

Date: Monday, August 20, 2001
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

T. Bunting Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

Absent

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

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

500 Pacific Street - DE405861 - Zone CD-1

R. Hughes Roger Hughes & Partners Architects
F. Roman Concord Pacific Group Inc.
B. Hemstock Phillips Wuori Long, Landscape Architects

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

Mr. MacGregor requested an amendment to paragraph two, p.4 of the minutes, to change the reference to "Council Committee" to "Council."

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 August 7, 2001 be approved as amended.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 500 PACIFIC STREET - DE405861 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Roger Hughes & Partners Architects

Request: To construct a 33-storey tower with 197 residential units, four (4) three-storey townhouses, and a health club (amenity area) with four (4) levels of underground parking having vehicular access off Richards Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Senior Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this complete application, referring to a context model of the Beach Neighbourhood and a scale model of Tower 1E, which is the mirror image of this proposal at 498 Pacific Street (approved by the Board on December 11, 2000). These two projects, together with 455 Beach Crescent and the soon-to-be-submitted application for Tower 1M, will form a consistent and mirror image across Richards Street. Staff have identified no substantive issues on this project. Several very detailed refinements are addressed in the prior-to conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 25, 2001. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the conditions, noting that staff consider the design to be of very high quality. The recommendation is for approval.

Questions

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the bridge feature at the northeast corner of the site, Mr. Segal noted that on 498 Pacific Street, the Board had disagreed with the staff recommendation for a public right-of-way through this zone and deleted the condition. Standard condition A.1.12 of the subject proposal calls for a notation on plan that the bridge is not to be gated. Mr. Segal explained that, while the intent is that the bridge becomes part of the public realm (although not a legal right-of-way), the concern is that a future strata council might be persuaded to gate it. Staff also recommend a notation on the development permit to this effect (B.2.8).

With respect to standard condition A.1.3 dealing with shared use and access to amenity spaces, Mr. Scobie questioned whether a similar condition was applied to 498 Pacific Street. Roger Hughes, Architect, explained that each building has its own amenity space (amenity room, conference area, kitchen, etc.) and the subject application includes a health club to be shared by all the buildings in this quadrant. Mr. Scobie expressed concern that the amenities to be shared are clearly identified, to avoid any misinterpretation in the future. Mr. Timm questioned the need for a condition on the development permit in this regard. Mr. Segal explained that, as the amenity areas are excluded from FSR, staff want to ensure the residents in the development have guaranteed access to it. He confirmed the application meets its requirement for amenity space, excluding the

health club. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, pointed out that condition A.1.3 may be in conflict with B.2.6 which is the standard condition regarding amenity spaces. In discussion, Mr. Segal confirmed the Staff Committee included A.1.3 to deal specifically with access to the health club.

With respect to condition B.1.1, Mr. Scobie suggested an amendment to require registration of a compatible subdivision plan rather than approval by the Subdivision Approving Officer. He also noted that B.2.3 needs amending to reflect the current regulation dealing with trees. Mr. Beasley commented that it would be helpful if staff would ensure all the standard conditions reflect current regulations.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Hughes noted the two developments (this application and 498 Pacific) are intended to be identical, including the townhouses. He explained they will be seeking a Minor Amendment to amend the top of Tower 1E and the end elevation of the townhouses to match the subject proposal. Referring to the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Hughes noted they have had considerable discussion with staff regarding the theatre amenity rooms and disagree with the need for more glazing (condition 1.2). He explained, there is already a lot of glass at the base of the tower, and the grades slope up rather than down (as on Tower 1E). Therefore, the view from Pacific Street at sidewalk level will be over a multi-level pond and a sloping diagonal bridge, with the meeting room at a lower level and the two theatre spaces 8 ft. above sidewalk level. Mr. Hughes noted that windows have been added to one of the theatre spaces to make it a multi-purpose room so it will likely not be curtained during the day. As well, in terms of the composition of the tower, the intent is that there is a front lightweight form of glass supported by a solid brick form. From an architectural standpoint, the brick needs to come to the ground and have some mass to it, which results in a partially blank wall. With respect to the bridge element, Mr. Hughes said they do not believe it will ever be gated, noting there is no privacy problem. He added, they would prefer the development permit for this application to be the same as for 498 Pacific Street which made no reference to gating the bridge.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, noted they have been working with the landscape architects for the adjacent development and will continue with that landscape plan on this development to reinforce the mirror image. He strongly supported the design development called for in condition 1.5.

With respect to condition 1.6, Mr. Hughes explained the health club will be constructed in two phases. The first phase, in this development, will include the amenity room, multi purpose room, change rooms, fitness areas, offices, etc. The next development application (yet to be submitted) will include a pool that will be accessed from the health club. The pool has the advantage of facing south and overlooking the courtyard. The courtyard will be used jointly by all three developments. Mr. Scobie noted there may be some subtleties associated with the implementation of this development permit, the subdivision and the future development permit.

Questions

Mr. Beasley requested staff's comments on the Architect's request to delete condition 1.2, noting also the concerns expressed by some members of the Urban Design Panel about the permeability and safety along this side of the building. Mr. Segal said he believes there is some fine-tuning that can be done on the two levels referred to by Mr. Hughes, without any drastic reconfiguring of the fitness area. In terms of surveillance, he noted this edge includes a meeting room that is not likely to be occupied on a regular basis. As well, while the architect's design rationale is appreciated, there is also a fair amount of blank wall contributing to the general absence of activity that is cause for some concern. Mr. Segal said he would be reluctant to delete the condition and would prefer to work further with the architect to achieve a more active area on this corner.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Board and Panel members reviewed the models and posted drawings.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting advised the Urban Design Panel was very supportive of this application and its comments were generally complimentary. The Panel supported the symmetry of the scheme and its more or less rigid application. He noted many of the Panel's comments are addressed in the prior-to conditions. In particular, the Panel saw the need for design development to the end townhouse unit to address the adjacency to the autocourt. Regarding the transparency along Pacific Street, Mr. Bunting said he personally regretted the lack of commercial space in the precinct, not necessarily on the street frontage, but a viable commercial retail space in an appropriate location. With respect to condition 1.2, calling for maximizing transparency along the north elevation, Mr. Bunting said he accepted the architect's design rationale for bringing the brick to the ground, noting the tower is very transparent at the corner. He said he would urge the Planning Department not to insist on spaces that do not work. He noted there was also a general comment made by the Panel about the whole precinct in that the lack of commercial space might lead to it becoming an exclusive area, less penetrable by the general public. Mr. Bunting recommended approval.

Ms. Leduc also supported the project. She recommended retaining the condition about not gating the bridge. With respect to the transparency of the north elevation, Ms. Leduc said she could not see what could be done to improve it and did not believe it appropriate to add windows to the second theatre room. She wondered if other ways could be found to create more activity.

Mr. Mortenson found the proposal very attractive and he supported the application. With respect to the north elevation, he agreed everything possible should be considered to increase transparency. He supported the condition calling for the bridge to remain ungated, noting this has occurred in some False Creek and Coal Harbour developments. He commented, the deviations from the sidewalk that attract pedestrians closer to the buildings and across water features add a lot of richness and texture to neighbourhoods.

Mr. Scot also supported the application. He supported retaining condition A.1.2, noting that more glass improves livability. He also supported condition B.2.8, requiring the bridge to be ungated.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said he appreciated that this project is following through on the assembly of buildings envisioned for this neighbourhood, adding, he also appreciated the applicant's assurance that the two towers and the ends of the townhouses will be the same. Mr. Beasley said he also appreciated how this project has evolved in terms of the detailed discussions that have taken place to achieve the townhouses at such a high level of design detail. Recalling the earliest vision for this area, Mr. Beasley noted this is one of the few places in the city where the expectation of an assembly of buildings that together are intended to make a statement can be realised. Mr. Beasley moved approval with a number of amendments. With respect to 1.2, he said he believed this condition is necessary, if only because of a general concern that the complete north frontage is not very friendly towards the street. With respect to the gating of the bridge, he said he followed the majority view of the Advisory Panel in recommending B.2.8.

Mr. MacGregor said he shared the opinion of the Advisory Panel that the architect has done an excellent job and achieved a high quality design. With respect to the health club, Mr. MacGregor said he believed this issue should be dealt with by the developer, without City involvement. Mr. Segal confirmed the intent of 1.2 was a matter of modest finetuning. Mr. MacGregor said he accepted the architect's explanation and therefore opposed retention of 1.2. He also opposed condition B.2.8 because he did not believe ungated access to the bridge to be very important in terms of public policy. He agreed it will be preferable if the bridge remains

open and added he believes it will always be open, given there is no reason to close it off. However, from a public policy perspective, the City should not be involved at this level of detail on a private development site.

Mr. Timm said he believed condition 1.2 dealt with an architectural issue and not whether there needs to be active uses along this part of the street. He said he felt the architect's rationale for bringing the brick to the ground was supportable, noting there is already a lot of glass on this building. He concurred with Mr. MacGregor that this condition should be deleted. With respect to B.2.8, Mr. Timm noted the identical building across the street does not have this condition. As well, it is not a public right-of-way that prevents access if it becomes gated. He agreed it would be unfortunate if it was gated, but he thought it would be very unlikely to happen. He agreed with Mr. MacGregor that the condition should be deleted.

Mr. Scobie noted he supported the deletion of 1.2. With respect to the bridge element, he said that in the absence of B.2.8 he did not believe it will remain ungated, for reasons of litter, vandalism and liability, which will be unfortunate, both in terms of its function and appearance.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405861, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 25, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the preamble to delete "the Approving Officer's approval" and replace with "registry in the Land Title Office";

- CARRIED

Amend 1.2 to delete the **Note to Applicant**;

- LOST

(Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Timm opposed)

Delete A.1.3;

- CARRIED

Amend B.1.1 to delete "the Subdivision Approving Officer has approved a compatible subdivision plan" and replace with "a compatible subdivision plan has been registered in the Land Title Office";

- CARRIED

Amend B.2.3 to read:

All trees in accordance with *the Private Property* Tree By-law No. 3575 are to be planted, etc.;

- CARRIED

Amend B.2.8:

~~It is intended that~~ The bridge feature at the Pacific/Richards Streets corner *is* not *to* be gated at any time, but allow free, unobstructed passage;

- LOST

(Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Timm opposed)

The following amendments were moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Timm:

Delete 1.2 in its entirety;

- CARRIED
(Mr. Beasley opposed)

Delete B.2.8

- CARRIED
(Mr. Beasley opposed)

Amend A.1.12 to delete "and notation on plan that the bridge is not to be gated";

- CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4.20 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\MINUTES\2001\Aug20.wpd