

Meeting: No. 472
Date: Monday, December 13, 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
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

R. Hughes Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
R. Mingay Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (Absent for Item 4)
B. Parton Representative of General Public

Absent

D. Chung Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner (Item 3 and 4)
M. Kemble Development Planner (Item 3)
S. Hein Development Planner (Item 4)
N. Peters City Surveyor
B. MacDonald Parking Engineer (Item 3)

Item 3 - 500 Nicola Street - DE404521 - ZONE CD-1

James Cheng James Cheng Architects
Domonique Domais James Cheng Architects
Bob Pearce Aspac Development

Item 4 - 2900 East Broadway - DE404308 - ZONE I-3

Tom Bunting Bunting Coady Architects
Kevin Hanvey Bunting Coady Architect
Alan Whitchelo Bentall Developments Ltd.
Randall Sharp Sharp and Diamond Landscape

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

Louise Christie

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of November 29, 1999 be approved with an amendment by Mr. Rudberg.

He noted on page 4 that the statement “. . .the utilities have been accommodated and should be protected” should be changed to “. . . had been accommodated and must be protected”.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr. Scobie distributed a copy of a fax received from Joe Wai, the applicant for 599 Columbia Street. The applicant thanked the Board for their approval but expressed a concern that was not clearly brought out at the Board Meeting, relating to Condition A.1.5 of Appendix A, as contained in the Dec. 7, 1999 “Prior-to” letter. The condition states that “arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Parks and Recreation and the Director of Legal Services for all design, financial and legal requirements” and the applicant wants to ensure the project does not have to go through a comprehensive design review to satisfy the Park Board. He pointed out that condition A.1.16 already asks for a Memorandum of Understanding between the Park Board and the Operators, the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Society.

Mr. Scobie asked for clarification of this Board’s intended scope concerning the design, financial and legal requirements, pointing out that the applicant is not the owner of the site and it is the landowner’s interest that needs to be addressed to ensure the Parks Board is itself free from liabilities, etc.

During discussion amongst members of the Board it was agreed that the project design should not be subject to revision as may be desired by the Board of Parks and Recreation. The site, although in the care and custody of the Parks Board, is owned by the City and both Council and the Development Permit Board have endorsed the project. The Park Board should consider the location of the project in relationship to the adjoining gardens, and how it is to operate.

Mr. MacGregor moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Beasley, to clarify condition A.1.5 to read “arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Parks and Recreation and the Director of Legal Services for the location and operation of the facility on this site.”

**3. 500 Nicola Street - DE404521 - ZONE CD-1
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: James K. M. Cheng Architects Inc.

Request: To construct a 268 unit, mixed-use, multiple dwelling development, including two residential towers at 20 and 25 storeys, over a 3-storey and 2-storey townhouse podium, respectively; a seven-unit, 3-storey townhouse building along Hastings Street; and a 4-storey townhouse/commercial building along the waterfront, with the commercial use fronting the waterfront at grade.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, presented this application. He stated that this was one of the last sites to be developed in the Marina Neighbourhood, with extensive guidelines to the area. The site, covering a full city block, is irregular in shape, and slopes from Hastings Street down to the waterfront. To maintain public and private views, the towers have been kept slim and meet the five degree street-end view setback requirements. Mr. Kemble then briefly outlined the principal issues. The first relates to the street level interface concerns of the townhouses on three sides and one of commercial facing the waterfront walkway, which are important links in the overall objective of creating a liveable residential neighbourhood. The initial submission did not have townhouses on Hastings Street but staff feel they are an essential part for providing eyes-on-the-street, for the domestic character of the neighbourhood, and for providing a buffer which improves livability and utilization of the private courtyard space. Condition 1.1 addresses the need for design development to ensure a comfortable relationship between the townhouse units and the public realm, in terms of detailing and the quality of materials. In condition 1.2, staff recommend approval of a height relaxation of up to ten percent for the commercial/ townhouses as long as shadows are minimized on the waterfront walkway. The view slot between the townhouses should be increased from 15 ft. to the guideline minimum of 20 ft. in condition 1.4. In condition 1.10, design development is requested to an extremely important edge of pedestrian interest on the site, the commercial frontage on the walkway along the bay.

The second issue is the tower massing where guidelines allow the tower height to be increased by 10 percent, but with a floor plate decrease. The applicant is requesting a 10 percent increase in tower height, along with a 5 percent increase in floor plate size. In discussion with the previous applicant, staff noted that FSR is higher than the guidelines can accommodate but condition 1.3 requests the floor plate size comply with the maximum recommended in the guidelines. Another concern was the mechanical penthouses which are perceived as fairly extensive areas, and condition 1.6 asks that their height and massing be reduced because of view impacts on the upland neighbours and shadowing on the walkway.

The third issue relates to the courtyard and the 34 family units residing in the complex. Condition 1.7 asks for design development to include most important access from the townhouse units to the children's play area and also a reduction in the amount of water area with an increase in green space to accommodate active uses.

The last issue is parking access in two locations. The guidelines indicate one from Nicola Street and one from Hastings Street, but the latter has been moved to Broughton Street for a convenient drive through arrangement, better serving the commercial frontage. This also allows for residential continuity along Hastings Street.

Four responses were received to the 800 notification letters, with concerns being expressed about view loss and the parking access on Nicola Street. Mr. Kemble concluded by saying this was a very high quality project which will provide a very positive street edge and reinforce the residential character of the neighbourhood. Staff recommend

approval, with attention to the street edges that the site demands.

Ms. Parton questioned the availability of surface parking for the community centre and commercial parking for the stores. Mr. MacGregor said the drop-off would be mostly on the east side of Broughton Street, where the impact is less. Mr. Timm pointed out the significant benefits of the 'drive-through' parking access, with drop-off and commercial vehicle loading all going underneath and no need for back-up alarms. For the commercial area, loading height of 11' 6" access needed to be off of Broughton Street because of the grade off of Hastings Street. For access to the commercial frontage, the driveway also needed to be near the waterfront to eliminate trucks on the sea wall. Mr. Timm asked about the impact of the increase of five percent in floor plate size relative to the view and through discussion was told the increase had been kept in the north/south axis to not affect the view corridors. Mr. Scobie asked about open and enclosed balconies which are not included in the floor plate calculations, and Mr. Kemble said that at this preliminary stage, he is assuming they are to be accommodated within the floor plate. Mr. Cheng concurred.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Cheng said this project was a rare opportunity to create something special. Originally, the Hastings Street open water court was related to the Henriques development proposed across the street but then staff asked them to consider townhouses there because of the goal in the broader context. Mr. Cheng advised his client is happy with either alternative. The applicant would like to clarify the following conditions: Condition A.1.2 concerns the mechanical penthouses which supposedly exceed the guidelines, but the applicant had difficulty in finding reference to this in the zoning or guidelines. Mr. Cheng said they understand the intent and explained that they cannot be limited ten percent on top as people are more interested in air conditioners now, which will be accommodated in the penthouses, so he asked the Board to consider rewording the condition. He thought there was misunderstanding concerning condition 1.4 regarding the view slot, and asked if the increase in the opening was for the top floor of the townhouses or for the whole slot. The lower view slot does not allow anyone to see the water so the effect is simply to increase the sky exposure. He then explained that, concerning condition 1.7, the water in the courtyard is used as a physical barrier for townhouse security without the loss of visual contact, and he asked if the request to reduce the extent of water area could be deleted.

Mr. Beasley asked if A.1.2 was a regulation or a discretionary item. Mr. Kemble noted that condition 1.6 covers the item and so both the condition A.1.2 and its Note to Applicant could be deleted. Mr. Scobie referred to the complex map in Appendix D on page 14 of the Development Permit Staff Committee Report, in relation to the view slot size, and Mr. Kemble explained that originally the site was two parcels which would have a three metre slot on each parcel, for a total of six metres (19.7 feet). Originally, a much more generous view slot was envisioned in the downtown area. It was clarified that the access was visual only and not a public thoroughfare from Hastings Street to the waterfront, and that by terracing the upper townhouses, a better mountain view could be established from Hastings Street. Mr. Gjernes asked why the parking access was off of Broughton, near the school and community centre facilities, and Mr. MacDonald explained that the height of the loading bay was affected by the grade off of Hastings Street and that this approach was an advantage to the circulation in the whole neighbourhood. Mr. Cheng said that a sensing gate could be installed to keep it from becoming a through route, and that parking had been moved inside under the control of the Strata Council, with a complementary dual use. Mr. MacGregor noted that the parking for visitors is 18 less than that proposed and Ms. Parton pointed out that in terms of the marina parking, people with boats may be gone for extended periods. Mr. Timm suggested changing the wording of condition A.1.4, requiring compliance with the parking requirement of the CD-1 By-law. Mr. Roodenberg brought up the issue of the mechanical penthouses for clarification and Mr. Segal said that view considerations were most important and that the issue is resolvable through condition 1.6, in consultation with staff.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Rex Debrisnay, a member of the Bauhinia Strata Council and owner of two units at 535 Nicola Street, said they were very concerned about a number of issues like the setback of the townhouses on Hastings Street and the parking entrance off of Nicola Street. He noted it was difficult to respond to the notification letter without being able to see the model, but were pleased to note the development is at the preliminary stage. He wanted the Board to realize that this area was very congested along the Coal Harbour Quay, with increasing traffic to the Bayshore, and expansion will only further effect the livability of Nicola Street. They opposed the increase in height and the amount of service area in the penthouse above the tower itself, and would prefer the openness on Hastings Street be maintained and the parking entrance put there also. He also raised concerns about pedestrians who now jay walk across Nicola Street as there are no crosswalks but said that he now understands engineering difficulties relating to parking access off of Hastings Street. Mr. MacDonald assured him the interface of pedestrians and traffic around this site would be studied closely.

Mr. Richard Henriquez, representing Westbank Projects Corp, developers of the site (the Pumphouse Mews) across Hastings Street, stated he was in support of the initial submission (Option A), supported by the Urban Design Panel. Mr. Segal clarified that the Option A proposal was not before the Board. Mr. Henriquez went on to say that there is some of the best urban design in this city as exists anywhere in North America; that makes Vancouver a unique place. He cited several successful developments that Mr. Cheng had worked on and how functional and attractive they were, particularly in terms of their courtyard/open spaces, and his first proposal for this development should be given consideration by the Board.

Mr. Ian Gillespie, President of Westbank Projects Corp., reiterated these perspectives of accessibility and the width of view corridor, and said it was odd that the design that the Urban Design Panel, neighbouring property owners and the applicant preferred was not acceptable to staff. He admitted that his concern was self-interest, relating to the development across Hastings Street but he strongly felt Option A was a better solution. In reply to Mr. Scobie, Mr. Gillespie confirmed that his advice was for the applicant to submit his initial proposal (Option A) and have it dealt with by the Board, rather than considering the one that was before them.

Mr. Segal asked to respond to a couple of points related to comments of the previous speakers. The guidelines for Georgia Street specify green courtyards on the busy thoroughfare, with the town homes provided on Alberni Street. As for the Palisades, some planners felt that townhouses would have been a better solution. In this situation, the debate took place over a few years and was resolved with Council approving the guidelines for the neighbourhood. In context along Hastings Street, and purely for urban design reasons, the block to the west provides frontage of non-market housing, this block provides townhouses, and then there is the open park and community centre space to the east.

Mr. MacGregor sought assurance that the access clearance to the loading was sufficient to allow garbage containers to be emptied in the underground area. Mr. MacDonald suggested an amendment to condition A.2.2 (a) to address this.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Hughes, representing the Urban Design Panel, said six were in support with none opposed but it was left to the applicant and staff to determine which version (Option A or the current submission) was preferred. A minority of the Panel agreed with the townhouses on Hastings Street option and a greener courtyard area. There were a number of comments on the tower massing, but the Panel were appreciative of the difficulties entailed with

accommodating the approved density and thought the applicant had broken it up quite well, with slim massing of the five percent increase in floor plate, and the way the corners and the shoulders had been reduced, which gave good view lines. The massing was bulky but well handled with superb architecture. There was no comment on access to the parking at the time. In response to a question by Mr. Beasley about staff's recommendation to lower the floor plate square footage to the largest floor plate allowed in the guidelines, Mr. Hughes responded that the Panel felt the increase in height and floorplate size was supportable, with the eight percent enclosed balcony, the shape of the tower, and the fact that five percent increase was very small. It was recommended condition 1.3 be deleted.

Mr. Hancock reiterated the Panel was supportive of either option as he had been present at that meeting. Option C exposes more of the courtyard with oblique angle. The increase in tower plate of five percent was in the north/south direction so views from behind would not be obstructed. He thought the worst parking entrance location would be from Hastings Street. He felt the view slot was very unconvincing and should be opened up to see into the courtyard, and questioned if stepping it back at upper floor was really a significant move. He thought the applicant could work with staff to respond to conditions 1.6, if A.1.2 was deleted; A.1.4. if it indicated a shortage of 18 parking stalls; and condition 1.7 concerning the courtyard area. He was unconvinced by condition 1.4 and what it was to achieve. For condition 1.2, a ten percent increase in townhouse height was supportable as shadowing can be minimized if stepped back.

Mr. Kavanagh supported approval. He suggested deleting condition 1.3; making condition 1.4 a consideration item; and relative to 1.6, delete A.1.2.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval of this scheme which adheres to guidelines. He agreed with a number of comments from other Advisory Panel members: the site is big enough to handle extra square footage so he recommended deletion of condition 1.3; condition 1.6 should suffice (delete A.1.2); A.1.4 should be tightened up to make reference to the Parking By-law; and he recommended a change to A.1.16 to specify that garbage pick up and delivery trucks are below grade, as A.2.2 deals with access and clearance.

Mr. Roodenberg said he was only considering the proposal before the Board, not Option A, and limited his comments to 1.4, supporting opening up the view slot if it is possible. Condition 1.6 should be for consideration and he hoped the applicant has very creative mechanical engineer. He was sure staff and the applicant could work together for an amicable solution to 1.7.

Ms. Mingay felt that the scheme engendered a bit of claustrophobia and that consideration of 1.4 is delicate - she recommended it be an issue for consideration.

Ms. Parton was in favour of the towers, and didn't object to them being taller. She would like to see Hastings Street open so as you walk or drive by, you could see right through to the water, like the building on the corner of Denman and Georgia Streets - this is what is so special in Vancouver. She thought the views should be opened up for the pedestrian, even if the towers needed to be three or four storeys higher.

In view of the comments from delegations and members of the Advisory Panel, Mr. Scobie asked members of the Board if there was an inclination to seek an alternate to what is before the Board as the preliminary application stage is the time to address fundamental issues of uses, density, massing, circulation, etc. but he received no response.

Motion

Mr. Beasley stated that it bodes to be a good piece of architecture, with the applicant having struggled with the

issues at hand, and having brought forward the current scheme which he personally thinks is right: how open space is used and not used, the quality of open space and the fact that it is very usable for these residences. The change in the location of the parking access as now proposed rather than from Hastings Street is appropriate, so that all utility function can happen quietly underground. The question of the townhouses was debated but there is a need to look at the larger community as there is a really difficult problem, to provide a residential density in the heart of downtown, to bring the people and their houses right close to the street, which leads to a safer neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley moved approval, with the following changes to prior-to conditions: Remove the words 'northerly' and 'to the waterfront' in condition 1.4; in condition 1.7 delete the words "that reduces the extent of water area to provide" and instead put in the word 'for'; delete A.1.2; amend condition A.1.4 to read "compliance with the parking requirement of the CD-1 By-law"; and amend A.2.2 to the wording suggested by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr MacGregor made comments, stating that what is presented goes a long way to meet the guidelines approved by Council with individual unit entries along Hastings Street. He said the view through needs to be substantial and, in terms of the towers, they should go to the maximum outlined in the guidelines. Building in the clearance for garbage pick up within the underground area was good and he would like to see a legal mechanism provided to ensure the company picking up the garbage has the equipment that functions within the design.

Mr. Tim seconded the motion, stating that the vision of the loading and garbage underneath is significant for the residents, and that with the drive through, the back-up alarms would not be as frequent or audible.

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE the concept of developing this site with a 268 unit, mixed-use, multiple dwelling development, including two residential towers at 20 and 25 storeys, over a 3-storey and 2-storey townhouse podium, respectively; a seven-unit, 3-storey townhouse building along Hastings Street; and a 4-storey townhouse/commercial building along the waterfront, with the commercial use fronting the waterfront at grade; as submitted under Development Application No. 404521, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 1, 1999, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.4:

1.4 design development to the view slot between the northerly townhouses to widen this gap to improve view through to the waterfront.

Amend 1.7:

1.7 design development to the treatment of the private open space courtyard area, that reduces the extent of water area to provide for more usable landscaped area for residents, including better access to the children's play area.

Delete A.1.2 and Note to Applicant.

Amend A.1.4:

A.1.4 *compliance with the parking requirement of the CD-1 By-law.*

Amend A.2.2, Section (a):

A.2.2 (a) a minimum 11 ft. 6 in., *or greater*, clearance for the loading spaces accessed from Nicola and Broughton Street crossings *to provide a*

height that is adequate for in-building garbage pickup;

Note to Applicant: The 11 ft. 6 in. *or greater* clearance should be provided throughout the loading circulation areas. The minimum clearance should not be obstructed by any structures or pipes and sprinkler heads. Cross sections of the Loading spaces should be provided.

**4. 2900 East Broadway; DE404308 - ZONE I-3 (Phase 1 - Buildings 1, 2 and 3)
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Bunting Coady Architects

Request: To construct three new buildings, and related access, on the northerly portion of this site to provide general offices for information technology

Introduction

Mr. Scobie explained that an appeal is going to the Board of Variance for the preliminary approval but he believes that the Board can deal with this complete application today as it is a can stand alone, much as if it had not been preceded by a preliminary application.

Development Planner's Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, reviewed the conclusions of the preliminary approval on November 1, 1999 as related to site planning, density, height, form of development and the East Broadway setback. The I-3 zoning was enacted on November 30, 1999. On the front page of the Development Permit Staff Committee (DPSC) Report of October 6, 1999, the owner of the development should be noted as a pension fund (#2725312 - Canada Inc.).

This complete proposal is for Phase 1 to construct buildings 1, 2 and 3 fronting on East Broadway, and for remedial adjustment to the existing warehouse structure, mostly cosmetic work. There are four issues the DPSC report refers to: questions on landscape quality and the potential for tree retention; the quality of the existing structure to ensure a good looking development; a perceived parking shortfall for the warehouse; and the 40 ft. setback on East Broadway. The height of the new buildings was a controversial issue for the neighbourhood and the heights are now lower. The required parking for high tech use is higher than that required for the current warehouse component, which will continue to be the use until the site is fully developed, and therefore, Engineering Services suggested grandfathering the previous warehouse standard, so there is no deficiency.

Mr. Hein then elaborated on the previously approved preliminary application for the site. Condition 1.1 asked for more information on the proposed uses. Condition 1.2 addressed the encroachment of buildings underground into the landscape setback off East Broadway, and in the complete they have been setback and staff are now asking that they explore tree retention. Condition 1.3 required improvement to pedestrian circulation systems. There is improvement to site entries with buildings 1 and 3 having employee entries but staff are also asking for better linking to the proposed park and bus stop. Discussion in terms of overall signage referred to in condition 1.4 has started and staff will continue to work with the applicant. Condition 1.5 required the creation of a safe pedestrian route from the proposed SkyTrain station through the northwest corner of the site to the neighbourhood to the north, with lighting being clarified for that route. As condition 1.6 refers to the southerly portion of the site and buildings 4 through 8, staff will be looking at that at a later stage after this phase is underway. Condition 1.7 looked to refining all site and external street edges, and staff are asking for refinements to the fairly extensive area of exposed blank wall. For condition 1.8, staff note the permeable surfaces have been maximized, with collection and retention of storm water run off. Further clarification is needed, as referred to in condition 1.9, regarding the seating and artwork being integrated into to the public open spaces, and the use of water and solar orientation. (Note: On page 9 of the DPSC report, reference should be made to A.1.25 and A1.26.) Condition 1.10 was to explore increasing the extent of open space by adjusting the road

alignment and staff sought the removal of the loading area to restore and preserve the entire public open space. Condition 1.11 referred to the execution of rights-of-way agreements, and, though they are not yet registered, they are underway and forthcoming. Condition 1.12 looked at the possibilities around buildings 4 to 8 of major moves in terms of site planning and building massing. There have been preliminary discussions with the applicant and, as future phases come back to the Board, details will be presented. As part of this condition, the applicant was asked to review the view and shadow analysis presented at the preliminary stage, to check for accuracy, and today there is a further presentation. Only one late response was received to the notification letter, in which staff took the opportunity to educate the public as to the conclusion at the preliminary stage. There are no neighbours of the development site in attendance at this public meeting.

In conclusion, Mr. Hein then reviewed the current prior-to conditions of the December 1 DPSC Report: Condition 1.1 - to relocate proposed loading functions; 1.2 - clarification of proposed lighting throughout the site, with emphasis on public spaces to ensure safe environment for pedestrians; 1.3 - requests an arborist's report for retention and relocation of significant trees on site; 1.4 - two proposed access stairs should be more transparent, utilizing CPTED principles, and be linked to the bridges that expand over the access roads; 1.5 - the extent of concrete blank wall surfaces need improved visual quality like secured glazed openings, given both parking and service functions, providing a better frontage on the street and access road, by utilizing high quality materials and detailed design development.

Mr. MacGregor then asked if some of the rights-of-way laid down in the preliminary approval are still not documented and if the conditions here should be combined with the preliminary. Mr. Hein said these conditions will be addressed as future phases come forward. There followed discussion concerning further approvals, the new I-3 zoning allowances and outright provision, and whether further buildings would need to come back to the Board or not. Mr. Scobie thought that the I-3 zoning allows certain development as a right and questioned if future applications will be returning to the Board, noting that since there will be more than one building on the site future approvals will likely be discretionary. Mr. Beasley asked how best to get the security to know there would be follow-up, particularly in regards to condition 1.12, and especially because of over height approval that the Board may be giving at this meeting.

Mr. Timm asked for clarification of condition 1.5 in the preliminary application, re: a pedestrian route intended to provide access through the complex for the neighbourhood to the north, which takes pedestrians away from the crossings provided on East Broadway. Mr. Hein said work is being done on the crossing at Renfrew Street. Mr. Scobie clarified 1.5 was to deal with the full length of Renfrew Street, the bulk of which is south of this Phase 1 and Mr. MacGregor said 1.11 in the preliminary application was to secure through legal agreements the routes required by 1.5, being the linkages through the site itself and the sidewalk width on Renfrew Street, also. Mr. Scobie said A.2.13 only addresses Phase 1, and condition 1.11, particularly the Note to Applicant, may need to be brought forward in this complete application for Phase 1, to secure the broader public access through the site. Staff feel only the portion relating to this site needs to be secured for this application as there will be further design refinements to the area south of Phase 1. Discussion followed. Mr. Scobie questioned what would happen if the SkyTrain is finished in two years, and if Phase 2 or 3 is delayed for five or ten years, which rights-of-way need to be secured prior to issuance of a permit for Phase 1 and which, if any, can be deferred. Mr. Gjernes asked, if the zoning was definitive, does further development need to come back to the Board and Mr. Scobie said there is also the issue of timing. Mr. Beasley suggested the applicant may help clarify this and address it in his presentation.

There was then discussion of condition 1.12 in the preliminary, as Mr. Gjernes inquired about the open

space in the middle which was requested but he thought that this particular scheme of development was seen as suitable. Mr. Scobie explained that only design exploration was requested, to look at moving mass to open up the centre of the site.

Mr. Scobie asked about preliminary condition 1.3, particularly concerning the entries to building 2 and Mr. Hein explained the landscape refinements are of sufficient high quality to indicate the entries and routes through the site and there is also a corridor right through building 2 which addresses the need for linkages from building 1 to 3. Mr. Scobie also wanted to ensure that signage would be reviewed in detail and be within the scope of the Sign By-law. Mr. Hein said discussions had begun with appropriate City staff. He then also asked about the interim treatment for preliminary condition 1.7, concerning refining all site edges, and what is being proposed in the current condition 1.4 with the access stairways. Mr. Hein said metal panels are being added, and where there are demolished areas, glazed openings are being introduced.

The cast-in-place concrete will have remedial sandblasting. To ensure the existing warehouse structure frontage facing the east-west access road is included in Phase 1, a phrase will be added to condition 1.5.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bunting clarified that they understand they will be returning to the Board with subsequent complete applications. He also explained that the development of the southwest corner was a condition of the rezoning, with the timing being tied to the Renfrew Street SkyTrain station. There are legal services agreements involving the southwest and northwest corners, the internal road and the signal at the intersection of Renfrew Street and Hebb Avenue, with letters of credit to secure these items being put in place with a drop dead date on each, but not yet registered in the Land Title Office. These agreements do not cover the north-south internal right-of-way as that was an additional condition required by the Board and not part of the zoning enactment conditions established by Council.

Mr. Bunting then expressed their concerns with the northwest open space and relocation of the loading zone in condition 1.1 now recommended by the DPSC. It was discussed with Engineering and Planning how to incorporate more loading, particularly into Phase 1. Because of the grade of the east-west road, loading underneath building 3 was possible but the grade rises up toward Renfrew Street. A solution has been designed (which the applicant circulated to the Board) which hides the loading spaces, not underneath building 1, but under an increased patio area, and by bringing the east-west road further to the south, there is also an increase in the open space. (The applicant handed out drawings.) There will be small courier stalls in building 2. Mr. Hein said staff's outstanding concern is the extent of the gaping hole and the frontages. He explained the I-3 Guidelines speak to showcasing inward working production line activity on edges in this new zone, and so by including the loading in the building itself, an idea may be to show those functions. Mr. Beasley obtained staff confirmation that the Board was being requested to adopt condition 1.1 not alternate wording so would permit Mr. Bunting's circulated drawing since it does not relocate the proposed loading functions out of the north west corner. Mr. Hein confirmed it was staff's desire to remove any encumbrance on the open space by any uses in the future.

Mr. Whitcelo addressed condition A.2.13 dealing with the registration of the rights-of-way for northwest access between buildings 1 and 2, and the east-west internal route. The requirement is to have it now, with crossings of East Broadway at Nootka and Renfrew Streets, and the applicant expressed concern that once access is through the site, then there is the possibility of theft, especially dealing with computer equipment, particularly between dusk and dawn. The applicant requested the possibility for public access to be closed at night as the right-of-way is problematic from security and liability issues. Mr. Beasley said

the intention is to achieve usable linkage right through the site, and security issues at night can be addressed, so it should be kept as part of Phase 1 approval, discussed with the authorities as stipulated in condition A.2.13.

