

Date: Monday, February 25, 2008
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
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

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 (Item 1)
M. Braun Representative of the General Public (Item 1 & 2)
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public (Item 1 & 2)
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
S. Brodie Civil Engineer
P. Cheng Development Planner
R. Segal Development Planner
M. Rondeau Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
D. Robinson Project Facilitator
R. Michaels Assistant Director - Enquiry Centre
L. LaClaire Strategic Transportation Planning Engineer

53 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE411639 - ZONE DD

G. Williamson Owner
R. Fung Sailand Developments (Paris) Ltd.

800 GRIFFITHS WAY - DE411483 - ZONE CD-1

J. Huffman Busby Perkins + Will Architects
D. Negrin Tri Power Developments

100 WEST 1ST AVENUE - DE411503 - ZONE CD-1

S. Lyon GBL Architects Group
B. Wall Wall Financial Corporation

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Timm seconded by Mr. Toderian and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on January 14, 2008 with the following amendments:

Amend Mr. Timm's comments under Board Discussion on page 11 to read:

Mr. Timm agreed that the design of the building was well done. He said he could feel for Mr. Ahmed, as this development certainly will have an impact on the liveability of his building, but unfortunately it is not a reasonable expectation that no development will happen on the adjoining lands. Mr. Timm thought that staff have done the best they can to try to accommodate an existing building on a narrow adjoining lot.

Regarding the issue of parking, Mr. Timm noted that parking needs to be provided according to the current Parking By-law, not based on speculation about future policy directions or by-law changes. He added that he couldn't foresee a time when the City would have a standard that would have a zero requirement for parking in residential buildings. Survey's that the City has undertaken to date do not indicate a significantly lower level of car ownership for rental properties than for strata properties so there is no basis for the linkage that the applicant draws between guaranteed rental tenure and parking demand. Mr. Timm also noted that the Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association (DVBIA) have voiced their concern with the current lack of parking in the Downtown South and South Granville areas and have even suggested that developments that displace existing surface lots ought to be required to replace that publicly accessible parking in addition to providing the for parking demand generated by the new development. While he does not support this proposal from the DVBIA, Mr. Timm also said that he does not believe that there is a good case for relaxing the parking standard to less than the demand generated by the development in this part of the City.

Amend the third sentence in Mr. Stovell's comments under Panel Opinion on page 10 to read:

He said that affordability in the city was becoming an increasing concern and buildings without parking might be able to achieve a higher level of affordability and encouraged the applicant to build the project as it would be a great addition to the cityscape.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 53 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE411639 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Gair Williamson

Request: The applicant is requesting an increase in the permitted floor space ratio, using a Heritage Density Transfer, to provide an additional 1,978 sq. ft. of live-work floor area in a proposed "annex" to the Paris Block, to be located at 47 West Hastings Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced the application for the proposed heritage density transfer to the Paris Annex. Mr. Cheng gave a brief description of the history of the Paris Block. In March, 2007, a Heritage Revitalization Agreement was approved by Council for the Paris Block to provide for its rehabilitation, including a Heritage Density Bonus. Part of this banked density was proposed to be transferred to 47 West Hastings Street, otherwise known as the Paris Annex.

The Development Permit Board has to approve the transfer of density for 10% of the allowable maximum density which is 0.5FSR. Staff have determined that the added .5FSR to this site is appropriately accommodated and absorbed on the site, and results in a building whose form, height and massing meets the intent of the Victory Square Guidelines.

Mr. Cheng reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Report dated February 25, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Fung agreed to the conditions in the Staff Report.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall thought it was an elegant proposal, and expressed how density could be used for an infill site.

Mr. Chung recommended approval.

Mr. Shearing recommended approval.

Mr. Stovell thought it was a supportable project, but thought the building masses could be higher.

Ms. Maust noted that the project had received full support from the Vancouver Heritage Commission and recommended approval.

Ms. Nystedt recommended approval.

Mr. Hung recommended approval.

Mr. Braun recommended approval.

Board Discussion

None.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411639, in accordance with the Staff Report dated February 25, 2008.

4. 800 GRIFFITHS WAY - DE411483 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Busby Perkins + Will Architects

Request: To develop the southwest corner of the GM Place Arena site with a 22-storey mixed-use building containing Office, Retail, Service and Cultural and Recreational uses.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, introduced the application for an addition to GM Place at the corner of Expo Boulevard and Griffiths Way along the Georgia Viaduct. The office development had been part of the original rezoning and subsequent development of GM Place. The building will have a very different architectural character and the footprint is slightly different from the original submission. In addition, the Green Building Design has been advanced and the applicant will be pursuing LEED™ Gold. Mr. Segal noted that it is a difficult site and there are a number of remaining issues that need to be resolved. The building height needs to come down to 91 metres. The building will be redesigned to have the top two levels come down and be incorporated in the 91 metres with the exuberant cap remaining. The building will have four telescoping spires that will exceed the 91 metres and will project into the view cone. Staff's recommendation is to have the issue of the spires dealt with at the Board. Generally staff suggest that such elements not project into the view cone, however there is a more serious matter that has to do with Condition 1.3. Staff suggested that the applicant remove the vehicular drop-off at the viaduct level as it creates visibility problems and pedestrian conflicts. This does imply, with the deletion of the lay-by, that the ground floor on Expo Boulevard would become the dominant front door and arrival point for the office tower and staff are suggesting an enhancement of the lobby should be pursued. Also, some investigation needs to be done for the arrival concourse. The pedestrian plaza needs some further design development and the pedestrian link needs to be reconfigured at the viaduct level. This is a timely and welcome use for the site, and is leading the way in LEED™ Gold. Staff believe that it is a very positive application.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated January 30, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Busby, Architect, said he was prepared to accept Condition 1.1 in the Staff Committee Report regarding the building height. With respect to the telescoping spires, Mr. Busby noted that they will refer to the score in a game being played in GM Place and that they are a character defining element on the building. Mr. Busby added that he would like to keep them above the view cone as he felt they would not compromise the view to the North Shore Mountains. Regarding Condition 1.4 in the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Busby stated that he was concerned with the landscape and the amount of people that will be walking through the area but he did agree to amend the landscaping to allow for softer elements. Mr. Busby was comfortable with Condition 1.5 regarding the elevated component of the sidewalk. Regarding Condition 1.6, Mr. Busby made a commitment to work with the Director of Planning to provide a right-of-way within the plaza for the future expansion of the SkyTrain Station. Mr. Busby was concerned with a possible financial penalty regarding the solar shading if the owner has to step back his property rather than allowing the shading devices to encroach over Griffiths Way.

Mr. Busby gave a Power Point presentation to show the location of the vehicle drop-off and the proposed solution to have it integrate into the viaduct. Mr. Busby stressed the importance for the building to have a West Georgia Street address rather than a Georgia Viaduct address. He proposed that the city grid be extended by one block to allow for a connection to BC Place and that traffic calming be done on the viaduct. Mr. Busby also proposed a modified version of the lay-by to allow for taxis and car drop-off. He noted that the area would include gates and barriers with no permanent parking allowed. Mr. Busby added that by decreasing the speed of the cars on the viaduct, it would be safe for a car to pull out of the lay-by onto the viaduct. Also the lay-by would be closed during game time. Mr. Busby asked the Board to direct Engineering Services to work with them to find an acceptable solution.

David Negrin noted that they had spent the last month looking at revisions for the tower with respect to the loading bay area. He added that the design of the area cannot be changed due to the number of trucks that use the space during events in the arena. He said he was prepared to work with the City to get a vehicle drop-off on the viaduct so that they could have a West Georgia Street address. Mr. Negrin also asked that the City work with them in order to meet their requirements.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The lay-by would be used on a short term basis by taxis or other cars to drop off visitors to the office tower.
- Present Council Policy is that lay-bys are actively discouraged.
- Bollards would control how far a vehicle would penetrate the area.
- A cross walk is proposed across the viaduct which could help to slow traffic down.
- Signs would be posted indicating that there will be no stopping or parking during game time. The owners would be responsible for managing the signs.
- There are approximately 45-50 events each year at GM Place.
- Having a West Georgia Street address is very important for a Triple A office building. Also the lobby entrance on Griffiths Way is beside the loading bay and will not be a pleasant environment or very welcoming to visitors to the office tower. There are approximately 20-25 trailers coming and going in the loading bays on game days.
- The applicant has done shadow studies for the tower but has not done any wind studies.

- The City Engineer needs to be satisfied that the safety issues have been resolved with respect to the lay-by.
- The Addressing Department makes the decision for the address on any new developments.
- The applicant has aspirations to go beyond LEED™ Gold for the tower, and is expecting to receive a two million dollar grant from the Federal Government. They are planning to have the building achieve a carbon neutral rating.
- The building will not contain any residential use.
- The building has a different envelope technology using a curtain wall with well finished edges and an expression of the steel structure at grade and a well finished top.
- The solar shading occurs where it should be on the south side of the building.
- The existing billboard on GM Place will be expanded and will have a Times Square type approach.
- The applicant is proposing a translucent screen at the Griffith's Way entrance to conceal the loading bays and will also be adding a public art component in the area.
- The spires would penetrate the view cone when fully extended and would be lit to indicate the score for the hockey game. Staff are asking the Board to consider the spires rather than leaving it to the rezoning application.
- The spires would be intruding into the view cone around 100 hours a year.
- The preference is to have the spires remain lit at night.
- The cast off heat from the office tower will be pumped into the arena to heat it. Also making ice releases heat and the waste heat that comes off the ice will heat the office tower at night. The waste heat will be used to melt the ice in the arena. The applicant is proposing that the office tower will be an emissions neutral building.
- The general rule is that any portion of a building that encroaches over City property would need to have an agreement.
- The applicant is prepared to work with VANOC and the City regarding construction during the time of the Olympics. The applicant has already had some preliminary discussions with VANOC.
- The City is asking for a right-of-way for the overhead connection to the new SkyTrain station. It is not a pediment on the property and there are no financial obligations to the developer/owner. Mr. Negrin agreed that it was not a problem for them to grant the request.

Lon LaClaire, Strategic Transportation Planning Engineer, stated that one of staff's concerns is the lay-by adjacent to the stadium off the viaduct. There are usually crush crowds of people coming out of the arena after an event and there need to be controls in place so that people don't flood onto the street when exiting the arena. There would need to be some significant barriers to stop them from jumping onto the viaduct roadway. Mr. LaClaire noted that with the proposed design there is no way for a car exiting the lay-by to view oncoming traffic and judge gaps in the traffic flow because of the curvature of the road in this location. In response to questions about the existing viaduct design in this location, Mr. LaClaire noted that the viaduct gets narrower at this location and the sidewalk on the west side, across from the proposed lay-by and crosswalk, is only about one meter in width. Although a crosswalk could be installed, this location isn't a desired pedestrian route at this time. Also, vehicle barriers required to keep the event crowds from the road, may hinder functionality of the pedestrian crosswalk.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stated that the Urban Design Panel completely supported the project both in terms of its sustainable aspiration and for the construction of another Triple A office building in Vancouver. Mr. Wall said he would encourage the Board to support the project. He noted that the Panel did have some concerns with the layout of the plaza. They thought it would be a hard area to landscape and asked the applicant to consider more measures to celebrate the space. Mr. Wall added that he was glad to see that the applicant was taking that advice under consideration. Mr. Wall thought it was important for the building to have a West Georgia address. Mr. Wall sympathised with Engineering Services' concerns regarding the lay-by and that there needs to be further study to find a solution. Mr. Wall said he supported the applicant's goal to pedestrianize the public realm. He thought the viaduct will change over the next ten to twenty years and hoped the viaduct would come down to grade to encourage more pedestrian movement down to the water. Mr. Wall supported the unique quality of the building form with its high level of detail. He thought the massing and floor plate size would make for a distinctive building in the city's skyline and that the power of the building was its simplicity. Mr. Wall acknowledged Mr. Busby and his firm for proposing honest architecture. He thought the massing and its expression would offer a counterpoint to what is already in the city. Mr. Wall did not think the spires would impact the view cone and thought it was fitting to have the spires celebrating sporting events in the arena. He added that the UDP thought they were an artful addition to the building.

Mr. Chung thought the telescoping spires were an excellent idea and that the condition should not be deleted. He added that since the hockey season is in the winter and the games generally take place at night, that the spires wouldn't impact the view cone. Regarding the vehicle drop-off, Mr. Chung did not see a solution and thought there needed to be more discussion on the matter between Engineering Services and the applicant. He did not recommend deletion of the condition. Mr. Chung thought it was an excellent idea to soften the landscaping and to add trees to the plaza. He also encouraged the applicant to install television screens on the building at the plaza level for passer-bys to enjoy the events in the arena. Mr. Chung thought the design of the building was very different and recommended approval for the project.

Mr. Shearing congratulated the applicant for a great project. He thought it was a complex building but would really stand out as an excellent piece of architecture in the city and looked forward to its completion. Mr. Shearing thought there was a real opportunity for public art in the plaza to humanize the space. He noted that across the street, Costco had gone a long way to improve the streetscape. He suggested the applicant add more detailing to the translucent wall in the loading bay area. He also thought the spires would be a great addition to the building and would add a great deal of value to the skyline. He added that he didn't see a problem with them protruding into the view cone at night or in the winter. Mr. Shearing thought the applicant's point of view regarding the viaduct as an extension of the city's grid was a compelling argument. He added that he thought there was an opportunity for the viaduct to be redeveloped over time and that the public space along the viaduct would be a huge public benefit. Mr. Shearing didn't think the plaza would work without a drop-off area and thought there was a way to make it work. Mr. Shearing added that he fully supported the project.

Ms. Maust agreed that it would be an iconic building in the city. She also agreed that the vehicle drop-off was necessary but added that the viaduct makes it difficult for the building to work. She added that she would like to see the traffic calmed along the viaduct. Mr. Maust said that as a hockey fan she would like to see the telescoping spires on the top of the building.

Ms. Nystedt enthusiastically recommended approval for the project. She agreed that there wouldn't be a problem with the spires intruding into the view cone. Ms. Nystedt thought a solution needed to be found regarding the vehicle drop-off and was sensitive to having traffic calming on the viaduct. She hoped that Engineering Services was willing to explore options. Ms. Nystedt congratulated the applicant on a great job.

Mr. Hung congratulated the applicant on a beautiful design. He said he liked the idea of the spires and didn't have any issue with them protruding into the view cone. Mr. Hung agreed with staff that it would be really difficult to calm the crowd after a game and that their safety needed to be taken into consideration regarding the plaza area. He hoped they could incorporate the lay-by and that a solution could be worked out between the City and the applicant. Mr. Hung added that he was in support of the project.

Mr. Braun recommended approval. He thanked the applicant for the level of detail in their presentation package. Mr. Braun thought that the Expo Boulevard façade needed a lot of attention to detail so that it did not become a boring space. He noted that Costco had improved the Boulevard but more could be done. Mr. Braun would like to see something special for the plaza as it will become a very public space. He also thought the spires were an integral part of the project. Mr. Braun thought it was a fabulous project and would like to see more of the same come to the Board.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian commended Mr. Aquilini for hiring Mr. Busby as he was extremely pleased to see plans for the greenest office building in Vancouver. He added that it was an unusual opportunity to get a Triple A office building. Mr. Toderian stated that the development shouldn't be dependant on the lay-by. The City wants the project to succeed as an office project and he added that he supported Condition 1.1 in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Toderian thought the City will have to find a way for the development to have a West Georgia Street address. Mr. Toderian thought the telescoping spires were a great idea and that they were a fun addition to the city's skyline. He added that normally he is the staunchest defender of view cones, but he felt that the spires didn't interfere with the spirit of Council Policy in that they don't block views, and only telescope at night. The policy is mostly about blocking views of the North Shore Mountains. Mr. Toderian felt they would not block the view during the day and would definitely not at night. Mr. Toderian said he agreed with Mr. Timm regarding the vehicular concerns for the lay-by and that the applicant was going to have to be very clever in order to make the design work. Mr. Toderian suggested the applicant integrate public art on the Expo Boulevard streetwall to animate the area. Mr. Toderian thought it was appropriate to make the solar shading work as part of the passive design in the building, and that the encroachment agreement was necessary but should not be an impediment. He said that it would be a beautiful building with unique elements that will be perceived from afar.

Mr. Ridge thanked Mr. Timm for his amendments to Condition 1.3 in the Staff Committee Report. He thought it was important to find a solution for the lay-by issue and hoped that the City could provide the applicant with a West Georgia Street address. Mr. Ridge stated that the spires would intrude into the view corridor approximately 2% of the year and thought there should be some flexibility in allowing the spires on the top of the building. He thanked the applicant for designing a LEED™ Gold building and that it would be an exceptionally attractive building in the city skyline.

Mr. Timm liked the overall design of the building and particularly the angled steel shown in the top couple of the floors and at the bottom of the tower. Also, he thought the flat top would be a great addition to the building and would also characterize the building. Mr. Timm had some concerns how the block on Expo Boulevard was getting more similar to the tunnel. It is getting more enclosed and it becomes a really challenging place to animate and to make more interesting for pedestrians. He added that it is important that the section isn't made any worse. With the opening of the Canada Line, it becomes even more important to make the street pedestrian friendly. With regard to the lay-by, Mr. Timm stated that a solution needs to be found, but felt it was not a forgone conclusion that it could be resolved to every one's satisfaction. He added that he was hopeful that a solution can be found. Regarding the spires, Mr. Timm noted that hockey is Canada's heritage and some recognition that this is the home of the Canucks was appropriate. Mr. Timm added that it was a good development and a great addition to the downtown.

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. DE411483, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 30, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.2 to read:

further consideration of the height, operation, timing and number of spires;

Amend Condition 1.3 to read:

design development of the Georgia Street vehicle lay-by, satisfactory to the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Note to Applicant: There are pedestrian and vehicle traffic safety concerns with the lay-by. If these concerns can not be addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, it may be necessary to delete the lay-by. If the lay-by is ultimately permitted, all design efforts shall be taken to integrate the lay-by fully into an exceptional and animated plaza design;

Add a new Condition 1.7:

design development to improve the Expo Boulevard building edge and public realm treatment.

Note to Applicant: Integration of public art and/or interactive technology may provide greater light, pedestrian interest and activity;

Amend Condition A.1.3 by adding to the condition the following words and a Note to Applicant to read:

submit a Construction Management Plan that clarifies how pedestrian and vehicle accesses to GM Place will be maintained during the construction period for this proposed building including complete removal of any materials, hoardings or other temporary obstructions from road allowances, pedestrian rights-of-way, and from the viaduct structures to allow clear access as required for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Note to Applicant: Use of street and pedestrian space around the construction site will require separate street use and/or street occupancy permits. No such permits will be granted that interfere with the street use requirements of the Games;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.3 to read:

Note to Applicant: It appears that the solar shading devices encroach over Griffiths Way. If suitable rational is provided, the devices may be acceptable and an encroachment application is required; and

Amend Condition B.2.5 to read:

This site has been identified as being within an area that may require special considerations during the upcoming 2010 Winter Games. This may include disruptions to construction activities and limitations on street access, during the period of February 5, 2010 to March 1, 2010. Use of street and pedestrian space around the construction site will require separate street use and/or street occupancy permits. No such permits will be granted that interfere with the street use requirements of the Games.

5. 100 WEST 1ST AVENUE - DE411503 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: GBL Architects Group

Request: To construct a mixed-use building including 399 dwelling units, retail and a cultural amenity space (260 seat theatre and associated theatre production space) with 4 towers all over 3 levels of underground parking at the above-noted address.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, introduced the application for a development on the private lands in SEFC just south of the Olympic Village site. The proposal is predominately residential with commercial at grade on Manitoba Avenue. The development will also be home to the Playhouse Theatre Production Centre and will contain a 250 seat theatre, production facilities and rooms for props and design. The street façade will be active and engaging on the street with a well treated lane. There is to be a public access walkway through the site leading down to False Creek. A pedestrian signal will be provided on West 1st Avenue. Ms. Rondeau described some of the changes to the plan since the rezoning noting and adjustment in the massing. Ms. Rondeau added that there is a requirement for public art in SEFC and the applicant will be integrating art into the central walkway area.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated January 30, 2008. 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 Ms. Rondeau:

- The pedestrian right-of-way would be maintained by the strata.
- The application received unanimous support from the Urban Design Panel as they felt the building design was an adequate response to the character of SEFC.
- Staff are looking for the conditions to advance the level of detail on the project.

Applicant's Comments

Stuart Lyon, Architect, further described the project and noted that the Playhouse Theatre Production Centre will become an integral part of the community and animate the street. The best part of the new theatre will be its lobby, located at the centre of the project and across the street from a new park. Mr. Lyon noted that there are serious height limitations on the site and the towers need to maintain an 80 foot clearance between them. The floor plans will generate a different façade on the buildings. The project was designed as a family of buildings with each of the four buildings having some distinct differences. Mr. Lyon stated that he was confident that they can work with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The colour on the project does not intend to mimic the colour of the Salt Building.
- The applicant has developed a different colour scheme for each building.
- The applicant is planning to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalent.
- The project will be tied into the NEU and they will be roughing in the system for energy reporting within the suites.
- Regarding solar shading, the applicant has designed extensive balconies that were exempt from the balcony calculations and will be using roll down blinds.
- The project will meet the 50% green roof as requested for SEFC.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stated that the Urban Design Panel (UDP) supported the project but had two major concerns. One concern was the passive design response to the south and west facades. The second concern was the overall tower design and the Panel asked the applicant to improve the overall architectural expression and increase the relative distinctiveness of the four towers. The Panel also wanted to see the applicant increase the environmental responsiveness of the project and improve the architectural expression relative to the neighbourhood and the emerging character in SEFC. The Panel also thought the project was too uniform and monotonous and could be more distinctive. They thought the building needed more depth and layers in the façade treatment. The Panel agreed that the overall aspirations of the project were laudable, but that when it came down to the detail expression, it seemed to lack the quality of other buildings in SEFC. Also, the project doesn't have the same visible habitation that are seen in other projects in SEFC where there are expressed balconies, roof top gardens and large areas of public amenity space that are highly visible as well as animated tower tops and either accessible roofs or distinctive penthouse treatments. It's a project that over all works well, but when it comes to the detail composition it seems to be less satisfying than other projects.

Neighbouring projects have been forwarded with a richer palette of materials and design forms and compositional strategies that create a bit more of an ad hoc quality to the overall neighbourhood experience. This is something that relates well to the industry past of SEFC. It seems to be an emerging trend that the projects that have a better response from the Panel are ones that pick up this history and heritage of the site. Mr. Wall encouraged the applicants to consider how the four towers will work together. He noted that the applicant had said that the four towers were to be considered a family of building and should relate to each other. Mr. Wall questioned that hypothesis and suggested that perhaps the four towers need to be more distinctive. Being that it is a very large block with big buildings, Mr. Wall thought the project might be more successful if they were broken down into more readable architectural forms. For example, the two storey upper floor treatments between the two middle buildings are very much the same. There's not really an expression of openness or expansiveness with open terraces that are often seen in buildings in the SEFC neighbourhood. Mr. Wall added that it's that engagement between interior and exterior spaces that really make the projects seem unique in the City of Vancouver. Another example is the south elevation. The four towers have a very similar strategy of concrete up stand, concrete eyebrow and then either one or two vertical concrete elements and there is really just a change in colour. These four elevations are really similar. Mr. Wall thought a careful analysis needed to be done and since the two end

towers have very different unit types the applicant may want to express the unit types on the outside of the tower. Also, let those two end towers read as book ends to the site and have a bit more variation on the two middle towers so that it doesn't seem too conceived or too monotonous. These issues are mostly formal issues and can be resolved. Mr. Wall said he looked forward to seeing how the project evolved and moved forward to a higher level of excellence as he thought there was potential in the project. Mr. Wall added that he thought the ground plain was very well considered. The lower floors are well done as is the meeting of townhouse to street with the one exception being the retail frontage on Manitoba Avenue. This needs the same kind of attention that was applied to the Playhouse Theatre Production Centre in terms of detail and architectural expression.

Mr. Chung thought the project was well conceived and liked the different heights of all four towers as they add to the diversity. Mr. Chung encouraged the applicant to add colour to any grey concrete in the project. Mr. Chung also thought it was the right form of development and the elevations were well thought out. Mr. Chung recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Shearing noted that the project will provide a benefit in terms of the Playhouse Theatre Production Centre and will be an asset for the neighbourhood. He added that he thought it will be a wonderful addition to SEFC. Mr. Shearing thought that the issues with the architecture were captured in the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Ms. Maust cautioned the applicant to stay away from the red or pink colour of the Salt Building. She wondered if the applicant had been encouraged by City staff to design a rectangular building form and the applicant agreed Planning staff were desirous of a very rectangular form on the site.

Mr. Hung commended the applicant on the sustainable measures and energy conservation in the project. He particularly liked the meters that will check on energy consumption in the suites and thought pursuing LEED™ Silver and attaching the project to the NEU was a great idea. He also liked that the Playhouse Theatre Production Centre was part of the complex. Mr. Hung recommended approval.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant and their architect for the appropriate approach to "urbanism" on the project. The public benefit in this context and basic relationships of good planning and urbanism are commendable. The form and massing works, the urban relationships are strong and will contribute to the overall urbanistic pattern of SEFC in the way the Policy calls for and expects. Mr. Toderian's concerns were not with the urbanism, but rather were with the architecture. He said he struggled with whether or not he was going to support the application because he felt there was an opportunity, within this project to get architectural variety and avoid a sense of monotony. He said that he knew the architect was capable of doing expressive architecture in these forms because he had been complimentary of his works in the Olympic Village in SEFC. Mr. Toderian added that the project didn't read as organic growth but reads as a large master plan project where the towers are part of the same project. Mr. Toderian stated that he had to decide if the conditions addressed his concern adequately and added that he will trust staff and the applicant to continue to work on the issues in the context of the conditions rather than not supporting the application.

After some discussion with the Board, it was decided that the following would be used as Mr. Toderian's comments rather than amending Condition 1.1. Mr. Toderian noted that there needed to be significant design development to the detailed architectural resolution of the buildings. He suggested further creative design thinking will be necessary to address the issues. Investigations should include greater variances to the appearance between the towers, and general improved expressiveness and creativity of tower design, through among other things the level of detailing embedded in the building materials and to include colour, spandrel panels, passive approach to shading, glazing systems, handrails, concrete detailing and expression of the angles of the east and west towers. Improve the response to the solar orientation on the west façade of the westerly Tower 1, and the south façade of the two centre towers, which would also contribute to creating variation between the towers. A more distinctive reference to SEFC in the details and materials to include such features as screens, handrails particularly to the lower townhouse and podium levels of the buildings; greater attention to green design opportunities as they relate to architectural expressiveness; greater variety of building tops, windows to solid wall relationships, unit type variety as expressed in the exterior design, etc.

Mr. Timm thought that going so far as to put out a new direction in terms of architectural expression was putting the Board in the shoes of the UDP to a certain extent. He said that he normally would look to the Panel for their review and commentary. He added that if the project was seen as deficient then maybe it should go back to the UDP for a further review. He said he was struggling and didn't know if he wanted to support such an extensive change to the conditions. Mr. Timm said he had some commentary on the monotony that is being seen in SEFC generally but which he attributed to the overall development plan which created a more lower form, larger townhouse building with tighter streets. Mr. Timm suggested that Mr. Toderian's comments be considered as direction rather than changing the condition.

Mr. Ridge said he shared similar concerns about the amendment because it anticipates substantial redesign. He added that the UDP did support it unanimously, all be it with some reservation. Mr. Ridge noted that there has been a number of exciting, bold and some of them quite jaw dropping projects that have come to the Board and some that have returned substantial energy commitments to the City. So when the Board gets a project that is adequate, barely meets the threshold, it is disappointing. The alternative is to acknowledge the fact that it is adequate and it can get somewhat above adequate with Condition 1.1 as written as he is confident that staff will work with the applicant to make the necessary changes.

The Board agreed to send the application back to the UDP for their review to provide advice to the Director of Planning on the above, prior to design approval and permit issuance. Mr. Wall noted that several projects in the Olympic Village in SEFC came back for a design update and it would not be unusual if this application also came back to the UDP for their review.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411503 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 30, 2008, with the following amendments:

Delete the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1;

Amend Condition 1.5 by the addition of the following at the end of the Note to Applicant:

opportunities to integrate art into the architecture expression of the buildings should be fully investigated;

Add Condition 1.7 to read:

strongly encourage the pursuit of LEED™ aspects relating to energy, water and storm water;

Delete Condition A.2.19; and

Re-number A.2.20 to A.2.28 to *A.2.19 to A.2.27.*

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair