

Date: Monday, April 7, 2008
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Ridge Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Tatimir 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
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
S. Brodie Civil Engineer
R. Segal Senior Architect/Development Planner
A. Molaro Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator

1133 HOMER STREET - DE411871 - ZONE DD

M. Bruckner IBI/HB Group

175 ROBSON STREET - DE411173 - ZONE DD

A. Jamal Relative Form Architecture Studio
J. Chow Relative Form Architecture Studio
M. Long PWL Partnership
Z. Bhatia Mayfair Properties Ltd.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 25, 2008 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend the first paragraph on Page 7 to read:

Mr. Jenkins added that the recommended changes will be addressed at the staff level and will include the architect's team and senior planning staff as required to provide the necessary clarity so that the project can proceed. Mr. Jenkins noted that in a recent SEFC application, the Board directed the project be sent back to the UDP *after approval. The Director of Planning may go to the Panel in the future, if necessary, depending on the progress of the design development*, but Mr. Jenkins did not feel it was required for this application, *at this time*.

Amend the first paragraph on Page 9 under Board Discussion to read:

Mr. Andrews thanked the applicant team for a great project and said he was looking forward to it being built. Mr. *Andrews* moved approval of the application.

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

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1133 Homer Street - DE411871 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: IBI/HB Group

Request: Interior alterations and a reduction in the number of dwelling units on the combined 15th and 16th floors from 6 dwelling units to 4 dwelling units in the existing multiple dwelling, thereby requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer.

Opening Comments

Mr. McLellan introduced the application for interior alterations and the reduction of a number of dwellings in the building at 1133 Homer Street.

Mr. McLellan noted the recommendations contained in the Staff Report dated April 7, 2008 and recommended support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Applicant's Comments

Martin Bruckner, IBI/HB, agreed to the conditions in the Staff Report.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

None.

Board Discussion

None.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411871, in accordance with the Staff Report dated April 7, 2008.

**3. 175 ROBSON STREET - DE411173 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Relative Form Architecture Studio

Request: To develop this site with a 20-storey mixed-use project containing Retail, Hotel and Residential uses, over three levels of underground parking. The project would contain 102 hotel suites on the 4th through 9th floors and 78 dwelling units on the 10th through 20th floors.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner noted that the proposal was a Complete Application after Preliminary. The application is for a hotel and residential building at the corner of Robson and Cambie Streets. The lower two floors will be retail uses along both streets. The hotel rooms are on the 3rd through 9th floors with floors 10 through 20 being residential. The Board approved the height and FSR at the Preliminary Application. Ms. Molaro noted that there had been a number of massing changes with a more subtle approach taken to the expression of the tower, however further design development is required to articulate the southern façade. Ms. Molaro noted that the applicant is being asked to move the air intake vent out of the sidewalk. She also noted that the applicant has proposed a number of sustainable features including a green roof, storm water management and geothermal. Ms. Molaro also described the developments in the surrounding area.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 12, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the Complete Application, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- Condition 1.7 is asking the applicant to note on the drawings what sustainable measures they are intending to provide.
- The wording "*and pedestrian rights of ways*" should be deleted from Condition A.1.12.

- The applicant is being asked to have the lounge maintained as a cantilevered structure with no columns so that it is a light and elegant structure. It will not extend beyond the property line.
- The sidewalk is wide enough to allow for outdoor seating but would require a permit.
- The applicant is being asked to reduce the parking spaces for the hotel side of the project.

Applicant's Comments

Allalah Jamal, Architect, noted that there will be sufficient elevators for the building. All four will be available for hotel guests and two of the elevators will continue to the residential floors. Regarding the parking stalls, Mr. Jamal noted that the Bylaw requires one stall for every 3 rooms to a maximum of 1 stall for every 2 rooms, however the owner feels that there will not be enough stalls for the hotel requirements. Mr. Jamal added that there are no parking requirements for residential. Mr. Jamal also noted that the residential will be run as long term executive rental. Regarding the geothermal, Mr. Jamal stated that they don't have the results of the survey although they have done the bore holes and the results were fairly positive.

Zack Bhatia, property owner, stated that they have signed a 20 year franchise with Hilton Hotels. The units are approximately 300-400 square feet with no ability to put in a kitchen so it would be difficult to convert from hotel use to residential use in the future. He added that as long as they own the property it will be kept as hotel and residential. Also, they have developed similar hotels which are stratified and have no intention of change the use.

Mr. Jamal had concerns with Condition 1.1 regarding the solar shading devices, and suggested that the solar shading issue be taken care of as a lower solar shading coefficient in the glazing for the south side of the building as that would not change the physical characteristic of the exterior of the building, and would still provide sustainable attributes. Regarding the relocation of the fresh air intake for the parking structure, Mr. Jamal noted that the only other location would be on the face of the building using ventilation louvers. He added that it would have a larger impact as it will bite into the retail space on Robson Street. He also suggested that if it was left in the sidewalk in an area that would not be used for an outdoor patio area or it would be a raised area. He added that they had done that in another project and it worked well.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The enclosed balconies meet Council policy other than the balconies on the top two floors. Staff do not have an issue with those balconies as they are attached to larger units and have more than one bedroom.
- The residential is intended to be run as long term rental for executives who want long term stay for business purposes and would be run by the hotel concierge.
- The applicant suggested that there was insufficient parking for the hotel, but overall there is sufficient parking. It's just a question of how it will be used.
- If the parking spaces are reduced the applicant would still require half a level and need to dig down for the lowest portion.
- There are four elevators planned for the project. All four elevators will have access to all the hotel floors. The residents will require a card key to access the floors for the residential units.

- The development will have one owner. The hotel will be stratified as well as the residential units.
- The owner has signed a 20 year franchise agreement with the Hilton Hotel chain.
- Geothermal is proposed for the entire building, not just for the hotel.
- The zoning limits 3 FSR for residential and the applicant is proposing 2.31 FSR. The overall FSR is 5.51.
- The hotel use can not be changed without a change in the development permit.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stated that the Panel had supported the project and that the applicant had made significant progress since the Preliminary Application. He thought the project had evolved into an elegant building and noted that the Panel had some small concerns about the detail quality of the building. Mr. Wall thought the detailing of the bridge elements should be as light as possible. The fine detailing of those elements would make them appear to span across the building elements. Mr. Wall commended the applicant on the projecting element over the entry on Robson Street as he thought it was an exciting idea. The Panel's main concern was the south elevation. Mr. Wall said he believed the strong solar shading devices were required for the façade and that to rely on low e glass was not sufficient otherwise the rooms will have to rely on air conditioning. Mr. Wall recommended the Board let Condition 1.1 stand. As for Condition 1.3, regarding the intake vents in the sidewalk, Mr. Wall encouraged the applicant team to look for an alternate solution. He thought it was a poor design solution to have them in the street. He suggested the applicant look for a way to integrate them with the fountain and lantern that is set back from the sidewalk. He thought this might make an interesting landscape and architectural feature. Mr. Wall recommended support of the application.

Mr. Tatomir commended the architect for a well designed building. He added that he was in support of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Regarding the intake vents on Robson Street, Mr. Tatomir thought a raised patio was a good solution. Mr. Tatomir questioned the necessity of having enclosed balconies as they won't add anything to the building in the way of sustainability and could bring more heat into the building. Mr. Tatomir thought Condition 1.1 should stay as he felt the south façade needs some sun shading. Mr. Tatomir said he was disappointed that the Board and Advisory Panel did not have the geothermal data. He suggested that it would be better to have the kitchens closer to natural lighting rather than in the middle of the unit. Mr. Tatomir thought the blank wall at the back of the project was unattractive and suggested the applicant make arrangements with the owner of the building to plant vines on the grey wall. Mr. Tatomir noted that LEED™ should not always be a standard of measure for sustainable initiatives as it is only a checklist. He added that he was in support of the application.

Mr. Shearing commended the architect for including the changes since the Preliminary Application in the booklet. Mr. Shearing thought the design was confusing, particularly the tower, as the pieces didn't seem to hang together. He also thought the solid elements on the facades looked like appliquéés and didn't read very well. Also, the scheme would be more successful if the glass pieces came out of the solid at the ground floor as it would make for a more solid looking building. Mr. Shearing suggested the solid form should turn the corner around the 3rd and 4th floors, which would make for a stronger façade. He said he liked the base and also thought solar shading was important on the south façade although it would have a significant impact on the design of the building. He supported taking the intake vents off the sidewalk as he didn't think it was a good idea. Mr. Shearing was in support of the application.

Mr. Stovell was in support of the application. He also agreed that the solar shading was required on the south façade. Mr. Stovell noted that the owner had given up 8 feet of their property to the City and he thought they should be allowed to located the intake vents on their property although he encouraged the applicant to continue their investigation for alternatives.

Ms. Maust recommended approval of the application. She also agreed that solar shading should be added to the south façade but that it needed to be well done. Ms. Maust particularly liked the brick base and thought the building would compliment the heritage buildings in the area.

Ms. Nystedt said her immediate reaction was that it was a fabulous project. She was concerned with the increased density to the area and the absence of surface parking and though the applicant should be allowed to have more parking available in the building. She added that from the general public's perspective, the building would be a great addition.

Mr. Chung commended the architect as he thought the design was perfect in terms of the Robson Street façade. He added that he liked the design of the balconies, and that they were recessed into the face of the building, as it made for a smoother surface to the tower. Mr. Chung said he supported having solar shading devices added to the south façade. Regarding the intake vents, Mr. Chung thought it was problematic to have the vents in the street and suggested if they have to be there to break them up and not have them all in one location. He added that having them in front of the retail space would ruin the experience of window shopping. He encouraged the applicant and staff to find a better solution. Mr. Chung said he liked the floating element above the entry and was in support of the application.

Mr. Hung commended the architect for his beautiful design. He said he liked the bridge elements and the roof with the swimming pool. Mr. Hung was also in support of Condition 1.1 as he too felt solar shading devices were required for the south façade. Regarding the intake vents, he thought they should be relocated to the other side of the building rather than on Robson Street. Mr. Hung recommended the applicant be allowed to have more parking spaces because of the hotel and commercial use as well as visitor parking requirements. Mr. Hung recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He said his only criticism was the lack of green features. He noted that the conditions have added a few, but he felt more sustainable measures could be added. Mr. Braun said he wondered if long term hotel and commercial uses should have separate zoning as he didn't understand why they were integrated. In terms of the parking, Mr. Braun hoped they could redistribute the residential parking to the hotel rather than deleting the spaces. As this will be a rental building in the downtown area, Mr. Braun thought there should be some reward for that and suggested the applicant get the extra parking.

Board Discussion

Mr. Ridge moved approval of the application with an amendment to Condition 1.3. He thanked the architect for the design. He thought it was an attractive building and will be a welcomed addition to Robson Street.

Mr. Timm supported Mr. Ridge's amendments to Condition 1.3 and seconded the motion of approval. He added that his own amendments were for the revision of Condition A.2.9 and Condition A.2.12. Mr. Timm thought that the project was a good looking design and had advanced since the Preliminary Application. He said he originally thought the retail on Robson Street seemed broken up, but was now consolidated. Mr. Timm agreed that the intake vent should be removed from the street as it would be a significant impediment to the public realm.

Mr. Timm noted that the bike racks had been deleted from the pedestrian right-of-way in staff conditions. Mr. Timm added that the thought the vents could be incorporated into the design of the water feature.

Mr. Toderian supported the amendments and suggested a change of wording for Condition A.13 which was accepted by Mr. Ridge and Mr. Timm. Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for the distance they had come with the design since the Preliminary Application. He thought it was very good architecture with many worthy aspects. He thought the inset of the glass at a slight angle was a clever solution and applauded the architect for his risk taking. Mr. Toderian said he also liked the bridges as stand alone pieces and how the glass facades had been broken up, which will add variety to what could have been a monotonous glass wall. Mr. Toderian said he had some fear that some of the detail might be lost in the follow through and hoped that would not happen. He also liked the choice of materials and again stressed to the applicant that he follow through with what was being proposed. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to go a little further with the sustainable measures. He added that he hoped the applicant used the geothermal though the whole building. Regarding the solar shading devices, Mr. Toderian suggested a combination of shading devices with deeper balconies and to keep the sustainable measures in the context of the architecture. Mr. Toderian added that he was pleased to support the project.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411173, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 12, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.3 to read:

Note to Applicant: This is to be achieved by relocating *and redesigning* the proposed fresh-air intake vents for the below-grade parking garage to minimize their impact on pedestrian or retail activities along this frontage. *Equally effective alternatives may also be considered.*

Amend Condition A.1.12 by deleting "and pedestrian rights of ways" to read:

submit a Construction Management Plan that clarifies how pedestrian access will be maintained during the construction period for this proposed building, including complete removal of any materials, hoardings or other temporary obstructions from the road allowances to allow clear access as required for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympics Games;

Amend Condition A.2.9 to read:

arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services in consultation with the Director of Planning for full reconstruction of the sidewalks adjacent to the site;

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair