

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 7, 2011

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Robert Barnes
Helen Besharat
Gregory Borowski
James Cheng
Jeff Corbett
Jim Huffman
Arno Matis
Geoff McDonell (Excused Items #1 & #4)
Scott Romses
Norm Shearing (left after 2nd item)

REGRETS:
Jane Durante
Alan Endall
Alan Storey

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	984 West Broadway
2.	400 Terminal Avenue
3.	3657 West Broadway
4.	1549 West 70th Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Romses called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. **Address:** 984 West Broadway
DE: DE414912
Use: New 10 storey mixed-use building, retail at grade and 9 storeys of office space from levels 2 to 10, totaling 96,629 sq ft. Includes 152 parking spaces below grade with access from the lane and provision for future access to a future LRT station at the corner of Oak and W Broadway. The site was recently re-zoned from C-3A and has not yet been enacted.
Zoning: C-3A to CD-1
Application Status: RZ
Architect: Chris Dikeakos Architects
Owner: Blue Sky Properties
Review: First
Delegation: Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Staff: Conrad Schartau, Cobalt Engineering
Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)**Introduction:**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for the southeast corner of West Broadway and Oak Street. Presently there is a single storey commercial building with parking at grade and on the roof. Mr. Morgan described the context for the area noting that there is a lot of older low rise commercial development, office tower and new mixed use residential along the street. Mr. Morgan described the urban design considerations and the Guidelines for the area. He added that the building has setbacks along Oak Street and West Broadway. The mid and upper massing will be setback 40 feet from the east property line to ensure good separation for any possible redevelopment of the site to the east. The applicant will be pursuing LEED™ Silver equivalent with a minimum of three points for energy, one point for water efficiency and one point for storm water management.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Richard Bernstein, Architect, further described the proposal. He indicated that they have increased the operable windows on all four elevations. The mechanical system is a good feature of the building. The fins are on the vertical window mullion and will allow light but will help with shading. The big design change was to the south elevation. Before it had narrow slots which have been changed to larger punched window openings. The portal entry to the future LRT station has been punctuated by the provision of a larger canopy. Until the Millenium line to UBC is built, the corner space will be used for retail. Mr. Bernstein stated that they will be pursuing LEED™ Gold.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. There are a number of roof decks planned that will be accessible to the occupants of the building with a number of seating areas. They will be using a cistern system to deal with potable water for irrigation.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Design development on the south façade;
- Consider improving the entry sequence;
- Consider maximizing the sustainability strategy.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought the changes since the last review were well done.

Most of the Panel agreed that the south façade was too prominent to be treated like it was facing a lane. They thought that although the south façade had been improved it didn't fit with the rest of the building's modern design. Several Panel members thought there were too many façade elements with one Panel member suggesting that, like happens on the north façade, and the west facade treatment could wrap around to the corner of the south façade to integrate it into the rest of the building composition. Another Panel member suggested wrapping the stone veneer around the corner to give it more strength. The Panel thought the applicant had handled the grade change well. The Panel thought it was commendable to have an exercise area at the top of the building. A couple of Panel members noted that the most successful piece is the entrance to the future LRT station. They liked that the LRT entry would be distinguished from the other entries but they didn't think the columns made for an inviting portal.

The Panel supported the landscape plans but one Panel member thought the basalt strip at the property line might not be strong enough. Also, the street trees could be planted to reflect the modulation of the building. Most of the Panel thought the landscape plans were modest in terms of the prominence of hard surfaces proposed and would like to see a stronger invitation into the building defined through landscape elements.

The Panel supported the sustainable strategy and thought the horizontal shades were good but had some concerns regarding the canopies. They suggested the applicant should maximize the sustainable strategy as it would save money in the long term.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Bernstein thanked the Panel for their comments noting that they have had similar discussions and would take the comments into consideration.

2.	Address:	400 Terminal Avenue
	DE:	DE414860
	Use:	General office up to 3.0 FSR, Financial Institution up to 3.0 FSR, School/College/Business/Vocational/ Trade up to 3.0 FSR, Service (Restaurant Class 1 or 2) up to 300 square meter per building. Retail (Limited Food Services).
	Zoning:	C-3A
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Third
	Architect:	B+H Bunting Coady Architects
	Owner:	Rize Alliance Properties
	Delegation:	Oskar Winnat , B+H Bunting Coady Architects Dwayne Smyth, B+H Bunting Coady Architects Mike Teed, Space2Place
	Staff:	Dale Morgan

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-1)

Introduction:

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that the site has been rezoned. It is large site with the rail lines to the south and the Skytrain running along Terminal Avenue. The proposal is for two office buildings with some commercial/retail. The City has asked for a dedicated area for a future bridge which will be greened and used for outdoor space until it is developed. At the previous review the Panel thought the proposal would benefit from more variety and more articulation. They also thought there should be more active retail uses at grade. The Panel suggested a brighter colour palette and asked the applicant to reconsider the Terminal Avenue expression. Mr. Morgan noted that staff have asked the applicant to remove the ramp, further design development to the massing to break up the long façade, expression of materiality with more variety and colour and to consider a higher quality of frameless glazing systems. They are also looking for more legibility of the main entry of both buildings with more weather protection. As well they are looking for greater enhancement of the center mews and street edges. Mr. Morgan noted that there is a large roof top appurtenance that will be included in the height calculations.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Dwayne Smyth, Architect, further described the proposal and explained that the original design was based on railway containers. He added that some of that expression has been lost with the latest design, and that they have added a curtain wall system. Since they liked the container concept, they have tried to reincorporate it back into the design. The street edge on Terminal Avenue has been opened up to the central courtyard space. There is a large cantilevered space in lieu of canopies and the atrium space was designed to have a connection between the two buildings.

Dwayne Smyth remarked that the drive way entry that was originally on the mews side has been incorporated into the building. Regarding the sun elements, sun shades have been added on the west and south facades.

Mike Teed described the landscaping noting that they are replacing the small trees on the street and have planned a more open space at the entry to allow daylighting into the building.

The tenant for Building 1 will be a college so there are some seating walls for the students with the primary seating on the south side of the mews.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider adding more reference to the rail yards and railway cars in the design;
- Consider reducing the number of materials being proposed;
- Design development to the landscape in the mews and the south lane;
- Consider improving the solar shading on the south and west facades.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought there was an improvement since the previous submission.

The Panel thought it improved the project by having the retail at grade and they also liked that the parking had been removed from the plaza/mews area. Several Panel members thought there should be a few more connections from the sidewalk on Terminal Avenue to the buildings. Most of the Panel liked the use of vibrant colours on the exterior of the buildings with one Panel member suggesting they could use other than the tenant's corporate colours for the other building not housing that corporate tenant. One Panel member noted that there might be some acoustical challenges considering how close the Skytrain track is to the building.

Several Panel members thought there could be more reference to the railway history in the design. They also thought there was a lot of proposed materials and would like to see them reduced. One Panel member noted that Terminal Avenue is an industrial street with its own character and encouraged the applicant to make a bold statement with the design.

A couple of Panel members thought the landscaping in the center courtyard was a little too hard paved and harsh and suggested that four trees might not be enough. Also, several Panel members thought the south lane was a little harsh as there are a lot of services in the area and suggested adding more landscaping. One Panel members suggested adding a couple of trees. Another Panel member suggested adding a double row of trees along the Terminal Avenue. One Panel member suggested finding a way to link the buildings, perhaps with some kind of bridging canopy element, and thought they could also be united through landscaping. One Panel member commented on the concrete seating walls and suggested instead of using metal skate stops that something interesting could be cast in the concrete.

Several Panel members said they appreciated the way the applicant had dealt with the solar shading, although one Panel member thought the south side needed more shading. Also it was felt that the canopies didn't work on the west façade. Several Panel members thought there were more opportunities for sustainability including geo exchange and improvement in the LEED™ credits. One Panel member noted that the applicant could get LEED™ Gold without too much trouble.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Smyth had no further comments.

3.	Address:	3657 West Broadway
	DE:	DE414574
	Use:	New 10-storey mixed-use building, retail at grade and nine storeys of office space from levels 2 to 10, totaling 96,629 square feet. Includes 152 parking spaces below grade with access from the lane and provision for future access to a future LRT station at the corner of Oak Street and West Broadway. The site was recently rezoned from C-3A and has not yet been enacted.
	Zoning:	C-2
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Second
	Architect:	Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc. Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc.
	Delegation:	David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Tim Orr, Orr Development
	Staff:	Sailen Black

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

Introduction:

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the proposal and reminded the Panel that this was the second review after receiving non-support from the Panel. The site is on the north side of West Broadway, between Alma and Dunbar Streets. He added that most of the lane is unusually narrow at 15 feet. Mr. Black described the context for the area noting the two-family zoning on the lots to the north. He explained that with any C-2 site, the building (including parking and loading areas) needs to achieve a neighbourly urban design and maintain residential liveability. For example, residents should be provided with views of gardens and landscaped area. He added that the architectural treatment and landscape at the rear and sides of the building are just as important as the front façade. Height and setback regulations are intended to set appropriate distances to nearby residential, moderate the apparent height on the street, and provide space for landscaping and articulation. Grade level commercial space should be designed with a strong pedestrian orientation, providing comfort and interest. The building as a whole should show articulation, colour, texture and detailing. Mr. Black noted that there are a number of red and brown brick buildings in the area, and asked the Panel if there should be support for local character in the expression of this application.

Mr. Black indicated that there are a number of changes made in response to the Panel's previous comments and that the applicant would describe those changes. He noted that as before the building height is about 2.8 feet higher than the recommended height at the street, and the structure at the rear, facing the two-family residential to the north, generally meets recommended setbacks except for portions of the top floor roof. Parking is underground, except an accessible space on the lane beside two open loading bays, landscaping and other services.

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

1. Have the items identified in the previous visit as needing improvement been addressed?
2. Does the proposed form of building create an appropriate interface to existing two-family residential properties to the north?

3. Are the building sides that appear above the context and the lane elevations well resolved?
4. Does the public realm interface along the front facade create pedestrian interest?

Mr. Black took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, further described the proposal noting the changes since the Panel's last review. On the West Broadway façade they have brought down the brick to the street to integrate more with the ground floor commercial. They have introduced a lighter coloured brick, accentuating the entry area as a vertical element, changed the cladding, and they also plan to bring the material into the lobby so it feels like the sidewalk folds into the building. The stairs have been widened and they have also incorporated a skylight. The canopy has been lowered to allow the store front wall to continue above it. On the lane the massing has been reduced and they also added more plantings. Before the planters were set on top of the second floor deck and now they have been lowered and gives more depth for trees to give a more layered transition to the adjacent single family residential. A trellis over the parkade entrance has been added. Clear-storey windows have been added in the loading and hallway areas, and also a transom window over the garbage/recycling area. They have introduced a vertical element to accentuate the residential entry on the front and have used a similar treatment on the back.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans. On the West Broadway side they have added an additional tree. On the back they have added terraced landscaping and have added trees. They looked for more opportunities to add greenery including spanning over the parkade entry and the plantings under the loading area has been removed.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Consider removing the trellis over the parking ramp.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and thought there had been some major improvements since the last review.

The Panel agreed that the street elevation on West Broadway had been improved along with the canopy. They liked the residential entry treatment that increased the size of the street numbers signage and the addition of Swisspearl panels. One Panel member suggested wrapping the Swisspearl along the top floor to make for a stronger expression. Most of the Panel thought that the applicant had done all they could with the north façade to merge with the nearby residential. One Panel member suggested adding skylights in the top floor circulation corridor.

The Panel noticed the planter had been lowered along the lane which made for a big improvement. One Panel member thought the treatment at the parking ramp didn't work well while several Panel members thought the trellis was unnecessary. The Panel liked that additional trees had been added and that there was more landscaping at the lane level.

One Panel member suggested adding shading devices on the West Broadway frontage to help with the energy loads. Another Panel member suggested the applicant design the roof to accommodate future solar panels. One panel member suggested integrating the top floor roof overhang with the two firewall end fin-walls to give the appearance of the fin-walls wrapping horizontally and creating a bold "hood" to the massing.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant team had no additional comments.

4.	Address:	1549 West 70th Avenue
	DE:	DE414999
	Use:	Develop the site with mixed use buildings containing retail use, grocery store use, and a total of 314 dwelling units-31 of which are to be secured rental units over two levels of underground parking.
	Zoning:	C-2
	Application Status:	Complete
	Review:	Second
	Architect:	Henriquez Partners
	Delegation:	Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Shawn Lapointe, Henriquez Partners Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Ian Gillespie, Westbank
	Staff:	Scot Hein

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)**Introduction:**

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a complete development application after rezoning. Mr. Hein noted that the application will not be going to the Development Permit Board and that the form of development is consistent with what has already been approved by Council at the Public Hearing. Mr. Hein explained that he was asking the Panel to focus on some of the applicant's responses to the rezoning conditions. Mr. Hein indicated that these conditions will form part of the future Marpole Community Plan. Essentially staff are looking for design development to improve the pedestrian's experience for Granville Street; design development of the overall massing and character of the three residential buildings to ensure greater variety and distinction towards establishing a local Marpole identity; design improvement to improve the pedestrian experience for the public realm, including the internal east-west route; and design development to confirm rooftop landscape amenity for active and passive programming. Mr. Hein explained that there are a number of other conditions, but they are secondary to these conditions.

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Gregory Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that at the previous review they presented a modernist option for the street front façade which was a larger-scale, more singular, streetscape gesture. He explained that they have come up with a way to modulate the façade more and allowed for more individual experiences and forms, as well as more transparency to the street. There is also a further development of a series of canopies to allow for more rain protection at the entrances. Mr. Henriquez described the materials and noted that there will be a public art component that they are planning to have created by a Musqueam Band artist. He further described the architecture noting the changes that have been made to some of the buildings to add more light into the courtyard and as well to add more retail space. They have also done some work in redistributing the density and with the public realm to create transparency and linkages through the site. He added that they have increased the amount of extensive green roof.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping plans and mentioned that there are a number of programs being proposed for the roofs such as urban agriculture, a putting

green, children's play areas, common amenity space that will include a barbeque area and fire pit. Also, a number of trees are proposed for the roof tops.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- The Panel had no substantial aspects needing improvement.

Related Commentary:

The Panel supported the proposal and congratulated the applicant for the improvements to the project based on the Panel's previous comments.

The Panel agreed that it was going to be a great project and that the changes since the previous review were strong. They thought the façade along Granville Street was improved and there is now a modern version of the Safeway store. They liked the reference to the Glulam beam with the Safeway façade although one Panel member thought the length of this element could be reduced. The Panel supported the widening of the mews and agreed that transitioning some of the massing down to the scale of the existing single family residential buildings was the proper solution. The Panel also liked the curving of the tower on Granville Street to get more sun into the amenity on top of the Safeway store.

A couple of Panel remarked that the materials made the project and congratulated the team for adding the wood and copper.

The Panel supported the landscape plans and commended the applicant for using a Musqueam Band artist for the public art piece. The Panel agreed that the pedestrian experience had been improved in the internal circulation with a couple of Panel members suggesting that careful detailing would be necessary to have the cars slow down in that area. One Panel member suggested the green wall come down all the way to the ground. The Panel liked the proposed roof top amenities and supported the green roof. One Panel member suggested there be some privacy created between the office and community spaces.

One Panel member encouraged the applicant to raise the bar with sustainability and optimize the energy performance in the project. Also shading devices could be considered on the buildings facing West 70th Avenue.

Applicant's Response:

Ian Gillespie, Developer remarked that the reason Safeway is going to turn out really well is because Scott stuck to his guns regarding the design.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.