
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 14, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Roger Hughes [Deputy Chair]
Lance Berelowitz
Tom Bunting
Alan Endall
Bruce Hemstock
Jack Lutsky
Brian Palmquist
Keith Ross
Sorin Tatomir

REGRETS: James Cheng
Paul Grant
Gilbert Raynard

**Acting Recording
Secretary:** M. Penner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1299 West Hastings Street
2. 395 West 5 th Avenue

1. Address:	1299 West Hastings Street
DA:	404821
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	First
Delegation:	D. Simpson, D. Stout, G. Hill
Staff:	R. Segal

EVALUATION: [7 - 1] Support

- **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, advised this project's market component would consist of rental and Social Housing in the Coal Harbour area. Mr. Segal referred to the previous March 8, 2000 UDP meeting Minutes, noting the Panel's comments and asked the Panel's advice on the Applicant's response to their comments/suggestions on the following:

1. whether the Hastings/Jervis Streets corner treatment had been resolved;
2. had the materials and colour palette been appropriately amended, i.e., more brick on the townhouse facades; and
3. had the townhouse expressions been strengthened on Hastings Street - increasing the massing of the low-rise aspect, etc.

Mr. Segal noted that while the Panel had sought strengthening of the townhouses via materials and massing, guidelines restricted the height to an elevation of 16.94 m [20 ft.], which had previously been negotiated with the City in order to preserve views for the neighbouring owners. He confirmed that in approving the preliminary application, the Development Permit Board [the Board] had agreed to consider height above 16.94 m on the proviso that consultation occur with the owner of the Evergreen Building, who had objected to a height increase. As a result of this height limit, the townhouses on Hastings Street would be limited to 2 storeys on the street level and 3 storeys facing into the lower courtyard.

Mr. Segal referred to the townhouses on the east side which have a 4 m setback [at the unzoned neighbouring Lot K], in compliance with the guideline's minimum setback, as per the Board's prior-to condition. He also pointed out that the proposed tower would be on axis with Cordova Street, making it a prominent site. He referred to the proposed landscaping at the Cordova/Jervis Streets corner, noting that the Board concluded in its preliminary approval that it best be appropriated as open space. Mr. Segal also confirmed staff's support of this project.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The Applicant noted the response to the that Panel's suggested treatment of the Jervis/Hastings Streets corner, and that the Cordova Street terminus of the tower had been more articulated. He also advised that the corner of Cordova and Jervis Streets had been expanded by combining the two loading spaces on Cordova Street.

Regarding some Panel Members' comments pertaining to lack of amenity space at the previous meeting, the Applicant reiterated that the community centre across the street and park-like surroundings would provide more than adequate amenities.

Mr. Simpson confirmed that brick would be pulled up to the parapet line on the townhouses. He referred to the tower top, noting the northwest corner portion of the mechanical penthouse had been glazed in order lend continuity in the facade; also, the balconies had been centred, rather than protruding at the corners. He felt response to the Panel's comments and suggestions had resulted in a sleek, simple tower.

- **Panel's Comments:**

Although some of the Panel felt the Jervis/Hastings Streets corner showed a marked improvement, others felt it could be more strongly articulated and sculptured; that it needed the architecture and landscaping to work more cohesively. In addition, landscaping could provide the northwest corner with a more public feel.

The Panel felt the tower base should be heavier, noting that at present, the tower lacked an articulated variation of ground, middle and top. Some Members felt the siting of the tower and townhouses lacked unity, and that the colour palette was monotonous. However, the Panel unanimously approved of the brick facades on the townhouses. Others noted that several end elevations of the townhouse rows, particularly the Cordova Street terminus facade, needed to be better articulated, given their prominence from the three streets. One Member suggested that the amenity areas could use canopies/aprons due to our inclement weather and that the patios needed cover; another felt the retaining wall could provide some seating and that the expression of the tower entries be enhanced. Regarding the townhouses, it was felt that the table top roofscape needed articulation by either extended parapets, etc., or segment them in order to provide variation.

The Panel felt the Applicant was not taking full advantage of the tower being on axis with Cordova Street. Although favourable comments were made regarding the re-situated balconies, it was still felt that the tower top required a more distinctive identifiyaty.

