
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 29, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Paul Grant, Chair
Lance Berelowitz
Alan Endall
Bruce Hemstock
Jack Lutsky
Brian Palmquist
Gilbert Raynard
Keith Ross (excused Item 2)
Sorin Tatomir

REGRETS: Tom Bunting
James Cheng
Roger Hughes

RECORDING
SECRETARY: Carol Hubbard

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1300 West Pender Street
2.	5438 Rupert Street (3014 Kingsway)

-
- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Address: | 1300 West Pender Street |
| DA: | 404571 |
| Use: | Residential |
| Zoning: | DD |
| Application Status: | Complete after Preliminary |
| Architect: | Howard Bingham Hill |
| Owner: | Pinnacle International |
| Review: | 4th |
| Delegation: | John Bingham, A. Hamilton, T. Ito |
| Staff: | Ralph Segal |
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, presented this proposal, last seen by the Panel on May 3, 2000. The Development Permit Board deferred the application on July 10, 2000, instructing the applicant to bring the floor plate more in line with the 6,500 sq.ft. indicated at the preliminary stage and having particular regard to view implications for the neighbouring residential tower (The Pointe). The applicant's response has been a substantive re-massing of the tower, resulting in improved view angles from suites in The Pointe and a reduction in floor plate size to 6,650 sq.ft. (previously 6,950 sq.ft.). In reducing the floor plate, however, the applicant is seeking some additional height to accommodate the redistributed mass. The tower was previously 309 ft. and is now proposed at a maximum of 318 ft. for terraced penthouse elements. The allowable maximum height in the Downtown is 300 ft. which may be relaxed. FSR remains unchanged.

After briefly reviewing the site context, Mr. Segal noted the basic configuration of the project remains unaltered but is now an asymmetrical composition which still respects the orientation of neighbouring towers and opens up a wider view angle down Jervis Street to the waterfront. With respect to the additional height being sought, Staff is supportive of some additional penthouse massing, noting the measurable improvement that has been achieved in terms of views from The Pointe. With respect to the overall design resolution, Staff consider the revised scheme has been simplified since the previous submission, resulting in a more orderly massing arrangement.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** John Bingham, Architect, briefly outlined the revisions to the scheme, noting the mass has been readjusted to minimize view blockage for The Pointe, with view improvements between five to fifty percent being achieved. The Pender Street elevation has been significantly changed. Mr. Bingham described how the mass has been redistributed as a result of the reduction in floor plate size. Alasdair Hamilton described the revised glazing system and noted that all four sides of the building are now treated equally, with no obvious back side of the building. With respect to glazing colour, Mr. Bingham confirmed the intent is for it to be lighter than the neighbouring buildings.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel responded very positively to this revised proposal and unanimously supported the application. The asymmetrical tower was thought to be very responsive to the site. It has a more disciplined and simplified expression than the previous submission. The Panel also applauded the equal treatment given to all four sides of the building.
-

The Panel had no concerns about the height and supported the height relaxation being sought. The extra height was considered to be a reasonable trade-off for the reduction in floor plate requested by the Development Permit Board, noting the significant improvement in views that has been achieved for The Pointe residents.

The change to a much higher glass-to-solid proportion on the south façade was also seen as an important improvement to the scheme, which one Panel member noted also improves sunlight penetration at the upper levels for residents of this building.

Some disappointment was expressed about the treatment of the lane. It was felt that more could be done, in concert with neighbouring property owners and City Engineering, to soften the other side of the lane and to generally make it much less utilitarian and more a part of the public realm. It was noted that, in very dense and urbanized environments such as this, the lanes are taking on a much more complex function than simple service corridors. One Panel member, however, thought the lane treatment was better than shown previously and was satisfied that the small amount of planting in the lane provided an adequate residential character.

Another area of concern was the Broughton/Pender corner. The rectilinear geometry of the top canopy and the solid element on the side is poorly resolved and possibly worse than before given the loss of the outdoor room proposed in the previous scheme. The corner lacks something that ties it in with the rest of the project and provides a suitable landmark for the corner. The commercial façade on Pender Street was also of concern in that it appears as a wafer thin shear glass wall devoid of texture. A much more articulated treatment was recommended, including canopies, entrance bays or setbacks at ground level along Pender Street.

