DATE:	June 16, 1999	
TIME:	4.00 p.m.	
PLACE:	Committee Room #1, City Hall	
PRESENT:	MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL: Roger Hughes (Chair) Patricia Campbell James Cheng (excused Item #2) Per Christoffersen (excused Item #1) Paul Grant Sean McEwan Gilbert Raynard (excused Item #1) Norman Shearing	
REGRETS:	Sheldon Chandler Joseph Hruda Keith Ross	

RECORDING SECRETARY: Carol Hubbard

Joe Werner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- 1. 4750 Arbutus Street
- 2. 1030 Pacific Boulevard
- 3. 4542 West 10th Avenue

1.	Address:	4750 Arbutus Street
	DA:	403590
	Use:	Residential (4 storeys, 101 units - rental)
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Paul Merrick Architect
	Owner:	Arbutus Gardens Holdings Ltd.
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Paul Merrick, Graham Fligg, Cam Halkier, Bruce Hemstock
	Staff:	Ralph Segal, Laurie Schmidt

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced this application. The Panel saw the proposal at the rezoning stage, in February 1998. The subject application, a rental building fronting on Arbutus Street, is the first in a series in this phased development. This building will replace an existing building of approximately the same footprint. The intent is that over a seven year program all the existing buildings on the site will be replaced by a range of built forms. 92 percent of the existing trees will be retained. Staff consider the project is progressing satisfactorily. As well as general feedback, the Panel's comments are sought on the proposed concrete base wall.
- Applicant's Opening Comments: Paul Merrick, Architect, noted the site is considerably constrained in the interest of retaining and working around as many of the trees as possible. In replacing each component, its successor has been reshaped to better manage the space between the buildings. Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, noted there is significant landscape treatment in front of the concrete wall so it will have very little impact.
- **Panel's Comments:** Following a review of the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel generally supported this project and particularly liked the campus approach and the way it knits with the existing landscaping. The detailing was also very well received.

The Panel noted the landscape is an important aspect of the scheme and applauded the efforts to save the existing trees, which reinforces the campus atmosphere of the site. With respect to the edge treatment on Arbutus, there was a recommendation to consider berming or other noise attenuation devices.

The Panel supported the proposal for the entry and strongly endorsed the drop-off as an important asset to a major project such as this. Given the nature of Arbutus Street it will be a welcome addition and will contribute to the street's pedestrian quality. One Panel member questioned whether the 12 ft. width of the drop-off was sufficient.

There were no concerns about the concrete wall.

The Panel's main concern related to materials. As the first component on the site, this project should set the tone for future developments and reflect the quality of materials that will be used in subsequent

buildings. Of particular concern was the proposed asphalt shingle roof, noting it will be overlooked by residents of surrounding buildings. It was stressed that this rental building should not set itself apart from its neighbours. One Panel member also thought there should be more rental units on the site and that the project would be stronger from a community point of view with more rental housing available.

• Applicant's Response: Mr. Merrick acknowledged the Panel's comments regarding materials. With respect to the roofs, he said they will not be dominant but will, of course, be seen by adjacent neighbours on higher floors. The Panel's interest in street trees is well taken. While not part of the subject proposal, Mr. Merrick noted that about three quarters of a million dollars will be allocated to public art in this project, and one item for consideration in this respect is a green sculpted wall on Arbutus.

2.	Address:	1030 Pacific Boulevard
	DA:	403987
	Use:	Residential (34 storeys, 396 units)
	Zoning:	CD-1
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	James Cheng Architect
	Owner:	Concord Pacific
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	James Cheng, Jane Durante, Fred Roman
	Staff:	Jonathan Barrett, Laurie Schmidt

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application. The area was first rezoned in 1993 and re-zoned in February 1996. The proposal comprises two market residential towers (34 and 24 storeys) and townhouse forms. Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the urban design concept for the area. Two changes have occurred since the rezoning: one tower has been increased to 24 from 22 storeys, and the townhouse lower form has been reduced from 3 to 2 storeys. The Panel's comments are sought on the appropriateness of these changes in terms of the scale relationship on Pacific Boulevard. In addition, there is a certain stepping in the first few blocks which is not shown for these towers. The advice of the Panel is also sought on how the development meets the public realm.
- Applicant's Opening Comments: James Cheng, Architect, briefly reviewed the design rationale. With respect to the treatment of the top of the towers, they believe the neighbourhood needs more diversity within the family of towers. With respect to the massing on Pacific Boulevard, the intent is to create more of a residential scale. There will be a public art component in the project. Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, briefly described the landscape concept and Mr. Cheng described the materials.
- **Panel's Comments:** After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported this application. It is a very well designed project that is working well.

There was general support for the interface with the public realm, with one comment about a weakness on Marinaside Crescent where the geometry might not be tying in as well on this project as on other projects.

The Panel strongly supported the tower massing as proposed, and liked its strong, simple statement, without stepping. The towers are very elegantly designed, they have a very streamlined quality and come to the ground very nicely in places.

With respect to the height of the townhouse form along Pacific Boulevard, one Panel member thought it was too understated and needed more height, trading some of the massing from elsewhere. However, the majority of Panel members supported the proposed lower, two-storey element and

increasing the height at the corners to 3 - 4 storeys to emphasize the mews. It will also help the relationship to the non-market housing to the east and the future non-market housing to the north. As well, there was one comment about a weakness in how the knuckle of the low rise relates to the podium, which it was suggested perhaps another storey would could help resolve.

With respect to materials, the Panel welcomed the diverse and colourful palette while maintaining some family relationship to the other projects in the area.

The landscape plan was well supported, with one suggestion that perhaps the jungle theme could be extended and integrated into the play area with more imaginative play opportunities. There was also a recommendation to consider the penetration of sunlight into the play area as a result of the 4-storey element at the front.

3.	Address:	4542 West 10th Avenue
	DA:	404134
	Use:	Mixed (4 storeys, 19 dwelling units)
	Zoning:	C-2
	Application Status:	Complete
	Architect:	Rositch Hemphill & Assoc.
	Owner:	United Pacific Dev. Corp.
	Review:	First
	Delegation:	Keith Hemphill, Wendy Armstrong-Taylor
	Staff:	Anita Molaro

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

• Introduction: Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application. In accordance with Council's instructions, this C-2 application is before the Panel for advice on architectural quality. The site is located mid block on the south side of West 10th Avenue, between Sasamat and Tolmie Streets. The block is zoned C-2, and has RS-1 zoned single family houses across the lane. C-2 zone permits residential as a conditional use and an FSR up to 3.0. The proposal is 2.9 FSR, 2.5 of which is for residential. The site is 80 ft. x 122 ft., sloping down from south to north. The proposal is a mixed use project with four commercial units on the ground floor and three floors of residential above plus two residential units at grade off the lane. The residential parking entry off the lane. The building has a flat roof with an articulated cornice line, and has a three-storey expression with the 4th floor set back. Materials include architectural concrete at the base and brick above. The proposed height is a little over 43 ft. Maximum height in C-2 is 40 ft., but the guidelines allow for a marginal height increase for concrete construction providing views and overshadowing are considered. The building is organized around a courtyard.

The Panel's advice is sought on the architectural design, materials, form and massing, height, streetscape response, the rear elevation, circulation, landscaping and the courtyard.

- Applicant's Opening Comments: Keith Hemphill, Architect, briefly reviewed the project. He stressed it is a high quality project with concrete construction and a highly articulated principal façade. They believe the courtyard concept is a good alternative to an internal corridor scheme, noting that unit planning is usually very difficult in C-2 projects because of the depth of the sites. All the units in this proposal have access to outside balconies so the courtyard is not their only source of outdoor space.
- **Panel's Comments:** Following a review of the model and posted materials, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported this application. It is a handsome building that will enhance the streetscape on 10th Avenue. In general, the Panel thought the scheme was a good point of departure for a C-2 project. The concrete construction was strongly supported.

The Panel had no problem with the slight overheight given that it relates to an architectural appurtenance. One Panel member suggested there may be some flexibility to bring the height down by reducing the extra height in the floor-to-floor dimension.

The Panel liked the variety of storefronts on the street elevation, although it was felt that because the first floor is at 14 ft. 6 in., the canopy might be too high. It was recommended bringing the canopy out further into the street and lowering it to ensure better weather protection.

It was felt more needed to be done to the side walls, particularly the west elevation given the adjacent building is likely to remain for some time. It was recommended to let the brick turn the corner, using concrete block for the remainder, without painting. Another comment was that the cornice should turn the corner in a more elegant way.

There was a recommendation to consider lowering the balcony upstand on the second floor to improve light penetration for these north facing units.

The Panel strongly supported the rear elevation and appreciated that the attention given to this elevation will considerably improve the outlook for the neighbours across the lane. The Panel also endorsed the residential units on the lane, although there was a recommendation to review their layout because the restrictions caused by the loading bay and parking access have resulted in them being somewhat contorted.

The Panel found the central courtyard to be an interesting and innovative solution for this C-2 site which has facilitated the overall planning of the units. The Panel considered the units to be very well designed and offering a high degree of livability. The Panel thought the size of the courtyard was reasonable. There was a recommendation to modify the upper edge to allow greater light penetration, and to take into consideration possible privacy impacts resulting from the configuration of the walkways. There was a concern about the upper south edge of the courtyard, with a suggestion to somehow slide it back, pulling back the parapet and master bedrooms slightly to open up the courtyard more. There were some suggestions for the courtyard treatment, including lining it with glass block to create a central lantern, and doing the walkways in steel for a filigree effect.

Overall, the Panel found the architectural design and the materials to be of very high quality.

• **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Hemphill noted the guidelines recognize that when a site is sloping it generates many problems. The loading bay does set the height of the second floor slab. The only part that technically generates an overheight is on the corner because of the slope of the site.