Rafii Architects
 Pawel Gradowski, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
 David Evans, Cressey Development
 Staff: Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for 152 market residential units and includes a 13 storey tower on the corner of Crowe Street with 3 storey townhouses along West 1st Avenue. This is a complete development application following a rezoning. Mr. Morgan noted that this was the third review by the Urban Design Panel with the 1st review during the rezoning. The Panel suggested further design resolution and to reduce the bulkiness of the tower. At the 2nd review the Panel suggested design development to the city homes at the ground level of the tower and design development of the tower to simplify the form, reduce the apparent bulk and to improve the passive solar response on the south and west facades. Mr. Morgan described the changes since the last review noting the applicant had further simplified the northwest façade, added more articulation to the residential expression on Crowe Street and had dealt with the passive solar expression on the tower.

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

1. Has the revised application addressed the previous concerns of the Panel with respect to:
 - a. Tower Massing; reducing bulkiness and improving unit identity at the tower base; and
 - b. Greater response to passive solar strategy in the tower expression.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Rafii, Architect, described the changes since the last review. He noted the townhouse portion, landscape, height and floor plans for the

project had not changed. Some of the elevations have been simplified and they have reduced the overhangs. As far as solar responsiveness the units facing north are shallower and wider for more exposure to the light. There will be a high rise across the lane which will provide some additional shading on the site to the west. To reduce the apparent bulk of the building, they emphasized more of the vertical elements.

Pawel Gradowski, Landscape Architect described the minor changes in the landscaping.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider additional design development to the passive design strategies for the Southwest facades.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the tower elements had been more clearly expressed.

The Panel thought the articulation of the tower had incrementally improved and that reducing the slab extensions had helped integrate the expression of the tower and the townhouses. Also the new townhouse expression at the tower base had been improved as well as the entries to the ground floor units. The Panel thought reducing the glass area was a big move on the south and west façades. One Panel member noted that the orientation couldn't be changed as it was site specific but the design could maximize view and light. One Panel member suggested adding exterior shading devices on the south/west façade to reduce solar gain. When the solar gain hits the floor, the heat will radiate into the suite and using interior blinds won't work as they get hot and radiate more heat into the suite. He added that you need to deal with the heat before it gets through the glass. Another Panel member suggested doing a full shadow analysis to see where the sun hits the windows. The Panel agreed that there was a learning curve regarding solar response but thought the project was in keeping with the spirit of the SEFC area.

The Panel liked that the canopy pieces at the entry to the tower were expressed in the townhouses but they felt it was still a bit disconnected between the townhouses and the bulk of the tower. The Panel agreed that the townhouses were the most attractive component of the design and that the overall landscape concept was very strong.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Rafii noted that everything in architecture has to have balance. Regarding solar responsiveness, Mr. Rafii agreed that it is a learning process. He was concerned with window cleaning with the addition of exterior shading devices but agreed that all issues could be dealt with in the project. Mr. Rafii added that the percentage of glass to floor area of the units was much less than other new buildings in Vancouver. The tower has a large floor plate and less windows and he thought interior blinds could also cut the solar gain. Also the building will not be mechanically cooled so any shading will have a positive affect on the suites.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2. Address: | 322 Davie Street |
| DE: | N/A |
| Description: | A rezoning/text amendment application to allow an increase in the FSR and height to accommodate a rooftop restaurant. |
| Zoning: | Text Amendment to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Architect: | Endall Elliot Architects |
| Owner: | Trilogy Property Corporation |
| Review: | First |
| Delegation: | Alan Endall, Endall Elliot Architects Nicolas Gandossi, Opus Hotel |
| Staff: | Dale Morgan/Karen Hoese |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Karen Hoese, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal to amend the CD-1 zoning for 322 Davie Street. The purpose is to increase the height and density to provide for an open air seasonal restaurant on the roof the Opus Hotel. An extension for the stairs, guest and service elevators is proposed along with the addition of permanent structures for washrooms. Seating is proposed for approximately 280 patrons. In the original approval for the site, there was a roof top amenity area on the Hamilton Street side proposed. The applicant plans to mitigate privacy and noise for the surrounding neighbours through screening devices and landscape elements.

Dale Morgan, Development Planner using the context model, described the surrounding developments noting there are a number of roof top uses which are primarily private roof top gardens. Mr. Morgan described the architectural plans for the roof noting that the parapet edge will be stepped back to preserve the existing cornice line as perceived from the street. There is to be minimal landscape treatment surrounding the wood deck which will improve the overlook from surrounding buildings.

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

1. Use: Is this an appropriate use for this particular rooftop, given the context and proximity to residential use? Is the proposed size a limiting factor?
2. Comments are requested on the benefits and attributes of the proposed rooftop treatment as a visual and (potentially landscape) amenity to the surrounding neighbourhood.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Alan Endall, Architect, further described the proposal. He noted that they are trying to create a platform that allows for flexible arrangement of furniture that will be taken down for eight months of the year. It's meant to operate as an outdoor terrace that is an adjunct to the ground floor restaurant. Handicap access is being provided, including washrooms and storage facilities. Mr. Endall added that a good neighbour agreement has been in place since the hotel opened that will limit the hours of operation.

Mr. Endall took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to increase the height of the glass guard to reduce overlook from adjacent properties.
 - Consider adding more greenery to the roof to improve screening of overlook.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel had no concerns with the proposed use and strongly supported the application for rezoning.

The Panel had some minor concerns regarding noise and overlook but thought those problems could be mitigated through good design. They thought the height for the glass rail was extremely important to help buffer some of the noise. The Panel members encouraged the applicant to consider making the roof useable throughout the year. One Panel member noted that the Sandbar restaurant on Granville Island and Earls on West Broadway have window wall systems that open up in the warm weather and thought something similar could be used to make the roof more useable.

One Panel member noted that the design shouldn't pander to the heritage character of the neighbourhood but should be more contemporary.

The Panel members suggested adding more green elements to the roof and one Panel member suggested collecting rain water for irrigation. One Panel member was concerned that lighting could be an issue for the neighbours.

One Panel member noted that Yaletown is a vibrant and noisy place with lots of restaurants and clubs already in the area. A couple of Panel members thought limiting the hours of use and having a good neighbour agreement would help to resolve any issues.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Endall thanked the Panel for their comments noting they were on the same wave length. He agreed that it was all in the details.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 3. Address: | 1550 Caroline Street |
| DE: | 411996 |
| Description: | To construct an 8 storey mixed use building and a 2 storey brewery with ancillary office/retail/banquet hall all over one and a half levels of parking. |
| Zoning: | I-2 |
| Application Status: | Complete |
| Architect: | Ankenman Marchand Architects |
| Owner: | Damb Good Investments Inc. |
| Review: | First |
| Delegation: | Tim Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Charles Leman, Ankenman Marchand Architects Maizy Chan Yip, DMG Landscape Architects John Makepeace, Jade West Engineering |
| Staff: | Dale Morgan |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for an eight storey office/retail/manufacturing building and a two storey brewery with ancillary office/retail/banquet hall on the second level all over one and half levels of parking. Mr. Morgan noted the proposal is located in the I-2 Zone located on Terminal Avenue. He described the surrounding development including the zoning guidelines regarding height, FSR, setbacks and design. The proposal is seeking a maximum possible height of 100 feet. Mr. Morgan noted the materials will include brick with a large two storey truss. He also described the landscape plans.

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

1. Form of Development: General comments are requested on the proposed form of development. Is the form appropriate to its proposed use?
2. Materials & Expression: General comments on the use of brick and exposed trusses are requested.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Tim Ankenman, Architect further described the plans for the proposal. Red Truck Brewery currently has a space in North Vancouver and is over capacitated and as a result has been looking for a new location. The facility will have tours with a two storey banquet hall being used for guests with views into the brewery. With respect with the Brewery, the entire brewery process is self contained. Mr. Ankenman noted that the manufacturing/office component is speculative with an anchor tenant yet to be identified. Mr. Ankenman noted that they are having a discussion with Engineering Services regarding the pump station to renovate possibly with glazing in order to see the workings inside.

Mary Chan Yip, Landscape Architect described the landscape plans noting the boulevard will be upgraded with new street trees and paving patterns. There are three levels of amenity space including one off the banquet hall. Another amenity space includes an active sport court for basketball and a seating area. The space will be defined through landscaping. Rain water will be collected for irrigation.

John Makepeace, Sustainability Consultant described the energy needs for the project. The brewery will reclaim the waste heat from the brewery. For the rest of the office and main building a hybrid yield thermal system is proposed. Supplement boilers and cooling towers for the peak times when more heat or cooling is required. Mr. Makepeace noted that it will be an efficient system.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider design development on the west façade to reduce solar gain;
 - Consider adding more passive design sustainable measures to the office component including operable windows, exposed structure and reduced window area;
 - Consider adding a high albedo (white) or intensive green roof to the upper roof.
 - Recommend working with City Engineering to upgrade the existing pump house.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel unanimously supported the project and thought this type of development was perfect for the area. They supported the overall massing, height and uses including the retail, street uses and the brewery use.

The Panel liked the sustainability strategy and encouraged the applicant to push for more measures with one Panel member suggesting the applicant consider adding a public interpretive strategy for the sustainable systems used in the project and use pine beetle wood for the timber structures. Another Panel member suggested the top roof could benefit by going a step further by making it an intensive green roof or high albedo (white) roof. One Panel member said he supported the use of geothermal but suggested reducing the energy load first and before considering the use of air conditioning. The Panel member thought there might be enough heat recovery from the brewery that geothermal wouldn't be necessary.

Several Panel members thought there was a lack of unifications between the four facades and thought the office mass should be reoriented to face south. It was suggested that the west side still needed to be addressed and that horizontal sun shades wouldn't do anything to reduce the heat gain. A more creative solution needs to be applied with vertical sun shades and large shade trees on the west side. One Panel member suggested that if the orientation was left the way it was presented to the Panel then a double façade could be added to the west side such as an atrium to deal with the heat gain. One Panel member suggested the higher building could express sustainability more.

Generally, the Panel thought the trusses unified the building but preferred the trusses on the low element. A few panel members preferred the version of the south elevation as it was presented on the elevation drawings. They also thought the design vocabulary was more successful on the brewery building than on the higher building. A couple of Panel members suggested the truss on the office component should be continuous and not break at the vertical circulation element. The Panel liked the use of brick and how it related to other buildings in the area.

One Panel member noted that the building could be adaptable over the years with the tall building being converted to residential. The Panel agreed that the public pump house should be upgraded to include the red truck and turn it into a sign for the brewery.

The panel commended the applicant on the public realm treatment. Some of the Panel thought the roof top open space plan needed to be developed further. They liked the roof top amenity and thought it was well programmed but would take it further so that smaller groups (2-4 people) could feel comfortable using the space. One Panel member suggested

adding a covered area to the roof amenity for use during inclement weather. The Panel liked the idea of integrating the court for exercise and thought it was a great idea.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ankenman thanked the panel for their comments and said they were all extremely helpful. He noted that all the windows would be operable for cross ventilation. Mr. Ankenman added that more design development needed to be done regarding the solar gain on the west side of the building. Mr. Ankenman added that they are waiting for an anchor tenant to be identified which will drive a lot of the design for the interior.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 4. Address: | 1102 Hornby Street |
| DE: | 412079 |
| Description: | To develop this site with a six storey multiple dwelling (containing a total of 21 units) over two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane. |
| Zoning: | DD |
| Application Status: | Complete |
| Architect: | GBL Architects |
| Owner: | Hornby Residences Ltd. |
| Review: | First |
| Delegation: | Stuart Lyon, GBL Architects Bill Harrison, Forma Design Inc. Daniel Roberts, Kane Consulting |
| Staff: | Sailen Black |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a six storey multiple dwelling building with 21 units with underground parking. Using the context model, Mr. Black described the surrounding buildings and the zoning guidelines. He noted the guidelines encourage a variety of expressions and an activated public realm. The proposal will have a number of patios off Hornby Street that will be gated and some of the patios will have steps to Helmcken Street. Mr. Black noted that the patios will not be unit entries, as the entrances to the units will be internalized and accessed from a hallway. Mr. Black described the architecture noting that the first floor of the project will have two levels of open void space above, within three storey frames. In terms of detailing of the building, it responds well to the guidelines suggestion for richer materials and more intensive decorative details and lighting at the ground level to enhance the pedestrian experience. Mr. Black noted that the developer had done another similar project, The Grace, which has also has a high level of detailing and finish material at the pedestrian level.

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

- Comments on landscaping and architecture in general;
- Resolution of edge against adjoining 5-storey office building; and
- Active connection to street and public realm.

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Stuart Lyon, Architect, further described the project noting the project was an opportunity to create a really different kind of suite layout in the downtown core. The suites are larger and completely different with a number of two level suites. The suites are laid out around the core in the middle of the building to take advantage of the perimeter for glazing. The project doesn't contain balconies but in fact all the suites have terraces and are open to the sky. Mr. Lyon noted the robust townhouse conditions around the perimeter of the building with a lighter, conservatory style top on the building. The detailing on the building will be critical to the success of the project. Mr. Lyon described the materials that will be used on the project.

Daniel Roberts, Sustainability Consultant, noted the lack of natural light available on the site and as a result the building was designed with around 42% of the structure being glazing. An analysis was done for solar gain as well as a shading study. A mechanical engineer was consulted regarding the envelope design. He noted that Energy Star

appliances and low flow fixtures will be used to help reduce the energy use in the building. They will be installing an energy user device in each of the suites to promote user awareness. Mechanically they are looking at geothermal to take over remaining loads of the building including heating and cooling.

Bill Harrison, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the outdoor living on Hornby Street and the grand entry at the corner. Mr. Harrison noted a potential greenway is planned for Helmcken Street and as a result the sidewalk is wider. A green strip of grass is proposed along the edge of the building. Green walls are planned for the lane and at the 5th level there will be a large tree on the terraces. An extensive green roof system is planned for the roof level to mitigate heat island and to improve the overlook from the surrounding buildings.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to the roof expression to improve animation of the building top as seen from the street and from surrounding towers looking down;
 - Consider opening the deep unit layouts to make more natural light available;
 - Provide additional measures to improve thermal comfort in the winter and natural ventilation of the units.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it was a unique boutique project that appeals to a select clientele, and noted that the developer has proved in past projects that high quality materials will be used.

The Panel had some concerns with the suite layout noting that several suites are very deep and may have insufficient natural light. They suggested opening up the units to more light which would also make the space more livable. They also thought the heavy mullioned windows would give the building a lot of character. Several Panel members thought the top of the building did not match the quality of the base and the building loses impact as you move up the building. A few Panel members also had some concerns with the design noting that it looked like an echo of another time.

Regarding the relationship to the office building next door, the Panel thought that the massing and the setback at the upper floors was fine. Another Panel member noted that the relationship to the office building and the tower was going to have to rely on the quality of materials and execution of details in order to make that relationship work.

Several Panel members had concerns regarding the amount of glass and the issue of heat gain. They also thought that air conditioning might not be necessary. They noted that the top units weren't as deep as the lower units and therefore didn't require as much glass.

Most of the Panel liked the patios to the public realm and thought they would be interesting from the pedestrian level. They thought the relationship of the elevation to the street was elegant although one Panel member was concerned about privacy.

Several Panel members thought the applicant had gone a long way on including sustainable features in the project, noting that the worst façade for heat gain is the blank south-west wall on the property line. There was some concern regarding thermal comfort during the winter months in the suites because of the amount of glazing. The Panel member noted that the amount of glass and mullions will cause thermal comfort problems, which is not easy to control with mechanical systems.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon thanked the Panel for all the comments and said they will take them into consideration.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 5. Address: | 1601 West 7 th Avenue |
| DE: | 412144 |
| Description: | Social and Supportive Housing Project. |
| Zoning: | C3-A |
| Application Status: | Complete |
| Architect: | NSDA Architects |
| Owner: | Katherine Sanford Housing Society |
| Review: | First |
| Delegation: | Larry Adams, NSDA Architects Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates |
| Staff: | Anita Molaro |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the complete application to construct a nine storey building which consists of seven floors of subsidized rental housing and a separate social services facility on the lower two floors. Using the context model, Ms. Molaro described the surrounding developments in the area including the zoning and Burrard Slope Guidelines. Ms. Molaro noted that West 7th Avenue is also a bike lane. The Zoning Guidelines state that the density allows for 1 FSR which can be increased up to 3 FSR. The proposal is to increase density beyond 3 FSR up to 3.97 FSR through the provision of the social services facility which the Zoning Guidelines provide for. Ms. Molaro added that the Development Permit Board (DPB) can consider the increase in FSR for the provision of this type of public amenity. Also under the zoning the permitted height is 30 feet which the DPB can also relax up to 100 feet. The building height is 103 feet at the front of the site and 108 at the back of the site. This is in part because the site slopes along the Fir Street frontage about eight feet. Ms. Molaro noted that the proposal is to achieve LEED™ Gold.

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

Whether the proposal has earned the increase in density from 1.0 to 3.0 FSR and further can the additional increase in density for the provision of the social service facility for a total FSR of 3.97, taking into consideration the intent of the zoning and guidelines; and

- Relationship of the development with nearby residential areas;
- The height, bulk, location and overall design of the buildings and its effect on the site, surrounding buildings and streets and existing views;
- Amount of open space and the effects of overall design on the general amenity of the area;
- Provision for pedestrian needs; and
- Preservation of the character and general amenity desired for the area.

Does the form of development support the increase in height, up to 100 feet but also the further additional increase in height to 103 feet at Fir Street and approximately 108 feet at the lane; taking into consideration the intent of the zoning and guidelines.

Other comments:

- Overall building design/character including resolution of the elevations and their response to their various orientations;
- Livability of the units;
- Use and quality of the proposed materials; and
- Design of the open space and street edges.

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Larry Adams, Architect, noted that the proposal is a partnership between Katherine Sanford Housing Society and the Motivation, Power & Achievement Society (MPA Society). They are organizations dedicated to providing services and housing for people with mental illness. The Katherine Sanford Housing Society is the developer and the MPA Society will be the provider of the services in the building and will manage the residential component. There will be 62 units and 10,000 square feet in the social service area.

Bob Barnes, Landscape Architect described the landscaping plans for the proposal. Mr. Barnes noted that the street trees will be retained on West 7th Avenue with new trees added within a boulevard. There will also be a double row of trees along Fir Street. Mr. Barnes noted that there are terraces planned for the 2nd, 3rd and 9th levels with the third floor terrace having a residential garden area.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to the bike storage area;
 - Consider further design development to the vertical elements on the west & east façades.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal as well as the increase in the FSR and the height as they felt the proposal had earned it from the project's design excellence.

The Panel thought the character and architecture of the building was well done with a great deal of care and attention given to the liveability of the unit layouts. They also thought the palette of materials was well done. One Panel member thought there was an opportunity on the north side of the site to open up the façade for some views. One Panel member commended the design team for taking the first two storeys and integrating it well with the rest of the building. Another Panel member suggested making the elevation facing the bridge less institutional so that it fits better into the neighbourhood.

The Panel thought there was only one issue that needed to be taken care of and that was the open bike storage area on the north side of the proposal. They felt there would be too many CPTED and noise issues.

Regarding the landscaping, the Panel supported the double row of trees with one member suggesting increasing the area of urban agriculture. The Panel thought the main patio off the service facility was a good size but suggested the applicant think about the program for the patio at a time when only 2 or 3 people are using the space.

Regarding sustainability, a couple of Panel members suggested the applicant revisit the rotation of the building to achieve a better solar orientation for the tower. An east-west oriented tower would have a blank east wall that could be used as a sound barrier to the traffic noise and would also create great views to the north for some of the residential units. Other panel members thought the west façade has been handled well with all the vertical elements but all the windows should have the same sun shading and in the south corner the vertical elements could be added to complete the whole west façade. Another Panel member thought the fins on the east elevation were facing the wrong way and would prefer to have the headlights at night rather than block the north view.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Adams thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that all of the issues have been debated in the office including looking at the building facing the other way, but this layout works best for the client.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.