

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** February 28, 2007

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** **MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:**  
John Wall, Chair  
Walter Francl (excused SEFC 2A- Parcel 4 - 1598 Columbia Street)  
Tom Bunting  
Maurice Pez  
Douglas Watts  
Richard Henry  
Bill Harrison (4:25 PM)  
Albert Bicol (excused SEFC 2A- Parcel 4 - 1598 Columbia Street)  
Eileen Keenan  
Martin Nielsen  
Mark Ostry

**New Member of the Urban Design Panel (non-voting this meeting):**  
Ann Kjerulf (Vancouver City Planning Commission Representative)

**REGRETS:** Gerry Eckford

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	2402 East Broadway
2.	SEFC 2A - Parcel 4 - 1598 Columbia Street (Workshop)

**BUSINESS MEETING**

The Panel unanimously supported John Wall as Chair and Walter Francl as Deputy Chair. Chair Wall called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no other New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address:         | 2402 East Broadway                             |
| DE:                 | Rezoning                                       |
| Use:                | Four storey mixed use with underground parking |
| Zoning:             | CD-1 to CD-1 amended                           |
| Application Status: | RZ   |
| Architect:          | Minten and Stewart Architects                  |
| Review:             | First  |
| Delegation:         | Joe Minten, Masa Ito, John Skender             |
| Staff:              | Dale Morgan/Joanne Baxter                      |

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-1)**

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner and Joanne Baxter, Rezoning Planner, introduced the rezoning application. The project site is located at the south-east corner of the intersection at Broadway and Nanaimo Street. The proposed development is a four storey structure. The lot is currently zoned CD-1 and the rezoning is to amend the CD-1 to permit construction of a four storey mixed use building with commercial retail uses at grade and dwelling units at grade at the rear and three storeys above. Residential dwelling units are viewed as Conditional Approval Uses under the zone.

The advice of the Panel was sought specifically on the following:

1. *Use, form & Density:* The Panel is asked to comment on the three broad criteria for rezoning applications.
  - a. *Use:* Is the mixed use, with commercial at grade and residential at grade and above supportable?
  - b. *Form:* Is the form, height and massing appropriate for its context and location? Does the massing allow for a good neighbourly interface, notably at the south and east property line? Would the form of development benefit by following more closely a C-2 building envelope with greater stepping on the upper floors? In terms of architectural expression and materials, is the form well handled?
  - c. *Density:* At 1.83 FSR, is there good liveability at this density? Should there be more common indoor/outdoor amenity space provided?
2. *Shared Easement Access and Grade Interface at the Ground Plane:* The site shares a common shared easement with its eastern and southern neighbours. This easement functions similar to a laneway providing access to parking, utility locations and garbage collection. There are also pedestrian linkages through this easement, with connecting stairs to the adjacent sites. The easement is approximately seven feet lower than adjacent grades and will need to be extended, requiring the removal of two sets of stairs that provide pedestrian linkages. Dwelling units from the adjacent buildings front directly onto this tight urban space. From an urban design perspective, the Panel is requested to comment on how this space has been treated architecturally, potential liveability issues and to suggest how it might be improved.

Mr. Morgan and Ms. Baxter took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Mr. Minten, of JM Architecture, further described the project. He stated that they had looked at the overall block and wanted a fairly solid edge to the corner to carry the scale. A contemporary sense of material and form was also chosen.

Masa Ito, of Ito & Associates Landscape Architects described the landscape plans for the development.

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

- Minor concerns around the handling of the ground floor;
- Consider strongly expressing the corner through an architectural massing;
- The massing should relate better to the neighbouring properties and improve the light access to neighbouring windows;
- Consider CPTED solutions with respect to the easement, stairs and narrow spaces between neighbouring buildings;
- Design development to reduce the heaviness of the canopy and roof top;
- Support for using brick but with lighter colours; and
- Consider providing more amenity space.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application. The Panel agreed that this was an important site and that it will set a precedent for future development on adjacent sites. There are some challenges and the Panel realized the applicant was trying to develop a neighbourly approach to some un-neighbourly buildings.

The Panel thought the mixed use and commercial at grade with residential was supportable. However there were minor concerns about the ground floor and how it was handled. Some of the Panel members thought it could be better handled through landscaping.

Most of the Panel thought the project would benefit from following more closely to a C-2 type building envelope with greater stepping on the upper floors as it would help to reduce the street scale and add more light into the neighbouring property. There was divided opinion on stepping the upper floors with a couple of Panel members discouraging it and suggesting a greater amount of fenestration. One member thought it didn't need to be stepped back and supported the blocky form. Strong comments from the Panel regarding the corner expression as they thought it should have a more architectural response rather than a sculptural or applied corner response.

The Panel thought there were real issues regarding the relationship between the adjacent properties stating they appear too close together. There was concern regarding the bedroom windows on the adjacent property as the Panel thought there wasn't much separation between the buildings and privacy could be compromised.

Most of the Panel supported the density with some Panel members suggesting there could be more density on the site. Most of the Panel had concerns about the lack of an indoor/outdoor amenity space. The Panel's suggestions were for roof top access or ground floor amenity connected to the common exterior space. The Panel would support additional height to get the units up and the amenity in the courtyard.

The Panel was concerned about the shared easement and possible CPTED issues. They agreed that it was the only way to service the site but suggested finding ways to prevent people passing through the area. One Panel member suggested creating a park at the end of the easement. The Panel agreed that it would be worthwhile to look at the easement

from a safety point of view. The Panel also had concerns about the exit on the south side of the site. A couple of members of the Panel thought the interface on Nanaimo Street needed some design development and suggesting flipping the residential lobby from Broadway to Nanaimo Street.

One Panel member had concerns about the balconies on Broadway and felt there could be a lack of privacy. Several members of the panel thought the material colours could be lightened.

A couple of members of the Panel were concerned about the lack of sustainable features with one member suggesting adding a green roof. A couple of members of the Panel would like to see more design development in the landscaping.

The Panel felt the canopy was too heavy with one member suggesting a glass canopy with signage below it to put more light into the retail. The Panel also felt the cantilevered roof looked heavy.

The Panel asked the applicant to come back to the Panel at the development permit stage to give a design update.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Minten thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed to look at all the suggestions. He also agreed to look at the CPTED issues more closely and to come back to the Panel at the development permit stage for an update.

---

2. Address:	SEFC 2A Parcel 4: 1598 Columbia Street
DE:	411068
Use:	Two residential buildings of 8 and 9 storeys with 2 levels of underground parking
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Erickson/Milkovich/Doyle
Review:	Workshop (First Review: February 14, 2006)
Delegation:	Nick Milkovich, Peter Kreuk
Staff:	Scot Hein

---

## WORKSHOP

Panel members Walter Francl and Albert Bicol declared a conflict of interest and did not participate in discussion on this item.

Referencing the re-zoning and architectural model, Scot Hein, Development Planner and Urban Designer for SEFC, introduced the workshop regarding the site at 1598 Columbia Street. Mr. Hein gave an overview of the site's urban design considerations and an update on the other projects in the South East False Creek precinct that should inform the design response. The advice of the Panel was sought specifically on the height and form of both the westerly and easterly tower buildings. There was some question as to whether the westerly tower building should be an eleven or twelve story building. Mr. Hein asked the Panel for their comments. Mr. Hein let the Panel know that the applicant would be coming back to the Panel in a few weeks for a vote and that they may come back again with a design update prior to the Development Permit Board.

Mr. Naylor, Rezoning Planner, indicated that a text amendment to the CD-1 By-law for the westerly tower height was necessary to accommodate the proposal before the Panel and that the Council report would proceed immediately for referral to Public Hearing. The Panel was made aware that this text amendment on the westerly tower height will be in process by the time the Panel reviews the proposal again.

Nick Milkovich, Architect, described the design development since the Panel last saw the application including a 7/11 or 12 storey re-massing with smaller, more curvilinear form/floor plates.

The Panel's comments included the following:

- generally in support of a twelve storey westerly tower building;
- looking for more terracing of the upper floors, particularly the south end of the westerly tower to improve the interface with sites 3 and 6;
- better articulation of the balconies;
- some concern with proximity to the public spaces and privacy issues;
- concern with shadowing on the private courtyard space;
- the design principles including materiality and detailing need to be incorporated into the UDP submission;
- the building form is supportable but will be challenging requiring adequate budget; and
- careful integration with the public realm at the boardwalk and Athletes Way is required for the edges.

## Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

---