

**Date:** Monday, April 14, 2003  
**Time:** 3.00 p.m.  
**Place:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

K. Terriss Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (not present for 610 Granville St.)  
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry  
C. Henschel Representative of General Public  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

D. Chung Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

S. Harvey Sr. Social and Cultural Planner  
J. Barrett Development Planner  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**718 Drake Street**

A. Policzer Policzer & Felip Architects and Planners

**901 Mainland Street**

D. Buttjes Buttjes Architecture Inc.  
J. Durante Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects  
B. Wall Wall Financial Corp.

**610 Granville Street**

M. Elliott Stantec Architecture Ltd.  
A. Endall Stantec Architecture Ltd.  
B. Glass

**Clerk to the Board:** C. Hubbard

---

**1. MINUTES**

Mr. MacGregor requested the following amendments:

p.17, penultimate paragraph, line 5: Add "General Manager of the" before "Park Board";

p.20, amend the sentence after "Delete the Note to Applicant in 1.4", to read:  
*, on the understanding that the Director of Planning, General Manager of Engineering Services and the General Manager of the Park Board will communicate the details of the Operations and Management Plan to local stakeholders in the area;*

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor, seconded by Mr. Beasley, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 31/April 1, 2003 be approved as amended.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 718 DRAKE STREET- DE407352 - ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Policzer & Felip Architects & Planners

Request: To receive 35 sq.ft. of heritage density bonus pursuant to Section 3.12 of the DODP By-law and change of use of approximately 3,982 sq.ft. from amenity area (Elks Lodge) to a restaurant class 1 and meeting rooms.

**Staff Comments**

Sue Harvey, Senior Social and Cultural Planner, briefly described the history of this site. A rezoning application in 1985 secured a Community Use Agreement to allow Elks Lodge free use of the amenity room, up to 24 hours a week. The rezoning did not proceed but the Community Use Agreement was signed and carried forward with the subsequent development application. The Agreement was registered in 1996 and the community has been using the space since that time. The Elks have now requested the transfer of the Community Use Agreement to new contemplated facilities on Hastings Street. Social Planning supports this request and condition 1.3 of the Staff recommended conditions of approval facilitates the change.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the Community Use Agreement, Ms. Harvey explained its value is determined by an average rental value that is reviewed annually. The charge on the existing property will be released as soon as it can be converted to serve the same community use obligation on the new premises.

**Applicant's Comments**

Adam Policzer, Architect, explained that the ground floor amenity proved to be unsuitable for the Elks Lodge and has been underused. While it has been adequately maintained there is little activity and it is dark at night, which is unfortunate given its location at the gateway to the downtown. The Elks' proposed move to a more suitable location now allows the hotel to provide a restaurant with an improved facade with night time lighting and animation. Mr. Policzer had no concerns with the Staff Report. However, with respect to condition 1.2, he explained that in order to maintain the curved facade on Granville Street he proposed a minor encroachment over City sidewalk for outdoor seating, which Staff now seek to remove. In discussion, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised an application for outdoor seating can be made through the Sidewalk Café program and Engineering Services would have no objections.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

### Panel Opinion

It was noted the Urban Design Panel did not review this application since minor heritage density transfer applications such as this are not usually referred to the Panel. Mr. Terriss said he did not agree with the applicant's rationale for changing the canopies because they do not match the symmetry of the building.

The Advisory Panel supported the application and recommended approval. They had no objection to the applicant's proposal for the canopies and appreciated that the restaurant will enliven the street.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said the proposal clearly will be an improvement and is consistent with efforts being made to animate the entrance to the downtown. With respect to condition 1.2, he noted the concern is that the outdoor seating is shown on the plans but its approval is beyond the purview of the Board. There is a separate process to ensure appropriate interface with the pedestrian realm and the outdoor seating can be considered under the Sidewalk Café Program. With respect to the canopies, Mr. Rudberg concurred with the applicant's intent to strongly identify the entrance.

Mr. Beasley said it is unfortunate the space did not work for The Elks and their new premises on Hastings Street should be much more successful. With respect to the outdoor seating, Mr. Beasley said he strongly supported greater animation on the setback and encouraged the applicant to seek approval from Engineering Services. He commented that he believed the restaurant use is more logically expressed in the architecture because of its single entrance. The revised canopies will help to express that entrance and identify a site which is somewhat inconspicuous at first glance and help to make the restaurant successful.

### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg and seconded by Mr. Beasley, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407352, in accordance with the Staff Report dated April 14, 2003, with the following amendment:

Add to the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2: An application can be made to the General Manager of Engineering Services for consideration of outdoor seating, either as an encroachment or a sidewalk cafe.

#### 4. 901 MAINLAND STREET - DE407235 - ZONE DD (PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Buttjes Architecture Inc.

Request: To construct a multiple dwelling development containing three towers ( 33-, 31-, and 29-storeys) with a two-storey base that includes 13 townhouses (for a total of 725 dwelling units), three retail units, a cultural facility, and three levels of underground parking for 728 vehicles. Also included is a public park at the corner of Mainland and Nelson Streets over public underground parking for an additional 153 vehicles.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this preliminary application, referring to a context model and posted drawings. He stressed that the intent of a preliminary application is to determine the appropriateness of the use and the overall built form. He briefly reviewed the context, noting the site comprises three quarters of the block bounded by Mainland, Nelson, Homer and Smithe Streets. Mainland Street is a historical pedestrian route in the downtown. The site has no lane but contains an existing dock behind three existing buildings at the Nelson/Homer corner of the block (not included in this application), and accessed from Homer Street. The docks, which provide access and maintenance to these three buildings, are in Lot 57 which is City-owned and will be acquired by the developer for incorporation into the proposed development.

The proposal includes three major towers and a previous development application, approved in 1993 but not pursued, also proposed three towers. Among the distinctive features of this proposal is that the City will acquire a public park at the corner of Mainland and Nelson Streets. The developer will design and implement the park for subsequent conveyance to the Park Board which will be responsible for its long term maintenance. As well, public parking (approximately 150 stalls) is proposed beneath the site, to be developed by Engineering Services. It will still be needed to service the existing buildings on Homer Street, and used as access through the development, but it will be integrated with the proposed park at the corner of Nelson and Mainland Streets. The applicant is also proposing a public right-of-way linking Smithe Street to Lot 57 to allow pedestrian circulation through the mid-block. It will be open to the public between 6.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m. Because of the width limitations of this site, the proposal also includes a vehicular exit onto Homer Street.

Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the recommended prior-to conditions contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated April 2, 2003. He noted the report indicates the possibility that full density may not be achievable. Mr. Barrett advised staff now believe full density will be achieved. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval in principle, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Kavanagh concerning the provision of live/work use in place of the initially proposed amenity for the Vancouver Opera Society, Mr. Barrett advised it will have no impact on the proposed public access route.

With respect to phasing, Mr. Beasley asked the developer to clarify in his presentation when the park and walkway will be completed. Regarding the location of the park, Mr. Beasley questioned whether the Homer/Smithe corner had been considered. Mr. Barrett explained that both Park Board and Planning staff have been involved in the discussions and have concluded that the current Mainland/Nelson location has a number of advantages. It will form a terminus to Yaletown, it has maximum sun exposure and its adjacency to Lot 57 also makes it appear larger and will allow events to spill over into Lot 57. As well, the corner of Mainland and Nelson is a very public, exposed location.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding condition A.1.19 which calls for reducing access through the site. Mr. Barrett explained that a CPTED principle is to limit pathways with dual access through a site. There is also a concern that the area around the stairs and elevator may not be fully controllable from a safety and security point of view. Mr. Barrett said the details will be worked out at the complete stage.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the request to increase the townhouses from two to three storeys, Mr. Barrett noted that because a substantial piece of the site will be undeveloped in favour of the park, it results in very large towers. The rationale for seeking more massing at the lower level is to relocate some of the density from the towers. Three- and 4-storey townhouses also achieve a better relationship to surrounding higher massing. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding the existing docks, Mr. Barrett advised a Council policy requires the dock character to be maintained throughout this block.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the 1993 approved application for this site, Mr. Barrett advised it was a complete application and it located three towers in similar locations to the current proposal. In discussion about the siting of towers, Mr. Beasley noted there is no policy requiring a chequerboard pattern of towers in the downtown, rather, the guidelines call for towers to be offset to maximize views and avoid directly opposing building faces for privacy reasons.

#### Applicant's Comments

Bruno Wall, developer, noted this is a complicated application. He responded to questions raised in the foregoing discussion, as follows:

- the originally proposed amenity space for the Vancouver Opera Society was subsequently found by the Society to be inappropriate for its needs. The density will be converted to townhouses;

- construction phasing has not yet been determined. If Tower A proceeds in phase one it will be completed to the edge of the proposed right-of-way and possibly include a portion of the lane enhancement. If Towers B and C proceed first, the public parking and the park would also be included in phase one;
- they have reached an understanding with Engineering Services with respect to the public parking which will extend throughout the P1 level;
- provision of the park is not dependent upon the parking facility proceeding, nor on completing the purchase of Lot 57;
- they believe the retail at the edge of the park will be viable given the amount of pedestrian traffic through the site.

Dirk Buttjes, Architect, said he found the Staff Committee Report very concise and fair and they intend to meet the recommended conditions. With respect to condition 1.1 relating to the floor plate area and dimensions, Mr. Buttjes noted the guidelines contain some flexibility with respect to floor plate, depending on the tower height and the size of the site and its location. He confirmed that all the tower floor plates will be reduced to 6,500 sq.ft. except the lower levels of Tower C. With respect to the tower dimensions, the guidelines suggest 75 - 85 ft. as optimum, to a maximum of 90 ft. Their redesign proposes one of the two dimensions at 90 ft. and Mr. Buttjes requested amendment to condition 1.1 to permit this. He noted it is a very large site having a 474 ft. frontage on Mainland, 224 ft. on Homer Street and 287ft. on Smithe Street, the latter also having no lane to interrupt its frontage. The second dimension would be approximately 84 ft. The shadow analysis of their proposal shows only minor variations from the guideline recommended floor plate dimensions.

Mr. Buttjes questioned the inclusion of condition A.1.14, noting that direct internal access from the lobby to all townhouses will be very difficult to achieve given the front and rear exposure of the townhouse units.

In summary, Mr. Buttjes said the proposal meets the criteria for Downtown South, except as noted, it meets the zoning requirements for density, the site is not within any view corridors and the towers are within the maximum height restrictions. This proposal is not significantly different from the application that was approved in 1993 in terms of massing and tower positions. However, this proposal offers significant public benefits: the park, the public parking and the right-of-way.

Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, briefly described the landscape plan. She noted they are very well aware of the CPTED requirements and will ensure the safety and security issues are addressed. Discussions with the Park Board are ongoing with respect to the programming and design of the park.

With respect to condition 1.10, Mr. Wall requested that resolution of the legal agreements be prior to the Development Permit Board's consideration of the complete application, rather than prior to submission of the complete application.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the applicant's request for flexibility in condition 1.1, Mr. Barrett noted that one of the objectives is to make the floor plates as compact as possible. While something in excess of 85 ft. is anticipated, staff believe the current 97 ft. is excessive. More analysis will need to be done.

With respect to the condition calling for direct internal access from the lobby to the townhouses, Mr. Beasley noted there is no guideline for such a requirement. Regarding the park, Mr. Beasley suggested it might better be described as an urban square. Ms. Durante stressed the design is only a diagram at this stage. With respect to its integration with Lot 57, she said the intent is to carry through the paving material between the trees into this space. The Park Board would also make use of the Lot 57 space, particularly at the edge, for occasional use with some events in the park. Mr. Wall said that if the Park Board is for some reason unable to proceed with the park, it will be built to Downtown South semi private open space standards.

With respect to the legal arrangements referred to in condition 1.10, Mr. Scobie commented there is still a lot of ground to be covered with respect to the park, the parking and Lot 57. Mr. Thomson said it is challenging for

staff to review the application without understanding what the intents are. He agreed the issues could be required to be resolved before the Board's consideration of the complete submission.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to whether alternative locations were considered for the park, Mr. Buttjes said they considered placing it between the two towers on Mainland Street but they concluded it would be less of a public park in this location. They ultimately decided on the current location because of its south exposure. Most of the built forms to the south and around that corner are lower, providing greater sunlight access. As well, the opportunity of joining the park area with the adjacent Lot 57 provides greater flexibility and more open space. Locating the park at the corner of Homer and Smithe was not considered because of the restrictions it would impose on siting the towers.

#### Comments from Other Speakers

Tilly Thomas, 888 Hamilton Street, expressed concern about the proposal in terms of its density, shadowing, setbacks and access. She suggested the proposal is not responsible development, noting it pushes the regulations to their limit in order to maximize the number of saleable units. The proposal shows a disregard for the neighbourhood. The towers are out of scale. She urged the Board to maintain the character of the neighbourhood.

Andy Gohill, 888 Hamilton Street, concurred with the points made by Ms. Thomas. He noted he also represented the residents of his building (Rosedale Gardens) who have submitted 35 written petitions in opposition to the development in terms of its location, size and view obstruction. Mr. Gohill said he was concerned that there may be a glut of residential units in the downtown with the number of new buildings now being constructed, negatively impacting the value of existing units. He stressed they are in full agreement that the proposed park will be an asset to the area. However, they believe it should be located at the corner of Smithe and Mainland Streets where it would be more accessible for the residents, both of this site and neighbouring buildings. Mr. Gohill was also concerned about safety in terms of increased traffic congestion around the site, noting the corner of Mainland and Smithe Street is already a high accident zone. With respect to shadowing, Mr. Gohill questioned why only three times of day were chosen for the analysis. He was also concerned about the impact of this development on privacy due to the proximity of towers.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning tower adjacency, Mr. Barrett advised that 888 Hamilton Street is approximately 150 ft. from Tower B and the buildings do not directly face one another. Mr. Beasley added that studies have shown that, beyond about 80 ft. separation, the impact on privacy becomes negligible. Concerning the nature of the proposed development, Mr. Barrett advised this site has always been part of the Downtown South which was conceived in the early 1990s and confirmed in the zoning in 1991.

With respect to shadowing, Mr. Barrett confirmed the applicant's analysis meets the guideline standards. He noted that at 4 p.m. the whole of the Downtown South is in shadow.

Alex Taylor, 867 Hamilton Street (Jardines' Lookout), urged that consideration be given to locating the park at the corner of Mainland and Smithe Streets and shifting Towers B and C to the south of the site. Mr. Taylor presented 40 signed petitions of objection from residents of 867 Hamilton Street (on file). The concerns are that the development will severely affect existing view corridors, increased noise and traffic, insufficient retail space, and the proposed park is not conveniently located for most residents of the area. He described the concerns in greater detail, noting that relocating the park would also improve privacy. With respect to noise, as well as the proximity to St. Paul's Hospital there is also a fire station at the corner of Smithe and Hamilton, causing high traffic volume and high noise levels at all hours of the day and night. If tower B is built at the corner of Mainland and Smithe, street sounds will greatly increase whereas the park in this location will absorb much of the street level noise. With respect to construction of the project, Mr. Taylor urged that the Board insist that the project be completed in a reasonably short time frame, given the inconvenience it will impose on nearby residents.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Barrett advised the distance between 867 Hamilton Street and the nearest tower of the proposed development is approximately 230 ft. With respect to the park location, Mr. Barrett noted the Park Board recommended strongly the location at Mainland and Nelson because its sun

access makes it more usable. Ms. Durante confirmed Mr. Barrett's comment that studies have shown that people follow the sun in parks.

In response to a question raised by Mr. Taylor regarding the condition of the sidewalks, Mr. Thomson confirmed the developer will be required to construct the sidewalks in accordance with the Downtown South Guidelines.

Mr. Kavanagh sought clarification regarding the redevelopment potential of the three existing properties at Homer and Nelson Streets. Mr. Barrett suggested that if they were combined they would likely meet the minimum frontage necessary to be redeveloped with a tower. 948 Homer is a 'C' heritage building and two of the buildings already achieve more FSR than would be permitted now. It is therefore likely they will remain and adapted for re-use in the long term.

Regarding the amount of retail space in this development, Mr. Barrett noted the zoning does not allow more than 2,500 sq.ft. of retail space per site in Downtown South in order to reinforce the established shopping streets. Mr. Beasley added there was a very careful analysis done by retail experts which indicated that only so much retail space can be supported successfully in Downtown South.

Ken Waters, 889 Homer Street, expressed concern about the proposed park location. He concurred with previous speakers that it should be relocated and suggested the issue of shadowing on the park has been overstated.

Board and Panel members took a few minutes to review the model and posted drawings.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Ken Terriss advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application. With respect to the shadow analysis, Mr. Terriss said there may be some value in looking at the use of sun angles more carefully and tailoring them to specific sites.

Mr. Hancock said that despite the arguments presented about the park location, he could not support moving it to the northeast corner of the site. He noted that shadow analysis at different times of the day and year can be easily done. At the corner of Mainland and Smithe there is no question that a park will be in shadow and sun is a very precious commodity in this city. Mr. Hancock said he agreed with the Park Board that it is very important to make sure the park is located to be in sunlight as much as possible. Mainland and Nelson is also a good location for the park because the existing buildings on Homer Street and their docks back onto it, expanding the usability of the park and giving it the potential to be a very successful, strongly animated urban park. Given the complexities of the density in the Downtown South, the tower locations work quite well. Mr. Hancock said he would like to see more retail space in the development but the location of the retail as proposed is appropriate. He agreed that internal access from lobby to the townhouses is very difficult to achieve and suggested modification of this condition. Regarding floor plate size, Mr. Hancock commented that 90 ft. is a fairly big dimension and recommended limiting it to 85 ft. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Mah supported the submission as a preliminary application. He said he particularly liked the potential for additional park space in the Downtown South as well as some continuation of Yaletown retail. He supported the recommended amendment to condition 1.10 to refer to "principles agreed upon" rather than finalized legal documentation. He also supported amending condition 1.1 to allow a tower width of up to 90 ft. in one direction and a slimmer width on the other side. He supported amending A.1.14 to add "where possible and appropriate". He said he found the buildings to be in scale with the neighbourhood. He suggested that moving the park as requested by the delegations would increase shadowing on the park and decrease its usability, which he did not recommend. He looked forward to resolution of the issues in the complete application.

Mr. Kavanagh thought condition 1.1 should remain as written, noting that some of the density from reduced tower floor plates may be shifted into the increased massing at the base. He recommended amending A.1.14 and 1.10 as suggested by Mr. Mah. Mr. Kavanagh also agreed strongly with the present location of the park because it will likely encourage the existing buildings on Homer Street to be retained individually and adapted for retail use.

Mr. Henschel thanked the delegations for their thoughtful presentations which he said made him take a second look at the tower locations. However, he supported the current location of the park for the reasons stated. He agreed the tower dimension should be limited to approximately 85 ft. as called for in condition 1.1. He also supported the condition calling for the towers to be more in keeping with the character of Yaletown, and he supported the live/work use on Smithe Street, as recommended by staff in a forthcoming report to Council to amend the ODP.

Ms. Leduc said she sympathized with the residents' concerns. However, with respect to the park, she suggested they may find that when the park is built they may appreciate it being located at the Mainland and Nelson end of the block because night time activity in urban parks can be intrusive. Ms. Leduc said she would like to see more service retail in the development and thought a coffee shop at the edge of the park would be desirable. With respect to floor plate sizes, Ms. Leduc suggested that perhaps the smallest of the three towers could be located at the corner of Mainland and Smithe Streets. She recommended approval of the preliminary submission and said she looked forward to seeing the complete application.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley expressed appreciation for the delegations' presentations which he said made him think very carefully about the larger urban design issues involved. On balance, however, having heard the advice of the Advisory Panel, he said he believes the park location should be as proposed by the applicant. He noted the shadowing would be much more significant if there are any high buildings to the south of the open space, and the park would not be well used. He added there is a good possibility of another public park being provided within a block to the west. Mr. Beasley said another issue is the nature of the open space because it will be more like an urban square than a traditional park. If it is successful, there will be activity occurring all around it as well as within it, which is not very appealing for people living above it. However, in its proposed location, the square is far enough away from the nearest tower that the lower massing around it will screen the noise for neighbours to the west and the north. Mr. Beasley agreed with the staff conclusions that the base massing of this project needs to be increased somewhat. Another important issue raised by the delegations was the proximity of the proposed towers to existing towers. He noted that analysis indicates that over about 80 - 90 ft. separation, the impacts of overview, noise and privacy start to diminish. In this project, all the towers are significantly farther away, the nearest being the Pinnacle but it is offset in a corner-to-corner condition which also lessens any impact.

Mr. Beasley said a number of things need to be followed up and reported back in the complete submission. Staff need to review the implications of the fire hall with a view to possibly initiating some protocols regarding the sirens. As well, a shadow analysis for summer months would be helpful. Staff should continue to work with the applicant concerning the amount of restaurant-retail facing the park. Mr. Beasley stressed, however, that he did not support creating another retail street because it would negatively affect existing retail streets. There is also a need to create as much residential at grade in the downtown as possible. In conclusion, Mr. Beasley noted that the architecture of the towers will be a very important consideration at the complete stage.

Mr. MacGregor said he supported the applicant's rationale for the proposed park location and its integration with the existing docks, as well as the opportunity for connection to retail space along the edge of the park. He agreed with Mr. Beasley that much more detail on the architecture will be necessary at the complete stage. With respect to the possibility of another park to the west of this block, Mr. MacGregor noted that while the land has been acquired by the City it is not yet designated as park. He noted that the issue of noise from the fire hall relates more to the activity and density of development around it in terms of the frequency of response. He stressed, and Mr. Beasley concurred, that it is a matter that is better dealt with internally as opposed to a condition of this development application.

Mr. Rudberg stressed this is a preliminary application in which the broad issues are considered. He said he believes the proposed massing and park location are appropriate noting also the advice of the Urban Design Panel, staff, the Advisory Panel and Board members in this regard. At the complete application stage, Mr. Rudberg stressed that he would like to be assured that vehicular access and loading issues are satisfied on what will be a very busy site. Finally, given this is a preliminary submission, Mr. Rudberg expressed concern at the



inappropriate level of detail in the recommended standard conditions, which he proposes to follow up with staff. He supported approval of the application and looked forward to seeing the complete submission.

With respect to the amount of detail in the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Scobie commented that staff feel compelled to respond to details provided in the submission materials, otherwise applicants assume they meet the City's requirements. Mr. Beasley suggested that these details might be identified in an appendix to the report, similar to the comments provided by Building and Fire & Rescue Services.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Mr. MacGregor, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 407235, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated April 2, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.3 to add, after "eliminate": *,as requested by the applicant and the Vancouver Opera Society,;*

Amend 1.7 to add, after "public park:  
*and design integration of the treatment of Lot 57's area into the concept of the park, acknowledging its traffic, parking and access requirements,*

Amend 1.10 to replace "resolution of" with: *agreement in principle on;*

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.10 to read:  
*Satisfaction of this condition is required prior to Development Permit Board consideration of the complete development permit application.*

Delete A.1.14;

Delete A.1.19.

#### 5. 610 GRANVILLE STREET - DE407219 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Request: To construct a 35-storey mixed-use retail/office/residential building containing 404 dwelling units, with seven levels of underground parking, for 522 vehicles, with access from the lane. The project includes the retention and restoration of two municipally designated heritage building façades, at 600 Granville Street (B.C. Electric Building) and 648 Granville Street.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this application. The site is located at the corner of Granville and Dunsmuir Streets and was rezoned from DD to CD-1 in September 2002. The proposal takes residual density from the Gotham and St. Regis sites, and there are also two heritage structures on the development site itself. As well as preserving the heritage resources (all from heritage buildings now being designated as part of the site's zoning), the proposal also achieves handicapped access to the ALRT station. Mr. Barrett noted that the application differs little from what was approved at the rezoning stage. He briefly reviewed the three major conditions recommended by the Staff Committee in its report dated March 19, 2003. The recommendation is for approval.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification with respect to the treatment of the heritage buildings. Bob Glass explained the facade of 648 Granville Street will be protected and secured. 600 Granville Street, being concrete, is less fragile. With respect to weather protection, Malcolm Elliott, Architect, advised that on the BC Electric Building it will be similar to the original and it has been extended along the Dunsmuir edge, which has been supported by the Heritage Commission. The original 648 Granville building did not have solid canopies and it has been concluded it is better to delete the weather protection over this building in order not to detract from the character of its small and delicate facade. With the exception of this 25 ft. strip, weather protection meets the requirements for downtown.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg about identifying the access to the ALRT, Mr. Elliott said TransLink have indicated they wish to have a number of signs in this location, including a suspended sign. The entry itself will be quite open with roll-up gates.

In response to a question from Ms. Leduc about the residential use, Mr. Elliott said it is currently proposed to be rental accommodation and an application will be made shortly to convert the building to live/work use.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Elliott addressed the conditions recommended in the Staff Committee Report. With respect to the loading bay, the loading management report has been completed, and the issues raised in condition 1.3 are being discussed with staff. Mr. Elliott noted that at the rezoning stage it was agreed that the ALRT station would be excluded from FSR, and a maximum was established. Since that time, TransLink has requested more presence on the street, resulting in expansion from a single to a double portal entry on Dunsmuir Street. This has resulted in an overage to the project of about 347 sq.ft. In discussion, it was noted the CD-1 By-law permits a maximum FSR exclusion of 820.2 m<sup>2</sup> for ALRT entries. The Development Permit Board is not authorized to relax the by-law in this respect and an adjustment can only be achieved by a CD-1 text amendment. In response to a question from Mr. Elliott about condition A.1.12 which calls for deletion of all signage from the drawings, Mr. Scobie pointed out that the Sign By-law is not within the purview of the Development Permit Board. Further, any alterations to designated buildings would require a heritage alteration permit, the authority for which is exclusively with the Director of Planning. In response to Mr. Elliott's request for clarification of A.2.1, Mr. Thomson explained that traffic management measures would normally be covered at the rezoning stage. However, a decision was made to defer the loading management plan to the development permit stage since it is only as the plan is developed that necessary changes to the lane interface can be identified. He added, the condition applies only if the uses that occur as a result of this development require those changes, and creates a five-year window in which to identify them.

In conclusion, Mr. Elliott thanked staff for their assistance in processing this very major project.

Mr. Scobie questioned why this application was brought to the Board given it was a very site specific CD-1 rezoning with a very specific form of development approved in principle by Council and very insignificant issues identified in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Barrett responded that it is a large and complex project and resolution of some of the issues was not always clear. Mr. Beasley added he was satisfied from the point of view of the Director of Planning that the complexity and the very close fit of all the details of this project warranted its referral to the Board. Mr. Scobie disagreed, indicating this could readily have been dealt with by the Director of Planning.

#### **Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Ms. Leduc expressed appreciation for the preservation of the heritage buildings in this development. It will be an attractive project and the heritage has been worked in exceptionally well. She commended the applicant and recommended approval of the application. She was also pleased with the future proposal to convert the residential use to live/work in this location.

Mr. Henschel was pleased to see the BC Electric building preserved and appreciated the introduction of residential use into this area. He commended the applicant for an excellent project.

Mr. Mah also appreciated the opportunity to preserve heritage buildings and liked the improved access to the ALRT. He noted that weather protection is very continuous around this project except for the 25 ft. facade of 688 Granville Street. Unless that original canopy can be restored it should not be a condition of the approval. He recommended amendment of B.1.2 to extend the date for compliance. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Hancock agreed it is a very nice project, very well executed.

Mr. Terriss advised the Urban Design Panel strongly supported this application, noting the Panel also saw the scheme at the rezoning stage. He said the project is very well done and he complimented the applicants.

### Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor moved approval, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Rudberg concurred, noting it is an excellent development that achieves a number of public objectives. With respect to condition A.2.1, Mr. Rudberg noted that if anything might not work on this project it is the lane access because of its unusual configuration and high level of activity, including loading for The Bay. He stressed the importance of the loading management plan and said measures will be implemented fairly aggressively from the outset, noting this lane has already been a source of complaint.

Mr. Beasley supported the motion of approval and commended the applicant team who have worked diligently on all aspects of the scheme. He reiterated he believed that for a development of this scope it is important to get the level of consideration afforded by the Development Permit Board, noting it might not have proceeded as smoothly with different players. He noted a number of important objectives are achieved in this development: residential use is being provided well in a difficult location; precious heritage buildings have been saved; the continuity of retail on Granville Street has not been destroyed but the Granville Street experience has been enhanced; all of which speaks to good planning, good development management and good development.

Mr. Scobie drew the applicant's attention to Appendix C of the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Elliott confirmed they are comfortable with the comments provided by Processing Centre - Building and Fire & Rescue Services.

### Motion

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Rudberg, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407219, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 19, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend A.2.1 to read:

*arrangements for the provision of any and all traffic management measures required prior to occupancy as required by the General Manager of Engineering Services in order to regulate site and other vehicles at and adjacent to the lane interfaces with Seymour Street and Dunsmuir Street;*

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.2.1;

Amend A.2.15 to delete "ensure adequate" and replace with *improve*;

Amend A.2.17 to add *disabled* before "access";

Amend B.1.2 to amend the date to *August 9, 2003*.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.40 p.m.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie  
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2003\apr14.wpd