

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 11, 1998

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Sheldon Chandler
Patricia Campbell (excused #1)
Per Christoffersen (excused #4)
Geoff Glotman (present #1 and #2 only)
James Hancock (excused #3)
Joseph Hruda
Peter Kreuk (excused #2)
Sean McEwan
Jim McLean (present #1, #2 and #3 only)
Norman Shearing (present #1 and #2 only)
Peter Wreglesworth (present #1 and #2 only)

NON-VOTING MEMBER:
Denise Taylor-Ellis

RECORDING SECRETARY:
Georgia Dahle

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	2330 Kingsway
2.	3550 Vanness (the tower)
3.	777 Beatty Street
4.	1000 Robson Street

1. Address: 2330 Kingsway

Use: Mixed

Zoning: C-2 and RS-1 to CD-1

Application Status: Rezoning

Architect: Timothy Ankenman

Owner: Synergy Projects Ltd.

Review: First

Delegation: T. Ankenman, K. Noel, B. (Botley)

Staff: Rob Whitlock/Yardley McNeill

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-7)**Introduction:**

The Rezoning Planner, Rob Whitlock presented this rezoning project. Mr. Whitlock briefly described the history of the site, the surrounding area, and the current application. The applicant is proposing to keep the pub on site, but relocate it to the second floor of the building. This has been done to reduce the total number of licensed seats, and to make the pub into a more upscale establishment. Underground parking has been proposed that would accommodate the necessary requirements for both the commercial and the residential components of the development. Advice from the Panel is sought regarding several issues:

proposed overall FSR for the site;

redevelopment of the site is also a major concern;

the overall scale of the development and its compatibility with neighbouring properties;

residential livability of the proposal combined with the commercial and retail uses;

the residential portion of the development on 30th Avenue;

the lack of open space proposed;

the proposed Clarendon Connector, and the possible noise concerns that this connector would raise;

the drive-thru, on-grade parking for the beer and wine store;

the overall massing along Kingsway; and

the activity occurring between the lane and Nanaimo Street.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Timothy Ankenman, Architect, briefly explained the economic considerations regarding the overall proposal for the future development of the site and of the surrounding area. The two components that will be remaining are the pub and the beer and wine store. The pub will be changed to an upscale 125 seat establishment from the current 450 licensed seats. The beer and wine store will remain on the main level facing Kingsway. The attempt to integrate pedestrian activity throughout the site has also been focused on. The slope of the site causes serious grade concerns when considering the overall success and viability of a site such as this.

The massing on the corner of Kingsway and Nanaimo has been changed from the traditional four-storey C-2 massing style and has been broken up to mimic the sites geography and to ensure that

the views for the residential units remain. Mr. Ankenman further explained that no specific area of the proposal had been dedicated towards a public amenity space.

Panel's Comments:

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

The Panel did not support the application. There was a strong consensus for the overall scale, the character, and for the use of materials proposed for the site. The uses were generally supported, as many Panel members felt that this proposal was a significant improvement over the existing site.

Several Panel members felt that the density was justifiable for the overall site, but that the corner site was giving away too much density to the other parts. One Panel member suggested that any amount of density would be supportable, as long as other retail uses were approved for the site. It was felt by several members that the corner of Kingsway and Nanaimo should be more massive, that additional density should be added, and that the corner should be enhanced.

It was expressed by one member that the surface parking on the site should be covered to increase privacy for the residents facing the pub and the beer and wine store. It was also noted that according to the current dimensions, the overall livability would be difficult to achieve and should be reconsidered. A further livability concern was that of the motorcourt. It was felt that the increased evening activities would create an urban problem and not a solution for the neighbourhood.

Several Panel members suggested that a more defined open space be included in the drawings, and a method of achieving additional open space be sought for the southerly site. Although the lane between the site currently allows for some pedestrian movement, it was believed that increasing the overall public amenity for the residents and the surrounding neighbours would increase pedestrian movement through the site.

Parking on the site was also considered to be a problem for the future development. If the underground parking was extended to the west, it was believed that part of the concerns could be alleviated. Increasing the overall density of Kingsway was also recommended by some members, thereby allowing more residential units in the area.

Finally, there were strong concerns voiced over the proposed connector and the potential implications that could result from Council's approval of the project.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Ankenman indicated that prior to the applicant's submission, a neighbourhood open house had taken place to discuss the possibilities of the types of developments that could be constructed on the site. Neighbourhood support was indicated for the current proposal. It was felt that subdividing the site would be detrimental to the overall success of the development. One Councillor suggested that the beer and wine store be completely segregated from the residential component of the development, thereby reducing the livability concerns and increasing residential privacy. Covering the on-grade parking would actually increase the overall risks for security and safety and by doing so would increase the risk of break and enters and thefts.

2. Address: 3550 Vanness (the tower)

DA: 402724

Use: Residential

Zoning: CD-1

Application Status: Complete

Architect: Lawrence Doyle

Owner: Greystone Properties

Review: Second

Delegation: B. MacCauley, R. Patzer, M. Pez, L. Doyle, P. Kreuk

Staff: Yardley McNeill

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)**• Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Yardley McNeill, presented this application, referring to a model and posted drawings, seen previously by the Panel approximately one month ago. Ms. McNeill discussed the Panel's previous concerns regarding this portion of the site. The current proposal reflects the change of materials for both the fifth and sixth floors, as well as the redesigned cornice line. The loading bay has been relocated, as well as the relationship to the street front reconfigured. The skew of the building has also been reconfigured to reflect the comments made by the Panel. The tower has been moved five feet and grade access has been included for the ground floor townhouse units from the western portion of the public walkway. Organic paving methods for the entrance suites have also been added.

Ms. McNeill further explained that the original skew of the tower had created an inside knuckle that created some internal view issues, but had since been resolved. The average floorplate size remains consistent, and the inside units have been altered to address the concerns over privacy. The amenity area located on the podium roof had been increased for additional space. One final concern that remains outstanding is that of the hammerhead turn. Discussions are underway with Engineering in an attempt to have it removed.

• Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Brian MacCauley, the Architect, briefly described the history of Collingwood Village and of its intent to provide affordable rental housing to families in East Vancouver. Parking requirements have been reduced overall because of the reduction of vehicles and the increased use of Skytrain in the neighbourhood. Reducing the large U-shaped building scheme was an important consideration for the developer, as it would increase the livability for the suites and was otherwise difficult to accommodate housing with the previous style. At the previous meeting, discussions ensued with respect to the relocation of the underground parkade, but was later discovered that by doing so the overall public open space would be reduced. The entrance to the parking has been reduced, the loading area was redesigned with a more usable space, and combining the loading area with the outdoor play area for children could be achieved and made larger.

Larry Doyle, the Architect, briefly discussed the changes made from the previous meeting. Tower floorplates had been reduced to comply with the Guideline requirements. The massing had been increased at the lower portion of the building, and the remaining massing had been relocated to Gaston Street. Balcony elements have been increased to enhance the 4th floor and to ensure that a cohesive floor to floor succession for the podium suites be achieved.

Mr. Doyle stated that the glazed elements had been designed to contrast with the punched windows. The alteration of the on-grade entrances have resulted in an increase of studio units on the lower floors, and one-bedroom suites above the sixth floor. The 7th floor roofdeck has added additional landscaping, thereby allowing the roofdeck.

Mr. Kreuk, the Landscape Architect, explained the continuity of the surrounding parks with the on-grade suite entrances. As well, future common open space is being proposed for the tower and for the future mature building. The redesigned loading bay will reduce the overall asphalt surface area and increase the landscaping.

Panels Comments:

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

The Panel unanimously supported the application and commended the applicants on the changes made to the proposal in such a timely fashion. The relocation of the building has significantly improved the design and the slenderness of the building. The cornice line extension was seen as a positive aspect of the redesign, but suggestions that the line be strengthened to relate to the adjacent development were offered.

There was a concern from a Panel member that the privacy issue for the inside suite had not been adequately addressed and should be researched further. Another Panel member viewed the parking ramp as a problem, and suggested that additional consideration should be given to the overall location of the ramp.

Two Panel members felt that the roofdeck should be extended further to the 4th floor, and to increase the strength of the cornice line. One final concern was noted that the laundry room should be relocated closer to the children's play area, to ensure that the safety of the children was not compromised.

Support was indicated by one Panel member for the removal of the hammerhead.

-
3. **Address: 777 Beatty Street**
DA: 402400
Use: Hotel/Residential
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Complete
Architect: James Hancock
Owner: Gangley Trading Ltd.
Review: Second
Delegation: J. Hancock, C. Smallenberg
Staff: Mike Kemble
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

Introduction:

The Development Planner Mike Kemble, presented this complete application. The Panel supported the preliminary application in the summer of 1997 and it was subsequently approved in-principle by the Development Permit Board. Mr. Kemble reviewed the Panel's previous concerns and how this submission attempts to respond to those past concerns. With regards to the current proposal, the building has been recessed from Beatty Street to line up with the Georgian Court Hotel. The curtain wall expression has also been revised to include two different colours of glass, with a number of windows being introduced into the facade.

Mr. Kemble explained that both the vehicular and the pedestrian entrances had been altered, and that paving materials were of a high quality nature and used to respond to the pedestrian realm. The Robson Street entry has also been increased in scale. Landscaping of the roof has been increased over the loading area. Advice from the Panel is sought as to whether the changes have adequately responded to the requested changes from the Panel at the preliminary stage.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Mr. James Hancock, Architect, did not have any comments.

Panels Comments:

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

The Panel unanimously supported this application and complimented the applicant for the revised changes and the completeness of the submission. The revised relationship to the Georgian Court Hotel was seen as a significant improvement, and that the curtain wall expression was found also to be interesting.

There were several concerns still outstanding. The corner site was indicated to be an ongoing concern. One Panel member suggested that the front entrance should be relocated to Robson Street. Another Panel member felt that additional emphasis was required to the Robson Street portion, as it was considered to be a major thoroughfare within the city.

One final member suggested that additional recognition of the Terry Fox memorial be given and that landscaping for the hotel and the memorial should coincide more positively with the street trees.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Hancock stated that to alter the entrance to the development would limit the overall achievable height, as Robson Street is predominantly a two-storeys, while Beatty Street allows for higher developments.

4. 1000 Robson Street

DA: 402992

Use: Commercial

Zoning: DD

Application Status: Complete

Architect: W.T. Leung

Owner: Kwan Development Ltd.

Review: First

Delegation: W. T. Leung, B. Krause

Staff: Mike Kemble

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-2)**Introduction:**

Mike Kemble, Development Planner, presented this application which is located on the corner of Burrard and Robson Streets. He briefly reviewed the history of the site and explained that a 10% transfer of heritage density was being sought for the site, and subsequently, they were required to come before the Panel. The site is 'landlocked', with parking and loading constraints necessitating relaxations for this proposal. Two forms of weather protection features were being proposed; fabric awnings for Robson Street, and glass canopies along Burrard Street. The advice sought from the Panel is whether or not the current proposal provides the appropriate expression and massing required for this highly visible corner.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Mr. W. Leung, Architect, stated that as a true 'landlocked' site, this proposal was limited in the height and FSR that could be achieved outright without a rezoning application. The treatment of the two corners has been considered at great length and detail; Robson Street requires a more unique and modern look, while Burrard Street should enhance the crisper, more business-like atmosphere of the city. The curtain wall expression proposed on Burrard Street was done in an effort to increase the overall natural light in to the development. Relaxations for parking, garbage and loading were sought, as there is no lane or additional parking facilities on site. Mr. Leung explained that an effort would be made to ensure that the appropriate signage was installed, but stated that it would be difficult to regulate, as it would be solely dependant upon the tenant and the type of retail business that opened at the site.

Panels Comments:

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

The Panel supported this application and complimented the applicant on the elegance of the building, and the split personality of the Burrard and Robson Street facades.

Several Panel members believed that the corner deserved a stronger definition, with a larger building and additional density. Some members suggested strengthening the differences of the two streets by adding some height to the glazed curtain wall sections.

There was a general concern over the possible signage for the building. A suggestion was made that regulating the type and size of the signage could control what type of sign could be installed on the building. Discussion took place regarding the materials proposed, with some members recommending that a more tactile approach to the materials be taken.

The proposal was referred to several times as a 'jewel box' site, and should therefore, be reflected as such.

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Leung stated that his preference would have been to construct a larger building. Due to the regulations from the city, and the constraints from the site, it was not a feasible consideration at this time. Including the type of signage for the building would be difficult to incorporate into the proposal, as the tenant, not the developer would be applying to the city for the signage..