
URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 17, 2000

TIME: 4.00 p.m.

PLACE: Committee Room #1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Paul Grant [Chair - 1st Item only]
Lance Berelowitz
Tom Bunting
James Cheng [Acting Deputy Chair - 2nd Item]
Alan Endall
Bruce Hemstock
Jack Lutsky
Brian Palmquist [1st Item only]
Gilbert Raynard
Keith Ross
Sorin Tatomir

REGRETS: Roger Hughes

**Acting Recording
Secretary:** M. Penner

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING
1. 1673 Bayshore Drive [<i>Traders</i> Restaurant]
2. 3778 West 28 th Avenue

1. Address:	1673 Bayshore Drive
DA:	404739
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Urban Design Group Architects
Owner:	562270 B.C. Ltd.
Review:	Second
Delegation:	R. Jones, S. Gould
Staff:	R. Segal

EVALUATION: [3 - 7] Non-Support**• Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, introduced the revised project for the “*Traders*” restaurant [initial submission presented February 9, 2000], proposed at the foot of Bayshore Drive. Mr. Segal confirmed that the 50 ft. x 76 ft. pad over the water was in place, with a zoned height limitation of 5 m and a restricted floor area. He advised the Panel had previously not supported this scheme [Mr. Segal referred to the previous presentation boards], and that the Panel’s concerns had dealt primarily with the architectural design, stating that this previous scheme was too “boxy” and that in order to present this application to Council, an outstanding piece of architecture would be necessary to justify the Applicant’s request for additional floor area and additional height. Therefore a unique, exciting building was being sought by the Panel, and by staff. Mr. Segal pointed out that the previously proposed height of 30.7 ft. had now been reduced to 24.8 ft. and the floor area had been reduced from 6,849 to 6,458 sq. ft. for this 2-storey pub/restaurant building. He further noted that the revised proposed architecture for this project had taken on a very different look with an attempt to incorporate as much glass as possible, combined with an up-graded mixture of materials and that various adjustments to floor-to-ceiling heights had been made in order to accommodate the rooftop mechanical being pulled back to the southeast corner in order to provide a better view corridor. Mr. Segal concluded by pointing out the various built, and under construction, towers in the Bayshore area and asked Panel’s advice on whether the Applicant had successfully responded to their previous suggestions and concerns, and possible solutions for this high-profile, challenging project.

There was a question from the Panel as to the property line and was advised that it was at the building edge on the south side and that the walkway and two “bridges” leading into the pub/restaurant were on City property which would result in some encroachments.

• Applicant’s Opening Comments:

Mr. Jones stated they had met with the Bayshore area neighbourhood groups on several occasions regarding the views from the various towers. The resultant action had been to reduce the rooftop screening of the mechanicals from their initial submission of 100% coverage of the rooftop, to approximately 55%, by changing the floor-to-ceiling height of several rooms on the upper floor to 8 ft., enabling them to pull back the mechanical to the southeast corner in a simpler minimalistic fashion,

thereby providing a better viewscape for the neighbouring towers. Mr. Jones stated that in order to bring more of a nautical feel to this project, tiered canopies had been added; the west wall had been pushed back introducing more glass, including a clear glass balcony, and full height bi-fold glass doors on the west and north sides which can be opened up in good weather. In response to one of the neighbourhood's main concerns, patio areas had been moved to the north side and had also introduced patios on the 2nd floor as well as the main level. Mr. Jones reiterated that the actual size of the pad was 4,181 sq. ft. and the allowable buildable portion measured 3,791 sq. ft. He stressed that the materials had also been upgraded, incorporating textured porcelain-type tiles, a lighter colour palette and that the entire roof would be covered with a larger, textured slate tile. He briefly referred to the landscaping which had been incorporated since their original submission.

In response to a question from the Panel, Mr. Jones confirmed that this project would not be operated by the Bayshore Hotel and that their only concern would be the new project's hours of operation. The Panel was also informed that "Traders" would share the hotel driveway for future customers, delivery of supplies and pick-up of garbage - the latter being done at night.

The Panel reviewed the model and posted drawings.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel Members unanimously concurred this was a demanding, challenging site which would require a thoughtful, well-executed solution. Some Members felt since the original submission, this project had come a long way - moving more in the direction of articulation and a lighter aspect. The Panel felt this project should portray more marine aspects in light of its location, that it felt too 'urban'. Several Members voiced their disappointment with the flat roof, felt this was a lost opportunity - perhaps it could go higher in order to articulate the roof more; also noted the importance of a roofscape as seen from the surrounding towers, as well as in profile by pedestrians approaching from the east and south from the waterfront walkway in order to portray a more distinctive profile. There was also the feeling of lack of cohesiveness about this project; that the project was too massive, too bulky and boxy and that the problem was architectural. Some Members felt that unless the Applicant would be prepared to reduce the size of the project, fundamental changes would not happen; however, it was also recognized that obviously the financial/commercial consideration was a fundamental challenge. It was noted that this site would be ideal for a smaller project, incorporating balconies and terraces, surrounded by an 'apron', thereby taking full advantage of this extraordinary location. Most Panel Members felt the strategy of pushing the patios to the north side was a mistake, as those patios would almost always be in shade, and that the patio shapes were too narrow and awkward. It was felt that the choice of materials and colour palette were not appropriate for the setting.

The Panel were unanimous in stating this site had the potential for a signature building that would stand out and catch the eye of any passerby. They also felt that perhaps the maximum height could be relaxed if only in one section of the rooftop - to bring some meaning to the roofscape.

There was a feeling that the landscape needed to be rethought as the proposed plan adds nothing to the project and only encroaches into the public views. It was pointed out that the small patios around the perimeter might be areas where landscaping could be introduced, but that the access bridges from the seawall walkway should be kept clean and simple - which would lend itself to a simple kind of elegance.

It was evident to the Panel that although the Applicant had tried to address the three main areas of concern as per the February 9th Minutes, i.e., height, bulk and design quality - the same concerns still remain. It was also stressed that when a height restriction is so stringently imposed, it will make the project bulkier and that it was most inappropriate that such restriction was largely determined by people who lived no closer than the length of a football field away from the proposed building and that it was an unreasonable demand made of the architect. In order for the Applicant to attempt to meet this height restriction, he was forced to bunch all the mechanical into the lower left corner, increasing the bulky look. Some Members felt the Applicant should perhaps ignore the height constraint.

Other Panel Members pointed out that as the pad was already built, a possible solution would be to underbuild. Some couldn't see that height was a major issue and felt it was ridiculous that the neighbours residing 120 m from the project, have such power that the demands of this site couldn't be met. It was also mentioned to the Applicant that perhaps revisiting the functional layout of the project might garner them more usable/flexible space, i.e., amount of space for washrooms and service areas, staircase areas, service and cash areas, etc. could be more efficient.

One Panel Member pointed out that at the rezoning stage some 8 years ago, the proposed structure for this site had been a single storey building, with perhaps a partial loft.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Simon Gould stated that the actual buildable area on the pad was 3,700 sq. ft. and that they couldn't go beyond that. He also referred to the Member's comments about the functional layout of the project, stating that the washrooms were in accordance with code requirements regarding size and handicapped access for both the pub and restaurant operations, leaving no flexibility; the two exits downstairs were required and that an open staircase was a requirement regarding viability of the pub and restaurant working together; concerning organization of the floorplan and the building - he confirmed the height of the kitchen and service area was down to an 8 ft. ceiling now, allowing the mechanical on the roof to be pulled back into the left corner in order to minimize the height, in order to comply with the neighbourhood's demands for better view corridors. Mr. Gould stressed that it was difficult to reach the desired design when dealing with such height constraints; they had tried to work to the satisfaction of a variety of factions - after this particular UD Panel meeting, they would have to go before Council who will make the decision regarding height as well as floor area, a design which will fit with the neighbourhood, as well as the developer of Bayshore Gardens; having to balance all these demands for this proposed development they would appreciate having some specific directions to give them an opportunity to achieve those goals.

Mr. Jones referred to the time expended [almost 1 year] since initial discussions were held with the City. They had understood the sq. ft., the FSR, the height restrictions and had detailed the actual cost of the property; that the cost of this project thus far would be very difficult without having approximately 200 seats in this facility. He confirmed that under the existing by-laws, their initial proposal included a 5,000 sq. ft. building on this site, incorporating unlimited seating under their restaurant license, and have rooftop patios facing to the east, west and the north, only to discover that the Bayshore Gardens and the Westin Bayshore Resort Marina opposed their project. Therefore, in order to make this project economically viable, they had agreed to a variety of adjustments including reconfiguring the patios by enclosing them, etc., and felt the architect had done a fabulous job in creating it so far, in response to the myriad of

concerns posed by the Westin Bayshore and the Bayshore Garden residences who indicate they had not been aware of this proposed development. Mr. Jones stated this project had been scrutinized by a variety of groups, and they had tried to answer all the questions from every faction. At the February 9th UDP they were told the building was too boxy, too dark, to keep the building down to approximately 7 m; the patios should be kept to the north side only, etc. and they had tried to do all of that in answer to what happened on February 9th. He concluded by stating they were finding it very difficult to appease everybody; however, they understood what the Panel was saying - but as per Mr. Gould's comment, they require a more definite direction.

The Chair commenced by stating the Panel does believe that which was presented today was a definite improvement over the February 9th submission. Some of the highlighted comments were: that the overall form needed to be cleaned up - there needed to be an emphasis on more of a signature building; there were perhaps some unfair comments regarding being able to push through the height restriction and that this would need Council's discretion; this project did appear to cry out for a more nautical building with perhaps a more tensile approach and thought there were positive comments about the transparency that's been developed and this transparency could be expanded on. The Chair noted the narrowness of the patios had come under criticism along with an alternate suggestion of dispensing with the patios in favour of the open glass concept shown on the west elevation. He noted the consideration that this site could be underbuild in order to achieve the prominent architecture it deserves.

The Chair called for the vote and advised the Applicant that at this time they did not have the support of the Panel.

2. Address:	3778 West 28th Avenue
DA:	405003
Zoning:	RS-5
Application Status:	Preliminary
Architect:	L.O. Lund
Owner:	Roman Catholic Archbishop of Vancouver Immaculate
Review:	First
Delegation:	J. Clark, B. Crick
Staff:	S. Hein

Deputy Chair: James Cheng

EVALUATION: [7 - 0] Support

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Mr. Scot Hein, introduced the proposal, which involved an expansion to an existing institutional use located in a predominantly single-family zoned area [RS-5], and directly adjacent to St. George's School. This form of institutional infill is uncommon and why staff is seeking Panel's advice. This project consists of a new parish hall and gymnasium for the school and church, which was established in 1926. Mr. Hein advised that the parish owns property fronting both 29th/28th Avenues and 28th/ 27th Avenues. St. George's Junior School to the west, Immaculate Conception School to the north, with 28th Avenue dead-ending at the St. George's School site. He noted the 144 ft. x 278 ft. irregularly shaped site sloped north to south by 24 ft. He also referenced an existing house owned by the church which would be demolished. Mr. Hein mentioned the possibility of consolidating both parish sites at the 28th Avenue closure, thereby linking the parish buildings while preserving trees. He stated this proposal would include the demolition of the parish hall, thereby creating space for a new hall which would front 29th Avenue. A landscape link, with a drop-off/turn-around area to serve the existing church and future expansion of that church, as well as the school to the north of the site would occur over 28th Avenue.

Mr. Hein advised that the church and school presently use the Dunbar Community Centre for their recreational activities. The Centre's increasing needs require the parish/school to have their own facilities on site. In addition to the gymnasium and seniors components, the proposal provides meeting rooms, space for the performing arts functions, and kitchen facilities for joint use by the parish and the school. One level of underground parking is proposed with access off 29th Avenue, to be used by the parish and school.

He confirmed the parish had hosted a number of neighbourhood meetings, and that Engineering is reviewing traffic and parking concerns with residents. A parking problem is evident in this neighbourhood and the parking garage is seen as a positive aspect of this proposal.

Mr. Hein referred to the high quality materials proposed, including wood siding, granite with architectural expressions intended to integrate the expansion into this RS-5 area, which seeks a very contextual response. With reference to the proposed massing, Mr. Hein referenced the terracing by the proposed roof-forms in response to the single-family lots to the east.

Mr. Hein concluded his presentation by requesting Panel's advice on 4 key issues:

1. Given that RS-5 was essentially a residential zone, he requested comments on the proposed uses,

specifically the expansion of institutional uses.

2. Advice on the general contextual fit, i.e., specifically site planning, proposed set backs, etc.
3. The handling of the proposed closure of 28th Avenue; [their comments would assist staff in discussions with Engineering].
4. General architectural quality, proposed materials, and specifically the handling of the 29th Avenue elevation.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. John Clark confirmed that the existing 1926 church was expanded with the addition of a small parish hall in the '40s and the Immaculate Conception School in 1954. He confirmed that the Dunbar Community Centre had advised Immaculate Conception Parish that, effective June 2000, they would be unable to use their facilities due to the increased community programs. Mr. Clark described traffic concerns, including morning drop-offs and after school pick-ups, with drivers not respecting private residents' property and driveways. He described the constant flow of children running back and forth from the various facilities, and related safety concerns. Mr. Clark described the plaza/courtyard areas proposed and confirmed the parish served 400 parishioners.

Mr. Clark advised that this development would incorporate institutional and residential character by the use of materials such as granite stone facing, cedar shingles, wood siding and trim, along with other architectural details.

Regarding the 28th Avenue traffic issues, Mr. Clark referenced recently completed traffic studies that reviewed impacts of underground parking and the closure of 28th Avenue. Mr. Clark referred to the meetings with 27th and 28th Avenues neighbours; the feedback from them included traffic issues. A similar meeting had also been held with 28th and 29th Avenue residents noting concerns of traffic, blocked driveways, parking in front of their homes, the daily routine of children being dropped off, etc., and having a more pedestrian- oriented neighbourhood. The Applicant's parking requirements are 40, and 130 are being provided.

Concerning landscaping, Mr. Clark referred to the major stand of trees on St. George's School property, some of which have already been chopped down and that they wanted the west elevation to form a backdrop to these trees to the west. They will encourage St. George's School to participate in creating a stronger forested area and better integrate their campuses. Also, these trees would act as a buffer and appear more reflective of the surrounding residential character. He noted that the walkway between St. George's and Immaculate Conception Schools was a benefit to the community.

The Panel viewed the model and posted materials.

- **Panel's Comments:**

On the four key issues staff had sought Panels' advice, the proposed development received unanimous approval. Specific approval was voiced regarding the architectural quality and appropriateness. The Panel concurred that this project was consistent with the existing neighbourhood in that a church and school belonged in a residential area; that this project would not add to the number of parish uses, nor increase the traffic volumes. The latter, while being addressed jointly by the applicant and Engineering, would never be completely resolved to everyone's satisfaction, and it was acknowledged that any neighbourhood with

churches and schools, would always include traffic concerns.

The landscaping plans were well conceived, especially the treatment between St. George's School and the Immaculate Conception site. The linking of these two schools should be incorporated in future landscaping plans and the overall campus approach should be more formalized.

There were suggestions that by moving the gymnasium building slightly to the north and lowering its height, would reduce its bulk and still enable the ramp. Advice was given that the sloped roofs should be carried through on all the elements. The Applicant was also urged to pay attention to the spaces between the buildings.

Concern was voiced regarding the problems encountered with the drop-off/pick-up area and that perhaps moving this area to either end of 28th Avenue may offer a better solution. It was suggested that moving the old cedar tree to a symmetrical position with the church, would allow more room in the traffic circle.

A few Members had concerns with the fit of this expanded project in the neighbourhood, yet supported it given its social value, but felt the neighbourhood impacts be minimized.

The majority of Members concurred with the closure of 28th Avenue, acknowledging it as a tremendously important and a rich addition to the project.

A Member was concerned with the height of the 29th Avenue facade in relationship to the residential neighbourhood, both across the street and adjacent, and felt it was somewhat overpowering and suggested this might be scaled down in the final plans.

In conclusion, a number of Members suggested that the proposed courtyard plaza and walkway, unless Immaculate Conception intended to have this area gated, should be made available to the public if they wished to enter, and that the area should be well-lit.

The Deputy Chair confirmed that in response to Mr. Hein's four key issues, the proposal had complete support from the Panel in terms of the use, the fit, the closure of 28th Avenue and architectural quality with some comments/suggestions for the next stage of this project. He noted the Panel had mentioned several issues that would require further resolution, including the traffic and the drop-off area and that there were some suggestions as to whether the turning circle should be moved forward or alternate locations be considered. The Chair reiterated the Panel's urging for the Applicant to pay attention to the spaces between the buildings. He also referred to several Members' comments about a "campus plan-like character" and that this implied that a building had four facades and if the west side walkway was to be maintained, this should be acknowledged and should reduce opportunities for graffiti.

• **Applicant's Response:**

Mr. Clark referred to the Panel's comments on drop-off area and location and that they had been careful in its size and location, given the varied interests to be considered. He also referred to the numerous designs reviewed for their plaza concept before deciding on this one.

The Deputy Chair interjected, noting that was up to the Applicant to resolve and that they had the Panel's support for the green space, which needed refinement; also reminded the Applicant that this was a preliminary application and that at this stage the Panel only discussed the issues detailed by the Development Planner.

The Deputy Chair called for a vote and advised the Applicant he had the full support of the Panel.

Q:\Clerical\UDP\MINUTES\2000UDP\May 17UDP.wpd