

Date: Monday, April 23, 2007  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:**

**Board**

F. Scobie Co-Director of Development Services (Chair)  
B. Toderian Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**Regrets**

D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
H. Hung Representative of the General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor  
S. Hein Development Planner  
D. Robinson Project Facilitator

**1598 COLUMBIA STREET (SEFC) - PARCEL 4 - DE411168 - ZONE CD-1**

N. Milkovich Nick Milkovich Architects Inc.  
R. Bayley Merrick Architecture  
P. Kreuk Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 10, 2007 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph that begins "Mr. Meehan", in line 3, change "Keyside" to *Quayside*;

Amend page 8, in both the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph that begins "Mr. Wall" (line 6) and the paragraph that begins "Mr. Stovell" (line 4), change "B.2.6" to *B.2.5*;

Amend page 9, in the paragraph that begins "Mr. Braun", in line 3, add *in height* after "reduced";

Amend page 9, in the paragraph that begins "Mr. Braun", in line 4, delete "not", to read:  
*which had been part of the last development application approval.*

Delete "underground" after Class A on page 10, in the amended motion to Condition A.1.6, to read:

*provision of a Loading Management Plan for the Class B loading space at Homer Mews, and a Class A loading space located underground, provided the Class B loading space is within "The Erickson" lot at 1500 Homer Mews and located on-surface, or in the alternative, provision of two underground Class A loading spaces.*

Other minor typographical errors were also noted for correction before signature of the minutes.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1598 COLUMBIA STREET (SEFC) - PARCEL 4 - DE411168 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Nick Milkovich Architects Inc.

Request: To construct two residential multiple dwelling buildings of 7 storeys (East Tower) and 12 storeys (West Tower) with 60 units over two levels of secure underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application for two residential towers and reviewed the site context and application with the aid of the context model for South East False Creek (SEFC). Mr. Hein noted the CD-1 Zoning By-law for SEFC - Area 2A was enacted by Council on April 17, 2007. As well, a Text Amendment to increase the building height from 30.0

m to 40.5 m (98 ft. to 133 ft.) for Parcel 4 was approved on April 17, 2007 after a Public Hearing.

Mr. Hein acknowledged that Parcel 4 is an important site on False Creek and will complement other prominent sites. Parcel 4 is considered a component of the waterfront buildings which also includes the SEFC Community Centre (Parcel 11).

The design, for two buildings of eight or nine storeys, around a common courtyard went to the Urban Design Panel in February and received non-support. The Panel thought the buildings were not differentiated enough and the scale wasn't consistent. The Panel was also open to additional height on the westerly building. Mr. Hein stated the design development advice from the Urban Design Panel had been incorporated into the application. Mr. Hein added that with proper envelope treatment, attention to the edges, and the courtyard, this would be an important signature project for SEFC and the city.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Team Report dated April 23, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Hein:

- There are a number of initiatives to achieve LEED™ Gold registration. These include the use of solar shading devices on the west elevations of the East and West Towers, ten foot deep balconies and sun shades.
- The intent is to restrict public access through the courtyard with a formal right-of-way along the public edge of the park.
- Planning of the lower suites concerning ground-orientated entries, grade separation and setbacks is still being explored with the applicant.
- The enclosed balconies follow the Balcony Enclosure Guidelines.
- Sustainability is mixed across the entire SEFC site and includes social, economic and environmental initiatives.
- Similar green roof strategies are being used in other projects in SEFC.
- This project has a different architectural response and is more prominent than other sites in SEFC.
- Staff are confident that the application is as advanced as other projects. Once the envelope is figured out, the quality and simplicity of this elegant design will emerge.

#### Applicant's Comments

Regarding sustainability, Mr. Bayley, Project Manager, noted that they have looked at passive ventilation programs. The building will be using pre-stressed slabs, so the ventilation shafts will run vertically through the building to the roof line, and will form part of the 2% passive design exclusion.

Mr. Milkovich, Architect, confirmed he did not have any problems with any of the recommended conditions of approval.

Mr. Kreuk, Landscape Architect, noted that the waterfront walkway was designed with a more seamless edge. He thought there were opportunities to pull the building back at the ground plane in order to shape the edge of the site which would result in a better interface with the public realm.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by the applicant team:

- Parcel 10 will have about 4.5% sustainable passive design elements with a similar achievement for Parcel 4.
- 30% will be green roofs in Parcel 4 with 50% required in the entire development in SEFC.
- Value engineering has been done on the window systems. The general contractor will fabricate the window systems on site.
- The suites will be 70% glass and 30% solid material.
- There will be sun shades on the west side of the buildings.
- The enclosed balconies follow the City of Vancouver Enclosed Balconies Guidelines.
- The applicant is still experimenting with the type of glass for the buildings. Coloured glass won't be used as it would affect the colour in the suites.
- Reflective pools in the courtyard will use circulating water with three waterfall elements.
- The applicant is planning an art feature in the courtyard.
- At the request of the developer, 58 out of 60 suites are family-oriented suites having two or three bedrooms.
- Only one supplier offers a 6L/3L dual flush toilet.
- Millennium will use rain water for toilet flushing which means plumbing all of the toilets independently, and installing filtering and water treatment equipment which will reduce the overall water use by 30-40%.
- The applicant preferred installation of low-water-use plumbing fixtures at 2.4 gpm for faucets and showerheads and not 1.8 gpm as stated in Condition A.5.4. Staff agreed that this was acceptable and would revisit the condition on other SEFC projects.
- In the water balance model, the applicant should be able to achieve 2 LEED™ points for water efficiency.
- Millennium has instructed that the Safer Homes Program be undertaken for all units in the project.
- All the internal doors will be 34 inches wide and the external doors will be 36 inches wide.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Milkovich confirmed the items raised by the Processing Centre - Building, Fire and Rescue Services (Appendix C) are resolvable without substantively affecting the proposed building design.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

### Advisory Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel was impressed with the proposal, the massing and how the building fits on the site. There was a lot of enthusiasm for the project and the Panel thought it was potentially a ground-breaking project which would be a key focal point on False Creek.

The Panel had some concerns about the resolution and execution of the pieces, but the proposed conditions will address those concerns. The concerns included; how the building met the ground and; how the building terminated at the parapet. The Panel thought a potential source of problems could be the skin of the building as the design detail hadn't been achieved before in Vancouver. Mr. Wall noted that when he was in New York City, a French architect had designed a similar building and the success was in the careful detailing of the skin which was divided into panels resulting in a shadow relief over the building. He thought it was a powerful statement. Mr. Wall noted that attention to detail will be critical for the success of the project. Mr. Wall added that the Panel's concerns had been well considered in the proposed conditions recommended by staff.

Mr. Tatomir thought it was a great project and had the potential to be a landmark building. He thought the use of materials and the orientation and shape of the buildings were interesting. Mr. Tatomir said he did not see much in the way of sustainability and urged Staff and the applicant to work together to address this important issue. He added that he was in support of the conditions.

Mr. Shearing thought it was a good project and looked forward to the execution of the design. He added that he was confident that this was the right team to deliver on the design as they understand the challenges. Mr. Shearing thought the biggest disappointment was the public ground plane and how it meets the site. He added that he would like to have seen the building fill the site more and recommended more attention be given to the public realm. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Stovell stated that he would embrace the developer's aspirations providing they use the money to successfully refine and implement the envelope design. Mr. Stovell thought the project should meet LEED™ Gold for water use, but didn't think the applicant needed to be micro-managed regarding the selection of the toilets. Mr. Stovell was concerned that the design might get watered down if the design became too difficult to achieve. Mr. Scobie noted that the application would go back to the Urban Design Panel in order for the Panel to provide additional assistance to Staff and the applicant, as the project evolves. Mr. Hein added that prior to clearing Condition 1.1, Staff would be asking the Urban Design Panel for their review. Mr. Scobie added that the Director of Planning has the right to have the application returned to the Development Permit Board for adjudication should there be a question as to whether a condition(s) had been satisfied.

Ms. Nystedt noted that this would be the most visible project in the Olympic Village development portion of SEFC and could be a flagship building. She congratulated the architect on his design and recommended approval. She was encouraged that the project would be going back to the Urban Design Panel as she felt the execution of the design was critical to the success of the project.

Mr. Braun recommended approval. He thought the building was magnificent and congratulated the architect on the design. Mr. Braun added that he was confident the curtain wall would be spectacular. Mr. Braun hoped that the colour notation in Condition 1.2 wasn't taken too seriously as he thought a simple colour scheme would be enough. Mr. Hein agreed with the comment noting that the colour would be understated. He added that the use of light, water and colour together relates to the features in the courtyard.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Toderian complimented the applicant team for a beautifully designed building. Mr. Toderian was satisfied with the sustainability initiatives undertaken by the architect and Millennium. He thanked the Urban Design Panel for their comments regarding the missed opportunity in the relationship between the two buildings which resulted in a Text Amendment. He commended Staff for following through with the text amendment as he thought it made for a better project. He noted that the majority of the Panel was enthusiastic about the design. He said he supported the project because of its expressiveness and was looking forward to seeing less constraint in the architecture in Vancouver.

Mr. Toderian was disappointed that the design had ruled out pedestrian passage through the courtyard. He added that he thought pedestrians would find it odd, but realized it was probably a matter of marketing. Mr. Toderian was concerned about the quality of the ground plane and strongly encouraged the applicant to continue working on improving the interface between the site and adjacent public realm. Mr. Toderian fully agreed with the simple elegance of the colour scheme.

Mr. Timm agreed that the sculptural architecture will set the building apart from the rest of the Olympic Village. He added that he was not a proponent of the overall massing style in the Olympic Village and thought there was more opportunity for expressive architecture in the higher towers. Mr. Timm agreed that more work needs to be done on the details, but was confident that the conditions recommended by staff would address any concerns.

Regarding Condition A.5.4, Mr. MacGregor stated that he didn't want the Board to be so specific as to cause the applicant to be restricted to one manufacturer. He felt there was a need to be practical and would like Staff to come back with a full report on the issues, as staff had advised this condition was also approved by the Board for earlier SEFC development applications. Mr. MacGregor congratulated the architect on a wonderful building design. He added that he was glad to see the project go back to the Urban Design Panel in terms of the skin of the building. He thought it was important for the architect to have a vision for the building and to be able to put that forward. Mr. MacGregor added that Staff should not hesitate to come back to the Board if the problems are not getting resolved. Mr. MacGregor thought there didn't need to be a public path through the courtyard, noting it was a short block. He was concerned about possible security issues on the ground plane and encouraged the applicant to rethink the design.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411168, subject to the conditions presented in the Staff Team Report dated April 23, 2007.

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

- a) **Leave of Absence:** It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Timm that the Board grant Darren Chung a three month leave of absence from the Development Permit Board Advisory Panel. Mr. Scobie reminded the Advisory Panel that if they are going to be absent for more than three consecutive meetings they are required to ask for a leave of absence or they will have removed themselves from the Advisory Panel.
- b) **550 Bute Street/1189 Melville Street:** It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Timm, and was the decision of the Board:

To consider that Condition 1.7 as indicated in the Minutes of the Development Permit Board of March 1, 2004 be satisfied on the undertaking in the letter dated April 23, 2007 from McCarthy Tetrault LLP (Scott D. Smythe) and the email from Mr. Wittstock to Mr. Scobie dated April 20, 2007.

Richard Wittstock, Amacon, confirmed that the residential tower is substantially complete. Amacon has made assurances in their disclosure statements to their purchasers of the residential tower that they will have the availability of the boutique hotel services.

- c) **Retirement:** The Board acknowledged Mr. Scobie's departure from the Board as Mr. Scobie will retire from the City of Vancouver at the end of May 2007. The Board thanked him for his considerable contribution as Chair of the Development Permit Board.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair