

Meeting: No. 489
Date: Monday, December 11, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Council Chamber, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services [Chair]
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Cheng Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions (excused Item 4.)
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
R. Mingay Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer

Item 3 - 498 Pacific Street - DE405201 Zone CD-1

R. Hughes Roger Hughes Partners Architects
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group Inc.
B. Harrison Landscape Architect

Item 4 - 1499 Homer Street - DE405202 Zone CD-1

D. Hewitt Hewitt & Kwasnicky Architects
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group Inc.
B. Harrison Landscape Architect

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

The Chair noted that four Advisory Panel members have reached the end of their terms. Council has appointed the following replacements: Darren Chung, Jim Ross and Bruce Scott. These members will join the Board its deliberations in the New Year. James Hancock was reappointed for a further two year term, representing the design professions. Mr. Beasley commented that the outgoing members have been excellent contributors. Accordingly,

It was moved by Mr. Beasley, seconded by Mr. MacGregor, THAT the Board thank Allan Gjernes, Rona Mingay and Robert Roodenburg for their contribution to the Board in the last two years.

- CARRIED

1. **MINUTES**

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of October 30, 2000 be approved.

- CARRIED

2. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

3. **498 PACIFIC STREET - DE405201 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Roger Hughes Partners Architects

Request: To construct a 33-storey high rise residential tower (designated as Tower 1E of the Beach Neighbourhood) comprising:
-208 dwelling units (5 townhouses and 203 condominium units)
-overall floor area 17 993.6 square metres.
-overall building height 90.88 metres
-5 levels of underground parking for 276 vehicles accessible from Richards Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application in the Beach Neighbourhood, referring to a model and posted drawings. There are several detailed items to be resolved but no substantive issues have been identified. The proposal includes a component of townhouses on Beach Crescent, facing George Wainborn Park, and staff are anxious to see how these townhouses shape and frame the crescent, in concert with the adjacent project (Site 1D). The expectation is that the townhouses should be treated uniformly and provide a consistent curve, with the intent of creating one of Vancouver's great spaces. Mr. Segal also noted that the proposed shared pathway and common courtyard between this development and the adjacent site will require legal agreements for shared access. Legal agreement is also sought to ensure public access to the Pacific Street setback area. A loading bay has been provided in the driveway area and staff wish to ensure it is as functional as possible, preferably under cover. Subject to satisfactory resolution of these and other detailed conditions, the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application in accordance with the report dated November 29, 2000.

With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Scobie expressed concern that this condition accurately convey what is envisaged in terms of the designers of the two adjacent properties working together on the design of

the Beach Crescent townhouses. Mr. Segal confirmed the intent is that the entire row be the same design. With respect to underground parking access from the townhouses (condition A.1.23), Mr. Segal advised the applicant is now proposing to provide direct stair access from individual townhouses to their own secured garage.

In response to a question by Mr. MacGregor regarding the need to require public access to the Pacific Street setback area, Mr. Segal advised staff saw an opportunity for public seating at the feature "wave wall" in this location.

Applicant's Comments

Roger Hughes, Architect, explained the Pacific Street setback is paved right up to the "wave wall" and is not expected to be a maintenance problem. With respect to the design of the townhouses, Mr. Hughes said they have been working actively with the Site 1D architects and the design is the same for the full length of the crescent. Mr. Hughes noted the current parking requirement is based on 0.9 spaces for each residential unit and the applicant is requesting that this be reduced to 0.8 spaces per unit, with the remaining parking calculated on the standard formula of one parking space for every 200 m² of floor space. This would reduce the total parking count by 16 stalls and allow the elimination of the lowest level of parking, thus making the development much more economic. Mr. Hughes said he had no other concerns with the conditions in the report.

Discussion

Paul Pinsker, Traffic & Development Engineer, confirmed the Board does have the authority to relax the parking requirements. The current requirement for this site is 277 spaces for an average of 1.33 spaces per dwelling. With the visitor parking component this reduces the ratio to less than 1.25 spaces per unit. A recent study in this area and Southeast Granville Slopes indicates car ownership to be about 0.7 per unit plus one for every 200 m². With the addition of visitor parking spaces, this brings the ratio close to 0.9 spaces per unit, which staff believe is not unreasonable. Mr. Pinsker added, Engineering is prepared to consider a slightly reduced standard provided some compensating measures are taken to improve alternative means of transportation.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm, David Negrin, Concord Pacific, advised they are in discussions with the City's Housing Centre to investigate the possibility of locating parking spaces for this development in the adjacent non-market housing project.

The Chair noted the requested parking relaxation was not reflected in the notification letter, nor in the advertisement for this meeting. Mr. Negrin agreed the relaxation request was too late for inclusion in the notification information. He suggested the relaxation request could be handled later by Minor Amendment.

Comments from Other Speakers

Ms. Carol Lee Randall, Yaletown Residents Association, expressed appreciation for the high quality planning in this area. She drew attention to the family orientation of the Beach Neighbourhood, as called for in the Guidelines, and in this respect asked the Board to consider this fact when it deals with the proposed Corrections Canada facility one block away. The development application for this facility is currently on hold. Ms. Randall also expressed concern about notification to prospective purchasers in the neighbourhood. Mr. Negrin advised Concord Pacific does send out notices to buyers. He noted they are not pre-selling units in the subject development.

Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted there is no children's play area identified in the courtyard, despite the inclusion of 24 family units. Mr. Segal confirmed the guidelines do seek play areas for large developments such as this. Mr. Harrison advised "tot lots" are included in the interior courtyard but they have not yet been added to the landscape plan. Mr. Beasley noted this will be followed up by the Director to Planning to ensure the guidelines are met.

Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted drawings.

Mr. Beasley sought further clarification regarding the pathway through the open space. Mr. Segal explained this would be a semi-private space to be shared by residents of this development and the adjacent site. It is not intended to be accessible to the general public. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor expressed concern about the City's involvement in such legal agreements between strata councils. Mr. Segal confirmed the intent is to encourage the applicant to work out the arrangements for the mutual benefit of residents of the two properties.

Panel Opinion

James Cheng advised the Urban Design Panel enthusiastically endorsed this application. The main concern of the Panel was with the design of the townhouses, with the recommendation for double fronting units for improved surveillance. Mr. Cheng suggested an amendment to condition 1.2 to reinforce this idea. He said he fully supported condition 1.3, to provide generous rear courtyards for the townhouses, but suggested stronger wording because he did not believe it fulfilled the intent of the Master Plan which clearly shows a landscaped garden zone to the rear of the townhouses.

The Advisory Panel members recommended approval of the application and endorsed Mr. Cheng's suggested amendment to condition 1.2. Mr. Gjernes recommended the applicant pursue a Minor Amendment for a reduction in parking. Given the constraints of this site, Mr. Hancock suggested "borrowing" parking from the adjacent non-market housing site be considered.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said this is an excellent scheme, very much in line with the vision for this neighbourhood. He added, he was pleased to see the different design approach as compared to some other areas which have very similar building designs. He stressed the management of the realisation of the townhouses will be very important given there are two different projects involved. The level of consistency being sought will require not only the same design but management at the construction level in terms of consistency of materials and details. Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was important to have a general public linkage between Richards Street and the north-south public mews to the east of the project because there already exists a public right-of-way further east from the mews out to Homer Street. There does, however, need to be security of the courtyard for the residents of these buildings, and there needs to be agreement among them to ensure its shared use.

Mr. Beasley noted his motion of approval is on the basis that the children's play facilities are assumed to be included.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405201, in accordance with the Staff Report dated November 29, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development to the detailed treatment of the Beach Crescent townhouses and their ~~integration~~ *continuity* with the contiguous townhouses of the easterly Site 1D *and ultimately for the entire crescent*;

Note to Applicant: Submission of larger scale elevations, sections and model is needed to confirm the intended high quality treatment and ~~to coordinate~~ *the continuity of* the design of this unique Park-fronting component.

Amend 1.2:

design development to end and rear townhouse elevations to upgrade their quality *in line with the quality of the front facades* given their visibility from Richards Street;

Amend 1.6:

coordination with Site 1D courtyard, including any legal agreements needed ~~for~~ *between the owners of this site and the adjacent site for the joint use of the courtyard and* pathway(s) crossing the interior property line;

Delete 1.7;

Amend A.1.4:

provision of parking spaces to be in accordance with Section 8.1(c) of the CD-1 By-law (366) *except that the Director of Planning, in consultation with the General Manager of Engineering Services, may relax parking up to 16 spaces subject to review of the possibility of locating that parking on an adjacent site and after further input from nearby property owners*;

Amend A.2.12:

design development to the loading bay to improve its function and location;

Add A.2.13:

arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for the provision of street trees and special sidewalk treatment;

Note to Applicant: An application for street trees and sidewalk treatment is required. Submission of a copy of the landscape plan directly to Engineering for review is required in support of this application.

Delete A.3.3.

-CARRIED

4. 1499 HOMER STREET - DE405202 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Hewitt & Kwasnicky Architects

Request: To construct a 28-storey high-rise residential tower (designated Tower 1B of the Beach Neighbourhood) comprising:
-131 dwellings units (10 townhouses and 121 condominium units);
-total floor area approximately 22 599 m²;
-overall height 82 m;
-3 ½ levels of underground parking for 198 vehicles accessible from Beach Crescent.

Mr. Hancock declared a conflict of interest as he is the architect for the same client on a project which abuts this property. He removed himself from the Advisory Panel on this item.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented the application, referring to a model and posted drawings. After reviewing the site context he focussed on the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 29, 2000. The Urban Design Panel did not support the initial submission and the application was subsequently revised to have the tower lobby at the corner of the site. The earlier scheme included a loading bay in the courtyard which was removed in the current submission on the erroneous assumption that a loading bay is not a requirement of the by-law. Staff do not support a loading bay in the courtyard but believe an alternative location can be found, as called for in condition 1.3. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the main conditions, subject to which the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application.

Mr. Segal tabled two additional standard conditions, to secure a right-of-way along the north edge of the site and to provide a children's play area in the courtyard.

Discussion

Commenting on the obvious difficulty of including a loading bay on this very tight site, Mr. Beasley questioned whether the Board is able to relax this condition. Mr. Segal confirmed the Board does have the authority to relax this provision, and he briefly described the possible solutions for providing the loading bay. In discussion, Mr. Cheng noted that locating the loading bay in the courtyard would be very detrimental to the project. He questioned whether a height relaxation could be considered to allow a loading bay in the underground parking area. Mr. Cheng added, the Urban Design Panel is not in favour of sharing a loading bay with the adjacent site.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to the feasibility of this project and the adjacent non-market building sharing a ramp, Mr. Segal said it is physically possible but would require negotiation between the two property owners. Mr. Beasley also questioned the safety of the walkways. Mr. Segal said the conclusion from a CPTED point of view was that the townhouses would provide sufficient surveillance.

Mr. Scobie questioned the interpretation of the guidelines with respect to the condition to lower the townhouses. Mr. Segal explained that while the guidelines do state "approximately one metre", there is now considerable experience with respect to townhouse development in the downtown and it has been observed that where townhouses are more than a metre above the sidewalk they do not meet the objective of achieving a pedestrian friendly interface. Mr. Scobie suggested the guidelines may need to be revised to reflect the current expectations.

With respect to loading, Mr. Scobie questioned whether there is any merit in sharing a loading bay between this development and its neighbour. Paul Pinsker, Traffic & Development Engineer, briefly described the standard requirements for loading bays. In the large, newer development areas in the downtown a standard of one loading bay per 200 dwelling units has been established, with the trigger at 100 units. He noted the 3.5 m height requirement may be reviewed in the future. As well, a new type of loading space was recently approved for service vans and there has been some discussion as to whether the loading bay for this site might be similarly downsized. Mr. MacGregor stressed that in high density areas such as this there have to be adequate loading facilities. He suggested the Board should be very cautious before considering a relaxation.

Applicant's Comments

David Hewitt, Architect, noted they did look at the option of locating the loading bay below grade but, because of the configuration of the site, it was found to be not possible. The extra height clearance that would be necessary would extend the ramp another 45 ft., completely cutting off the courtyard. The position of the tower also has an impact in terms of its columns and transfer beams. Also, the site is too restricted to achieve an adequate turning radius at the bottom of the ramp.

David Negrin, Concord Pacific, said they have no problem with lowering the townhouses another foot, as called for in the conditions. He explained, this project is intended to be one of Concord's "high end" projects with high quality materials. For this reason, they would not support sharing a ramp with the adjacent building. However, he said they would like to discuss the matter with their lawyers and the Housing Centre to try to find a satisfactory solution. From an urban design standpoint, an on-site loading bay would be detrimental to the project. Mr. Negrin confirmed a children's play area will be included in the project.

Comments from Other Speakers

Ms. Carol Lee Randall described the problems experienced in the area with off on-street loading and stressed the importance of providing *on-site* loading bays.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Cheng said the Urban Design Panel commended the applicant on the revisions made in response to the Panel's earlier comments. The Panel now considers it to be an excellent project. With respect to the loading bay, Mr. Cheng said he would like the City to consider relaxing the height requirement so that the applicant could consider a below grade loading bay. Given the size and limitations of this site an on-site loading bay would take away from the very precious ground area for the use of the residents. As well, the children's play area should remain in its present sunny location.

Mr. Kavanagh recommended approval, noting a loading bay is necessary but he would not want to see it in the open area of the site. Mr. Gjernes questioned whether relaxing the loading would set a precedent if other similar projects have been required to provide it. Mr. Pinsker explained that in most cases the 100 unit threshold has been strictly enforced on large developments. One exception was the Bayshore Gardens area which had a number of buildings at just over 100 units and in this case the provision of one loading bay per building would have been excessive overall. Mr. Gjernes said if a satisfactory arrangement cannot be worked out with the adjacent non-market building, he would prefer to see the loading provision relaxed.

Mr. Roodenburg, Ms. Mingay, Mr. Mortenson and Ms. Leduc supported the project and recommended approval. Ms. Leduc questioned whether a loading bay should be provided for this project since it cannot accommodate very large moving vehicles, rather that the City should look at accommodating off-street moving. In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Pinsker said the typical moving vehicle is a box van, about 26 ft. long by 11 ft. high. He added, loading bays are generally very well used.

Board Discussion

In moving approval of the application, Mr. Timm said it is important to provide for loading but agreed it could be off-~~street~~ *site* rather than on-site, to allow for an arrangement with the adjoining site if possible.

Mr. Beasley noted he was persuaded by Ms. Randall's comments that a loading bay is important. On this very tight site, however, it will be very difficult to achieve. To this end, he said he was very hopeful that the discussions with the adjacent property will be fruitful, otherwise it could have a very detrimental impact on the courtyard. He added, he supports the project on the assumption that a children's play area will be included.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405202, in accordance with the Staff Report dated November 29, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 to change Beach Avenue to *Beach Crescent*;

Amend 1.3:

provision of one ~~on-site~~ *off-street* residential loading bay, *either on this site or the adjoining site by agreement satisfactory to the Director of Planning and Director of Legal Services*;

Add A.1.8:

legal arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and Director of Planning for public access to the pathway along the north edge of the site;

-CARRIED

5. OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair noted that a concern has been raised by an Advisory Panel member about the size and legibility of the plans and elevations in the Staff Committee Reports. He directed staff to review the submission requirements in this respect so that key elements are labelled at a scale that they are still legible when reduced.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5.30 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch