

Date: Monday, August 2, 2005
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services

Advisory Panel

A. Endall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public

Regrets

R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
G. Chung Representative of the General Public
J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
D. Robinson Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

1675 West 8th Avenue

T. Miller Intracorp Pine Street Development Ltd.
R. Koodoo Intracorp Pine Street Development Ltd.
R. Worden Ramsay Worden Architects
B. Hemstock PWL Partnership

Raincoast Ventures: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Beasley, seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 18, 2005 be approved with the following amendments:

- p.4, para. 3, to reword the last sentence to read:
In discussion, Mr. Scobie commented that staff's recommendation that the *Development Permit Board's use of* Section 3.2.4 is an extremely encompassing interpretation, noting that the Board of Variance is not able to consider varying any use provision in the Zoning and Development By-law;
- p.8, to amend the Note to Applicant in 1.4, to delete *if possible* from the first sentence.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1675 WEST 8TH AVENUE - DE409080 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Intracorp Pine Street Development Ltd.

Request: To construct a 77-unit residential development with an 11-storey residential tower, townhouses at grade and 2.5 levels of underground parking and incorporating a transfer of 766.4 m² (8,251 sq.ft.) of heritage density.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this application, noting that the proposed all-residential use is consistent with the intent of the Burrard Slopes C-3A Guidelines to create a predominantly residential neighbourhood. The application is generally well resolved, with a few minor issues as described in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 6, 2005. As well as the use, the proposed building form is also fairly consistent with the guidelines.

Referring to a context model, a project model and posted drawings, Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the scheme and described the revisions sought in the recommended conditions of approval. With respect to condition 1.8 which seeks provision of a traffic circle on Pine Street at West 8th Avenue, Ms. Rondeau noted that several area residents have requested a traffic circle on Pine Street. She stressed that staff are recommending the traffic circle as a contribution to the development earning its maximum density potential and not to address increased traffic caused by the development itself. Staff believe it will add to pedestrian amenity and generally improve traffic congestion in the neighbourhood. Ms. Rondeau noted the Urban Design Panel had recommended provision of a wheelchair accessible elevator to a shared roof deck. However, because this is a very view-sensitive area this is not being recommended by staff, which is consistent with past practice in view-sensitive locations.

In summary, staff conclude that the application has earned the height and density being sought by the resolution of the massing, the enhanced pedestrian realm, provision of a corner open space and landscaped corner bulge, a traffic calming circle on Pine Street, high quality building materials and detailing, sustainable building features, parking access from the lane, and an art feature at the residential entry. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Questions/Discussion

Referring to condition A.1.1, Mr. Beasley questioned the recommendation for storage rooms to be relocated to the ground floor. Ms. Rondeau explained the concern was that storage rooms should not be off the master bedroom, not necessarily to limit them to the ground floor. In response to a further question from Mr. Beasley on condition A.1.1, Ms. Rondeau confirmed that staff were unable to confirm technical calculations due to late arrival and numerous changes to revised drawings. Ms. Rondeau also clarified how some of the Urban Design Panel's design development suggestions have been addressed.

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts with respect to the proposed artwork, Ms. Rondeau confirmed the matter has been discussed between the applicant and the Office of Cultural Affairs. With respect to the requested traffic circle and corner bulge, Ms. Rondeau confirmed they are not a requirement of the development itself but they do contribute to traffic calming and pedestrian amenity in the area. She noted it is not unusual in the C-3A zone to require developers to provide corner bulges.

Mr. Henschel questioned the extent to which reducing the slab extensions would improve shadowing. Ms. Rondeau agreed it will result in only a slight improvement but will be more consistent with the shadow criteria suggested by the massing controls in the guidelines. Mr. Scott urged that careful consideration should also be given to address water egress, particularly on the north façade.

Referring to the request for a traffic circle, Mr. Scott questioned whether the City intends to generally improve traffic conditions on Pine Street. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised it is not a priority for Engineering Services at this time. In discussion, Ms. Rondeau advised that staff balanced the request against how the development earns its maximum density potential, noting also that this site is larger than typical. Mr. Scott said he considers the traffic circle to be an important initiative for Pine Street, adding that a circle on the bicycle route at Pine and 7th Avenue would be particularly beneficial.

Mr. Scobie expressed concern about the issue of public art, noting the proposed artwork is more private and contributes little to the public realm. Nevertheless, he said he would accept it on the basis that the Office of Cultural Affairs is satisfied the proposal meets the intent of Council's public art policy. Mr. Scobie was also concerned that the request for the traffic circle goes further than seeking improvements adjacent to a development site. He commented that he did not believe the Board has previously applied such a condition off-site except where a development itself is directly contributing to an increase in traffic. Mr. Scobie noted that a similar requirement was not sought on the recently approved application at 1690 West 8th Avenue. Ms. Rondeau explained the latter development was a smaller site and did include a requirement to provide a corner bulge. She stressed the requirement for a traffic circle in this instance is to contribute to earning the maximum height and density.

Mr. Beasley commented on the absence of a condition related to provision of hose bibs and was advised a condition was not necessary as hose bibs will be provided as indicated in the landscape plans.

Mr. Henschel expressed concern about requesting a traffic circle as well as the corner bulge, stating he believes traffic circles to be hazardous for both drivers and pedestrians. Mr. Thomson said Neighbourhood Transportation has reviewed the proposal and believe it can work in this location.

Applicant's Comments

Tom Bell, Intracorp., noted that many of the conditions have already been considered and resolved. With respect to 1.6 which deals with the setback at the property line of the adjacent building, he said their preference is to deal with it on this site rather than negotiate with the neighbouring strata council. Referring to Mr. Beasley's earlier question about storage, he confirmed that it can be dealt with. Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, addressed the landscape issues. He confirmed the street tree in front of the main entrance will not be removed and he briefly explained how they intend to deal with softening conditions on the lane. Responding to the concern raised by Mr. Scott about water egress, Bob Worden, Architect, noted the overhang will still be 3 ft. In response to a question from Mr. Endall, Mr. Worden briefly explained how they intend to deal with conditions 1.3 and 1.4.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Endall noted he was not in attendance when the Urban Design Panel reviewed this proposal. The Panel unanimously supported the scheme and found it well resolved. Mr. Endall noted the only area of consensus in the Panel's recommendations was that the elevator should be taken to the roof. However, he confirmed it is not a critical matter and acknowledged the development planner's explanation regarding neighbouring view impacts. Mr. Endall said he did have some concern about the condition to provide a traffic circle and suggested it needs to be part of a comprehensive strategy for Pine Street. Mr. Endall said he was satisfied with the architect's response to how he intends to address conditions 1.3 and 1.4.

Mr. Scott said he believed the development would be a real asset to the neighbourhood. He expressed concern about the condition to provide a traffic circle at Pine and 8th Avenue. He noted the neighbours' preference was for a traffic circle at Pine and 7th Avenue. As well, he thought the request should not be entertained by the Board, noting it is not a part of any comprehensive plan for the area.

Mr. Henschel agreed it is an attractive project. He suggested condition 1.2 should be a consideration item and did not believe the minimal improvement in shadowing should compromise the design of the building. He strongly supported condition 1.4 to provide internal access to all the units. With respect to the art feature, he suggested it could be near the entry and more in the public realm. Mr. Henschel supported the condition to provide the corner bulge but did not support the traffic circle. He did not believe it should be a requirement of this development because it is off-site. Mr. Henschel recommended that the Board consider requiring taking the elevator to the roof deck because it would increase the livability of the building.

Ms. Hung found it a very attractive project and was particularly pleased with the south elevation. With respect to condition 1.8, Ms. Hung said it is clear that a traffic circle is needed on Pine Street. She did not consider it inappropriate to request the developer to provide part of its cost, or its construction. While it is off-site, it is related to the site. Further, this development will be contributing to neighbourhood traffic congestion. She recommended the

optimum location for the traffic circle should be determined and the developer asked to contribute to it.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is a good design and a good addition to the neighbourhood. He said he appreciated the commentary on the traffic circle but noted the guidelines do not preclude the Board from considering amenities off-site. He stressed the application requests a major increase in density from 1.0 to 3.0 FSR, in compensation for which the Board seeks appropriate amenities. He also noted the applicant has not expressed any concern about providing the traffic circle. He said the traffic circle is not a traffic management measure but a means of domesticating the street and while he agreed there could be a review of the whole street, it should not delay this development application. Mr. Beasley said he also did not believe it sets a precedent for the Board, and noted that Engineering Services has indicated it can be made to work in this location. However, there could be an issue relating to access to the nearby Post Office building which may need to be addressed. Mr. Beasley added that, without the traffic circle, he was not convinced the development fully earns the maximum density.

Mr. Beasley said he believes the condition at the easterly property line must be resolved and the best solution would be to discuss it with the neighbouring property owner. Only if the neighbours are not in agreement would a solution need to be found on this development.

With respect to the townhouse form, Mr. Beasley said he appreciated the conditions recommended by staff, noting that many of the townhouses seem more like apartments with doors to the sidewalk rather than townhouses. He noted that townhouses that are designed robustly as townhouses are very popular and sell quickly. Direct access to parking is also an important feature of successful townhouses. With respect to condition 1.3, Mr. Beasley agreed it is essential that the floor and terrace levels are resolved.

Mr. Beasley agreed with the Urban Design Panel recommendation that the street tree in front of the entrance should not be removed, noting that street trees add a very softening quality to the streets.

Regarding the public art question, Mr. Beasley noted it is not being considered as a major factor in earning the density. He therefore was comfortable to leave it to the architect where it should be located. Mr. Beasley said he also appreciated the landscape architect's proposal to add some wall landscaping at the garage entry.

Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application, with amendments to the conditions.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts agreed with Mr. Beasley's motion and offered further amendments to which Mr. Beasley concurred. With respect to access to the roof, Ms. Forbes-Roberts said it would be a major benefit to the residents and add to the livability of the building, although she appreciated the need to balance concerns of neighbours with respect to view impacts. She urged that staff give conduct further analysis to determine if a satisfactory solution can be found that also addresses view issues. With respect to the traffic circle, Ms. Forbes-Roberts said she had no concern about requiring this development to provide it because it does affect the immediate livability of the site. Nevertheless, given the concerns that have been raised, she recommended that there be some assessment of traffic and pedestrian needs in the area.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 409080, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 6, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend condition 1.5 to add:

and further consideration of the benefits of providing elevator access vs. shadow and view impacts;

Amend 1.6 to read:

design development to provide *the best* contextual response *practical* to the existing setback at the property line of the adjacent building to the east, *to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning;*

Amend 1.8 to read:

arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services' *assessment of traffic and pedestrian needs in the area* and the Director of Legal Services, for the provision of a traffic circle on Pine Street at West 8th Avenue, with 100 percent of costs to be provided by the developer/owner;

Add 1.9:

design development for as much glazing as practical at the north side of the northwest corner of the building;

Amend the penultimate sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.1 to read:

Storage rooms in townhouses must be relocated *so as not to be accessed from a bedroom* to qualify for exclusions from FSR.

Add A.1.20:

design development to provide wall landscaping at the parkade entrance, planted from above or below.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Scobie advised that Council has recently directed to add a ninth Advisory Panel member who shall be a member of the Vancouver Heritage Commission. The necessary amendment to the Development Permit Board By-law is expected to be before Council after the summer recess.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Raincoast Ventures

F. Scobie
Chair