

/

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 19, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Paul Grant [Chair]
Lance Berelowitz [left after Item 1 (a) and (b)]
Tom Bunting
James Cheng
Roger Hughes
Brian Palmquist [left after Item 3 (Broughton Street)]
Gilbert Raynard [excused from Item 1]
Keith Ross
Sorin Tatomir

REGRETS: Jack Lutsky

Acting Recording Secretary: M. Penner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1300 Marinaside Crescent
2. 1175 Broughton Street
3. 361 Heatley Avenue

1. Address:	1300 Marinaside Crescent [Lot 2G]
DA:	DE405004
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning and Complete
Architect:	Henriquez & Partners
Owner:	Concord Pacific Group Inc.
Review:	First
Delegation:	R. Henriquez, M. Meehan, B. Hemstock
Staff:	J. Barrett

EVALUATION: Rezoning - [6 - 1]
Development Permit - [5 - 2]

• **Introduction:**

Mr. Jonathan Barrett, the Development Planner, explained that there were two applications before the Panel; the first was a rezoning in the form of a text amendment to the Roundhouse Neighbourhood, Area 2, to increase the height of the proposed project; and the second would be a review of the development permit application.

First of all, Mr. Barrett advised this was the last site to be developed, as well as the most prominent one, in this neighbourhood. He stated that the existing zoning's permitted height was 51 m [17 storeys] and the applicant was requesting a height increase to 68.4 m [22 storeys]. Mr. Barrett described the proposed addition of two townhouses at the inner edge facing the tower, and requested Panel's advice on this aspect.

He also noted the surrounding towers, in a similar relationship to the water in the Roundhouse Neighbourhood, were at the following heights: The Columbus - 54 m, The Crestmark - 61 m, and the Peninsula at 86 m.

In summarizing this rezoning request, Mr. Barrett stated the principle urban design objectives for this site were the grade level residential units with individual entrances off the street, a 4-storey maximum built form along the waterfront walkway, and the proposed tower height increase from 51 m to 68.4 m, and requested the Panel's advice on the following issues:

- the 17.4 m increase in tower height, public and private view impacts - at grade and higher levels, as well as shadow impacts on open space;
- the grade level residential units at present do not provide a residential presence and entrances on the street; the proposed changes would incorporate the "eyes on the street" aspect, and improve view objectives from adjacent developments into the inner courtyard; and
- the appropriateness of this built form in the neighbourhood - the increased height would exceed the closest tower by 17 m, the smaller waterfront 3-storey built form, and the larger floor plate.

Mr. Barrett also stressed that a very clear statement needed to be made regarding the height issues.

Regarding the Development Permit application, Mr. Barrett advised the project was identical to the rezoning in all respects, with the exception that the tower is 51 m high [17 storeys] and the lower built

form shows 4-storeys rather than 3-storeys. He confirmed this project would consist of 71 units and that staff were seeking Panel's advice on the following issues:

- the at grade residential units with individual entrances from the street - although this objective has not yet been achieved, the potential is there;
- the appropriateness of the built form, i.e., the proposed tower is approximately 17 m higher than the nearest building, the waterfront 3-storey townhouses are smaller in scale as compared to those in the neighbourhood, the proposed larger floor plate relative to its context, and that the street defining built form appears weak.

- **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Henriquez's comments were brief. He referred to the various view corridors from the neighbouring towers, at grade as well as higher levels and noted that the view impacts would be negligible. He described the proposed views through the lobby of the tower from the north, through to the water works element in the front into the private lagoon, with a raised connecting walkway [over water at high tide] from west to east overlooking the marina.

The Panel reviewed the models and posted plans.

Prior to the Panel's comments, the Chair reminded the Panel that there were two issues to be commented on and that separate votes would be made:

1. Rezoning application primarily for the height and the additional townhouses at the northerly wings of townhouses; and
2. The Development Permit application.

- **Panel's Comments**

The majority of the Panel were most supportive of the tower height increase and noted it was an improvement over the previous scheme. It was noted that although this was a difficult site, the architect had done a good job in splitting this project into a group of 3 buildings; also approved of the architectural space inside the courtyard and its relationship to the townhouses and tower. Some Members liked the glass wall separation in that it offered a sense of closeness yet provided security. There were comments about the elegance of the tower and it being a superior design for the density on the proposed site.

However, the Panel had concerns about the proposed walkway along the lagoon, stating it should be public and should be removed; that the public benefit should be rethought to discover new vistas and needed serious consideration; some Member were not in favour of the added townhouses and that this project needed more open space; it was also indicated that the patios along the waterfront are undefined - they should be more private in order to retain a residential character on both sides of the street; that there should be a linear walkway on the seawall connecting the townhouses.

The Chair noted the Panel's general support on the height issue; however, there was considerable discomfort with the walkway component. There were some interesting points of view whether the additional townhouses should be inserted or not and unanimous support for more public access to the lagoon and the public walkway. He referred to the support for eyes on the street and distinct emphasis on the townhouse doors on the public walkway and streetscapes. The Panel expressed concern regarding lack of landscape exposure to the public in terms of being able to walk into that space, and that the most controversial aspect appeared to be the closed glass linkages connecting the three buildings. The Chair invited the Applicant to comment prior to taking the votes.

- **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Henriquez advised they would certainly look at points made and as far as the extra townhouses were concerned, they would be prepared to accept whatever the Panel's "collective wisdom decreed". He stated they would revisit the linkage factor to determine whether it could be opened up. The Applicant agreed it would have been nice if the mews was in fact a street enabling them to incorporate front doors on that street, with a lobby in each of the three buildings, but that this didn't think this would be feasible, but would look into possible alternatives.

Upon voting, The Chair advised the Applicant he had the support of the Panel for both the rezoning and development permit applications.

2. Address:	1175 Broughton Street
Use:	Congregate Housing
Zoning:	RM-5 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Tomas Wolf
Owner:	Columbus Charities Association
Review:	First
Delegation:	T. Wolf, M. Chan-Yip, C. Brook
Staff:	L. Challis, Rezoning Planner B. Adair, Development Planner

The Chair announced that this presentation would cover both the Rezoning, as well as the Development Permit Applications, and reminded the Panel that the Development Permit becomes an integral part of the Rezoning.

EVALUATION: [a] Use, Density and Height 7 - 0 [Support]
 [b] Form of Development 0 - 7 [Non-support]

- **Introduction:**

Ms. Lynda Challis introduced this project as a rezoning application [from RM-5 to CD-1] in order to permit a 9-storey tower, with 90 units of congregate housing, at an FSR of 2.67, on a lot 94 ft. x 106 ft. This structure would consist of 42 one-bedroom units approximately 400 sq. ft. [36.9 m²] in size and 48 studios, approximately 275 sq. ft. [25.3 m²]. She described Congregate Housing as a facility for seniors that provides support services, including housekeeping, some meals, etc. The podium at the base of this 9 storey structure would contain a commercial kitchen, dining facilities, amenity space, and a multi-purpose common area. Ms. Challis advised the north side of the podium, i.e., the back half, would be a multi-purpose space available for use by the church and residents. The main entrance to the congregate housing would be off Broughton Street with a secondary entrance off Davie Street.

The setbacks would meet, or exceed, the RM-5 zoning requirements, appropriate landscaping would provide a buffer zone for the residential building to the west of this site, and at grade common open space would be located to the south, along Davie Street. The property line between the existing residential building and this project would be maintained at the same level, and the ground floor interior and the landscaped outdoor common areas would be on one level for easy access. Two levels of underground parking, as well as loading space, would be accessed off the lane at the rear.

The Rezoning Planner briefly outlined the project: the proposed tower height of 94 ft. [28.5 m] would be in line with the existing high rises in the neighbourhood, and the proposed footprint of the ground floor would be 6,293 sq. ft. [584.5 m].

Ms. Challis concluded by stating this rezoning would accommodate the defined programme outlined for this facility, which had resulted from in-depth consultations with the City officials, the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board and future users of this project, and sought the Panel's advice regarding the proposed height, density and use of this facility. She also stressed staff's awareness of the social issues, and the demand for this form of affordable seniors housing.

Mr. Bob Adair, the Development Planner, briefly described the building heights, applicable zones and applicable FSRs of buildings surrounding this site. He confirmed staff had been generally supportive of this proposed Congregate Housing use and had suggested the applicant consider a density of 2.2 to 2.5

FSR and that the application before the Panel had a proposed density of 2.68 FSR.

He noted that the grade along Davie Street sloped down to the west and asked Panel's advice re the compatibility of this project with the surrounding area, in terms of massing, view obstructions and shadowing.

Mr. Adair advised that the Planning Department had a number of concerns about the proposed form of development and sought the Panel's advice on the following:

- With respect to views and shadowing, there is general concern about the overall size of this structure and question its compatibility with the general scale of buildings in the surrounding neighbourhood, specifically in terms of form, scale and proportion. Also, the usual rationale for permitted height increases would result in a reduction in site coverage and staff therefore question the size of the footprint.
- Staff questioned the treatment of the site edges to Davie Street and its overall image from a pedestrian point of view, Davie being one of the major streets in the West End.
- The amount of large hard surfaces portrayed in the landscape plan is also a concern.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Wolfe spoke briefly - referred to numerous discussions with Planning staff which had resulted in changes in various areas, e.g., increasing the amount of amenity space, etc. and felt they had conformed to the City's demands.

Mr. Brook stressed that this was a rezoning presentation and staff were seeking guidance re height, use and density. He noted there was a significant amount of work yet to be done in terms of addressing the urban design, open space, and various contextual issues; however, Mr. Brook felt these could be satisfactorily resolved prior to enactment of the rezoning. He felt at the rezoning stage, Council could consider a condition which would allow the applicant to secure approval for a development permit, once the various articulated concerns had been fulfilled. Mr. Brook advised that the proposed cost of rental, including one meal per day, would range from \$850 to \$1,100 per month, being at the low end of seniors' market housing.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding notification and/or meetings with the surrounding neighbourhood, Mr. Brook confirmed that a public meeting had been held and that another one was scheduled for May 4th; 80 - 100 people had shown up at the first meeting and had been quite supportive of this facility in their neighbourhood, including a couple of requests for signing up for residence in this tower.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel approved of the socially desired use, found no problem with the proposed density and height, and concurred that a congregate housing project had strong public value.

However, the Panel felt the massing was too bulky, that the expression of the architecture should be taken into consideration, and that the architecture indicated in the presentation model lacked rationale. It was felt that this project lacked a sense of identity and the west wall presented too large an expanse of bluish green glass with balconies that are too small for use by the tenants; and all had difficulty with the form of development. One Member referred to the model which indicated stairs at the Broughton Street entrance and felt this could be a problem access for some seniors. It was also pointed out that as this project was

seeking an increase in density, the applicant should indicate how this density would be utilized.

Another area of concern was the open space and landscaping. The Panel felt the proposed open space treatment was minimal, at best, and suggested that the proposed landscape should be revisited to incorporate hedging, more shrubbery and trees around the podium, and intensify the Davie streetscape, other comments included the existence of too much hard surface; that the open space would be the major source of activity for the residents and needed more variety; that the overhang should be expanded to provide a type of “porch” element as a form of shelter for the residents to enjoy and make it user-friendly year-round; that raised planters be incorporated for flowers, or perhaps even small vegetable plots for the seniors to tend to.

Various Members referred to Davie Street as having a generous amount of street life and this openness should be taken advantage of, i.e., to open up the project into the sidewalk for communal interest - benefiting the residents and public. It was also noted that the slope at the Broughton and Davie Streets corner needed to be resolved.

- **Applicant’s Response:**

Mr. Wolfe indicated they had made numerous revisions to the drawings and appreciated the Panel’s comments.

Mr. Brook emphasized they were here for a rezoning and as staff had indicated, they were seeking approval for the use, height and density and that there appeared to be a general level of comfort regarding those fundamentals. He advised they were aware of the significant amount of work to be done in terms of addressing urban design, open space and contextual issues, and believed this could be accomplished to staff’s satisfaction prior to the approval of the rezoning at which time Council could make it conditional that they secure development permit approval after addressing the various development concerns that would be articulated at that time.

The Chair referred to the Panel’s general support for the use certainly, and the height and density, but a lot of it depends on the urban aspect of the design with respect to the streetscape, and it seemed that many of the Panel Members would like to see more of a design development in the area of siting the building, dealing with the edges and proposed landscape, as well as the sloping corner at Davie and Broughton Streets, and the functional aspect of the elevation relative to the type of project. The Members also commented on the private space, suggesting it be more interesting and making the outdoor amenity space more livable for the residents.

Separate votes were taken for the two aspects of this site. Upon taking the votes, the Chair advised the Applicant he had the full support of the Panel for the use, height and density; however, non-support for the form of development. The Chair suggested that a revised development permit must be presented to the Panel for review.

3. Address:	361 Heatley Avenue
DA:	DE404938
Zoning:	DEOD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Gomberoff Policzer
Owner:	J. Harrison
Review:	First
Delegation:	T. Bell, M. Chan-Yip
Staff:	Scot Hein

EVALUATION: [5 - 0]**• Introduction:**

Mr. Scot Hein, the Development Planner, advised the Panel that the proposal involved a mixed-use, 4-storey building containing 81 units, ranging in size from 320 - 401 sq. ft. and will provide housing for low income singles under a 60 year lease arrangement. The site is 122 ft. x 100 ft. located on the northwest corner of East Hastings Street and Heatley Avenue and is zoned Downtown Eastside Official Development [DEOD] Oppenheimer District Sub-Area 1. The zoning provides an FSR of 3.0 for residential use and 2.0 for other permitted uses. No setback requirements.

Mr. Hein noted that the proposed height was well below that permitted. Context included a 4-storey development to the south, a 3-storey office to the east and a 3-storey mixed-use building to the southwest. He also referenced two 'B'-listed heritage houses to the south.

Residential units are arranged around a common courtyard with three internalized units. Each unit would have kitchen and bathroom facilities. The project provides some disabled access units. Mr. Hein noted the residential units front on Heatley Avenue, which slopes approximately 9 ft. These units are not accessed at grade.

Mr. Hein advised that retail continuity at grade is achieved in the form of a thrift shop to be managed by the Union Gospel Mission.

The 4-storey project will be wood frame, with brick, split face block and Hardi Plank as exterior materials.

Mr. Hein advised that staff were generally supportive of the projects provision of social housing in this area but seek Panel's advice on the following:

- the general massing and related bulk;
- treatment of the facade, noting the brick building across the street as a conditional contextual reference requiring a streetscape response;
- relationship to heritage houses;
- courtyard size and related livability of the internalized units;
- proposed landscaping for public realm and 2nd floor rear yard deck;
- private open space considerations; and
- extent of blank street facing walls.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments**

Mr. Bell noted this project was for the Union Gospel Mission Housing Society who would manage this project as well as the thrift store at grade. He described the site's topographical characteristics and respective challenges. He highlighted the unit mix for the 81 residential units, including 75 bachelor, three 1-bedroom, and three handicapped units. Six units would be located on the ground floor fronting Heatley Avenue. A retail store, amenity and entrance areas, and loading would be located on the ground floor

Mr. Bell referred to the nine units facing the interior courtyard which would provide light for these units. He noted that the form would be a simple box expression with a strong concrete base that supports a three storey brick frame with contrasting 4th floor. Spandrels are proposed on the 2nd floor with punched windows on the 3rd floor. The top of the building would be capped with a continuous cornice. Mr. Bell referred to signage for the thrift store would be located directly over the ground floor entry way. A retractable canopy system is proposed.

With reference to the landscaping, the applicant stated there would be low planting along Heatley Avenue, in accordance with CPTED guidelines and new street trees along Hastings would conform with City standards; also proposed are Japanese Maples to be planted in planters.

- **Panel's Comments**

The Panel expressed concern with the livability of units facing the interior courtyard. There was advice given for the ground floor units to take advantage of the 14 ft. ceiling height. Members were supportive of the brick being incorporated into this project and suggested that the brick columns could extend to grade on Heatley Avenue. The Panel viewed the proposal as a generally efficient and attractive building and was well-suited for this corner site.

Concern was expressed about the courtyard landscaping and that the proposed stair should be reconfigured to maximize openness. The Panel thought the extent and quality of the residential entry should be more distinguished.

The Chair reconfirmed the Panel's support of the massing and the form, as well as the use of the brick and general expression. There were comments on some potential improvements of the Heatley Avenue elevation, as well as the relationship of the 3rd floor to the 4th floor. The Panel supported the courtyard in general, with suggestions about the possible reconfiguration of the stair. There were mixed comments about the project's relationship to the heritage houses. A few concerns were expressed about the extent of blank walls on various elevations

- **Applicant's Response**

Mr. Bell stated he appreciated the Panel's comments and felt there was constructive advice that should be considered during further design development. He specifically noted advice to improve the Heatley elevation and the courtyard. He concluded by stating that the opportunity was there to make this project function better.

The Chair took the vote and advised the Applicant he had the full support of the Panel.

Q:\Clerical\UDP\MINUTES\2000UDP\Apr19UDP.wpd