

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 19, 2005

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden, Chair
Larry Adams
Robert Barnes
Jeffrey Corbett
Alan Endall
Marta Farevaag
Ronald Lea
Margot Long

REGRETS: Steven Keyes
Jennifer Marshall
Brian Martin
Mark Ostry

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	26 SW Marine Drive (Canadian Tire)
2.	4453 Main Street
3.	3811 West 18th Avenue

-
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address: | 26 SW Marine Drive (Canadian Tire) |
| Use: | Retail |
| Zoning: | I-1 to CD-1 |
| Application Status: | Rezoning |
| Architect: | Kasian Kennedy Architects |
| Owner: | Canadian Tire Real Estate |
| Review: | Second |
| Delegation: | Mike McDonald, Joanne Stich, Mary Chan-Yip |
| Staff: | Scot Hein |
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, presented this rezoning application. The Panel did not support the form of development when the application was first reviewed on November 24, 2004. The current zoning allows a density of 0.6 FSR and the application seeks 0.79 FSR.

Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the Panel's previous concerns and suggestions with respect to the form of development and described the applicant's response. The advice of the Panel is sought on this response, including:

- density (specifically the increase in retail density);
- form of development, including:
 - the relationship of the new building to the heritage structure;
 - treatment of the northeast corner of Marine Drive;
 - the Ontario streetwall with respect to use, scale, expression and signage;
 - landscape treatment and sustainability strategy.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Mike McDonald, Architect, briefly described the revised scheme, noting the approach is now for more of a single building which is set farther back from the heritage structure. Signage will be addressed in greater detail at the development application stage. Joanne Stich briefly summarized the approach to sustainability which includes a bio-filtration pond to handle the "first flush" water off the parkade roof and the use of grey water for toilet flushing. To reduce energy costs, the incorporation of skylights in the Canadian Tire building is being investigated, as well as wrapping the rear building with clerestory lighting to get some daylight into the retail space. Large clerestories on the north façade will also bring daylight into the upper retail. A more sustainable approach to the mechanical systems will also be pursued at the development application stage.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to strengthen and clarify the architectural character and authenticity of the expression;
 - Design development to the north landscape and bio-filtration pond to ensure functionality, giving consideration to the potential for a simpler, more formal language reflecting both the heritage building and including consideration of pedestrian desire lines;

- Enhance and emphasize vertical connections between parking levels including consideration of both way-finding and addition of natural light to the lower level;
 - Enhance the Ontario street ground plane to emphasize pedestrian quality, greenway links, planting quality and way-finding;
 - Provide an integrated signage strategy that is respectful of the simplicity of both the heritage building and the new building, particularly on the Marine Drive façade.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel unanimously supported this revised submission. There were no concerns about the proposed use and density.

The Panel found the form of development considerably improved and was satisfied the project is now moving in the right direction. It is much simpler and the industrial language works well. Panel members liked the warehouse character as a backdrop to the heritage building but with some concerns expressed that the Chrysler building still seems a very inert building. Concerns remained about the relationship of the heritage structure to the new building with respect to connection details and suggestions were offered to make it engage more. There was a recommendation to ensure that the overall architectural expression takes precedence over the commercial uses on the site.

The Panel supported the massing and the bicycle hub at the northeast corner and thought it would work well. A number of concerns were expressed about the proposed bio-filtration pond. Some Panel members questioned whether it would be successful because they tend to dry out and pumping water would contradict the goal of sustainability. It was also noted that the natural landscape expression around the pond seems counter to the very formal aspect of the lawn. The heavy vegetation and shrubs may also work against the goal of maintaining the vista across the lawn. It was suggested a simpler, more urban approach might be better. Instead of the bio-filtration pond, there was a suggestion to consider a green roof, even partial, which might be easier to achieve than the pond. Given the size of the building, a green roof would also help to bring down its scale and would be more reflective of the simple heritage green lawn.

The Panel supported the preservation of the simplicity and clarity of the lawn. It was suggested the circulation in the open space needed more work, with a recommendation to consider respecting some diagonal desire lines.

The Panel found the Ontario Street elevation much improved. It has much greater clarity and the trellis is an interesting solution. It was stressed, however, that the detailing will be critical in terms of the amount of transparency it has and whether there should be variable heights. Further design development was recommended to ensure this façade more accurately reflects the uses behind it, which would also help with way-finding. One Panel member questioned whether the trellis element was warranted between major building masses, suggesting a more distinct break between primary building masses might offer greater visibility to the parking areas above as well as help to clarify the expression of the different components on the site. Some concerns were expressed that way-finding might be confusing. Greater attention at the development application stage was recommended to strengthen way-finding and to make the arrival and movement to the upper levels a more positive pedestrian experience. In general, there is need for greater consideration at the ground plane.

With respect to signage, the Panel liked that the signage will be contained within the overall frame of the building rather than protrude. It was also suggested the signage seen driving east

along Marine Drive should be similarly sensitively handled. Signage will be an important consideration at the development application stage.

With respect to the driveway crossings on Ontario Street, it was recommended that priority be given to pedestrians rather than vehicles. Likewise, the circulation in both levels of the parking lot should ensure pedestrian priority, possibly with a central north-south spine through the centre. There was also a recommendation to consider skylights in the upper parking level rather than trees, to allow light down to the lower level, noting that trees in upper parking decks are seldom successful. It was strongly suggested that everything be done to get some daylight into the lower level parking to create a more pleasant environment and improve security.

With respect to the Ontario Street greenway, it was noted there is opportunity to increase the setback (a least three metres) from the CRUs and garden centre to offer more than a typical streetscape and create more of a greenway , making it a bold statement rather than a narrow boulevard. It was noted the second row of trees currently will have insufficient room to produce a full canopy but with a greater setback at least one of the rows could be quite large specimens.

With respect to the north façade, it was stressed that night lighting will be an important consideration at the next stage of design development.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. McDonald thanked the Panel for what he considered to be good recommendations.

2. Address:	4453 Main Street
DE:	409034
Use:	Mixed (4 storeys, 51 units)
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	GBL Architects
Owner:	Kevington Building Corp.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Tom Bell, Amela Brudar
Staff:	James Boldt

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-1)

- **Introduction:** James Boldt, Development Planner, presented this C-2 application. The site is at 30th Avenue and Main Street, 101 ft. deep with a frontage of 210 ft. The immediate context is small, single storey retail on Main Street and single family residential across the lane. The proposal is for three floors of residential (51 residential units ranging in size from 492 sq.ft. to 601 sq.ft.) above ground floor retail. Total density is 2.51 FSR. The fourth floor is set back in accordance with the C-2 regulations. The residential entry lobby court breaks the wide frontage on Main Street and separates the retail components. At the rear, landscape decks are proposed up to about 20 ft. from the lane, except for a central community garden area which steps down to about 2 ft. from the lane. The proposed architecture and landscape design are contemporary in expression and the materials include concrete brick, cement fibreboard, steel, and coloured glass balcony panels.

Noting the C-2 regulations call for a high level of design and livability, the advice of the Panel is sought on the following:

- The overall expression of the building, both front and rear elevations, and the extent to which the scheme addresses the wide 210 ft. frontage, including the depth of the residential entry court;
 - The materials and the manner in which they are employed, in particular the relationship of the brick to the large window areas, and the use of cement fibreboard;
 - The lane treatment including setback of the terraces and the commercial parking and loading area;
 - Relationship and integration of the residential and commercial uses.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Tom Bell, Architect, briefly described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.
 - **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Treatment of the currently untreated lane roof with consideration to expanding the community garden and/or expanding the adjacent decks and/or providing a green roof or expanding the outdoor amenity space;
 - Consider providing a more direct link from the indoor amenity space to the outdoor amenity space;
 - Enhance grade treatment of Main Street including street trees, new concrete and consideration of art, sculptural lighting or other features, particularly at the entry;
-

- Consider reducing the depth of the entry inset or providing other means of enhancing security;
 - Consider providing a shed roof over the loading area which will address issues of overlook and acoustic separation;
 - Ensure transparency of the storefront detailing to enhance visual interest on the street.
- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel strongly supported this application. It was thought to be a very well handled scheme and a fine example of a mixed-use urban building. It is contemporary and interesting and will set a nice tone for the neighbourhood. The Panel had no concerns about the separation of residential and commercial uses and strongly supported the provision of rental accommodation.

The Panel generally found the front and rear elevations to be very handsome.

The Panel had no concerns about the treatment of the long frontage and considered the massing to be broken up quite well. There were some concerns about the depth of the residential entry, mostly from a security point of view. Suggestions included bringing it out and enlarging the lobby, adding glass to the entry space, ensuring good night lighting, adding a transparent ornamental gate, and providing public art rather than planters.

It was noted there are currently no City guidelines for treatment of the public realm in this area. However, the applicant was urged to provide more than the minimum for this important site; something that responds to the energy of Main Street, including larger tree wells and better than conventional landscape treatment at the entry.

The Panel thought the two major commercial tenants will do a lot for the street. However, the applicant was encouraged to ensure the whole frontage of the market is as transparent as possible and providing a strong indoor/outdoor relationship. Containing the commercial branding within the signage strip was strongly recommended.

There was a livability concern noted with respect to the two end party walls at the property line, affecting the end patios.

With respect to materials, the Panel had no concern about the use of cement board in this location. In general, the Panel's concerns were in the details and how one material relates to another. With respect to the coloured balcony panels, there was a recommendation to consider a ceramic grid behind them rather than metal, to bring more light into the units and still maintain the desired solid expression. There was also a comment that opaque coloured glass balustrades have a tendency to look dated.

With respect to the lane elevation, several Panel members recommended extending the lower roof community garden and to ensure it is handicap accessible. It need not all be community garden but could include some other amenity. There was a recommendation to provide more direct access from the lobby to the community garden without the dog-leg through the corner of the end patio. The applicant was cautioned to give careful attention to the guard rail to ensure it does not end up looking monolithic.

Some Panel members recommended enclosing the loading area, possibly with a trellis, although there were concerns about covering this area given its proximity to the liquor store parking lot. A change in paving texture for the loading area was recommended. Some Panel members recommended including a suspended canopy over the loading bay to provide some screening for overlook and to help mitigate noise.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bell noted that, on the advice of staff, the extent of the community garden was limited to reduce noise impact on the neighbours. He appreciated the Panel's advice which has provided some good ideas for improving the project.

3. Address:	3611 West 18th Avenue (at Dunbar)
DE:	409057
Use:	Mixed (4 storeys, 16 units)
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Ankenman Marchand Architects
Owner:	Erika Zellman
Review:	First
Delegation:	Francois Marchand, Patricia Campbell, Saeid Ansari
Staff:	James Boldt

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-3)

- **Introduction:** James Boldt, Development Planner, presented this application. The site, at 18th Avenue and Dunbar, has a frontage of 99 ft. and a depth of 96 ft., and has a significant slope in two directions. Overall density is 2.35 FSR. The project proposes three storeys of residential (16 units) above ground level retail on Dunbar and medical offices on 18th Avenue extending to the lane at the rear. The residential entry is on 18th Avenue. The proposal is for a highly sculpted building with contemporary materials and expression. The massing on Dunbar is broken down into three blocks which reflects the typical 30 ft. rhythm on Dunbar. Materials include brick, hardi panel, hardi plank, steel canopies, concrete bases, metal soffits, precast concrete caps and sills, aluminum and glass railings, and a small amount of wood.

The advice of the Panel is sought in the following areas:

- Overall expression of the building, in particular on 18th Avenue and the exposed elevator core;
- Materials and how they are employed, in particular the large areas of hardi panel;
- Impact on the property to the north and its internal courtyard;
- Transition of landscaping and massing at the lane corner and the impact of the medical office use on the adjacent single family lots across the lane.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Francois Marchand, Architect, described the project in greater detail, noting it is a very difficult site because of the severe grades. The applicant team responded to questions from the Panel.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Add a street tree on 18th Avenue, if possible;
 - Provide quality material treatment to the north party wall facing the courtyard of the adjacent building, in harmony with the building to the north;
 - Expand and enhance the residential entry;
 - Consider simplification of the roof line including consideration for enhancing vertical visual links with the façade;
 - Consider simplification and clarification of colour and material strategy.

- **Related Commentary:**

The Panel acknowledged the applicant had done a very good job of achieving a workable plan on this very challenging site, although some Panel members thought there was too much on the site.

There were some concerns expressed about the sloping roof on Dunbar Street. There were suggestions that a stepped roof pattern would work better with the rest of the building, extending the three massing elements up to the roof. The Panel generally found the Dunbar elevation to be the most successful façade in the way it picks up on the rhythm of the street with the separately expressed storefronts but there was a suggestion that it is currently too complex and in need of greater simplification, particularly at the datum line. There was a recommendation to reconsider the fourth floor roof deck and hot tubs; they may be too ambitious for the project and the guard rail could have a negative impact on the massing.

The Panel had no concerns about the 18th Avenue façade. The exposed elevator core was supported and the vertical expression considered acceptable. There were, however, concerns about the residential entry lobby which the Panel found too small. There were recommendations to eliminate the indentation and bring the glass to the street. Also, to eliminate the exit through the lobby in favour of direct street exit, making the lobby appear a lot more spacious and interesting from the street. One Panel member also thought the glass roof over the lobby should be reconsidered.

There were no concerns about the step down at the lane. There was a recommendation for street trees in the lane, and to relocate the hydro kiosk.

The Panel had some concerns about the material palette and it was stressed that the success of the building will depend on how well the details are handled. The handling of colour on the 18th and lane facades was a concern for one Panel member who thought it could be better used to express the function of the building. Simplification of materials at the roof level was recommended.

The Panel had no major concerns about the impact on the property to the north but acknowledged it is unfortunate there will be some loss of light. The Panel strongly recommended sensitive treatment of the party wall to minimize the impact, possibly a brick facing or some other treatment to soften the upper level courtyard. Screening of the HVAC equipment was also strongly recommended.

The Panel was satisfied with the transition of the lane massing and the relationship between the medical office windows and the lane which was thought to be quite neighbourly to the residents across the lane. There were no concerns about the windows on the lane, noting they will likely be permanently covered.

It was noted there appears to be a tree missing from 18th Avenue, and a recommendation to give greater consideration to the streetscape on Dunbar Street. As well, a more consistent landscaping was recommended, noting it is currently a mix of 70's landscape with tropical planting at the corner.

One Panel member had a concern about livability with respect to the ramp in the hallways which result in very awkward narrow corridors.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Marchand thanked the Panel for the comments. The Landscape Architect, Patricia Campbell, added that a street tree on 18th Avenue was omitted to accommodate the existing street light.