

Date: Monday, April 8, 2013
 Time: 3:00 p.m.
 Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
 S. Johnston Deputy City Manager
 B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development
 P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

N. Shearing Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
 S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
 J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
 K. Chen Representative of the General Public
 D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Busby Representative of the General Public
 K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
 J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
 R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
 S. Black Development Planner
 A. Molaro Development Planner
 C. Lau Project Facilitator
 M. Dirk Engineering Services
 L. Beaulieu Landscape Development Specialist

803 WEST 12TH AVENUE - DE41467 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

D. Jansen DYS Architecture
 K. Boeck DYS Architecture
 J. Losee Jonathan Losee Landscape Architecture
 A. Collins Vancouver Coastal Health Authority

800 GRIFFITHS WAY - DE416399 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

W. Francl Francl Architecture Inc.
 S. Mitchel Francl Architecture Inc.
 M. Long PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
 E. Santos-Brault Recollective
 J. Packer Recollective
 R. deBeer Aquilini Development

685 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE416437 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

W. Francl Francl Architecture Inc.
 S. Mitchel Francl Architecture Inc.
 M. Long PWL Partnership Landscape Architects
 E. Santos-Brault Recollective
 J. Packer Recollective
 R. deBeer Aquilini Development

Recording Secretary: D. Kerr (Item #3) L. Harvey (Item #4 & #5)

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Judd seconded by Mr. Jackson and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on March 25, 2013.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 803 WEST 12TH AVENUE - DE41467 - ZONE CD-1
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: DYS Architecture

Request: A Preliminary Development Application to develop the site with a new 8-storey acute care hospital building (Joe and Rosalie Segal Family Centre (JRSFC)), to consolidate existing mental health facilities at Vancouver General Hospital (VGH) and University of British Columbia (UBC) hospitals and for updates to the master plan. The building will consist of out-patient facilities on levels one and two and 100 in-patient beds on levels three to seven, with the top floor to be for roof garden and mechanical space.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Black presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

The staff team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Applicant's Comments

Knut Boeck, Architect from DYS Architecture, confirmed their acceptance of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He added that there was nothing in the conditions that was impossible to achieve and that the design team would have a chance to respond appropriately to staff. Mr. Boeck remarked that Condition 1.4 might be difficult to achieve as the floor to floor heights were fairly low for a hospital building and the rest of the floors up to level 7 were for patients.

Mr. Boeck stated a preference for Condition 1.6 to be a condition of occupancy, not Complete Development Permit, in order to allow time to meet the condition. Mr. Boeck also noted that with respect to daylight access, the idea was to provide as much daylight as possible to the common areas for patient interaction and interaction with staff.

Mr. Boeck also noted that the entry was challenging because they were trying to have level access from West 12th Avenue and West 10th Avenue in order to allow for wheelchair access and have the two entrances respond to different needs by modifying the grades.

The applicant team took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from other Speakers

A member of the community expressed concerns about view impacts.

Panel Opinion

Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

- When the project went before the Urban Design Panel the three items of critical importance were design development to improve the area around the East entrance, to increase the amount of natural light in the courtyard and to address the Willow Street promenade which is next to the east entrance.
- A suggestion to strengthen the language on Condition 1.1 to allow for a better relationship between the main entry and Willow Street.
- Depressing and terracing down the greenway to the entrance was not satisfactory.
- Design of the building itself was very well handled.
- Concerns regarding natural light penetrating into the courtyard for the patients and the glazing of the west end of the courtyard space needs to be addressed.
- This is not a typical residential/commercial building due to a challenging site with the proximity to other buildings and the importance of the hospital function.
- The exterior design and form of development is appropriate for the area but there is an opportunity for improving the public realm.
- The exterior design of the building was a bit of a concern because of the large amount of solid exterior surface.
- There is an opportunity to improve the public realm and openness at the east entrance.
- On the east portion of the roof, there is an opportunity for design development to soften the area.
- Statistics on the parking and transportation are ongoing for this precinct but will have to be satisfied through staff prior to the full application.
- The biggest challenge is the entry and the function of the mews. It is unclear how that is going to work with parking and the connections to the commons.
- The building may not work in 25 years or be used for the same purpose, so it was suggested that some future proofing be taken into consideration.
- Improving the north view from the roof top might be addressed with Condition 1.4.

