

---

---

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

---

---

**DATE:** February 9, 2000

**TIME:** 4:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Committee Room #1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Joseph Hruda (Chair)  
Patricia Campbell (excused from Item 4)  
Sheldon Chandler  
James Cheng  
Per Christoffersen (excused from Items 1 and 5)  
Paul Grant  
Roger Hughes (excused from Items 4 and 5)  
Keith Ross

**REGRETS:** Gilbert Raynard  
Norman Shearing  
Sean McEwan  
Joe Werner

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Louise Christie

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. <b>1028</b> Nelson Street
2. 1088 Marinaside Crescent
3. 201 Alvin Narod Mews (1125 Pacific Boulevard)
4. 1478 West Hastings
5. 1673 Bayshore Drive

---

---

1.	Address:	<b>1028</b> Nelson Street
	DA:	404744
	Use:	Commercial
	Zoning:	DD
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Hyland Turnkey Ltd.
	Owner:	Trustees St. Andrew's Wesley Congregate United, Church of Canada
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Clifford Korman and Don McPhee
	Staff:	Ralph Segal

---

**EVALUATION: ( 0 - 6 )****• Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, introduced this project, placing it in context at the corner of Burrard and Nelson Streets. St. Andrew's Wesley Church, a designated heritage building, owns the site. There are three parcels, two in the Downtown District (DD) including the Church and proposed tower, and the third, the westerly 66 ft. zoned RM-5B. It is not a consolidated site but the a single site covenant for zoning purposes is contemplated which deals with the two parcels as one site. The DD allows a density of 6.0 FSR and a height of 300 ft. maximum.

The proposal is for a base of two-storey commercial space which may be taken up with church programs and functions, a 19-storey residential tower, and a townhouse interface set back from the west property line. The income from the rental building will go to the sponsoring of Church programs and the maintenance of the heritage Church. The proposed tower is just over 200 ft.. The proposed density over the entire DD site, including the Church, is well under that specified in the zoning at 3.44 FSR. The challenge is to respond to the heritage Church on the east and to the lower-rise residential West End district. To setback as far as possible, a gated semi-private walkway, not a public thoroughfare, separates the townhouses from the residential next door. On the east side, the Church's grand stained glass window needs to be considered. To get as much separation as possible, the east-west dimensions of the tower have been minimized. On Nelson Street, the street trees will be maintained and a second row will be introduced.

There has already been significant response from neighbours on Nelson Street who are concerned about scale, massing, shadowing, view blockage and traffic - a whole range of issues that will have to be dealt with. The six-storey apartment block adjacent the site has numerous windows and balconies facing this development. Staff request feedback on the general massing, the interface with the heritage building and the neighbouring development.. The DD district is fully discretionary; RM-5B zoning and guidelines are more regulatory. The Heritage Commission has not yet commented.

**• Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Korman, Architect, reiterated that St. Andrew's Wesley Church is the owner of the site and their mission statement says the development is to help fund the maintenance of the expensive heritage building and to sponsor the Church's programs. The Church is a motif with modest simple colours as a response to the heritage building.. There is no view corridor issue as the project is under density and under height. There is a rhythm to the base, vertically as well as horizontally with bay windows, a raised canopy and a three storey set back toward the Church. The corners are pushed back to get articulation facing the other buildings. On Nelson Street, there is a two-storey plane, with an increase in the landscape component for a buffer, and another plane at six or seven-stories to reflect the type of

base in other buildings in the neighbourhood.. The tower is the strong vertical expression.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel members expressed a desire for more information, one member stating that important context issues need to be clarified, especially in sectional terms, like the physical relationship to the heritage Church which would clarify how connections are made between these two elements. The Panel endorsed the rental use and was supportive of the height and density. They liked the setback of underground parking to allow retention of the existing landscape. One member did question if two large existing trees that were to be lost were specimen trees or not, and if the design could be changed to ensure their retention. Members thought that various options for the location of the tower should have been explored and that the project needs to relate more to the Church. Concerns were expressed about how the existing Church facade would be seen against a background of the tower when viewed from Burrard Street. The Church facade is currently seen in this context as a profile against the sky and the current proposal could create an undesirable change to this perception. A more in-depth view analysis of such impacts should be provided. Comments were made that the neighbourhood must expect a large development here and the adjacent buildings were well served by the townhouses and landscaping, given that the context is the West End. One member said the landscaping should be of a higher quality and that the wall between the Church and the adjacent apartment, with both pedestrian and vehicular access, should be more welcoming.

The Chair also commented that he felt the tower form was contextually inappropriate and that a lower form, more in scale with the Church, would have a more desirable fit not only with the Church but with the adjacent neighbours.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant thanked them for their comments and said that in the preliminary designs, the strong heritage base was discouraged by the Planning Department. He also clarified that the Church has not as yet defined how many spaces they will need, and the second floor terrace is for Church functions. He said more landscaping could be added but they are rental units and cost effective at 200 units, although the By-law would allow 300 units. He explained the tower is situated to keep the density where it is zoned. He went on to say the townhouses do not encroach on any of the major trees and they have taken measures to ensure the trees on Nelson Street survive.

In response to questions, the Chair explained that, as this is a complete application, a supporting vote would mean that it would not again come before the Panel. The Panel then voted non-support

---

2.	Address:	1088 Marinaside Crescent
	DA:	404731
	Use:	Marina
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Busby & Associates
	Owner:	Concord Pacific
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Susan Ockwell, David Negrin and Peter Busby
	Staff:	Jonathan Barrett

---

**EVALUATION: (7 - 0)**

- **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, introduced this complete development application for a marina with 150 berths, including a public pier, a floating marina office and utility building, and floating pavilion at the end of the pier. In July, 1999, the CD-1 rezoning included public uses such as kayak and small boat launching, short term day and overnight moorage accessible to the public at market rate, and a significant provision for handicapped access to the boats with a disabled ramp coming down from Davie Street. There are three minor changes proposed: for better views of the water and the layout, the public pier has been pulled to the westerly side of the right-of-way from the foot of Davie Street. This would provide for better use of the water and makes the layout more efficient. The walkway that curved parallel to Marinaside Crescent has had to be straightened as the water level is not deep enough to allow it to float. Also, there has been a minor re-configuration to the marina office on the easterly side. The major change from the rezoning stage is that there is no restaurant, which was not approved by Council.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The applicant, Mr. Busby, showed the two areas of the marina development. One area is publicly accessible from the pier coming down from Davie Street. The other, for private use, is defined by a series of gate houses. The total number of berths is 150 and the variety of size of the vessels has been changed substantially since the previous application. The materials for the marina office are glass and wood in a very simple form with a breeze way. The amenity building is shown as a 750 sq. ft. seasonal facility with a canopy; and the kiosk area can be glazed in at the option of the operators depending on the economic viability. The challenge for the design of the access ramp is to get elegance into the bridge structure by using aluminum trusses, and into the control houses, utilizing glazing. The piles will be octagonal concrete piles as they are the most economical and there will be bollard lighting such as in Coal Harbour for the pedestrian walkway. Also at the option of the operator, the addition of kayak storage racks could be designed in such a way as to accent the curve of Marinaside Crescent.

Mr. Barrett said the project was reviewed by the police. They thought it would be very safe with so many eyes on the site, as the upland residential development is finished. The public pier could be closed to the public at night.

The Panel took time to review the posted drawings and model.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel commented it would be a welcoming facility and complimented the applicant on their clear, well executed presentation. One member encouraged the operator to incorporate the roof form as an icon for an entry to the marina, and another suggested providing lighting on the pier to increase the visual animation of the area. Also, the functionality of the design was commented on as excellent with the two ferry docks for summer and winter use. Another member suggested lighting the pavilion canopy from underneath and said the addition of lighting to the crescent of piles was important. Another member said the signage could have been a layer of the presentation to clarify that the pier is public, and also that the public entries could be better enhanced, particularly for the smaller ramp, thus tying it in with the pedestrian network better. Several members commented on the successful resolution of the relationship between the marine piers and the existing crescent shoreline through the use of the visually curved set of pier structures adjacent to the shore walk.

- **Applicant's Response:**

None.

---

3.	Address:	201 Alvin Narod Mews (1125 Pacific Boulevard)
	DA:	404811
	Use:	Residential
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Down Archambault
	Owner:	Pacific Place Holdings Ltd
	Delegation:	Ron Beaton, Dane Jansen , Harold Neufeldt, Bob Nicholson
	Review:	First
:	Staff:	Jonathan Barrett

---

**EVALUATION: ( 6 - 0 )**

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, introduced this complete application for non-market housing. It was rezoned in the early 1990's and previously received an approved development application for family and non-family housing. As there is little funding for non-family housing, the scheme has come back as 60 family units. It is located at Pacific Boulevard and Cambie Street, next to Helmecken Park at the edge of Yaletown. The project has lowered from nine stories to eight so it is bulkier than in its previous form. There are no substantial issues. The proposal contains 140 parking spaces for Yaletown, as a City owned parking space, along with 66 spaces on the lowest levels for the residents. The Panel is asked to comment on the entrance to parking and CPTED concerns. There are substantial brick areas in the facade, and also concrete, so commentary on the materials and colour is requested. The third issue is the landscaping of this irregularly shaped site. Does it encourage pedestrian movement from the park and is the layout of the trees good for utilization of the site, especially referencing the large open space on Pacific Boulevard. The roof-top terrace is pulled back from the edge. As it is the sunniest place on the site, Staff would like to see the use of the area maximized. The Panel is also asked to comment on the layout of the ground level units and their relation to the entrances and handicapped access.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Jensen, the Applicant, explained that attention was paid to access points and there was concern about the street edge being carried up through the mews and addressing the buildings. The project emulates the motif of the adjacent buildings which are brick on the lower three-storeys and above that, stucco and glass. Mr. Nicholson, as the operator, said their experience with other projects in the City is that rooftop decks are not highly utilized. Mr. Neufeldt explained that the various types of paving in adjacent areas are being carried into the site to incorporate the project into its surroundings. In the space at the front of the building, a grid of small trees is used to create a visual break from above but the lawn area can still be used as a space for playing. There is a dense level of planting on the mews' side to give the impression that the building is set back more than it actually is. There are also plantings around the entry to the parking garage. Fencing (which will eventually vanish), hedges and shrubs are used to keep people from infringing on the children's play area, adjacent to the amenity rooms and the doors for interaction with the public parts of the building. Lowering the building height was a purely functional consideration. The building was also shifted to the west to increase the sun onto the playground. The colour of the brick is a blend between the Yaletown houses which are terracotta and the more contemporary tan building on the other side, the intention being an attractive transition in the street scape.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel expressed support for a well-done project, noting the amount of sun on the play area as being important. Individual comments by the members for consideration suggested: for livability, the corner unit facing the offices across the lane has the opportunity to face east; provision of a gate from the easterly open space into Helmecken Park would provide more play opportunities; the mews should have speed bumps to slow traffic and encourage pedestrians; and lastly, the tiering and intense landscaping at the building base will work well, although the appropriateness of the magnolia tree species as in the tree bosque was questioned. One member suggested that the bosque could be brought around the corner into the east entry court. Another member commented on the landscaping suggesting it be lowered around the parking ramp at the entrance on the lane for better visibility and also that using screens to give privacy for the play area and ground floor units means less surveillance for the adjacent park. As for the roof-top use issue, the lower roof was seen as more accessible and should be treated for use as a deck and both upper and lower roofs should be developed in design terms to deal with overview from adjacent buildings from above. Although the colour of the concrete and the masonry were supported, the Chair suggested that because of the building's role on Pacific Boulevard, forming a pair with Yaletown House, and the gateway to Helmecken Park, that a matching of the brick colour and a greater emphasis on amount of brick was appropriate.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant appreciated the Panel's comments and thanked them.

---

4.	Address:	1478 West Hastings Street (600 Nicola Street)
	DA:	404727
	Use:	Mixed Use
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Henriquez & Partners
	Owner:	Westbank Projects Corp.
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Richard Henriquez Gregory Henriquez and Gordon Koppang
	Staff:	Mike Kemble

---

**EVALUATION: ( 5 - 0 )**

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Mike Kemble, reviewed the comments of the previous panel presentation in April of 1999. At the rezoning stage when the form of development was approved, one condition had to do with the treatment of the street base and interface. The guidelines strive for a consistency of the materials in the Marina Neighbourhood, particularly at the lower levels, to reflect maritime structures. Previously, the units at the first and second level were single storey oriented to Hastings Street. Their layout has now changed so they are two level units with bedrooms on the upper floor facing the mews. There are more private patios on the mews itself, and the entrance steps come up from the street level and turn into the patios. The height of the building has been lowered somewhat, as the roof now slopes for more light for the neighbours to the south. Staff would like to see a more direct relationship between the front doors of the townhouses and Hastings Street, which is important to the pedestrian on the street. The massing relationship is not an issue but on the south face there are questions about safety and security of the lower units, and about the use and usability of the space and the general landscaping treatment proposed, because of the tight relationship to the adjacent buildings. Staff would like the Panel to comment on the street base treatment, the south interface with the neighbours, and the relationship of the townhouse entries to Hastings Street.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Henriquez questioned the nautical theme being enhanced by the use of brick according to the guidelines. In abstracting the nautical idea, two tone concrete is used with darker buttresses to give a dry dock feel - the boat on land. There were meetings with the neighbours when the form of the development was negotiated and, as well as cutting back the corner, they insisted the mews be gated and, therefore, private. There are distance, views and security problems in this narrow area and the solid wall was required as there are windows that exceed the 20 percent openings allowed.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel supported this intriguing building - a successful design for a difficult site that will form a base for what will be developed behind it. Improvements to the project from the previous scheme were noted. One member could not see the doorways on Hastings Street being problematic but suggested the nautical theme could be accented here with gateways, or portals. Another said the square plaza meeting the round end of the building further design resolution, and one member was not convinced the mews should be private rather than public, although from a safety and security perspective, it should be kept private. A member suggested the terrace walls should tie in with the saltwater treatment station which has all concrete walls. Generally, the materials were supported and the introduction of masonry was not seen as necessary. A member supported letting the architect decide what is the best colour in the interests of the building, in strengthening the form.

---



---

	The Chair congratulated the applicant on a project well done.	
5.	Address:	1673 Bayshore Drive (Restaurant)
		DA: 404739
	Use:	Restaurant/pub
		Zoning: CD-1
	Application Status:	Rezoning
	Architect:	Simon Gould
	Owner:	562270 B.C. Ltd.
		Review: First
	Delegation:	Richard Kolodziej; Simon Gould, and Ron Vornbrock
		Staff: Mike Kemble/Laurie Schmidt

---

**EVALUATION: ( 0 - 5 )**

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Mike Kemble, explained that this project, a restaurant at the tip of the walkway opposite the tower of the Bayshore Hotel, is essentially a complete application as part of a text amendment rezoning. The current zoning allows 5,000 sq. ft and a height limit of 16 ft. (5 m). The application is to increase the FSR to approximately 6,850 sq. ft. and to double the allowable height to 30 ft. The base concrete pad is already in place and measures 50 by 76 sq. ft. with about 5,000 sq. ft. of area. This is a very prominent location seen from the south side of Coal Harbour as well as from Stanley Park, and just outside of the Bidwell Street view corridor to the north. To the south is the stepped Bayshore building. A height comparison to this proposal is a the restaurant on the Marathon site, "Cardero's," with a maximum height of 7 m. The rectangular floor plate of the pad would be developed with a building of post and beam structure. The roof would hide the mechanical with a curvature reflecting a marine theme of waves. The Panel is asked to comment on two issues: the height and bulk of the building, and its design quality. The request is for a height relaxation for a full two-storeys, plus an extra high roof to hide the mechanical. While Staff support the increase in floor area, the height is a concern. The second issue is the architectural character and how it fits in the context of the marina sub-area.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The interior structural skeleton is meant to reflect the dock structure and pylons. In terms of vehicular access, there will be a requirement for a 20 ft. lane, between the trees, for valet parking. Initially, there was a balcony of 500 sq. ft. proposed on the north side but the Bayshore Hotel requested it be removed. The elevator was moved closer to the outside, and will be used for both handicapped access and supplying the restaurant, with double doors on both sides. The rationale for the extra space is the economics for a viable pub and restaurant.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel was supportive of the use and the increase in floor space, although one member commented that, if space is precious, the three stairways and large office seem excessive and could be reconfigured. The height of the roof scape was seen by a number of Panel members as being not justified by its use for mechanical space, and that the architectural expression should be reconsidered for a unique building in this nautical area of the Bayshore and Coal Harbour to earn any height relaxation. A member noted that the challenge is to fill the envelope to the maximum without appearing 'boxy', and to keep within the 7 m limit. The Panel found the colour palette dark and thought the whole concept needed to be lightened up.

It was not considered an exciting and inviting solution for the visual terminus of the waterfront walkway. The Chair noted that detail attention had been paid to views

throughout the Coal Harbour marina area and that this over-height solution would negatively impact distant mountain views from the westerly waterfront walkway. He also commented that the form and colour felt heavy and that a more exuberant and elegant form should be sought.

- **Applicant's Response:** None