

---

---

**URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

---

---

**DATE:** September 18, 2002

**TIME:** 4.00 p.m.

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

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Walter Francl, Chair (excused Item 1)  
Richard Henry (Chair, Item 1) (present for Items 1-3 only)  
Joseph Hruda  
Reena Lazar (present for Item 1 only)  
Stuart Lyon  
Sorin Tatomir  
Ken Terriss

**REGRETS:** Helen Besharat  
Jeffrey Corbett  
Gerry Eckford  
Kim Perry  
Maurice Pez

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Carol Hubbard

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	4588 Clancy Loranger Way
2.	1966 East 19th Avenue
3.	500 - 600 Pacific Street
4.	Burrard Street Bridge - Workshop
5.	Granville Street Bridge - Workshop

---

- 
- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Address:         | 4588 Clancy Loranger Way                   |
| DA:                 | 406930                                     |
| Use:                | Sports Facility (2 storeys)                |
| Zoning:             | RS-1                                       |
| Application Status: | Complete                                   |
| Architect:          | Walter Francl                              |
| Owner:              | Vancouver Park Board                       |
| Review:             | First                                      |
| Delegation:         | Walter Francl, Michael Epp, Rudy Roelofsen |
| Staff:              | Ralph Segal                                |
- 

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0)

- **Introduction:** Rudy Roelofsen, Facility Development Manager, Vancouver Park Board, provided some background information on this application. He noted the Park Board supports the objectives of both the Phoenix Gymnastics Club and the Pacific Indoor Lawn Bowling Club and has been in discussions with them regarding an appropriate location for their facilities. Several years ago, the clubs combined their efforts by uniting to form the Millennium Sports Facility Society. The Park Board has agreed in principle to the Society building the facility at the Nat Bailey Stadium Park, and a Master Plan for Hillcrest, Nat Bailey Stadium and Riley Parks, completed in June 2000, recommends the intersection of Clancy Loranger Way and Midlothian Avenue as the location for the proposed Millennium facility. More recently, however, Nat Bailey Stadium Park has also been identified as the future site of the 2010 Winter Olympics curling venue, if the Vancouver/ Whistler Winter Olympics Bid is successful. After the Games, the curling venue would convert to a community centre curling club, replacing the existing Riley Park community centre and Vancouver Curling Club (located in Hillcrest Park to the west of this site). Also to be located in the general area of the three parks is a new citywide swimming pool to replace the aging Percy Norman Pool. If the 2010 Winter Olympics are awarded to Vancouver, a new master planning exercise will need to be undertaken to update the existing plan, and the siting of the proposed Olympic facility will be under review. As well, the future of Nat Bailey Stadium will be closely examined as part of such a planning process. It is therefore not known at present exactly how the development of the park and the future facilities will proceed around the proposed Millennium facility.

The proposed facility is a public building, located in a public park. As such, the Park Board wants to work with the Millennium Society to ensure the building will be an appropriate and welcomed addition to the community, meeting the Park Board's high standards of design. The advice of the Urban Design Panel is sought before the Board gives its approval.

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, briefly described the proposal, noting the following areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought:

- the height, at approx. 45 ft., requires a relaxation from the maximum permitted 35 ft. in RS-1;
  - how the facades and the scale of the walls of the "box" are handled;
  - the shape of the roof, the profile of the parapet;
  - landscaping around the site;
  - whether there is sufficient articulation in the proposed tilt-up slab construction.
-

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Following a general discussion and question period, Walter Franci, Architect, briefly described the design rationale. He noted that while funding for the project is largely from the Millennium Foundation, the Federal Government also has some financial involvement. Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plan.
- **Panel's Comments:** After reviewing the model and posted drawings, the Panel commented as follows:

The Panel unanimously supported this application and was generally very enthusiastic about the opportunity to develop this facility, noting it could become a great asset to both the smaller and greater communities.

It was agreed that tilt-up concrete is very difficult to deal with and the applicant was commended for the interesting attempts to break out of the "industrial box". The north and west elevations were thought to be quite successful but the south and east elevations appear somewhat stark. While the tilt-up system has its limitations, it was suggested there might be a little more articulation in these walls. One Panel member indicated a preference to see it all one system rather than a different colour or material at the angle line between the top and the bottom. Another suggestion was to emphasize the horizontals.

Concerns were also expressed about the roof. A suggestion was made to make this a very green building, given its setting in the park. Planting could be used to green and animate the south and east elevations as well as screening the roof. In this way, the "box" could meld in with the surrounding structure and really fit into the park. Another suggestion with respect to the roof was to consider a lighter, metal roof form to help lighten up the bulk of the building.

Panel members expressed regret that the lawn bowling facility does not have more reasonable daylight access. It was also thought to be very unfortunate that it is not possible to see into this area to watch the bowling activities from the outside. Visual access would also alleviate CPTED concerns in this area. One suggestion was to create a stepped seating area around it.

There was strong support for expanding the roof deck to include a terrace for overview opportunities.

Some Panel members found the palette of colours a little harsh and too intense for the park setting.

With respect to the westerly side, facing Midlothian Avenue, there was a suggestion made to create an artificial stone pathway on a diagonal to one of the entrances, ending with some public art, in order to take the eye from the muted walls on the west side.

Several Panel members urged that showers be added. While they may not be required for the young gymnasts, they could be very important for others who may use this facility in the future.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Franci said he agreed with most of the Panel's observations. There has always been a concern, given the budgetary constraints of the project and the nature of the gymnasium, about how much glass can be used. He said he liked the idea of lightening the roof. They have been looking at opportunities to introduce some clerestory light with an overhang projection of the roof structure to control the ingress of light, using that as a method of relieving the parapet alignment around the building and reducing the apparent height of the wall.

---

2. Address:	1966 East 19th Avenue
Use:	Congregate Housing (117 units)
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	JM Architecture
Owner:	New Chelsea Society
Review:	First
Delegation:	Joe Minten, John Cassell, Mary Chan
Staff:	Alan Duncan

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:** Alan Duncan, Rezoning Planner, introduced this application to redevelop the northernmost of three existing buildings to increase the number of units and provide more livable accommodation for low income seniors. The project also includes 17 units of congregate housing, for a total of 117 units. Mr. Duncan briefly described the site and its immediate context, noting the original CD-1 zoning has been in place since 1966 and included no guidelines. The application seeks to increase the unit count from the existing 71 units to 117 and the density from 0.76 FSR to 1.25 FSR. The northerly building would be demolished and replaced with a new building containing 68 one- and two-bedroom suites. The two existing buildings to the south containing 49 units would be retained. The proposed increase in density is generally supported by staff, subject to the form of development and other considerations. The height on the 19th Avenue elevation is just below 35 ft. which is comparable to the adjacent RT-5 zone. The lane elevation ranges in height between 43.9 ft. and 52.8 ft. Front yard setback ranges between 17 ft. and 20 ft., noting that while RT setbacks require 24 ft., most of the adjacent houses are non-conforming and much closer to the sidewalk. There is a 25 ft. separation between the proposed new building and the existing structures.

The areas in which the advice of the Panel is sought include:

- appropriateness of the form of development, particularly the height;
- density;
- 19th Avenue streetscape within the context of the neighbouring RT-5 and RS-1S zones;
- materials and general appearance of the building.

Mr. Duncan noted that staff believe the design resolution has improved considerably through the process, however, it is thought some things could be done to make it even more neighbourly.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Joe Minten, Architect, briefly described the access to the buildings and stressed the security aspects of the scheme. The congregate care units are contained on the second level and are independent of the other floors. In addition to independent living units, the ground floor also contains the dining, kitchen and recreational facilities. Mr. Minten responded to questions from the Panel.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel strongly supported this application. Most Panel members found this site ideally suited for the use which addresses a real social need.

The majority of Panel members had no problem with the proposed height, noting the strong effort that has been made to mitigate the height on the 19th Avenue frontage. There was a suggestion

that the scale along 19th Avenue might be modified to be more representative of single family homes.

Concerns were expressed about the awkwardness of the blunt cut-off at the end of the buildings, suggesting that greater attention should be given to the end elevations as well as the transition from the higher to the lower building. It was suggested a hipped or gable form might be a more appropriate way to deal with the end elevations.

The Panel found the main entry to the building too subdued and almost like a back door. A much stronger presentation to the street was recommended, even making the building wider at the street if necessary to provide a front door that leads more directly to the elevator. There was also a recommendation for more glazing at the front entry to the independent seniors' component, noting there might be an opportunity to open it up to create more eyes on the lane.

There was a recommendation to cover a portion of the outside terraces. As well, to consider some sort of rail or hedging treatment along those edges to provide a buffer next to the lane.

Several Panel members were concerned about the lack of contained open space in the proposal. A little more developed common outdoor space, either at grade or on the roof, would be a great asset to the project.

There was a recommendation that some of the suites, particularly 301 and 201, might be given a little more pleasant outlook.

With further development of the site amenities, and particular attention paid to the entrance sequences, most Panel members thought the proposal could earn the 1.25 FSR being sought. By a vote of 3-2, the Panel supported the application being returned for its review at the Development Application stage.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Minten thanked the Panel for its comments and positive criticism. He noted they have been looking at the end gables and will continue to do so. He also agreed with the comments about the front door which will also be reconsidered.

---

3. Address:	500-600 Pacific Street
Use:	Marina
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning (Text Amendment)
Architect:	Busby & Associates
Owner:	Concord Pacific
Review:	First
Delegation:	Peter Busby, Matt Meehan
Staff:	Jonathan Barrett, Michael Gordon

---

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (4-1)

- **Introduction:** Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application for rezoning. The proposal is for a marina in the Beach Neighbourhood which was first rezoned in 1999. The application proposes to move part of the expansion of the existing marina eastward to the side of George Wainborn Park and in front of one of the major Beach Neighbourhood residential buildings. The total area of the marina remains unchanged and it will accommodate a similar number of vessels as originally envisaged. The marina contains 27 - 35 berths and a 150 m<sup>2</sup> marina accessory building and will also include some visitor moorage on the westerly side.

The main issue identified by staff relates to view impacts, both public and private. These are: the street-end view at the foot of Homer Street; near and far views from the seawall walkway; views from the private development behind the walkway; and far views from the "bullnose" which was considered a principal viewpoint in the design of the park. Mr. Barrett noted that longer views are generally considered to be more precious than shorter views, having been embodied in policy documents. Some private views are also impacted.

The public benefits offered by this rezoning application include the provision of five visitor berths, a moorage referral service, a pump-out station, and laundry/toilets/shower facilities. As well, an extension of the seawall walkway through the False Creek Yacht Club is being negotiated. The City is also seeking wheelchair accessibility for the ferry dock.

Staff recommend moving the outboard section of the marina back into the area originally intended, to protect views from the bullnose viewpoint, and to reduce the size of the marina accessory building from 150 m<sup>2</sup> to 75 m<sup>2</sup> to minimize view impact from the waterfront walkway.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Matthew Meehan, Concord Pacific, explained they are working to find a longer term tenure for the yacht club, noting this proposal maintains the yacht club water area as it now exists. Peter Busby, Architect, described the project, stating they believe it achieves a better relationship between the park and the water.
- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel strongly supported this proposal as submitted. It was agreed that the boats are an important aspect of the life and character of the creek.

Most Panel members preferred the open water in front of the park and one Panel member thought there would be little view impact if there were smaller boats in front of the park. There was also

---

a suggestion that it could be opened up more if the end slip was eliminated in exchange for extending out to the headline so that no capacity is lost.

There was a recommendation to disperse the bigger boats throughout the marina rather than having them together at one end where they create a wall of view blockage.

The height of the accessory building was not seen as a problem, especially at low tide and noting it is very much a part of the water experience.

A suggestion was made to limit the slip size of the outboard portion to 36 ft. sailboats rather than 45 ft. power boats.

While there was some sympathy expressed for the Planning Department's position, a comment was made that there could be a compromise if this approach makes better business sense, especially if it puts the public benefits at risk.

One opposing Panel member thought the views from the park should be maintained, especially from the bullnose. This member also felt it was an imposition on purchasers in the buildings behind since they were not anticipating a view of the boats and associated activities.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Meehan noted there has been full disclosure to potential purchasers in the neighbourhood. Mr. Busby agreed the idea of dispersing the larger vessels around the marina can be accommodated. With respect to the idea of further opening up the area in front of the park, it would depend on how much space is left for the yacht club.

---

4. Address:	Burrard Street Bridge
Use:	Pedestrian/Cyclist Sidewalk Study
Application Status:	<b>WORKSHOP</b>
Architect:	Busby & Associates & Robert Lemon
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Delegation:	Peter Busby, David Dove (Engineering Services)
Review:	Second
Staff:	Yardley McNeill/Michael Gordon

---

- **Introduction:** Yardley McNeill, Heritage Planner, reviewed the options now under consideration. The choice has been reduced to two basic concepts, one of which has three variations. Council considered the options in July but there is yet no clear preference identified. All options have pedestrians on the outside and cyclists on the inside, next to vehicular traffic.

A1 is the base case scenario which adds a sidewalk to the outside of the existing sidewalk, with no other changes to the bridge.

A2 is the "pinch point" option. This scheme has the original railing removed and the sidewalk extended. A new railing is added which reinterprets the original railing in its form and massing. At the approach of the towers at the central span, the sidewalk narrows to recede and go through the original portals. The central span is about ten percent of the overall length of the bridge.

A3 adds an extended sidewalk at a level 4 ft. - 6 ft. lower than the original sidewalk. The existing railing remains in place and a new railing is added to the outside. The extended sidewalk extends around the towers but at a lower level so the Juliet balconies remain intact. Stair access is provided between the two sidewalk levels.

Option C has a new sidewalk significantly below the level of the existing road deck, extending through the towers at a lower level.

Peter Busby, Architect, member of the consultant team, noted that an important issue in developing the various options has been retention of the existing balustrade, and the main issue for heritage interests has been to maintain the clarity of the portal and the tower. He noted that Option C has now largely been discounted due to CPTED issues. All the options include a lighting system that picks up on the original lighting on the bridge which was removed several decades ago.

David Rawsthorne, Engineering Services, briefly reviewed the rationale for the project and responded to questions from the Panel.

- **Panel Comments:**

The Panel commended the project team on the thorough analysis which makes the options very clear.

Comments on the options were as follows:

- Option C: although very interesting it is not appropriate to put either pedestrians or cyclists below the level of the bridge deck because it puts them into a place where it feels vulnerable. It is a "second class" location and also quite elaborate. Don't support that.



- I would have difficulty supporting the holes through the torches. They are just not wide enough to support a decent width of opening and it would really take away from them. I think a better solution is to go around them.
- Pleased to see the option which replicates the existing handrail further out. It gives quite a wide sidewalk, although the appearance is not particularly intimate and there is not the same sense of the edges on either side.
- I think it is worth looking at modifying the Juliet balcony - there are ways to make it "of" the bridge;
- The pinch point is not a successful solution.
- What are the real problems with the pinch point scheme for users? If it was found to be acceptable by the users (which seems unlikely) then I think it is without question the best solution. It has the least impact to this Vancouver icon.
- It is not acceptable to put pedestrians down on another level.
- I rather like A3 but am concerned about the split in elevation and what an appropriate separation might be to make sure there is still a view of the original rail.
- I really like the idea of having the glass platform in front of the piers themselves, as long as there is some solid surface on the outside edge for people to walk on.
- On A3 it might be worth considering bulging the railing line out more to get really clear of the balcony.
- The design and details of the edge are very important because it will influence the whole appearance of the bridge. It must be considered earlier rather than later.
- I would like to see a feasibility study to know if it's justified. I do not support the pedestrian walkway lower than the bridge deck and don't like the metal hand rails.
- A2 is the least damaging to the appearance of the bridge. The right-of-way should be given to pedestrians in the pinch points.
- I like A3 with modifications. It comes down to what is a comfortable separation and to deal with the transition around the piers to make it as transparent as possible.

Although the Panel reached no conclusions about the different options, a vote was taken on the preference for each of the schemes, as follows:

Option C: 0-5 - This scheme should be eliminated.

Option A1: 0-5

Option A2: 3-0

Option A3: 2-0

Panel members stressed that they believe all three A options should be further explored.

---

5. Address:	Granville Street Bridge
Use:	Pedestrian/Cyclist Sidewalk Study
Application Status:	<b>WORKSHOP</b>
Architect:	Hotson Bakker & Buckland Taylor Eng.
Owner:	City of Vancouver
Review:	First
Delegation:	Peter Taylor, Bruce Haley
Staff:	Michael Gordon, Doug Smith

---

Michael Gordon, Central Area Planner, introduced this workshop discussion on the proposal to improve the pedestrian and cyclist amenity on the Granville Bridge, and Doug Smith, Structures and Greenways Engineer, provided a brief history of the project.

Improvements to all the bridges were reviewed in the False Creek Crossing Study and Council has instructed staff to explore Option G1 for the Granville Bridge in greater detail, for consideration for the 2003-2005 Capital Plan. The False Creek Crossing Study describes Option G1 as a mid level walkway that connects seawall to seawall. The current Option G1 is a shortened version of this alternative, without the extended ramps which proved to be unfeasible. It has also been determined that this option would not benefit commuter cyclists but has considerable potential for recreational users, tourists and commuter pedestrians. A second option provides elevators and stairs to the upper deck level, with some improvements/widening to the deck.

Bruce Haley briefly described the various options that were first considered and Peter Taylor described the technical considerations. The estimate of \$11 million for Option G1 in the False Creek Crossing Study did not include any allowance for strengthening the existing structure which would require another \$1.5 - 2.0 million.

Option 1 is intended to create a very attractive stair access, with the crossing reduced to the narrowest point of the creek crossing. This pedestrian crossing is supplemented by elevators which also extend to the bridge deck. It is thought the CPTED issues relating to the Burrard Bridge crossing would not apply to Granville Bridge because it is a much shorter span and there is the alternative route on the bridge deck itself.

Option 2, providing elevators and stairs to a walkway and to the bridge deck, recognizes there are technical and architectural challenges in creating a form that works effectively.

Option 3 has no lower level connection and involves an upgrade to the bridge deck.

In the general discussion and question period that followed, the following questions/observations were made by Panel members:

- is it known how far people will realistically walk up to reach the walkway? The stairs may not be used very much;
  - is it technically possible to put the mid-level crossing internally in the bridge?
  - question the usability/desirability of the spiral stair - particularly coming down;
  - Option 1 is better in that it maintains an orientation to the bridge;
-

- there are probably linear back-and-forth stair schemes that can be done around an elevator tower rather than a spiral;
- Option 3 solves different problems than Options 1 and 2;
- what is the cost of escalators?
- Option 3 provides a big improvement to the bridge environment;
- Option 1 is delightful and it is important to introduce elements of delight into the city fabric; it is appealing and a draw in itself;
- has a destination at the top been considered (eg, glass coffee shop)?
- the vertical stair is too boring and will be repetitious whatever shape it is;
- Option 1 might be popular with tourists, but not sure whether residents will use it;
- what is the capacity of the elevators?
- has another, less obscure, location on Granville Island been considered for the south connection?
- consider breaking up the climb into different stages, with each section having a distinct character;
- Options 1 and 2 have the advantage of being able to see your destination, unlike Option 3;
- suggest improving the appearance of the walkway by making it curvilinear.