

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 11, 2005

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Alan Endall, Chair  
Larry Adams  
Robert Barnes  
Nigel Baldwin (Items 1-3)  
Shahla Bozorgzadeh  
James Cheng (Items 1-3)  
Marta Farevaag (Items 1-3)  
Ronald Lea  
Margot Long  
Edward Smith  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:** C.C. Yao

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Karen Miller, Raincoast Ventures

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	702 West King Edward Avenue
2.	3200 West 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue (Crofton House)
3.	1818 Nelson Street (1025 Denman)
4.	10 Terry Fox Way (FCN-5B)

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Endall called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 702 West King Edward Avenue  
DE: 409168  
Use: Mixed (4 storeys, 42 units)  
Zoning: CD-2  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: Gair Williamson  
Owner: 701890 BC Ltd.  
Review: First  
Delegation: Gair Williamson, Scott MacNeil, Senga Lindsay  
Staff: Dale Morgan

**EVALUATION: UNANIMOUS SUPPORT (10 - 0)****• Introduction:**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner presented the application which included a total of 42 strata residential units; underground parking for 50 cars including six spaces for retail; a class B loading bay and bicycle parking; a 140 ft. frontage on Fraser Street and an 88 ft. frontage on King Edward. The intent of the CD-2 zoning was reviewed; and it was noted that the applicant requested 2.33 FSR although the site provided for an actual allowance of 2.5 FSR. The Planner described the building setback referenced on posted drawings.

The context of the development within the neighbourhood was reviewed noting that a vacant lot existed on the northeast corner; an older building dating from 1912 was on the southern face; east of the site was RS-1 zoning; and there was a shared lane which faced the side yard of a bungalow. It was noted that the adjacent 1912 building was renovated in the 1970's and that side light wells had been added. Planning Staff's recommendation that the sidewalks along the dual frontage would have to be replaced and the sidewalk along King Edward widened, was reviewed. General site topography was acknowledged with a rise of 20 ft. over 100 ft., giving the corner site visual prominence.

Mr. Morgan advised that the building stepped back at the second level; rose to a maximum height of 45 ft.; and included a projecting bay element. It was noted that setback requirements for C-2 are relaxable; and that departure from the building envelopment was to provide for a better fit with adjacent housing and scale relationships.

Comment was offered on the floor layout recognizing there were five ground access units off the lane with an enclosed garden area (due of the change in grade these units were below grade). It was noted that most of the units were single unit variation on a bachelor suite; and that current practice had allowed for bedrooms to appear inboard of an exterior wall. He added that the location of the parking ramp was setback from the street and did not front onto the side of the existing single-family house. It was further noted that the layout of the southside of the building faced the window wells of the adjacent building, with glazing occurring in the bathroom and dining room of the units facing the windows of the adjacent building.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the building's materials including brick facing and zinc paneling on the balcony treatments and the top floor. He added that the two mature trees along

Fraser Street would remain; new trees would be planted; and landscaping would be included on the terrace.

The advice of the Panel was sought on:

- building massing: is this an appropriate response within the context, keeping in mind the massing along E King Edward is a departure from guidelines?
- should more brick be introduced at the base to give a more consistent architectural expression?
- livability of the units.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Gair Williamson, Architect, commented on the context of the site within the 1920's era. He advised that the existing building on the southwest corner broke the continuity that flowed down the street. The neighbourhood stores were acknowledged. It was noted that the massing presented, kept a continuous frontage along grade at the commercial level. Mr. Williamson noted that polychroming was introduced to relate to the building across the street. By maintaining a strong scale and giving a hint of the two-storey scale, it was noted that the building responded to the views and picked up a bit of the history of the area. He added that a grander entrance going up 13 feet to the underside of the bay was included; and 66% of the façade had a rhythm that would be broken with a single element at the corner. It was noted that two trees had been removed due to their proximity.

Senga Lindsay offered comments on landscaping, and acknowledged communications with Parks and Engineering regarding their requirements and street widening. She noted that the development entries were punctuated with a Japanese Maple; the foreground planting included evergreen and colorful seasonal perennials; and the planters had been kept to the perimeters to respond to the architecture. It was noted that a simple glass partition system with an evergreen screen at the patio units had also been included.

The proponent team responded to the Panel's questions and the following highlights were noted:

- a review by Engineering indicated that sight lines for vehicular traffic could be impacted by additional street trees towards the corner of King Edward; they subsequently requested the removal of the trees indicated on the drawings;
- the entrance would be 8 ft. high by 13 ft. wide;
- direct street presence was desired and further embellishment was added relative to the access to Unit 101;
- the height maximum of 45 ft. had been achieved in the project;
- with respect to the public realm from the edge of the building to the curb on King Edward it was acknowledged that Parks and Engineering were setting a standard for the streetscape; street trees in grates with a concrete sidewalk were included; and
- the deepest patio step down from the lane would be close to 6 ft.; a deep landscape buffer was also included.

Additional responses to the Panel's queries were provided as follows:

- with respect to the brick material meeting the glass, the Architect acknowledged that it was coming down onto the concrete slab for support; visually it was supported by a metal fascia which was also a sign band; glass and brick were in the same plane;
- the structure was behind the glass and did not express itself on the street;
- no amenities were proposed for the building;
- there was a glazed partition, and one step up between sleeping and living areas;
- an optical vent in the screen was being examined from the economics perspective;

- there were no overhangs from the north and a continuous weather protection was included on the other sides; where there was a lot of glass, there were projecting concrete canopies;
- landscape trees would have foliage in the summer to provide shade, and would be bare in winter to let in heat and light; and
- the project included skylights on a 2% slope.

Panel Members reviewed the model.

- **Panel's Recommendations:**

Chair Endall summarized recommendations discussed by the Panel with respect to building massing along King Edward (particularly the corner expression, and whether the treatment along the King Edward elevation was appropriate to the residential uses to the East). The architectural expression (particularly the brick at the base) was discussed, and comments were offered regarding the general livability and design layout of the units, as follows:

- there was overall comfort with the general massing of the building and corner expression at Fraser and King Edward; with some work the expression of the northeast corner was also appropriate;
- general comments on the architectural expression acknowledged that it was going in the right direction;
- no one expressed concern over the absence of brick on the main floor; particular attention needed to be paid to the detail design of the brick cladding, connections, sills, headers and the like;
- there were some mixed commentary relative to the livability of the units;
- caution was offered relative to code issues with the south elevation openings and proximity to openings on the building to the south;
- street trees should definitely be continuous;

**Key Issues to be Addressed:**

- relocation and further consideration to detailing of the parkade exhaust and transformer location;
- raising the floor level of lane oriented units and design development to screening to be provided between units and to the lane;
- design development to emphasize the main entry, and consideration to either improve or eliminate the north east ground level unit's entry off King Edward;
- further articulation to alleviate the continuous expanse of the top floor, perhaps relating to the indentation at the second and third levels;
- clarification and refinement of landscape treatment and detailing along the 7 ft. setback on the north side

- **General Comments from the Panel:**

The Panel offered the following comments relative to building massing:

- the building massing was appropriate and well handled for a C-2 project;
- it is a successful project in terms of visibility of the neighborhood; and
- no major concerns were expressed.

The Panel offered the following comments relative to architectural expression:

- it was recognized that the King Edward façade was the most difficult façade; consideration could be given to expressing the end unit with brick to better relate to the scale of the residential to the east;

- articulation of the fourth floor was discussed and a suggestion was offered to consider a way to indent the upper unit with the roofline so the 33 ft. scale could be appreciated at the top;
- the residential entry needed to be more strongly expressed;
- the residential entry on King Edward and the corner expression was underwhelming and should include more structure coming to the street; it was too light at the pedestrian scale;
- the entrance on King Edward should be celebrated more with width and glass;
- the expression could be stronger where the retail turns the corner;
- there was no need for adding more brick;
- the relationship of the brick to the metal fascia band was relevant;
- commendation was offered for the use of brick and zinc on the building and a question was raised relative to budget issues; if the proposed zinc was not included then what metal would be used?
- more design development to the 7 ft. setback was suggested as it needed more than concrete;
- the beginning of asymmetry was noted; the box on the top expressed as veneer brick, could be expressed as something else;
- there should be detailing around brick openings and details in the brick veneer addressing windows;
- some attention should be given to the paving surface around the building to relieve the concrete finish; a surface of a different quality in the entry recesses could be explored (such as going forward into the sidewalk with different paving materials);
- the building would be better served not to have a door to Unit 101 in the location shown; the unit could benefit from more glazing to that side; and
- it would be worth considering the column locations in terms of the upper façade.

The Panel offered the following comments relative to design layout and livability:

- some concern was expressed with regard to livability specific to the internal bedroom area and bathroom window/light wall concept;
- concerns regarding details were expressed relative to the bedrooms; a member suggested that a window and direct light was needed;
- kitchen design was a concern to one member;
- skylights and overhangs could be further considered;
- livability of units on the lane could be improved if the units were raised up;
- concern was expressed specific to the livability of Unit 105; a member advised that they would not approve it in its current form with the transformer included;
- with the transformer and exhaust, Unit 105 had an inappropriate response to an outdoor patio;
- concern was expressed regarding the livability of the units on the lane relative to the safety and security in the depressed area; and
- privacy issues needed to be addressed along with the patio detail, as there were issues with the livability of the outdoor spaces.

With respect to landscaping the following comments were offered:

- the third tree on King Edward was essential and the proponent was encouraged to work further with Planning and Engineering on this;
- streetscape detail should be considered carefully as it would likely set a precedent;
- planting at the patio on the northernmost corner was encouraged;
- patios off the lane were a great treatment;
- more privacy was needed between the patios and King Edward;
- the addition of street trees on King Edward and Fraser Street was supported; and
- suggestion was offered that plants and bushes could be used to cover the transformer at Unit 105.

Additional comments were offered as follows:

- concern was expressed relative to the garage exhaust near the end unit and suggestion was offered that the exhaust grill be made flush with the garage entrance or the loading bay to give more area back to the end unit for planting; the operable door and window would then be further from the exhaust;
  - consideration to code issues with respect to limiting the distance from the adjacent building's light wells was needed;
  - potential CPTED problems were noted by a member with respect to the 3 ft. wide entry area;
  - the bike rack deserved another solution;
  - it was suggested that the interior mailboxes be moved away from the exit and elevator; and
  - a member offered comment that the corner of Fraser and King Edward (at the retail corner) appeared too short; a sloping ramp for handicapped was necessary; and the point of access looked too narrow.
- **Applicant's Response:**  
Mr. Williamson thanked the Panel for their comments and indicated that he would consult with Planning to determine whether the extra door could be removed; and noted that balancing the asymmetrical façade would be considered.

---

2. Address:	3200 West 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue (Crofton House)
Use:	School
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Brook Dev. Planning / Cornerstone
Owner:	Crofton House School
Review:	First
Delegation:	Simon Richards, Robert Lemon, Jane Durante
Staff:	Dale Morgan, Michael Naylor

---

#### EVALUATION: UNANIMOUS SUPPORT (10 - 0)

- **Introduction:**

Michael Naylor, Rezoning Planner, referenced the aerial photo on page two of the distributed package and provided a description of the project within the context of the neighbourhood. He noted that the site was a former estate property; the original residence had been retained; and that since 1942 it had been a school. It was noted that Crofton House wanted to rebuild part of the senior school, an early childhood centre, and add a dining hall. It was noted that passenger loading activity was addressed through a drop off loop on Blenheim Street; and that the entrance to the future parkade would be off of Balaclava (with a narrow right-of-way).

Dale Morgan, Rezoning Planner, provided commentary on the interface between the private school and public realm, noting that the underlying philosophy of Planning was to ensure a good fit between public and private uses.

The Panel was apprised of project details noting that along W. 41st Avenue the hedging was approximately 8 ft. in height; and gates were defined by granite pillars. A CD-1 multi-unit development near the site was referenced and the immediate context was displayed in a photo. Mr. Morgan noted that the main point of entry acted as a ceremonial entryway. Photos displaying the main gate interface with the public realm were referenced. It was acknowledged that the houses on Balaclava were oriented away from Balaclava; and that the campus itself faced away from Balaclava and de-emphasized this access. It was noted that the existing roofscape provided a variety of roof forms over the hedging.

Site context was reviewed including a slope over 45 ft. and a large artificial field, which would be retained. It was noted that buildings were organized around two courtyard spaces; and that the character was mixed. Existing cladding materials were reviewed; and existing and expanded uses were noted. The Panel was informed that the project would be addressed in phases, with the first phase being the replacement of the secondary school, which could be built in two stages. It was noted that phase two included the new athletics facility, dining hall and may also include a new swimming pool. It was further noted that subsequent phases would include the addition of a stage in the Fine Arts Centre and a new Early Childhood Education Centre. Mr. Morgan added that the proposed building height was up to 35 ft., and that an underground parking structure would be added.

It was noted that the Heritage Commission had supported the proposal.

Additionally it was noted that the applicant was requesting a height relaxation beyond 35 ft. due to sloping grade; and that by comparison the CD-1 next door included a 40 ft. height allowance. Proposed values were summarized: preservation of a wooded area; meaningfully linking outdoor spaces; acknowledging the building expression with stone at

the base; the use of windows as a character expression; and an appropriate scale of massing elements.

Direction from the Urban Design Panel was sought relative to the proposed architectural form and character, as they were viewed from the public realm. Design Guidelines are to be developed during the rezoning and suggestions from the Panel on appropriate guidelines are welcome.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Simon Richards, Architect, advised that they were requesting a rezoning, and more appropriately an amendment, that allowed for a density of .6. It was noted that the intention was to develop the plan over ten years and the applicant wanted to be able to complete all of the phases. He noted that comments about the public realm were valid. The architect acknowledged that along West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue the school did not have a strong presence and part of the plan was to have a single front door that would be entrance to the senior school for pedestrians.

The proponent team responded to the Panel's questions and the following highlights were noted:

- the forest was sacrosanct;
- existing buildings being removed were Gordon and Farrell Halls; the buildings had not specifically been identified as outstanding heritage buildings; the Heritage Commission's concern was maintaining the three facades of the main building and its relationship to the central courtyard;
- with respect to the connection between the old residence and the new dining hall, it was noted that importance was placed on the preservation of three sides; issues of mechanical, exiting, seismic were considered; this would be an assemblage of buildings;
- public meetings were held during the course of developing the Master Plan and positive responses were received; people enjoyed the fact that this was a green site in the neighbourhood, however two people expressed traffic concerns;
- the field was private as the school had an informal arrangement with the neighborhood not to overuse it;
- with respect to the potential use of a geothermal system, the Architect advised that deep wells under the buildings would be included as they were developed;
- comment was offered on the landscaping, noting that the interior of the space was its own domain and there were weak windows and gates allowing the community to see in;
- with respect to the potential to add interventions to the green façade it was acknowledged that the current gate was four or five feet wide and it would be expanded so there was a formal entrance into the building and somewhere to wait; and
- the gym façade involved a proposed set back; the transition of two scales with a storage facility in front and clerestory windows, were included in the gym.

The Panel reviewed the model and material.

- **Panel's Recommendations:**

The Chair summarized the Panel's comments on the proposed architectural form and character as viewed and experienced from the public realm.

Chair Endall recognized that overall the Panel was supportive of the Master Plan and supported relaxations in height towards the centre of the site, also noting that they had no problems with the proposed density. He acknowledged that it was early to comment on the architectural form and character. Concern was indicated by some over the continuous



length of the façade along West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, others recognized it more as an issue of scale, texture and roof form.

#### Key Issues to be Addressed;

- Form and massing of the Early Childhood Education Centre;
  - Reconsideration of the form, massing and location of the gymnasium and perhaps to take better advantage of the natural slope of the site;
  - More definitive architectural guidelines addressing the form, character and detail of the project should be developed and included as part of the CD-1 zoning in order to define key character forming elements and to inform and address more detailed design considerations at the Development Permit stage, including;
    - Preservation and reinforcement of the site's landscape legacy;
    - Form and character of internal courtyard pedestrian spaces;
    - Roof forms, screening of mechanical equipment, non-habitable use of roof space over the 35' height guideline, etc..
    - Preservation and reinforcement of the site's estate character
    - Respect for the existing proportion, scale and intimacy of the site
    - Overall lighting considerations
- **Panel's General Comments:**  
The following comments were provided relative to proposed architectural form and character as viewed and experienced from the public realm:
- the use and density strategy were fine;
  - interior spaces were well handled;
  - the Master Plan was well done;
  - more height towards the interior of the site would be supported;
  - height relaxations to the range of 40 and 45 ft. were worthwhile if they could achieve more articulated roof forms;
  - support was expressed for the school having more presence and identity on West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue;
  - concern was noted over the expression of the senior school and its potential to be overly drastic;
  - concern was expressed relative to the continuous building form on West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue;
  - the project was an interesting combination of buildings running at 45 degrees, and was a successful blending in terms of preserving existing buildings and surrounding space;
  - the senior building on West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue could use some breaking up and differentiation at the scale of the other buildings;
  - one member disagreed with the concern of the long building form that was connecting the Bryan Hall to the Fine Arts Centre, and noted that the roof form was more important than whether or not the building was long; additionally it was noted that texture and articulation were relevant;
  - the plaza in front of the older building and the access running through that central space terminates in the plaza;
  - it was noted that the Early Childhood Education Centre was awkward in plan and height, and didn't seem to be integrated; it seemed to be an afterthought;
  - the Early Childhood Education Centre was crowded in terms of its relationship to the building next to it;
  - the gym would be the most contentious in its currently proposed setback and form; more conceptual options could have been presented;
  - the gym needed consideration with respect to how it was brought to the street;
  - some concern was expressed relative to the gym volume as perceived from the street;

- the form and development and resulting inside spaces and courtyards were quite nice;
- it was suggested that consideration be given to putting the gym more inboard on the site with more orientation to the field;
- a member commented on the parking, pick up and drop off loops relative to the safety of children; a setback was suggested for parents to stop, pick up, and drop off directly from the street;
- the series of open spaces formed by buildings was very unique, and felt like a complex; this was a legacy that needed to be preserved;
- the roofscape was the most successful part of the school with a combination of pitch and flat roofs;
- all mechanical equipment should be screened and not be visible to neighbours;
- the legacy of the estate character should be preserved including the curved driveway and entrance gate;
- lighting at night for the overall project needed to be subtle but safe; higher intensity lighting would be required towards the centre of the site and softer lighting towards the outside;
- a small concern was noted over where the new senior school separated the central court and arrival route - it could be opened up more; and
- a diagram from a student or pedestrian point of view would be a useful piece of information to determine if the site was working from an 'on-the-ground' perspective.

The following comments were provided relative to the landscaping:

- some of the richness of the landscaping that came in between the buildings would be lost as a result of the continuous building form on West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue; and
- the legacy of the site was noted and a recommendation was made that a landscape inventory be done with consideration to the preservation of the character of the site.

The following comments were provided relative to design detail:

- concern was expressed that there be a process that allowed the detail to be reviewed by the Panel and/or Planning at each phase;
- the scale of all buildings needed to be considered with respect to the guidelines;
- support was offered for CD-1 zoning with a request that design guidelines be put in place; the Development Permit Board had the power to relax the 35 ft. height limit provided it was used only to articulate the roof form and not for habitable space;
- sensitivity and movement through the site should be included in the design guidelines as principles for the future with texture, proportion and scale considered; and
- proposed sustainability measures were commented on relative to the use of geothermal systems.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant expressed appreciation for the Panel's comments and indicated that they would look at the project again with the Panel's recommendations in mind.

- 
- |                     |                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 3. Address:         | 1818 Nelson Street (1025 Denman) |
| DE:                 | 409185                           |
| Use:                | Mixed (5 storeys)                |
| Zoning:             | CD-1                             |
| Application Status: | Complete after Rezoning          |
| Architect:          | Millenia Arch.                   |
| Owner:              | George Loh Ltd.                  |
| Review:             | First                            |
| Delegation:         | Russ Meiklejohn, Larry Diamond   |
| Staff:              | Mary Beth Rondeau                |
- 

#### EVALUATION: UNANIMOUS SUPPORT (10 - 0)

##### **Introduction:**

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, provided an overview of the proposal noting that it included retail on the ground; a restaurant on the second floor and residential on the three floors above. The rezoning application was to provide a blended density.

It was recognized that at the rezoning stage the Panel unanimously supported the form and density. Vitalization of the side street was commented on; and it was noted that there had been some development of the boulevard. Embellishment of the planting along Nelson Street was included. Ms. Rondeau added that the Panel previously had spoken about the texture, the small scale grain of Denman Street, the highly textured building itself, and the podium and resolution between the two.

Ms. Rondeau acknowledged that there were no specific issues to be addressed by the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Russ Meiklejohn, Architect, and the proponent team addressed the meeting around the model noting that details had been developed since the last meeting. It was noted that a rationalized approach to the building and a common language between the retail-commercial base and the residential component had been included. Mr. Meiklejohn acknowledged the determination that there was not a need to emulate the building behind. Sandstone colored concrete, windows in an aluminum frame in a mahogany color and contrast details were referenced.

Mr. Meiklejohn advised that the green ground plane had been pulled into the project for the residential access and wrapped up over the retail component. The benefits of a green planted roof from an environmental energy point of view were addressed. Service elements of the building were noted and a green wall element was acknowledged. A green building approach to materials and character was discussed. It was acknowledged that Denman Street had a different character from Robson Street in that it was softer and more organic in terms of colors and materials. Additionally, it was noted that Denman Street was historically made up of small shops and street wall type buildings. Details relative to the retail frontages; small store frontages; and canopies were discussed. It was noted that subsets of the building had been detailed with a slightly different approach in color and shape to the canopies.

The Architect requested the Panel's comments on the restaurant windows facing Denman Street, as some opening windows with a little balustrade at table level had been added to open up the activity from the restaurant to the street.

With respect to the landscape, the proponent team advised that they had tried to respond to the scale of Denman Street; a rainwater feature and green roof had been detailed using eco-roofs to cool the building and provide greater insulation. Discussions with the City of Vancouver regarding the softening of the landscape treatment in the lane were acknowledged. It was noted that modifications to the courtyard entrance were being considered relative to security concerns, and could include a permeable, wrought iron fence and public art.

The proponent team responded to questions from the Panel and the following highlights were noted:

- the Emerald Pointe building was referenced as the residential component with the least view impacts and zoning envelope massing criteria;
  - the proposed development was set back five feet from Nelson Street, but was otherwise clear of setbacks and height limitations;
  - refinements had been made in response to the Panel's previously indicated concerns and suggestions;
  - with respect to noise considerations the Architect noted that it would be less noisy once the building was in place as there was a currently lot of ambient noise on the site; there was no residential use immediately across the street; and the outdoor deck of the restaurant was partially covered;
  - restaurant exhaust issues received a lot of consideration;
  - on the ground floor level the restaurant had a receiving area and holding bar with seating; one operator had expressed interest in making use of the space as designed, as it was intended that there be some outdoor seating;
  - beam detail was queried and it was clarified that the building was all concrete structure; and
  - from an energy point of view the Architect advised they were looking at options in terms of systems with respect to going to radiant or geothermal heating; it was noted that ground water was close and geothermal was an attractive option.
- **Panel's Recommendations:**  
The Chair summarized that the Panel was generally supportive of the design direction and acknowledged that the Panel's prior comments at the rezoning stage had been incorporated. Support for fully operable windows in the second floor restaurant was noted, although the arched style of the windows was not supported by the majority.

#### **Key Issues to be Addressed;**

- It is essential that a viable restaurant / food and beverage use be incorporated at the Denman / Nelson corner at grade level in order to animate the street frontage and public realm;
  - Careful consideration of the interface between commercial and residential uses, particularly in regards to the handling of parking and restaurant exhaust, screening of mechanical equipment, and control of noise
  - Design development to the residential entry courtyard to ensure security without compromising the spatial experience
- **Panel's General Comments:**  
The following comments were provided relative to the basic principles of use and form of development:

- the applicant was commended for providing a thorough package including landscape architecture; and made an effort to understand Denman Street and what made it different from other retail city streets;
- it was noted that this would be a great addition to Denman Street; and
- there were no major concerns noted.

The following comments were provided relative to landscaping:

- it was suggested the applicant consider redoing the sidewalk pattern on Denman Street; and consider relocating the small street trees;
- the residential portion was described as an oasis with landscaping on the roof; and
- Panelists suggested the project could set a nice precedent on Denman Street, in terms of how to integrate commercial and residential; the landscape and materials suggested were recognized to be of good quality and a large scale.

The following comments were provided relative to design details:

- the opening windows over the street were considered an improvement;
- the applicant was encouraged to consider the exit convergence to prevent difficulties;
- a Panelist supported the eco-roof and rainwater treatment coming forward;
- support was provided for the level of streetscape detail presented;
- support was offered for the public art concept;
- a retail unit that could take advantage of the corner and animate the street was suggested;
- the applicant was encouraged to consider the parking and restaurant exhaust locations;
- a suggestion was offered that consideration be given to the number of exit stairs from the garage; consideration should be given to having only one stairway at the end, allowing for increased retail area space;
- the building would benefit from being less decorative in the sprung arches and entrance;
- the project would benefit from having the corner canopy broken to respond to both facades on Robson and Nelson Streets;
- opening windows and asymmetrical deck were considered successful;
- comment was offered on the relationship of the public realm and the idea of the streetscape changing;
- the mosaic alcoves were supported;
- caution was offered regarding the courtyard not being designed in a way that residents felt like they were behind bars;
- the leftover shadow of Admiral Pointe was acknowledged;
- the idea of a fabric awning and the tile detailing of the storefront elements were recognized as appropriate;
- Panelists acknowledged the restaurant configuration with opening garage doors onto the street as appropriate to Denman Street;
- the proponent was encouraged to embrace eccentricity including the potential for not having symmetrical facades on the front; and
- suggestion was offered to calm down the roof to something that was plainer, simple and floating when viewed from above.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Meiklejohn expressed appreciation for the Panel's support and recommendations.

---

4. Address:	10 Terry Fox Way (FCN-5B)
Use:	Mixed
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	James Cheng
Owner:	Concord Pacific
Review:	First
Delegation:	James Cheng, Chris Philip, Joyce Drohan, Matt Meehan, David Negrin
Staff:	Jonathan Barrett, Phil Mondor, Michael Gordon

---

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

Nigel Baldwin, James Cheng and Marta Farevaag declared a conflict with the application and departed the meeting at 7:17 p.m. prior to consideration of this application. James Cheng then rejoined the meeting as part of the delegation.

**• Introduction:**

Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, invited the Panel to gather around the model for the presentation. He reminded the Panel that this was a rezoning application and therefore consideration was to be given to form, density and use. The site context was reviewed noting that it was primarily residential. Background was commented on relative to a False Creek Design Study with the principles designating this as a gateway landmark into the downtown core, improving the pedestrian/cycling corridors, preserving street end views, improving pedestrian environment and ensuring buildings preserve some of the Yaletown character. It was noted that the existing ODP allowed less square footage and primarily commercial use, and that a substantial increase in density was being requested. A net value of 4.9 FSR was acknowledged, and a typical 5 FST in the downtown core was discussed. Mr. Barrett noted that the application was primarily residential (575,000 sq. ft.); included pockets of retail/commercial at the base; and was designed as paired towers. The ground plane defining a diagonal between the towers; and a coniferous forest park were acknowledged. The concept of moving the landscape up to the edge of the ramp to soften the edge condition was discussed. It was noted that the variety of uses at grade deserved some discussion.

The advice of the Panel was sought relative to the appropriateness of the form of development for the context and density (i.e. can it be accommodated on the site?), and specifically regarding:

- the city context as a gateway for arrivals and departures; and the appropriateness of bringing the Yaletown character in;
- the neighbourhood context and compatibility in form and use to the surrounding neighborhood;
- built form of the towers which were quite tight (only 30 ft. apart); bridge elements and amenity elements; and some environmental concerns;
- grade level uses (question of townhouses);
- livability; privacy and the relationship between the towers and the ground plane being given over to the public with no semi-private entrance; rooftop landscaping scale and compensation for a lack of ground level semi-private; and
- plaza with a highly landscaped area that was more natural than urban; the amenity value; and treatment to the rampages.

It was noted that if the rezoning was successful the Panel would be reviewing more details in the future.

In response to a request for clarification relative to the 'gateway', Mr. Barrett acknowledged that its intent was to emphasize a particular point of access to the city - a place of arrival as opposed to a threshold.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

James Cheng, Architect, briefly described the project rationale noting there had been some changes in viewpoints, noting that commercial activity would be better placed near the water. With respect to being a gateway to the city, it was noted that consideration was given to re-introducing the urban forest started by Expo '86. Mr. Cheng added that due to the view cone, they could not build a pair of traditional towers.

It was noted that large trees could be planted to take advantage of natural soils; support native flora; and attenuate noise. Mr. Cheng added that amenity open space for the residents would include wind screens; the ground plane would be devoted to public use; and the underside of the viaduct would be up-lighted and used for public art. On the landscape plan, it was noted that the sounds of the waterfall would create a respite for people on their way to the water.

He added that diagonal pedestrian movement through the site was developed to divide the buildings; allow people to move through the site; and add visual interest. It was noted that no residential units would face each other as there were 90 degree angles that addressed livability issues. Mr. Cheng added that a conscientious effort was made to mark the two tallest buildings at the crescent; noting that the view to the mountains was preserved. It was noted that the amenity space included substantial platforms uniting people from different buildings. A demonstration of various building forms was provided on the model.

Mr. Cheng acknowledged the provision of water; open space; a surprise and delight at the end that offered motion, light and color; public amenity; and an opportunity for public art. A contribution to the 'public realm' was reviewed (i.e. the urban forest and public art space).

The proponent team responded to the Panel's questions and the following comments were noted:

- there were numerous precedents where fir trees doing well in the city; the forest would not be dense;
- the towers averaged 5500 sq. ft. each;
- an architect of the future would be allowed some freedom in the complexity of the shape;
- this was an urban design exercise; it was the intention to prescribe the guidelines;
- commercial uses were only at the corner points; what was in between would be crafted with a guideline for uses (e.g. artist studios or commercial);
- in the near future it was thought that commercial would not do well at the site, however with some flexibility, artist's working/living space could evolve;
- a design to compliment rather than duplicate Yaletown was considered;
- the urban forest related to the history of the site;
- the southern part was more hard surface plaza;
- the source of water detail strategy had not yet been developed; the use of storm water run off would be beneficial;
- a waterfall idea over glass with lighting and shadow on the underside of the bridge would be included;
- nothing precludes a simpler form and exploration of tower shapes; and
- the proposal was at the limit of the view cone.

- **Panel's Recommendations:**

Chair Endall summarized the Panel's comments and recommendations noting that there were no concerns indicated with the overall residential use, although grade level uses and form should be further considered. He added that there was little concern with density. General support was expressed for the plaza and forest treatment, noting the importance of consideration to lighting and security. There were no concerns with respect to the overall character and the transition from Yaletown. One panel member suggested that additional height would be warranted.

**Key Issues to be Addressed;**

- A clearer commitment to grade level uses and their form and expression;
- Reconsideration of the positioning of the amenity bridges between the towers in regards to issues of daylight, sunlight access, and separation between the towers;
- Consideration of the orientation to sun, wind, etc..., to further inform the architectural expression of the buildings;
- Landscape treatment, terracing, etc..., particularly at the lower levels of the buildings to reinforce the overall landscape concept.

- **Panel's General Comments:**

The Panel offered the following comments on the appropriateness of uses:

- the gains made at an urban level and larger urban achievements made the approach on the towers successful;
- it combines the two sites, recognizes some pairing and has created space;
- the use change from office to residential, and the proximity to the Cambie Street Bridge were both appropriate;
- a valiant attempt was made at being innovative and creative on the site;
- residential was definitely the use for the site; office use would be out of context;
- commercial was important; some unique uses could also be considered;
- the applicant was commended for considering the uniqueness of the site;
- the grade level uses work well; the idea of 'flex space' should be considered; and
- the paired towers respond uniquely to the site.

The Panel offered the following comments on the proposed density:

- no problems were expressed with respect to density;
- perhaps there was not enough private or semi-private amenity space; this should be looked at with respect to the density for the site; and
- relaxation of the 80 ft. setback was probably acceptable.

The Panel offered the following comments on the overall form of development:

- the form and the perception of a single mass and how it blocked views could be an issue; the current scheme may not address this as well as it could;
- concern was expressed for the residential component where it came down to grade; there may be a clearer case for a tougher residential environment (i.e. studio/living); more definition to a raised and redefined ground plane for the tower could be considered (i.e. an overlook to the area);
- there was some uncertainty expressed with respect to circulation patterns across the site;
- the applicant was encouraged to be artistically creative with respect to the heights of the towers;



- the towers would be better taller; the form of development could be made more unique as there were external forces to the site that could be better responded to (i.e. the ramps and structure of the bridge); and
- a stronger presence at grade of live/work opportunities was suggested.

The Panel offered the following comments on compatibility with the neighborhood context and livability issues:

- the idea of trees as a visual buffer and sound buffer was good;
- the bridges between have skillfully handled the livability;
- moving the amenity space to one side or the other could be better;
- the buildings should be green and sustainable; the key to a sustainable development was to: combine the form and shape of the building within the envelop and natural ventilation; and consider the prevailing winds and sun for an opportunity to create a micro-climate;
- the success would be at the grade level; private or semi-private amenities could be dealt with above the grade level; and
- if the buildings were asymmetrical (i.e. the northeast being longer and the southeast being shorter), the buildings would be more defining from a visitor's visual perspective.

The Panel offered the following comments with respect to the Plaza:

- the approach to the plaza and combination of forest and commercial was good;
- mixture on the site that was retail/commercial/forest was of great interest; making the buildings look like they were growing out of the forest was key;
- the landscaping with water and forest served the public beautifully;
- details under the bridge should be carefully considered, specifically with respect to light;
- the plaza could be great or it could be unfriendly; it could be a token in that it was a piece of urban forest; critical details would need to be addressed to ensure its safety;
- plaza trees are a great idea; it is unique to the site;
- grade level connections were good; and
- the natural forest at the foot of the bridge was a powerful idea although it was contradictory to the amount of density accommodated on the site; further research was suggested regarding the critical mass of trees that would be required; and
- more green could be added at the bottom levels of the building; a greater integration of the lower levels of the building with the forest could be considered.

The Panel offered the following comments on the transition of the Yaletown character:

- the transition occurring on the site doesn't have to be 'Yaletown' or 'waterfront';
- there was need for greater difference in the approach to the Cambie Street Bridge; the shape of the towers on the east should clearly consider a different form rather than towers;
- by virtue of this being unique, the site addressed the transition and made its own statement appropriately;
- something dynamic was critical in the pedestrian movement from Yaletown to False Creek;
- a gateway that would stand out and be a step in the right direction for the whole city; lighting would be critical;
- this was a unique site; carrying the Yaletown character did not provide any benefit as the site had to provide its own character;
- the creek was the gateway to the town; the architecture in the city was not expected to provide that; and
- the site was well connected to the city and didn't need any more architectural connection; it could be its own unique solution.

- **Applicant's Response:**  
The proponent team thanked the Panel for their comments that would help move the project along.

The meeting of the Urban Design Panel held May 11, 2005 concluded at 8:51 p.m.