

Date: Monday, August 14, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Co-Director of Development Services (Chair)
T. French Assistant, Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
P. Judd Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public (excused prior to concluding Item 4)

Regrets

R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

V. Potter Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor
A. Molaro Development Planner

#309 and #703 - 1238 Seymour Street

Todd Senft Applicant
William Jackson Applicant

1120 East 7th Avenue

Larry Waddell Vancouver Community College
Rainer Fassler Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Peter Judd, seconded by Brent MacGregor and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 17, 2006 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE410388 and DE410460 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE)

Applicant: Todd Senft and William Jackson

Request: Interior alterations to relocate an existing stair and add 117.0 sq. ft. by converting the existing enclosed balcony to floor space and expanding the mezzanine in Suite #309, and construct a 165.0 sq. ft. addition to the existing mezzanine in Suite #703 in the existing Multiple Dwelling / Residential Unit with Artist Studio - Class A building on this site, using a Heritage Density Transfer of a total of 282.0 sq. ft.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Scobie presented the applications for Suite 309 and 703 being applications similar to numerous previous applications for heritage density transfers to suites in this building. It was suggested that in the future staff should provide the Board with a status report of residential capacity before the 10 percent maximum is exhausted, when presenting future heritage density transfers to this building. Mr. Scobie has formalized a request to have this take place.

Panel Opinion

The members all recommended approval.

Motion

It was moved by Ms. French and seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the applications be approved as recommended in the Staff Report.

4. 1120 EAST 7TH AVENUE - DE410322 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

Applicant: Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Request: To develop a seven storey post-secondary education facility and replacement child daycare centre as Phase 1 of the Vancouver Community College - King Edward Campus expansion project.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the complete application for Phase 1 of a comprehensive plan to be built out over 25 years on the King Edward Campus. This first phase

is on the southeast corner of Glen Drive and 7th Avenue. The campus first developed a policy statement to define and establish the urban design which was approved by Council in April 2005. The subsequent CD-1 amendment approved by Council contains design changes with a number of these changes applicable to this first phase. Some of the changes proposed included how this proposed building responds to the north edge of the existing building. The applicant came back with a reduction in the length of the proposed building and with a space between the two buildings linked by a pedestrian bridge. Also the glass element has been reduced in scope on Broadway. The building includes a strong circulation spine and the main entry is on 7th Avenue. A secondary entry has been provided along the Glen Drive elevation.

In November 2005 the amending CD-1 Bylaw was enacted but there were a number of outstanding enactment conditions at that time. A "No Development" covenant was registered on title to enable enactment while ensuring subsequent satisfaction of the outstanding conditions of rezoning approval. These outstanding obligations included provision of a community amenity contribution for the day care, park and recreational facilities and a certain amount of unallotted CACs as well as soils agreement and offsite infrastructure works.

The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application and the deferment of the required Broadway frontage and plaza improvements noting that there are a considerable number of items that remain outstanding prior to the release of the "No Development" covenant.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Scott asked for an overview of the full plan of the site. Ms. Molaro provided an overview of the elements of the long-term plan and clarified the plan for Phase 1 indicating that the sequence of the overall campus build-out will be up to the college to decide and will also depend on future Provincial funding. All of the phases will be for college functions.

Ms. French asked if all the Broadway development is being deferred. Ms. French sought clarification of Condition 1.2. Ms. Molaro stated that the condition addresses concerns identified by the Urban Design Panel. The Panel's comments were that the massing treatments were very well done but they had a concern with the difference between the hard surfaces and the glass as they felt it might have a flatness to the elevation.

Ms. French also asked what staff is asking the applicant to do in Condition 1.3. Ms. Molaro explained staff concerns about the high concrete wall and the absence of a pedestrian connection to Glen Drive. The bench may be removed and the glazing enlarged to open the view into the library and increase its presence. The Urban Design Panel had also asked the applicant to consider the upper level connection and asked if there was a way to provide a stair connection down to street level.

Ms. French wanted to know what the zoning says about the green roof and what the applicant is obligated to provide. Ms. Molaro replied that a green roof is asked for in the rezoning document and provides a bit of a buffer around the day care.

Mr. MacGregor asked the applicant to talk about the changes they are making for the corner and to comment on the design rationale. Mr. MacGregor asked the applicant to comment on the "No Development" covenant and to how readily they will be able to satisfy those conditions to enable release of the covenant. Mr. MacGregor also expressed concern about the implementation of enhancements to the Broadway frontage and plaza on Broadway and asked if there was an indication as to when this might take place and to explain why the applicant was seeking to defer the enhancements.

Mr. Shearing also expressed some concerns about Condition 1.3 and Condition 1.5 but felt they had already been addressed by members of the Board.

Mr. Scobie wanted to know why the Broadway improvements were not addressed since Council had set out some things they wanted particular attention given to in looking at the development application and one of them was the design development to improve the campus presence along the Broadway frontage and to enhance the element and public function. Mr. Scobie was anxious to see that staff were prepared to defer the Broadway improvements and asked if it was for a reason other than funding. Ms. Molaro advised that the applicant has some significant funding concerns in achieving some of the major elements of the Phase 1 development especially the day care element, and staff felt they should try and support the applicant and defer the Broadway element. Mr. Scobie expressed concerns that it could be deferred again in the next phase. Ms. Molaro stated that the applicant is working towards ensuring they have the funding under the next phase.

Referring to Condition 1.8, Mr. Scobie questioned how common it is for staff's attention to be drawn to the interior of buildings. Mr. Molaro's stated that it was important to ensure that the width of the corridor and the connections be addressed as it will impact the next phase which will be built to the east of this phase.

Mr. MacGregor asked about the Employment and Skills Training found on Page 13 of the report. He wanted to know if the Director of Planning needs to approve this and felt it goes beyond what the Council has asked for. Ms. Potter noted that this is the first time City Staff has been asked to go this far but indicated the specific condition was seen to be a practical means of implementing the requirement established by Council. She stressed that it would be a collaborative effort between the college and City staff in the development of an appropriate tracking mechanism and progress report. They are planning to work with the BOB organization (Building Opportunities with Business) to identify how this will work.

Mr. Scott asked if the Board was approving two blocks. Ms. Molaro replied that the rezoning dealt with two blocks, separated by 7th Avenue, however the Board is only being asked to approve new development in Phase One, which lies on the southerly block.

Ms. Nystedt inquired as to what the intent of the programming will be in the new building. Ms. Molaro replied that in general it will have a bookstore, student study area, labs, computer labs, offices and day care. Mr. Waddell clarified that nursing training/health science is the biggest component.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Waddell thanked staff for all the help. They have been challenged with this development as they are a publicly funded institution. He stated that the Phase 1 project is a great building for the college as it will support the college's growth in the sciences area. The "No Development" covenant requires various legal agreements. They have received the first draft of some from the City's Legal Services Department and he realizes that there may be other legal agreements they haven't seen as yet. He pointed out that on Page 18 the Social Planning requirement is not what they agreed to as this will take place after the first application in Sub Area B or Sub Area A that's submitted after 2016.

Mr. Fassler said he appreciated the Urban Design Panel Workshop and the Panel's input. There has been lots of dialogue and he felt the process worked very well and the development wouldn't have happened without this process.

Mr. Fassler is confident that the conditions recommended by staff can be met although there are four items that he is concerned about. In Condition 1.3 he asked the Board to take the consideration item out of the Note to Applicant as it will destroy some of the amenities they are trying to achieve. He asked the Board to consider deleting Condition 1.7 as he felt the facade on 7th Avenue expresses differently than the south elevation. Also he would like to see the Note to Applicant in A.1.11 deleted as the outdoor area in the day care is not that large and to cover it more would make it even smaller. On Page 19 on Sustainability he stated that they had not made a commitment for LEED silver. They have agreed to provide LEED Certified which is between 26-32 points which are the standards the City had at the time of application. He also noted that the language is vague in condition 1.2.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Francl said he was unclear if there is any effort intended to subsume the stair volumes into the building mass with regards to the south elevation of the building. Mr. Fassler pointed out that this was difficult to resolve and they moved the stairs out of alignment for proportion as they are different heights and believes this was a good solution.

Mr. MacGregor asked when the Broadway plaza might be done. Mr. Waddell said that it is not possible in this phase and the next phase is dependent on government funding. They will be putting in a request once this building is completed. He noted that the plaza is the roof over the existing library. The requirements are that they will do the upgrade to the plaza in the next Sub Area A phase which will be the next project since they will need an underground parking lot when they will undertake Sub Area B.

Ms. Hung asked how many spaces were in the day care. Mr. Waddell replied that there are currently 37 spaces with 24 for infant/toddler. The new facility will serve 24 infant/toddlers and 25 three to five year olds.

Mr. Braun asked for clarification of the requirements to improve the Broadway element as it seems broad and he was wondering why the applicant couldn't undertake some small, incremental improvement in order to address the Council's requirement. Ms. Molaro replied that in discussion with the applicant it was decided to defer any changes to a later date due to the limited resources available in this phase.

Mr. Francl asked if the applicant had a choice to make between the stairs and the glazing improvements to the 7th and Glen corner of the building which would they prefer? Mr. Fassler stated that the stairs are redundant. He believes that animating the corner and creating a beautiful street experience is the thing to do which would connect the levels.

Mr. Scott asked about the overall plan. Mr. Waddell stated that an expansion of their auto trades program will be in Phase 2. Phase 3 will be to build on top of that to add library and classroom space to replace the existing library. In Phase 4 they would be moving the dental programs to this building. Mr. Scott asked why they weren't shown how the phases are being laid out and how it all works together. Ms. French answered on behalf of Planning staff stating that they could have done a better job on presenting the rezoning context for this Phase 1 development application.

Mr. Scobie asked to clear up the understanding about when the Broadway plaza will be addressed. Mr. Waddell stated that before they leave Sub Area A and start building in Sub Area B is when the plaza would be addressed.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl stated that the project was strongly supported at the Urban Design Panel. It is an elegant and capable scheme. As for Condition 1.2, the observation of the Urban Design Panel was that a stronger definition is required and feels this condition should be retained as the space is very small. With regard to Condition 1.3 the applicant is correct that to layer another stair here would be redundant. With regards to Condition 1.7 it would be for Planning to ask for an expression of a portico on the side of the elevation. It's simply a break in the elevation of the surface materials and would adequately address that item. Mr. Francl would like to see if there could be an expression of the entrance at this elevation in relation to the adjacent stairs.

As for Sustainability, Mr. Francl would like the applicant to get a score of 33 which is LEED Silver but doesn't feel it is necessary to insist on the applicant going for LEED Silver. As to A.1.11, in the outdoor play area Mr. Francl recommended that the connection to the covered space not be a requirement.

Mr. Shearing felt that the applicant is being diplomatic in his comments regarding Condition 1.2. He sees a strong design commitment and the condition goes further than it needs to be taken. Mr. Shearing agreed that the Note to Applicant should be deleted. Mr. Shearing strongly supported the deletion in Condition 1.3 to provide the outside connection at a wall height of 5.5 meters as it is not an added benefit. As for Condition 1.7 Mr. Shearing felt that it should be deleted as he doesn't think this is a direction that needs to be taken. Mr. Shearing also agreed to delete the Note to Applicant in A.1.11. He believed that the Sustainability clause should go back to the original commitment under the LEED program. Mr. Shearing recommended the deletion on Page 14 under Integration with future phases regarding the future phasing of the corridors as he felt this should be left up to the designers and the college to decide. He felt that A.1.13 under Skills Development is setting a precedent and is going in a direction that is beyond the scope of the Board.

Mr. Scott was concerned about the overall plan and would have appreciated a total understanding of the phasing as it would have helped the discussion about when the money was being spent on the plaza. Mr. Scott felt that staff needs to be commended for working on a very complex project. He stated that Condition 1.1 addresses release of the "No Development" covenant and urged the applicant to deal with this right away. Mr. Scott felt that the Note to Applicant should be deleted in 1.3 as it will give flexibility to the applicant. He felt that deleting 1.7 was a bit strong and suggested that the wording could be broadened. In A.1.11 he would delete the Note to Applicant as he believes the Board should offer some flexibility and not be so tight. Mr. Scott strongly supported the application.

Mr. Chung commended the applicant on the design. He believed that the architect has achieved a lot of articulation and stated that Condition 1.2 is not that important. In terms of Condition 1.3 he also recommended deleting the Note to Applicant. Mr. Chung felt it was unfortunate that the corridors couldn't be all straight with the bridge but felt that this condition should be left to see what the applicant can do in terms of strengthening the architectural elements. As for LEED Silver, he felt it was difficult to commit to 33 points and

that the Board should leave room for flexibility although he suggested that the applicant could push further. Mr. Chung was pleased with the project. He also agreed with Mr. Scott that having an overall plan for the next 25 years presented to the Board would have been helpful.

Ms. Hung said it was an attractive project and doesn't look like an institution. She saw this as a great vision for the area between Broadway and the VCC Clark SkyTrain station. Ms. Hung was concerned about the child care as she was disappointed that there won't be an increase in infant care. However she did understand that this is related to funding opportunities and can't be achieved right now. She supported the deletion of the Note to Applicant in A.1.11.

Ms. Hung was pleased that the applicant is committed to achieving LEED Certified and her understanding was that the applicant could reach in the range of 30 points without the green roof. In a situation where there is a funding shortfall she was surprised to see that the green roofs were being called for and that the enhancement of the Broadway plaza was not being pursued at this time as it is the front door of the campus. The plaza looks faded and is not being used to its best advantage. She would prefer the Broadway plaza enhancement sooner and the green roof later.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. As far as Conditions 1.2, 1.3 and 1.7, they all start off with design development and he didn't see the need to delete them as he felt the applicant and staff can work out the problems together. Mr. Braun agreed that the Note to Applicant in A.1.11 should be deleted. He didn't see any problems with the requirements for the specialized labour force. Mr. Braun was disappointed that nothing could be done to the Broadway plaza in this application suggesting it looks like the next phase won't be done for many years and he believed that a little something could have done even if it was on the landscaping. Also he felt that underground parking should have been considered.

Board Discussion

Prior to moving approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions, Mr. MacGregor indicated the design was well handled and he was confident his concerns with the corner of the proposal at East 7th Avenue and Glen Drive will be addressed via introduction of more glazing. He was disappointed with the proposed deferral of improvements to the Broadway plaza, wishing to see a commitment to some immediate upgrading in the context of a longer term plan for improvements. He strongly encouraged the applicant to work with staff and conclude the outstanding conditions of rezoning approval that were deferred via the "No Development" covenant, as the covenant must be released before any development permit can be issued. Mr. MacGregor also agreed with concerns that had been expressed during the meeting regarding commentary in the Staff Committee report under the heading "Sustainability", indicating the two paragraphs would more accurately read as follows:

"The City of Vancouver Council adopted a Green Building Strategy on November 3, 2005 which identifies three priorities energy efficiency, water efficiency, and green roof development for building of the type proposed in this application. It also proposes a LEED parallel approach to measuring a building's environmental performance in these and other categories. In measuring this performance, the Green Buildings Strategy proposes future by-law changes that will see equivalent to "LEED Certified" achieved automatically.

The applicant's response to Green Building principles is encouraging, as it addresses very well two of the three priorities: energy; and, water efficiency. The applicant's checklist indicated they may achieve 33 points on the LEED Canada checklist. (See Appendix E, 5 of 5). Staff considers this a very appropriate response to the

sustainability objectives identified at the rezoning stage. Achieving 33 points meets a LEED "Silver" standard which is higher than the 26-32 points or the base "LEED Certified" standard that the proponent originally committed to achieving."

Mr. Judd expressed support for Mr. MacGregor's position, subject to inclusion of a correcting amendment to condition A.2.6.

Ms. French expressed her congratulations to the applicant for achieving a handsome proposal, acknowledging the challenges involved in having undertaken the long term plan for the future campus leading up to rezoning and then this development application.

Mr. Scobie indicated that as much as there may be some concerns with the existing presence of the campus along Broadway, the development does preserve the public view of the downtown from Broadway, and the current development is a vast improvement over the former, dilapidated cycle track.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410322, in accordance with the Staff Report dated July 19, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.3 to delete *Consideration should also be given to introducing a pedestrian connection between the upper level west-facing patio/porch and the open space at the corner of Glen Drive and 7th Avenue;*

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in 1.4 and add to the condition after "plaza": *to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services to secure major enhancements;*

Delete 1.7;

Re-number 1.8 to 1.7;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.11;

Minor clarification in A.2.6 should be Block **179** instead of Block 95;

Amend B.2.9 to read: *design development and construction of the Broadway frontage improvement are required prior to completion and occupancy of Sub Area A or any development in Sub Area B whichever occurs first.*

4. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:12 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair