

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** March 28, 2007

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

**PLACE:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
John Wall, Chair  
Maurice Pez  
Douglas Watts  
Richard Henry  
Bill Harrison  
Martin Nielsen  
Mark Shieh

**REGRETS:** Mark Ostry  
Walter Francl  
Albert Bicol  
Tom Bunting

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. SEFC 2A Parcel 4: 1598 Columbia Street
-

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Wall called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There being no New Business the meeting considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: SEFC 2A Parcel 4: 1598 Columbia Street  
DE: 411068  
Use: Two residential buildings of 8 and 9 storeys with 2 levels of underground parking  
Zoning: CD-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: Erickson/Milkovich/Doyle  
Review: Second (First review: Feb 14, 2007)  
Delegation: Nick Milkovich, Roger Bayley, Peter Kreuk  
Staff: Scot Hein

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

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application for Parcel 4 in South East False Creek which is to be an all residential parcel on the waterfront. Mr. Hein reminded the Panel that this was the third time before the Panel. The first time the project received non-support for 8-9 storey split with the Panel giving good advice on the massing, scale and the courtyard. The second time was a workshop and the applicant took the advice from the Panel and will be applying for Text Amendment for the 12-7 storey split. The height is consistent with the back row of the development. Mr. Hein stated that the scheme works within the height envelope that was set in the zoning.

Mr. Hein noted there is an updated Master Plan for the whole of SEFC and a working drawing of the park adjacent to the site as well as the information on Parcel 11 (Community Centre) with the three dimensional model which will be going to the Development Permit Board in two weeks.

The advice of the Panel was sought specifically on the following:

- 1) general advice on the response to the form of development;
- 2) advice on the envelope strategy which has taken on an interesting and challenging parti;
- 3) advice on the ground plane, the interface at the perimeter with the ground oriented units and the courtyard and the relationship to the view corridor.

Mr. Hein advised the Panel that the proposal will come back to the Panel after they have gone to the DPB. This will give the applicant adequate time to work out the envelope strategy.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**  
Nick Milkovich, of Nick Milkovich Architects Inc., described the submission in further detail. He described the design evolution since the proposal was last seen by the Panel. The suite layouts are the same with four suites per floor. At the ground level, the amenity space looks into the courtyard.

Peter Kruek, Landscape Architect, noted the landscaping is similar to the previous scheme. There is a simple reflective water feature with some moving water. Water will be recycled rainwater and will be stored in cisterns for both the water feature and irrigation. Bamboo groves will be planted on either side of the water feature. The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects:**
  - Some concern around the success of using the proposed cladding system;
  - Concern about the capping of the building that's responsive to the overall form;
  - Consider engaging the public in the landscaping courtyard through light, fountains or an active edge;
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel unanimously supported the proposal and was excited about the project and how it had evolved with the redistribution of the massing and thought it was an elegant solution. A couple of Panel members thought the smaller building was more successful in terms of its scale and massing but thought the changes had reduced the overshadowing on the park.

Several Panel members had concerns with the units coming to the ground on the north side of the west building as they thought it was too close to the public realm. The buffer doesn't seem big enough and the ground floor units could have little privacy as well as security issues. It was suggested that the landscape buffer be increased or the building inched back.

Several Panel members noted that the success of the building was dependent on the quality of the building envelope detailing. There was some concern over the "achievability" of the skin and noted the east elevation of the tall tower could be a problem if not done well. One member asked the applicant to consider how the little bits of roof up the building would work.

A couple of Panel members agreed with the applicant's proposed idea of a fish scale style of a cladding system as it will add a textural value to the skin of the building. One Panel member hoped there would be some flexibility to allow the architects and the developer around the use of the curtain wall. A couple of Panel members thought the parapet didn't quite fit on the top of the buildings.

One Panel member thought the simple, curving gestures around the pools in the landscaping was more sculptural. Several Panel members encouraged the applicant to allow as much of an interface for the public as possible even if they can't access the courtyard. It was suggested that more interactivity could be added to the public realm and to create places of discovery along the water's edge. Several members commented that the landscaping was bold with the integration of the water noting that how the water worked would be important to the project. One Panel member thought the public face of the pool at the north side was tight given the bike path crosses the access plaza. A couple of Panel members suggested shifting the walkway near the western pool over to the main walkway which would give more of a private space to the amenity rooms rather than a walkway.

One Panel member thought it might not be the best solution to have the amenity space on the corner and suggested having something more engaging for the public.

One Panel member thought the project would have some interesting plays of light and shadow as a result of the level of detailing. The Panel agreed that it was crucial that the detailing be done correctly in order to add to the richness of the building.

The Panel agreed that the project was beautiful and will be a signature building on the waterfront in False Creek.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Milkovich thanked the Panel for their comments. He said he agreed with most of what was said noting the project has been challenging.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.