
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: March 8th

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
J. Hruda [Chair] [first 3 Items]
P. Campbell [left at 6:00 p.m.]
J. Cheng
P. Christoffersen
P. Grant
R. Hughes [Deputy Chair for Item 4]
S. McEwan [Deputy Chair for Items 5 and 6]
G. Raynard
K. Ross
N. Shearing

REGRETS: J. Werner
S. Chandler

**ACTING
RECORDING
SECRETARY:** M. Penner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1299 West Hastings Street
2. Broadway & Commercial Rapid Transit Stations
3. 2799 Yew Street
4. 1304 Seymour Street
5. 2626 Watson Street [230 West 10 th Avenue]
6. 2102 West 36 th Avenue

1. Address:	1299 West Hastings Street
DA:	404821
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Preliminary
Architect:	Davidson Yuen Simpson
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	First
Delegation:	David Simpson [DYS], Bob Nicklin [Affordable Hsng], Dick Stout [DYS]
Staff:	Mike Kemble [for Ralph Segal]

EVALUATION: [9 - 0] FULL SUPPORT**• Introduction:**

Mr. Kemble introduced this project by referring to two models - one for the project site, the other for the Coal Harbour context. This site fronts onto three streets - West Hastings, Cordova and Jervis Streets. This proposal is for a 30-storey residential tower consisting of two components: a market rental and a non-market. The non-market units will be at the base as well as the 30 townhouses around the edges of the site - for a total of 112 non-market units, and 171 market units in the upper portion of the tower. Overall density proposed is roughly 4 FSR; however, the applicants are proposing a slight increase in density, which will require a text amendment. The guidelines limit the tower height to 81 m (266 ft.). The tower's dimensions are below guideline maximums; i.e., the base width is 27.5 m and upper portion of the tower about 24.5 m, and the tower will also be slimmer. Vehicular access is provided from the north side off Cordova Street, with at grade loading near the tower entrance. He further described this project as having two completely separate lobbies - one for the non-market rental component from Cordova Street, and non-market access will be from Jervis Street. Also proposed is a green courtyard space on the south side of the building, providing a tot lot, with the older children's play area towards the middle.

The proposed amenity space located on the ground floor, approximately 2,000 sq. ft., includes the BC Housing amenity space facing southeast, and rental amenity space facing north at the lobby.

Mr. Kemble also described the various existing developments in the area, as well as proposed future developments. Mr. Kemble described the Harbour Green Neighbourhood's extensive guidelines, noting the key ones affecting this project area: required continuity of low-rise buildings defining the street edges, orientation of the tower's axis to be perpendicular to Hastings Street, maximum tower height is 81 m, limiting townhouse heights to two storeys along Hastings and Jervis Streets in order to preserve views, and maximum tower floor plate specified in the guidelines of 625 m² similar to the floor plate allowable to the north. The tower massing covers 4 zones: (i) street-based zone up to the 3rd storey; (ii) the terraced zone which can extend up to 12 storeys; (iii) a main tower zone; and (iv) the tower top zone, in order to present a more expressive top treatment in possibly stepping back at the top, or change of materials.

Materials and finishes have not been finalized at this stage; at present the suggested materials for the townhouses is a combination of brick and stucco, and coated concrete for the tower with glass walls and metal railings.

Mr. Kemble asked for the Panel's comments on the following:

1. Street base treatments:
 - interface at the east property line;
 - open landscaped corners at Cordova and Hastings Street;
 - extent of townhouse base.
2. Tower orientation and massing:
 - response to Jervis Street, and towers north of Cordova Street;
 - treatment of the tower top.
3. Landscaping and open space treatment
 - shifting of sunken courtyard to the east;
 - vehicular access and at grade loading provisions from Cordova Street;
 - generally how this courtyard will be used by children/seniors.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Simpson confirmed the tower floorplate and dimensions. He pointed out that all townhouses will have front doors off the street, in addition the one-storey step down on the inside will yield two-storey townhouses with front doors on Hastings Street and 3 storeys on the inside of the courtyard, thereby providing a more private backdoor access from the courtyard, as Jervis Streets slopes northward. He also briefly confirmed that the proposed amenity space meets the requirements and that their shadowing analysis indicates that the courtyard will have considerable sunlight.

Mr. Simpson further mentioned that the open space in the Jervis/Hastings corner is required to accommodate the two entrances and described the purpose of separating family and non-family residents. He also referred to the park across the street and how this element would be pulled across the street in order to introduce a component of park-like space into the courtyard. Mr. Simpson confirmed that the tower incorporates the use of concrete and glass, with the water view elevations being predominantly glass, whereas the city side will have concrete with some glass.

Mr. Bob Nicklin, BC Affordable Housing, defined the market rental: the Cordova Street side, consisting of 1 and 2 bedroom apartment from the 13th - 30th floors, targeting single people and couples. The family rental entrance will be off Jervis Street. The City is contributing equity to this project - providing more affordable rental accommodation. He noted that with the community centre nearby, the amenity space for the market rental was kept to a minimum as residents would tend to utilize the facilities nearby.

Panel Members viewed the models and drawings.

• **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel had some positive comments - it felt this project, although complex, was an interesting concept and generally felt the developer had dealt well with the challenge of integrating townhouses with a tower and would blend in well with the neighbourhood. It also commented that the tower massing and orientation would enhance the street environment. The Panel also noted that the open space/courtyard is working well and the applicant has taken good advantage of this open space area.

However, the Panel expressed concern with various areas of this project; more work was needed on the Jervis/Hastings corner treatment in that the present design calls for different unit types and that there should be a better transition of these townhouses at the street corner. It was also felt that the colour palette should be more uniform, suggesting the townhouses be brick only and the tower concrete and glass; further that the balconies on the south side of the tower could be incorporated better into the tower mass. The Panel also suggested that as Hastings and Cordova Streets are major thoroughfares in the city's historical area, a stronger expression is needed for the townhouse elevation on Hastings Street which tends to be weak in comparison to the strength of the tower, suggesting perhaps sloping roofs on the townhouses, and increasing the massing of the low rise aspect of this project in order to strengthen the streetscape.

The Panel made specific reference to the townhouses on Jervis Street, noting that 3 or 4 are directly opposite a major public garage entrance for the community centre, and the exiting vehicles' lights will be directed at these townhouses. It also suggested deleting some of the townhouses on Jervis Street and moving them to Cordova, having the vehicle access come in on Jervis Street opposite the park. This would achieve the applicant's objective to bring the greenspace across from the park into the building, thereby giving the tower a better aspect towards the water. There was also concern about the lack of amenity space for the market units.

The Chair confirmed there was a general sense of comfort of how the tower was situated and massed. Reviewing the surrounding towers, it would be appropriate that this proposed tower would not have such a blunt top. He suggested there is some discomfort regarding the Jervis/Hastings Streets corner - which is weak and there are suggestions about how to reinforce the Hastings Street elevation and how the townhouses could better relate to the garage across the street. Perhaps consideration should be given to more townhouses on Cordova Street and less on Hastings Street. The material palette appears too complex a treatment for the townhouse base and should tie in more with the tower base - perhaps more attention to how that area is treated.

- **Applicant's Response:**

He referred to the comments on the height of the townhouses and noted they were working to what had been specified; they appreciated the Panel's comments about the townhouses and tower bases.

2. Address:	Broadway & Commercial Rapid Transit Stations
Zoning:	C-3A, CD-1(250) & C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Baker McGarva Hart
Owner:	Rapid Transit Project 2000
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Graham McGarva [BMH], Edward Leflufy RTPO], Graham Ball [BMH] and Jane Durante [PKL]
Staff:	Scot Hein, Ralph Segal

EVALUATION: [4 - 3]**• Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, introduced this project by referencing the many posted illustrations which indicated how the various concepts would pull this precinct together and that the main community focus would be at the intersection of East 10th Avenue and Commercial Drive, with the subject triangle site serving as the transit focus by serving as the terminus of the 99-Bee, the anticipated Super 99 and skytrain. He stressed that East Broadway was the most intensely utilized station within the emerging regional transit system. He noted that the locally serving retail on East 10th Avenue would be concentrated between Grandview Highway and East 12th Avenue.

Mr. Hein noted that Grandview Highway had been de-commissioned as a designated truck route, which provided the City with a greenway opportunity to be connected to the north side of the cut along Grandview which, itself, will function as a landscape amenity. He also mentioned the potential for a second track in the cut, which will prohibit a possible nature trail. Mr. Hein noted the potential development for the corner CIBC site which could also visually improve the public realm for the transit users and the community.

Mr. Hein presented the key issues of the August 25, 1999 Workshop:

- extent of public plaza and corner treatment which had received wide-ranging advice;
- inclusion of retail components at the time of construction and responsibility for operational aspects;
- general architecture quality re form/expression, citing that a more commercial expression for the station house was not appropriate, and that improvement to the overpass and existing station was also sought;
- intervention in the cut regarding the new platform which would produce blank walls as seen from the south;
- crime and safety considerations; and
- local access from the north to the station house.

He reviewed the programme requirements for skytrain station including the station house, connecting bridge, a platform on the north side of the BNSF cut, an overpass to connect with the existing station itself.

Retail uses proposed, as part of this development, would be of high architectural quality, intended to integrate and blend with the existing streetscape, and would provide double fronting access on Commercial Drive, and the station house.

Mr. Hein then reviewed specific advice sought from the Panel for the proposal, on the following:

- finding the balance between locally service scale vs. community opportunities, a regional identity within the transit system;
- possibilities for the south side of the street noting reviewing existing station house constraints with potential theatre use and commercial at grade;
- architectural approach being taken to achieve a balance between distinct station house functions;
- the wall treatments for the existing station house and overpass;
- proposed public art component in the SkyTrain station, specifically at the entry levels of the station;
- on how the double-fronting commercial blocks have been developed;
- comments on the proposed landscaping in the cut, treatment of the blank walls in the cut, and screening utilities;
- should the open space at the corner incorporate both hard and softscape treatment; and
- the new platform on north side possibly having a more transparent roof so as to enhance the view from Grandview Highway.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

The applicant referred to this project as a work-in-progress noting that some spatial/functional elements were fixed while others were in design development. He referenced their close work with the community.

He stated that the triangle site would be the "hub" that connects all the components of this project. He also stressed the community's crime and safety concerns and that this situation must be addressed; the neighbourhood needs to reclaim ownership of its area. The proposed expansion of the transit system for this area will generate interest in doing something about the existing crime element. The applicant compared this area to that of Granville Street mall which also had been reclaimed.

The applicant described the proposed public art noting that development is at an early stage. The proposal is a colourful art piece that is kinetic and interactive. He described the relationship between a floormat that reads and transmits footprints of pedestrians walking across the duo-location to read-out screens in two other locations. For example, rush-hour would result in a lively series of footprints.

Ms. Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, described proposed landscape aspects of this project. She confirmed that reforestation of existing trees to Slocan from the north side of the cut would be implemented as they will ultimately have to be re-planted or replaced. These trees will provide the community with a buffer. Concerning the greenway at the top of "Grandview Cut", they have changed the geometrics of the street so that a greenway will continue on, providing a soft environment and urban edge of this proposed triangle. Their ultimate goal is to make the area green for the community and provide wider sidewalks for the planting of trees.

Ms. Durante was asked how much of the existing Grandview Cut quality would change. She advised that this depended on a number of issues, including the tree inventory to determine damaged trees to be replaced. There will also be tree protection requirements in the construction contracts to protect the trees

during the construction periods, noting that trees were easier to save where the banks were less steep.

With respect to visibility from the Grandview Cut down towards the proposed new platform, the applicant noted that this wall would have to be cut back.

Ms. Durante noted that the Broadway-Commercial open space configuration attempted to balance the entry street wall and amenity considerations.

Panel Members viewed the models and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel was unanimous in its approval of the proposed public art. Several Members congratulated the architects for the design, noting how it fit well into the site. Members noted that the applicant was heading in the right direction and liked the idea of increased retail space. They noted it was a vast improvement over the development proposal [CD-1] of several years ago. Others noted that this proposal displayed too many design aspects leading to a rather weak scheme, and suggested that perhaps it would be best to identify key elements, simplify them and make the scheme stronger with greater variety. Members voiced their preference for the proposed clear span bridge, which could be visually more pleasing. Members thought that the proposed building next to the existing skytrain station would not only create a wind tunnel, but also create an immense security problem by concealing the platform from the street view. Greater clarity [hierarchy] of elements should be established.

Other Members referred to some missed opportunities for better integrating the north side station with the cut and the surrounding greenway, stating that the use of a glass roof would provide a great view into the cut, a better view of the other side, as well as trains. The Panel also suggested the Phase 1 station be moved as far north [over East Broadway], as possible. Some referred to the lack of balance of open space vs. shops vs. cut or the green space. Comparisons were made to the successful Burrard Skytrain station which provides more public realm and less commercial space and that the East Broadway station could have a similar public realm which would be a positive element for this site. References were also made regarding the double-sided retail which could cause complications and make it more difficult to be successful. Several Members also were uncomfortable with the cut, the vegetation, the replacement of the vegetation as well as the the impact on the natural systems in the cut and felt the developer needed to put more work into this element; they also noted the difficulty involved in approving a project where the problems of the triangle haven't been satisfactory resolved. Others felt that plaza could be larger at Commercial Drive and East Broadway and stated this project could provide this community with a public focus. The emergency stairs at the end points need not be such a focal point at Broadway and Grandview.

Members stated that a six-storey building would not be a redeeming element and that more transparency would be preferred in terms of viewing the cut.

The Chair reiterated the concerns about integrating the north and south sides, referred to the good suggestion about moving the platform right out over Broadway, bringing it closer to the north side. Primary concerns included that the open space should be enlarged and reshaped to provide more of a civic gesture. Concerns were also voiced about the proposal on the south side that ought to be carefully rethought in terms of its safety and visibility aspects with more transparency. Thought should also be given to creating visibility to the north platform, particularly the idea of using glass which would brighten and lighten up this area, allowing people to see down into the station.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant noted that they would refine some design aspects as a result of the comments received from the Panel. The applicant stressed that the key area of concern would be the urban repair required for this area.

The Chair took a vote and advised the Applicant he had the support of the Panel.

3. Address: 2799 Yew Street
DA: 404825
Zoning: CD-1(341)
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Downs Archambault & Partners/Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
Owner: M.A. Rose [Concert Properties]
Review: First
Delegation: David Simon, Barry Downs, Chris Sterry, Maurice Pez
Staff: Eric Fiss

EVALUATION: [7-0]

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, introduced this project being in Kitsilano, part of the Arbutus Industrial Lands redevelopment. The south frontage would be on West 12th Avenue, an eastern frontage on Yew street, and a greenway to the north. The proposed structure would consist of 8 storeys on Yew Street and 6 storeys on West 12th Avenue, with access to the building off Red Bud Lane, which would also provide access to loading and underground parking.

He further noted that this project is permitted to have an FSR of 5.1, and an area pf 167,300 sq. ft, and an additional 5% of excludable amenity space. Mr. Fiss advised the proposed use for this project would be for congregate housing, being the only site in the area that would permit this use. He described this project would provide 177 SNRF residences, a blend of 44 market condos with some form of service contract, 37 two-bedroom or more, single entrance for the underground parking for 52 cars, a reduced parking requirement of 1 in 4.

Mr. Fiss went on to describe this 15-acre industrial site, of which approximately 9.5 acres would be for residential purposes and leaving the balance for greenway space, as having been an industrial site including the Molson Brewery, schools, as well as larger park amenities to the west. The applicable CD-1 guidelines were established in 1994 with neighbourhood input. He also noted there were 16 buildings in the whole site - including an academy, a co-op, and that this particular site had the greatest density in the precinct, largely because of the existing buildings on the site, and that there had been some vision to replicate the brewery tower and that this heritage reproduction would be based on archival drawings, materials and proportions. The intent of the guidelines is to direct an urban design context in the area with a public open space that would recognize the working history of the site. Mr. Fiss noted the proposed elements of this project - the restoration design, public access, new interpretation impression of the site, general level of architectural effect throughout, and materials.

Mr Fiss referred to the context panel and noted that the project had to balance the industrial past with the present and referenced the following:

- 1 use - whether this site is suitable for SNRFs
- 2 examine the livability for seniors, amenity space, and the roof top terrace
- 3 heritage authenticity vs reinterpretation
- 4 the expression of architectural design
- 5 relationship of the building in terms of its form and massing and the neighbouring buildings - provision of public open spaces

The Chair enquired if there was an agreement between Concert and the City to replicate this tower. The Development Planner advised that Concert Properties has given the City a letter confirming their commitment to reconstructing the original tower element of the now demolished brewery building.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Downs referred to the tower of 1908, when Cascade was the variety of beer and had represented beer making in the city of Vancouver. He referred to various mounted pictures retained from the old brewery and surrounding site, and confirmed that the proposed form could deal with the references to the past.

Project design has been developed in conjunction with discussions with the Planning Department. This would include an interpretive display about the history of beer making in Vancouver.

The landscaping has paid close attention to sustaining the public realm aspect of the neighbourhood.

Panel Members viewed the model and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel Members were impressed with this project - noting that it was a wonderful opportunity to produce a good structure that had been skillfully handled in bringing together the many parts of this site; a good urban design and record of a history legacy. They also stressed the importance and need for this type of housing in the neighbourhood, and were basically in favour of the historic replication of the tower and entry-way. Various members proposed metal cladding on the upper two floors. However, one member felt the history had put a constraint on the designers, who should have more of an opportunity to show their own experience. Yet another felt the archway could reflect more of its history and although it appeared weak, was vehicle friendly, but no specific pedestrian access was indicated.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Thanked the Panel for their generous comments.

The Chair advised the applicant that they were to be congratulated on a project well resolved in design and that they had the full support of the Panel.

The Chair left the meeting.

4. Address:	1304 Seymour Street
DA:	404852
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Gomberoff Policzer
Owner:	Margrietha Evens
Review:	First
Delegation:	Stu Lyon
Staff:	Bob Adair

Deputy Chair: Roger Hughes

EVALUATION: [6 - 0] Support

• **Introduction:**

Mr. Bob Adair, the Planning Facilitator, introduced this project as an 8-storey, mixed-use building containing institutional and dwelling uses, with one level of underground parking, which would be accessed from the lane at the rear. The proposed location is the Seymour Street off-ramp as it turns into Seymour Street, which influenced the design of this project. He advised it was in the Downtown District Sub-Area L [the New Yaletown District] and that the surrounding area was comprised primarily of one and two-storey commercial buildings, with a 13-storey rental residential building across the street and a new 31-storey residential condominium at the corner of Richards and Pacific Streets. The floor space ratio allowed under this schedule is 3.0. He advised the first three floors would be for institutional use, i.e., a Special Needs Residential Facility, Group Living and a Social Service Centre which would be operated by Corrections Canada for the purpose of a Community Reintegration Centre, providing programs for recently released parolees. Floors four to eight would be residential rental, targeted for low-income seniors. The units would be approximately 330 sq. ft. and would be operated by the Home Mutual Aid Society, a registered non-profit organization. This use would be completely separate, with the Corrections Canada facility being entered at the north end, and another entrance at the south end of the building for the residential facility. He further described the the large outdoor amenity space at the rear of the the building for the Corrections Canada residence and a smaller separate outdoor amenity space would be designated for the seniors. The senior residents also have a larger amenity space on the roof deck with umbrella forms for trailing plants, etc. The materials to be used for the first three storey would be face brick. From the fourth storey on glazing and glazed spandrel panels are proposed, with the end walls to be painted concrete with recesses and some glazed spandrel panels.

Mr. Adair asked the Panel to address the following issues:

1. The design of this building given its highly visible location at one of the major gateways to the downtown and the image that would be portrayed to people entering the downtown. Also commentary on the proposed materials, details and colours;
2. Height - the Downtown District allows a maximum of 70 ft., with relaxations available only in certain situations. The proposed height on the side elevation would be a maximum of 76 ft. [the roof top umbrella forms would go to approximately 86 ft.]. The relaxations available under the ODP are not available for the proposed uses; however, what would be available would be a general relaxation under "hardship" and staff have advised the applicant that they would be willing to recommend this to the Development Permit Board. The hardship would be the difficulty in meeting urban design objectives

for this site if the application were limited strictly to the 70 ft. height allowance, as well as a programmatic hardship for the applicant if larger floor plates were required. The increase in height allows the width of this building to be 52 ft., instead of the 61 ft. in an earlier proposal, and also allows the corners of the building to be pulled away from the property lines. The proposed combination of reducing the width of the building and greater articulations made available by going an extra storey, results in a 6 ft. overage on the height maximum. Staff do not believe there would be a significant view impact or shadowing be impact as a result of the 76 ft. height, and asked the Panel their opinion on this relaxation; and

3. Materials and detailing - specifically how it would relate to the streetscape, pedestrians along the sidewalk, the facades, etc.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Stu Lyon referenced the public information meeting being convened at the Roundhouse as this presentation was being made to the Panel. He went on to explain that the site size was 100 ft. x 120 ft. with an FSR of 3.0; 1.0 FSR for the Corrections Canada use [maximum allowed] and 2.0 FSR for the seniors. Due to the 12 ft. setback in the front, as well as a significant setback required at the rear of this proposed project, as per the New Yaletown Guidelines, the resulting seniors' apartment sizes range from 325 sq. ft. to 400+ sq. ft. The Corrections Canada facility would consist of 30 units, 10 of those allotted for single occupants located at the front of the building. The rest of the units would house 5-bed clusters. The original concept had been to combine the entrances for these two facilities; however, as Corrections Canada would be monitoring their facility on a 24-hour basis, with an on-site commissioner, limiting the travel of 'residents' and imposing a curfew, they were split, to either end of the building, with independent elevators. He also pointed out that Corrections Canada's residents were not 'incarcerated inmates', but rather would be in a transitional stage of re-entering society. Mr. Lyon concluded his presentation by confirming that the Corrections Canada base would be of brick with steel lintels.

The Landscape Architect briefly described the proposed landscaping, designed in conjunction with the Downtown South and New Yaletown Guidelines, which would incorporate a single row of trees in front [due to the 12 ft. setback, a double row of trees would not be feasible], and the seniors' rooftop amenity space landscaping which would incorporate trellises, a separate seating area with a great view over to South False Creek, and space for short walks. The notion of planting a herb garden was also suggested. He confirmed that the total landscaping would result in 60% soft landscape and 40% hard surface. The ground level outdoor amenity space would incorporate a 6 ft. fence separating the seniors from Corrections Canada residents.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel voiced approval of the height relaxation, and commented favourably on the design concept, commenting it had been well handled being in an awkward site. They felt the building was well-massed, and approved the proposed materials and colour palette. Some members referred to the proposed landscape and suggested there should be a provision to ensure this proposed concept would be maintained, and that perhaps some thought should be given to the seniors' entrance which was viewed to be a bit too obscure. Upon taking a vote, the applicant was advised by the Deputy Chair that they had the full support of the Panel.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Lyon expressed his appreciation for the Panel's comments and support. Also noted that although

three or four neighbourhood meetings had been held, somehow no particular interest in the architecture had been shown - only the proposed use was of concern.

The Deputy Chair advised the Applicant he had full support of the Panel.

Deputy Chair left the Meeting.

5. Address: 2626 Watson Street [230 East 10th Avenue]
DA: 404736
Zoning: C-3A
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Gomberoff Policzer
Owner: Rick Ilich
Review: First
Delegation: Tom Bell, Mary Chan
Staff: Mary Beth Rondeau

2nd Deputy Chair: Sean McEwen

EVALUATION: [5 - 0] Support

• **Introduction:**

Ms. Mary Beth Rondeau, Planner, introduced this project by describing the proposed site, which would be on Watson Street, at the corner of West 10th Avenue, just east of Main Street. This area is going through a local upgrading, (i.e., putting in of curbs, a grass boulevard, street trees and sidewalks). She further advised that this 50 ft. site is in a C-3A zone, where the outright FSR is 1.0 (but which could be relaxed to 3.0 FSR) and an outright height 30 ft (which could be relaxed conditionally to an unspecified height). This proposal is for a social housing project, for low-income singles. Of the proposed 39 units, 38 would be small studios at approximately 350 sq. ft. This proposal is for 2.75 FSR and a proposed height of approximately 45.5 ft. Ms. Rondeau requested the Panel's comments on the proposed relaxations of the FSR and height, as referenced above, noting that in doing so, this project could achieve social and community goals. She further emphasised the importance of this project which will help in the improvement of Watson Street and 10th Avenue. The Planner briefly explained the history of this area, noting the Mt. Pleasant Neighbourhood had been the first suburb of the downtown around the turn of the century, an indication being big square, brick buildings, etc. as well as the historic right-of-way of Brewery Creek. The proposed project would be adjacent to the creekbed, where a bit of original embankment is still discernable. She further noted that Watson Street was a dry creekbed and would be bridged over at the entrance of this building, similar to the project being constructed across Watson Street to the south, thereby achieving much of the neighbourhood character and amenity encouraged by the by-law.

Mr. Rondeau next referred to the materials, similar to those being utilized at the development under construction across the street, (i.e., brick on the lowest level and concrete fibre-cement panels on the upper floors, with metal finish on the cornices and overhangs over the entrances). She concluded by stating that the proposed development complied with the neighbourhood desired character, (i.e., the entrances off the street, the building materials, etc.) and met the criteria for the relaxations. She requested Panel's advice on the materials and design of the entrances, and the proposed materials in general.

Applicant's Opening Comments:

Mr. Bell confirmed that the proposed built form was the expression of their small site. The building had been purposely massed up in a rectangular form, in keeping with the other old buildings in the buildings

and that, together with the massing, materials, bays and large cornices, this project would evoke a building from the past while presenting a fresh, clean, contemporary look which they felt would be appropriate in the location.

Ms. Mary Chan advised they had met with the Brewery Creek Society in order to understand their mandate, which primarily was recognition of Brewery Creek that once flowed through the Mt. Pleasant area into False Creek. Due to spatial constraints, the landscaping would run south to north, perhaps including a meandering stream. She succinctly described the resultant landscape concept which would be a straight-forward design, incorporating the use of old logs, stumps, granular pathways, native plants indigenous to the area during the Brewery Creek era - in essence, recognition of, rather than re-creation of Brewery Creek.

Panel's Comments:

The Panel en masse liked the building describing it as tidy, clean cut and compact and making this a dignified building - with compliments to the architect. They approved the landscape concept, but encouraged the applicant not to rely totally on plants, but rather tie it in with wooden bridges, maintaining the trees, etc. Unanimously supported the relaxation in FSR and height, as well as approval of the proposed materials. One Member suggested "a few more columns in the parkade would be nice". The primary concern stressed by the Panel was about the proposed parking entry being off the lane, rather than the front street, but they were cognizant of the reasoning for this decision, (i.e., the street site drops approximately 5 to 6 ft.).

Applicant's Response:

Mr. Bell was delighted to hear the Panel's generous comments regarding the overall design quality and reiterated their general approach had been to keep the project simple on this small site. He also appreciated the Panel's suggestions of emphasizing the building entrances, as well as integrating the concept of Brewery Creek, emphasizing the bridge at the entry way and strengthening the view from 10th Avenue. They confirmed they will continue to work on these details.

The Panel did not wish to view the Model.

The Deputy Chair advised the Applicant that they had the full support of the Panel.

6. Address:	2102 West 38th Avenue
DA:	404751
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill
Owner:	Orca West Developments
Review:	First
Delegation:	Keith Hemphill
Staff:	Mary Beth Rondeau

2nd Deputy Chair: Sean McEwen

EVALUATION: [4 - 1] Support

• **Introduction:**

Mr. Rondeau, Planner, introduced this project, and pointed out that it was in Kerrisdale, in a C-2 zone along West Boulevard, with high-rise apartments to the west directly behind this proposed project. The applicant had proposed this four-storey project, with commercial on the ground floor and three storeys of residential use above. She further advised that the FSR in this zone is 3.0, [which would be unusual to achieve on this type of site], with an allowable height of 40 ft. This project requested an FSR of 2.98 and an approximate height of 43.5 ft., the overage thus probably due to the slope on the site. Technically this site did not qualify for a height relaxation, as per the guidelines (not the by-law), and staff were cautious in considering a height relaxation for this project. Ms. Rondeau advised that a number of letters had been received from residents in a high-rise to the south, which stressed their fear of proposed view blockage, but she felt any blockage of views would be minor.

Staff's primary issue would be the desire for more articulation in a four-storey building and they also had great concerns about the size of the interior court yard, proposed to be approximately 119 ft. by 125 ft., which technically would not meet the guidelines. The large court yard pushed the massing out to the edges. Staff would anticipate a substantial decrease in the massing in terms of more articulation on both the street and on the lane. Ms. Rondeau advised that the Planning Department had given the applicant a number of suggestions on how to effect this massing, and in summary asked the Panel for advice on this application, with particular attention to the massing issue.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Hemphill stressed that even though Ms. Rondeau had detailed the attributes of the C-2 zoning, the proposed structure and the Planning Department's views, there were a number of points he needed to make. He advised that the main lobby would be coming off the residential avenue and the retail lobby would be off the commercial street, (i.e., West Boulevard). He believed that this project had a different context from the normal C-2 zoning, and went on to explain the context. He noted that this building would be different as the context here was one which would be dominated by high-rises. Mr. Hemphill advised this building would generally follow the guidelines regarding setbacks and proceeded to quote a portion of the guidelines to prove this particular site would not produce one problem referred to in the CD-2 Guidelines, namely that it would not over-shadow the high-rise towers. He went on to advise they had not proposed to incorporate the multiple stepping at the rear of the site primarily for that reason.

Mr. Hemphill stressed the importance of the court yard in this project. He said that the court yard would be over 50 ft. x 30 ft. in size, and that the concept was to enhance the livability of this project, in that it would incorporate windows in bedrooms that would look out into the court yard, thus providing light at

both ends of the units. He believed this to be a significant enhancement. He also noted C-2 zones had limited landscape opportunities, and that this had been the concept of introducing this court yard into the plan. He felt and that this design would be a major improvement over dark corridors. He further advised the walkway would be cement, with metal guardrails and confirmed the distance between the walkway and any bedroom window would be approximately 15 ft.

He went on to state that the height overage was 2 ft. 9.5 inches, rather than 3 ft. 6 inches quoted earlier, confirmed the massing would be quite uniform, and asked that the Panel consider the height and massing of this project.

Panel Members reviewed the model and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel did not have a problem with the height overage and that the applicant appeared to have made a serious effort to articulate the two major streetscapes with respect to the building. The project had good street appeal, the rear of the building had been well resolved, the view blockage to the southwest corner was not seen as problematic, and some Members were comfortable with the proposed massing and thought the court yard would be an attractive feature. However, there was concern about the size and depth of the proposed court yard and it was felt that this would require further care and diligence. The Panel queried the livability of the court yard, with its proposed interior space of 50 ft. x 30 ft. which would also contain concrete walkways with wooden ties. These walkways would serve only approximately 6 - 8 units, with the other tenants utilizing the elevators.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Hemphill apologized for not having covered all of his notes, but rather had focussed mainly on the court yard. He advised that they had taken a more tailored approach, and a sense of tradition. He stressed that the proposed market for these residences would not be seniors, but rather a younger crowd which would be desirous of more contemporary materials and colour, and that the court yard had not been intended for residents to spend a lot of time in, but rather to provide a better corridor to and from the parkade and elevators as well as provide better landscaping for this corridor, thereby incorporating C-2 requirement of landscaped open space.

The Deputy Chair thanked the Applicant and advised that this project had the support of this Panel.