

Meeting: No. 478
Date: Monday, April 17, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F.A. Scobie Director of Development Services [Chair]
L.B. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. McGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

P. Grant Representative of the Design Professions
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry [for Item 3 only]
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
R. Mingay Representative of General Public
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Also Present

M. Kemble Development Planner
N. Peters City Surveyor

**ITEM 1 - 1299 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE404821 - ZONE CD-1
[Preliminary Application]**

D. Simpson Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
D. Stout Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
B. Nicklin Affordable Housing Advisory Association
C. Gray Housing Centre, City of Vancouver

Acting Clerk to the Board: M. Penner

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 3, 2000 be approved with minor amendments to the Note to Applicant under Condition 1.2.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1299 West Hastings Street - DE404821 - Zone CD-1
[Preliminary Application]**

Applicant: Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Request: To construct a 30-storey, residential tower containing 253 dwelling units (82 non-market family and 171 market rental units) and 31 units of 2 to 3 storey, non-market family townhouses along the site edges.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble [Retired], introduced this as the first development site to be considered in the Harbour Green Neighbourhood, with a proposed site area of approximately 58,600 sq. ft. He noted this site fronted onto three streets, Hastings, Jervis and West Cordova Streets, and that the Jervis Street Park and Coal Harbour Community Centre were located to the west of this site. Mr. Kemble advised this 30-storey residential project would provide non-market units at the base of the tower, along with the 30 townhouses around the edge of this site, for a total of 112 non-market units, and 171 market units in the upper portion of the tower. He noted that the proposed density had been approximately 4.0 FSR but that the applicant would be seeking a slight increase in density by way of a text amendment. Mr. Kemble also advised the tower's dimensions were below guideline maximums, with a base width of 27.5 m and the upper portion of the tower would be approximately 24.5 m. He emphasized that this project would have two completely separate lobbies with 3 elevators and noted that the proposed amenity space located on the ground floor [approximately 2,000 sq. ft.] would include the BC Housing amenity space facing southeast, and the rental amenity space facing north of the lobby.

Mr. Kemble also referred to Lot K to the east of this site, which was not yet zone and would not be covered by the Harbour Green Neighbourhood Guidelines.

Mr. Kemble listed the key guidelines which would affect this project area: the required continuity of low-rise buildings which would define the street edges, orientation of the tower's axis to be perpendicular to Hastings Street, the maximum tower height would be 81 m, and limit townhouse heights to 2-storeys along Hastings and Jervis Streets in order to preserve views, and would limited the maximum tower plate to 625 m². He also advised that the tower massing would cover 4 zones: [i] street base zone up to the 3rd storey; [ii] the terraced zone which would extend up to the 12th storey; [iii] a main tower zone; and [iv] the tower top zone.

Mr. Kemble referred to the proposed project's interface with the public realm at street level and emphasized four major areas of concern: the proposed configuration; the public open space at the Jervis/Cordova corner; vehicular access to parking and loading; and tower massing.

He advised staff felt the Jervis/Cordova corner of the proposal presented a weak street character due to varying street grades, i.e., level on Hastings, below grade on Jervis, and had encourage the applicant to have the townhouses along Jervis stepped up.

Condition 1.1 - staff proposed a height increase above the maximum 16.94 m level to a portion of the townhouses, but stressed this would be in consultation with adjacent property owners and would require a view study.

Condition 1.5 referred to the Jervis/Cordova corner open space treatment which would require a strong street definition and that this had been discussed with the applicant.

Condition 1.7 referenced parking and loading access and that staff would not support the loading off Jervis Street, but would prefer to see the 2 access areas combined into a single access off Cordova Street.

Regarding tower massing, Mr. Kemble advised staff felt there should be more prominent tower articulation and that the guidelines required the top of the tower be stepped up. He advised that concerns had been raised by adjacent property owners about the bulkiness of the tower which warranted further design development.

Mr. Kemble advised that approximately 1,000 letters had been mailed to surrounding neighbours which had produced 4 letters and 1 telephone call in response; major concerns mentioned were impacts of views, townhouse roof treatment and mechanical penthouse bulk, and that all issues had since been resolved.

In conclusion, Mr. Kemble felt this proposal had potential for a very livable, high quality rental housing project, located close to the waterfront, parks and other community amenities and that concerns about interface with the streets, and public open space, would be resolved at the next stage in consultation with the neighbours. Staff recommended approval in principle.

Mr. Beasley requested clarity on a number of issues: would there be a possibility of raising the 2- and 3-storey townhouses along Hastings Street to a 4-storey level; whether the tower and balconies complied with the guidelines; and about the possible relocation of the easterly 5 townhouses. Mr. Kemble advised that the townhouses would remain at the proposed 2- and 3-storey height; that the tower and balconies complied with the guidelines, and the 5 townhouses could be interspersed elsewhere around the street edge.

Mr Kavanagh had concerns about the wording in Condition 1.5 and Mr. Kemble advised that the guidelines called for a 3 m setback along the edge. Any type of landscape screening for the patios facing the east property line [adjoining Lot K] wouldn't leave any room for the patios, hence the request for a 5 m setback.

Mr. Gjernes enquired about the underground parking off Cordova Street, the proposed at grade loading, and whether the two lobbies could be combined. Mr. Kemble confirmed that the loading would be at grade, that the front door loading would apply to the BC Housing lobby as well; however, the pedestrians would have separate entries.

Mr. Kavanagh referred to Condition 1.8 and asked whether the Development Staff Committee would prefer amending the design of the townhouses, or to have the setbacks increased? Mr. Kemble confirmed that in addition to an increase in the setback, staff would be recommending some changes to the design development.

Mr. Rudberg referred to Condition 1.5, acknowledging staff's rationale re seeking an open public space that would relate to the open space across the street, but questioning whether any form of structure erected along the edge wouldn't diminish this desired open space. Mr. Kemble referred to the Roundhouse where structural frame works had been utilized to give the street a definition, yet had remained fairly open. Mr. Rudberg also enquired about the proposed separate entrances for the two components of tenants and whether the same elevator bank be used. Mr. Kemble advised that a development of this size would require 3 elevators, two would be shared by use of a security card access and the third elevator would be for the rental tenants.

Mr. Beasley questioned whether Condition A.2.4 was redundant with Condition 1.7; Mr. Kemble concurred. Mr. Beasley voiced concern about the privacy and usability of the main open courtyard space and asked about the feasibility of perhaps closing the Hastings Street frontage utilizing more rowhouses, and would that result in a better urban design? Mr. Kemble confirmed there had been a notion of moving some of the easterly townhouse units and that if this open space were enlarged over to the property line it would become a more flexible space, well-buffered from the adjacent traffic. Another advantage would be more continuity along the Hastings Street frontage.

The Chair noted that for a preliminary application, it had been well detailed regarding building heights, floor plates for the tower, open space, etc. and yet several conditions suggested that the guidelines ought not to be followed, [e. g., the townhouses on the east edge and Condition 1.8 which referred to the relocation of those units]. He also noted some greater anxiety expressed about future development on Lot K than was apparent at the time the guidelines were created and queried the greater sensitivity now to the easterly site. The Chair referred to Mr. Beasley's suggestion about moving those townhouses which would close the Hastings gap to the courtyard and how did staff see the relationship between the guidelines and the proposed preliminary application. Mr. Kemble explained that the applicant had encountered unexpected program changes since the guidelines were compiled and that at the time the easterly side of the project had been conceived as a more of a typical apartment building. He confirmed this current development had been re-designed and deviated from the guidelines. He referred to the various applications that staff were processing in the area and had realized that in order to incorporate open spaced courtyards, street fronting townhouses, etc., certain adjustments were necessary in the design of this project.

The Chair referred to the Note to Applicant under Condition 1.1, specifically to the 1 m between the entry level and adjacent sidewalk grades, and asked whether this was intended to allow entries up to 1 m below the sidewalk level. Mr. Kemble confirmed this would need rewording and that the entry level should be above sidewalk grade.

The Chair noted that the Staff Committee recommended this rather detailed preliminary application be returned to the Board as a Complete Application and would this be the case? Mr. Kemble replied that need not be the necessary, but that it would be helpful if the Design Panel could review it.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Simpson advised there were five areas of concern which related primarily to the guidelines. Should the applicant comply with the City's guidelines, or risk departing and the potential of being caught up in a lengthy process. The applicant had chosen to comply with the guidelines presented to them. He also noted as this was a non-market project, timing was of the essence.

Mr. Simpson referred to Condition 1.1 and advised the applicant would not have the ability to raise the floor of the townhouses without raising the roofs which were at the maximum guideline limit, and this would impede the neighbours' views; therefore they would prefer to maintain the present height. Concerning Condition 1.2, Mr. Simpson confirmed the applicant would comply with the recommendation to increase masonry on the tower and apply more design on the townhouses. Mr. Simpson confirmed Condition 1.4 had also been commented on by the Urban Design Panel and that the tower's development would be revisited.

Condition 1.5 concerning the open space treatment at the Jervis/Cordova corner, Mr. Simpson advised because the Urban Design Panel had supported this aspect of their proposal and felt strongly that given the tower location and entry conditions, the open space would be a reflection of the open space across the street to the park. However, Mr. Simpson felt this could be handled and still fulfill the City's desire to have a good interface between the private and public realm.

Regarding the loading areas, Mr. Simpson confirmed that combining the two into one would not be an issue and confirmed the deletion of access across Jervis Street. He also confirmed that although the 3 m setback for the easterly townhouses had been in accordance with the guidelines, this could possibly be pulled back, however, would need to discuss this with the applicant.

Mr. Simpson advised that Condition 1.9 would present a problem in that cost constraints would make it difficult to redesign the roofs, which would also raise the heights; however, he suggested that perhaps the roofs could be diminished, creating better articulation.

Mr. Gray referred to the massing issue and noted that the rezoning of this site had resulted in intense discussions with the Harbour Green neighbours; the height limits had been a major issue and the guidelines were the result of a lot of work.

The Chair referred to Condition 1.10 and noted that development applications in these new neighbourhoods frequently resulted in some minor amendments required in terms of FSR, square footage, unit mix, etc. In this case, the applicable text amendment would be reported to Council in June; however, at this time the Board attempted to understand the design requirements for the project. He understood the need for a decision so that budgets could be finalized and approved. He noted with the proposed September Public Hearing, Council's anticipated approval and BC Housing's funding could occur at the same time.

Mr. Rudberg commented on the elevator traffic between the BC Housing family units and rental market and, after clarification by Mr. Simpson, felt the proposed 3 elevator bank would work well and that the bank of elevators could also be used to separate the two lobbies.

The Chair referred to the "soils problem" in the open space and asked if this would impede landscape options. Mr. Kemble assured the Chair this would not be the case, as parking and the townhouses had been pulled back. Mr. Simpson advised the problem was with structural stability of the soils here, not contamination.

Board and Panel Members reviewed the model and posted materials.

Comments from the Public

Mr. Paul Merrick, consultant to the Babiki project, spoke on their behalf. He stated their only concern related to notification - that Mr. Babiki had not been aware of this application until the afternoon of Friday, April 14th when Mr. Kemble had forwarded a copy of the report to him. Mr. Merrick's principal request was that the Board endorse the last sentence in Note to Applicant of Condition 1.1, "... changes should be considered in consultation with adjacent owners ...". He noted they no doubt had different interests than the applicant did and that dialogue could benefit should that opportunity be accorded.

Advisory Panel

Mr. Grant confirmed the Panel had fully supported this preliminary application and had a good discussion with the applicant and based on Mr. Simpson's comments, many of these issues would be dealt with suitably. However, the Panel had issue with the Hastings Street elevation, that it needed more reinforcement and that a 2-storey presentation was not strong enough. The 5 townhouses on the east property line had not been a serious consideration. The Panel felt the two corners, southeast and southwest on Hastings should be revisited in terms of modulating the views, as well, the massing on Hastings should be reinforced. In general the Panel felt this was a good, commendable effort with the understanding that some of the issues and conditions raised would be pursued in the further stages of the development.

Mr. Kavannah was pleased to recommend approval of this application with emphasis on the last sentence in the Note to Applicant under Condition 1.1 and suggested that in Condition 1.8 the word "on" be deleted and recommended that the complete application be referred to the Director of Planning.

Mr. Gjernes asked the Board to emphasize the last sentence in Note to Applicant under Condition 1.1. The Chair suggested the word "considered" be replaced with "undertaken", and noted that the entire Note to Application under Condition 1.1 was a consideration.

Mr. Gjernes supported this preliminary application, thought the applicant had handled this complex project well, and that the complete permit development application be referred to the Director of Planning. With reference to Condition 1.1, Mr. Gjernes suggest that the height on West Hastings not be increased to three levels but remain at the 2 storey level, and approved of Conditions 1.2 and 1.3. He suggest that townhouses on the east side remain as per Condition 1.8, approved of the 5 m setback increase and advised that the date of August 8, 2000 shown in Condition A.5.2, be amended to read October 31, 2000. Mr. Kemble confirmed that this date change would not be an issue.

Mr. Roodenburg recommend approval, and concurred with previous speakers regarding the Note to Applicant under Condition 1.1. He suggested the 5 easterly townhouses be retained but the southeasterly townhouses along Hastings could possibly be moved west by perhaps the width of 2 units, providing a better opening between that southeast block and the easterly units. Mr. Roodenburg recommended against an increased setback for the easterly townhouses to deal with what might be development on Lot K. He felt that whatever would be developed on this lot in the future would have to respond to what exists on the site now under consideration.

Mr. Mortensen supported this application with minor concerns about the elevation of the townhomes: there should be eyes on the street, etc., which would improve the quality and the livability of those units, as well as improve the quality of the public realm on Jervis Street.

Ms. Leduc supported the application and commended the applicant. She noted it seemed most of staff's conditions did not appear to be problematic to the applicant. Ms. Leduc stressed that consideration should be given to ensure that the internal courtyard would be safe for children and inaccessible for the public.

Ms. Mingay thought it was a good artistic effort toward condensed living; agreed with the no stepping down of Jervis, liked the Hastings Street gap for a sense of a breeze way, and felt this conditions would keep this project from becoming a compound-like living environment.

The Chair advised that Mr. Kemble suggested the inclusion of the word "lower" in the Note to Applicant under Condition 1.1 - a difference of approximately "lower sidewalk grades", to indicate that the intent was to have the entry ways above, not below, the sidewalk level.

Mr. Beasley commented this was a really good resolution on this site, that it had been a difficult site from the beginning and worrisome that it achieve the quality of massing, as it involved social housing. He approved of the move to the townhouses as being what the whole neighbourhood is evolving toward and commended the applicant for his foresight. Mr. Beasley commented that living in this type of environment himself, he had notice that the continuity of rowhouses on a street is important to the image of the street having domesticity; also the proposal to keep these courtyards closed and private is important if they are to be utilized by children and adults, instilling a sense of security. He said that the easterly rowhouses had been well handled by providing them some closure to the open space and that adjacencies of open spaces in other projects had not been as comfortable. Mr. Beasley concluded by moving approval of this preliminary application.

MOTION

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

THAT the Board APPROVE in principle this Preliminary Development Application No. DE404821, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee's recommendations, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant following Condition 1.1 by removing the words "three-storey street base expression and a difference of approximately 1.0" and replace them with *"in order to achieve a minimum of 1.0 m above the entry level and the lower adjacent sidewalk grades "*; in the last sentence insert the word "include" to read *"These changes should include consultation with adjacent owners to the south "*.

Amend Condition 1.5 to read "design development to the Jervis/Cordova Street corner open space treatment." The Note to Applicant has been amended to retain the second sentence.

Amend Condition 1.8, the reference to "an increased sideyard setback of 5 m," to read *"an increased sideyard setback of approximately 5 m, "*, and delete the Note to Applicant.

Delete Condition A.2.4 as being redundant.

Amend Condition A.5.2 has been amended to change the date from "August 8, 2000" to *"December 1, 2000"*.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

M. Penner
Acting Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair

: