

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** July 15, 1998  
**TIME:** N/A  
**PLACE:** N/A  
**PRESENT:** James Hancock (Chair)  
Sheldon Chandler (excused Item #1)  
Per Christoffersen  
Geoff Glotman (excused Item #3)  
Peter Kreuk (present for Items #2 and #3 only)  
Norman Shearing  
Peter Wreglesworth (excused Item #3)

**REGRETS:**  
Joyce Drohan  
Patricia Campbell  
Joseph Hruda  
Sean McEwan  
Jim McLean

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:**  
Carol Hubbard

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 5605 Victoria Drive                              |
| 2. | 990 West 41st Avenue                             |
| 3. | 3501 Euclid Avenue (Collingwood Village Lot ABC) |
-

1. **Address: 5605 Victoria Drive**  
Use: Mixed  
Zoning: CD-1 Text Amendment  
Application Status: Rezoning  
Architect: James Cheng Architects  
Owner: Westbank Projects Corp.  
Review: Second  
Delegation: James Cheng, Dawn Guspie, Chris Philips  
Staff: Lynda Challis
- 

## **EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-0)**

### **Introduction:**

The Rezoning Planner, Lynda Challis, presented this application. An earlier proposal reviewed on April 22, 1998 was not supported by the Panel. The revised application includes the re-use of the former Safeway store for a new London Drugs store, two new 2-storey commercial buildings fronting onto a central surface parking area and a 2-storey open-air parkade. The main change from the previous submission concerns the residential component which now extends the entire length of the proposed London Drugs store. As well, the residential has been reduced from six to four storeys along 41st Avenue, with three storeys above the London Drugs store. The proposal also includes two-storey townhouses with single-storey units above, centred on a linear courtyard. The site was rezoned from C-2 to CD-1 in 1997 as a result of concerns about the scale and impact of potential redevelopment on the single family residential area to the west. The current CD-1 limits the density to 0.3 FSR although it was intended that the site would be rezoned to accommodate future redevelopment. The site falls within the boundaries of the Kensington-Cedar Cottage community visioning program which is currently underway.

In its review of the previous submission the Panel supported the proposed use and density but had concerns about built form and massing. There were concerns about the livability of residential units, particularly the units facing the lane and those overlooking the roof of London Drugs. The Panel was also concerned about the treatment of the lane and the surface parking area. Quality of the pedestrian environment was also an issue, as was the landscaping, especially around the surface parking area and relationship to the open air parkade. Ms. Challis described how the revised proposal addresses the Panel's concerns. Staff support many of the changes made to the scheme and seek the Panel's advice on the following:

- response to C-2 residential guidelines with respect to setbacks and terracing;
- articulation of the west elevation;
- width of the linear courtyard;
- livability of units located behind the London Drugs roofline.

### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

James Cheng, Architect, noted that the size of the London Drugs sign has been reduced and the residential units above London Drugs have private front and rear gardens. The width of the linear courtyard is similar to Trafalgar Mews and developments in the Fairview Slopes. Dawn Guspie noted the areas in which the project responds to the Kensington-Cedar Cottage vision statement. A primary change is the reduction from 6 to 4 storeys in response to the vision's encouragement for more 4-storey mixed-use developments. Also, to provide a major neighbourhood shopping area for the community for a long-term tenant such as London Drugs. The variety of housing units proposed will provide the neighbourhood with different housing alternatives for those who want to stay in the area. The improved pedestrian environment since the previous submission also addresses the vision, including greening the lanes, and adding more street trees on 41st and Victoria and in the central parking courtyard. Treatment of the London Drugs roof has also been reconsidered, resulting in the redistribution of the massing over the entire length of the store, also achieving a

more integrated development. The project also includes a community police office and a kiosk for the Neighbourhood House. Chris Philips, Landscape Architect, briefly reviewed the landscape plan.

**Panel's Comments:**

After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel offered the following comments:

The Panel responded very positively to the changes that have been made to the project and unanimously supported the application. In particular it was felt that distributing the massing over the entire roof of the London Drugs store was a significant improvement, resulting in some very livable units. There may be a couple of units whose outlook may be somewhat tight but it was noted that the units themselves are very handsome. The reduction in height from 6 to 4 storeys was supported.

A number of comments were made about the linear courtyard. There was some confusion in that the width of the courtyard appears to be quite adequate in section whereas the model seems to indicate that it will be very dark and constricted. Further design development to the courtyard was strongly recommended to make it work. It was suggested that the projecting third floor exterior walkway could be a contributing factor.

The Panel strongly endorsed the lowering of the London Drugs canopy and urged that everything possible be done to play down the typical London Drugs imagery to achieve a more harmonious fit with the residential.

The Panel strongly supported the proposed paving treatment. Given its importance to this project as a unifying device and as a response to the neighbourhood vision statement, the Panel expressed the hope that it will also receive the full support of the Engineering Department.

The Panel had no concerns about the setbacks along the lane.

There may be an opportunity to introduce some landscape vines and trellises on the parkade deck next to the residential-retail mix which would help to soften both the overlook from neighbouring properties and from the residential units themselves.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Cheng said they will be pleased to work with the Panel's comments. He apologized for the confusion between the model and the section.

2. **Address: 990 West 41st Avenue**  
Use: Mixed, Institutional & Residential (5 storeys, 53 units)  
Zoning: RS-1 to CD-1  
Application Status: Rezoning  
Architect: Urban Design & Development Consulting  
Owner: Lubovich  
Review: First  
Delegation: Paul Chiu, Margot Long, Jim Lehto, Roger Moors  
Staff: Rob Whitlock

---

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-6)****Introduction:**

Rob Whitlock, Rezoning Planner, presented this application for rezoning from RS-1 to CD-1, to allow the replacement of the existing Lubovich Centre which provides religious, educational and community services, and 51 residential units, four of which will be given to the City as a community amenity consideration. The site is on the southeast corner of West 41st Avenue and Oak Street in the Oakridge area. Following a brief description of the surrounding area, Mr. Whitlock described the project which is proposed at 1.98 FSR and 15.24 m (50 ft.). Two levels of underground parking are proposed with access off 41st Avenue for the institutional uses and off Oak Street for the residential. The institutional component is on four floors at the corner with a fifth floor of residential above. The remainder of the project contains five floors of residential units.

A major concern with the scheme when it was first submitted earlier this year was that the building was too blocky in appearance. The Panel's comments are sought on how the current proposal responds in terms of its articulation. The Panel's advice is also sought on how the 41st Avenue elevation relates to the street, the treatment of the 41st/Oak corner and the general theme of the 41st Avenue façade and the relationship of the building to this prominent corner. Other areas for comment include the relationship between this site and the Jewish Community Centre, and the open space plan.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Jim Lehto, UD&D Consulting, noted the proposed height (50 ft.) is in accordance with the Oakridge Langara Policy Statement. Paul Chiu, Architect, and Margot Long, Landscape Architect, provided some additional details on the project.

**Panels Comments**

After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel supported the proposed use and density but had serious concerns about the form of development. The application for rezoning was not supported at this time.

It was stressed that for such a significant corner the symmetrical approach on the north elevation may not be appropriate. The Panel felt that the Lubovich Centre, which is a very important presence in the community, should have a much more memorable expression that celebrates its cultural aspects. The typical office appearance proposed is too bland and anonymous for the use that is being accommodated, and more effort should be spent on the design of the interior in order to develop a distinctive signature building. Too much emphasis seems to have been given to the integration of the residential and institutional uses, at the expense of the corner expression. It was strongly suggested that at the next stage, a program be established for the interior so that there can be a plan for the building which can then inform the architecture.

The proposed floor-to-floor height in the institutional component was questioned from a functional point of view, noting that air-conditioning is intended. Achieving five floors within the 50 ft. envelope is clearly dictating this arrangement. The Panel indicated support for greater height on the corner, up to 60 ft., in order to achieve more useful 11 ft. 6 in. - 12 ft. floor-to-floor heights for the institutional use. A higher building will add some needed strength to this important corner. Reducing the residential to the more typical 9 ft. floor-to-floor height would then help the dynamic between the residential and institutional use, as well as contributing to more economic construction for the residential component.

The Panel commented on the façade treatment, in particular that the two types of materials proposed appear equally heavy, despite one being lighter than the other. It was felt the window expressions could be contributing to this perception because they have identical proportions on all elements of the building. Some variety in window treatment would help to convey a different expression to the building. As well, the projections and recesses in the building seem too severe. In particular, the deep recesses on the east elevation will be in darkness for most of the day. From a massing point of view the building still looks very blocky, with a relentless 50 ft. line with deep slots in the residential. A much finer grain should be sought in the next stage of the design. A simpler, more regular exterior elevation will result in better units and a more economic building, and likely better architecture.

The Panel thought the building should be moved closer to Oak Street to create a stronger sense of streetwall. By doing so, it would also serve to provide a little more space on the east side of the building. There would then be greater distance between the residential uses and the Jewish Community Centre which would respond to Planning's concern about this relationship. This area could also be used for some usable outdoor space which currently seems to be lacking in the project.

Given the cultural relationship between this building and the Jewish Community Centre it was recommended that some architectural cues be taken from the JCC in terms of expression on the street.

Finally, it was noted that if the two trees on the corner are worth preserving then it might be worth considering an indent in the parking in order to save them.

**Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Moores agreed they need to take another look at the treatment of the corner. He also thought the Panel's comments were valid regarding the floor-to-ceiling height of the institutional component. He explained they had thought the proposed setback from Oak Street was appropriate but they will take another look at it. They do not believe there is an adjacency problem between the east elevation at the Jewish Community Centre, but there may be an opportunity to provide more outdoor space in this location. Mr. Chiu also thanked the Panel for its comments. Regarding the architectural treatment of the corner, he noted that emphasis of the corner creates a challenging transition between the institutional and residential uses.

**3. Address: 3501 Euclid Avenue (Collingwood Village Lot ABC)**

DA: 403391

Use: Residential (4 and 17 storeys, 272 units)

Zoning: CD-1

Application Status: Complete

Architect: Architectura

Owner: Greystone Properties

Review: First

Delegation: Brian McCauley, Don Wuori, Glen Burwell

Staff: Bob Adair

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-0)****Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Bob Adair, presented this application in the Collingwood Village development. He described the context and the status of the surrounding Collingwood projects. The proposal is for a 17-storey tower with a 4-storey podium, and two 4-storey wood-frame buildings to the south. Staff are generally supportive of the proposal and concerns are at a detailed level. The areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought relate to the integration of the tower and the podium base, the expression of the low rise elements, the slope of the roof, the proximity of one of the components to the walkway, and the location of the children's play area in relation to the family units.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Brian McCauley, Greystone Properties, noted this project is the first in Phase 3 of the Collingwood Village development and the proposal is consistent with the guidelines established in the rezoning. Glen Burwell, Architect, noted they have tried to give this project a distinctive character. It is the first site which twists its axis relative to the local Collingwood axis and the major Vancouver axis. It is also the first Collingwood site which abuts existing single family housing to the south. Setbacks are larger on this site, especially along Euclid Avenue at 7 m and 5 m along Tyne Street. The colour palette is stronger and warmer than on previous buildings. Don Wuori, Landscape Architect, briefly reviewed the landscape plan.

**Panels Comments:**

Following a review of the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported this application and generally had very positive comments about the project. The proposed colour palette and the architectural expression were considered quite successful.

Panel members found the basic planning of the project to be very good and particularly liked the way the colliding axes of the site have been handled. As well, the way the circulation flows through the courtyard and across the top of the site has been very well done. The Panel thought the entry court on Euclid Avenue was very good, having a nice scale and providing a good introduction to the central courtyard.

The Panel supported the massing on the tower and the base. Some Panel members thought it could be improved if the corner element that picks up on the street grid could be a bit stronger and carried through to the south side of the building in some way so that it reads all the way through. There was support for this building being a bit different and memorable compared to other Collingwood projects which are fairly regular.

With respect to the 4-storey component, the Panel agreed that the eave line seems very continuous and uninterrupted. It was suggested there may be an opportunity to raise some sections and articulate the roof more. One Panel member felt that enclosing the balconies would improve the overall appearance of the building. The texture on the low rise could be refined somewhat, e.g., look at articulating the windows to add a level of interest to the elevation of the building. Overlook from the tower to the roof of the 4-storey was also a concern and the Panel urged that the roof either be landscaped and associated with an amenity space in the building, or ensure that the numerous vents and protrusions are adequately screened. The Panel had no problem with the roof slopes.

The Panel considered the relationship between the family units and the first-time buyers' units to the courtyard was acceptable, and had no problem with the proximity of the low rise to the walkway.

The landscape development addresses the issues that have been important to Collingwood Village, including individual entrances and ground oriented patio spaces, etc. Careful attention should be given to privacy issues to ensure there is sufficient planting and adequate separation. The Panel strongly supported the central green and the large children's play area. There was also strong support for the trellises and bird houses, etc. which add richness to the scheme.

The Panel recommended introducing some natural light into the upper floors of the low rise component by way of skylights, either in the units themselves or in the corridor space.

The Panel again questioned the necessity for a loading bay on this site. If it is required, the proposed solution was supported in that it minimizes any intrusion.