

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: August 11, 1999

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Joseph Hruda (Chair)
Sheldon Chandler
Paul Grant
Keith Ross
Per Christoffersen
Gilbert Raynard

REGRETS:
Patricia Campbell
Roger Hughes
Joe Werner
Norman Shearing
Sean McEwan

RECORDING SECRETARY: Rick Page, Frontline

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	3319-3325 Kingsway (Mixed 4 storey)
2.	2900 East Broadway (Mixed Renovation)

BUSINESS MEETING

1. **Address: 3319-3325 Kingsway**
Use: Mixed (4 storeys)
Zoning: C-2
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Michael Barley
Owner: Lalli Development Ltd.
Review: First
Staff: Scot Hein

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:**

The members of the Panel gathered around the model for the proposed project and Mr. Scot Hein, Development Planner, provided background information on the process to date.

The proposal is a mixed use project of office, residential, and structured parking. The project contains approximately 2,700 sq. ft. of commercial retail units (CRUs) accessed from Kingsway; 1,200 sq. ft. of office use, also accessed from Kingsway; and, on the second floor lane grade; 17 market residential units ranging from 590 to 870 sq. ft.; and two levels of structured parking with the upper level at lane grade. The height at approximately 45 feet requires relaxation and reporting to Council.

Mr. Hein noted that staff are looking for feedback in a number of areas including general design and landscaping. It was noted that this proposal was presented two years prior; however, a number of changes have been made since that time. Architectural quality and on-site amenities were also reviewed.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Mr. Barley provided a brief presentation of the project and noted that the issue of concern is the height of the building and that Council would have to be approached to relax the height restrictions for the zoning in this area.

- **Panel's Comments:**

It was noted that the site is a challenging site, as it is a narrow area in a high traffic location. The FSR of 2.0 for the residential aspect was generally supported as there appears to be a need for additional housing in this area. The creative approach of the plans to C-2 zoning was considered to be a positive one. Given the width of the street and the minimal impact on other buildings, the height concern was not major.

It was also noted that, regarding the office portion, it may be difficult to market at the rear of the building; however, if proper lighting is introduced and the office is marketed well, it would be a benefit to the area. The architectural elements generally were positively received. If variety is introduced in the canopy/signage, it may establish a positive standard on the street. Noise concerns may be a problem for the office unit, as there is no air-conditioning, therefore windows would be left open. A discreet identity for the residential area is a good idea.

Architecturally, there were some concerns expressed and some suggestions made for improving the following:

- Residential alcove (relocate entrance to office from east side to west side of building to provide more room and provide access to the elevator);
- The rectangular geometry should find its way to the back of the building as well as the front; and

- The gabled addition could be removed as it is not consistent with the overall design.

Some Panel members expressed concern with the office area access. The office in the rear has a difficult access from Kingsway. A solution suggested was to separate the office entry from the residential entry. A different treatment from the commercial area for the residential entry would also be beneficial. There may be too much of a recessed area at the entrance and it may be better to move the doorway closer to the street. Also, from a safety perspective, the back stairway with masonry walls may result in some safety issues. Sight lines should be checked.

The Chairman summarized the Panel's comments, noting that there was a need to improve certain aspects through further design development, particularly the separation of office and residential entries, and other suggestions raised in the discussion.

- **Panel Decision**
The Panel voted unanimously to support this proposal.

2. **Address: 2900 East Broadway**
DA: 404304
Use: Mixed residential
Zoning: I-2
Application Status: Preliminary
Architect: Bunting Coady
Owner: 2725312 Canada Inc. & T. Eaton Co. Ltd.
Review: First
Staff: Scot Hein

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:**

Scot Hein, Development Planner, convened again at the model of the proposed project, to review the relevant architectural information. It was noted that the new architectural "High Tech" presentation is evidenced in this preliminary project. The site is proposed essentially for hi-tech office use and warehouse use. The site is almost 18 acres and two full city blocks. There is proposed a 40 foot setback along the entire Broadway frontage, as required by the City's Zoning and Development Bylaw. This will be the subject of Council consideration in September, 1999. Also, the site slopes down from north to south ranging from approximately 36 feet on the easterly edge to approximately 47 feet along the Renfrew Street edge. Mr. Hein further noted that there is an existing warehouse structure, of which a significant part, including the main structural grid, is to be retained, and provide support for buildings four to eight. Other portions will be demolished. Mr. Hein also reviewed the open space guidelines document.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Tom Bunting and Larry Diamond introduced themselves and provided an overview of the project. It was noted that a considerable amount of work was undertaken to enhance landscaping on Broadway. Mr. Bunting suggested that the current setback in this area is 40 feet, a guideline which the City has not adhered to over the years. As the zoning changes and as this will be an area of minimum transition, use will also change. The enhanced 25 foot proposed set back will work very well. The Federal government has also become involved and are considering assistance with this project. Mr. Bunting also noted that the height of building. The No. 2 building evens out at 76 feet. None of the other buildings are above 60 feet.
- **Panel's Comments**

A Panel member agreed with reduction of the set back on Broadway and supported relaxation. Pedestrian linkage at the south end is weak and needs to be reviewed. Street parking should be minimized, especially at south east corner. Also, it was suggested that the architect leave an option to build a taller building at this corner later. The member supported the application

There was considerable concern expressed regarding the link to SkyTrain and suggestions that it should be made more inviting, and provision made for weather protection.

A 15 foot setback along Broadway rather than a 25 foot setback was suggested by a number of Panel members. It was also noted that the grid system runs the risk of being suburban due to parking being introduced between buildings. The dead-end near Broadway coming into Renfrew Street needs to be enhanced, providing an opportunity for pedestrians to access the site in a gradual fashion. Stairs to project from SkyTrain should be reviewed for convenience. The southeast corner could profit from more people space.

There were a number of comments regarding the south edge treatment, particularly with regard to a need for more landscaping. Also, the change of grade to provide a connection for pedestrians

could be brought down more gradually rather than the proposed big staircase. One Panel member did not support the grid layout which causes an amount of "sameness" and has limitations for pedestrian access and little identity for tenants. Spacing of buildings appears very suburban. Surface parking should be reduced a lot and put underground as the overall image of the site will be one of a "parking lot". The street adjacent to the open space could be better designed as it is currently confusing for public. The two main plaza areas (Broadway/Renfrew) need more detail. The south-west corner of the development would benefit by the reorientation of the proposed corner building rather than the current design. Pedestrian access is not very good and should be reviewed. It is also unclear how storm water from the site is being used and there were suggestions that this is a major issue to be addressed/resolved.

The hi-tech expression of the buildings was generally well received.

Comments were made regarding the vehicular connection to Renfrew Street by extending the central east-west road out to Renfrew Street. The conditions at the western edge could be enhanced and the idea of a covered landscape deck or similar design could be beneficial.

There was general support in the objective to make this a more urban project. It was agreed that there is far too much of a suburban feel about the parking that dominates the open areas of this site. The proposed setback on Renfrew should be amended and buildings brought closer to Renfrew Street. There was concern expressed about the amount and location of the open space amenity, especially in a high density complex. A potential solution might be to take out the center building and add another level to the other buildings to create a more urban area that is also friendly to public use. There was general support for reduction of Broadway setbacks and several comments that perhaps one of the southerly sites could support even greater density and height nearer to the LRT. Also, improved access to the SkyTrain should be addressed. Extension of the central street in/out to Renfrew is helpful and is a positive suggestion. Further suggestions were made regarding the Hebb Street edge which needs a greater emphasis on greenery as opposed to parking lots. Creating a stronger sense of entry to the project from a vehicular perspective was also considered beneficial. The use of water/landscape images is good and should be developed further.

- **Applicant's Response**

The Applicant noted the suggestions and advised that current program restrictions unfortunately dictate how the end result will be. The comments, however, were well taken.

- **Panel Decision**

The Panel voted with four in support and one opposed.

The meeting concluded at 6:30 p.m.