

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** January 9, 2007

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Margot Long, Chair  
Nigel Baldwin  
Shahla Bozorgzadeh  
Tom Bunting  
James Cheng  
Eileen Keenan  
Bill Harrison  
John Wall  
Peter Wreglesworth

**REGRETS:** Walter Franci  
Albert Bicol  
C.C. Yao

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	SEFC 2A Site #2 (199 West 1 <sup>st</sup> Avenue)
2.	SEFC 2A Parcel 9: 1685 Ontario Street
3.	SEFC 2A Parcel 10: 1631 Ontario Street
4.	SEFC 2A Parcel 3: 1600 Columbia Street
5.	SEFC 2A Parcel 6: 108 Athletes Way

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Long called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: SEFC 2A Parcel 2 (199 West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue)  
DE: 410840  
Use: 13-storey market and 5-storey non-market residential buildings  
Zoning: CD-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: GBL Architects  
Review: Design Update  
Delegation: Roger Bayley, Stuart Lyon  
Staff: Scot Hein

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, noted that the application will go to the Development Permit Board on Monday, January 15, 2007, as the first site in SEFC to be considered by the Board.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Roger Bayley, Engineer, Merrick Architecture, described the proposal in detail describing the planning of the next phase. At the end of January they will be moving into the construction documentation. They will be pouring concrete on Parcel 2 in about four months followed by Parcel 9 and then Parcel 3, 6 and 10. They continue to work towards LEED gold accreditation that Millenium has committed to obtaining.

Stuart Lyon, Architect, went over the changes and modifications since they were last at the UDP. Mr. Lyon went through five of the issues that the panel had been concerned about from the last review. With respect to the non-market housing building, there was commentary regarding the elevator being open to the elements. The elevators have now been moved closer to the street and have been enclosed. As a result the size of the amenity space has been increased with a better outlook onto the park. The bridge element has been removed along with four units which have been relocated elsewhere in the building. In the market building the entrance and the amenity space has been reconfigured. The size of amenity space has also been increased and relates strongly to the interior courtyard in the non-market building. The stairs have been moved across the corridor for a better circulation flow in the corridor. The penthouse shape has remained the same with larger decks but the stairs have been pulled back as they restricted some of the views. A series of horizontals has been introduced into the walls and will incorporate roll down screens on the west side of the building. A different kind of scale has been introduced to the bottom of the building by reversing the suites so the decks aren't stacked all the way up the side of the building. Further refinement will continue to take place as the design of the building evolves.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

---

2. Address:	SEFC 2A Parcel 9: 1685 Ontario Street
DE:	410876
Use:	A mixed-use multiple dwelling/live-work/grocery store development consisting of 3 buildings
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	GBL Architects
Review:	First
Delegation:	Tom Bell, Stuart Lyon, Jennifer Stamp
Staff:	Scot Hein

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-1)

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, gave an overview of the site which is located at the south east end of the Olympic Village site. This parcel is located with its west edge facing the Salt building and public plaza and the east edge facing the public park across Ontario Street. He asked the Panel to comment on the character, expression, and architectural expression. Also, comments concerning the landscaping and the interface to the ground plan as well as the transition between the public and private areas. General advice on the green roofs and urban agriculture was also sought.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Tom Bell, Architect, gave an overview of the project starting with the market building. The building has two distinct faces. The western façade will have heavy solar gain and big water views. Long horizontal balconies will offer northwest views and will provide shade. The eastern façade has recessed two storey townhomes on the ground floor. The modest market housing has been designed as a frame over slim columns with live work townhomes a ground level. The two storey townhomes are expressed with a garage door for the work area and an adjacent raised residential entry.

Stuart Lyon, Architect, further described the design of the buildings including the non market seniors housing. The building has been developed to introduce passive design strategies for minimum energy usage and enhanced liveability. The commercial frontage extends along Manitoba Street and will include a grocery store. The frontage is to be highly glazed as a counterpoint and reflector of the Salt Building across the street.

Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect described the landscape plans for the project.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

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

- Consider stepping the penthouse and more design development on the roofs;
- Re-consider the circulation in the Senior's building;
- Concern about the under cut of the buildings particularly on Walter Hardwick Way on the north side;
- Concern about the loading bay and parking ramp entrances off Walter Hardwick Way;
- Consider adding brighter colours to the north side.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application. The Panel appreciated having the context plan and agreed that the applicant had done a lot of work on the project and realized that there are still some refinements to take place.
-

Some of the Panel thought the facade seemed cramped on Walter Hardwick Way and were concerned about the liveability of the units but agreed that the north side was more successful. Several members of the Panel felt more design development need to take place on the penthouses and one member suggested terracing the penthouse on Block 2 as it seemed boxy. The market building seems well resolved and the Panel liked that each building is distinctive. One member of the Panel suggested moving the circulation in the Senior's building as it fronts the living rooms although another Panel member thought that seniors might like having an interaction to the corridor. The Panel agreed that the wave action on the Ontario Street face would be nice to look at from the park. They also agreed that the indoor/outdoor amenities worked well.

The Panel had concerns about the street level presence of the townhouses with the units above, especially the units on the north side of Walter Hardwick Way. They might be dark at ground level and it was suggested setting back the upper floors which would also give some variety to the street. Some of the Panel would like some design treatment to make the garage doors more sympathetic to the townhouses.

The Panel liked the colour palette especially the deeper colours. Several members suggested not using the colour red on the site so as not to take away from the Salt Building. A couple of Panel members questioned why the south side was brightly coloured which would get all the sun and why the north was so grey when it wouldn't get much sun and could use more colour.

One member of the Panel thought the width of the loading ramp needed some work to avoid congestion in the area. One member of the Panel would like the canopy higher than twelve feet over the retail and suggested it needed to be well detailed.

One member of the Panel would like to see reference to the ship yard neighbourhood and suggested it could come out in the detailing. For the most part the Panel thought the landscaping was well planned but would like to see more trees along the commercial edge.

The Panel liked the net zero building approach along with the green roof solution.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lyon said he was learning to enjoy the Panel's commentary and that it had been useful. He said they will continue reviewing the design and would like to bring it back for and design update in the future.

---

3. Address:	SEFC 2A Parcel 10: 1631 Ontario Street
DE:	410878
Use:	A mixed-use multiple dwelling/pharmacy development with 3 buildings and 2 levels of underground parking
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Merrick Architecture
Review:	First
Delegation:	Greg Borowski, Roger Bayley, Paul Merrick
Staff:	Scot Hein

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-4)**

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced this application located on Ontario Street bound by Athlete's Way on the north, Walter Hardwick Avenue on the south and Manitoba Street on the west and consisting of two buildings with an interior courtyard. The Panel convened around the model where Mr. Hein described the project in further detail and took questions from the Panel. He asked the Panel to comment on the east elevation and balcony strategy on Walter Hardwick Way and the breaking down of the scale in the blocks so they might not be seen as super blocks.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Merrick, Architect, and Greg Borowski, Architect, described the project in detail. The residences in the north-south facing buildings are single loaded, through units which will provide them with both a strong source of daylight and natural ventilation. The taller east-west structures, while double loaded to meet density have corridors and public spaces that work to bring as much air and light into the building. The grade-level retail feature recessed frameless glass doors with individual signage and retractable awnings. Roger Bayley described the sustainability principles of the development noting that Millennium is committed to achieving LEED Silver. Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect described in detail the landscaping for the site. Ms. Stamp described the plans for the streetscape and public realm as well as for the courtyard and the semi-private patios. She added that there will be an area for urban agriculture in the courtyard.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Concerns about the massing particularly at the top of the buildings;
  - Consider returning the penthouse level to the design that was presented at rezoning;
  - Concern about the liveability and sustainability of the residential units;
  - Some design development around the materials and colour palette; and
  - Concern about narrow gap between corner building and townhouse on Athletes Way.

**Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application. The Panel commended the architects noting that a huge effort had been put forth and some risks had been taken with the design.

The Panel had concerns around the massing; particularly the top of the buildings which they thought wasn't working well together. The Panel suggested the top expression of the bookend and the plaza buildings could be different and should go back to the way it was originally proposed at rezoning. Some of the Panel felt the lower podium on the plaza building was too

heavy in relationship to the top of the building. There was also some concern about the edge condition around the building, as it seems too heavy and needs to be lightened.

Most of the Panel had concerns around the use of materials noting there didn't seem to be a strategy around the elements and thought the colour palette was too muted. They suggested a second layer of colour to enliven the project.

The Panel was concerned around liveability with the number of suites with light-locked, internal bedrooms and suggested reconfiguring the floor plans. The plaza building entrance needs to be expressed in a better way as it is not reflecting the importance of the building. The bookend building needs some design development especially on the east façade with one member of the Panel suggesting the mechanical screens on the roof needs to be more sculptural. Some members the Panel were concerned about the distance between the bookend and the north building.

Most of the Panel liked the arcade and the way it is being applied on the north side but agreed that the table expression was too relentless and felt narrow and encouraged the applicant to explore a different expression. One Panel member suggested adding a glass canopy.

The Panel liked the subtle language and the differences between the blocks. They also liked the glass tower for the stairs, the landscape treatment and especially the water feature. One member of the Panel suggested adding more greenery to the terraces on the bookend building. They agreed that the common courtyard layout works better in this scheme than in the last one. The Panel agreed that the location of the pharmacy was in the right place.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Merrick thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed to bring the application back to the Panel for a design update.

---

4. Address:	SEFC 2A Parcel 3: 1600 Columbia Street
DE:	410877
Use:	A multiple dwelling development with 3 buildings and 2 levels of underground parking
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Merrick Architecture
Review:	First
Delegation:	Rob Ciccozzi, Paul Merrick
Staff:	Scot Hein

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)**

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner introduced the application located at 1600 Columbia Street. The Panel convened around the model where Mr. Hein described the project in further detail and took questions from the Panel.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Merrick, Architect described the project in detail. The Bookend tower, northern Gateway and southern Courtyard buildings all sit atop a common two level, underground parkade. The modest market housing is contained in the Courtyard building. There will be ground oriented suites along Walter Hardwick Way, Columbia Street, Athlete's Way and the Pedestrian Mews. Walter Hardwick way is punctuated by the entry to the underground parking and the main entry to the east building. The main building entry is distinguished by a series of ornamental pools. Columbia Street has semi-private raised patios along its entire length. The main entry to the West building is located in the centre of the building. Athlete's Way has raised semi-private patios and three entry lobbies to the suites above. Along the East side of Parcel 3, the Pedestrian Mews connects Parcel 5 and the Pocket Park with the waterfront.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Concern about the liveability and sustainability of the residential units; and
  - Consider design development to the west side balconies.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application and thought the project was well resolved.

The Panel thought the water feature coming through the entry court was exciting and agreed that the courtyard was well organized.

The Panel thought there were strong liveability issues with some of the units noting that one suite has two interior bedrooms. It was noted that some of the units don't meet the basic standards of twenty-five back with a glazed openings. The balconies along the west side of the Bookend building seemed too deep and could be quiet dark. One lobby on the courtyard near the ramp seemed hidden away. The south façade of the Bookend building seemed out of character and is getting too much shade. They also thought the entrances to the townhouses on Walter Hardwick Way were well handled. A couple of members of the Panel questioned the mimicking of the curve of the other building and thought it would get lost in the shadows and was the least successful.

Several members of the Panel thought the south end of the Bookend building had a masonry expression that doesn't seem to relate to the rest of the scheme and could be better integrated with the rest of the project. They also thought the detailed material

presentation wasn't up to standard. One member of the Panel liked the colour and warmth of the materials.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Ciccozzi thanked the Panel and noted that the interior planning would be reworked and as they are aware of the deficiencies.



---

5. Address:	SEFC 2A Parcel 6: 108 Athletes Way
DE:	410879
Use:	A mixed-use multiple dwelling/liquor store development with 3 buildings and 2 levels of underground parking
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Merrick Architecture
Review:	First
Delegation:	Rob Ciccozzi, Paul Merrick
Staff:	Scot Hein

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-2)**

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner introduced the application located at 108 Athletes Way. The Panel convened around the model where Mr. Hein described the project in further detail and took questions from the Panel. Parcel 6 is bounded by Athlete's Way on the north, Manitoba Street and a large public plaza on the east, Walter Hardwick Avenue on the south and a public right-of-way on the west.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Paul Merrick, Architect, described the project in detail. The north face of the Plaza building is a variation on the Bookend buildings on Parcel 3 and 10. It creates a large scale opening framing the view into the plaza across False Creek. The Plaza building's massing is much lower than the Bookend buildings. There will be good views from the units through the plaza and out to the north and east towards the mountains facing east, a moderate amount of shading is also required to keep those units from getting overheated. The façade will allow the retail to stand out more clearly at ground level. On the southern façade, the openings are kept to a relative minimum under a protective sunshade. Dividing the Plaza building from the streetscape of the residential is a glass stairway which will bring large amounts of natural light into the interior circulation space. A significant number of the units have semi-private patios. The main outdoor amenity space is on Level 3. The courtyard contains a children's play area, a large lawn, a rain garden water feature and potential for urban agriculture.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider design development along the mews and its relationship with the amenity building;
  - Concern around the liveability of the Modest Market housing;
  - Consider increasing the size of the lobbies; and
  - Concerns about the massing particularly at the top of the buildings
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the application and thought this was the most successful of all the blocks.

The Panel felt the gap between Block 6 and 3 was too narrow and since the living areas in Block 6 face the mews there could be a privacy issue. They suggested pulling back the block in line with the smaller townhouses. One member of the Panel suggested giving the amenity space a strong, generous entrance that's inviting.

The Panel felt the north east corner needed something more powerful, something more articulated as it seemed dated. Several members thought the massing and elevation of the Plaza building on Walter Hardwick Way seemed confusing and didn't have the sensitivity as

seen in Parcel 3. One member of the Panel felt the lobbies seemed small in their entry to the major portions of the buildings.

The Panel thought there were some issues with the liveability of the Modest Marking housing on Walter Hardwick Way and suggested using the townhouse design from Lot 3 which seemed more successful and would get the bedrooms off the ground. They also noted that there are several units with light locked bedrooms and the second and third floor units in the market housing seems to be cut off from light. One member of the Panel felt the decks were very deep in places and may not get a lot of light.

One member of the Panel thought the arcade could be indented less and suggested lining up both arcades to keep it constant across the project.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Merrick thanked the Panel for their comments and agreed that the width of the mews was too narrow. He also agreed that they need to work in light into the back side of some of the spaces or find another way to reconfigure the spaces.