

---

---

**URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

---

---

**DATE:** September 20, 2000

**TIME:** 4.00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

**PLACE:** Committee Room #1, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Paul Grant (Chair)  
James Cheng  
Roger Hughes  
Brian Palmquist  
Gilbert Raynard  
Keith Ross  
Sorin Tatomir

**REGRETS:** Jack Lutsky  
Lance Berelowitz  
Bruce Hemstock  
Tom Bunting  
Alan Endall

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Kathy Pedersen, Raincoast Ventures

---

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	65 Water Street
2.	2263 Redbud Lane
3.	3602-3666 Vanness Avenue [Collingwood Village Phase 3 and 4]
4.	854 West 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
5.	858 Beatty Street

---

<b>1. Address:</b>	65 Water Street
DA:	405358
Use:	Mixed commercial/live-work studios
Zoning:	HA-2
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Paul Merrick
Owner:	Harco Building Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Roger Bailey, Paul Merrick, Mitch Sakumoto
Staff:	Ralph Segal/Eric Fiss/Yardley McNeill

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

• **Introduction:**

Eric Fiss presented an overview of this project as well as advised the Panel that this proposal had previously been approved but due to declining market, the proposal has been reduced in size. The project is for heritage retention, renovation, and additions to an existing heritage warehouse building, the Malkin Building. It is located on the north side of Water Street, between Abbott and Carrall Streets. The railyards extend to the north of the project and beyond that the waterfront.

The previous application for this project was approved by the Development Permit Board in November of 1998 with some conditions. An extensive public process and design development review took place which led to the approval for restoration to the Malkin Building. This application is no longer viable due to market conditions. A report to Council was prepared by Staff requesting endorsement for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement [HRA]. The HRA which has been endorsed by Council in principle would allow for two key features:

1. To allow the Malkin Building the use of commercial/live-work, which is not currently listed in Zoning By-laws but has appeared in 2 other projects, the last one being 600 Nicola Street; and
2. To allow for transfer of density which has not been previously possible in Gastown. This is conditional on an agreement which would allow the proponent to lease parking spaces for this project (48) from City parkade. The transfer of density would be on the condition of deleting the approved 3 storey addition on top of the Malkin Building as well as reducing 1 storey from the approved 11 storey tower.

These changes provide a better fit for the project and meet some important heritage objectives. The project will benefit Gastown by revitalizing the historic core and by providing an increase in residential space. The Gastown Policy is under review under the Gastown Historic Management Program, which has not yet been completed. Council felt this could be a demonstration project.

Staff concluded that the transfer of density and incentives are consistent with the policy direction of this program. The site in question reaches over 4 lots with the Malkin Building on 2 of the lots. The proposal includes restoration to the Malkin Building, addition of the new tower, and one level of underground parking, and retains commercial use on the ground floor. Additionally, plans include a water tower (heritage character) which can also be used as an emergency response sprinkler system for the building. The 33 ft. lot will be a glazed atrium, having a view through the water. The 66 ft. lot would have 58 units.

---

These units will be marketed as residential units with a courtyard. The latter part will likely be part of Phase 2. Parking entry is at the rear of the site with loading underground off the new 66 ft. tower.

The Panel's comments were sought and provided with regard to the following:

- appropriateness of new commercial type/live-work within this building as well as site liability and unit layout from plans presented;
- how does the proposal fit within the heritage streetscape? In terms of height there is a bit of height relaxation which Staff supported before (HA-2 Zoning provides for maximum of 75 ft. Applicant to demonstrate that the impacts on the use, shadowing, rhythm of streetscape is not impacted and will improve streetscape; and
- the appropriateness of architectural, building, materials, and the way the new residential tower is blending in with and working with historic district.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Roger Bailey advised the Panel that the previous proposal for this project had been endorsed by the Design Panel. The Malkin Building is a historic site and the applicant seeks to frame this building rather than mark the brick facade. The facade was well received before in a light glazed Victorian railway station attitude.

Messrs. Bailey and Merrick were of the opinion that something had now been lost in the design as it does not allow the Malkin Building to retain its integrity. The roof changes were not part of the request made to the developer, but an offer that was made subsequent to the approval essentially stated that a density transfer would be provided if that portion was removed in order to retain the heritage Malkin Building. This was a valuable approach considering the budget of this project.

As mentioned, underground parking has been reduced to 1 level with a Parking Agreement with the City for off-site parking. The facade treatment had provided different opinions. There is laneway access, however, the City does not own the laneway and an agreement with the adjacent property owner would be required. Further, the By-law in Gastown does not allow access to sites across pavement so there may be an access issue with the City. Timber structure and brick wall will be exposed inside. The north wall is punched windows. This proposal would try to develop a wall (masonry perpendicular and glass transparent) by putting a slider on rail to open to a french balcony.

For the suites, the Applicant suggested a second layer of screen for noise and temperature control, which would also provide for an interesting street scheme. In the original scheme a connection to the buildings was provided from the atrium. The focus now would be more on public amenity as there is not a lot of this in the Gastown area. Mr. Merrick provided the comment that the possibility to connect the buildings still exists.

• **Panel's Comments:**

After reviewing the models and posted materials, the Panel provided the following comments:

In terms of use, the retail and proposed work/residential was a good mix for this area. There was a noise factor to be considered for those residential units on top of the restaurant [if it were tenanted] when people leave at 2:00 a.m. The areas without windows could perhaps be looked at. Livability would work with an effort made on the internal layout to include more light, perhaps glass blocks would be appropriate.

The height was fine.

Heritage aspects have been adequately dealt with. The use of the railway station imagery and balance of glazing and brick peers will work really well. Appreciated the ability to open up into the street with french balconies and also the ability to keep that separate. A relationship could be created between the atrium rooftop and the tower facade to create a balance there [move some brick on the tower building and get closer to the atrium roof top]. More definition to be provided to the entrance to the residential building.

Some Members preferred the old facade and viewed it as more elegant than the current one. A stronger transition between ground floor and residential units was preferred to differentiate the usage from commercial to residential. A suggestion was made to perhaps carry the atrium into the Malkin Building because it was very deep with no inside light, but this was not a requirement. More contrast with brick peers of the new tower and Malkin Building as it appears as if it stops at first peer. The elevation to the parking entrance should be more pleasing. The atrium should fit into Gastown character. The streetscape was very interesting and had been handled well in order to fit into heritage character. Roofscape and roof skyline of the building were very interesting and provided a good fit with the new building and the Malkin Building. A Comment was made that trees were shown on the model, but not on the drawings.

The Chair summarized the Panel's comments as follows:

It appeared that everybody had fully embraced the design particulars. There was a desire from some Members to perhaps revisit the previous facade on the higher building, but it also appeared to have met with favour as presented today so it could be left as is. The heritage component was also met with favour, as well as the use and livability. Everyone was in favour of the height. The architectural detail will be well resolved by the Applicant.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant did not comment further, but thanked the Panel for their input.

---

<b>2. Address:</b>	<b>2263 Redbud Lane</b>
DA:	405332
Use:	Residential
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	Lawrence Doyle
Owner:	Concert Properties Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Peter Kreuk, Richard Henry, Maurize Pez, Garry Doyle
Staff:	Ralph Segal, Eric Fiss, Laurie Schmidt

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

• **Introduction:**

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, presented this new submission for a previously approved Application on this site. This was the last development site in the 4-block Arbutus Industrial Neighbourhood, located on an internal private road and would front onto the Greenway. He explained the previously-approved application on this site essentially broke the building into 2 parts with a glazed one-storey link between the buildings. This new submission was in response to new market conditions. The desire was to create smaller units, as well as provide an improved weather type building, so this new proposal was for a 4-storey concrete construction.

Mr Fiss noted this proposal had also extended the space between this building and the adjacent Ridge development to approximately 7 m, which would be used as a pedestrian right-of-way. He advised that 87 units would be provided of which 59 would have 2 bedrooms or more; these units would average 90 m<sup>2</sup> and the FSR maximum would be 2.1. He described Redbud Street as a one-way private street going to the west, and the entry to the underground parking facility would be located at the western edge of the building. Also, this project had responded to the 2-3 m average setback, and that Guideline relaxation for an additional 2 m setback was being sought for this project, and noted that Guidelines allow for this relaxation when consideration is provided on how well it achieves the intent of the Guideline to create an industrial residential character and how it responded to other buildings adjacent to the project.

Mr. Fiss advised the cutbacks at the corner and proposed materials were brick base with painted exterior concrete finishing; the evaluation on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor set out how it will impact on use (privacy issue); and the shading on Greenway due to the reduced 4<sup>th</sup> storey setback was minimal. Also, paved walking areas with planters would be provided.

Some issues to be addressed by the Panel are as follows:

- overall massing of building; how the massing responded to this shifting over and pushing together and how it related to other buildings;
- relaxation of 4<sup>th</sup> storey setback which was a guideline requirement;
- how well the final articulation would relate to the park located to the west of the project and the newly created pedestrian walkway;
- specific relationship between ground plane to pedestrian areas and expression of ground-oriented townhouses around the perimeter of building;

- architectural expression of the building and compatibility to this emerging neighbourhood; and
- design of the forecourt with some seating areas and play area for children raised slightly from street.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Maurice Pez noted the preference by the Applicant for concrete building as well as for a simpler design.

Mr. Richard Henry provided comments with respect to the old buildings which used to be on this site, were built out of concrete and various pictures were displayed for the Panel to view, and that this site had not been a most prominent site. They had made an effort to provide 3 elements which had been broken into 3 modules to provide an hierarchy of expression. Access had been provided to Redbud Lane and to the Greenway and that views as expressed in the guidelines had been maintained. Feature elements of the building to elude to historical elements which were previously found on the site (Brewery Tower, which was a wonderful brick structure for many years).

The entrance had been off-set in an attempt to mitigate the difference in the classical central entrance of Claremont. The play area had been located in such a manner that it was visible from the living area. This Applicant had attempted to maximize the number of unit entrances which penetrated the building from the street and parkway. In discussions with City there appeared to be additional opportunities from Redbud Lane which would be explored. There were no entrances off the park which they felt would compromise public nature of the park and also provided a private use for tenants as opposed to the general public.

This application emphasized the need to provide as much family housing as possible; 59-60 units would be 2-bedroom and den [the requirement was for 39 units], and 20 units would have direct grade access. The Lobby area had been centralized and an amenity room had been provided for residents' use. Displays illustrate the entrances on parkway and path by the Ridge. Raised and lower planters would also be provided which families can use for personal use in order to enhance their entrance. Re-grading the slab level by the Ridge in order to enhance openness and connectiveness of Greenway. The building itself had a planer quality to it as it was vertically divided. This created a larger flat roof which could be dealt with in a number of ways, i.e., 2 dimensional plane and applied pattern of gravelling, place chimneys to highlight planer development as well as different colour for the chimneys as they are not seen as decorative items. Accessibility was an issue.

With respect to the setbacks, this project would maintain a principal setback along Greenway and park for 3 lower floors; however, it exceeds on the Redbud Lane side. This building would be the only one which had a courtyard compared to other buildings in this area. The setback was substantially increased from Ridge property line. The 4<sup>th</sup> floor setback was supposed to be an additional 2 m.

The Applicant would try to maintain guideline intent with material and glassy penthouse level. The Applicant is excited to use concrete as principal building material. The windows would recess into the concrete to create a nice shadow around the window frames. Mr. Henry apologized to the Panel for the colours in the model as they were brighter than on the material board displayed. It is the intention to provide warmer colours, such as sandy grey, clay and light green but on the models they are shown as cool colours.

When questioned by a Panel Member, Staff clarified the 2 m setback was for top level only and many projects in the area had followed this setback

Mr. Pez provided some additional comments noting that the overall average height was lower than permitted. As well, Mr. Pez felt that the Arbutus frontage model was perhaps not that accurate as the 2 m setback had not been followed by other developers for this neighbourhood. The additional overhang was for weather protection as they want to create a robust building.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Panel provided the following comments:

Accept massing of this project. Concerns with the facades and roof of the building as the neighbouring building which was taller will be looking down onto the roof. The project provided for a flat roof with coloured gravel on it whereas sloping roofs have been placed on other buildings in the area. Proposal as a consideration for development would be for a sloped roof.

The facade treatment was the weakest out of all the buildings in the area. When looking at the facade, there was not a clear direction where it is going. Thinly glued on brick is weak and the relationship of brick to concrete should be looked at by the Applicant. The relationship to lower floor to concrete on top floors needs some reworking. Consistency of design to the facade. Changing colours of one facade to the one beside it when it is all concrete and Applicant should look at simplifying this perhaps (express true concrete as it is).

Two trees had been placed in front of the entrance which seemed awkward. The character for the Arbutus area was the treeline boulevard and this should be carried through. The facade facing the Greenway requires one main entry which connects to the lobby. Some Members supported the landscape and materials as presented.

One Member was not comfortable with the relaxation to the 2 m setback on the north side of the building and the impact it would have on the Greenway. The relationship with the street at Redbud Lane should be looked at as the 2-4 units at the end of Redbud lane look one way or another and appear to be quite raised. Parking garage issue to be dealt with. A nice environment has been created around the lane.

At the south side of the street there was a very dense row of gates and access to the building. It appears that there were at least 3 lost opportunities for access and animation from the street edge and the building. The 2 southwest corner units will have to be planned properly otherwise these units may end up with headlights from traffic into bedrooms as opposed to livingroom. Would like to see the south facade more pedestrian-friendly. Consider reducing glass on south and west facades. It appeared that the south facade would be extremely hot. Support received for flat roof with the suggestion of a vent being placed there.

The material palette used was reasonable for area. The architectural detail compensated for the 2 m setback and has been expressed nicely. The colours on the board were perhaps too light and one Member preferred the colours on the models. Potential problem of shadowing on Greenway. The forecourt was a good idea for this building. There might be a privacy issue with the courtyard. Suggestion to allow access not only from street but also from courtyard to the playground. The design was perhaps a bit busy with open spaces very close to private suites. It was unfortunate that the higher floors nearby would look onto a roof and the relationship between the buildings could be an eyesore for people on higher floors of other buildings and perhaps the Applicant could look at this.

Some units facing Greenway appeared to be sunken below grade. The Applicant should deal with northeast corner in particular. There also appeared to be no direct view of the front door and not sure why an effort was made to relate the front door entrance to the building across Redbud Lane. Concern about the roof being too flat and too big. It appeared that the view from the street would show mainly a lot of walls. The courtyard and south face was not inviting. Entrances to be placed on both sides in order to enter from the Greenway. The 4 storey setback is almost there with perhaps some variation to less than 2 m. Perhaps the view onto the roof could be accentuated by placing trellises on the roof.

The Chair summarized the comments from the Panel as follows:

It appeared that the Panel generally was in favour of the massing and setback from the Ridge as well as in favour of the relaxation of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor setback. Design development to occur in corners. The roofscape could probably profit from some more design development. Place trellises on roof in order to mitigate flatness. Comments about materials that would suggest simplifying them. Look at entrances off Greenway. As well, the visual offset to entry into courtyard was confusing.

The Chair also provided some personal comments by commending the Applicant on proposing a 4-storey concrete building. The building mass sat well and the stratification worked well. Perhaps the dark brick is too dark. Perhaps look at simpler materials.

- **Applicant's Response:**

The Applicant agreed with the Panel's comments about the roof treatment. However, the Panel should be aware that the Savona displays a pitched roof with all the other buildings in neighbourhood displaying flat roofs. In terms of overview, the Applicant agreed with the comments from the Panel. Applicant would look at the facade recognizing that perhaps they were trying too hard to overcome some design issues. Other comments would be considered.



---

<b>3. Address:</b>	<b>3602-3360 Vanness Avenue [Collingwood Village Ph. 3 &amp; 4]</b>
Use:	Residential
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Nigel Baldwin
Owner:	Concert Properties Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	NAME WHO FROM PROJECT
Staff:	Bob Adair, Lynda Challis

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

• **Introduction:**

Ms. Lynda Challis, Rezoning Planner, presented this rezoning Application to the Panel. The By-law for Collingwood was currently CD-1. The Application seeks an increase in percentage of rental housing; a decrease in the percentage of family housing; reducing the size of a 2- bedroom family unit; redistribution of residential floor area; and allocation of floor area for congregate housing. There is also some decrease in height for mid-rise buildings, an increase in height for 4 high rise buildings and an increase in floorplate for 2 highrise buildings.

This property is bounded by Vanness Avenue on the North, Ormidale to the East, Euclid to the South and Joyce to the West. In 1993, the site was rezoned from primarily M-1 Industrial to CD-1 through a comprehensive zoning process. The property would be developed in four phases with 10 sub-areas. Part of Phase 3 was under development now and this proposal dealt with amendments relating to Phases 3 and 4, and that this was a single family neighbourhood nearby and commercial use on Joyce Street and Kingsway.

This Application deals primarily with the housing mix and form of development. The current CD-1 By-law allowed for a maximum of 25% of units for family housing and 15% for rental housing. The proposed Application sought a decrease in percentages to 20% of units for family housing and 20% for rental housing. This was based on the Applicant's previous experience from Phases 1 and 2 where there had been a greater demand for rental housing and less demand for family units. The Application also sought a reduction in the minimum unit size for a 2-bedroom unit from 78 m<sup>2</sup> to 72.5 m<sup>2</sup>, which was consistent with current recommended standards of BCHMC. Amendments were also proposed so that the floor area for residential use could be used for congregate housing for seniors. The models displayed current CD-1 By-law and proposed amendments.

The CD-1 By-law allocated floor area for each sub-area in Collingwood Village and also allocated maximum floor area for the entire Collingwood Site. This Application did not deal with any changes to maximum overall floor area, but dealt with redistribution of the floor area between sub-areas in order to reflect the changes in the form of development. The Application was requesting the flexibility to increase maximum floor area by 5% so long as the overall maximum remained the same.

The sub-areas affected were 7, 8, 9 (Park) and 10. The changes to reduce building height from 6 to 4 storeys were primarily along Vanness Avenue. This had been reduced due to neighbourhood concerns. The floor area from mid-rise buildings would be transferred to the 4 towers. The tower in sub-area 7 would be increased by 3 m, 8 increased by 14 m and 10 by 16 m and 3 m. The floorplate would be

increased for the 2 tallest towers. The current floorplate was 625 m<sup>2</sup> average with a maximum of 650 m<sup>2</sup> above the 6<sup>th</sup> floor. The proposal was for 675 m<sup>2</sup> average and maximum of 700 m<sup>2</sup> above the 4<sup>th</sup> floor. The changes in height and floorplate would result in increased open space in each sub-area which had generated mini-parks [public supports]. The park in sub-area 9 would remain the same size as currently proposed. An increase in parking access points was proposed in the streets where they are discouraged now [Vanness, Euclid & Foster].

Staff sought advice on changes to the building height, floorplate, open space and parking access.

Mr. Bob Adair, Development Planner, provided the Panel with the additional following comments on this Application:

Planning was generally supportive of this Application. Market conditions were changing and there was a need to look at this project in order to keep it successful. The rework of massing and tower did break up what had become too predictable. The changes in orientation of the towers related to the street grid at the eastern end of the site. The concerns raised included the massing of towers. There could be some issues coming forward from the neighbours to the south. The stepping approach shown on models was very important. The floorplate in some other towers had become averaged and should not be repeated so the stepping approach should be followed. In respect of lowering the units closest to the Skytrain, it was important that the view from the Skytrain be considered.

The other concern was the length of the building and to ensure enough articulation is provided. Design of the park and the buildings' relationship to the park was favourable. Regarding architecture, it was felt that the language in the revised By-law should include high standard materials for these highrises, as well as for the lowrise buildings. The quality should be guaranteed, as some of the smaller building sites could be sold off to other developers and this provision could then be lost.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Maurice Pez advised the Panel of Concrete Properties' involvement in this project since 1993. About ½ of the approved units had been built and this Application needed some fine tuning in respect of size of units, affordability and cost of building, and congregate housing which was much needed. They had benefited from meetings with the community and felt they had met the needs for more parks and open spaces.

Mr. Nigel Baldwin provided a new view analysis which displayed the proposed By-law and current By-law. A concern had been raised by a neighbour who lived on Church Street, which runs parallel to Kingsway, with respect to view. Pictures displayed at meeting. He also advised that some topographical errors had occurred in their report, i.e., the report stated 665 rental suites which should be 704; 665 units to be built in the park which should not have any units; word decreased instead of increased. He also advised that this Application was for the ongoing process of Collingwood. Phase I was built very close to requirements of the By-laws.

A study was done about 4 years ago which looked at ideas for tower massing for projects in the east end which resulted in more variety being sought in this area.

The Telus Building was the long view for this project. Some concerns from neighbours had been raised with respect to the higher massing in the middle area. The landscape and parks were very successful aspects of this project. It also created parkways by creating setbacks between the buildings. They had also tried to create variety in the storeys of the building. One [1] parking garage for a large space which

could be bought by other developers was not sufficient.

Mr. Chris Sterry provided information on landscaping, the streetscape and public park. The streetscape or public realm was not changing and was consistent with previous plans. In addition, 1 hectare had been allocated for a public park. The plan was consistent with guidelines and the design could be resolved later. They had now connected public open space with private space by providing rights-of-way to connect with the street, i.e., a 3 m pathway between 2 private courtyards. Due to neighbourhood public comments, it was felt that the public open space could be increased which had changed the shape of the rights-of way. Going from linear and widening out to crescent or semi-circle where people could sit on benches.

There would be some tree planting to soften the impact of building. The space around these routes would tie into the entrance way as well as the private adjacent courtyards. The public spaces would all be located on one lot. There was a requirement for this development to provide landscape on this path, but path is located on this lot so the issue had been addressed this way. An additional open space setback of approximately 30 ft. from the previous application had been created in order to provide 2 public gardens in that location, which reduced the mass off Vanness Street. They also provided a visual landscape breeze-way by breaking apart 2 buildings from the previous application.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Chair reminded the Panel that the Application dealt with rezoning only.

The Panel's comments included the following:

More park was great. In respect of end of street view, perhaps a smaller building or no building at all so that you can see the Telus Building. No problem with tinkering and adjusting to densities and some of building forms. In favour of towers on park. The stepping language for tower would be good language to have included. Not too sympathetic with loss of view from neighbours.

Parking access points were 1 per block but should perhaps not be placed beside each other. Park planning and connection of public spaces were really well done. The links created between public spaces should be made generous in size and not too narrow (10 ft. space too narrow). They must be as wide as possible for public right-of-way.

Support also to include language relating to setback and quality of materials for this project. The standard BCHMC size was too small, but felt this architect could provide livable smaller units. This item should be proven out more clearly before finalizing these numbers as per their amendment. This scheme was a big improvement over previous scheme. In respect of unit size, the market would dictate what was required. Support 700 sq. ft. to lower portion up to shoulder height and then 675 sq. ft. up further to maintain the step. Would also support 2 towers being the same height if developer wishes.

Developer to consult with Staff to see if more green space can be provided and terminate the forecourt in a cul-de-sac manner to address the landmark buildings and influence design of the park. Cutback the southern most building of Area 10 to allow geometry to flow and more park area. There were perhaps more refinements to explore in order to produce more green space. Definition of the 3 zones had been produced very well with the 4 towers. The 2 signature towers on the north side and reorientating them to the city grid was a major move to create the 3<sup>rd</sup> zone in the Development. There was a different approach than in the first phase of the project. Slimmer tower contrasting with a much lower proportioned building. Mid-rise massing combined with shoulder highrising in first phase concerned people and it would be

interesting to see response to this development. The Developer was going higher and slimmer and reduced the floorplate slightly. The slim floor tower was a better approach. The reduction from 6 storey to 4 storey was great. The length of the building was not too long.

The Chair provided a summary from the Panel's comments as follows: The Panel was in favour of the new orientation with city grid, landscape and lower building. Larger green space was very favourable. Landscape had been well addressed. A favourable consensus among the Panel.

- **Applicant's Response:**

Responded to comment regarding minimum size of the suites and the fact that the Developer was attempting solely to meet the needs of buyers and neighbourhood. Affordability was a big item for this development. If the market needed change in this area then this would be looked at again.

Responded to comment regarding developing more street end at 2 towers and more green space, which brings up some sensitivity from neighbourhood regarding traffic and would have to ensure neighbours are on side for this to happen.

**NOTE:** The Applicant's notes from this UDP are attached for reference.

---

<b>4. Address:</b>	<b>854 West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b>
DA:	405322
Use:	Mixed
Zoning:	FM-1
Application Status:	Complete
Architect:	W.T. Leung
Owner:	McIver's
Review:	First
Delegation:	Wing Ting Leung, Barrett Hills
Staff:	Bob Adair

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)**

• **Introduction:**

Mr. Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this application for a 4-storey mixed-use of residential/commercial located on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Zoning was currently FM-1 with the neighbourhood consisting of a combination of residential and mixed-use development. A residential courtyard bordered the site to the west. A landscaped berm with mature trees was located on the north side of West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Views from surrounding site might be affected.

In plan the scheme worked out fairly well. There was no feedback from neighbours regarding views yet, but this could be a major issue. This development had kept views in mind. There were concerns with covered arcades and how this will work with street. Overall massing seems to work quite well. Off-lane loading for commercial loading. Due to traffic on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the Applicant had kept units away from West 6<sup>th</sup>. There was also a concern in respect of acoustics with the courtyard design and screening from traffic noise. The treatment of the parking ramp and reduction of impact on West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue was also an issue.

The issues to be addressed by the Panel were as following:

- the arcade along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue;
- access to parking from West 6<sup>th</sup> and method achieved; and
- views from behind.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Mr. Will Leung advised that the 2-storey arcade appeared to be a reasonable solution to act as a buffer. It also served as commercial loading into building; otherwise an internal corridor would be needed. The arcade was on the property line which served a series of functions. The lower residential units are not visible when travelling along West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Commercial usage was challenging for West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and would most likely be offices which would require nominal loading.

- **Panel's Comments:**

The Chair noted that perhaps no Panel comments could be made on the view from behind.

Comments from the Panel included the following:

The arcade was well supported as West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue was a busy street and additional width for pedestrians was a welcome relief. Everyone also agreed that this was a very difficult site to work with and that the Applicant had optimized on facing the units as presented. Stepping down to courtyard and the distinctive floor levels for commercial and residential use worked well for 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

It was a noisy street so the funnel of noise in courtyard could be a problem and the Applicant could perhaps look at screening in front. As well, look at safety issue of courtyard from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Concern about livability along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Neighbours' views would be protected by the height envelope and the Applicant had complied with same. Parking access was also an issue. The arcade can work, however, it may depend on tenants.

Support of the scheme which was nice and simple, and support of materials used. This Applicant had done a great job in resolving a difficult site. The unit on the west side looking into courtyard could perhaps benefit from windows, if possible. Concern raised with respect to entrance to parking with perhaps signs being placed stating "no parking/no stopping" as visibility could be an issue.

Loading area may cause concern, but Applicant had advised that due to area it would more likely be offices than retail space which would not result in a lot of moving in the loading area. Concern raised in respect of the columns defining arcade and in particular the one adjacent to parkade which could pose some obstruction for drivers to see pedestrians and these could perhaps be removed or made thinner. The inset windows were great. Dirt from street may cause problem or health hazards. Ensure use of good anti-graffiti coating on masonry at lower levels with a penetrating sealer used at higher levels.

The Chair provided the summary that the Panel was enthusiastically in support of this Application.

The Chair on a personal note commended the Applicant on this project and solving the problems of noise, pollution from this street and had made it as livable as possible under the circumstances.

- **Applicant's Response:** No comments and thanked Panel for their comments.

---

<b>5. Address:</b>	<b>858 Beatty Street</b>
Use:	Mixed
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Architect:	Busby & Associates
Owner:	Pacific Place Properties Ltd.
Review:	First
Delegation:	Peter Busy, Andrew Grant
Staff:	Phil Mondor (in place of Michael Gordon)

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-0 \*Note: Roger Hughes left after Item 4)**

• **Introduction:**

\*Note: Applicant proceeded first due to Staff being unavailable. Phil Mondor attended at 7:47 p.m. and provided the following comments to the Panel:

Mr. Mondor reminded the Panel that their comments are sought only on rezoning at this time. The Panel is not dealing with the specifics of architecture this will be dealt with when the project comes back as complete DE application.

He also advised that the form of development is more in need of discussion than is land use and density. Elements of the form of development which would benefit from discussion include massing, scale, and street edges.

Regarding edges, the applicant seeks a smaller setback Beatty Street setback than the existing CD-1 Guidelines require. Staff recommend that the 3.7 m setback minimum be maintained. The significant context is that Beatty Street provides a significant pedestrian link starting in Gastown/International Village through Keefer Circle/steps then Beatty Street (the easternmost grid street on the downtown peninsula) through Beatty Mews down to Quayside/Roundhouse (shown using the Concord Pacific Place master site plan).

Another important edge is Smithe Street, particularly the very prominent S.E. corner of the proposed development on axis with the Cambie Bridge ramp down to Smithe Street. Finally, the blank wall along some of the Pacific Boulevard elevation is noted.

Regarding use and density, the significant policy context here are amendments to the Official Development Plan for False Creek North which are contemplated. Concurrently with this Application there is an Urban Design Study underway for North-East False Creek, Cambie Bridge area. This "rethink" and updating to reflect current conditions proposes a swap of residential density from this part of the Quayside Neighbourhood for commercial density from the area north and east of BC Place Stadium.

Staff is in support of this Application.

• **Applicant's Opening Comments:**

Peter Busby commented that the Panel has seen this Application before in a workshop. This Application is for rezoning of the PCI site at Beatty Street. The site has an unusual configuration. The site transfer issue has been resolved with the City's Engineering Department.

Proposed development consists of concrete structures to the street edge and corners of the lot to allow for the "Yaletown Character" look. Phase 2 is a smaller component which has a different character to it with

lower massing. The public streetscape is enhanced along Smithe Street. The roof is treated with landscape except for the roof on the eight-storey building which is not really visible. Canopies provide sun shading. The space between the two buildings provides for a plaza area .

Panel guidance is sought in respect of the general architecture of building, appropriate setback on Beatty Street, and character of main entrance on axis with Cambie Bridge.

With respect to the Beatty Street setback, the CD-1 Guidelines call for 3.7 m while the Applicant seeks a 1 m setback -- resulting in 4-4.5 m when combined with sidewalk. Staff want 7-8 m for pedestrians which relates to downtown residential sidewalk guidelines and provides for separation from the street to the residential project. This setback requirement relates to previous zoning for this site which was for a residential project. The present proposal provides for sidewalks with street trees, bicycle parking, a walking section and space for cafés to spill out into sidewalk. A 4 to 4.5 m setback from curb is right character for Beatty Street as this is not a high pedestrian route. Applicant believes the commercial usage needs smaller sidewalks to allow pedestrian traffic to walk right beside commercial as opposed to larger sidewalk. If larger sidewalks, the pedestrians tend to walk along edge and not against storefront.

In respect of the corner on the Cambie Bridge axis the Applicant has two different proposals with the Panel having received one of the proposals at the workshop. This was reviewed at the models with the following comments from Mr. Busby:

- to create a hard edge to the development and then work with crossings, landscape treatment and paving treatment on sidewalks to define zones;
- to have displays in the large public space on the corner, perhaps public art with an environmental theme, e.g. wind sculpture;
- appropriate for this building edge to have larger scale;
- establish the corner with an urban element so that one can drive by or walk through and be aware of the larger space beyond; and
- perhaps building an arch with entrance through it.

Questions from Panel to clarify the following: Entire podium has to be built at once. Street edge (podium) and building is Phase I. Phase 2 is a second, smaller building above the podium. Panel Comment was made that it appears 3 different architectures have taken place. Applicant stated that 2 have taken place, in an attempt to keep building in character with Yaletown and not look so institutional. As well the major tenant wants to see a specific character with large windows, etc. Several drawings were prepared as was suggested by Panel, however, tenant has requested this specific drawing. The rooftop is clean with nothing on it as mechanical stuff has been placed below.

Panel comment was made that this proposal is better than a residential project would be on this site. There is some discomfort with blank wall to northeast. This is not a pedestrian street, but there is a lot of traffic with connection here to the lower end of Stadium Skytrain Station. The Applicant responded that with respect to a wider sidewalk, they are working with Engineering. Planning pushed for storefronts as far down towards Stadium as possible. Area below Stadium concourse is marginal space.

• **Panel's Comments:**

The Chair reminded everyone that this was a rezoning application only and Panel advice sought about setback on Beatty Street, terminus at end of Cambie Street and overall tone of architectural direction.

The Panel's comments included the following:

Support use and density and form of development.

Character of building needs more expression as activity should be visible to Cambie Bridge and Smithe Street traffic. Corner entrance on axis with Bridge should be animated to create strength. When context



is better known, which will evolve over the next month, then further design development can occur and this can be reviewed at DP stage.

Smith Street facade to have activities on roof deck to complement the street and provide a welcome into the City. Support the narrower sidewalk and not 7.5 m sidewalk with 2 rows of trees as displayed on pictures tonight from other streets in the City. Agree that commercial space needs pedestrian traffic and will support 4 to 4.5 m but not 3.9 m. Don't want to lose continuity from Keefer steps to Beatty Mews. Perhaps could reduce street width from lanes to provide more space? Perhaps the 4 to 4.5 m does not allow for a table to be placed on sidewalk by tenant but perhaps bench okay.

In respect of the terminus facing the bridge, perhaps this is too early - need composition of the elements discussed in respect of larger building, public element and smaller building on corner. Perhaps the smaller building is too weak and drab in terms of being right on the corner. The podium deals with slope and top elevation of site which creates band underneath. Nice to see that the building is tucked into notch between wall on Beatty Street buildings and the Stadium. There is a lasting appeal on the corner element and feel that rather than tie into building, it should pull ahead from building.

The Chair provided the summary that the Panel was in favour of this application with further design work to the south-east corner on axis with Cambie Bridge. The Panel was in support of the narrower sidewalk on Beatty Street. On a personal note from the Chair, would remove the hat on the large building, not have different treatment of larger and smaller building.

- **Applicant's Response:** No comments, but thanked Panel for their input.