

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 20, 2010
TIME: 4.00 pm
PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall
PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden (Chair)
Robert Barnes (Excused Item #1)
Jeff Corbett (Item #1 and #2)
David Godin
Jim Huffman
Steve McFarlane
Scott Romses
Alan Storey

REGRETS:
James Cheng
Jane Durante
Oliver Lang
Vladimir Mikler
Maurice Pez

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	15 and 97 East 2 nd Avenue (Opsal Steel)
2.	228-246 East Broadway/180 Kingsway (The Rize)
3.	1455 Quebec Street (Science World)

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Haden 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: 15 and 97 East 2nd Avenue (Opsal Steel)
 DE: 414185 and 414186
 Description: To develop this site with a 12-storey mixed-use building containing retail uses at grade and a total of 79 dwelling units at floors 2-12 over 2 levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.
 Zoning: CD-1
 Application Status: Complete
 Architect: IBI/HB Architects
 Owner: Bastion Development
 Review: Second
 Delegation: Jim Hancock, IBI/HB Architects
 Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Architects
 Mike Patterson, Perry + Associates Landscape Architecture
 Kim Maust, Bastion Development
 Staff: Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal to rezone two parcels from M-2 Industrial to CD-1 Residential in conformance with the South East False Creek ODP and partial retention and integration of the heritage resource, the Opsal Steel Building. Retail uses are proposed at grade with residential above. Mr. Morgan noted that there was a previous review by the Panel where the proposal received none support although there was support for the proposed height and density. At that time the proposed height was for a twelve storey and an eighteen storey building and same is currently proposed. The Panel thought the following key aspects needed to be improved: visibility and access to the Opsal Building; improved relationship of the Opsal building to the east tower; consideration to relocate east tower away and behind the Opsal building and non support for parking at grade.

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

1. Given the increase of height above the recommended ODP from 15 to 24 storeys, and the resulting building form of a taller slender tower, does this extra height and change in building typology effectively weaken that the overall urban design as originally envisioned for the SEFC basin?
2. Aside from the parking at grade indicated on the heritage site, has the resubmission satisfactorily address the previous concerns of the Panel?

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Jim Hancock, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they responded to a number of heritage conditions. The frontage of the building was originally proposed with more of a glass front at the bottom but has now gone back to a punched opening. The big change with the surface parking is to create an open space for uses associated with the retail such as a restaurant.

Kim Maust, Bastion Development, noted that they were at the Heritage Commission and received their support for the project.

Mike Patterson, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans noting the streetscape will be a planted boulevard with street trees as per the SEFC guidelines. In the space between the Opsal building there will be some planting along the edges and there will also be a water feature located at the entrance to the residential tower (east building). An amenity deck is planned for the second floor of Tower A (west building) with some urban agriculture with an outdoor deck area off the indoor amenity space.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consideration to further parking reduction especially at the southwest corner of the open space. This should include consideration to provide direct access at the lane for all spaces.
 - Design development to the gap between the Opsal building and the east tower including consideration to increasing the gap between the roof peak and the immediate adjacent tower floors three and four.
 - Considerations to using industrial building highlight materials and / or colours to increase the sense that the building is part of SEFC.
 - Design development to increase the distinctiveness of the lower levels in the west building.
 - Consideration to a retail signage strategy on the heritage building particularly.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well conceived project. They had no concerns with the heritage portion of the project and were glad to see it being preserved.

The Panel thought the overall composition, massing and character was well thought out. Given the overall scale of the Olympic Village, the design puts a lot of weight on the east tower which the Panel felt was the right way to go. However, the Panel felt it was a too close to the Opsal building at the lower levels. Several Panel members said they liked the visual impact of the open end of the Opsal building and the treatment of the gantry crane. One Panel member noted that there didn't seem to be a signage strategy for the project. Another Panel member thought the corner expression at Quebec Street and East 2nd Avenue could be improved and suggested allowing the glass piece to go higher to contrast the mass.

Although the design has a more industrial character some Panel members thought it could be located any where in the lower mainland and encouraged the applicant to push the design further. One Panel member noted that the applicant had done a good job in articulating the mid rise tower. With the car wash site separating the two building, some of the Panel thought the west tower could have a more industrial look. They also wanted to see more of a connection between the two towers. One Panel member would like to have seen a plan for when the car wash site became available on how it might be incorporated into the present plan.

The Panel thought there had been an improvement in the public realm since the last review and regarding the gantry crane and the nature of the landscaping and pavement. However, most of the Panel still thought there didn't need to be so many surface parking spaces give that a lot of people would be walking to the site. They were in favor of adding more public space rather than parking space with one Panel member suggested adding more covered

outdoor space. Another Panel member acknowledged the applicant for a well thought out bicycle parking strategy given that the site is on the Ontario bike route.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Maust noted that they were committed to preserving the Opsal Steel signage but will have to work with the City to make that work.

2. Address:	228-246 East Broadway/180 Kingsway (The Rize)
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	to construct a 6/7 storey and 26-storey mixed-use retail, service and residential project comprised of 62 rental dwelling units (STIR), 206 market dwelling units with commercial uses at grade on this full-block site bounded by Broadway, Kingsway, East 10 th Avenue and Watson Street.
Zoning:	C-3A to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Acton Ostry Architects Inc.
Review:	Second (First was a Workshop)
Delegation:	Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Inc. Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc. Gerry Eckford, Eckford and Associates Landscape Architects Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Recollective
Staff:	Scot Hein and Alison Higginson

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- I Introduction:** Alison Higginson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site that is bounded by Broadway, Kingsway, 10th Avenue and Watson Street. The site is currently zoned C-3A which permits a maximum floor space ration of 3.30 and has a guideline recommended height limit of 70 feet. The rezoning application proposes an addition in density and height beyond the C-3A maximums. The proposed FSR is 6.40 and proposed height of the tower element is 253 feet. The proposal is for a mixed-use retail, commercial and residential complex with a total of 268 dwelling units with 62 units being rental under the STIR program. The remaining 206 units will be market condos. The application includes a potential for a future transit portal at the 10th Avenue and Watson Street corner and also proposes a 10,000 square foot artist's production space in that general location as part of the public benefit offering. The policy context for this application is the emerging Mount Pleasant Community Plan which is scheduled to be reported to Council in November. The site has been identified by the community and staff as one where additional height and density can be accommodated.

Scot Hein, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting that the Panel was being asked to look at use, density and form of development. He noted that a public hearing could take place early in the new year. With respect to use, Mr. Hein noted that there are some challenges with the Watson Street frontage regarding entry and exiting of the site. He added that the artist's production space will help to activate the street in that location. Regarding density and form of development, Mr. Hein noted that there had been much discussion with the tower placement but feels that it is in the correct position. The tower has come down in height since the last review with the Panel and there has been some further density added to the podium. Mr. Hein noted that the proposal will be coming back to the Panel at the DE stage given that it is a major project. He noted that they have a good working relationship with the community to explore the density, form and height that is happening as a result of the project.

Ms. Higginson and Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Ostry, Architect, gave a PowerPoint presentation noting that they had been working on the project for over two years and have been following and participating in the Community Planning Program. He noted that there are a number of considerations to be made on the site in particular the topographical apex

(hill town). Mr. Ostry noted that they are also focusing on sustainability and density. There are two conditions that affect the site: one is the Main Street corridor and the other is the Kingsway corridor. The Main Street corridor is essentially mid-rise block buildings with a certain character and the Kingsway corridor is where the City has been permitting additional height. He noted that they are planning for a transit portal along Broadway but they are also allowing for a potential one on the site at West 10th Avenue and Watson Street. He also noted that the best location for parking and loading is off Watson Street.

Mr. Ostry noted that they have added the artist's production space since the last review by the Panel. He added that it will be a semi-industrial space and is being proposed as an amenity on site. There will be two residential entries: one is on East 10th Avenue and the other is on Watson Street. They are also going to acknowledge Brewery Creek as it cuts across a corner of the site. Mr. Ostry described the architectural plans for the site using the PowerPoint slides. He noted that they wanted the location for the height on the site to have the least negative impact on the neighbourhood and at the same time a lower streetwall condition along Watson Street, Broadway and Kingsway that maintained the best amount of light onto the street. In terms of other uses including office, twenty-five percent of the project is for non-residential and almost five percent of that is artist production space.

Mr. Ostry described the changes since the last review noting that they had pushed the tower down four storeys and pushed up the street wall massing along Watson Street, Broadway and Kingsway. They converted the component of the retail into artist studio production space (two levels) and they reconfigured the rental units and as well added some additional units. The Watson Street entry has been relocated opposite the current open space where there might be a transit portal one day. A restaurant is planned for the corner of 10th Avenue and Kingsway.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, noted that the landscaping hadn't changed much since the last review. They are still focusing on geography and the interesting context of the site with the changing grid of Kingsway. On 10th Avenue there is a higher level of detail with the transit use focusing on the plaza and open space in front of the artist's production space. The podium will still contain amenity areas and a community garden as well as a children's play area.

Eesmyal Santos-Brault, Sustainability Consultant, noted that the digital clock on a microwave takes up more energy than the microwave itself over a year and this is an example of phantom loads that happen in buildings. He noted that there is lots of opportunity to reduce energy through simple technology such as a universal kill switch and metering energy consumption. Mr. Santos-Brault added that the project will meet all the City's requirements in terms of EcoDensity and will meeting LEED™ Silver equivalent at a minimum with some room for LEED™ Gold.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider reducing the streetwall height by one floor and increasing the tower by two storeys to compensate.
 - Consider increasing the artist's production space.
 - Consider enhancing creative cycling amenities particularly on East 10th Avenue.
 - Careful consideration of the treatment of the parking and loading access.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal noting that it was an exciting mix of market and rental residential as well as retail and art production.

The Panel supported the use, density and form of development. As well they liked the addition of the artist's production space. Several Panel members said they would support more height in the tower and more in the podium while one Panel member suggested one less storey on the podium and making it up the tower. Another Panel member thought the streetwall was a little over bearing and suggested it could be broken up a bit to get more light into the courtyard. One Panel member thought the top of the tower needed to be a bit stronger as seen from a distance.

Most of the Panel did not see any liveability issues with the units facing either Broadway or Kingsway. One Panel member noted that for everyone who likes quiet and shady there are other people who like vibrant and sunny. The Panel supported the uses that will support the proposed transit node.

The Panel supported the location of the tower as well as the architectural treatment and the colour palette. As well they liked the suite plans noting that the addition of the artist's component and the STIR program were appropriate for the area. A couple of Panel members suggested the applicant go further with the artist's production space perhaps by adding a gallery space or other creative ways to display the artist's work.

The Panel supported the plans for the landscaping and thought it responded well to the architecture. A couple of Panel members suggested some integration into the landscape for people on the bike path. One Panel member would like to see a more exciting surface palette and a better acknowledgement of Brewery Creek and how it relates to the city grid. A couple of Panel members were concerned with the loading and parking access noting a possible impact from the future development on the lot opposite for the transit station.

The Panel supported the sustainable measures noting that putting energy monitors in the units was a great idea as people often don't realize how much energy is being wasted.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ostry thanked the Panel for their comments noting that they will make the project stronger. He added that they are proposing to line the loading bay with an art piece.

3. Address:	1455 Quebec Street (Science World)
DE:	414096
Description:	Construction of enclosed outdoor science park for Science World visitors. Landscaping of surrounding creek side park, including renovation of bike/ pedestrian paths, replacement of chicane with canopy, relocation of children's playground and tower of bauble, and addition of free science exhibits to public space.
Zoning:	BC-PED
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Cannon Architectural Design
Owner:	Science World
Review:	First
Delegation:	Matthew Thomson, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg Marta Farevaag, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg
Staff:	Scot Hein

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-5)

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Urban Planner, introduced the proposal for the outdoor science experience at Science World. It is the second phase of a two phase project; the first being interior alterations and some expansion to the building proper. He noted that the first phase wasn't brought to the Urban Design Panel but instead went to the Heritage Commission. Given there are some open space considerations with Creekside and some larger questions regarding North East False Creek and an open space opportunity at the end of the creek basin, it was decided that the Panel should review the proposal before it goes before the Development Permit Board. Mr. Hein noted that the proposal is for the exterior component which is a multi zoned educational and interactive experience.

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

- Edge condition being proposed and its degree of publicness, permeability noticing there is some initial landscaping being proposed and how that plays out in a seasonal way.
- Programming regarding the loading interface and the shared zone in terms of how that might work and how it is gated from the paying patronage that will come in through the building.
- Publicness and programming as well as the performance of the space.

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Marta Farevaag, Landscape Architect, further described the proposal noting that Science World has been perusing an outdoor science experience as an idea since 2002. In 2007 Science World was able to get the City's attention for a process that would align with the City's requirements for what the outdoor science experience would be and the City put together a committee with a series of workshops. The committee represented planning, urban design, cultural affairs, parks and engineering. Through that process a series of guiding principles were developed.

The future of the outdoor science experience is anticipating what the end of False Creek will look like in the long term. The City did a detailed study of the decking around the Expo site and found that some of it is not in good condition and after an assessment it was determined how it could be replaced. The intention of the study was to develop a capital plan on replacing the deck however that was found to be not possible at this time. As a result the City is committed to removing as much as possible of the decking and continuing the process that had been started on South East False Creek of bringing more of the original

foreshore back and having a more sustainable edge. Ms. Farevaag noted that the decking goes as far back as the first row of parking in the parking lot. They are looking at a long term plan that would bring the sea walk around past Science World and then back to the waterfront.

Ms. Farevaag noted there are a couple of interim pieces including using the future street car stop in front of Science World as a drop off for tour and school buses. Also, a bike route that will bring a cyclist route on the outside with the same material that was used in South East False Creek. There will be a strip that will separate cyclists from pedestrians and then a unobstructed pedestrian route.

The entrance to Science World is moving closer to Quebec Street and the children's play area will be relocated slightly to the north.

Matthew Thomson, Landscape Architect, described the public realm and the experience of the park. He noted that the current way finding is not working well and so they are focusing on extending a covered canopy and utilizing an existing exhibit by bringing it closer to Quebec Street. They are also proposing making public interactive opportunities such as bringing the bike power interactive exhibit onto the entry area. The main principle is sharing the activities and making them as visible as possible to the public. Mr. Thomson described the flex space that will be used for temporary exhibits that will be fenced with gates can be opened or closed. The Outdoor Science Experience edge is structured to present sustainability to pedestrians. They are proposing the perimeter to be as permeable as possible recognizing that on the southern end it is influenced by the park and is little more urban while the remainder of the edge will be more trellis-like and very green using less fencing.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Clarify and enhance the entry sequence particularly from the north and south parking lot;
 - Maintain the diagonal top of bank route of the pathways for bicycles across the park in the long term;
 - Review and enhance consideration of future public transit and associated links to Science World;
 - Design development to clarify and enhance the experiential quality, view and openness of the exterior fence;
 - Enhance artistic engagement strategy;
 - Consider additional rain coverage.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal noting that although they thought Science World was an important institution there were concerns regarding the Outdoor Science Experience.

The Panel liked the idea for the outdoor science experience and changing the entry sequence noting that the progression to the front door is confusing. They thought that the alignment to the front door made sense but felt the design was a bit weak. One Panel member suggested having more weather protection so that the area could be used all year long. In terms of animation, the Panel wanted to see stronger wayfinding elements that would lead people to the front door of Science World from the parking lot. One Panel member thought there needed to be clarity as to where the front door was located.

The Panel felt there needed to be a clear overlook into the paid space so that people could see the action taking place on the other side of the fence. They also thought more free things could spill out into the waiting line up area. One Panel member noted that the concept of having as much activity as possible at the entry was important. A couple of Panel members thought there should be more artistic elements included in the proposal.

The Panel thought the links from the parking area seemed a bit over scale and not clear as to the location of the front door. They thought the desire lines needed to be clearer with more rain canopies around the exhibits.

Most of the Panel liked the flex area but felt it could be a bit disappointing if nothing was going on in the space and the gates were closed. A couple of Panel members were concerned that it would only be used on weekends and felt the area needed to be more permeable. Another Panel member was concerned that the area would appear a little cage like. The Panel also felt the area should be more exciting coming along the pathway from the north.

The Panel had some concerns regarding the pedestrian and cyclist's intersections. They felt they should be clearer and suggested keeping the diagonal pedestrian route across Creekside Park. The Panel did not have any concerns with the relocation of the play area or loss of a little of the park space.

Regarding the landscape, a couple of Panel members wanted to see the landscaping organized with various pieces that would create quiet places in the landscape. The screen wall is an interesting idea and knits all the pieces together, but several Panel members thought it could be stronger and more remarkable. One Panel member suggested the screen wall be more playful and could have some interactive pieces. Another Panel member thought it would be great to have a special play garden that wasn't as transparent as everything else along the water front.

The Panel noted that how the edges were treated was an important element and they felt the presentation was weak in terms of what that edge was as they didn't think it was well resolved. They thought it was a fundamental piece and felt hedge like. One Panel member noted that the metal fence seemed uninviting and rather cumbersome and suggested it could be an interactive element instead.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Farevaag thanked the Panel for their comments noting that the access is wide as it also accommodates trucks to the loading area. There is a lot of asphalt currently on the north side but it is only temporary.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.