

**Meeting:** No. 468  
**Date:** Monday, August 23, 1999  
**Time:** 3.00 p.m.  
**Place:** No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F.A. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L.B. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

J. Hruda Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public (arrived at 3:23 p.m.)  
B. Parton Representative of General Public

**ABSENT:**

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
R. Mingay Representative of General Public  
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Segal Senior Development Planner  
M. Thomson Assistant City Surveyor

**Item 3 - 1128 West Hastings Street - DE404219 - Zone DD**

Mr. Bruckner Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

**Item 4 - 940 Seymour Street - DE404258 - Zone CD-1**

Dirk Buttjes Buttjes Architecture Inc.  
Robert Emslie Buttjes Architecture Inc.  
Bruno Wall Wall Financial Corporation

**CLERK TO THE BOARD:**

Rae Ratslef, Frontline Associates

**1. MINUTES**

The Chair informed Board members of the time and effort spent to make corrections to the draft minutes of the August 9, 1999 meeting. The draft minutes were submitted lacking significant detail of members' comments and of the motions passed at the meeting.

Approval of the August 9, 1999 meeting minutes was deferred to the Board's September meeting to allow members to review them for accuracy. Members were requested to forward their comments to staff by August 26, 1999. The minutes will be revised based on comments received and will then be sent as draft minutes to the applicants whose projects were considered at the August 9, 1999 meeting in order that they have access to the Board's feedback in as timely a fashion as possible.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1128 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE404219 - ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

Request: To add by infilling 1,030 sq.ft. of floor area in this existing mixed-use commercial/hotel/ residential building.

To receive an additional 1,030 sq.ft. of heritage density bonus floor area transferred from the former Vancouver Public Library site (750 Burrard Street), pursuant to Section 3.12 of the DODP By-law.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, utilizing illustrations, reviewed the proposed project configuration noting the plans permit the infilling of an additional 1,030 sq. ft. of floor area on the second floor to permit CRU in this existing mixed-use commercial/hotel/residential building. Staff have no issue with the infilling as it will not affect the massing and it makes more efficient use of the layout on that level.

The subject site seeks a heritage density transfer of 1,030 sq. ft. which was to have been transferred from the former Vancouver Public Library (Robson Central). However, complications have arisen in this regard, as Robson Central has oversold its available heritage density bonus and has no remaining density to sell. Robson Central has been contacted and is making adjustments to its contractual arrangements with other developers. Staff feel the subject site is a priority given that it is at the construction stage.

Mr. Segal noted the following options for the Board's consideration:

- i) to defer consideration of this project at this time given relative uncertainties surrounding the availability of heritage density bonus to transfer from Robson Central; or
- ii) to approve the project subject to the following revised conditions:
  - 1.1 submission of a letter (sample attached, Appendix D), completed by the owner of the "donor" site, confirming that an agreement has been reached to sell 1,030 sq. ft. of heritage density to

- the developer of the “receiver” site; and
- 1.2 legal arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services verifying that the proposed density to be transferred (1,030 sq. ft.) Is available from the “donor” site and confirming the balance of transferable density remaining on the “donor” site.

### **Board Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Segal confirmed the Board could approve the project with a condition that the heritage density bonus may be provided by any donor site as the ODP does not require the donor site (the former Vancouver Public Library) needs to be specified.

Mr. Chung arrived at the meeting.

3:23 pm

### **Applicant's Comments**

None presented.

### **Comments from Other Speakers**

None presented.

### **Panel Opinion**

Panel members noted their approval and support for the development and agreed to the suggested revisions to the conditions.

### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404219, as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the infilling (open to below spaces) of an additional 1,030 sq. ft. of floor area on the second floor to provide a CRU in this existing mixed-use commercial/hotel/residential building, including receipt of 1,030 sq. ft. of heritage density bonus transferred from a heritage density bonussed site, and in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 23, 1999 with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

submission of a letter (sample attached, Appendix D), completed by the owner of the “donor” site, confirming that an agreement has been reached to sell 1,030 sq. ft. of heritage density to the developer of the “receiver” site; and

Insert 1.2:

legal arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services verifying that the proposed density to be transferred (1,030 sq. ft.) is available from the “donor” site and confirming the balance of transferable density remaining on the “donor” site.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**4. 940 SEYMOUR STREET - DE404258 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE WITHOUT PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Buttjes Architecture Inc.

Request: To construct a commercial/residential development containing 16,466 sq. ft. of retail use at grade with a 2½-storey podium base, including two residential towers (30 storeys and 22 storeys) for 429 residential units.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, noted the Board has previously approved a preliminary application for this site, however, it was a one tower scheme versus the new two tower scheme. Staff determined the two tower scheme to be a substantially different scheme and a complete application in itself, however, the Development Permit Staff Committee (DPSC) report does occasionally reference the previous submission.

Referring to the model, Mr. Segal reviewed the area around the site noting heritage bonusing from the old Dominion Motors created a CD-1 on the subject site with additional FSR over the previous 5.0. There is an approved scheme across the lane on Richards with two towers and a bonus for a gallery, and also, the Dufferin Hotel has a delicate building/property line situation that neighbours the subject site.

The previous submission had a 5½ story podium using considerable FSR. However, objections had been received from the developer across the lane, suggesting the podium looked into the back of their development and was too high. The new scheme with two towers matches what staff had originally envisioned for the site at the time of the CD-1 zoning. Staff are supportive of the new scheme and note it meets downtown massing criteria in terms of checker-boarding tower massing. Staff feel the spaces are being quite well used given the area's high density and park area deficiency.

Mr. Segal reviewed in detail comments in the DPSC report dated July 28, 1999, noting the following with regard to the conditions:

- 1.1 The previous scheme had more semi-private open space; staff suggest more garden area be created by roofing over more of the drive court area; staff believe there is a compelling need for the large garden space given the large number of units in this project;
- 1.2 Lobbies to the towers lack openness and visibility through to the drive court, the condition suggests glazing back walls and reconfiguring lobby areas to become points of easy surveillance into the drive court to prevent their becoming nuisance areas for security;
- 1.3 Staff have concerns regarding proximity and privacy and anticipate the Building Department will require the windows on the Dufferin to be blocked;
- 1.4 Guidelines call for high quality materials (i.e. masonry), staff are concerned concrete and glass will be a rather stark finish, particularly at the podium level; staff recommend use of higher quality materials (i.e. brick or stone) to continue up the towers appropriately; this was a similar condition in the previous scheme;
- 1.5 The majority of units have no balcony or private-open space; staff are recommending predominantly open balconies, noting the full FSR exclusion available in that category has not been utilized; french balconies are an option;

- 1.9 Staff are concerned the tower caps are rather truncated and flat;
- 1.10 Recommending the developer work with staff to retain street trees;
- A.1.2 A number of the units are quite close to or below 400 sq. ft.;
- A.1.15 The Board may wish to reinforce references to covenants and legal arrangements.

The staff recommendation is for approval subject to the conditions noted.

### **Discussion**

In response to questions raised by Board and Panel members, Mr. Segal provided additional information as follows:

- the previous building scheme had 12,000 sq. ft. of private-open space, this design has reduced that space to 9,000 sq. ft. and does not account for the large number of small units that do not have private-open space (50 sq. ft. of private-open space per unit is standard);
- condition A.1.15 should reference 76,943 sq. ft. of heritage density;
- the property is CD-1 zoned, divided amongst three sites, the apportioning constitutes 6.71 as a maximum on this site; and
- the Dufferin Hotel would be held responsible for non-compliance on their property line, however, City staff are responsible for contacting the Dufferin to advise of the non-compliance.

Members discussed in detail the similarities between conditions A.3.1 and B.2.6. It was clarified the conditions are slightly different in that one is a prior to condition for the development permit and the other is a condition of the permit. It was noted B.2.6 seems redundant.

### **Applicant's Comments**

Dirk Buttjes, Buttjes Architecture Inc., outlined the progressive review of the subject site plan through the Urban Design Panel and the Board to date noting many of the concerns previously raised have been addressed in the present submission.

Mr. Buttjes provided the following comments regarding concerns raised in the staff report:

- 1.1 Conditions 1.1 and 1.2 are related; we have struggled to ensure a balance between the need for open space and the need for an open drive court area; attempts have been made and will continue to be made to maximize open spaces on the site; additionally, the site is in close proximity to a major City park to be located one block away at Smythe and Richards Streets. It is requested the words "at least" be removed from the condition as it is somewhat restrictive.
- 1.4 The developer has no difficulty incorporating higher quality materials at the lower and podium levels; note that the Richards project uses coated concrete and developer feels the coated concrete is appropriate for this project also. Request the condition concerning the towers be softened.
- A.1.2 The units are wide, have good exposure and a fair amount of exterior skin proportionate to the depth of the units; calculated correctly, the smallest would be 343 sq. ft. (not including 40 sq. ft. of storage); the number of units affected is 68. The developer understood the Board could relax the requirement of 400 sq. ft. per unit if deemed appropriate.
- A.1.15 The solution at the preliminary review had been to add the words "if necessary" to the condition.

Mr. Buttjes thanked staff and the Board for their input over the past year, noting it has resulted in a better project.

### **Comments from Other Speakers**

None presented.

### **Discussion**

In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Segal responded to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning past practice for relaxing unit size requirements. Relaxation of the 400 sq. ft. per unit requirement has occurred in other projects, however, it has been relaxed for no more than a 10% component of the subject projects. In the subject site 15% of the units are affected. Mr. Segal then reviewed details of the by-law pertaining to the relaxation criteria.

The Chair noted the by-law refers to the authority of the Director of Planning rather than of the Board with respect to the relaxation. Mr. Beasley noted the projects are technically recommended to the Board for review by the Director of Planning, if the Director has concern with a decision of the Board, the Director would be in a position to rectify it. The Chair suggested this and other by-laws referring to the authority of the Director of Planning, rather than of the Board, should be reviewed with the Director of Planning and amended or clarified as to jurisdiction.

Mr. Beasley registered his support for the creation of additional open space on the site, possibly over the drive court. However, Mr. Beasley did not agree the developer should be held to the amount previously approved and therefore suggested condition 1.1 be amended by deleting the end of sentence following the word "guidelines".

In response to a request from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Buttjes confirmed his willingness to use higher quality materials at the lower tower and podium levels. Mr. Beasley therefore suggested condition 1.4 be amended to read "especially for the podium level", not referring to the towers, to give the applicant more flexibility.

Ms. Parton noted the driveway to the underground parking seems very tight. Mr. Buttjes assured that the area has been designed according to the turning area for vehicles and incorporates a 10 ft. set back area.

With respect to condition 1.5, Mr. Buttjes confirmed the project will introduce more open balconies.

### **Recess**

The meeting recessed at 4:29 p.m. to allow members to review the sketches and models and resumed at 4:37 p.m.

### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Hruda, representing the Urban Design Panel:

- 1.1 Concern with quantity and quality of open space; suggest there be more of an emphasis on green rather than hard surface paving; if the whole drive court was covered and the centre part left open and handled spatially, that would be nice; it is justifiable to trade off light for some open space. Support that condition 1.1 be approved as written, to at least meet the previous requirement.
- 1.4 Concerns with the quality of materials/finishes, particularly in terms of the pedestrian experience, applying to the towers and the podium; the Panel did not feel strongly that it needed to apply to the whole building, but that it should at least apply to the entrance portion.
- 1.7 Blank facades on the lane way need to be dealt with.
- 1.9 Tower tops need more exuberance. These don't fit in the family of interesting tops that are happening on buildings in that area. The condition should be maintained as written.

Mr. Kavanagh, representative of Development Industry:

- 1.1 Need to achieve the maximum amount of open space.
- 1.4 Suggest that the condition be amended to read “for the podium level, including the lower elements of the towers”...

Mr. Gjernes, representative of Development Industry:

- 1.1 Concerned with compromising the drive court, it is important to leave it open, covering it over to create more open space might be a very expensive feature for the developer. Support leaving the drive court open.
- 1.4 Coated concrete for the tower is acceptable, however, we should work out an acceptable area for high quality materials on the lower part of the design.
- 1.5 Would support more balconies in lieu of additional semi-private space.
- 1.9 The area already has too much articulation of tower tops. The building design is fine as is.
- A.1.2 There is a lot of frontage to the studio units and 40 sq. ft of storage. Support approval of the unit sizes as presented.

Mr. Chung, representative of the General Public:

- 1.1 Concerned regarding limited open space, however suggest the drive court should be left open as it provides a pleasing curve rather than a straight edge.
- 1.4 Not impressed with the coated concrete, would prefer other materials for both towers and the podium, neighbours in other towers might be displeased by simple concrete facade.
- 1.5 French patios would be good.
- 1.9 Tower tops fine as presented.

Mrs. Parton, representative of the General Public, noted:

- the two towers with different coloured tops are very pleasing to the eye and allow for easy recognition of the buildings;
- have concerns regarding vehicles’ ability to get in and out of the driveway, the turn from the lane is very sharp; and
- 1.4 Alternate materials on the lower portions of the building would be pleasing.
- 1.1 Support covering the drive court to provide more open space.
- 1.9 Tower tops should be less squared and treated.
- 1.10 There should be trees and a set back for buses.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley noted there are 429 units in the project, and that there needs to be a better balance between the number of smaller units and the availability of semi-private open space and private open space. Mr. Beasley expressed support for changes in the conditions to reduce the number of smaller units and increase the open space.

Mr. MacGregor suggested that the note to the applicant in condition 1.1 be amended to include “maintaining significant natural light to the drive court”.

Upon query from the Chair, members expressed confidence that staff and the applicant have received sufficient direction from the Board to ensure condition 1.4, concerning quality of materials and their application to the podium level and portions of the towers, to achieve a balance that is pleasing to all parties.

### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE404258, as submitted, the plans and information forming part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of a retail/residential development containing four retail stores at grade with a 2 ½ storey podium base and two residential towers (30 storeys and 22 storeys) for a total of 429 dwelling units, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 28, 1999 with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development, to increase the amount of semi-private open space to be closer to that specified in the guidelines;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.1:

Consideration should be given to extending the usable semi-private roof deck on the podium level 2 over more of the vehicular drop-off area, while maintaining significant natural light to the drive court and further consideration should be given to softening of the hard surfaces.;

Amend 1.4:

design development to the exterior materials, especially for the podium level, to provide better quality finishes and a stronger colour palette, in response to the guidelines;

Delete A.1.2 and replace with:

the minimum size unit be relaxed from the 400 sq. ft. for no more than 10 percent of the units with the minimum unit size to be no less than 343 sq. ft. (Note to Applicant to remain as written);

Delete A.1.15 and replace with:

Arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services to ensure that conditions are in place to permit the legal transfer of the proposed heritage density, including if necessary, confirmation from the owners of the donor site.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## 5. OTHER BUSINESS

None presented.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



Clerk to the Board

Chair