

Date: Monday, April 2, 2001  
Time: 4:00 p.m.  
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

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

**Advisory Panel**

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of the Development Industry  
J. LeDuc Representative of the General Public  
J. Ross Representative of the Development Industry

**ABSENT:**

T. Bunting Chair, Urban Design Panel  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
W. Francl Deputy Chair, Urban Design Panel  
M. Mortenson Representative of the General Public  
B. Scott Representative of the General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

S. Hein Development Planner  
E. Fiss Development Planner  
R. Segal Planning Department

**Item 3 - 1225 Richards Street - DE405502**

C. Brook Brook Development Planning Inc.  
F. Rafii Rafii Architects Inc.

**Item 4 - 1295 Richards Street - DE405476**

J. Bingham Howard Bingham Hill Architects  
P. Kreuk  
B. McCauley Concert Properties Ltd.  
G. Yoshizowa

**Item 5 - 422 West Cordova Street - DE405422**

L. Adams Neale Staniszki Doll Adams Architects  
P. Joyce Bunt and Associates

---

G. Ramsey  
G. Turnbull

Neale Staniszki Doll Adams Architects  
Harbour Centre Properties Ltd.

**Recording Secretary:**

R. Ratslef

Raincoast Ventures

**CALL TO ORDER**

A quorum being present, Chair Scobie called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

**1. Minutes**

The Board considered its March 19, 2001 meeting minutes. General comments were made concerning the poor quality of the minutes and regarding the inaccuracies contained therein both with respect to individual's comments and the resolutions. Options for proceeding were considered.

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

THAT the Resolutions contained in the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 19, 2001 be approved with the following amendments:

- Resolution 1, paragraph 1, insert "Station" following "Commercial SkyTrain", and bullet 6, replace "use of occupancy" with "use or occupancy";
- Resolution 2, replace "moved by Mr. Adam" with "moved by Ms. Forbes-Roberts", and direct that staff review and confirm the accuracy of the amendment noted with respect to Condition 3;

AND THAT all references to "LeDuc" be replaced with "Leduc";

AND THAT consideration of the remaining content of the Minutes be deferred to the next meeting to allow members to review and submit revisions to the Chair concerning their comments noted therein.

- CARRIED

**2. Business Arising From the Minutes**

None.

**3. 1225 Richards Street  
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Brook Development Planning Inc.

Request: To construct a 26-storey, 185 unit multiple dwelling building with limited ground floor commercial space with three levels of underground parking on this site.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

---

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, referencing the distributed Development Permit Staff Committee report dated March 21, 2001, and a project model, introduced the 1225 Richards Street preliminary application. Comments were made concerning the nature of the project taken in the context of the surrounding neighbourhood, and members were informed that the application complies with applicable by-laws and guidelines with the exception of its shadow impact.

With respect to the proposed project's shadow impact, members were informed that the present tower location casts a shadow on a park area and were advised that consideration had been given to other locations for the tower in consultation with neighbouring residents. During the consultation it was determined that any movement of the tower's location would negatively affect the livability, privacy and views of residential towers in the area. Given this, staff propose that the tower remain in its present location, that its height be reduced by two storeys to limit the shadow impact on the park area and that the lost floor area be recovered through other means.

### Questions

Mr. Segal outlined further issues for the Board's consideration as contained in the Staff Committee report and, in response to Board members' questions, provided additional information as follows:

- the applicant has indicated support for all conditions with the exception of the reduction of the tower height;
- it is not believed that developments on other sites in the area will have a shadow impact on the park area; and
- the shadow guidelines attached to the Report in Appendix E, call for the absolute minimization of shadow on public open spaces and lists parks as a first priority in this regard.

Mr. ~~Dreyson~~, Driessen, Vancouver Park Board, commented concerning the Park Board's intention with respect to the park area, noting that seating will be concentrated in the Davie and Richards Streets corner but that additional seating could be provided in other areas of the park. The Park Board's concern is to ensure that there is adequate sunlight on the park, particularly during winter months.

### Applicant's Comments

Chuck Brook, Brook Development Planning Inc., commented concerning the consultation process that had been undertaken with staff and neighbours to determine the optimum for the tower's location, height and form. Referencing the Report's Appendix D, pages 12 and 13 of 14, it was further noted that there is a dramatic improvement in the overshadowing performance of the tower as a result of moving to daylight savings.

Mr. ~~Brooks~~ Brook further commented on the related discussions of the City's Urban Design Panel and advised of the Panel's eventual support (with one dissenting vote) for the tower in its present location with the removal of one floor, the reduction of the tower top and the creation of a fourth floor on Davie Street to achieve an overall tower height of 220 ft. This is desirable given that it would not force the applicant into a modified floor plate design in which the north side of the tower protrudes and the livability and marketability of central units becomes questionable.

In response to questions from the Board, Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Inc., advised that the tower rooftop in its present form obscures from view the rooftop's mechanical units, and that changes to the rooftop's form would result in their exposure. Clarification was also provided that shadowing attributable to the penthouse is minimal and would be reduced even further by reductions in the parapets. Additionally, the possibility of reducing attic space to achieve height savings was explored.

Staff considered the alternative option presented by the applicant to reduce the overall tower height to 220 ft. and expressed general support, particularly given the extensive consultation the applicant underwent with neighbouring residents.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

Grant Saar, representing the residents of Metropolis, commented concerning the applicant's consultation process with neighbouring residents and staff during which the location of the tower was discussed. All those who attended supported the tower location and design put forward by the applicant and appreciated being consulted. Mr. Saar further advised, as a resident of Metropolis who will benefit from the development and from the park, that the development would not affect his enjoyment of the park.

*Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.*

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Hancock recommended support of the project noting that the applicant has demonstrated a willingness to lower the tower height. Also, the critical time for the park is between 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. and the shadowing in question occurs closer to 2:00 p.m. Mr. Hancock advised of his satisfaction with the project as presented and suggested that the project would not benefit from increasing the floor plate.

Mr. Ross noted that the shadow impact on the park had been tweaked down to only a few feet, and suggested that the remaining shadow impact was not reason to hold up the application, particularly given that the lunch hour sun would not be impacted by the tower. Mr. Ross advised of his support of the project with an overall reduction in tower height to 220 ft and with the addition of a floor on the Davie Street frontage.

Mr. Kavanagh indicated his support of the previous speakers' comments with respect to lowering the tower height to 220 ft. and adding substance to the Davie Street frontage.

Mr. Scott expressed his support for the application with a maximum tower height of 220 ft. and suggested that the park has not yet been designed and could be designed to accommodate the shadow impact.

Ms. Leduc commended the applicant on the attractiveness of the tower which she suggested would add to the neighbourhood, and on the neighbourhood consultation process the applicant employed. Ms. Leduc recommended approval of the application with a one storey reduction in the tower height, noting that the park could be designed so that its seating isn't in shadow.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley suggested that the application's overall response to the Downtown South guidelines and conditions is one of the most understanding designs submitted to date. The townhouses look attractive and livable and achieves what the City envisioned for this area. The tower looks very suave, the open space is handsome, and there is not too much detail. Mr. Beasley indicated his extreme pleasure with the application as presented.

Mr. MacGregor commended the applicant's design to achieve substantially with a smaller floorplate and to minimize shadowing impacts.



## 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 the concept of developing this site with a 26-storey, 185-unit multiple dwelling building with limited ground floor commercial space with three levels of underground parking, as submitted under Development Application No. 405502, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 21, 2001 with the following amendments:

- Condition 1.1 to read:  
*“design development to lower the tower height by at least one storey, and incorporated other architectural adjustments (to a maximum height of 220 feet) to reduce shadow cast onto the future park in response to Section 2.6.1 of the Downtown South Design Guidelines;*  
  
*Note to Applicant: Lost floor area can be recovered by increasing the floor plate on the north side of the tower and by adding an additional floor to the low rise building along Davie Street.”;*
- Condition 3.0, replace “Development Permit Board” with “Director of Planning”; and
- Standard Condition A.1.3, insert “provide” prior to “details of”.

- CARRIED

In his concluding remarks, Chair Scobie requested that the applicant, in plans to separate the retail from the residential, give early consideration to air space parcel subdivision in consideration of building bylaw implications.

4. 1295 Richards Street - DE405476-ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill, Architects

Request: To construct a 23-storey multiple dwelling development containing 215 dwelling units with two levels of underground parking.

· **Development Planner's Opening Comments:**

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, referencing a model and posted drawings, introduced the application and discussed the proposed site in the context of the surrounding neighbourhood. Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 7 and 21, 2001, Mr. Segal outlined staff's primary concern in Condition 1.1, with respect to the livability of the low-rise component. Staff's

suggestion is that the low-rise design be reversed so that the two-level units are on the ground floor with the one level units placed above them and having direct access to the patio area. The applicant has indicated support for this Condition and staff are pleased with the reference diagrams.

Mr. Segal reviewed the other conditions as contained in the Staff Committee Report pertaining to suggested improvements to the public interface and the rooftop and to achieve a well-integrated juncture between the townhouses. Staff have received seven letters of concern regarding the application but feel that the concerns have been addressed.

### Questions

In response to Board members' questions, Mr. Segal provided additional information concerning the proposed reconciliation of the townhouses noting that this could be achieved by ensuring that there are no exposed party walls, wrapping the finished materials around the side, and/or by providing distinct treatment to the end townhouse unit.

With respect to Condition 1.3, Mr. Segal advised that the applicant has investigated the end elevation, added more brick, incorporated windows and some articulation and that the Condition has been addressed.

Concerning Condition 1.1, clarification was provided that access to the one level units would be by virtue of a bridge element (included in the original plan) and a heavily glazed rear corridor on the third level. The applicant advised that for security reasons, there would be no direct access to units from the patio and that the stairwell would be used for exiting purposes only.

Questions were raised concerning how the site relates to its adjacent site and whether blind walls are visible to the residents in either building. Staff advised that there will be a separating wall and some building mass, however, the buildings are close in height at the rear and, the applicant advised that they are in discussions with the neighbouring property to blend the two garden designs.

Mr. Segal further commented regarding staff's concerns with the livability of the units on the street. Members were informed that a study of the matter has shown that one level units on the street are not very livable or marketable and can remain empty for some time.

### *Request of Staff*

*Staff was requested to provide members with copies of the study undertaken concerning the livability and marketability of townhouses in the downtown core.*

### Applicant's Comments

John Bingham, Howard Bingham Hill Architects, referencing the Conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report, commented as follows:

- extensive revisions have been made to the design to put the two-storey townhouse on the lower level and the one-storey units above while maintaining the character of the street scape;
- the townhouse concept has been continued along Richards and Drake Streets via the extension of the brick framework to the tower and up the streets;



- windows have been provided looking back onto the lane to provide additional security;
- the brick has been increased to hydrate the finish and it has been returned to the lobby;
- townhouse entries have been enhanced with brick and gates;
- the tower has a concrete frame projecting up on Drake Street and an extended parapet line on Richards to enhance its presentation to the lane, also there are steps at the 17, 22 and 23 floors with a 10 foot set back on the top level, and additional refinements will be explored;
- townhouse roofs will have character to provide greater visual amenity from the towers;
- the grade has been increased a foot to provide a greater difference between the street and the project;
- consideration is being given to warming the colour palate while retaining the modulation of colors;
- location of the end unit and the rental office will be exchanged so as to locate the office on the busier more active corner.

Brian McCauley, Concert Properties Ltd., further advised that:

- the applicant will work closely with staff to address concerns and has no difficulties with the conditions;
- some amenity spaces have been reconsidered, particularly the building massing adjacent to the northern neighbour;
- fitness area and lounge have been moved to reduce the amount of built form in the amenity;
- we are encouraging pet ownership with the groom room in the landscaped area and a children's play area has also been included.

***Request of Staff***

*Staff was requested to report back regarding the circumstances in which a covenant should be attached to applications to prevent discriminating against renting to families with children.*

**Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

*Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.*

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Kavanagh recommended approval of the application and relayed the Urban Design Panel's appreciative comment that the project is not obviously a rental project.

Mr. Ross recommend approval of the application and advised that his concerns regarding the top of the tower, livability and the blank wall had been addressed.

Mr. Hancock recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions noted in the report.

Ms. Leduc recommended approval of the application noting that the applicant is working with the staff and other architects to meet the conditions.

Mr. Scott recommended approval of the application and suggested that it is an unique project that will add to the area.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley commended the applicant on the project's diversity in its unit sizes and design and for their quick response to the various concerns identified by staff, and indicated his support of the resolution.

## 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. 405476 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of a 23-storey multiple dwelling development containing 215 dwelling units with two levels of underground parking, subject to the conditions noted in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 7 and 21, 2001.

- CARRIED

### 5. 422 West Cordova Street - DE405422 - ZONE HA-2 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Neale Staniszki Doll Adams

Request: Interior and exterior alterations from demolishing the uppermost two floors of this existing parkade/retail building on this Provincially designated Heritage site, to add two replacement floors on the top of the original parkade structure to create 5,545 m<sup>2</sup> (approximately 60,000 sq. ft.) of open floor area specially designed to accommodate offices, communications and data equipment. In addition, the proposal includes exterior finishes upgrade to the existing facade along Cordova Street and portions of the Homer and Richards Street facades.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, referencing the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 7 and 21, 2001, introduced the application and the following on-table additional condition:

*"Approval by the Director of Planning pursuant to Section 12 of the Heritage Conservation Act, permitting alternations to the Provincially Designated Heritage site."*

Mr. Segal proceeded with a review of the project model and the site context noting that the proposal's principal benefit is an upgrade to its appearance. There is a height relaxation of 12 ft. beyond the 75 ft. zoning that staff support on the basis that no further shadow is generated on the north sidewalk. The critical point in terms of the sloped roof expression is that no further shadow be created than would otherwise be achieved by a 75 ft building.

Information was provided on other improvements that the site will undergo, including seismic upgrading, improved weather protection, brick additions, and additional display windows. Mr. Segal advised, with respect to the parking, that some spaces will be lost due to the seismic upgrading, the demolition of the upper two floors and the addition of office space to primarily house data equipment. Staff support the calculation of the number of required parking spaces based on an office place

designation for this site which results in a 17 space shortfall, and support the implementation of payment-in-lieu to meet the parking requirement.

Staff also recommended replacing Condition A.2.10 with:

*"Arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for a single site parking covenant so as to link the sites at 515 W Hastings, (Harbour Centre), and 422 W Cordova for parking purposes."*

Mr. Segal advised that staff also seek improvements to the exterior in a more interesting roof form and a series of conditions in the Report seek more glazing and some expansion of weather protection along the side streets. Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions noted.

### Questions

Question was raised regarding the use of dormers in the site's roof design and why there was lack of support expressed for their use, particularly given that they would offer light to the office space. Clarification was provided that comments received regarding the dormers were that they did not add to the overall design or improve the visual element of the site as seen from street level.

Mr. Segal provided information concerning the proposed improvements to the lower levels of the parkade, including the addition of brick to the concrete face, a new canopy of steel and glass, brick wrapping along the stair corridors and between the windows. Members were informed that the top two storeys are structurally unsound given that they were poorly added on to the existing structure in 1970.

Information was sought concerning the comments of the Gastown Historic Area Planning Committee (GHAPC) with respect to the design. Members were informed that GHAPC was supportive of the overall design but had some reservations regarding the dormers.

### *Request of Staff*

*Staff was requested to ensure that, where applicable, comments from Area Planning Committees are included with application presentations.*

In discussion of the conditions in the Report, question was raised concerning the Board's authority with respect to Condition A.2.5. Clarification was provided that the determination of whether to allow an encroachment lies within the purview of the General Manager of Engineering who is guided, not mandated, by the Board's decision. If permitted, there an annual fee for use of the street area would apply.

### Applicant's Comments

Larry Adams, Neale Staniszki Doll Adams, commented that the applicant has no concerns with Conditions 1.1 to 1.4 in the Report and advised that they have worked closely with staff to deal with issues that arose during the design and will continue to do so. Mr. Adams further advised that the application received the unanimous support of the Urban Design Panel with the exception of the dormers

which they felt were superfluous and should be replaced with a more adventurous, ultra-contemporary roof-form.

With respect to Condition 1.5, Mr. Adams expressed concerns regarding the requested increase in parking stalls and reviewed Appendix E, pages 10 through 12, correspondence dated March 23, 2001 from NSDA, providing rationale for a relaxation of 17 stalls for the above project.

Peter Joyce, Bunt and Associates, reviewed details of Appendix E, pages 1 through 9, correspondence dated March 19, 2001 from Bunt and Associates, regarding "Cordova Parkade, Vancouver BC, Parking Study", and outlined its conclusions regarding parking demand in the area for the Board's consideration.

Grant Turnbull, Harbour Centre Properties Ltd., offered further comments regarding the application noting that its office space component is targeted to the high-tech sector in the City, and is primarily intended for use as a web-hotel for computer equipment.

In the ensuing discussion, Board and Panel members sought additional information and clarification concerning the parking issue from the applicant and staff. Information was provided with respect to the following:

- present Parking By-law requirements for the site and for Harbour Centre;
- number of stalls that would be needed to meet compliance on the site;
- present dimension of parking stalls, including small-small stalls, vs. the dimensions required to meet the existing By-law requirements and the resultant loss of approximately 8 stalls due to seismic upgrading;
- existing benefits to the site including use of a bridge connecting it to Harbour Centre for a nominal annual fee and a height relaxation;
- interpretation of the space as either a dwelling or non-dwelling use to determine the parking requirements, clarification that there is a single standard for any and all non-residential uses;
- opportunities that exist for relaxations when a site is protected as a heritage building; and
- number of stalls lost as a result of seismic upgrading.

Mr. MacGregor clarified that the Parking By-law requirements were developed by the City as a holistic approach to parking. The By-law was constructed to accommodate changing uses on sites recognizing at times that there would be a surplus and at other times a shortage of parking.

In further discussion it was suggested that it would be appropriate to design the top floor of the project to be agile for a variety of future uses in the event that the web hotel concept is unsuccessful or becomes unnecessary in time. Options for ensuring that light is emitted into the space were considered, including use of dormers, strip windows and increased glazing. Additionally, information was provided on factors affecting the use of such means, including the special temperature requirements necessary for the computer equipment that would be housed therein.

Comment was made that the building in its present form is subject to a lot of graffiti and options for reducing the opportunities for graffiti were explored, including using an anti-graffiti coating on the brick work.

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

None.

*Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.*

#### · **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Hancock expressed support for the inclusion of dormers in the rooftop design but given that the roof is not particularly visible was willing to forgo their inclusion. Additionally, Mr. Hancock indicated his preference for the strut supported cornice over the hanging one, was content with the base brick and recommended the application be approved subject to the resolution of parking issues.

Mr. Ross indicated his support for the application and its height relaxation but suggested that something be done with the blank wall on the Homer Street frontage given its visibility, and that glazing, dormers or an alternate design feature be incorporated on the top level.

Mr. Kavanagh recommended approval subject to the resolution of Condition 1.5 to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering.

Mr. Scott indicated his support for the application but suggested, having worked in the immediate area, that maximizing the site's parking is essential.

Ms. Leduc noted her support for the building's proposed upgrading and suggested that improvements should be made in line with the heritage elements of the area. Ms. Leduc noted that the Gastown Area Management Plan starts to address the proposed taxation relief, etc. designed to help people maintain heritage elements. Additionally, Ms. Leduc indicated her support of a relaxation in the parking requirements as compensation for the seismic upgrading on the site and suggested that consideration be given to reconstruction applications in Gastown given that the relaxations that would be provided in other areas do not apply.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley commended the applicant for their efforts in significantly improving this building and noted it would be a better building with more glazing on the top floor and with a more visually interesting cornice in the spirit of the basic arrangement of the architecture. Mr. Beasley suggested that the retail at grade was very important and stressed that it not be endangered as a resolution is reached regarding parking. Mr. Beasley expressed support to relax the parking requirement somewhat in recognition of the hardship faced by the applicant as a result of seismic upgrading.

Mr. Rudberg commented concerning Condition 1.1, noting that some knock-outs would be to his satisfaction, but would be not an absolute requirement. Mr. Rudberg also noted his support for a slight relaxation in the parking requirements, given the seismic upgrading being done, but did not support having to resort to small-small stall dimensions.

### **Motion**

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

**That the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405422 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the interior and exterior alterations to this existing parkade/retail building on this Provincially designated Heritage site to remove the top two levels and replace them with two storeys for office use and provide an upgraded facade**

to the remainder of the building, subject to the conditions in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 7 and 21, 2001 with the following amendments:

- Condition 1.1, Note to Applicant, add "but should consider allowing light penetration to the upper level beyond what is presented in the reference drawings.";
- Condition 1.5, given that this is an existing parking facility and that bringing it up to seismic code will result in the loss of a number of parking spaces, replace "613" with "605" and add "geometric standards" following "Parking By-law",
- Condition 1.5, Note to Applicant, replace "613" with "605";
- Condition A.1.12, add "and graffiti" following "mischief";
- add Condition A.1.15 as follows:  
*"Approval by the Director of Planning pursuant to Section 12 of the Heritage Conservation Act, permitting alternations to the Provincially Designated Heritage site."; and*
- Condition A.2.5, Note to Applicant", add "as well as compliance with the Building By-law" following "necessary".
- Condition A.2.10, replace it with the following:  
*"Arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for a single site parking covenant so as to link the sites at 515 West Hastings and 422 West Cordova Street for parking purposes."*

- CARRIED

6. Other Business

No Other Business Items were presented at the meeting.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Rae T. Ratslef  
Recording Secretary

---

F.A. Scobie  
Chair