

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** July 5, 2006

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Nigel Baldwin (Chair)  
Albert Bicol  
Shahla Bozorgzadeh  
James Cheng  
Eileen Keenan  
John Wall

**REGRETS:** Walter Francl  
Margot Long  
Tom Bunting  
Bill Harrison  
Peter Wreglesworth  
C.C. Yao

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** D. Kempton

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 256 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Baldwin called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Address:         | 256 East 2 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue                               |
| DE:                 | 410276  |
| Use:                | Live/work   |
| Zoning:             | IC-3  |
| Application Status: | Complete  |
| Architect:          | Christopher Bozyk Architects                                  |
| Owner:              | Intracorp   |
| Review:             | First   |
| Delegation:         | Roger Koodoo, Tom Miller, Craig Taylor, Ed Craig, Peter Kreuk |
| Staff:              | Dale Morgan   |

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (5-0)**

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, presented this complete application for a live/work and residential development in the IC-3 zone along East 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. This steeply sloped site is located on East 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue west of Scotia Street. Mr. Morgan described the surrounding site context noting that to the east, there are three old timer buildings with some which have heritage character merit but are not on the heritage register. He also advised that the three buildings have a minimum setback from the side property line and there is an existing two storey wall which partially blocks views. Mr. Morgan said that Brewery Creek is included in this application passes through the neighbourhood; however the watercourse does not pass-cross this site.

Mr. Morgan advised that there are no design guidelines for IC-3 but there are external design requirements that are part of the IC-3 regulations. The use is conditional and the permitted height is 60 ft. outright with a permitted outright density of 3 FSR and up to 2.5 FSR for live/work. In IC-3 Mr. Morgan said that front yards are not permitted on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, side yards are not required and there is with a requirement for a 10 ft. rear yard setback requirement. rear yard and no sideyard requirements. The proposed height and exceeds the massing of this proposal is maxed out at 60 ft. maximum and projects, projecting beyond the envelope at the west end of the site.

The typical floor to floor heights are 10 ft. and 12 ft. at grade. Underground parking is provided for 138 cars, which is 14 spaces in excess of the requirement, and is accessed from the lane. There is no provision for outdoor amenity space, except at the gallery entrance. and Mr. Morgan advised that the live/work guidelines call for shared outdoor space.

Following the project description and overview of the material palate and landscaping, Mr. Morgan noted the following areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought:

- General scale, massing and neighbourly fit; specifically with respect to the treatment facing the adjacent dwellings to the east and south of the subject sitehouses;
- Comments on the interface with the street;
- Livability of units, noting the lack of outdoor amenity space;
- Comments on the lane treatment and specifically the driveway access location.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicants briefly described the design rationale and responded to questions from the Panel.
- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Scale and massing should respond better to the sloping grade on the street;
  - Revisit issues of natural light accessibility, ventilation and livability of the units, in particular the long narrow units exacerbated by ~~being north facing~~ east exposure with deep balconies.
  - Concerns about the long narrow hallways in general;
  - Have a more sensitive relationship to the ~~sloping topography site crossfall.~~ The suite entries below grade are not acceptable;
  - Concerns about possible CPTED issues with the deeply recessed common entry;
  - Create ~~more~~ outdoor amenity space.
  - Lack of an ~~nice~~ indoor amenity space aside from the gallery.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support this application and had a number of suggestions for improvement.

There were no concerns about the general materiality and balcony treatments which were generally well regarded.

The Panel generally thought more attention should be paid to the response of the scale and massing to the sloping grade of the street. The Panel also felt that the interface with the neighbours ~~needed~~ deserved further consideration and several options were suggested.

Design development to the lane elevation was recommended to add some screening to the parking access area. It was also suggested that the lane treatment itself could be more articulated and the patios could be further developed.

In terms of sustainability, the Panel felt that the ~~parti-suite layout concept~~ was backwards. ~~and that the~~ The long narrow units should be south facing and the shallow units should be north facing. The Panel was concerned about the livability of the dark, deep suites and noted that the bedrooms are at the back of the bottom floor suites.

The Panel felt that the long corridor on the top floor needed further consideration to create a sense of arrival. One Panel member suggested exploring opportunities for modulation to create a ~~front door type of space~~ for socializing.

With respect to amenity space, the Panel felt strongly that the basement exercise room would be underutilized due to lack of natural light or ventilation and that an outdoor amenity space should be developed. There were suggestions to allow roof access and possibly create a common area on the roof top and to consider developing the top floor walkway as a social spine.

Two Panel members thought that the gallery area could be improved by opening the wall between the gallery and the entrance to give it more transparency. One Panel member encouraged the applicant to consider providing additional amenity such as storage, back of house functions and a wet bar for the gallery space.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Taylor agreed with the livability issues addressed by the Panel; however he advised that the building is not purely facing north. Mr. Taylor said that there will be good morning light coming into the northerly facing units.

The applicant team responded to the Panel commentary and indicated where they might be able to make changes to the design. It was noted that this design is similar to the UNO building where the view is the amenity and the view is what makes the units livable. The applicant team indicated that they could resolve the outdoor amenity space concerns and added that the basement exercise room would also be a workshop space and that skylights and ventilation would be provided. In addition, the applicant team said they have considered using a glass wall in the gallery space and are sorting out the structural implications.