

---

---

**URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

---

---

**DATE:** June 11, 2003

**TIME:** 4.00 p.m.

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Stuart Lyon, Chair  
Helen Besharat  
Jeffrey Corbett (excused Item #2)  
Bruce Haden (present for #1 and #2 only)  
Reena Lazar  
Brian Martin  
Kim Perry (present for #1 only)  
Sorin Tatomir (present for #2 and #3 only)  
Ken Terriss  
Mark Ostry  
Jennifer Marshall  
Eva Lee

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	950 Quebec Street
2.	1210 Seymour Street
3.	3831 Main Street

---

**Business**

## Procedure:

The Chair noted that when Panel members are giving their opinion on a project, occasionally statements are made to the effect that a member disagrees with the opinion of other member(s). It was suggested that this may not be helpful to applicants. Rather, it might be better just to indicate that a different opinion is held, before proceeding with the commentary.

## C-2 Zoning:

Reena Lasar sought confirmation of the status of the Planning Department's review of C-2 zoning. The Secretary will report back to the Panel at the next meeting.

## End of term critique:

Reena Lasar suggested it might be helpful if Panel members, at the end of their term, bring to the attention of the Planning Department any areas of concern or ideas to improve the process. In discussion, the Panel generally agreed that this would be a worthwhile exercise. Panel members will give further consideration to when and how this commentary might best take place, e.g., at the final meeting or at the changeover dinner. Ms. Lasar agreed to prepare a written proposal to present to the Panel for further discussion before the end of the year.

## Minutes:

Some discussion took place as to whether the April 30, 2003 minutes fully captured the Panel's commentary. There was also discussion about the timing of distribution of minutes in general. Panel minutes are typically forwarded to the Chair for approval within one week of the meeting. If possible, the minutes are included with the Agenda package for the next meeting. It was noted that, very soon after the minutes have been approved by the Chair, they are also posted on the City website:

***[www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/planning/udp/Udp.html](http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/planning/udp/Udp.html)***

---

1. Address:	950 Quebec Street
Use:	Residential
Zoning:	M-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Perkins & Co.
Owner:	Bosa Development Corp.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Nat Bosa, John Perkins, Larry Diamond
Staff:	Jonathan Barrett

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-1)

- **Introduction:** Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this rezoning application and briefly described the site context. The Panel first reviewed the application on April 30, 2003, when it was not supported. The Panel had four main concerns at that time, namely: the location of the tower; the height of the massing next to Millross Avenue which caused shadowing on the semi private open space; relationship with the lane (overlook, safety and security, containment of the courtyard); treatment of the facade and the overall character of the scheme. Mr. Barrett advised that significant changes have been made, including locating the tower 15 ft. farther to the west and lowering the massing on Millross Avenue by two storeys. As well, some detailed aspects of the lane have been addressed.

The Panel's advice is sought as to whether the earlier concerns have been adequately addressed in this revised submission, as well as comments on the general character intentions of the project and the landscape plan.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** John Perkins, Architect, described the revisions in greater detail and the applicant team responded to the Panel's questions.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel strongly supported this application and thought the applicant had responded well to the Panel's previous concerns.

The Panel strongly supported the revised siting of the tower. It was noted, however, that relocating the tower has created a privacy issue between the lower units of the tower and the live/work units facing Prior Street. To provide a more generous separation, a number of Panel members recommended eliminating a couple of units at the base of the tower and transferring the massing to the top. Adding height to the tower for this purpose was supported. Another suggestion was to add the massing above the double-loaded component, in the form of a single loaded floor to avoid casting shadow onto the courtyard. It was also recommended that the lobby and/or amenity space be opened up to the corner to take better advantage of the light and green space resulting from relocating the tower.

The Panel strongly supported the height reduction in the Millross component and its expansion to a corridor building which effectively addresses the shadowing issue and improves the livability of the courtyard. A recommendation was made to bring some daylight into the long corridor of the Millross building. Given that residents of the units at grade may install bars on the windows, at least in the bedrooms, one Panel member suggested designing them into the units from the outset. One Panel member welcomed the inclusion of ground level units suitable for seniors because they are in short supply in the city.

---

The Panel responded very positively to the landscape plan and supported the revisions. One Panel member suggested there should be a stronger link with the landscape of the previous CityGate projects.

With respect to the lane, it was noted it will set the standard for what will occur on the other side. One Panel member would have preferred the live/work units to be extended around to the lane. Another questioned the amount of pavement in the lane.

Some Panel members suggested exploring a different character for the tower. A comment was made that a character that is distinct from the other towers might be appropriate for this site given it is at the end of the block and next to the viaduct. Continuing the existing palette of materials and colours could be monotonous. The 5 - 6-storey street wall along Quebec Street is very appropriate but some Panel members thought the element towards Prior Street could be a bit weak at the parapet level. As well, it was recommended that careful consideration be given to the south wing as viewed from Main Street, to ensure that it does not appear as a back door.

**Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bosa advised they can easily switch units with the amenity space. Mr. Perkins thanked the Panel for the very good comments that will be taken into account as the project proceeds.

---

2. Address:	1210 Seymour Street
DA:	407602
Use:	Mixed
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Preliminary
Architect:	Davidson Yuen Simpson
Owner:	Barwel Enterprises Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Jim Lehto, Dane Jansen, Peter Kreuk, S. Brad Armstrong
Staff:	Anita Molaro

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT(9-0)**

- **Introduction:** Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this preliminary application to develop a 50 ft. wide site in the Downtown South (New Yaletown). The proposal is for institutional use to accommodate a social service centre on the first and second floor. The third floor is separate residential use. The institutional use is to accommodate street youth services already provided by Family Services of Greater Vancouver, including the current Street Youth Services at 1065 Seymour Street, and the Dusk to Dawn Program at St. Paul's Hospital, both of which will relocate to this facility. The programs include daytime drop-in, counselling, access to outreach nurses, and youth advocacy. The facility will also be a home-base for street youth workers. The facility will provide a safe and secure place for young people under 21 years, from evening to morning, with access to food, water, showers and counselling. The main floor will accommodate most of the street youth services and the second floor is mostly for administrative offices and meeting rooms. A number of outdoor spaces are provided for the institutional use, including a deck at the rear of the main floor and at the front, facing Seymour Street, set within the facade of the building and screened off. There is also a small outdoor area adjacent to the courtyard of the neighbouring Space residential building. Outdoor decks are also provided off the second floor. The third floor accommodates five small dwelling units, some of which also have outdoor spaces.

The overall density is 1.5 FSR; 1.0 for the institutional use and 0.5 residential. This site qualifies for a maximum of 3.0 or 5.00 FSR, depending on the use, and the proposed height of 41 ft. is well within the height limit of 70 ft. The Downtown South Public Realm treatment has been incorporated along the Seymour Street frontage. Staff have no major concerns with the overall form of development. The Panel's comments are sought in particular regard to how the proposal relates to the neighbouring Space building in terms of privacy and security. Comments are also requested on the facade treatment and the proposed metal screen separating the outdoor space from the street.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Dane Jansen, Architect, noted the ground floor will accommodate the most intensive programming of the facility. Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, advised the planting at the front is fairly defensive and intended to discourage the clientele from congregating in front of the building. Mr. Armstrong briefly described the programming and the applicant team responded to the Panel's questions. It was noted that Family Services of Greater Vancouver has been looking for suitable location for this project for some time in order to serve the street youth in the area.
  - **Panel's Comments:** The Panel unanimously supported this application and found it a handsome little building. It is a unique and important project that makes very good use of limited space. Some Panel members remarked that a small building such as this is a welcome change in the downtown.
-

The proposed use was considered commendable and highly appropriate in this location. Several Panel members recommended additional residential use on the site and strongly recommended that the parking regulations be relaxed to achieve it. Compliance with the Parking By-law is not an issue for this building given its use and proximity to public transportation. The applicant was encouraged to explore allowing for adding another floor in the future by ensuring the elevator shaft is high enough. Several Panel members thought the building could be higher and recommended that the City give the applicant the choice of increasing the FSR to 3.0 when funding becomes available.

The Panel saw no problem with the relationship to Space and thought that privacy and security issues were adequately addressed by the adjacent gap. One suggestion was to introduce some ground floor glazing, possibly glass block, if fire wall regulations allow.

Some areas were identified as needing further study and analysis, in particular the front street edge and the entrances. There were serious concerns that the screened porch area has the potential to be a problem area. One Panel member was concerned that it comes across as a bit of a cage. The detailing of the screen will need to be very carefully handled, and how the entry sequence is addressed will determine whether loitering occurs. Some Panel members encouraged the applicant to look at bringing the lounge and dining area out to the front and relocating the screened outdoor area to the south for better sun access. Another concern was that the vestibule area is too small for receiving and welcoming clients. As well, further thought needs to be given to the location of the canopies. It was also suggested that the exit doors on the Seymour elevation should be downplayed and the main entry made more obvious, without signage. One Panel member recommended that any signage should encourage more youth to enter the facility.

With respect to the interior of the building, there was a suggestion that some space might be gained by incorporating a scissor stair. There may also be the opportunity for more light in the central space with the introduction of a clerestory window.

With respect to the Seymour Street façade, some Panel members thought there needed to be better integration of the top floor, even setting it back slightly. Alternatively, to incorporate the residential floor more fully with the rest of the building. A comment was made that the top floor needs to be more carefully detailed to make it look a little less like social housing.

Several Panel members recommended eliminating the false front on the elevator tower.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Lehto thanked the Panel for the comments, particularly the strong support for the use and location. With respect to the front indoor space on Seymour Street, Mr. Jansen advised an earlier solution included internal lounge space but they have since attempted to pull it back in order to comply with the maximum permitted 1.0 FSR for institutional use. He concurred with the comments about the elevator tower. Mr. Armstrong added, the Panel's comments will be considered very carefully.

---

3. Address:	3831 Main Street
DA:	407525
Use:	Mixed (3 storeys, 6 units)
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Esther Csutkai
Owner:	Luigi & Rosa Fabbino
Review:	First
Delegation:	Eszter Csutkai, Luigi Fabbiano, Rose Fabbiano
Staff:	Bob Adair

---

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

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this application in the C-2 zone. The 60 ft. x 83 ft. site is located on the west side of Main Street, north of King Edward. The proposal is for a mixed use building containing retail and restaurant on the ground floor and three levels of artist live/work use above. Parking is underground, accessed from the lane. Materials are painted concrete with aluminum storefront windows, vinyl residential windows, steel canopy with plastic covering, and a metal roof on the rear elevation. Two conditional aspects of the proposal relate to the residential use and height. Currently, Council requires all C-2 residential applications to be reviewed by the Panel. Outright height in C-2 is 40 ft. which may be increased to 45 ft. where the cross fall of the site is 5 ft. or more and/or concrete construction is proposed. Concrete construction is proposed for this development and the site cross fall is 4.62 ft. With respect to the height, Mr. Adair noted the floor-to-floor heights are somewhat higher than typical given the proposed artist live/work use.

The Panel is asked to comment on whether the development earns the additional height, and on the standard of architectural design and materials. Issues identified by staff relate to the scale and proportions of the front facade and the glazing, and the dormer expression at the rear which also relates to height. Proposed FSR is 2.426, 1.7 of which is for the residential use above the main floor.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Eszter Csutkai, Architect, described the project in greater detail, and responded to the Panel's questions.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel did not support this application. The proposed use was strongly supported and the applicant was commended for responding well to the evolving nature of Main Street with the introduction of live/work studios. The majority of Panel members also supported the requested height relaxation. The Panel's concerns mostly related to issues of scale and proportion.

The Panel generally found the quality of materials to be very good and supported the proposed concrete construction. However, there were serious concerns expressed about the detailing and the interface between the concrete panels and the windows. One suggestion was to consider having the details cast into the concrete rather than applied. The Panel stressed that the quality of the detailing will determine the ultimate success of this building. One Panel member thought the colours could be more muted.

The proposed plastic canopy was not supported and the use of a glass canopy, perhaps sandblasted for opaqueness, strongly recommended instead. A sturdier canopy material will be easier to maintain as well as achieve the desired curvature.

The Panel's main area of concern related to the second level of the Main Street elevation which was thought to require significant design development. There was considerable discomfort with the shape and proportions of the curved windows. They don't seem to belong to the rest of the building and detract from the quality of the main floor retail windows. A comment was made that curved windows are more typically seen at tops of buildings (eyebrows) than in the middle. Given the large amount of glazing on the front façade, with very little solid wall, resolution of the details of the interface between the glazing and the concrete panel system will be extremely important to this project.

Most Panel members supported the rear dormers. They enhance the rear elevation and are an appropriate gesture to the adjacent residential neighbourhood.

The streetscape at the base was thought to be well handled and there were no serious concerns about the top floor. There was one suggestion that the Main Street cornice line appears to end too abruptly.

Some Panel members commented that the character of the front and rear of this building are totally different, suggesting there should be more integrity in the façade design.

Other comments/suggestions included:

- the common circulation areas inside the building seem very tight, especially compared to the very generous size of the units;
- consider taking the elevator to the third floor to facilitate the moving of materials, noting the proposed artist live/work use;
- there could be a CPTED issue at the rear stair on the lane;
- the lobby area seems very tight;
- question whether the second and third floor balconies are necessary;
- provide more counter space and a proper pantry in the kitchens;
- there seems to be no provision for dealing with signage;
- concern about how the 2 ft. front setback will be handled.

Several Panel members strongly recommended that the applicant use the services of a landscape architect noting that issues such as sizes of planters, drainage and irrigation are important aspects of the overall scheme. Paving materials, planting material and how they relate to the building, should be clearly identified.



[The Development Planner noted the City does not require a landscape architect for a project of this size. However, plans are required to a level of detail that includes plant lists, sizes and hard surface treatments. As well, the submission material will be reviewed by landscape staff.]

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Csutkai noted the 2 ft. front setback was introduced in response to an anticipated revision to the C-2 zoning.

Q:\Clerical\UDP\MINUTES\2003\jun11.wpd