
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 24, 1999

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Roger Hughes (Chair)
Patricia Campbell
Sheldon Chandler
James Cheng (excused Item 2)
Per Christoffersen (present for Item 2 only)
Paul Grant
Sean McEwan (present for Item 2 only)
Keith Ross
Norman Shearing (withdrew from Item 1)
Joe Werner (present for Item 1 only)

REGRETS: Joseph Hruda
Gilbert Raynard

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 4500 Oak Street
2. 301 Jervis Street

1. Address:	4500 Oak Street
Use:	Hospital
Zoning:	CD-1 (Revised)
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Henriquez and Partners
Owner:	BC Women's & Children's Hospital
Review:	First
Delegation:	Ivo Taller, Jane Durante
Staff:	Ralph Segal/Rob Whitlock

EVALUATION: Master Plan: DEFERRED Phase 1: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** The Rezoning Planner, Rob Whitlock, presented this proposal for a Master Plan Update for the Children's and Women's Centre and Phase 1 of the development comprising the ambulatory care building, extension of the emergency department of the Children's Hospital, a small psychiatric addition and extension of the Women's Hospital.

The site is bounded by Oak and Heather Streets, 28th and 32nd Avenues. Existing density on the site is 0.616 FSR for hospital uses and 0.25 FSR for parking. The proposal is to update the by-law and convert the total FSR to hospital use at 0.85 FSR, with parking and underground mechanical excluded from FSR, similar to other zoning districts. If the Master Plan proposal does not meet with Council's approval, the applicant proposes to seek an increase in FSR to 0.70 to allow for the phase 1 development.

The principal issue for staff and Council relating to this site over the last twenty years has been strong concern within the surrounding community for continued expansion of the on-site facilities. Currently Council has policies in place which place a moratorium on rezonings in the surrounding RS area to allow hospital-related uses such as medical offices. Current Council policy with respect to the site itself is that further changes to the development on site should comply with the existing CD-1 by-law. The proposed master plan is seen as the mechanism for allowing redevelopment over the next twenty years. Council will be seeking the advice of the Panel and the Planning Department on the comprehensiveness of the master plan and management of impacts on the surrounding community. Parking and traffic studies are underway by the applicant.

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, reviewed the master plan model, noting the minimizing of development on the RS-1 edges of the site and options for retaining heritage (post-1940's) buildings. New buildings will be concentrated on the Oak Street side and an attempt has been made to achieve some coherency to the site plan. The proposal includes the creation of a quadrangle with parking beneath. While the master plan encompasses a twenty year period, staff believe it provides sufficient structure within which to consider the proposed phase 1 development. Mr. Segal then reviewed the phase 1 proposal, noting the issues for the neighbourhood are traffic and parking. Staff have no major concerns with respect to the building design for phase 1.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Ivo Taller, Architect, briefly described the history of the site and reviewed the proposal, noting they think they will be able to save the older buildings in this plan. The Landscape Architect, Jane Durante, stressed the legacy of the handsome mature trees and other greenery on the site, as much as possible of which will be maintained and, over time, enhanced. She briefly reviewed the landscape plan, noting the improved access and creation of a pleasant environment for patients and their families, and hospital staff.

- **Panel's Comments:**

Master Plan Proposal

The majority of Panel members thought there was not enough information to be able to comment effectively on the Master Plan proposal. The lack of a traffic study was of particular concern. The quadrangle concept and general organizing principles were generally supported and should be pursued.

However, a clear strategy should be shown for the edge treatment (all sides), as well as a clear indication of how vehicular and pedestrian traffic moves through the site, with updated information provided on traffic patterns as each phase proceeds. There also needs to be a strategy for heights of buildings (scale and datum lines for the massing). Site coverage might also be a consideration.

Some concern was expressed about providing commentary on Phase 1 while deferring the Master Plan; however, the majority felt prepared to proceed with Phase 1. By a vote of 5-2, the Panel agreed to defer the Master Plan and proceed with Phase 1. One Panel member, who subsequently withdrew from the meeting on this item, felt there was enough information to comment on both the Master Plan and Phase 1, but thought that deferring the Master Plan and commenting on Phase 1 was inappropriate.

In discussion, the applicant advised the traffic study material should be available within a few weeks. Mr. Taller added, phase 1 must be opened in January 2001. A development application will be submitted in May 1999 and a building permit applied for in September in order to break ground by November 1999 at the latest.

Phase 1

The Panel unanimously supported this application. The Panel found the building architecturally interesting and supported its simplicity of form and the minimalist approach to the materials used. The treatment of the building edge in terms of its transparency and relationship to the future quadrangle was also supported.

Several Panel members commented that the proposed form seems more appropriate than the existing massing on the site, and it could be the start a good trend away from the more suburban forms. There was, however, a recommendation from one Panel member to try to create a massing relationship to the existing children's hospital, noting the strength of the new design could serve to emphasize the inadequacies of the older building. An important aspect of the Master Plan will be to create a hierarchy of form as a framework for dealing with future developments. As a first phase, the Panel considered this building appropriately located. Its relationship to the existing hospital is good and the connection to the emergency is well done. There was strong support for the weather protection at the emergency entrance as well as for the proposed activities that will add a level of interest to this area

There were a number of concerns expressed about how the traffic will be managed. Conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the emergency drop-off were noted in particular, with problems relating to orientation and legibility, and in general how people will find their way around.

There was strong support for the quadrangle as the major hub for the site. Given its importance, it was stressed that the water feature in the centre should make a significant contribution to defining it as an entrance and as a very important space within the hospital campus.

There was support for the emphasis on public open spaces, with some concerns expressed about ensuring the playgrounds are appropriately located. Attention should also be given to the relationship between indoor and outdoor waiting areas.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Taller noted this is a very complex site with approximately 20 buildings over 45 acres. The emergency building cannot be moved because changing its location would be too costly. Fire access requirements also impose some restrictions. "Layering" of traffic is impossible to achieve; however, most of the traffic problems can be alleviated by routing the traffic around the future quadrangle and handling the ambulance traffic at the same time. Mr. Taller noted that some of the issues raised by the Panel have already been addressed.

2. Address:	301 Jervis Street
DA:	403667
Use:	Residential (29 storeys, 87 units)
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete after Preliminary
Architect:	James Cheng Architect
Owner:	Hillsboro Investment Ltd.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	James Cheng, Jones Lee, Chris Phillips
Staff:	Mike Kemble

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Mike Kemble, Development Planner, presented this application. The Panel unanimously supported the preliminary submission on November 4, 1998. The Coal Harbour ODP and CD-1 Guidelines apply to this site which is at the foot of Jervis Street. Some key requirements relate to street end views, and tower width, height and location. There is also a requirement for retail at grade along the walkway, previously shown as residential. The Panel's concerns about the preliminary submission included the treatment of the right-of-way and vehicular and pedestrian access, the grade level relationship to the adjacent parks, treatment of the south façade, and treatment of the top of the tower. Mr. Kemble briefly reviewed the applicant's response to the previous concerns and noted the following areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought on this complete submission:
 - Jervis Street right-of-way treatment, vehicular and pedestrian access, and the number of crossings;
 - the tower base and its integration with the adjacent open space;
 - general tower massing and tower top treatment;
 - landscape treatments, both private and public open space.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** James Cheng, Architect, reviewed the response to the Panel's previous comments, including the façade treatments. He noted the retaining wall belongs to the adjacent property. It is intended that some form of public art will be incorporated on the site. With respect to the grade level use, Mr. Cheng explained they intend to seek an amendment to the ODP to permit residential at grade rather than retail which they do not believe will be viable in this location. It is currently shown as retail in compliance with the ODP.
- **Panel's Comments:** Following a review of the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported this complete submission and commended the applicant on a very thorough response to the issues raised previously. All the areas of concern have been very well handled.

The Panel was satisfied with the treatment of the right-of-way and the Jervis Street access, and agreed with the applicant's rationale. There were no concerns with having three crossings in this case, given it is a dead-end street. There was a suggestion from one Panel member to consider lessening the sense of the width of the curb cuts by strengthening the pedestrian feel. The sidewalks on either side of the right-of-way don't seem to flow very well into the opening into the outlook and might be improved by

creating more of a funnel effect. Another comment about the treatment of the crossings was that because the pedestrian walkway is essentially a drive aisle, consideration might be given to eliminating the sidewalks and bringing pedestrians through the pedestrian link. In this way, the crossings would be creating “islands” within the auto/pedestrian court. The use of paving for visual demarcation purposes was highly commended. These kinds of subtle treatments are an excellent approach and really complement the site.

The ground plane treatment on the south side facing the park is very good. On the north side, the Panel endorsed the parallel private pathway as being an appropriate solution.

The Panel agreed with the applicant’s proposal to seek a Text Amendment to permit residential instead of retail use along the seawall edge. The opportunity for live/work with office potential to animate this part of the seawall was noted. If the use is changed to residential consideration should be given to providing the same landscape treatment as the north elevation.

With respect to the tower base, there was a comment that the Juliet balconies may be a little too literal and traditional compared with the design of the rest of the building. The Panel strongly endorsed the choice of materials and the colour palette. On the northeast shoulder of the building, one Panel member suggested it might be better to have the return in limestone rather than the zinc. Attention might also be given to the scale of the punched windows in the limestone façades and consider treating them in a similar way as those at the penthouse level, with a reveal which creates a subtle shadow line.

It was suggested by some Panel members that the curve of the westerly façade could be too subtle to be worthwhile.