Mention was made that the facade on the shared property line was identical to the others and this treatment needed to be reviewed, as well as the setback.

The Chair's summation confirmed the Jervis/Cordova Streets corner would benefit from a bolder expression, perhaps a combination of landscaping and built form due to its significance.

It was felt the addition of the brick would be a definite improvement in the form of the townhouses, noting the simplicity of the form; however, a few Members thought there was insufficient articulation. Although the Panel felt the colour was monotonous, the richness of the natural materials would compensate for that; also, the expression of the townhouses

needed more articulation, as well as the tower entrances. Concern was voiced about the shared property line facade being identical to the other 3 street-bound sides, suggesting the Applicant respond differently to the east facade. The Chair added his own comment to the Panel's concern about the table-top roof of the townhouses, suggesting one small intrusion into the adjacent owner's view might be tolerated at that corner and that one would have to appeal to his sense of civic pride. The Panel stressed the importance of the Cordova Street tower facade at the corner and suggested this could be enhanced either by a single line from top to bottom or a more articulate tower top.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Simpson appreciated the Panel's input as well as their additional comments to further refine and revise some of the elements of this project.

The Chair called for the vote and advised the Application they had the support of the Panel.

2. Address:	395 West 5 th Avenue [Lookout Emergency Aid Society ("Lookout")]
Zoning:	I-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	John Currie Architect Inc.
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	First
Delegation:	J. Currie
Staff:	R. Whitlock, Rezoning Planner A. Molaro, Development Planner

EVALUATION: [8 - 0] **Full Support** - Rezoning and Form of Development

- **Introduction:**

The Rezoning Planner, Rob Whitlock, introduced this rezoning application which would replace the existing I-1 Industrial zone with a CD-1 Comprehensive Development district zone, to provide an emergency shelter and transition house on the northeast corner of West 5th Avenue and Yukon Street. He noted there were various industrial and business-serving operations, including auto repair and suppliers. Mr. Whitlock advised this non-market housing project would feature 37 short-term stay units [sleeping rooms] to house homeless persons, and 37 units for those requiring longer term housing. This facility would include a kitchen/dining area, lounges and a multi-purpose room. Twelve underground parking stalls are proposed with access from the north lane. Mr. Whitlock confirmed that the height of 13.5 m [44 ft.] and an FSR of 2.75 are well within the I-1 Industrial zoning limits [maximums: 18.3 (60 ft.) and 3.0 FSR, respectively].

Mr. Whitlock advised the most prominent office building to the southeast of this proposed project was occupied by an ICBC Claims Centre, as well as the Vancouver Police Department's Headquarters. He advised there was a minor component of recently-constructed artist live/work units between Yukon and Cambie Streets, as well as approximately 100 dwelling units in the adjoining I-1 Industrial area, and various commercial ventures to the west of this site, zoned C-3A.

Ms. Anita Molaro presented the form of development details, describing the 4-storey building with underground parking, having the main entrance located off Yukon Street, and providing handicapped access off West 5th Avenue. She referred to Mr. Whitlock's description of the long term non-market units [for durations of up to 1 year], adding that these units would be articulated with balconies. Ms. Molaro confirmed that the 37 short-term beds would be located at the rear of the building on the Main and 2nd Floors - some facing the lane, others would be looking into the courtyard, and that this project would be situated around an internal 50 ft. x 50 ft. courtyard, providing secure outdoor amenity space for the residents.

Ms. Molaro described this project as a simple building to reflect the industrial character of the neighbourhood with store-front openings to the main floor amenity and office areas, and that the proposed materials were concrete at the base of the building, metal cladding and brick [blending in with the nearby ICBC/VPD building].

Ms. Molaro stressed the special need for this type of housing, advised that staff supported the overall form of development and architectural expression, and asked Panel's advice on the following:

1. overall massing impact and architectural expression, which was well within the adjacent massing context I-1 zoning;
2. proposed materials; and
3. change of use.

In response to Panel's query regarding the change of use, Mr. Whitlock stated this rezoning was for a very specialized need of housing and would not serve as a precedent, nor impede on operational limitations in industry. He further explained that this proposal would replace an existing facility in Marpole.

When the proposed location was questioned, i.e., why not the Downtown Eastside - Mr. Currie noted this facility would house people from the temporary "Lookout" shelter in Marpole who would not wish to relocate to the Downtown eastside and the Society felt this to be an appropriate alternate location.

Mr. Whitlock confirmed the property is owned by the City of Vancouver, and would be leased to and operated by "Lookout".

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Currie referred to their difficult search for an appropriate location in Vancouver and felt this industrial edge which was well-serviced by transportation, available to outreach services on Broadway, close to downtown, as well as various take-out restaurants, indicated this to be an appropriate location. He concurred this was a complex use to insert in a residential area due to the clientele but felt having the VPD in close proximity would be an asset, and noted ICBC's full support for this facility.

Mr. Currie noted that their choice of materials had been dictated by the brick ICBC/VPD building and the industrial character in the area.

He described the sleeping rooms as being 100-125 sq. ft. and the long-term units in the range of approximately 350 sq. ft., contained in a repetitive format. They had attempted to add a residential-like element by the use of large glass openings and small balconies, and punched windows for the sleeping rooms in the back of the building; the ground floor amenity space would include offices, lounges, kitchen/dining services, located around an internal courtyard which would provide secure outdoor space for the residents. Their intent was to keep the long-term and sleeping room areas separate, with a common lobby; however, these plans were schematic at this point.

In conclusion, Mr. Currie hoped the presentation by Mr. Whitlock and Ms. Molaro, as well as the review of the model and posted drawings, had provided the Panel with a level of comfort regarding this proposed rezoning and form of development, without re-referral to Panel for

the Development Application.

In response to various questions from the Panel, Mr. Currie confirmed that the maximum FSR and allowable height had not been utilized due to the proposed 4-storey wood frame structure, with concrete base and didn't need to utilize the maximums. He confirmed there were no setbacks in I-1 zones, and the building line would be 4 ft. from the property line on Yukon Street which had been pulled back to allow for the 2 ft. balcony projections.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel was unanimous in its approval of the proposed use, location, form of development, the simplicity of the project, proposed materials, general treatment, and encouraged this project be expedited.

The Panel was also unanimous in their concern for the internal courtyard scale, i.e., depth, height, lack of sunlight, shadowing, perhaps requiring a stronger sense of connection to the outdoors by opening up the lobby with more glazing, enabling the residents to see out to the street. The majority of the Members suggested that in order to increase the courtyard size, the building could be pushed out to the maximum building line in order to maximize the building footprint. Some Members noted that although the balconies provide this project with some articulation, reducing the depths of these balconies from 4 to 2 ft. would add to the courtyard. They also felt the roof line and interior size of the building could be articulated more.

A Member felt the choice of materials was too close to that of the ICBC/VPD building and that this project should have a more residential appearance. Perhaps some outdoor seating at the Yukon Street sidewalk could be an added amenity. Others felt that although this was an industrial area, the proposed use was not and therefore an effort should be made to present a more residential look on the exterior, suggesting landscaping be incorporated with the architecture in the form of trellises, etc. A stronger elevation from a landscape point of view was also suggested.

The Chair reiterated the Panel's unanimous support for the use and massing, but stressed concern about the courtyard size. Although the Panel was supportive of the building form, they suggested some articulation of the interior roof line; the Members were split on increasing the courtyard size vs retaining some of the exterior, i.e. the balconies. The Chair noted his support for the retention of the balconies and the use of landscape elements to reinforce the residential character of this facility, even though it is in an industrial area, and that the Panel applauded the proposed quality of materials. With respect to a re-submission, the Panel was split.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Currie confirmed the Panel's concern about the courtyard size were valid and appreciated their alternative suggestions. However, as the sleeping rooms face the back and their adjacency to the courtyard, the privacy of those residents had to be considered. He also confirmed that although it may not show well in the model or the drawings, their intent was

to make that visual connection through from the street to the courtyard.

The Chair called for the vote and advised the Application he had full support of the Panel on the rezoning.

Q:\Clerical\NUDP\MINUTES\2000UDP\June14UDP.wpd