One Panel member questioned the splayed columns at the bottom of the tower and suggested something more robust that visually carries the load of the tower to the ground would be more appropriate. As well, the same element on the Jervis Street façade appears to be just slightly higher than the building across the street. It was suggested an adjustment be considered.

The Panel thought it was important to consider the colour of the glass and stressed the need to lighten up the tone and colour to differentiate it from the surrounding dark green buildings.

The Panel generally liked the landscape plan. One minor suggestion was to consider screening the top of the mechanical equipment as well as the sides, for the benefit of those overlooking it.

In general, the Panel thought the minor concerns raised could be easily addressed in design development. The Panel considered that the applicant had fulfilled the requirements of the Development Permit Board.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bingham noted that revising this project has been an exhaustive exercise over the last few months. He agreed with the Panel's comments that it has improved in certain areas and said they think it now responds very well to the site. They are very satisfied with the direction the project has taken to date.

2. Address:	5438 Rupert Street (3014 Kingsway)
DA:	405240
Use:	Mixed Use
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Andrew Cheng
Owner:	Hungston (Rupert) Development Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Andrew Cheung, Francis Yau, Keith Ross
Staff:	Bob Adair

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2-5)

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this application. The site is located at the corner of Kingsway and Rupert Street in the C-2 zone. The proposal is for a mixed use building containing ground floor commercial space facing Kingsway with some residential units at grade in the rear facing the lane and three storeys of residential above. Proposed FSR is 2.76, 2.12 of which is residential. A height relaxation of 4.21 ft. is being requested.

Following a brief description of the site context, Mr. Adair noted the main areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought:

1. Height relaxation. The crossfall on the site is about 9.5 ft. along the lane, east to west, about 6.5 ft. along Kingsway, and 7 ft. diagonally. Current C-2 policy is to consider height relaxations up to 5 ft. when there is a 5 ft. crossfall and all concrete construction is proposed. Staff would like to see more stepping to reduce the amount of additional height being requested. Outright permitted height in C-2 is 40 ft.
 2. Architectural design. Council has also asked the Panel to look at C-2 projects with a view to achieving a very good standard of architectural design and detailing. Staff recommend some additional masonry elements, perhaps a stronger corner expression and some additional articulation of the Kingsway façade.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Andrew Cheng, Architect, briefly described the design rationale and response to the site context.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:** While the Panel agreed this project has many positive elements, it was unable to support the application at this time.

The Panel generally supported the mass in terms of its height and stepping. Some Panel members thought the stepping could be accentuated, making it three steps rather than the proposed 2½, and one Panel member thought it might be possible to lower the western third of the building another few feet to bring it closer to the permitted maximum height. In general, however, the proposed height was considered acceptable in this location.

Concerns were expressed about the Kingsway facade and the manner in which the top three floors rest on the plinth of the retail bays. The varying height and thinness of the lintels was questioned. It was suggested it might be better for the three bays to continue down to the ground and establish more of a vertical rhythm along the street. The Kingsway facade has a flatness that needs to be improved upon. The upper level massing on Kingsway, as well as the massing at the rear, was thought to be quite interesting.

Placement of the elevator was questioned. If it could be moved back inside as opposed to having an external wall, better articulation of the corner would result.

The Panel thought more attention needed to be given to the quality of materials and choice of colours. The use of vinyl siding was questioned, particularly the fine grain vinyl indicated. In this high traffic location it will quickly become very dark and dirty. It was felt the colours need to be darker and bolder.

Serious concerns were expressed about treatment of the Kingsway corner which needs to be much more robust. As well, the southwest corner could be improved by building it out to the same footprint as the building above. This would enable the amenity space to be enlarged as well as providing a better anchor for that corner. One Panel member found the whole southern facade very awkward and suggested reorienting the exit stair from the garage towards the west. This would also gain some of the open planter area for the adjacent unit.

In general, the Panel found the material presentation and resolution of the mass - particularly on Kingsway - far too timid. This is a highly visible corner that needs to be emphasized with a strong piece of architecture. This is an area in flux, and this project will set the tone for the future development of neighbouring corners.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Cheung agreed the Panel's comments are very valid. He expressed concern that greater stepping of the floor plan will cause problems in terms of handicap access.