

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 6, 2010

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden (Chair)
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett (excused Item #1 & #3)
David Godin
Jim Huffman
Oliver Lang
Steve McFarlane (Item #1 only)
Vladimir Mikler (excused Item #1)
Maurice Pez
Scott Romses

GUEST PANEL: Mark Ostry
Jim Hancock

REGRETS:
Robert Barnes
Jane Durante
Alan Storey

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1075 West Hastings Street
2.	3212 East Boulevard
3.	1134 Burrard Street

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Haden 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: 1075 West Hastings Street (High Building Review)
 DE: 414163
 Description: To construct a new 36-storey mixed-use office/retail on this site.
 Zoning: DD
 Application Status: Complete
 Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Owner: Oxford Properties Group
 Review: First
 Delegation: Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Mark Thompson, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
 Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
 Mark Cote, Oxford Properties Group
 Staff: Ralph Segal and Yardley McNeil

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-9)

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that a High Level Panel was convened for the review of the proposal which comes from Council's Policy to review projects that are deemed to be high buildings in the context of achieving architectural excellence. Mr. Segal described the surrounding context noting that the site currently is the home of the University Club. He noted that although the building is sitting within a 450 foot height zone, the proposal protrudes into the Queen Elizabeth View Cone and is therefore subject to review under the High Building Review Policy. Mr. Segal noted that there is a slight protrusion into the Cambie Street View Cone by a marginal amount. Staff are taking a report to Council to get their endorsement that the building height can project into the Queen Elizabeth View Cone. Mr. Segal said that perhaps the more significant matter is the relationship of the proposed building to the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower.

Yardley McNeil, Heritage Planner, further described the proposal noting that the building was designed in 1929 by Sharp & Thompson and built prior to the construction of the Marine Building (1930). It was originally the Quadra Club and became the University Club in 1957 and later used for the Terminal City Club prior to their move east on West Hastings Street. It is listed as a "B" on the Vancouver Heritage Registry and has several of the interior features included on the Heritage Interiors Inventory, namely the lobbies off West Hastings Street, the spiral staircase and the heavy timber trusses in the rear with turned diagonal members.

It is a four storey massing along West Hastings Street and the intention is to retain only the façade and some of the interior features in exchange for a 9% of additional density on the site. It is important to note that the application will go to the Development Permit Board for decision on the added density. It has been to the Heritage Commission with some of the issues being the proximity between the Guinness Tower and the Marine Building.

The new floors will align with the first and third floors of the heritage façade with the remainder removed to create double height spaces. It was considered that the height of the new tower was a better solution than a lower tower as this leaves free the detail of the

Marine Building cap without interfering with the new tower. The Heritage Commission gave their support by a 4 to 3 vote and their motion was to support the project as presented requesting further detail on the conservation plan.

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

1. Has the proposed design achieved the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building Policy?
2. Does the proposed tower's massing, height and character achieve an appropriate relationship to the heritage Marine Building and Guinness Tower?
3. Is the proposed new construction appropriately integrated with the retained heritage University Club façade?
4. Does the proposed design make a positive contribution to the Public Realm?

Mr. Segal and Ms. McNeil took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mark Whitehead, Architect, further described the proposal noting that that it is a mid block site that is either partially or completely obscured from almost every view around the city. They tried to find a precedent for the site in the city and found it in Jamieson House which is a 36 floor residential mixed-use building as opposed to office and the Credit Foncier building which is a designated heritage building. Mr. Whitehead noted that their approach was one of restraint. They see the Marine Building as the gem and this building as the back drop that the Marine Building will be read against. It is also in contrast to several other buildings adjacent. Mr. Whitehead discussed the proximity to the surrounding buildings nothing that they had pushed the building to the north as much as possible to create space between it and the heritage façade. It will preserve a view down West Hastings Street of the Guinness Tower and will give a view of the Marine Building. In trying to give the building some identity, they created a reveal top to bottom which relates strongly to the entrance and the entrance canopy. They also created more open space and access through the site for pedestrians with an entry to the lobby on Cordova Street as well as retail space. In terms of the Club, the façade will be retained and the ramp at the front of the façade will be removed to restore it to its original state. There is a blank concrete wall facing the plaza that will also be removed and will be replaced by a fenestrated concrete wall and the ivy will be reestablished as it exists currently. The building will fit into the mullion tower as it comes down to base and will project through the site to a similar plan on the north side which is scaled to the base of the Marine Building and the base of the Guinness Tower.

Mr. Whitehead described the architecture, the proposed materials and color palette for the project. He noted that the top of the building has been designed to conceal the elevator overrun and the water tanks from the West Hastings Street view. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Whitehead noted that the proposal will use triple glazing that will provide comfort for the tenants and effective daylighting. They are also proposing a Variable Refrigerant Flow (VFR) system on the tower that allows heating in one portion of the building while cooling in another. They plan on getting all 10 of the energy points for the project in LEED™ and are planning to make LEED™ Platinum certified. He noted that there isn't a certified LEED™ office building in the downtown core at the moment.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the proposed landscaping plans noting that they are looking at high quality materials on the ground plane on the west side of the project with curved ipe benches and a two toned treatment for the pavement which is similar to what is on the Guinness Tower. The landscape will be permeable with linkages across from West Hastings Street to Cordova Street. There will be a roof deck assessable from the tower on top of the old University Club that links across to the Marine Building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Enhance the architectural integrity, presence and autonomy of the building with consideration to expressing aspects of current architectural innovation.
 - Design refinement to the lower floor elevation with particular attention to the Cordova Street façade and to the relationship with the University Club building.
 - Design development to the top of the building with particular attention the visibility of the elevator tower.
 - Design development to increase the vitality of the public realm ground plane including allowing indoor/outdoor permeability particularly with respect to the restaurant.
 - Design development to the east façade with particular attention to the exterior treatment of the service core.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and agreed that the proposed design had not achieved the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building Policy.

The Panel thought the proposal had a simple, clean expression and responded well to the city grid. They felt it was a good urban fit and liked the through connection from West Hastings Street to Cordova Street. However they thought the designed seemed to be stripped down and was lacking in character and that there wasn't enough delight as a 2010 designed building with one Panel member noting that it showed it's history but didn't show the future. One Panel member thought the materiality was mute and timid and that the reveal between the two facades was an opportunity to express some creativity with the use of texture or colored glass or other materials. However, the Panel thought it was sensitively inserted between the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower. They thought the massing, height and character achieved an appropriate relationship to the heritage of the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower. One Panel member noted that where the design was most successful was the middle part where it meets all the constraints but falls short at the public realm level and at the top of the tower. It was noted that it was important to have vibrant and active work places in the downtown core rather than adding another residential building.

Most of the Panel agreed that the building had potential to be a great building because of its iconic shape and encouraged the applicant to think about expressing more sustainable features in the facade. They found that the façade treatment didn't have the kind of integrity it needed in order to stand shoulder to shoulder with the surrounding buildings. However, the Panel thought the new construction of the tower was appropriately integrated with the retained heritage of the University Club façade.

They thought the canopy was a little weak in its design and that there are some façade treatments that didn't work at the base. One Panel member noted that the relationship to the Guinness Tower could be improved by lifting the base up higher to make it stronger and to create some space. Another Panel member noted that façade didn't turn the corner very well and the rear elevation adjacent to Cordova Street didn't have a relationship to any of the surrounding buildings. Also most of the Panel thought the top of the building could be higher around elevator core to reduce it being visible from West Hastings Street. It was noted that the service core will telegraph through the building with one Panel member wondering why the core wasn't closer to the Guinness building as it would strengthen the design. Another Panel member noted that the elevator location needs to be rethought for the parking garage.

A couple of Panel members thought the landscape plans were confusing and wondered why it needed to be broken up as it didn't seem to reinforce the architecture. There was some concern regarding shadowing of the plaza during the noon hour with several Panel members suggesting the proposed restaurant on the ground floor should be allowed to expand out into the plaza as it would animate the street more. Another Panel member noted that having a ground floor restaurant was integral to the downtown core.

Regarding sustainability, most of the Panel thought the skin supported the sustainable premise although one Panel member thought it could be expressed more powerfully.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Whitehead noted that there are some finer points to take into consideration. He noted that the restaurant is four feet above the plaza and to change that would be mean rethinking the lobby. He added that the thought the comments were thoughtful and appreciated the Panel's input.

2. Address:	3212 East Boulevard
DE:	Rezoning
Description:	To construct an eight unit Housing Demonstration Project on this corner site, consisting of four 3 1/2-storey townhouse units, two lock-off suites and two over-the-garage suites at the rear of the site.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Allan Diamond Architect
Owner:	Sat Lally
Review:	First
Delegation:	Allan Diamond, Allan Diamond Architect Craig Marcs, Allan Diamond Architect Jarrod McAleese, Samra Landscaping Troy Glasner, E3 Eco Group
Staff:	Sailen Black and Alison Higginson

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Alison Higginson, Rezoning Planner, introduced the proposal for a site that is currently zoned RS-1. The purpose of the rezoning is to create a comprehensive development district zoning which would permit a total of eight dwelling units on the site. The project is comprised of four 3-level dwelling units and two garden suites in the principal building with two small studios above the parking garage at the rear of the site. The proposed rezoning would alter the density, height, site coverage and yard regulations of the RS-1 district. In addition the application is seeking a parking relaxation. In terms of policy the site is located within the Arbutus Ridge Kerrisdale Shaughnessy Community Vision area. The rezoning is proposed as a housing demonstration project which can be considered under the Vision without additional area planning being completed. This type of project is required to demonstrate the new a form of housing in a neighbourhood, improved affordability and a degree of neighbourhood support. Staff are considering the project on the bases of the mix of the unit types that are proposed. The site is located on two significant arterials which are well served by transit and also adjacent to local commercial services.

Sailen Black, Development Planner, further described the proposal noting the zoning for the neighbourhood to the north allows for multiple dwellings. He also described the context for the area noting the single family character in the area which includes consulates, senior's homes and care facilities. Four parking stalls will be provided.

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

- Fit within the immediate context especially with regard to the adjacent neighbours; and
- Architectural and landscape design in terms of livability for the future occupants.

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

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Allan Diamond, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the property is close to amenities. They originally designed a townhouse oriented project but the client wanted more diverse unit types and Vision group wanted a more traditional form. The units above the garage are small and are designed for students or for people who want a small city home. Mr. Diamond noted that they are proposing four car parking spaces and that there is a bus stop on West 16th Avenue. Mr.

Diamond described the architectural expression noting that they are not trying to replicate a heritage building but is similar to other architectural expression in the surrounding neighbourhood.

Jarrod McAleese, Landscaping Architect, described the landscaping plans noting that they are trying to maintain the existing hedge with a bit of art deco flair to the entrance while giving privacy. Trees will be added to the corners of the property. They have incorporated storm water retention, crushed rock and permeable pavers on the walkways.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Enhance the ability of the occupants to easily access and store bicycles;
 - Ensure effective acoustic separation between the suites and for road noise;
 - Design development to enhance private outdoor space particularly for the lowest levels; and
 - Consider some massing and details simplification.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was a well handled and interesting project.

The Panel supported the variation of suite types stating that it was a good choice to provide smaller units in the neighbourhood. They thought the project had a good relationship to its neighbours and as well spoke to the older architectural expression found in the area. However, several Panel members suggested the massing be simpler so as to not read as a single house or replicate heritage houses in the area. Regarding the height, a couple of Panel members noted that the proposal was at the upper limits but still fit well on the site. As well they thought there was enough of a setback and that the sideyard were comfortable. One Panel member suggested the applicant take privacy into consideration when adding glazing on the side walls of the buildings.

As a demonstration project the Panel said they would like to see more of this type of housing noting that it allows for more affordable prices ranges.

A couple of Panel members suggested additional sound proofing over the lower floor living spaces. The Panel thought the liveability was good noting that the circulation was generous and sheltered. A couple of Panel members thought the bike storage needed to be better addressed and wanted to see it closer to the garage door. Also a couple of Panel members suggested flipping the coach house entrance so it was off the courtyard rather than the lane. A couple of Panel members suggested the lower floor didn't work and wanted to see more open ends on them to allow for more light.

The Panel supported the landscaping with several Panel members suggesting some outdoor space for the units. One Panel member suggested some thin trees on the south side of the site that would provide a separation to the neighbour. Another Panel member suggested moving the garbage on the south side of the site so the residents won't have to walk past it to get to their suites.

The Panel commended the applicant on green building and sustainable measures with one Panel member suggesting larger overhangs. The Panel agreed that the parking relaxation was an important precedent.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Diamond thanked the Panel for their comments.

3. Address:	1134 Burrard Street
DE:	414166
Description:	To construct a non-market residential development to provide 141 units of housing and facilities for the Family Services of Great Vancouver "Directions" youth program. The development is to consist of a 16-storey building over one level of parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	DYS Architecture
Owner:	BC Housing
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Dane Jansen, DYS Architecture Gerry Eckford, Eckford and Associates Landscape Architects
Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a development permit application following a rezoning for one of the twelve social housing projects. It went through a rezoning to achieve a couple of things: an increase in FSR and increase in height. Under the current zoning it was limited to a height of 120 feet and an FSR of 5. The Panel endorsed the addition FSR. The height is up to the underside of the view cone which is 178 feet. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the buildings in the surrounding area. The form of development issues have all been addressed through the rezoning process. There were two questions that the Panel had put forward which were adopted into the rezoning conditions. One was to simplify the building's expression including consideration to reducing the variety of materials that were being proposed and design development to respond to the Burrard Street elevations especially at the lower level. At the time that the proposal went through the rezoning they were only required to achieve LEED™ Silver and they are now perusing LEED™ Gold.

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

- Has the proposal adequately responding to the Panel's advice and subsequent rezoning condition seeking design development to simplify the building's facades and architectural treatments?

Ms. Molaro took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Dane Jansen, Architect, further described the proposal noting the building will be used by the Directions Program which is a street youth program. The first two floors are dedicated to that program and there will be support space for the housing on the third floor and then above that are the units. In response to the comments from the previous review of the Panel, Mr. Jansen noted that the materials are more robust as it is intended to be a sixty year building. He also noted that there will be brick and metal cladding on the building. He described the sustainable initiatives in the building noting that they will be saving energy on the domestic hot water and they will be using a source heat pump exchange system for energy on site. Mr. Jansen described the improvements to the design noting that they had brought colored glass into the space. He also noted that they had chosen a more gray colored palette for the building's exterior.

Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, noted that they were maintaining the design primarily as it was presented at the last UDP review. They will be using robust materials and green

screen elements. There is a certain amount of landscaping on the fourth level that has a common space with landscape screens. The Burrard Street streetscape follows the guidelines and has a simple and clean expression. Urban agriculture is planned for the third floor.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Consider further simplification and enhancement of the tower elevation including consideration of integration of the lower levels with the façade above.
 - Design development to north façade including consideration of additional colour.
 - Ensure the building will allow future solar hot water panels.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought it was improved since that the last review.

The Panel thought the Burrard Street elevation had been improved although they thought it expressed as two separate projects and would like to have seen a stronger relationship between the two towers as they didn't seem to be working together. Several Panel members thought there was a playfulness and vibrancy in the architecture for the first three floors but then seemed to disappear into the tower. Most of the Panel thought the proposal didn't have a clear expression and had too many ideas for a small building. One Panel member suggested the applicant could consider a more expressive design that would make for a funky building.

The Panel felt the north façade being a prominent façade was the weakest in terms of materials, colour and articulation. Several Panel members felt the colour palette need to be improved.

Although the Panel agreed that the proposal had improved since the last review they had some concerns with the architecture. They felt the program was strong and that the uses came through more in the expression of the building.

One panel member noted that the proposal will contain rather small units and since social spaces are important suggested that some roof top public space be included even if it was relatively small.

Some Panel members were concerned with the loss of the solar panels and suggested the building be designed so that they could be added in the future.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Jansen noted that there will be a little roof top amenity area on the lane side of the building. He added that he appreciated the comments from the Panel.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.