

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 17, 2010

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Steve McFarlane (Chair)
Robert Barnes
James Cheng
Jane Durante
David Godin
Jim Huffman
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
Jeff Corbett
Bruce Haden
Oliver Lang
Vladimir Mikler
Maurice Pez
Scott Romses

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1455 Quebec Street
2.	685 Great Northern Way
3.	3485 Victoria Drive

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair McFarlane called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1455 Quebec Street
DE: 414096
Description: Science World - Outdoor Science Exhibit
Zoning: BCPED
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Cannon Architectural Design
Owner: Science World
Review: Second
Delegation: Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg
Kevin Kearns, Science World
Talent Pun, Science World
Staff: Scot Hein

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for the Switch at Science World. He noted that it was the second review for the outdoor science experience and there were a number of concerns raised particularly about the nature of the edge onto the park. He noted that some of the original materials were also available for the Panel to see as well as new information.

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Chris Phillips, Architect, noted that they had put a lot of work into design development and gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Panel. He said that Science World is a very creative and collaborative group and hoped that the presentation would reflect some further thinking on the edge for the proposal. He said he realized that there was a lack of clarity at the last review regarding the concept for the outdoor Science Experience. He noted that a series of six themes have come out of their discussion which includes energy, transportation, water, food and agriculture, waste and housing. Kevin Kearns stated that the focus of the park is on sustainability in the six themes as a way of helping people understand the implications of the choices they make. Mr. Phillips described the overall plan and included a description of the six themes.

The criteria for the public edge is to engage the public and to display curated and evolving content. The public edge includes the Arrival Plaza, Solar Tower of Bauble, Cycle Corner, Water and Food Pockets, Demonstration Deck, Waste Wall, Innovation Space and the C-Wall.

The Arrival Plaza is to be a staging area for groups and will have some weather protection and public seating. The Tower of Bauble will be an iconic solar powered Science World experience. The Cycle Corner will be a public interactive exhibit along the bike and pedestrian pathway. The Water and Food Pockets will have modular and interchangeable graphic panels, a rain gauge, urban garden as well as a Pipe Wall and Cellular Wall. The Demonstration Deck will serve as public invite into the Switch with a view of the exhibits in the Demonstration Area and will overlook the wetlands. The Waste Wall will be constructed with re-used and recycled materials with modular and interchangeable graphic

panels including a chalkboard and seating nook. The Innovation Space will be a unique Vancouver outdoor programmed space for sponsored programs, special events in addition to the current Outreach and free admission opportunities. The C-Wall will include a display illustrating impact of CO2 and climate change on sea levels and will be made of recycled concrete.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider some a stronger element to pull all the themes together.
 - Design development to the dawdle walk to enrich the connective elements.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had come a long way in creating some excitement in the edge.

The Panel thought there was a balance of permeability and screening and liked that the pedestrian route had been separated from the bike route which had helped the edge experience although they encouraged the applicant to look for places where they still interact and improve them. The Panel thought the entry sequence hadn't changed very much and they hoped that the Tower of Bauble with the covered area would be a large enough element to announce the front door of Science World.

There were some concerns regarding the workability of the future bus unloading and loading area when a street car is added. One Panel member suggested there might be insufficient bike parking especially if a bike share program was added.

The Panel noted that the transition from the parking lot to the demonstration overlook was stronger with a bit more emphasize on the arrival area. They also thought the flex area had been improved but was still a little vague. They Panel wanted to see more excitement in that area.

Several Panel members acknowledged the applicant for the six themes and how they will engage the public and they particularly liked the bike counter. One Panel member was concerned about the space being used in wet weather and suggested a tent style cover could be added. Most of the Panel was concerned with the dawdle path and thought it needed to be treated the same as the rest of the path. One Panel member suggested extending the space and having an area for people to sit.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Phillips noted that they were still working with the City regarding the parameters for the dawdle path. He also noted that there will be a number of exhibits inside the Waste Wall including a large black board and a series of shelves. They would like to have a bigger expression but there is also a concern regarding costs. Mr. Kearns noted that they have put a lot of effort into the exhibits going on inside Science World and they want them to be seen from the outside as well. Mr. Pun said they were really excited about the potential of a bike hire on the site and the bike counter. He added that they are working with the City to make sure it happens.

2. Address:	684 Great Northern Way
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	To construct a new four-storey mixed-use university building consisting of institutional and retail uses on the ground floor and 76 units of student housing on floors 2 to 4.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Owner:	Great Northern Way Campus Trust
Review:	First
Delegation:	Mark Thompson, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Mike Patterson, Perry & Associates Matthew Carter, Great Northern Way Campus Trust
Staff:	Anita Molaro and Ian Cooper

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, noted that the proposal is part of the Great Northern Way campus. Regarding policy, this is a concurrent rezoning and development application. The rezoning application component requires a text amendment. The CD-1 zone for the site, was rezoned in 1999. The area is bounded by Great Northern Way, Prince Edward Street, Glen Drive and the railroad yards to the north. The lands have been subdivided and held in trust by Great Northern Way Campus Trust which is a consortium of UBC, SFU, Emily Carr and BCIT to ultimately develop what is going to be called the Great Northern Way Campus. As part of the CD-1 zoning and guidelines there was also a structure plan that was developed that laid out the road network, the subsequent development parcels and essential open space. The CD-1 also prescribed the permitted uses and maximum floor areas, setbacks and height.

In terms of residential uses, the CD-1 prescribed residential uses as live/work that would only occur in Sub Area 3B. There was no provision for any residential use such as student housing provided within the original CD-1 zone. The project site is located in Sub Area 3A which didn't permit any residential uses. This proposal includes 76 units of student housing. Staff believe that inclusion of student housing is an important component as part of the continuum in creating a vibrant, livable, sustainable learning environment for the future campus. On this basis staff are supportive of the required text amendment to the CD-1 to permit the student housing use and also note that student housing use will be secured through a housing agreement.

Some of the key urban design principles within the CD-1 guidelines are: integrating the development with the city by generally extending the street grid; creating a strong sense of place including reinforcing existing features such as the landscape buffer along Great Northern Way; providing a grain of building units and massing typical of an inner city location; provide for a mix use of form of development which integrates non-industrial uses into the fabric of development and effectively services the needs of high tech businesses; provide a high degree of amenity for workers and visitors; varying building heights across the site to preserve the northward views from Mount Pleasant, street ends and lessen view impacts towards the residential development south of Great Northern Way.

The proposed building is located on an existing parking lot at the corner of Fraser Street and Great Northern Way. The site was determined as appropriate given the proximity to the existing digital facility classrooms in the building next door. There is a consideration of a future built out context and for a visible campus along Great Northern Way. It consists of

three levels of student housing on top of a ground floor media centre and classroom and a variety of project and audio rooms and office space. There is a retail component that is integrated with the lobby and lounge areas on the ground floor. The main entry of the building is located in close proximity to the existing facility. The building position has respected the nine metre setback along Great Northern Way and set backs along Fraser Street and the height permitted within the CD-1 zoning. The guidelines also call for architectural design that is expressive of the building structure and environmental design considerations. Also that high quality and durable materials be utilized and that roofs should be designed to be attractive as seen from below as well as above. In terms of environmental performance, the project proposes to meet a LEED™ Gold certification. In general Staff are supportive of the overall approach and supportive of the text amendment for the student housing.

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

- Overall architectural resolution
 - Sitting and form of development
 - Architectural treatments of walls/glazing
- Landscape concept

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Thompson, Architect, noted that the proposal is in one corner of the campus. The Great Northern Way campus is a partnership of four institutions and has a three part philosophy to bring education, industry and commerce together. The idea was to locate the new building together with the existing building and a space for students as they graduate to incubate businesses in a portion of the building. The portion that is missing on the campus at the moment is that the students don't have any place to stay so one of the important pieces is to bring student housing onto the site. Mr. Thompson noted that the massing for the building came out of the programming for the building. He described the proposed materials noting the angled wall that provides opportunity for signage and display. Weather protection is provided around the building on the public edges by the overhangs. He added that sustainability is an important factor noting that there is a green roof proposed for the lower portion of the project. LEED™ Gold is a target and part of the sustainability strategy will be geo thermal heating, solar hot water, high water efficiency, storm water management, sun shades and as well they are making provisions for a future district energy system. Off the lobby there will be a coffee shop with a wood deck for outside seating.

Mike Patterson, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the project noting that they will be grading the site with a bio-swale along the north edge which have rain water flow into a gravel trough articulated with boulders. Currently there are some existing trees that will be retained. Because of the slope across the site there is a berm that will have the plantings replaced with draught tolerant species. There will be two tones on the green roof as there is the ability to have more soil depth because of the structure of the building so they are proposing to use two types of planting material for contrast. The pedestrian connections on the site are important as there is the need to connect with SkyTrain and busses. There is a connecting walkway that will be carried through the site as more of it is developed. A patio is planned in front of the coffee shop with wood seating. Mr. Patterson described the materials that are proposed and noted the colour palette.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to improve the building's presence along Fraser Street.
 - Design development to improve the relationship to Great Northern Way with regard to noise.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the uses and thought the addition of student housing on the site was important.

The Panel felt that a lack of an over riding master plan created some difficulty for the Panel to make comments and encouraged the applicant to consider creating a master plan for the entire site.

The Panel liked that the architecture captured the industrial heritage of the site and letting that translate into materials and form. They also liked that the architecture expressed the function and programming in the building. They noted that since this was the first new building for the campus that it sets a tone for future development. One Panel member thought the wooden slats didn't have a strong language to them and thought the façade could be simpler and cleaner in terms of colour.

Several Panel members thought the building turned its back on Fraser Street and that it needed to respond on all sides. One Panel member thought garbage trucks would have a difficult time trying to get access to the garbage room off great Northern Way.

Several Panel members noted that Great Northern Way is the public face of the institution and didn't support having the garbage and washrooms on the front of the building. They thought they should be in the interior of the building and that outdoor seating space should be provided on Great Northern Way. They also didn't support the student rooms which are facing Great Northern Way and suggested the blank end should face that street. As well they would like to see additional seating outside the lounge area. They could be located in between the buildings and away from the noise and traffic.

Several Panel members didn't understand the message of the future of the campus. They noted the funky character of the current building and although they understood the thinking of the applicant didn't support the design for an institutional building.

A couple of Panel members thought there could be digital centre signage and possibly a large urban screen that could express some of the work going on in the building.

It was noted that the landscape plans were interesting and that they needed to be robust being that it is a campus and money may be tight for maintenance.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Thompson noted that the master plan is being developed with the City and they think the industrial character will stay.

3. Address:	3485 Victoria Drive
DE:	414151
Description:	New 4-storey multiple dwelling with a total of 8 units.
Zoning:	C2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Egil Lyngen Architect
Owner:	Interform
Review:	First
Delegation:	Egil Lyngen, Egil Lyngen Architect May Chan Yip, DMG Landscape Architects Ian Kent, Interform
Staff:	Marie Linehan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Marie Linehan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a double fronting site with no lane and streets on both sides. The site is located on Victoria Drive between Victoria Diversion to the south and Trout Lake Park to the north east. Ms. Linehan described the context for the area noting the senior's residential care facility to the south. She also noted that there isn't any retail or service oriented commercial at the ground floor for either of the adjacent buildings and in general, this pocket of C-2 does not have a great deal of ground-oriented commercial uses.

The proposal is for a 4-storey residential building, a courtyard scheme, with four townhouse units along Victoria Drive and four townhouses units along Porter Street with driveway access to one level of parking accessed from Porter Street.

Typically, for residential only buildings in C-2, a twelve foot setback is required from the front property line, mostly to provide adequate space for entry patios, landscaping and screening from potentially busy arterials. Because it is primarily residential in the area, this section of Victoria Drive is not busy in terms of vehicular traffic.

The building is located to align generally with setbacks of the adjacent building on the south property line with a two foot setback from the front property line provided at Victoria Drive. There will be an inner landscaped boulevard at Victoria Drive so there will be a total setback from the sidewalk of about twelve feet and a ten foot setback will be provided on Porter Street. Inset entry porches located a few steps above grade will be provided on both sides. Ms. Linehan noted that because the subject site is a relatively small site they did not seek a massing response or significant stepping of the form comparable to what is occurring on the neighbouring site. There is an expectation that C-2 development sites can go lot line to lot line.

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

- The setbacks provided at Victoria and Porter St, and the treatment of the residential entries in light of the relaxation sought.
- The overall massing of the building in particular the S E portion which projects ahead of the adjacent building (keeping in mind that the south portion of the seniors' building does go to the front property line).
- The articulation and material treatment of the south elevation as an 'exterior elevation' as opposed to a typical side elevation, as it will be visible in the long term as the adjacent site is not likely to be redeveloped.
- The overall design and materials in this application.

Ms. Linehan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Egil Lyngen, Architect, further described the proposal noting the character is a more contemporary theme to compliment the adjacent commercial and industrial uses. The architectural design was carefully detailed along each frontage and conforms to the guidelines. The main living areas are oriented towards the fronting streets with the kitchen patio doors opening onto the courtyard. The courtyard is oriented in a north south direction to maximize the sunlight access. The upper floors are set back three feet to open up for more light penetration. The planting beds, translucent glass and privacy screens are the only obstructions in the proposed courtyard. Weather protection will be provided over each entry by the overhanging upper floor with canopies over the doors in the courtyard. The private outdoor spaces on the roof are separated by privacy screens. Each unit has internal access to the parking garage with vehicle access from Porter Street. Mr. Lyngen described the proposed building materials and colour palette. Landscaping at grade has been designed to soften the building face and define individual entrances. The courtyard landscaping is proposed to enhance the livability and privacy.

May Chan Yip, Landscape Architect, further described the landscaping plans noting that Porter Street currently looks more like a laneway and as result they are proposing new walkways and making it more interesting with colour. There is an existing oak street tree but it is not in good shape, however they are going to try to save the tree and add some additional ones along the street. There are two trees on Victoria Drive and they will be supplementing the area with two additional trees creating a double row of trees. Some foundation planting is proposed against the building along with a decorative edge treatment. The patios on the upper level won't receive a lot of sunlight so they will be using shade tolerant plants.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to enhance the indoor/outdoor connection with respect to the central courtyard and improve the architectural character at the grade elevation.
 - Consider further design development to the courtyard landscaping with emphasis on exploration of alternate brighter green coloured species for more visual interest.
 - Design development to improve the maintenance access to the courtyard gardens.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a good neighbourhood fit and responsive to its site.

The Panel liked the form and sculptural nature of the architecture and thought the large pieces of glass were important. The Panel supported the setbacks noting that it was a constrained site but the resolution of the architecture was well done. They thought it was an unusual design for C-2 but was a good precedent for future developments. They felt the southeast elevation was well handled and supported the use of metal panels and acrylic stucco.

Most of the Panel would like to see windows into the courtyard from the kitchen with one Panel member suggesting a window below the cupboards and above the counter. They liked that the entries were simple and noted that the patios will have a lot of different uses by the owners. One Panel member thought there was a lack of windows on the top units and thought a clear storey on the inside of the courtyard might be an improvement.

One Panel member noted that there wasn't any bike storage in the parkade. It was noted that the proposal is on a bike route and using the vestibule space for bikes storage wouldn't work.

A couple of Panel member thought the courtyard could be more accessible with a couple of Panel members noting that the courtyard could be friendlier with the addition of some trees and better landscaping materials. One Panel member thought the colour palette could be lighter in the courtyard. It was noted that access needs to be given to the courtyard for maintenance. Another Panel member thought there were too many street trees on Porter Street. The second row of trees should be small and delicate otherwise it will feel too dense and will take away from the architecture.

One Panel member asked the applicant to consider the roof structure for possible solar panels for future use.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyngen thanked the Panel. He noted that this was his first project of this kind. As to bike parking, there will bike lockers at every car park space. Originally the room where there will now be storage was the bike parking but they felt it was more valuable to have personal storage. The bikes will be hung above the cars. Regarding the window treatments for the larger glass panels, Mr. Lyngen noted that there will be solar screens for privacy from the outside but will allow residents to still see out from the interior. The idea of having a clear storey or skylights over the top units is a great idea. He also thought the issue of the plant maintenance would be important.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.