

## URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** May 23, 2007

**TIME:** 4.00 pm

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
John Wall, Chair  
Walter Francl (Excused Item 3)  
Maurice Pez (arrived at 5:00 PM)  
Douglas Watts  
Richard Henry (Items 1 and 2)  
Bill Harrison  
Albert Bicol (Excused Item 3)  
Martin Nielsen  
Gerry Eckford  
Bob Ransford

**REGRETS:** Tom Bunting  
Mark Ostry

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Lorna Harvey

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	960 Kingsway
2.	2758 Prince Edward
3.	199 West 1 <sup>st</sup> Avenue

**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: 960 Kingsway  
DE: 410979  
Use: 4 storey mixed-use building  
Zoning: C-2  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: Matthew Cheng Architects  
Owner: Vishi Construction Ltd.  
Review: First  
Delegation: Matthew Cheng, Rosana Watson  
Staff: Dale Morgan

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0-8)**

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the application. The proposal has a double fronting street off Kingsway and East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The intent is to create CRU's along Kingsway with one on East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and for residential units on the second to fourth floors with underground parking. The zoning is C-2 which provides for a variety of mixed commercial and residential uses. This also ensures the building envelope will be a good fit to the adjacent residential neighbourhood. The applicant is seeking the maximum FSR and there is a horizontal angle of daylight requirement.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Commercial frontage along 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue: Is this the most compatible use for this frontage? Should the commercial unit connect with Kingsway frontage or would residential be a more compatible use for this street frontage?
2. Architectural Expression & Materiality: General comments are requested on the architecture expression.
3. Public Realm Treatment: The Panel is asked to comment on the lack of detail and resolution of the public realm treatment along Kingsway and the appropriateness of the landscaping for the proposed CRU frontage along East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and lane interface.

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Matthew Cheng, Architect, described in detail the proposal. Mr. Cheng noted that the underground parking will be a two gate system; one for the residential and one for the commercial occupants. Also he noted that there will be enclosed balconies on Kingsway to reduce the noise into the suites with open balconies on the lane.

Rosana Watson, Landscape Architect described the landscaping for the project noting the large tree on Kingsway which will have to be cut back significantly. The plans are to soften the corner treatment on East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and to create some privacy on the patio areas. Also there will be a screen around the transformer area.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider moving the entry from Kingsway to East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue;

- Consider including an modest amenity space in the project;
  - Consider design development to the public realm;
  - Consider a simpler, quieter residential expression to the Kingsway and lane elevations; and
  - Consider improving the sustainable measures in the project.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the application but thought the development worked in terms of density, form and massing.

Most of the Panel thought the commercial face should be on Kingsway with a residential face on East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue that would set the precedence for future development on the street. There was some concern that the commercial would not be successful on East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue although several members of the Panel thought there could be a commercial frontage on East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Several Panel members suggested there should be more differentiation between the residential and commercial and one Panel member thought the retail looked like an after thought. The Panel also thought the residential entry needed work and suggested moving it to the East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue side of the project to make for a more elegant entrance.

Most of the Panel questioned the increased height over the loading bay and thought it should be reduced. They also suggested a stronger separation between the residential and the service areas to improve the building. Some of the Panel members had some concerns regarding the lane elevation as they felt it needed a simpler and stronger residential expression.

Some of the Panel thought the Kingsway façade was better resolved and suggested wrapping the brick material around the corner on to the party-walls. Some of the Panel thought the canopy and signage was not resolved noting that it would set a strong architectural expression on the Kingsway frontage. Although the materiality was acceptable the Panel thought there needed to be more development on the drawings.

The Panel thought the public realm was adequately handled but questioned the use of the two feet of concrete pavers as an infill and suggested using another material. Some Panel members felt the public realm treatment on Kingsway needed more work and thought the planters on East 19<sup>th</sup> wouldn't work. Also there was some concern about the exiting tree and felt it should be removed and replaced with a smaller tree.

Most of the Panel liked the enclosed balconies on Kingsway noting that they would provide a buffer from noise and pollution. A couple of Panel members thought some of the bedrooms were too deep and thought the interior of the suites would be too dark.

Most of the Panel thought there should be some kind of amenity in the building. Also one Panel member suggested the roof area off the back of the building could be used for an outdoor amenity.

The Panel was very disappointed with the lack of response to sustainability and suggested the applicant look at roofing material, storm-water management and other sustainable measures.

- **Applicant's Response:** Matthew Cheng thanked the Panel for their comments noting the brochure was not updated although the landscape plan was current.

---

2. Address:	2758 Prince Edward
DE:	410898
Use:	9-storey residential building
Zoning:	C-3A
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Linda Baker Architect
Owner:	0771252 BC Ltd.
Review:	Second (First Review: January 17, 2007)
Delegation:	Linda Baker, Peter Kruek, Bill Kangara
Staff:	Dale Morgan

---

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

- **Introduction:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the application. The proposed development is located in the Mount Pleasant Area bounded by Prince Edward to the west, East 11<sup>th</sup> to the north and East 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south. The site is currently a surface parking lot for the Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel with two billboards on site. The current 97 stalls will be incorporated into the proposed development as a separate parking facility. The Panel grouped around the context and project models (including the previous and current designs) where Mr. Morgan described the surrounding area noting various properties and zonings. The applicant is requesting a building height relaxation from 30 feet to 95.8 feet and an FSR increase from 1 to 2.99.

At the previous review, the Panel was concerned about the suite layouts. Mr. Morgan noted that all the unit layouts with internal bedrooms had been eliminated from the current proposal. Mr. Morgan noted that the site fronts the Wellness Walkway along East 11<sup>th</sup> Ave and that speciality paving and landscape treatment has been provided. Building massing at the street is lower in height, similar to a townhouse form and within a landscape setback. Units at the street level have direct access from grade. Mr. Morgan stated that staff, in keeping with Council policy for high density housing for families, is seeking more variety of ground oriented units to include 2 level townhouses suitable for families.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Previous UDP issues: Has the revised scheme successfully resolved the previous concerns of the Panel?
  - i. Upper level massing and neighbourly response to RM-5
  - ii. Urban Form response
  - iii. Liveability
  - iv. Materiality
  - v. Public Realm
2. Building Response to Site Orientation: The previous Panel comments had recommended a "slab form" type of building to better address the prevailing urban context. This east/west orientation has solar gain implications to which the applicant has addressed with a high performance low "e" glass and balcony projections. The Panel is requested to comment on this response and to offer any further recommendations to improve building solar performance relative to its orientation.
3. Earning: Has this application earned the discretionary increases in height and density, through its contribution and enhancements to the public realm and through exemplary design?

Mr. Morgan took questions from the Panel.

---

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Linda Baker, Architect, further described the proposal. Ms. Baker noted that the orientation of the building is east-west and they are proposing to install low "e" glass which meets the Energy Star requirements and has been designed specifically for the project. She added that sun control will be achieved through the use of vertical blinds and translucent roll down shades. Fifty percent of the suites are corner units and will have good cross ventilation.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans for the building noting the green space has been redistributed. Also refinement has been done on the ground plane with the water feature being replaced with a public art piece.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider a more varied building expression in response to site orientation

**Related Commentary:** The Panel unanimously supported the project and commended the architect for all the work and the refinement to the project. The Panel agreed that the project had earned its height and density increases.

The Panel thought the upper massing made for a clearer statement and the units were more liveable. The Panel liked the redesign of the bedrooms and particularly the loft bedrooms although there was some concern about the size of the units. Some of the Panel had some concern about the liveability of the units on the south elevation and suggested the landscape scheme in that area should buffer the units from traffic noise on West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

The Panel liked the use of material and the distribution of the masonry on the building. They thought it was a more satisfying elevation although several members of the Panel thought the east and west facades could be a little stronger. Several Panel members liked the "deco" reference on the building. The Panel acknowledged that an east-west orientation was the most difficult to handle but thought the architect had achieved a good response for the building.

The Panel congratulated the architect on the green roof and the landscaping plans. The Panel thought the outdoor amenity spaces on both the south and north end was a good idea. The Panel also thought the public realm had also been improved since the last review and appreciated the attention to the Wellness Walkway. The Panel also commended the Panel on the sustainable aspects in the project.

The Panel was impressed with the "u" value of the glazing and suggested the architect push it more to get an even higher value. One Panel member noted that "e" glass was not the best answer for solar glass as it can get a hot surface inside and radiation into the space which works in the winter but could be unbearable in the summer. Another Panel member clarified that if only the inner glass face had a low "e" coating, then heat gain should not be an issue. One Panel member also thought that overhangs wouldn't work on the west side and suggested they should be vertical although several Panel members liked the extension of the slab beyond the glazing. It was suggested that external shades could also be used.

- **Applicant's Response:** Ms. Baker thanked the Panel for their comments. Ms. Baker noted that the development is targeting first time buyers and they have approached the design of the suites with that in mind.

3. Address: 199 West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue - Parcel 5 (SEFC)  
DE: 411328  
Use: Mixed-use development containing retail on the ground floor along Manitoba Street, 99 dwelling units of affordable housing and 58 dwelling units of market housing all over 2 levels of underground parking.  
Zoning: CD-1/M-2 to CD-1  
Application Status: Complete  
Architect: GBL Architects  
Owner: Millennium Development Group  
Review: First  
Delegation: Stuart Lyon, Jennifer Stamp  
Staff: Scot Hein

---

**EVALUATION: REZONING (5-2) - DP (5-2)**

- **Introduction:** Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application for a mixed-use development on Parcel 5 in South East False Creek. Mr. Hein noted that this is the last of eight sites to be submitted for a Development Permit at the Olympic Village in Sub-area 2A of South East False Creek.

There are two residential buildings, one non-market and the other market. The non-market building overlooks two sides of the “gantry crane” park. The building is stepped on the north side to improve sunlight access down to the street. There will be a variety of suites sizes including family oriented units. The building will contain a large rooftop garden terrace and green roof. A common amenity area is located on the ground floor. The market building has smaller units and high ceilings with single loaded corridors to allow for daylight and cross ventilation.

The Manitoba Street frontage will have a number of retail units with a commercial loading bay which will be concealed within the building. Underground parking is to be provided for both the retail and residential occupants.

Mr. Hein asked the Panel to vote separately for the Rezoning and for the Development Permit.

Mr. Hein took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Stuart Lyon, Architect, described the proposal in further detail noting the park was designed to be an amenity to the buildings and will be an asset to the project. Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect, described the landscaping for the project.
- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider emphasising the reference to the original shoreline in the landscape treatment or removing it from the design;
  - Consider Design development to the at-grade residential entries along West 1st Avenue and public realm interface throughout the project.
  - Consider design development to the façade on Walter Hardwick Avenue to reduce the building’s apparent scale at the street level; and
  - Consider reducing privacy issues between the two buildings.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the rezoning, the use, form and density and asked that the application come back to the Panel after going to the Development Permit Board.

Most of the Panel thought there was a great deal of maturity in the architecture and the landscaping although a few areas still needed to be refined. Also the material approaches, suite layout and landscaping was well done.

There was some concern about the north façade which seemed somewhat dense and the scale on Walter Hardwick Avenue was a little tough and the Panel suggested a townhouse type unit at grade to better integrate with the neighbouring site. Also most of the Panel thought the “line in the sand” that represents the shore line, needed to be a bit bolder or people won’t be able to get the significance.

The Panel thought the integration of the park made the project and glued together the non-market with the market housing. One Panel member thought the market housing, in the way it has been planned, created privacy issues across the slot to the non-market housing and suggested the applicant consider some form of screening. Also, one Panel member suggested having access from the market building to the park. One Panel member thought the elevator lobby for the market housing seemed forced and pressed onto the street.

Some of the Panel thought the woodland garden area between the two buildings needed more work and that the stepping seemed a little bit abrupt. A couple of Panel members thought the applicant was trying to squeeze too much on the site. One Panel member thought the West First Avenue residential entries needed improvement and that there wasn’t enough separation from the street noting that the street will be more significant once the development is completed.

One Panel member felt the project was the best in the precinct and thought the non-market housing would be some of the nicest places to live in the city.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Lyon thanked the Panel for their thoughtful comments adding that the team will look at incorporating some of the suggestions. Mr. Lyon noted that the panels’ suggestion of townhouse units on Walter Hardwick Avenue had already been discussed on previous sites and said it was not a preferred unit type from a marketing point of view. He added that it was a non starter for the non-market housing building; however they could look at a 2 storey expression on Walter Hardwick Avenue to address the scale issue.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.