

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 25, 1998

TIME: N/A

PLACE: N/A

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Sheldon Chandler
Patricia Campbell
Per Christoffersen
James Hancock
Peter Kreuk
Sean McEwan
Jim McLean
Norman Shearing
Peter Wreglesworth

REGRETS:
Geoff Glotman
Joseph Hruda

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:**
Carol Hubbard

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	333 East Pender Street
2.	1010 Pacific Boulevard South

- 1. Address: 333 East Pender Street**
DA: Congregate Care Facility
Zoning: RT-3 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning
Architect: Isaac-Renton
Owner: Home Mutual Aid Society
Review: First
Delegation: Robert Isaac Renton, Pastor Stephen Lee
Staff: Eric Fiss

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

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, presented this application to rezone from RT-3 to CD-1, to develop a congregate care facility. The site, which is located at the edge of Strathcona, is currently vacant and used for surface parking. The issues identified by Planning relate to the variance from the baseline of the existing zoning on the site. Existing zoning permits density up to 1.0 FSR; the proposal seeks 2.67 FSR. Existing zoning permits up to 2 1/2 storeys; the proposal seeks four full floors. Yard relaxations are also sought. As well, the existing zoning has requirements for external design to maintain the character of Strathcona throughout the neighbourhood. The proposal is for a single room occupancy facility containing 114 beds.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Pastor Stephen Lee, Vancouver Chinese Mennonite Church, explained the need for additional congregate care beds in the area. To date, the neighbourhood has not been consulted with respect to this proposal. Bob Isaac Renton, Architect, described the design rationale, noting the built form is intended to reflect the character of the three adjacent houses.

The applicants left the meeting after their presentation and were not present for the Panel's commentary. It was noted the applicant should be made aware that no part of the Urban Design Panel review is in camera.

Panel's Comments:

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

The Panel supported the proposed use but had very strong concerns about the density. The application for rezoning was not supported.

The Panel was unanimous in the opinion that the density being sought is too excessive for this site. The building appears quite massive in relationship to the adjacent houses, and the form of the building at the zero lot line is intrusive on the street. The scale of the top of the building could be reduced by eliminating the cathedral ceilings. The base of the building needs to have much more of a residential character. The use of concrete at the lower level was questioned. It was suggested the bay be lowered and reduced in size so that the gable end has more presence at the top. A much greater degree of neighbourliness is called for, especially in the setbacks.

There was strong support for the roof terrace, although its relationship to the adjacent interior amenity space should be carefully reviewed. The balance between the amenities in the building and the scale of the rooms needs to be carefully considered. The lounges on levels two and three and the roof are very modest and will encourage most residents to go to level one. It was suggested that one elevator may not be enough for a building with 114 elderly residents.

The Panel expressed major concerns about the livability of the suites because of their layout and very small size. There were serious concerns that suites such as these could become substandard rental units. There is little evidence that this is intended as a congregate care facility, e.g., designed for elderly, frail residents and with nurses' stations, etc.

The Panel expressed serious concern that this proposal would become a model for redevelopment in the area. Given the history of the Strathcona area, it was strongly recommended that there be full neighbourhood input to determine the future of this site.

2. Address: 1010 Pacific Boulevard South

DA: 403063

Use: Residential (9s - 93u)

Zoning: CD-1

Application Status: Complete

Architect: David Yuen Simpson

Owner: Concord Pacific

Review: First

Delegation: Dane Jansen, Gerry Eckford

Staff: Jonathan Barrett

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

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this complete application for a non-market family housing development in the Quayside Neighbourhood. The proposal is for 97 family dwelling units and a daycare centre at the base. The form of development is as indicated at the rezoning stage. The issues identified for commentary by the Panel are fairly minor and relate to (1) the interface between the public and private realm and the relationship with the adjacent formal mews; (2) landscaping next to the Cambie Bridge; and (3) the architectural character, given its high profile location.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Dane Jensen, Architect, explained the design rationale and Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan.

Panels Comments

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

The Panel unanimously supported this application. There was strong support for the design with its incorporation of whimsical elements to make it a more interesting building.

With respect to the architectural treatment, the Panel found that echoing the Yaletown character on the Cambie Street side is quite successful. There was a recommendation to extend this treatment around to the north façade. If the roof treatment could also be extended it would go a long way to improving the Pacific Boulevard façade.

Concerns were expressed about the use of stucco on this building. It was recommended to consider an alternative façade treatment from the point of view of its long term durability and the context, although one Panel member also commented that it might be an interesting contrast to the surrounding glass and steel. Better quality material should certainly be considered at the entry to the building.

The Panel found a good relationship between the ground floor uses and the adjacent outdoor spaces. Most of the Panel's comments focused on the landscape treatment between the building and the bridge. It was strongly suggested to get some layering in this area, to add some verticality and provide better screening. The advisability of the double row of laurels was questioned, given the possibility of engineering work in the future. Some Panel members suggested continuing the fence element and adding planting to it to soften the structure. A general increase in the amount of trees would be helpful to the project.

There was strong support for the unit layouts which the Panel found to be well worked out and well suited for families.

A number of concerns were expressed about the drop-off for the daycare. It is potentially a very busy area and it should either be opened up more to allow the different functions to occur, or reconsider the daycare entry location. As well, the marina parking operation is unresolved and needs to be carefully considered.

With respect to the gateway to the mews, suggestions were made to make it stronger and to look at it in relationship to the neighbouring building rather than in isolation.

If the roof could be made a bit more interesting with the use of coloured aggregate and patterning it would improve the overlook from the neighbouring building.