

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 27, 2006

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Walter Francl, Chair
Nigel Baldwin
Albert Bicol (sat out Item #3)
Shahla Bozorgzadeh
Tom Bunting
James Cheng
Eileen Keenan
Margot Long
John Wall
Peter Wreglesworth
C.C. Yao

REGRETS: Bill Harrison

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1177 West Pender/1180 West Hastings
2.	688 East 17 th Avenue
3.	360 West 1 st Ave. (Polygon Foundry Tower)
4.	1680 West 4 th Avenue
5.	4575 Clancy Loranger Way (Hillcrest Park Recreational Centre (Olympic Curling Venue))

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Francl called the meeting to order at 4:10 P.M.

1. Address: 1177 West Pender/1180 West Hastings Street
DE: 410598
Use: Hotel
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Downs/Archambault & Partners
Owner: Hayden Properties Partnership
Review: First
Delegation: Mark Ehman, Rob Barnes
Staff: Sailen Black

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (4-6)

- **Introduction:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced this application. Referring to the model Mr. Black described the project which is a complete development application for a 19 storey hotel with 220 rooms, located mid block on Pender Street. The proposal is in line with the Downtown District zoning and uses the 15% bonus offered for hotels, plus residual density from the Shorehill building. In terms of policy both the Downtown Guidelines and the character description for the Golden Triangle ask to consider the quality of pedestrian oriented development at grade and the compatibility and design of the above-grade portions. The previous DP permit in 1999 for an office included improvements to the Shorehill building on Hastings and Pender Streets, with street widening happening on Hastings.

The Panel advice was sought on the following:

- What is the appropriate extent of painted concrete?
- What is the optimum massing of the mechanical penthouse, in balancing the limited views through the site with the integrity of the form?
- Noting the single-site covenant will limit redevelopment of the Shorehill, how well does the podium relate to adjacent sites along the inside property lines?
- What is the appropriate balance along Hastings of a pedestrian scaled and detailed streetscape with the functional requirements of a vehicle loop, especially for the design of the retail kiosk?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Ehman, Architect, referred to the model and gave a brief overview of the site. Mr. Ehman advised the Panel that much of what is being done to the exterior of the building is to do with the programming requirements within a hotel. He noted that in discussions with Engineering Services, all vehicular arrival functions are to be within the site boundaries with access exclusively from West Hastings Street. Mr. Ehman also advised the Panel that the Planning Department had recommended a retail opportunity on West Hastings Street be created to provide a more animated, pedestrian friendly sidewalk experience.

Mr. Barnes, Landscape Architect, discussed the public realm and the streetscapes as well as the landscaping on the podium. He also advised the Panel of the sustainable strategies for the site. The applicant team responded to questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Concerns about the amount of painted concrete on the building as a finish material;

- Concerns with the heavy massing of the mechanical penthouse;
 - Concerns about the symmetrical orientation of the units in the floor plan not responding well to the varied view exposures and privacy concerns from neighbouring buildings.
 - Design development to better articulate the podium side walls; and
 - Design development to lighten the building base on Hastings Street and expand the kiosk.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel did not support this application.

It was acknowledged that the building has a strong presence on the street and that the architect had done a great job on this difficult site. However, the Panel considered that considerable design development and revision is required to yield a satisfactory result.

The majority of the Panel members felt there was too much painted concrete.

The Panel felt there was too much massing on top of the building drawing emphasis to the mechanical penthouse and making it appear heavy. It appears to be larger than necessary. A change of materials, the addition of louvers or a reduction in mass was suggested to make it more successful.

Most members commented that the podium could be better articulated by stepping back. This would also create opportunities for planting or glazing.

The Panel was concerned about how the hotel function addresses Hastings Street. The Panel was concerned that the retail kiosk was too small and that it would not have enough frontage on Hastings Street. They suggested expanding the space between the structural columns. Some felt that the porte-cochere space was too deep and may read as a void from the street. It was suggested that careful design of the reflected ceiling and a good lighting plan would be needed to help animate and celebrate the entrance. Several members of the Panel liked the location of the ballroom but several felt that the façade needed more articulation. One member of the Panel suggested reducing the frontage of the ballroom and allowing the ballroom to appear to “float” over the porte-cochere.

Several members commented that the relatively symmetrical pinwheel floor plan created blank side walls and missed good view opportunities. There were also overlook and privacy concerns. It appeared that more suites than necessary were oriented into adjacent offices.

Some of the Panel members felt that the podium of the building wasn't relating well with adjacent sites and that the some attention needed to be given to the massing of the podium to achieve a better fit with the neighbouring streetscape. A quieter more neutral treatment of the elevation, particularly the grid elements on the façade, was also suggested by one member. Two members suggested less vertical emphasis on the tower.

Two members suggested having green roofs on the lower roofs as there are a number of towers overlooking the property. Green walls with a variety of shade tolerant vines were also suggested.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ehman thanked the Panel for their comments. He noted that the applicant team had discussed the lighting in the porte-cochere as they recognize this area needs to be very well lit.

2. Address:	688 East 17 th Avenue
DE:	410111
Use:	Mixed-use residential
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Cornerstone Architecture
Owner:	690233 BC Ltd.
Review:	Second (first review June 7, 2006)
Delegation:	Scott Kennedy, Richard Finley, Andres Vargas
Staff:	Bob Adair

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this complete application in the C-2 zone. The application was not supported by the Panel when it was first reviewed on June 7, 2006. The site is located at the southwest corner of 17th Avenue and Fraser Street, about a block and a half south of Kingsway. There are water table problems which necessitated the parking not being completely underground. Mr. Adair briefly described the site context and noted that it is a standard C-2 development with commercial on the main floor and three levels of residential above. Mr. Adair summarized the Panel's concerns from the last review which included the overall complexity of the building, particularly the rear elevation; concerns with the liveability of some of the floor plans; the proposed rear yard relaxation at the fourth floor level at the north west corner; concerns about a general lack of amenity space in the building and the small size of the residential lobby; landscaping treatment along 17th Avenue and along the lane and expression of the residential entries along 17th Avenue. Mr. Adair stated that the applicant had made significant changes to address the issues. Referring to the model Mr. Adair described the changes the applicant has made to the project.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Kennedy, Architect described the changes they made to the project including reducing the number of units in the building in order to change the façade as well as expressing the rhythm differently on the street.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Concerns about the amount of painted concrete on the lane side;
 - Consider breaking down the laneway elevation; and
 - Concerns about the size of the master bedroom window in the two bedroom suites.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this proposal. The applicant team was congratulated for their thorough response to the Panel's previous comments.

Several Panel members expressed concern about the amount of painted concrete on the lane frontage. It was suggested that a change of materials or color composition could improve the expression. It was also felt that the lanescape might benefit from some more planting, especially around the bicycle storage and garbage areas.

One Panel member felt the weather protection on both streets could be improved. They also suggested making the main residential entry more prominent.

The Panel felt there was a better relationship with the single family neighbours but would like to see an increase in the size of the trees.

Several members of the Panel felt the master bedroom windows in the two bedroom suites were rather small.

One Panel member noted that in South East False Creek, the applicants are getting credit for enclosed balconies with the City relaxing the 50% rule in C-2 zoning with regards to solar and environmental control.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Kennedy thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that they will be redesigning the windows in the master bedrooms of the two bedroom suites.

3. Address:	360 West 1 st Avenue (Polygon Foundry Tower)
DE:	410612
Use:	106 residential units (13 storey tower with 10 townhouses)
Zoning:	CD-1 Southeast False Creek Private Lands
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	IBI/HB
Owner:	Polygon Foundry Tower Ltd.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Jim Hancock, Robert Barnes, Heather Tremaine
Staff:	Mary Beth Rondeau

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

- **Introduction:** Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented the application and noted that this is the first SEFC application seen at this stage. The application was not supported by the Panel when it was first reviewed on April 12, 2006. The development is a 125 foot high all residential mid-rise building with ten three storey townhouses on West 1st Avenue. This site is next to the Best Warehouse site. Mr. Rondeau briefly described the use and massing of the proposal and noted the proposed density is 3.5 FSR.

The Panel advice was sought on the following:

- Should there be a more visible response to solar orientation (SE and SW facades, slab extensions to the North facades) and building durability (rain penetration)?
- Has the north-south link been developed sufficiently to provide the visual permeability through the site given that it will not be publicly accessible?
- Is design development needed to provide a uniquely South East False Creek (SEFC) character and historic reference in the Public Realm?

Ms. Rondeau took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Jim Hancock, Architect, noted that they are at 37 LEED points and may make LEED Gold. He stated that they are redesigned the North and East facades of the building by adding more glass to increase sun penetration into the suites. On the South side for both solar gain and privacy reasons, smaller windows are used. There has also been additional modeling of the west façade and a downsizing of the glass to achieve a comfortable range of heat gain. Regarding through-site permeability, a gate is currently shown and it will be up to the Strata Council to make the decision as to whether or not it's locked. Mr. Hancock also noted that the material palette has been selected to address the uniquely SEFC character.

Mr. Barnes, Landscape Architect, briefly described the landscaping and sustainability plans for the development. Ms. Tremaine noted that they are using a green roof on the tower as well as having a cistern located in the parkade for the irrigation needs of the site.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development for the townhouses, especially on the south lane facade;
 - Recommendation for shading on the south west façade.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this proposal and felt the project was nicely resolved.

The Panel felt the public realm was strong and that adding high quality pavement would give character. One Panel member suggested having some fun with the design of the gate and to develop the imagery on the gate and the roof to relate to the industrial heritage of the neighbourhood. Some of the Panel felt the north side link should not have public access and should have a gate. The Panel agreed that part of the charm is the lane and the open areas that tie everything together. Several members would like to see all the developers in the area come together on the design theme to develop a consistency in the character of the public realm.

In terms of the north south link through site link, several members of the Panel felt it might help the elevation and character of the building if that link was heightened by raising the opening up one floor.

Some members of the Panel felt the south side of the townhouses were the weakest part of the scheme in terms of character and solar control and felt that an overhang might help with some solar shading. Some members also felt the metal screens appeared a little heavy on the top of the townhouses. Several Panel members liked the north screen on the townhouses but felt that the project would be better served if it was on the south side.

One Panel member suggested using shutters on the south west orientation of the tower to control solar gain. They also suggested that using the steel from the penthouse roof screen for these shutters might be a more practical use of the screening elements.

One member of the Panel suggested that the expression could be different on West 1st Avenue from the lane and to make the expression unique for the townhouses.

One Panel member liked the terracotta on the base and felt it speaks well to the industrial precinct and history of the area. The Panel member would like to see more of it at grade level on the mews between the two buildings and felt it would help to develop a stronger reading of the mews through the site.

Several members noted that the top of the tower seemed less resolved and didn't seem to fit with the building. It could be emphasized in a manner more complementary to the rest of the building.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hancock thanked the Panel for their comments and mentioned that the team would work to accommodate the Panel's suggestions.

4. Address:	1680 West 4 th Avenue
DE:	410474
Use:	Mixed-use Grocery Store/Residential
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	IBI/HB
Owner:	Cressey Pine Holdings Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Martin Bruckner, Tracy Chong, Dylan Chernoff
Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner introduced the C2-B application which is a five storey mixed-use building with retail at grade and residential above and three levels of underground parking. The applicant is seeking a density of 2.5 FSR and a height of fifty feet. The project is located on the corner of West 4th Avenue and Pine Street.

The building massing is grouped into two separate blocks and will be adjoined by a glass enclosed bridge element. There will be two residential entrances; one off Pine Street and another off West 4th Avenue. The ground floor will be large tenant retail with smaller CRUs off Pine Street with three off West 4th Avenue. The parking is accessed off the lane with two Class B loading bays. The landscaping will upgrade the sidewalk with new trees on both West 4th and Pine Street. The units are primarily one and two bedrooms with some form of outdoor space. The top of the building steps back and there are terraces on the top floor. The predominate material is to be painted concrete while the base material is to be stone. The canopies are steel and fabric. Staff is supportive of the project and feel the conditions are relatively minor.

The Panel advice was sought on the following:

1. Height and Massing:
 - The proposed height exceeds the conditional maximum of 50 feet by approximately 1.5 feet (to be confirmed). Under Section 5.3 the Director of Planning may relax any of the regulations of the C2-B By-law for developments involving dwelling units in conjunction with any other permitted uses. Do you support the extra height and have they earned this discretionary increase?
 - General comments are requested on the building massing.
2. Streetscape frontage/edge treatment:
 - The C2-B By-law limits commercial frontage for a single occupancy to a maximum of 50 feet. This can be relaxed provided a pedestrian amenity area such as a courtyard or resting area is provided, or where pedestrian interest is maintained. Has this been achieved?
3. Entries:
 - Comments are requested on the two residential entries at the east and west corners of the site. Do they need stronger identity and greater differentiation than the store entry?
4. Material treatment:
 - Comments are requested on the proposed material treatment.
5. Liveability:
 - Comments are requested on general liveability including the absence of an indoor amenity room, the size and location of shared open amenity space, configuration of the internal corridor, and issues of sound attenuation from West 4th Avenue.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Mr. Bruckner, Architect gave a brief overview of the site. Mr. Bruckner noted that a relaxation in the height means they will be able to use concrete construction.

Dylan Chernoff, Landscape Architect gave a overview of the landscape plans for the site noting there will be benches and trees on West 4th Avenue. The 4th floor has an amenity deck and there will be a green roof with a bar code of visual interest on the top of the two buildings. The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

The Panel had some concerns about the residential entries and locations and thought that a single more central location may be preferred.

The Panel felt that the color palette was too uniform and grey.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this application and found the additional height supportable and they agreed that the applicant had earned the discretionary increase.

The Panel members would like to have more landscaping on the streetscape with seating and additional greenery, especially at the residential entries. It was suggested that the tree on the corner could be enlarged to make a bigger statement. Moving the exhaust grilles to the inside of the building would give more of an opportunity to plant the lane. One member suggested making the maple trees on the patios larger.

Several Panel members questioned the location of the residential lobbies and suggested having a mid block entry. Since the corner of West 4th Avenue and Pine Street is a major corner, several of the Panel members suggested having a plaza on that corner to make for a stronger entrance. One Panel member felt the residential lobby was too small.

A number of Panel members felt the building colors were rather sombre and needed to be more vibrant to animate the façade.

The Panel felt it was a positive move to have green roofs on the two buildings. Several members expressed concern for the location of the amenity roof deck and would like to see it attached to an amenity room. They felt that an outdoor amenity wouldn't work without an indoor space as the residents need room for storage as well as a sink to wash up after a barbeque.

One Panel member suggested open corridors to promote cross ventilation and also one member thought the bridge could be covered with some landscaping and that it didn't need to be as narrow as the interior corridor.

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

-
5. Address: 4575 Clancy Loranger Way
DE: 410676
Use: Hillcrest Park Recreational Centre (Olympic Curling Venue) - Legacy Community Centre & Percy Norman Aquatic Centre
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Hughes Condon Marler Architects
Review: First
Delegation: Rudy Roelofsen, Darryl Condon, Jim Waugh, Margot Long
Staff: Dale Morgan
-

EVALUATION: (8-0)**• Introduction:**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced this application which is the Olympic venue for the curling facility. This application applies to the legacy mode, which represents the conversions of the Olympic Curling venue after the 2010 Winter Games. Mr. Morgan introduced Rudy Roelofsen, Manager of Facility Development for the Park Board who gave an overview of the Master Plan and history of the site. Mr. Roelofsen stated that the Legacy Building would be converted to a community centre, ice rink and other community uses after it has served its function for the Olympic Games and a new Aquatic Centre would be constructed. The Master Plan also includes revised parking and access for Hillcrest and Nat Bailey Parks. Once the facilities are in operation the plan calls for the demolition of the Riley Park facilities.

Mr. Morgan added that the Master Plan and rezoning process is being fast tracked to have the facilities ready for the 2010 Winter Games. He reminded the Panel that as a condition of approval for the proposed form of development, the Director of Planning may allow minor alterations to the proposed form of development when approving the detailed scheme of development.

The Panel's comments were requested on the following:

1. Scale and Massing:

Noting the programming requirements for large, simple spaces, has the massing successfully broken down the building scale into smaller, finer scaled elements that reduce its apparent bulk? Does it relate well to the existing stadium?

2. Material Treatment and Architectural Expression:

Is the material treatment and expression well handled?

3. Landscape and Parking:

General comments were requested on the proposed landscape treatment. Are the building's edges well integrated with the landscaping? Are the pedestrian paths leading from the parking areas and from the park's edge well handled? Comments are requested on the central parking area on which the existing stadium and the proposed aquatic centre both face, and the potential to make this a more meaningful urban space.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the panel.

- Applicant's Introductory Comments:**
- Mr. Condon, Architect, discussed some of the design decisions that were based on considerations raised by the community to keep traffic to a minimum and developed the project with a series of pedestrian pathways through the site. He also went through the challenges of building a site for the Olympic which will then be reconfigured to add in the library and other facilities after the Olympics. Margot Long, Landscape Architect described the landscaping for the project, noting the large entry plaza area and the landscaped green terraces with granite bands around the trees and seating.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects:**

- Consideration to use a metal roof, rather than the membrane roof being proposed.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this proposal. The Panel felt that it was well handled. The applicant team was congratulated for their work on this project.

The scale and massing has been effectively and satisfactorily dealt with and while it sits on a very large site next to other large structures, it holds its own. They also felt that the team produced a legible, coherent resolution to a very complex program.

To the question of material treatment, a majority of the Panel felt it was a shame that the roof material proposed was a membrane roof. They would like to have seen either a metal or possibly a green roof. As a civic project and legacy building the Panel felt it was short sighted not to have sufficient money to do the roof properly.

Some of the Panel felt that the West façade needed a bit of work. They felt there could be some difficulty, especially in the library and the fitness area with inadequate solar shading. One Panel member suggested that since the north side has an angled façade using angled glass could reduce solar gain without using overhangs.

One member of the Panel stated that the final master plan was an improvement over the original, particularly in the revised distribution of parking.

Another Panel member noted that the Preschool was located on the far side, and remote from the drop off.

The Panel felt the public spaces had been well designed spatially and were well detailed. One member noted that the parking lot seemed to have fewer trees than the other similar parking lots.

One member suggested that there seemed to be a lost potential for a more ceremonial entry by having the entry closer to Nat Bailey and building on the qualities of Nat Bailey to make a kind of semi urban space where the two significant buildings share a common urban forecourt.

One member of the Panel suggested introducing skylights to provide natural light into the circulation spine of the building. Also one member suggested a glass canopy be added to emphasize the entrance and to provide rain protection.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Condon thanked the Panel for their kind comments. He stated that the entry canopies and the interior spaces were still part of their development. He noted that the project has been designed with an integrated design process and is meeting LEED Gold targets and is integral to everything they have done in designing the building.

Meeting concluded at 9:40PM.