The Panel generally supported the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson said that with respect to the height brought up by the neighbour, Condition 1.4 does give both the applicant and staff the flexibility to look at reducing the height and significance of the mechanical structure. As well Mr. Jackson said there was some potential for looking at floor to floor heights but is certainly not something that he felt was necessary given the fact the building is thirty-three feet below the maximum height as set out in the zoning By-law. Mr. Jackson said he also thought that Condition 1.1 provided enough direction to the future architect and the developer of this specific building plan for a different way of accessing the building from the Willow Street pedestrian corridor. Mr. Jackson added that he thought it was a well-designed building and had more appreciation for the amount of solid wall versus glass that is required for a building with this use.

Mr. Judd said that he had no further comments.

Mr. Johnston said he thought the applicant had done a nice job of integrating the green building components. As well, he said he supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and thought that staff would be able to move forward with the applicant on the next version of the building.

John Greer, Assistant Director, Processing Centre, Development Services, said in response to a question from the Board regarding Condition 1.6 that staff preferred to keep it as a condition of Development Permit. . He added that staff will need this information in order to properly assess and work with the applicant. As for Condition B.1.2, Mr. Greer noted that it is standard to allow six months for the applicant to respond to the prior-to conditions. He added that if the applicant gets close to that date and they know they won't be able to make it, they can request additional time.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Judd and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. DE416467, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 13, 2013 with the following amendment:

Delete "*and 3.0*" from condition B.1.2 to read as follows:

It should be noted that if conditions 1.0 and 2.0 have not been complied with on or before **October 8, 2013**, this Development Application shall be deemed to be refused, unless the date for compliance is first extended by the Director of Planning.

4. 800 GRIFFITHS WAY - DE416399 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

- Applicant: Francl Architecture Inc.
- Request: To develop a 28-storey tower (East Tower) at the southeast corner of the existing arena, containing residential and commercial components; including renovations to the existing arena building and interconnections to the new South Tower (685 Pacific Boulevard - DE416437) for underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the issues noted in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was support of the application. The staff team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Applicant's Comments

Walter Francl, Architect from Walter Francl Architects, confirmed their acceptance of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He mentioned that they were originally given a height that was reduced when the view cones were re-evaluated. Mr. Francl added that there will be bicycle parking located under the south tower and they will meet the bicycle parking By-law with respect to the number of spaces.

Mr. Debeer, from Aquilini Development, stated that their studies indicate that they will be able to comply with the ASHRAE 2007 and Vancouver Building By-law criteria.

The applicant team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

The Panel members offered a range of comments on the application, including:

- Concerns as originally the building was designed with a large floor plate and density for office space that was too large for residential uses.
- Expression of the building was critical.
- Concern regarding the built form as it was too similar in expression to other towers in the area.
- A recommendation for a stronger departure than what was shown in the application to bring some individuality to these important buildings.
- A greater opportunity to do something interesting with the design.
- It is a quality project as it is adding rental units.
- Impressed with the green building features and developer's support for the Blade Runners organization.
- The application was challenging in terms of space and public realm.
- Sustainability strategy was well done.
- Unusual to have a tower attached to an iconic building such as the arena.
- Council's recommendations need to be addressed.

The Panel generally supported the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson said he thought it was a good building, in a prominent location, with potential to be an excellent building with advice built into the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He acknowledged the applicant for delivering rental housing and a good sustainability strategy. He added that he hoped the applicant team would take the design conditions seriously as he thought the building had the potential to be something different in the skyline in Vancouver.

Mr. Judd offered an amendment to Condition A.2.12 regarding the bicycle parking. He noted that with the constraints on the site the applicant has done a good job of adding the bicycle parking as close as it could to the tower. He mentioned that the parking was not under this building but will be accommodated under the viaduct on the lands leased from the City. He added that the amendment will clarify how bicycle parking is dealt with in this building. Mr. Judd said he thought the applicant had done a good job of developing something that could accommodate the removal of the viaducts if that is what Council decides to do and the space will be enhanced even if the viaducts stay.

Mr. Johnston noted that this building is in a key location and was a great opportunity to improve the area. He mentioned that attaching a tower to the arena makes the city more interesting. As well the project takes some vacant, under-utilized area around the stadium that feels a little empty and activates the spaces. He thought the towers would enhance what is a standard stadium that is found in most cities in North America. He also thought they would add a lot of value to the cityscape and to the stadium. Mr. Johnston added that even when there isn't a game at the stadium, there will be life around the area.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416399, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 27, 2013, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.4, Note to Applicant to read as follows:

Note to Applicant: *Elements such as window washing equipment or cell towers are not permitted incursions into the view cone.*

Amend Condition 1.6 to read as follows:

provision of a revised acoustic and thermal comfort study confirming that the summertime internal comfort levels are in line with *applicable ASHRAE (2007) and Vancouver Building Bylaw standards* (with windows closed) will be achieved, *with the intention of not requiring air conditioning;*

Amend Condition A.2.12 to read as follows:

provision of an updated parking study for the Rogers Arena site outlining where the *vehicle parking and bicycle parking* spaces for the three new towers are located and how the spaces will operate for residential and commercial uses;

Note to Applicant: The parking study must show on a plan where the commercial and residential *vehicle and bicycle* parking spaces are being provided and how *the bicycle spaces in particular* will be *conveniently* accessed. The study should ensure that the visitor parking being provided under Rogers Arena is accessible from all of the residential towers. *The study should indicate how direct access without stairs can be achieved for the entry and exit of bicycles.* The study should include a detailed

summary of the overall parking for BC Place Stadium and Rogers Arena in the surrounding area and the parking plan for Rogers Arena showing the proposed parking breakdown for the three towers.

5. 685 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE416437 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

- Applicant: Francl Architecture Inc.
- Request: To develop a 31-storey tower (South Tower) south of the Georgia Viaduct over five levels of underground parking, including stairs to level 100 of the arena. This building will also contain parking for the East Tower at the southeast corner of the arena (DE416399 - 800 Griffiths Way).

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the issues noted in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application. Ms. Molaro also advised of the replacement to the wording in Condition A.2.3. The staff team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Applicant's Comments

Walter Francl, Architect from Walter Francl Architects, confirmed their acceptance of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report including the amendment to Condition A.2.3. He noted that the curved profile for the balconies is important to the design of the building and welcomed the opportunity to explore how that will be accomplished with staff.

The applicant team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Panel members offered a range of comments on the application, including:

- The structural stilt component is important to the overall design and hoped that it would find its way into the final design.
- Support for the applicant's request to revise the wording requiring curved glass on the balconies to make it more cost effective.
- It is a quality project as it is adding rental units.
- The building has a tremendous opportunity to achieve something exceptional.
- Adding public art or landscaping would make a big difference in the public realm.
- Unusual to have a tower attached to an iconic building such as the arena.

The Panel generally supported the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Johnston recommended approval based on the amendments to the Staff Committee Report that had been discussed during the meeting.

Mr. Judd said he thought the sculpting of the building using the balconies is brilliant especially achieving that on a rental building. He congratulated the architects on their design.

Mr. Jackson said he thought it was a great foreground building and the architects had done a great job with the architecture.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Judd and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416437, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 27, 2013, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.5 to read as follows:

provision of a revised acoustic and thermal comfort study confirming that the summertime internal comfort levels are in line with *applicable ASHRAE (2007) and Vancouver Building Bylaw standards* (with windows closed) will be achieved, *with the intention of not requiring air conditioning*;

Amend Condition A.2.3 to read as follows:

Arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services, for a Statutory Right-of-Way in favor of the City over the southwest corner of the site, in the vicinity of the proposed overhead balconies, for street and utility purposes;

Note to Applicant: *The subdivision plan will need to be revised to reduce the proposed dedication area to accommodate the balconies.*

Amend Condition A.2.12 to read as follows:

provision of an updated parking study for the Rogers Arena site outlining where the *vehicle parking and bicycle parking* spaces for the three new towers are located and how the spaces will operate for residential and commercial uses;

Note to Applicant: The parking study must show on a plan where the commercial and residential parking spaces are being provided and how they will be *conveniently* accessed. The study should ensure that the visitor parking being provided under Rogers Arena is accessible from all of the residential towers. *The study should indicate how direct access without stairs can be achieved for the entry and exit of bicycles.* The study should include a detailed summary of the overall parking for BC Place Stadium and Rogers Arena in the surrounding area and the parking plan for Rogers Arena showing the proposed parking breakdown for the three towers.

Renumber Condition A.2.4 (second one) to A.2.32 to *A.2.5 to A.2.33*

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:52 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

V. Potter
Chair
