

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 3, 2004

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Helen Besharat, Deputy Chair
Stuart Lyon
Jeffrey Corbett (Items 2 and 3)
Bruce Haden (Item 2)
Reena Lazar (Items 2 and 3)
Brian Martin
Kim Perry (Item 1)
Sorin Tatomir
Ken Terriss
Mark Ostry
Jennifer Marshall (Items 1 and 2)
Eva Lee (Items 2 and 3)

NEW MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL (non-voting this meeting):

Larry Adams
Robert Barnes
Ian Endall
Marta Farevagg
Steven Keyes
Ronald Lea
Margot Long (Items 1 and 2)

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Rae Ratslef, Raincoast Ventures

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	101 West Hastings Street (Woodward's)
2.	575 Bute Street (1200 West Pender Street)
3.	Southeast False Creek

Deputy Chair Besharat expressed appreciation to departing Panel members for their contributions, welcomed new Panel members, and announced Bruce Haden and Mark Ostry as the incoming Chair and Deputy Chair. In response to a poll, 14 members indicated their ability to attend the Panel's upcoming change-over dinner.

1.	Address:	101 West Hastings Street (Woodward's)
	Use:	Mixed
	Zoning:	DD
	Applicant Status:	WORKSHOP
	Architect:	Hotson Bakker
	Owner:	City of Vancouver
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Norm Hotson, Joost Bakker
	Staff:	Scot Hein

WORKSHOP

Panel members Stuart Lyon, Jeffrey Corbett, Bruce Haden, Reena Lazar and Eva Lee declared conflict of interest and did not participate in discussion on this item.

Introduction

Michael Flannigan, Project Manager, provided background information on the project, specifically referencing the creation of the Woodward's Project Steering Committee, extensive public consultations and targeted outreach the previous May and July. He noted that expressions of interest had been crafted and directed at developers, and representatives for non market housing, commercial and retail and non-profit to express interest in the development. Members were informed that the next phase would be the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP).

Mr. Flannigan reviewed the project's guiding principles and clarified the City's role as a participating investor. As such, he noted that the City would sell the site to a successful developer who would be required to convert the market value into an air space parcel that would be acquired by the City at the construction price. Mr. Flannigan advised that SFU had an interest in acquiring 180,000 sq ft for a school of contemporary arts, noting that the RFP required developers to create two options, one that included SFU and one that did not.

The Panel was advised of the developer and non-market sponsors that had been short-listed. Important components of non-market housing element were reviewed and it was noted that additional criteria had been identified for the developers recognizing that the urban design would be very important moving forward. Comment also offered that Vancouver Community College and the Army and Navy had been identified to partake as commercial anchor tenants.

Mr. Flannigan discussed the project timeline explaining that it was hoped the RFP process would conclude in May followed by consultations in June, building 2005-2006, and occupancy in 2006-2007.

Scott Hein, Development Planner, reminded the Panel that this was a workshop in regard to the urban design for the site and that no vote would follow. As well, he confirmed that a separate economic viability analysis would be done internally and somewhat independently to ensure the viability of options.

Applicant's Opening Comments

Norm Hotson and Joost Bakker, both of HBBM Architects, were present to address the Panel on this application.

Mr. Hotson noted that the distributed information package did not include the body of the text of the guidelines as they were still under development. He reviewed the project context noting that it was situated partly in Victory Square, Gastown and the Hastings Corridor. Urban design elements of the surrounding areas were discussed noting that they would inform the

development and serve as precedent for the redevelopment of other underutilized sites within the Hastings Corridor.

Referencing the model and display boards, Mr. Hotson discussed each of the massing options thus far considered for the site as follows:

- Option 1 - Development Permit Scheme (595,000 SF)
- Option 2 - Slab (611,000 SF)
- Option 3 - Tower (564,000 SF)
- Option 4 - Lower Slab (595,000 SF)
- Option 5 - Tower/Slab (585,000 SF)
- Option 6 - The Big 'W' (595,000 SF).

As well, Mr. Bakker presented contemporary and historical precedents identified.

Scott Hein, Development Planner, sought the Panel's comments on the following:

- Are all influencing factors identified?
- Is the form appropriate as derived from the fabric, particularly with regard to height?
- Information on other relevant projects in North America or internationally known for their innovation in housing and/or for urban design and architectural quality with respect to melding new to old.

In response to questions, it was noted that the lane to the west of the site would be active for parking access and egress, and that the two-waying of Abbott and Cordova and the incorporation of a street car element was anticipated. Also, it was noted that the project would include 100 units of non-market housing and would likely include market housing or another anchor.

The importance of the retail grade being animated with an active use throughout the day and night was noted, as was the assumption that any open space on the site would be primarily for the use of residents, recognizing the interest in a high ratio of family housing. It was likely that a daycare would be provided with associated outdoor space, and was noted that sustainability was a key interest.

Mr. Hein discussed the surrounding area offering that it would be reviewed in the context of what was decided on this site. It was assumed that there would be parking provided and that up to 500 spaces could be used in the neighbouring parkade. Mr. Hein noted that the guidelines were intended to be clear enough to allow the proponents to meet the project objectives while being sufficiently flexible to allow for innovation and new ways of thinking about housing in the urban context.

The Panel's comments on the key guidelines were welcomed as were indications of strong feelings for and against particular schemes. Clarification was offered that Council would approve the form of development, that the application would have an opportunity for a variety of rezonings, and that the guidelines would not have a prescriptive density and would relate primarily to height and massing.

With regard to heritage elements, Jeanette Hlavach indicated hope that the original 1903 building with the two storeys added in 1908 would be restored. She advised that the guidelines were contemplated to address the building being street-related rather than internalized, recognizing that there could be some internal uses. It was clarified that entrance locations were not prescribed, and that priorities for frontage could be suggested. It was added that streetscape elements could be appropriate but would not be prescribed given the necessity for a broader plan.

Mr. Hein discussed four pedestrian routes around the site, and clarified that a requirement would be for continuous weather protection around the frontages. Information was also provided on the Victory Square Plan under development that would limit the neighbouring site to 100 ft. The Panel was informed that the guidelines did not address the adjacent sites and instead focused on site-specific form considerations. It was hoped that the proponents would help in moving forward the guidelines for the neighbouring sites and was recognized that the guidelines could be made block-specific.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel's Comments

Given that this was a workshop, it was asked that the Panel's comments be captured in bulleted lists under broad categories. Comments from Panel members were as follows:

Regarding whether influencing factors had been identified:

- report is a wealth of information and has beautiful, informative photographs;
- influencing factors have been picked up;
- building is an anomaly and doesn't conform to most of the fabric;
- memory of the building is as a scale of massiveness that could be embraced;
- agree with historical precedents but not the contemporary precedents;
- should have included more information on heritage aspects and contextual information;
- would have liked more definition of the context of the neighbourhood block.

Regarding the Guidelines:

- helpful to inform future developers;
- should give proponents an envelope that includes height and FSR;
- let the designers working on the proposals have freedom rather than basing the design on existing buildings; it could set standards and new design guidelines;
- don't see its importance; it warps the scheme and doesn't seem very sensible;
- don't like the corner for the major tall building;
- agree that the Cordova access is important as an urban design guideline;
- like the goal of achieving guidelines that are open and as flexible as possible and flushing out the pros and cons of massing;
- could formally take a look at broader contextual elements;
- diagonal approach through International Village is a broader aspect that should be considered;
- guidelines should extend to the inner core with consideration as to how it could be handled and filled in;
- need potential transitional uses that could become retail at some point to connect to the community;
- could act as a catalyst for regenerating the community; need clear guidelines for performance that needs to be met;
- canopies should be included but not necessarily the present ones;
- flexibility is a very positive perspective that will allow for maximum benefit;
- could make the guidelines performance rather than prescriptive based;
- suggest that they don't include the models but give height limitations and discuss quality of tower or slab forms would leave more room for people to be inspired without getting hooked on images;
- seems too soon; there is no context, no program for the nearby streets; most of the commercial on Hastings is closed or barred;
- agree building should be street related to increase pedestrian traffic;
- streetscape is important; key to the project is the ability to revive the animation on Hastings; may be too much to hope that the other sides can generate that level of activity; without a program we're shooting in the dark;

- feel that the work that has been done to inform the proponents is useful to help the city understand the implications of the various options;
- support the idea of folding the whole block into the guidelines;
- support flexible guidelines but they have to include more words about the spirit of the place, i.e. strength of the building, sense of permanence;
- putting a university on the ground floor is a mistake; it would have a life of its own on the inside;
- the whole block should become part of the study, it will influence the site to the west and vice versa so they have to be associated.

Regarding form and massing:

- do not see that one form is better than the other, the solution will be in the details; gut response is to keep the height down within the limits of the neighbouring buildings;
- lean towards lower slab options set back from existing facade;
- the tower has an interesting relationship between Dominion and Sun tower;
- problem with shadowing on Cordova if the tower is on that end; acts as a divide between the two parts of Vancouver;
- no problem with slab or tower elements;
- prefer Option 1: Development Permit Scheme because it retains the many facets of architectural expression around the area of the project;
- believe that less will be more for this project;
- no problem with open space in the project but really like atriums;
- should be sensitivity towards the overall height of the buildings on the primary streets;
- courtyard needs more of a livability study;
- like the 150 FT as having some historical relativity;
- seems appropriate that the only open space part of the project is the sidewalk - needs to be dealt with before the project is conceived rather than after;
- concerned about the slab solutions,
- a tall tower with punched windows would be too dark; should keep the treatment light;
- massing is overpowering in all of the schemes and needs to come down a bit; the building is trying to solve too many problems and so may not solve any;
- prefer slab options to the tower option - tower would diminish other historical tower elements;
- limits of mass are a real challenge; surprised their are not east west slab options;
- tower scheme if well done could be successful if blended into a slab concept;
- stepped tower may not be successful given the solidness of the corner within the context.

Regarding the Cordova Street facade:

- needs to include a streetscape that bridges the retail streets immediately east and west of the site;
- do not support continuous canopies because it would prevent street planting;
- overhead canopy should be thin and light if included;
- do not want to forget Cordova, it's quite blank but there is a lot of pedestrian movement;
- Cordova is high enough as it is now;
- the project needs integration and extension off the site.

Regarding architectural expression:

- emotional transposes itself onto the physical building and that's worth something; there is a link that needs to remain part of the project;
- new part of the building could be a very modern departure.

Regarding the W:

- the glitzy sign with metal is very indicative of Vancouver;
- support reintroduction of the neon light that rotates so it can be seen from any part of the city;

- support retention of the W emblem and its lattice tower;
- the vertical "Woodward's" sign should also be considered for retention.

Regarding an overhead walkway:

- would not have a problem with it to facilitate a connection back to Gastown;
- could light the street but there is an existing tunnel for parking;
- do not particularly like the idea of an overhead walkway; it killed any retail beneath it and made it feel very unfriendly;
- like the idea of the overhead walkway because that was the way it was at Woodward's;
- the old bridge did provide some protection for a bus exchange so some protection makes sense;
- it did not work before because it was as wide as the street but it could work;
- could be appropriate depending on how it is done and the location.

Regarding sustainability:

- should be a requirement to a certain level as a model project.

Regarding the 1905-8 heritage element:

- make sure new design elements are distinct from old each had their own integrity;
- elements identified in the neighbourhood are thorough and well considered;
- important to recognize the heritage value was the business, family and way of life that the building offered, not the building itself; taking down the rest of the building and replacing it with a contemporary or modern response would be better; should go for something more exciting;
- this is a challenge on the site;
- modern heritage blend would give the project some interest.

Further comments:

- there is a building in Bellevue has a six storey courtyard;
- for programming the building there are a number of 80-year-old former executives that could add to an understanding of the real heritage of the site.

Applicant's Response

The applicant thanked the Panel for its comments.

2.	Address:	575 Bute Street (1200 West Pender)
	DE:	408162
	Use:	Mixed (33 storeys, 147 units)
	Zoning:	DD
	Applicant Status:	Preliminary
	Architect:	Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright
	Owner:	Mondiale Development Ltd.
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, Jim Hancock, Peter Kreuk
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: NON SUPPORT (3-5)

Introduction

Referencing the displayed model, Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the project in the context of the surrounding neighbourhood. She noted that it was within the sub-area commonly known as Triangle West and was affected by the Bute Street policy seeking retail usage on Bute Street frontages. Permitted density (6 FSR) and height (300 ft) were reviewed. The Panel was advised that the applicant was seeking support for 6.6 FSR and 340 ft, and were informed that the proposed uses were consistent with the intended directions for the area and that tower dimensions generally fell within the attributes for slim tower.

The Panel was specifically asked to comment on the following:

- Does it earn the additional height?
- Can it support the 10% heritage bonus through addressing shadowing and view impacts?
- Tower shaping and proportions.
- Ground oriented issues.
- Should the depth of street units be increased?
- Does the fitness room located on the Melville set back below grade work?
- Scale of the podium along Pender and Bute Street frontages.
- Location of parking directly adjacent to the parking for the neighbouring site.

In response to questions, Ms. Molaro advised that the building was 23 ft from the property line, and that Triangle West was a residential oriented area seeking residential uses along Melville and Bute with Pender being for retail.

Applicant's Opening Comments

Martin Bruckner, Jim Hancock and Peter Kreuk were present to address the Panel on this application.

Mr. Bruckner confirmed that the applicant saw Pender Street as the principle retail, noting that Bute was identified for the residential address given that the entrances were seen as compatible with the retail frontage. He also discussed the transition at the massing of the base and the use of the roof space as an amenity for the residential and as a visual amenity for neighbouring towers.

Mr. Bruckner commented on the evolution of the tower to minimize the floor plate size at higher levels, and reviewed the proposed building materials. He offered that the tower location allowed for sufficient set-back from Bute without overpowering the Melville Street development and minimized view blockages for a majority of buildings behind. It was noted that the tower orientation was set to the city grid that changed on Pender. Also, Mr. Bruckner advised that the suites would be air conditioned so that there would be the possibility of heat recovering from the commercial systems, dependent on costs, with the intent of meeting the city's new higher level sustainability guidelines.

Mr. Kreuk addressed the Panel concerning landscape issues noting that related requirements had been satisfied along Bute Street. He discussed the development of an area where people could set up tables and chairs on terraces, and commented that the roof deck intent was to offer private spaces to the north side of the townhouses with the rest of the deck being shared with an amenity space outside of the exercise area. It was added that the roof deck was quite accessible to the entire tower with a fair amount of lawn and the ability for storm water retention.

Ms. Molaro discussed the view impacts on neighbouring buildings depending on the location of the tower. It was noted that regardless of where the tower was located on the site it would impact the Orca but that the impact could be lessened by its design and slimming. It was noted that the permitted height on the neighbouring site was 300 ft but that it was uncertain whether this was achievable. Also, it was recognized that moving the tower on this site would impact the location of the tower on the neighbouring site.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel's Comments

As to whether the project earned the addition 10% height, several Panel members were uncertain, while others felt that it was acceptable in that the tower would be squatter and fatter without it. However, it was suggested that there should be further development to earn the additional height, that the mass reduction from 88 to 80 ft was not well perceived, and that the applicant should come up with more substantial sustainability requirements as part of the earning. It was also suggested that the building did not respond to the orientations being south and west, for solar gain and envelope performance.

Panel members agreed that more worked needed to be done to deal with view impacts of the tower. It was suggested that the tower needed to be located more westerly to address Orca concerns and to let Bute Street breathe, and was offered that it seemed unreasonable to locate the tower so close to one of the tallest buildings in the city when it could be further away. Problems with the view impacts to the Venus, Residences B, Orca and Melville were acknowledged.

With regard to the tower shaping, several members indicated their support for its handsome, simple, square design as a welcome departure from the city's glass buildings. However, others suggested that the tower should be further articulated, possibly with a higher scale on Pender, and thought that the tower's relationship with the podium was the weakest point that required clarification. Further suggestions were that the biggest missed opportunity was not taking advantage of the triangular shape of the site in the tower's expression that would also recognize axial views to the west; and that consideration be given to having several units on the fifth, sixth and seventh floors cascade down to the northwest to relocate some mass and make the tower slimmer.

In relation to ground-oriented issues, members offered that the experience on the ground plane was important given that this was a high tourist area, and suggested that it needed further consideration on all sides in terms of detailing and compatibility with neighbouring buildings. Further comments were that the retail on Bute was not very attractive and could be replaced with an amenity space for residents; that the facade along Pender Street was not in proper scale; and that putting the residential above the commercial on Pender could be beneficial with shared use of the rooftop.

Several Panel members indicated their dislike for the orientation of the townhouses to Pender noting that the access seemed disrespectful to the Melville Street grid. It was suggested that twisting the building could obtain a decent facade along Melville Street with 6-8 townhouses

(similar to the neighbouring building) that would be more in character with Melville Street. Another member suggested that it was a selfish to have the townhouse units almost solely benefit from the courtyard space on the tower podium.

With regard to the depth of the retail, it was recognized as being minimal, but was offered that the prospects of the space required a minimal depth and not something more substantial. It was hoped that the retail continuity on Pender was realized as envisioned by the planners.

The Panel commented on the corner of Melville and Bute suggesting that the transition between the tower and Melville was most unsuccessful and supporting the notion that this could be partially addressed by a residential entry on Bute. Opposing views were that the architect should decide the best location for the residential entry, that it could be successful in its present form if well detailed, and that the residential entrance should be kept off of Bute given the importance of continuous retail.

Concerning the location of the fitness room, one member's comment was that, set below grade it seemed leftover and un-thought out.

Two members commented on the location of the parking access, one offering that it was in the right place whether shared or not, and the other noting that it would facilitate not needing a secondary entry if the neighbouring westerly site were developed.

General comments from individual Panel members included that all of the city's buildings looked the same from Stanley Park and that this should be taken into consideration; desire for there to have been incentive to keep and work around the existing building; and that the site specific demonstration project at the previous meeting would be applicable for bigger sites to encourage more exciting projects, more experimentation and innovation. It was added that a smaller scale but larger size contextual model would have been helpful in reviewing the project, and was suggested that the city develop a city model that could be continually updated and provided for Panel members' reference on future projects.

Applicant's Response

The applicant offered that they felt hamstrung by the city's planning guidelines and noted that each time a building was designed the energy went into trying to interpret those guidelines in a different way.

3.	Address:	Southeast False Creek
	Use:	Mixed
	Zoning:	ODP
	Applicant Status:	Rezoning
	Architect:	VIA
	Owner:	City of Vancouver
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Graham McGarva, Margot Long, Jeff Olson
	Staff:	Karis Hiebert, Jonathan Barrett, Bruce Maitland

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-4)

Panel members Stuart Lyon and Bruce Haden declared conflict of interest and did not participate in discussion on this item.

Introduction

Karis Hiebert, Central Area Planner, discussed the area zoned as industrial M2 noting that the City owned 50 acres of waterfront with 30 acres between First and Second avenues being private lands. She noted plans for the waterfront land to focus on family housing and to serve as a model for sustainable development. Ms. Hiebert advised that the applicant had submitted a proposal for the ODP in May 2003 that went through extensive public consultation identifying five themes: support for 26.4 acre waterfront park with extension of the green fingers to the south; suggested animated and accessible waterfront considering recreational and commercial opportunities; consideration of an industrial legacy; reduction of development parcel sizes; need for a variety of building types avoiding overemphasis on podiums and towers.

The Panel was informed that the city was in the process of reviewing the revised ODP and would consider it at a May 18, 2004 public hearing.

Referencing the display model, Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, commented that an ODP secured density, overall urban structure, land uses and locations, and wide ranging amenities. He noted the project's objective to create a sustainable neighbourhood, and advised that the site area was approximately 48 acres with 12 acres of development. Mr. Barrett indicated that the target was for 35% family housing units, commercial in a variety of locations, and provision of a streetcar system on the development's edge.

It was noted that an Olympic Village would also be located on the site and that neighbourhoods would be developed into eastern, central and western schemes. Mr. Barrett advised that there were 10 organizing principles for the development that were provided in the summary, and reviewed these.

The Panel's specific comments were sought regarding:

- legibility of the overall form within the overall city context;
- urban structure and whether there were enough amenity opportunities;
- whether the urban form was generally appropriate for its context; and
- appropriateness of park and landscape representations.

Mr. Barrett reviewed the Panel's previous comments supporting: the extension of the green fingers; twisting the street grid along the north edge of First; increased water activity; relocation of salt building; development of smaller parcels; increasing development density; distribution of mass across the site; stronger engagement of the seaside walkway and water edge; modulation of development form with the park; and the proposed direction from the public comments. Mr. Barrett indicated that the Panel would review CD-1s for the three neighbourhoods within the project.

Applicant's Opening Comments

Graham McGarva, VIA Architecture, Margot Long, PWL Partnership and Jeff Olson, VIA Architects, were present to address the Panel on this application.

Mr. McGarva referenced the displayed model noting that the ODP submission was to try to meet sustainability expectations. He advised that the Panel was dealing with an ill looking pro forma that attempted to illustrate development parcels but that did not highlight an urban design form. He offered that the focus in the resubmission was on urban design elements and on shifting the massing through the site with a greater variety of forms. Confirmation was provided that the project was 'made in Vancouver' and was intended to encourage social life in a convivial urban centre.

Further referencing the display model, Mr. McGarva provided detailed information concerning how the five theme areas had been addressed. He highlighted the park spaces and noted the designation of certain common spaces; referenced the sediment issue noting that it prevented a developable building 30 metres back from the shoreline; and discussed the total study area having three designated buildings on the heritage registry. Mr. McGarva further discussed the connection of Commercial Street to the park entrance to enable closed vistas and to create a more intimate community, and commented on the City Gate context and neighbourhood pathways. With regard to sustainability it was noted that the applicant felt it was addressed relative to view, outlook and the celebration of water.

Ms. Long noted that a number of programmatic elements had been incorporated, including: informal soccer and softball pitch; amphitheatre; educational/community gardens; small neighbourhood parks within the water park; habitat zones to increase biodiversity integrated with sustainable approaches; play areas with sports courts under the bridge; opportunities for non-motorized boats and for launching boats; and connecting the city grid to the waterfront.

In response to questions Ms. Long discussed the plans for a combined pedestrian cycling walkway with mixed forest, boardwalk and foreshore areas noting the intent to leave the shoreline as natural as possible. Clarification was offered that there was a Council directive to provide 26.4 acres of park. Also information was provided on the original location contemplated for the Olympic Village, and the rationale for its relocation and security arrangements that would be in place during the 2010 Winter Olympics was provided. It was noted that the development would provide 19-20 sq ft per athlete.

Further questions were addressed relative to commercial opportunities along the water and the intended relationship with Science World. It was noted that recreational courts on the opposite side of the water under the bridge had been tremendously successful.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel's Comments

With regard to the project's legibility in the city context, a member questioned pushing the industrial activity away from the waterfront offering that this created exclusivity for the development. It was suggested that the eastern neighbourhood needed to identify itself, and particularly that the towers and podiums in east neighbourhood should be rethought to arrive at a more original solution for achieving the density, or to have fewer but larger towers. A member commented that they were unsure that having high rises encouraged socialization, and suggested that it started to wrap the downtown image on the south side of False Creek, that this was not a good transition, and that the breath ability needed to be protected.

Panel members offered that the project had been successful in its smaller parcelization, suggesting that this would go a long way to helping with incremental growth and development to prevent mega projects on the site's western and southern portions.

The rationale for dividing the site into three areas was queried. Also, a member indicated that they liked the green fingers but questioned the real opportunities for use of the open spaces. It was suggested that integration with commercial space would be beneficial to bring people into the area between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

In relation to the integration of private and public lands, several members commented that, because of First Avenue being such a divider, the area could handle having some abruptness in terms of its integration. Another view was that the integration was a little odd but that the waterfront was the one area where it was possible to go against the city grid.

One member commented that they were puzzled by the location of the school next to the commercial area, occupying the best spot on the site, and suggested that it should be moved to the west. Another member felt that the school was well located and that the children should have the first opportunity for open space and sunlight given that they were playing outside.

On the urban form, comments included support for the smaller grain for the development of the area noting that smaller sites could cause complications, and support for flexibility between the forms to allow architects to be creative. Also, it was noted that how security issues were addressed was unclear and was suggested that the streetcar should go into the centre of the development as an addition to the activity.

Concerning the park and landscape system, a comment was that it was too much park, and it was observed that the green space at Coal Harbour was comparable and was not a very effective use of space, acknowledging that this appeared to be a better solution.

With regard to the appropriateness of waterfront uses, several members expressed support for a less refined and seedier design but questioned how animated the area would be noting that, without commercial, there was nothing to attract people to the area. Others suggested that the design looked like a fairground in its animation, and could benefit from simplification. A further possibility identified was that there be more vibrant commercial areas on the waterfront with the whole building facing the water being made commercial instead of flex use to capitalize on its closeness to Science World and to encourage people to sit outside on the water.

Panel members commented on the below bridge activities. While one member offered that the planning and programming was excellent as a great transition between the west and east sides of the Cambie Street bridge, another suggested that the concentration of all courts below the bridge might not be appropriate. It was suggested that, with the aging population and their desire to be engaged as spectators, some of the courts be relocated, with opportunity for increased public views to court activities.

In relation to the termination of the bikeway from the northeast to the Village Square, several comments were that it was odd crossing Quebec so close to Terminal, and that it seemed confusing around the boardwalk area. As well, the ability to include an additional east-west bike route was queried.

Panel members commented regarding sustainability noting that insufficient information had been provided on what the city would do to ensure that sustainability objectives were met. It was suggested that the approval process be reviewed to ensure that the city's processes did not hinder innovative sustainability concepts. The importance of sustainability elements was further emphasized with suggestions that it be embedded in the ODP, observation that the

building orientations on the east side were not faced true north and true west for heat gain on the south and west sides, and suggestion that there be a minimum silver certification level for buildings.

In terms of general comments, Panel members did not see a lot of opportunity for business in the area, expressed hope that art would be a mandatory requirement in the development, and suggested that there be an architectural competition for building on city property. Also, it was noted that Science World was associated with the legacy of Expo 86, and question was raised regarding whether there would be a gesture towards an Olympics legacy on the site. Final comments were that the project needed to become bolder and more inspired, and suggestion that there be a study of successful Canadian villages with the intent of revisiting the project's village centre to see if the elements necessary for success were present.

Applicant's Response

Ms. Hiebert added that the ODP bylaw would include sections relative to sustainability, including: urban agricultural and design; street rights of way offering garden opportunities, storm water management in the development site and surrounding areas; green roofs; green building requirements in energy and water efficiency; three stream recycling; cycling routes; development of urban structure with pedestrian permeability; street car as a form of public transportation; and coordination of public transit on Second Avenue.

Mr. Barrett also offered that Council direction was to make this the most sustainable neighbourhood in North America and indicated the intent for this to be achieved.

Mr. Graham added that many of the Panel's comments had been about aspects of building and cycle paths but this was intended to show the beginning to inform phase 1 to address the detailed elements of the design. He noted that the display showed how tall the buildings could be but that this would be addressed further through the urban design process. It was projected that there would be 30,000 jobs in the flats, and he discussed the policy box that the project was working within.

Mr. Barrett reiterated that the intent of the review was to secure density, overall urban structure, general heights and massing, uses and general location and social sustainability that would be embedded in an ODP. He advised that the next stage of the process was the CD-1 zoning that would look at the level of detail shown on the illustrative plans.

Bruce Maitland indicated that efforts had been made to meet the city's standards noting that removing heights and density in towers would be a cost to the social sustainability resulting in the loss of social housing, daycare and park development, noting that money for those came from heightened density.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.