Comments from Other Speakers

None

Panel Opinion

Mr. Hughes, on behalf of the Urban Design Panel, supported all the conditions as this scheme is about a grid, and developing a campus feel. Notwithstanding Mr. Hruda's comments on the preliminary application, pulling out the central building to create a central open space between the buildings may defeat this.

Mr. Hancock said the scale is fairly vast, with a number of open spaces already. He said the loading proposal put forward is workable and distributes the loading to all three buildings and covering it as illustrated in the drawing circulated by the applicant accomplishes a lot. He suggested rewording of condition 1.1, to delete the word 'relocation' and replace it with properly 'screening' or 'shielding' or 'covering'.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval of Phase 1 with deletion of condition 1.1 and reworking the design so the loading area can be outside the building with a covering that would be appropriate. The rest is acceptable, with the northerly face of the existing warehouse being included in condition 1.7. He suggested the wording of condition A.2.13 is adequate to secure the right-of-way between buildings 1 and 2 and the 'north-south pedestrian access through the remainder of the site' could be added. Mr. Scobie said the condition of the Renfrew Street edge may also be an outstanding concern.

Mr. Roodenberg would like to see Phase 1 proceed, with the deletion of 1.1 as the way the architect is now proposing to handle it is acceptable.

Ms. Mingay recommends approval of this good development.

Ms. Parton also agrees 1.1 should be deleted. This will be a very nice project for this area and when completed will upgrade the area immensely.

Board Discussion:

Mr. MacGregor found the architectural treatment good and said it would be a positive addition to the neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley believed that at the preliminary approval stage there was a decision to not only deal with the rights-of-way but to deal with the configuration of these buildings, not just in regard to an open space but also in regard to Renfrew Street. The Board's concern is that the further design of the site should come back as time was spent discussing how the whole site fits together but they do not want to impede the development of Phase 1. Mr. Timm said the north-south right-of-way through the site needs to be established but clarified that he did not expect the public access to be in effect while the existing building is still being used as a warehouse. He suggested an addition to condition A.2.13 to deal with the issues of preliminary approval conditions that apply to the remainder of the site but, after discussion, a new condition 2.0, with the renumbering of conditions 2.0 and 3.0, was put forward as a friendly amendment by Mr. MacGregor. It was determined that condition A.2.13 can stay as written. Mr. Scobie expressed the belief this new condition will prove to be redundant as the balance of the site will require discretionary approval and subdivision is not an option.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Timm and seconded by Mr. MacGregor:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE404308 (Phase 1) as submitted, including height relaxations for buildings 1, 2 and 3 (Phase 1) and the use of hardship clause 3.2.4 for allowing development into the 40 ft. landscape setback below grade, and the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of the first phase of a general office (but limited to information technology use) complex consisting of three new buildings along East Broadway with two-and-one-half levels of underground parking having vehicular accesses from Renfrew and Nootka Streets, and exterior alterations to the existing storage warehouse to remove the delivery area and shed, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 1, 1999 with the following amendments:

Replace 1.1

1.1 *design development of the loading at building 1 to eliminate any impact on the usable area of the north west open space;*

Add to 1.5

1.5 *design development to improve the visual quality of extensive concrete blank wall surfaces for buildings 1, 2 and 3, as well as the face of the existing warehouse, fronting the east-west access road, the northwest open space and the east frontage of building 3 along Nootka Street;*

Add a new condition 2.0, with renumbering remaining conditions as 3.0 and 4.0:

2.0 *Arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the Director of Planning, to ensure that all site design related issues and rights-of-way as outlined in the preliminary approval of November 1, 1999, are complied with for the balance of the site, including referral to the Development Permit Board of all development applications for future phases on the site.*

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Louise Christie
Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair
