

Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2001
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F.A. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services (Items 1-4)
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer (Items 5-7)

Advisory Panel

T. Bunting Chair, Urban Design Panel
P. Kavanagh Representative of the Development Industry (departed 5:44 p.m.)
J. Leduc Representative of the General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of the General Public
B. Scott Representative of the General Public

ABSENT:

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
J. Ross Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

E. Fiss Development Planner
R. Segal Senior Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor

Item 3 - 455 Beach Avenue - DE405455 - ZONE - CD-1

D. Gurney The Hulbert Group
R. Hulbert The Hulbert Group
D. Negrin Pacific Place Development Ltd.

Item 4 - 401 Burrard Street - DE405133 - ZONE - DD

Consideration of this item was deferred to a future meeting.

Item 5 - 150 Drake Street - DE405573 - ZONE - CD-1

S. Baker Vancouver School Board,
B. Buchanan Chair, Vancouver School Board,

J. Davidson Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects,
M. Mehan Pacific Place Holding Co.
B. Ng Vancouver School Board
A. Shatwell Downs Archambault, Architects,

Recording Secretary:

R. Ratslef Raincoast Ventures

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chair Scobie called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. Attendees were informed that Item 4, "401 Burrard Street - DE405133 - ZONE DD" was deferred to a future meeting.

1. Minutes

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 19, 2001 be approved as circulated.

- CARRIED

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 2, 2001 be approved with amendments noted.

- CARRIED

2. Business Arising From the Minutes

None.

**3. 455 Beach Avenue
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: The Hulbert Group International

Request: To construct a 29-storey residential high-rise tower (designated as tower 1D of the Beach Neighbourhood) with a three-storey low-rise component along Beach Avenue and a two-storey component along the new "Mews", connecting Pacific Boulevard to Beach Avenue, with four levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, referencing the distributed Development Permit Staff Committee report dated March 21, 2001, and a project model and drawings, introduced the complete application for 455 Beach Avenue. Mr. Segal advised that the application complies with and exceeds the guidelines for the area and that staff are generally very supportive of the scheme with the exception of one unresolved issue relating to the design of the northeast portion of the tower, and several minor issues which it is understood the applicant has no difficulty with.

Mr. Segal advised that the face of the tower takes on the street curve and that staff are suggesting that the rest of the tower, including the northeast corner, reference the City's street grid so that when viewed from a distance the series of towers signify that this neighbourhood is an extension of the downtown. In terms of both room layout and orientation this is possible as is demonstrated in the Landmark Building at 1005 Expo Boulevard.

Remaining conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report were reviewed and it was noted that the developer has been requested to work with staff on parking issues relating to the construction period as a neighbourly consideration. Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions noted.

Questions

In response to questions from the Board and Panel members, Mr. Segal further commented concerning:

- proposed orientation of the building's northeastern floor units;
- need to ensure that there is enough square footage to achieve the market cap for non-market housing units in this zoning;
- public accessibility of the north-south and east-west Mews; and
- coordination of the landscaping, Condition 1.6, was also a condition for tower 1E's application.

Applicant's Comments

Richard Hulbert, The Hulbert Group, indicated support of the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report, with the exception of Condition 1.1, regarding the northeast tower corner's design and orientation. Mr. Hulbert commented that George Wainborn Park is a very public realm framed by very private residential buildings and that this building serves as a statement of enclosure for the Park and a gateway for the Mews. The tower design offers a visual clue from all directions that something special is happening here.

Mr. Hulbert advised that the applicant respects the City fabric but suggested that the special areas where the City approaches the water's edge, where there is historical land use, etc. require special consideration. Further, Mr. Hulbert advised that work has begun with the firm working on a mirror tower to complete the crescent and where the Seymour off-ramp also would support a rear facade consistent with what is proposed here. He also noted that the application received the unanimous support of the Urban Design Panel.

Regarding the livability and privacy of the units given the location of the tower's adjacent site, Mr. Hulbert commented that the tower's angle enhances the ability to get more sunlight into the inner part of the block, residents don't always look out perpendicular to the window surface but often diagonally, and suggested that unit views are enhanced by an orientation to the east end of False Creek.

David Negrin, Pacific Place Developments, reaffirmed that the application is seen as part of a unique crescent that is different from the City grid, and that the building design was developed with this in mind. With respect to parking during the construction period, Mr. Negrin advised that off-site parking for construction staff can be provided on other undeveloped sites owned by Pacific Place Developments in the area.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting commented that the Urban Design Panel generally supported the application and felt that it was handled well from an architectural point of view. Regarding Condition 1.1, there were a number of comments from Panel members concerning whether the northeast side of the tower seemed unresolved and should have had a stronger reference to the City's orthogonal grid or a more strongly developed response to its crescent facade. Approval of the project with conditions noted was recommended.

Mr. Kavanagh, referring to Condition 1.1, commented that the three-storey townhouse base and the tower design adequately reinforce the City grid, particularly as viewed by the pedestrian at grade level, references the gateway to the Park, and will work well with a mirror tower and the Seymour off-ramp. Mr. Kavanagh indicated his support of the application.

Ms. Leduc congratulated the proponents on the proposal and expressed support for the application as presented. She did not feel that the tower needed to be modified to the extent outlined in Condition 1.1 commenting that it is a design issue and the architects should have some liberty in this regard.

Mr. Scott indicated support of the application noting that this is a nice looking project and building.

Mr. Mortenson indicated support of the application. With respect to Condition 1.1, he indicated confusion regarding the intent of the design guideline but noted that there is an overlook issue relating to the view from the units into the adjacent building. Mr. Mortenson expressed his appreciation to staff for their attention to the pedestrian treatment of the site in terms of the mews.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg indicated his support of the application with the deletion of Condition 1.1. given that celebrating the crescent in as many ways as possible creates a look of a special place and suggestion that there is not the need to match the street network in all instances.

Mr. MacGregor commented that the design, if "mirrored as expected on the site to the west, picks up the off-ramp from the Granville Bridge to Seymour Street, responds to the shape of the crescent, and picks up orthogonal elements on parts of the building. His support for the deletion of Condition 1.1. was indicated.

Mr. Beasley commented that this building is part of the most significant assembly of buildings that will be done in this City in this generation, and noted his pleasure with the designs that have been put forward for the area. Mr. Beasley advised that he looks forward to viewing the mirror image application that will achieve the City's vision of a decade ago.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405455 as submitted, subject to Council's approval of the final form of development, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of a 29-storey residential high-rise tower with a three-storey component along Beach Avenue and a two-storey component along the new "Mews", with four levels of underground parking, subject to the conditions outlined in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 21, 2001, with amendment such that Condition 1.1 be deleted.

- CARRIED

4:05 p.m.

Mr. Rudberg departed the meeting and was replaced by his alternate Mr. Timm, Deputy City Engineer.

3. **401 Burrard Street
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

As was noted earlier in the minutes, consideration of this item was deferred to a future meeting.

4. **150 Drake Street
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Request: To construct a two-storey elementary school for kindergarten to grade seven with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Drake Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Eric Fiss, Development Planner, referencing the distributed Development Permit Staff Committee report dated April 4, 2001, and a project model and drawings, introduced the 150 Drake Street complete application. Contextual information was reviewed and information was provided regarding Council's approval, in principle, of the form of development for the site as part of the process for approval of the existing Dorothy Lam daycare.

Mr. Fiss, referring to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report, detailed staff's concerns with respect to the school's architectural treatment, including: its building materials, windows, entrance and roof form; its impact on neighbouring residents relating to parking, traffic, noise and privacy; impacts on David Lam Park; and the landscape design relating to the public realm context. Information was also provided regarding concerns expressed during the notification period and in public consultation specifically with regard to parking and traffic impacts.

Questions

In response to questions from Board and Panel members, Mr. Fiss commented concerning:

- short-term use of the area marked for future expansion as a kindergarten play area;
- need to identify more permanent locations for bicycle and garbage storage; and
- previous drawings are part of the approval of the daycare and included the phasing of the school.

Applicant's Comments

John Davidson, Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects, distributed a document dated April 17, 2001, prepared by Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects and Downs/Archambault & Partners, titled "City of Vancouver Development Permit Board Review False Creek North Elementary School".

Mr. Davidson, referencing the document, reviewed specific comments contained therein requesting deletion or modification of Conditions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4(a), and 1.15, outlined in the Staff Committee Report. With respect to Condition A.1.8, and other conditions referenced in the Report, the applicant advised that they look forward to working with staff on their resolution. Mr. Davidson further reviewed the conceptual design principles discussed in the document.

Alan Shatwell, Downs/Archambault & Partners, also referencing the document, discussed the project's design guidelines and materials intended to serve as a transition from the neighbouring heritage precinct to the more contemporary Seawall walkway. Mr. Shatwell introduced a proposed amendment to Condition 1.1 to incorporate brick masonry at the base of the school and to revise the metal cladding color scheme to match the pallet of the surrounding neighbourhood.

Barbara Buchanan, Vancouver School Board Chair, indicated that the School Board will work with the City to make this site the best possible site and noted that, if approved, the conditions in the Staff Committee Report would necessitate further negotiations with the Ministry and would likely delay the opening of the school.

In further discussion, the applicant and the Board and Panel discussed issues relating to:

- landscaping opportunities around the emergency exit off of the gymnasium;
- possible reorientation of classrooms so that more windows face the water;
- suggestion that covering the parking ramp rather than providing a set-back would go some way to resolving the unfriendly relationship of the ramp to the adjacent townhouse;
- need to conceal the two BC Hydro transformer boxes with landscaping;
- School Board and Ministry budget constraints relating to the exterior envelope of the building specifically with regard to building materials and maximum percentage allowed as windows;
- neighbours' concerns relating to unmonitored use and/or loitering in the emergency exit area;
- intent to make the school's base brick;
- need for the building design to consider children's safety as a primary concern;
- after hour public use of the school facility in keeping with other schools in the district; and
- City's role in building the parking area and its intent with respect to use of the parking during non-school hours.

5:44 p.m.

Mr. Kavanagh departed the meeting.

Comments from Other Speakers

Elyn Dobbs emphasized, over and above the specifics of this issue, that there is the need for cohesive neighbourhood planning and commented concerning how the Vancouver Charter and the Ministry's funding formula hinders developing neighbourhood plans. Ms. Dobbs further expressed her dismay that the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report would likely delay the opening of the school in this neighbourhood where a school is very much needed.

With respect to the school's landscaping and potential set-backs, Ms. Dobbs commented that consideration needs to be given to the health and safety of the children and residents to prevent people from loitering and littering in these areas. Ms. Dobbs advised that there are many schools in Vancouver where the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and Principal take a lead role in the landscape design to address security concerns and to design the use of the school area in a positive way so that it doesn't become an abandoned building.

Bob Pollard, Resident of the Columbus and member of the Strata Council's School Construction Committee, outlined issues identified by the Committee for residents and for the neighbourhood pertaining to:

- noise as a result of evening, weekend and summer rental of school space;
- all night noise from a commercial use of the parking lot;
- potential noise of the double-doors of the gym that open to the Columbus;
- expanded size of the school as contemplated in the future;
- use of metal cladding as the primary building treatment;
- the school roof design;
- request for sound dampening materials to be used wherever possible;
- how the potential for late night activity can be mitigated; and
- traffic safety on Drake Street as a result of increased traffic.

Mr. Pollard advised that the majority of Columbus residents recognize the need for a school in this area and wish it well in being constructed as quickly as possible. At the same time, residents recognize that the school will be there for a long time and will impact a lot of people and so urge that it not be approved until their concerns have been addressed.

Ali Pollard, resident of the Columbus, commented on the need for the new school to reflect the needs of the children and the uniqueness of the area and referenced the careful planning undertaken in the design of the neighbourhood's grocery store. Ms. Pollard expressed concerns regarding the School Board's lack of recognition of this school in a high density condo neighbourhood rather than a single-family residential neighbour and discussed the need for the School Board to make creative and innovative budget allowances for this project. It was suggested that the Board and staff need to take on the same function as a Strata Council for this area and turn down the application until the resident's concerns are addressed.

Leo-Jack Ferry commented that a delay in the school's opening will be a hardship to the children in this area. Transportation to their schools is a major issue for the children given that there are no direct buses to the schools that they presently attend. Mr. Ferry suggested that this is a unique social opportunity and an absolute necessity for the children and expressed no safety concerns for students with the present design.

Carolee Randal commented on the applicant's neighbourhood consultation process noting concerns that only two of the Columbus Strata Council's four members were permitted to attend relative meetings. Ms. Randal further commented that the design does not take into consideration the school's impact on the adjoining neighbours and discussed additional items of concern relating to:

- use of the area outside of the emergency exit for activities,
- commercial operation of an after hours parkade;
- exterior design of the school;
- sales literature that informed buyers that the school would have 120 students and would be for kindergarten to grade 3;
- lack of information regarding lighting systems and traffic impacts;
- noise from the school's P.A. system;
- lack of windows overlooking the water;
- need for limitations on the school's evening use;
- feasibility of underground parking given the softness of the soil and concern that the parking may become surface; and
- safety of children in relation to the parkade entry.

Morgan Greencourt discussed the history of the school's planning, commented on the success of the neighbourhood design in attracting families with children and concerning the need to provide education for children in their own neighbourhood. Mr. Greencourt noted that the School Board has gone a long way to meet residents' needs in terms of landscaping and building materials, asked that the limited budget for the project be considered, and requested the Board's speedy approval.

Matt Mehan, Pacific Place Holding Co., advised of his support for the Staff Committee Report, and commented on the hurdles that the developer went through to accommodate a school on the site and concerning the need to take the time to build the school right given that it will be there for a long time.

Irene Shield, Columbus resident, sought information regarding other schools and residential developments in such close proximity, commented regarding the expanded size of the school over what was communicated in sales literature, and concerning the space allocated to the daycare vs. the school.

Prior to reviewing the model and posted materials, staff offered clarification that from its inception the school for this site has been identified as being for kindergarten to Grade 7 students. Staff further commented on complaints received on various other projects as a result of misleading or inaccurate sales literature and encouraged individuals to check with the Planning Department to confirm information on promotional sales literature in future.

Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting relayed comments from the Urban Design Panel concerning the application noting that there was strong support expressed for its location, density, urban nature and uniqueness. The Panel, in a 7-1 vote, largely agreed that the applicant had handled the difficult site and guidelines well. Mr. Bunting expressed appreciation that the concerns regarding landscaping, treatments along the waterfront and the quality of building materials have been accepted by the applicant. Concerning the Ministry's guidelines, Mr. Bunting advised that he was happy to hear that they could possibly be amended, particularly with respect to window allowances.

Mr. Mortenson indicated his support for expediting the project noting that site planning has been done with sensitivity to minimize impacts to the adjacent building. He noted that esthetics are problematic given Education Ministry budget constraints and questioned the fairness of appropriating funding from other communities to improve this project. Mr. Mortenson endorsed the project and encouraged the applicant to work with the conditions for a better fit for the neighbourhood and to incorporate as much window space as possible.

Mr. Scott indicated his support for the application and school design and commended the applicant for their active approach to dealing with complaints.

Ms. Leduc recommended that the Board expedite approval of the application given that the neighbourhood is suffering from the lack of an elementary school and that the building of the school has to be a priority. Ms. Leduc further commented that it does have to be an attractive school, that what has been designed has a lot of visual appeal and that often schools purposefully don't blend in so that they are distinct in their neighbourhoods.

Chair Scobie relayed Mr. Kavanagh's comments, provided to the Chair at the time of Mr. Kavanagh's departure, noting that he recommended approval of the application and conditions given that the applicant has indicated that the conditions are achievable. Mr. Kavanagh further recommended that Condition 1.4(a) be amended to require screening of the ramp rather than a set-back.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley commented that the school is an important building that has been in the plan for this community from its inception and noted that it has to meet three tests relating to its compatibility with its neighbourhood, being a good neighbour and having a good image. He indicated that the conditions outlined in the Report go a long way in addressing those three areas. Mr. Beasley agreed with the need to build the school as soon as possible and noted that staff will work with the applicant in this regard. Concerning public use of the proposed parking, the issue will be considered by Council and the concerns of the neighbourhood will be considered at that time but have been noted by staff in the interim. Also, regarding the school's evening use, activities, and school yard, these are management concerns that will be decided on by the elected School Board which will be motivated to make agreeable arrangements.

Mr. MacGregor advised that City Council has contributed a lot to this development to try to encourage the school authority to build earlier. In terms of the Columbus, this is a development that was created in such a manner as to allow for a school to be developed near it. With respect to affordability, there are a number of important issues for the School Board and the Ministry to consider to achieve design standards for this unique inner city school considering that there are no costs for them associated with use or maintenance of playing fields in David Lam Park that will be maintained by the City and that the school/daycare underground parking will be paid for by the City. It was suggested that the least the Ministry could do is to go the extra mile to finance improvements to the school's appearance.

Mr. Timm agreed that the architectural appearance of the school, particularly the metal cladding, needs more attention and commented that the architects have done a fair job in dealing with the school's historic surrounding neighbourhood, the tight site, neighbourly issues and the strict Ministry guidelines. However, the City has made some significant contributions to this development that should be recognized.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405573 as submitted, subject to Council's approval of the final form of development, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of a two-storey elementary school (12 classrooms, 36 employees) for kindergarten to grade seven, with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Drake Street, subject to the conditions outlined in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated April 4, 2001, with the following amendments:

- Condition 1.1, Note to Applicant, delete first sentence in its entirety;
- Condition 1.3, add the following Note to Applicant:
"Modest further set-backs to provide greening of the easterly blank wall would be desirable.";
- Condition 1.4, replace with the following:
"design development in liaison with the adjacent resident to mitigate noise and improve overlook of the parking ramp by providing:
 - (a) covering of the ramp to the extent of the north edge of the adjacent townhouse living room windows; and
 - (b) an extended trellis as far north as practical towards Drake Street, in accordance with Section 4.2.10 of the Roundhouse Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines.";
- Condition 1.15, replace with the following:
"design development to fully screen the BC Hydro kiosks and incorporate their form into a pristine landscape treatment of the front set-back area.";
- add Condition 1.16 as follows:
"gym doors to be fitted out and managed for opening in emergency situations only in liaison with neighbouring residents and in compliance with the Vancouver Building By-law.

CARRIED

Chair Scobie offered concluding remarks to encourage the School Board representatives to relay a strong message to the Ministry that its budget standards are not acceptable in this context and that unless this is recognized, it will not obtain a permit for the school. Chair Scobie further offered School Board representatives the assistance of any of the Board members in related discussions with the Ministry. It was noted that members were particularly dismayed with the Ministry's standard with respect to windows and that a school in this location, on this site, in this public context to

have such a mean facade for budgetary reasons is not acceptable. Finishing materials and windows need considerable improvements.

6. **Other Business**

No Other Business Items were presented at the meeting.

7. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Rae T. Ratslef
Recording Secretary

F.A. Scobie
Chair