

Date: Monday, December 3, 2007
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Ridge Deputy City Manager
P. Judd Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Co-Manager of Processing Centre - Development
S. Brodie Civil Engineer
R. Segal Development Planner
D. Morgan Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
P. Huber Project Facilitator

399 SMITHE STREET (898 HOMER STREET) - DE410541 - ZONE DD

S. Lyon Gomberoff Bell Lyon Architects
D. Eisenberg Gomberoff Bell Lyon Architects
R. Wittstock Amacon Developments (Homer) Corp.

1096 WEST BROADWAY - DE411434 - ZONE C-3A

N. Baldwin Nigel Baldwin Architect
A. Ozols Crean Management Inc.
J. Ross Crean Management Inc.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Toderian, seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of November 19, 2007 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend the first sentence in the paragraph on page 6 starting Ms. Nystedt to read:
Ms. Nystedt was uncomfortable with the *last minute information the Board received at the meeting regarding the boxing school and also the artist's studios not being included in the proposal. She felt the Board had not been given the whole story.*

Amend the last sentence in the third paragraph on page 7 starting Mr. Hung to read:
Mr. Hung saw issues with cars interfering with pedestrians and agreed that the parking spaces could be turned into artist's studios.

Delete the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 8 starting Mr. Timm.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 399 SMITHE STREET (898 HOMER STREET) - DE410541 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Gomberoff Bell Lyon Architects

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use retail, office, residential project involving:

- retention of an existing five-storey office building;
- retention and adaptive re-use of a three-story heritage building at 337 Smithe Street (the "Homer Building"), to contain 15 (rental) dwelling units;
- development of a new 33-storey tower containing retail, office and residential uses (218 units) and
- seven levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Referring to the context model, Mr. Segal, Development Planner, introduced the application for a proposed development at the corner of Smithe and Homer Streets. The development will include the existing five storey office building, a heritage building, The Homer, which was built in 1912, and a new residential tower with office and retail and three townhouses on Smithe Street. The Homer will be upgraded and restored with new self-contained rental suites. Mr. Segal stated that the Council guidelines have been satisfied in terms of the tower position, liveability and shadow impacts. Mr. Segal added that the applicant will be pursuing a LEED™ Silver equivalent and the project meets all City requirements and guidelines.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 7, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Segal:

- The existing office building will remain as there are no plans to redevelop the site.
- The Urban Design Panel asked the applicant to be respectful of the heritage building by designing the new building with a clean glassy approach.
- The previous expression at the first review, was not supported by the Panel as it was thought to be too aggressive and unfriendly to the Homer heritage building.
- Staff do not object to the addition of more height on the townhouse portion of the project.
- The proposal includes the addition of a green roof to the existing office building.

Applicant's Comments

Stuart Lyon, Architect, further described the proposal noting that the site has a number of unique qualities including the Homer building, a heritage building, which will be restored. The site currently has a 50,000 square foot office building that will become part of the development and an additional 23,000 square feet of office space in the new development with the ground floor of the residential tower containing retail space. Mr. Lyon described the architectural features and materials that will be used on the project. He noted that they are targeting LEED™ Silver equivalent. Mr. Lyon stated that he had no major concerns with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report but asked for clarification on Condition A.1.16 and A.1.18. He added that they are peeling back some of the old cladding on the base of the Homer to find out what the original material was on the building. Mr. Segal replied that Heritage Staff is under the impression that the base of the heritage building is concrete.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- There will be no additional shadowing on Library Square at the time of the Equinox.
- The application has included the existing office building in the commercial FSR calculations.
- There is currently no Council policy requiring the applicant to include sustainability measures in the project.
- In order to obtain LEED™ Gold, the project would need to start at the beginning with that in mind.
- The applicant is planning on adding lighting to the Homer to give an expression at night.
- The applicant thought that staff had interpreted the UDP comments correctly in the prior-to conditions.
- The applicant thought having brick on concrete was redundant and would not offer a contrast to the Homer.

Comments from other Speakers

Janet Madsen was concerned about the loss of privacy and the amount of traffic in the lane as a result of the new building. Mr. Segal noted that the placement of the tower was contingent on saving the Homer heritage building and the tower was slimmed on the north-south direction to mitigate views.

Panel Opinion

John Wall stated that the second presentation to the Urban Design Panel addressed many concerns of the Panel's from the first presentation. The main concern dealt with the overall massing and expression and the Panel was pleased with the new approach. Also the Panel had some concerns regarding the commercial base and Mr. Wall noted that those concerns had been addressed in the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. The Panel thought a brick expression would be too similar to the Homer and asked the applicant for a more distinct expression. Some of the other concerns related to the expression at the top of the tower and how the interior and exterior amenity spaces met. Mr. Wall noted that those concerns have been addressed by the applicant. Mr. Wall thought there had been an improvement in greening of the lane. Also several Panel members suggested changing the material from a concrete expression to brick as they felt it would generally help the project to have a richer sense of materiality although the brick should not be the same as the Homer. Mr. Wall added that a modern and contemporary approach to the detailing of the project would help and as he was sensitive to the cost of using brick on the building suggested increasing the detailing to improve the building.

Mr. Shearing agreed with the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He noted that design development had improved the project but he did not feel it was an inspiring piece of architecture but thought the Homer was the best part of the project. Regarding the retail, Mr. Shearing thought the architectural expression was overused in the city with the use of a very thin façade connected to the rest of the building by glass. He encouraged the applicant to do better and to look at the expression on the street. Mr. Shearing thought the lantern expression at the top of the tower was just a continuous floor to ceiling glazing and would like to have seen a different expression that identifies the top as an architectural piece.

Mr. Stovell thought the applicant had done a good job in bringing all the uses together on one site. Mr. Stovell was in support of Condition 1.1 as he thought the building should have a more glassy façade and thought the brick expression should be kept to the Homer. He added that he was sympathetic to the applicant in not wanting a brick facade. He agreed that detailing the concrete could be a way to bring more detail to the tower. Mr. Stovell noted that LEED™ Silver can be difficult to achieve in towers and since this site has two other buildings he was in support of the applicant's plans to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalent.

Ms. Maust noted that the Heritage Commission supported the application. She was in support of not carrying the brick façade onto the new tower and thought the use of concrete was adequate. She added that the applicant should stay away from anything that would mimic the Homer.

Ms. Nystedt also thought the new tower shouldn't mimic the Homer. She agreed that putting the brick on the tower was not the best choice. She thought the application was a very positive expression of heritage density transfer. Ms. Nystedt was in support of the application and the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Hung stated that he liked brick as it gave a sense of quality to buildings and didn't think having it on the tower would conflict with the heritage building and would give a sense of continuity. Mr. Hung added that it wasn't necessary to have brick on the whole building as that would be expensive and that the use of painted concrete on the upper part of the tower would be sufficient. Mr. Hung thought LEED™ Silver was adequate for the development and supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Braun recommended approval stating that he found the tower met the standards for the area. He added that he didn't find the project exciting or interesting and hoped the remaining towers in the area would be more creative. Mr. Braun thought the podium was well handled in incorporating the Homer and the office building. He also thought that brick should not be added to the façade of the tower as it was not "west coast" enough and thought a modern expression next to the heritage building was appropriate. Mr. Braun challenged the applicant to exceed the point system for LEED™ Silver.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian asked for clarity on Condition A.1.16 from staff. Mr. Toderian noted that there was no Council Policy in place requiring an applicant to certify for LEED™ Gold and understood that the applicant aspirations had always been to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalency or better. He encouraged the applicant to achieve the best sustainability achievement they could. He added that the applicant in order to certify for LEED™ Gold would need to start at the beginning of the project as it can't be added on after the design has been completed.

Regarding the commercial calculations for the project, Mr. Toderian said he had some nervousness in the way the existing commercial building was included in the commercial FSR calculations and that he would be asking staff to figure out if this was the correct approach. Mr. Toderian noted that Council took into consideration privacy issues regarding tower placement and they set the standard at 80 feet between buildings. He added that he felt the tower had been placed in the best location on the site and that the applicant and staff had done their best to mitigate private views with the floor plate design. Regarding the architecture, Mr. Toderian thought it was a shame that the design of the building wasn't more interesting. He felt the building was well resolved but not particularly different from other buildings in the area. Mr. Toderian agreed that the design development conditions were fine but that the tower lantern could be connected in a better way to the tower. He thought there was still an opportunity to do something different with the design and encouraged the applicant to have the building express itself better at night. Mr. Toderian also encouraged the applicant to think about light and colour, especially inboard colour for night viewing. He added that he believed the site was worthy of a better design and thought the design conditions would help to get it there.

Mr. Ridge stated that he was not comfortable with the addition of brick on the façade as it would be an added cost to the project. He thought that obtaining LEED™ Silver was an important consideration. Mr. Ridge agreed that more interesting buildings were needed in the future.

Mr. Judd supported approval of the application.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Toderian and seconded by Mr. Ridge, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410541, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 11, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.2 by adding *or other equally effective approach*, to read:

Note to Applicant: Strengthening the tower's vertical expression and better integrating the top "lantern" feature is recommended. The use of brick *or other*

equally effective approach for the more solid “punched window” façade elements is sought. Having the “punched window” portion of the tower (southwest tower corner) continue uninterrupted to grade (deleting southerly frame element) is recommended, to enhance overall tower expression and to increase the sidewalk setback. Integrating “green building” design elements, such as solar shading on appropriate elevations, should also be considered;

Amend Condition 1.6 by adding *parking area adjacent*, to read:
design development to “green” the *parking area adjacent* to the lane through provision of more trees and landscaping (deletion of three surface parking stalls will be required) in the area of the repositioned proposed loading bay [see 1.4(i) above];

Amend Condition 1.8 by changing LEED™ Gold to LEED™ *Silver*;

Amend Condition A.1.16 by adding *consider* at the beginning of the sentence, to read:
consider replacement of the northern-most window panel of the retail unit on Homer Street with brick, in order to better align with the solid brick wall above;

Amend Condition A.1.18 by adding *consider* at the beginning of the sentence, to read:
consider changing the painted steel window panelling below the storefront windows on Smithe Street to concrete, to match the base on Homer Street;

Delete Condition A.2.9;

Amend Condition A.2.10 to read:
provision of *three (3) Class B loading spaces and two (2) Class A loading spaces to serve both the new development and the existing office building, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, having particular regard to:*

- clear identification of the residential loading space and provision of access to it from the residential lobby; and
- provision of the required loading space throat, additional width *for the second space*, a security gate and communication device.

Note to Applicant: *See also Standard Condition A.1.3, regarding an agreement to ensure access to the loading spaces (parking and bicycle spaces) for the office building (856 Homer Street);*

Delete Condition A.2.17;

Renumber Conditions A.2.10 through A.1.17 to A.2.9 to A.1.15

**3. 1096 WEST BROADWAY - DE411434 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Nigel Baldwin Architect

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-up building, containing retail on the ground floor plus 10 storeys of residential containing 49 units, all over 3 levels of underground parking. Further, the project includes a transfer of heritage density of 3,750 sq. ft. (10 %) to this site, for a total FSR of 3.3.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the application to build a 10 storey mixed-use building at the corner of Spruce Street and West Broadway. Mr. Morgan explained the guidelines for C-3A and also described other developments in the area noting the building under construction next door. The site is relatively small and was a challenge for a building of this size. Also there is a grade difference at the lane. Mr. Morgan noted that the applicant is planning to expand the public realm on Spruce Street with room for a coffee shop on the corner. There will also be two townhouses and the main residential lobby fronting Spruce Street. Mr. Morgan added that the tower is slimmer than what the guidelines suggest with a relatively small floor plate. The tower will contain mostly corner units for good cross ventilation with the upper units having an expanded amenity space with roof top garden patios. On the east side of the tower, on the podium, will be a courtyard, and a common amenity space which will connect to an interior amenity space. Mr. Morgan noted that the project was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel and received unanimous support with some minor issues that have formed the design conditions. Mr. Morgan added that staff consider the building well resolved and will be an important addition to the street.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 7, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Morgan:

- Two of the 2nd floor units have private entry access from the shared communal space and staff are asking the applicant to add some kind of transition that will better screen the area.
- The proposal's parking exceeds the current By-law. Parking for guests and retail will be provided.
- There isn't any indication that there is a pre-existing parking problem in the area.
- The permitted maximum FSR is 3.30 which includes 2.00 Conditional FSR.
- Staff have some concern with a terraced patio space at the corner of Spruce Street and West Broadway regarding pedestrian circulation.

Applicant's Comments

Nigel Baldwin, Architect, was in general agreement with the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He stated that there still needs to be some design development to the project and he plans to enlarge the amenity spaces and give a better relationship between the library and exterior space. Mr. Baldwin was concerned with the CPTED conditions as he stated that it would not be possible to move the electrical transformer. The transformer requires an 11'x5' space and needs to be on the edge of the property. He added that he could come up

with a better private gated courtyard. Regarding Condition 1.4, Mr. Baldwin stated that he is still trying to find a solution to make for a better pedestrian circulation in the public realm on Spruce Street. He added that he wants to preserve the flat area and have the area come directly out from the retail/coffee shop. Regarding the parking, Mr. Baldwin noted that he is proposing 50 residential parking spaces plus three visitor spaces. He stated that he plans to lose the bottom floor in the garage and relocate the bike storage so that he can be more efficient with the parking.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The applicant plans to set back the four units on West Broadway to allow for more privacy. Also there is a daylighting issue with the units and staff supports the relaxation of the horizontal angle of daylight.
- There are plans to make the patio area safer on the corner of Spruce Street and West Broadway with a hand rail and one tread of the stairs off the property line. There isn't much room to move the stairs.
- The applicant said he was satisfied with Condition 1.4 in the Staff Committee Report.
- The applicant had no objection to moving the transformer and if he can put a gate in the front, he will do so.
- The applicant is interested in doing something with the waste heat from the retail.
- The façade will have a rain-screen system but the applicant hasn't designed the entire skin as yet.
- The applicant is happy to reduce the parking to 50 residential spaces plus 3 for visitors.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

John Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the application and had a certain amount of appreciation for the project. There were some concerns about the daylight access to the second floor units, some concern regarding the semi-private and private interface as well as the amenity spaces. Mr. Wall said the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report accurately reflect those concerns and he recommended support for the application.

Mr. Shearing noted that the applicant could have put an enclosed balcony on the second floor units but thought the applicant had done a good job with their design and wasn't concerned about daylight getting into the units. Mr. Shearing thought it would be onerous to have the applicant move the transformers. He congratulated the applicant for using the roof deck as private space for the top floor units and thought it was an exciting way to use the space.

Mr. Stovell agreed that it was a nice project and liked the look and feel of it. He thought the spiral stairs to the roof deck were a nice added touch. Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Stovell thought the owners of the units on the second floor would appreciate the sheltered space and thought it was a nice way to make the scale work. Mr. Stovell suggested staff work with the applicant to improve the transition around the pedestrian circulation and public realm interface on the corner of Spruce Street and West Broadway.

Ms. Maust was pleased that heritage density was being used on such a beautiful building. She particularly liked the units on the open corridor and thought they would be very popular with purchasers as she thought they would be pleased to have the open space outside their front door.

Ms. Nystedt thought the applicant had done an excellent job. Once again, she cautioned about cumulative density and the problems that might bring to the area. She added that the area is already challenged with transit along the Broadway corridor and thought higher levels of parking spaces should be maintained and should continue to be a consideration.

Mr. Hung commended the design team on their project. He particularly liked the exposed staircase to the roof decks and thought it was a beautiful feature. Mr. Hung noted that it is difficult to find parking in the area and thought the parking should be left at sixty-eight spaces.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application and commended the applicant on a great project. He thought it was more spectacular than anything else in C-3A and deserved a gold star. He added that he hoped that other developers can live up to or exceed the design.

Board Discussion

Mr. Judd stated he had some concerns regarding the pedestrian circulation and public realm interface at the corner of Spruce Street and West Broadway and urged staff to consider the issue of accessibility and disability issues. Mr. Judd also urged the applicant to reduce the parking as the Broadway corridor was well served with a bus route and that the Millenium Line would be added sometime in the future. He added that he was satisfied with the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for the general design approach and sustainability initiatives. This shows what can be done when you start with the goal to reduce the energy load of a building. Mr. Toderian added that he would be looking forward to seeing how successful the design was in this regard and thought the approach went beyond LEED™. Mr. Toderian thought the discretionary height had been earned and the relaxation for the daylighting was appropriate and supported by the Board. Mr. Toderian stated that the design was what an architect can do with a glass box to make it interesting. He added that he was pleased to see more of the spiral staircase design as it adds architectural exuberance to the building. Mr. Toderian recommended the applicant explore using heat exchange from the retail.

Mr. Ridge thought it was an interesting design and supported the amendments put forth by the Board. He added that he struggled with the parking issue. He thanked Mr. Judd for deleting some of the unnecessary conditions in the report adding that any move to simplicity is the right move.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Judd and seconded by Mr. Toderian, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411434, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 7, 2007, with the following amendments:

Delete the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.8;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.13;

Note to Applicant: *Consider screening and relocating at grade utilities or equally appropriate approach should allow a larger, more useable patio area (See also A.1.8);*

Delete Condition A.1.14;

Re-number Conditions A.1.15 through A.1.20 to A.1.14 to A.1.19

Delete Condition A.2.6;

Delete Condition A.2.9;

Re-number Conditions A.2.7 through A.1.14 to A.2.6 to A.1.12

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLellan, Chair, reminded the Advisory Panel that their term will expire on the first Monday in December 2008.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair