

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** April 8, 1998

**TIME:** N/A

**PLACE:** N/A

**PRESENT:** Joyce Drohan (Chair)  
Per Christoffersen  
Geoff Glotman  
James Hancock (present for Item #1 only)  
Joseph Hruda  
Peter Kreuk  
Sean McEwan (present for Item #2 only)  
Norman Shearing  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:** Sheldon Chandler  
Patricia Campbell  
Jim McLean

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1742-1752 West 2nd Avenue
2.	600 Pacific Boulevard

- 1. Address: 1742-1752 West 2nd Avenue**  
Use: Mixed (4 storeys, 12 units)  
Zoning: IC-1 to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning Architect: Weber & Associates  
Owner: Millboro Holdings Ltd.  
Review: First  
Delegation: Tom Ecker, Al Hilford, Bill Harrison  
Staff: Lynda Challis/Eric Fiss
- 

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

The Rezoning Planner, Lynda Challis, presented this rezoning application. The proposal is for office/retail/service and residential uses. The 1 600 m<sup>2</sup> site is presently occupied by a single storey wood-frame wholesaling and warehousing operation, with 15 surface parking spaces at the rear off the lane. Surrounding developments are generally one to two-storeys and include retail, offices, vehicle dealerships, warehousing and wholesaling businesses. Applicable to this site are the Burrard Slope I-C District Interim Policies which were established to assist in assessing site-specific rezoning applications prior to preparation of a comprehensive policy plan for the Burrard Slopes. The goal is to allow some residential use without compromising the area's support service role to the downtown. As well, to maintain the area's small scale and architecturally varied character. Development Cost Levies are applicable at the building permit stage.

The proposal includes storage and commercial parking below grade, retail and service uses on the first storey fronting onto 2nd Avenue, and offices above, 51 residential parking spaces above grade exiting onto the lane, and two floors of residential units at the third and fourth storeys. Proposed density is 1.85 FSR which includes 1.0 FSR residential, 0.43 FSR office/service and approximately 700 m<sup>2</sup> for retail use. However, the proposed above-grade residential parking and canopies covering outdoor decks and patios are normally included in floor area calculation, which would bring the total density to 2.42 FSR. The Burrard Slopes Policies recommend an FSR of no more than 2.0. Two other CD-1 sites in this area have achieved more than 2.0 FSR only by including manufacturing uses.

Eric Fiss, Development Planner, briefly reviewed the proposed form of development, noting it is a well thought through and advanced proposal for a rezoning application. Staff have identified several areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought, including:

- built form and massing, in particular the impact of the above grade parking at the rear
- image and character
- streetscape character (including the lane)

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Tom Ecker, Architect, briefly described the design rationale.

**Panel's Comments:**

After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel supported the proposed use and density but had serious concerns about the proposed form of development. The application for rezoning was not supported.

There was strong support for the open space plan, and the substantial residential decks were considered to be a particularly positive aspect of the project. It was also noted that the residential courtyards in the front of the building contribute positively to the animation of 2nd Avenue.

The Panel's principal concerns related to the above grade parking at the rear of the building. While it was noted that the second level of parking was facilitating the creation of the generous decks above it, there were very strong concerns about the blank two storey massing it presents to the lane, particularly since it was felt that residential development across the lane should be anticipated in the future. It was suggested the FSR in the second level might be better put to some use more productive than parking. Safety was not considered to be a sufficiently strong argument for above grade parking, and the majority of Panel members urged that it be located underground if at all possible. At the same time, the applicant was strongly encouraged to retain the large decks on the lane side, and to considerably soften the two storey wall.

The Panel was not convinced that this proposal captures the industrial imagery called for in the guidelines. The applicant was urged to take some cues from other recent CD-1 projects in the area. Proportions and materials will need to be carefully considered, and the plans and materials worked in a more integrated way. Some livability issues were raised with respect to interior bedrooms and dens, suggesting a reconfiguration of the upper floors might be required.

Treatment of the Boulevard was generally considered to be acceptable.

**Applicant's Response:**

With respect to the use of the second storey of the parking garage at the rear, Mr. Ecker explained that the approximately 0.15 FSR remaining in the commercial allotment would be insufficient for this space. The owner has no wish to consider industrial use at this time, and the amount of residential included is the maximum allowable. While the suggestion of putting the second level of parking underground may be preferable from an urban design point of view, it is not feasible financially.

**2. Workshop: 600 Pacific Boulevard**

Use: Marina/Residential (3 - 32 storeys, 999 units)

Zoning: BCPED to CD-1

Application Status: Rezoning

Architect: The Hulbert Group

Owner: Pacific Place Dev. Corp.

Review: First

Delegation: Rick Hulbert

Staff: Jonathan Barrett

---

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this workshop item, noting it will be returned later for a formal review and vote. The Panel will also later be reviewing the proposed Beach Neighbourhood guidelines, as well as the individual development applications as they are submitted.

Mr. Barrett first reviewed the history of the project, from the approval of the ODP in 1990 to date. Following a description of the project and general question period, Rick Hulbert, Architect, explained the design rationale. In the ensuing general discussion, the following points/issues were noted:

- given the overwhelming formality of this precinct, Council's decision to reduce the tower from 6 storeys to 2 in response to concerns of a few neighbours behind was a mistake because it has a very negative impact. The park needs much greater definition;
- such a formal space on this stretch of False Creek is an anomaly; urge bringing some of the "looseness" found throughout the rest of False Creek to this development;
- since the 6-storey definition is lost, would support increasing tower heights;
- strongly encourage commercial, particularly restaurants;
- the formality of the space is so powerful it minimizes what goes on outside of it -- the linkages need to be looked at with much greater consideration (pedestrian linkages, roadways, mews as well as linkages to other open spaces);
- reinforcing the park with the height of the towers gives some clarity to the space and reduces the relentlessness elsewhere on the site;
- none of the open spaces in other parts of the development have any connection to the park;
- there are long distances across open spaces without shelter; there is potential for retail to serve the people who will be drawn to the space;
- for the park to be successful it needs to have a city scale to it;
- it is unfortunate the crescent buildings are so low and don't really frame the park;
- the strength of the park is very important. The edge of this park should be vital and active;
- it should be a requirement to put active uses on the crescent;
- adding some height to towers around the park is better than putting height to buildings E, J and K;

- importance of the podium landscape relationship to the ground level and pedestrian linkages through the entire site (podiums are becoming semi private open spaces);
- tower heights: the more that can be done to frame the park space the better;
  
- the vision for this park at night time needs to be given a lot more thought -- lighting will be very important;
  
- demonstrate connection with transit;
  
- the mews need design development;
  
- the ramp doesn't work, the cul-de-sac off the cul-de-sac is not desirable;
  
- the cul-de-sac should be open;
  
- having the marina function encroach along in front of the park is unfortunate -- it creates a conflict of scale and uses vis-a-vis the park;
  
- the extension of the marina narrows the views through False Creek;
  
- no problem with extending the marina that far along the sea wall. Granville Island is a good example of how it could work;
  
- the marina should be pulled back as far as possible so that the activity in the creek is more visible;
  
- marina location okay;
  
- don't support the marina going further, that is short-sighted;
  
- marina, no objection as long as it is for sailing boats;
  
- don't support the marina as the focal point at the end of the park; if it has to remain you have to do something with the park geometry;
  
- it is unfortunate that so much of the non-market housing is sandwiched between the bridge and the grand, formal park edge which could be seen as a premier address in the downtown. It relates to a problem in the initial conception that the scheme be symmetrical;
  
- the non-market housing should be more integrated across the site, not all together in one area next to the bridge;
  
- non-market housing, no problem with its location;
  
- non market housing: support more of an integration rather than more units beside the bridge;
  
- some of the play areas do not have sunlight;