

Date: Monday, January 15, 2007  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
B. Toderian Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions  
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
H. Hung Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor  
A. Molaro Development Planner (Item 1.)  
D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office (Item 1.)  
S. Hein Senior Urban Designer (Item 2.)  
T. Osdoba Manager, Sustainability Group (Item 2.)  
J. Greer Project Facilitator (Item 2.)  
D. Robinson Project Facilitator (Item 2.)  
D. Ramslie Central Area Planning, Major Development Group (Item 2.)  
V. Morris Social Planner (Item 2.)  
R. Whitlock Senior Housing Officer (Item 2.)  
L. Beaulieu Landscape Development Specialist (Item 2.)  
K. Hiebert Central Area Planning, Major Development Group (Item 2.)  
I. Smith Manager Development, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office (Item 2.)  
K. Robinson Project Planner, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office (Item 2.)  
J. Andrews Project Manager, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office (Item 2.)  
M. Naylor SEFC Planner, Major Development Group (Item 2.)  
K. Bayne Director of Financial Planning & Treasury (Item 2.)  
C. Warren Co-Director of Development Services (Item 2.)

**VANCOUVER CITY CENTRE - 702 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE410872 - ZONE CD-1**

C. McCarthy InTransitBC, SNC-LAVALIN Inc.  
A. Parker InTransitBC, SNC-LAVALIN Inc.  
E. LeFlufy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)  
J. Bird Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)  
G. McGarva VIA Architecture

**199 WEST 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE - PARCEL 2 (SEFC) - DE410840 - ZONE CD-1**

S. Lyon GBL Architects Group Inc.  
R. Bayley Merrick Architecture  
H. Jasper Millenium SEFC Properties Ltd.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. The Chair introduced new Advisory Panel members recently appointed by Council: Sorin Tatomir, representing the design professions; Jon Stovell, representing the development industry; and Herbert Hung, representing the general public. Michael Braun, also representing the general public, was reappointed for a second term representing youth.
2. **VANCOUVER CITY CENTRE - 702 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE410872 - ZONE CD-1 (FOR ADVICE)**  
  
Applicant: InTransitBC, SNC-LAVALIN Inc.  
  
Request: To construct a rapid transit station with an at grade entry and below grade platforms and guideway.

#### **Applicant's Opening Comments**

Jane Bird, CEO, Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO), gave an overview on the nature of the design process as it relates to Canada Line, the City and the stations. Canada Line is a subsidiary of TransLink and is responsible for implementing the line. CLCO contracts with InTransitBC who are responsible for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the line over a 35 year period. The line is 19 kilometres long with sixteen stations, nine of which will be located in Vancouver. Ms. Bird thanked City staff for their hard work and cooperation on the eve of achieving a great functional design for the stations.

Edward LeFlufy, Architect, Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO), spoke on the functionality of the station before the Board today as well as the commercial context and gave an update on the going negotiations with Cadillac Fairview.

#### **Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the Vancouver City Centre Station located on West Georgia Street. Ms. Molaro gave some context on the existing plaza and the below grade connections. Located at the corner of Georgia Street and Granville Street the station entry house is an opportunity to make an important and significant architectural statement for the Canada Line. She noted that Granville Street is going to be enhanced further with the Granville Redesign Project. The station is utilizing the same palette of materials, frameless glazing, cantilevered roof structure and wood soffit used on many of the station designs. Ms. Molaro stated that there is a challenge to design the station entry such that it may be integrated in the future retail development of the plaza. While there is this temporary aspect to the station design the station may remain as a stand alone structure for some time. Pacific Centre through the rezoning currently pending has the ability to infill the plaza. Cadillac Fairview, the owners of Pacific Centre, is looking for a retail tenant for the infill of the plaza and to date has been unsuccessful in finding a tenant.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated January 3, 2007 and advised they reflect the ongoing discussion between City staff and CLCO. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor inquired about Condition 1.5 and how far away the connection will be from the Sears' entrance. Ms. Molaro replied that it would be half a block and will have a knock-out panel for a future connection to serve pedestrians coming from Robson Street.

Mr. Timm asked if there was any consideration given to combining the exit stairway at the south end of the station with the existing exit stairway from the Pacific Centre Mall. Ms. Molaro replied that there were some discussions but believed there were some building code issues and would let the applicant answer the question.

Ms. Nystedt inquired as to the differences between the Vancouver City Centre location and the Oakridge Station regarding future incorporation into the adjacent development. Ms. Molaro stated that both station houses are similar with regards to the potential for being incorporated into future retail development.

Mr. Braun inquired why there are more ventilation grates on one side of Granville Street than the other. Ms. Molaro replied that she would let the applicant answer the question.

Mr. Scobie asked if the wording in Condition A.1.7 was standard and Ms. Molaro replied that it was standard wording. Mr. Scobie inquired if another development application would take care of future revisions adjacent to the station for alterations to Pacific Centre and the station regarding future connections. Mr. Thomson, City Surveyor, assured him that would be the case. Mr. Scobie noted that a minor rewording was required in Condition B.1.2 with the removal of the word "if".

Mr. Toderian asked if public art would be integrated into the plaza. Ms. Molaro replied that InTransitBC had hired a public art consultant and would defer to the applicant to add their comments.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification on Condition A.2.1. Ms. Molaro replied that she was unsure of the size and the applicant needed to answer the question. Mr. MacGregor also sought clarification on Condition A.2.5. Mr. Thomson stated the condition was included to insure that the City knows that CLCO has rights to the area and that the public have access across the plaza.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Graham McGarva, VIA Architecture, gave further context on the design of the station noting accomplishments to date. The layout of this Canada Line station is at a crossroads location and although the head house may be temporary, in terms of architectural language and design context, the station has been designed for the long term.

Responding to the recommendations in the report, Alan Parker, InTransitBC, noted that with respect to Condition 1.6, the exit stairs were located as far north as they can go without reconfiguring the ancillary spaces in the station below. Mr. Parker noted that there may be a future opportunity to relocate the stairs when the plaza is redeveloped. In addressing items on Page 16 under Processing Centre-Building, Mr. Parker noted that there are four issues (items with asterisks) that may not comply with literal requirements of the Vancouver Building By-law. He added that there are ongoing discussions between the City, CLCO and Cadillac Fairview as to the design and existing code strategy for the impacted area. They are expecting a tri-party agreement that will address all the issues and are confident that all the matters can be resolved.

Regarding the ventilation vents on Granville Street, Mr. Parker noted that the layout of the concourse level dictated the location of the vents.

Regarding the elevator, Chris McCarthy, InTransitBC, noted that the elevator is a passenger elevator and sized for a gurney, being of sufficient size to accommodate two bicycles and riders.

Regarding public art, Mr. McCarthy stated that InTransitBC is developing an art program and will release the details at a future date.

Mr. McCarthy addressed the issue of providing parking at grade for the bicycles adding that such parking will not be provided as noted on page 12, paragraph four.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked Ms. Bird's team and the City staff for the workshop held at the beginning of January and felt it was most helpful.

Mr. Toderian asked if it was the applicant's intention to incorporate public art on a station to station basis. Mr. McCarthy replied that it will be in strategic locations. There will be a review in the next few weeks to discuss the location of the public art.

Mr. Toderian asked if the applicant had looked at approaches to the public realm. Mr. McCarthy replied that they are willing to look at what opportunities are available to enhance the public realm including the design of the vents.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to the applicant's intentions around sustainable practices and if there was any new information in terms of approaches. Mr. McCarthy replied that they had not developed any further approaches than what was shared at the previous meeting.

Mr. Timm was concerned about the down escalator noting that it only goes half-way down and asked if would be extended from the platform to the concourse level. Mr. McCarthy replied that it should have been indicated on the drawings as a future escalator. They do not anticipate the need for the extension until later as ridership increases.

Ms. Nystedt noted that in an aging population more priority should be given to the escalators. Regarding the knock-out Panels, Ms. Nystedt inquired as to whether the connection would be completed for the opening of the line. Mr. McCarthy replied that it was a matter of getting commercial agreements in place and they were working on having the agreements resolved before the line was opened.

Mr. Braun asked why there was not an accompanying staircase for each elevator. Mr. McCarthy replied that the purpose of the elevator is to extend operating hours when the parkade access is otherwise closed and there are already stairs provided in the parkade. Ms. Molaro added that at rezoning it was discovered that another opportunity existed to provide for a fully accessible station.

Ms. Long asked if public washrooms had been considered. Mr. Parker replied that there will be public accessible washrooms at the concourse level. He added that there are no door signs that identify the washrooms and the public would need to find an attendant to unlock the door.

Mr. Chung asked what impact on the plaza the station house would have in terms of shadowing, visibility, sunlight, etc. Ms. Molaro replied that the plaza is already overshadowed by surrounding buildings so the station house does not have any additional impact.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the overbuild scenario and if the station house structure would make it easier or more difficult to construct future redevelopment. Mr. McGarva stated that they would be guessing as to what the redevelopment would be but they would be using the same lines of structure for any overbuild and would have to find its way onto the same column grid or substitute additional beams.

Mr. Scobie asked about Condition A.2.4 regarding the wheel ramps for bicycles and if CLCO's position was the same as in the past and Mr. Parker replied that it was.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Ms. Long supported the conditions as set out in the report. She noted that the Urban Design Panel was supportive of the location of the station house and its potential integration into the redevelopment of the plaza. She felt the success of the station house will be in the architectural detailing. She suggested that the concrete elements or corner treatments could be looked at differently using materials other than concrete. She noted that the surrounding buildings do not offer a lot of architectural expression and feel cold. Ms. Long added that she would like to see more expression of sustainability besides the fact that it is a transit station noting there are some opportunities within the roof forms. Regarding Condition 1.6 and the emergency exit stairs, Ms. Long stated that the detailing of this area was important as it will be part of the public realm. Ms. Long added the public realm needs to be celebrated and suggested that the vents could be used as a public art opportunity and could vary from station to station, making for a memorial to the line.

Mr. Tatomir commended the applicant and City staff on their presentation. He noted that visibility, easy access and signage are important to the station. He felt that public art could be kept to a minimum as people would be in a hurry and would not stop to enjoy the art. He said he would rather support small vendors to animate the station. He suggested that the concrete element on the head house could be translucent concrete and together with a lighting system would make for an interesting feature. He added that he would support the conditions.

Mr. Stovell said he would support all the conditions particular Conditions 1.1 and 1.3. He questioned the location of the station entry, suggesting it would seriously compromise viable retailing in an overbuild scenario. He thought the fin wall could be more interesting and less obstructive. He added that he supported the conditions that would improve the architectural expression of the station.

Ms. Nystedt commended everyone and said she was encouraged to hear about the recent workshop between City staff and CLCO. She liked seeing the design principles being considered for the station design, especially the sustainability principles. The escalator will become increasingly important for the ridership for an aging population who will require assistance when moving through the station. She hoped the knock-out panel situation could be resolved in time for the opening of the line. She added that she was in support of the project and supported the conditions.

Mr. Chung said he was in support of the project and the conditions. He felt it was the best station design he had seen thus far. He added that he would like to see the exit stairs moved off the corner of Robson Street and Granville Street as it is a high retail corner.

Mr. Hung said he was in support of the project. He agreed that there should be an up and down escalator to the concourse level. He would like to see consideration given for a connection to the bus system with provision for a bus pick up and drop off area.

Mr. Braun said that it was important that we get the best architectural expression for the station. He thought the design was elegant but somewhat underwhelming considering the location. He agreed that the exit stairs should be integrated into the existing stairway in the Sears building so as not to be an impediment to the sidewalk. He recommended the Board also consider an exit stair adjoining the elevator.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian said he realized that the design is a work in progress and thought the workshop was beneficial in helping move all stations forward.

Mr. Toderian noted that there are ongoing discussions occurring between the applicant team and City Staff, around realistic but compelling and substantive design adjustments for a number of planned stations, including this one. This station is highly prominent within the public realm, and thus is particularly important. The spirit of discussions thus far lend confidence that the design can continue to evolve to achieve a signature station with compelling architecture with characteristics of lightness and transparency, that is worthy of its important context. The applicant has shown a willingness to work collaboratively on this design evolution reflecting the Board and Staffs' advice, and it is for this reason, rather than the nature/status of the design before the Board today, that he provided his support and vote. He encouraged both the applicant and Staff to continue the design evolution with an open mind to achieving a meaningful and beautiful addition to the City's civic architecture and public realm. Mr. Toderian moved approval, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Timm supported Mr. Toderian's amendments to the conditions and suggested an amendment to Condition 1.6 to provide another option for adding the stairway by adding "*or to integrate it into the Pacific Centre*" as another alternative to relocating the stairs elsewhere along the sidewalk. Mr. Timm would encourage the applicant to consider building the extra escalator adding that it is not unreasonable for the applicant to add the elevator at this time.

Mr. MacGregor suggested amending Condition 1.5 by deleting the first line and Mr. Toderian concurred. He stated that there are all kinds of issues and it is not an easy process. He commended everyone for all their work. He noted that there could be viable retail to enhance the station entry. He added that he was glad that the workshop took place and was productive. In terms of the station entrance, he stated that he thought Condition 1.1 was sufficient and would like to see the money spent on the access to the station. He supported the motion and asked the applicant to look seriously at Condition 1.1 to ensure the improvement of the design.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE410872, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 3, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.5 to read:

*provision for a knock-out panel at the south end on the station concourse level to allow for a future additional entry access into the station;*

Amend Condition 1.6 Note to Applicant to read:

Note to Applicant: This exit stair should be located north of the west side sidewalk vents (approx. midblock along the blank portion of the Sears façade) and sited within 0.6 m of the curb to maximize the principal pedestrian walking area along Granville Street *or integrated it into Pacific Centre*. The exit stair should be designed so that it can be rerouted into the adjacent development at a future date;

Add Condition 1.9:

*applicant to consider all opportunities to integrate sustainable approaches into the station design;*

Delete "*if*" in Condition B.1.2.

4. **199 WEST 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE - PARCEL 2 (SEFC) - DE410840 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)**

Applicant: GBL Architects Group Inc.

Request: To construct a 13 storey (129 units) market multiple dwelling building and a 5 storey (84 units) non-market multiple dwelling building over two levels of secured underground parking. The two buildings are separated by a pedestrian mews.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application which is the first for South East False Creek. The Board convened around the model where Mr. Hein presented an overview of the development. Mr. Hein noted that as part of the special process, Staff will be showing the Urban Design Panel the results of their advice at the next Urban Design Panel meeting. There is a Council-approved public realm plan which binds all the sites together and brings quality to South East False Creek. Mr. Hein stated that there are no significant issues with the application, as discussed in the report, but refinements to the intent of the Urban Design Panel. The model had not been updated regarding the Urban Design Panel's comments but was reflected in the information provided to the Board in the report. Mr. Hein noted that Condition 1.1 seeks to further clarify the building envelope design intent to make sure the building systems are well handled. Condition 1.3 reaffirms what is typically done around ground-oriented housing in terms of the grade separation. He noted that it is challenging because of the minimal setbacks and is important for modelling future development throughout the city. Mr. Hein added that the balance of the conditions speak mostly to items that require further details.

Thomas Osdoba, Manager, Sustainability Group, discussed the overall sustainable practices planned for the development. He noted that a lot of innovative strategies have been planned for South East False Creek. The goal is to make SEFC a sustainable community with regards to energy, water, urban agriculture and infrastructure. Mr. Osdoba noted that there are a number of new practices being tried within the development to be a model for 2010 which means looking at leading edge options. He noted that there has been considerable advancement in terms of sustainable development and every year brings more improvements. He added that the development will be applying for LEED Gold certification.

Jody Andrews, Project Manager, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office, gave an overview of the responsibilities of the Project Office. The Project Office is a City group and represents the City as land owner and was created to develop the SEFC lands. In total the lands are 80 acres with the City owning 50 of those acres. The development is Sub Area 2A or the Olympic Village development and is the first phase of the project.

Ian Smith, Manager of Development, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office, noted that they are the group charged with getting the Olympic Village built by November 2009. They started in April 2006 and set deadlines for the rezoning and all the permitting for the construction. The rezoning has been approved and permit applications have been received on five sites. The projects are on time and he acknowledged the efforts of Staff, Millenium and the consultants. He noted that the process would only have worked with the Development Permit Board allowing a different process to review the applications.

Mr. Bayley, Engineer and partner at Merrick Architecture, explained his role with the development of SEFC. Millenium has given Merrick Architecture a coordinating role for the entire project and he will be actively involved in the many decisions that will impact and give direction into the technologies being used, such as the sustainable design initiatives as well as working with the Engineering Department. He added that he is the rezoning applicant under Merrick Architecture for the overall project and is involved with Parcels 3, 6 and 10.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. MacGregor sought clarity on the changes that occurred as a result of the Urban Design Panel's comments. Mr. Hein replied that three units were lost to make a U-shaped building containing the affordable housing component.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about the transportation planned for the area. Mr. Hein replied that the streetcar is planned to go along the street in front of the development.

Mr. Toderian was pleased and impressed to see how far the designs had progressed over the Christmas holidays. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Toderian asked Mr. Osdoba to elaborate on the kinds of opportunities and systems being put in place beyond the individual projects. Mr. Osdoba replied that they are being strategic with the opportunities that are City priorities and are focusing on transportation, energy, water and urban agriculture. They are looking at promoting the use of car sharing and electric cars. He noted that ten years from now vehicles are going to be different from what they are today. On the water side the developer has put together water management plans in terms of rain water harvesting and dealing with storm water. Mr. Osdoba stated that technology around energy is going to change over the life of the development particularly regarding thermal energy and are they looking at a system that can adapt to those changes. He noted that this is the first significant development to take on urban agriculture.

Mr. Toderian wanted to know what exclusions there were for passive design features. Mr. Hein referred the Board to Appendix D, Page 24 of 36 which summarizes some of the measures relating to the building envelope and detailing considerations. There are also inclusions for interior gathering spaces which will be considered for ventilation. Mr. Hein added that consideration will be given to exclusions on a case by case basis working closely with the applicant. Mr. Osdoba added that they have made a lot of progress in identifying the aspect of passive design which is absolutely critical to the buildings and the interface with the energy infrastructure. Mr. Osdoba noted that the applicant has gone further than the ODP in terms of reducing energy demands.



Mr. Toderian was concerned about the quality of the at-grade experience. Mr. Hein replied that the Urban Design Panel also had some concerns but through their advice further design development has occurred and there is a fairly typical approach to ground-oriented housing on all edges. There is a condition which asks for further design development to better understand entry related construction and landscape design intent. Mr. Toderian also asked if the balconies are fully exterior. Mr. Hein replied that there are some innovative ideas between the open and closed balconies and suggested the applicant could further explain their strategies.

Mr. Toderian asked if the tight time frames for the project had resulted in a lack of exceptional architecture. Mr. Hein replied that the applicants have been supported in bringing courageous architecture to the site. He noted several buildings and the design opportunities that have been taken with high quality material and attention to detail. He added that the Urban Design Panel supported the four other applications at their last meeting which showed some of the advancements in the architectural quality.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarity regarding the definition of non-market housing as shown in the chart on Page 4 of the report. Mr. Greer replied that in all cases non-market housing would be affordable housing. Mr. MacGregor noted that the By-law referenced affordable housing and not non-market housing. Mr. Whitlock added that the term should be affordable housing and will be owned by the City of Vancouver and managed by the Housing Society. Mr. MacGregor wanted to know what was meant by the "project addresses basic needs of affordable housing" as stated on Page 8 of the report. Mr. Whitlock replied that in terms of the household mix, they are asking for half the units for families and the rest for singles and seniors which will meet the conditions of the ODP. Mr. MacGregor also inquired as to where the affordable housing would be located. Mr. Hein replied that it will be located in the low-rise building having five floors.

Mr. MacGregor inquired about Condition A.1.19 regarding urban agriculture and if the condition was asking for the same kind of ratio of garden plots in the market housing. Ms. Morris replied that the design is still evolving and the condition was based on the drawings showing an elevator access to an amenity on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor. In recent discussion it was determined, that the intent of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor roof would be for private use. There will be an opportunity on the ground floor to provide an outdoor amenity space including resident-shared garden plots. Mr. Scobie added that the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.19 would need to be amended to reflect the change of use to the 13<sup>th</sup> floor. Mr. MacGregor asked for clarity on the wording and if it was to explore or to provide access to resident-shared garden plots. Ms. Morris read the rezoning condition and added that she had an amendment to the condition.

Mr. MacGregor asked if the technology was in place regarding green roofs so that there would not be problems in the future regarding leakage and maintenance. Mr. Hein replied that the applicant would answer the question.

Mr. Scobie asked if the conditions that were not fully addressed at the rezoning stage could now be deferred to the Building Permit stage and fall within the jurisdiction of the Chief Building Official to review. He noted that normally the conditions get detailed through the development permit process. Mr. Hein replied that as it relates to the current application they are expecting more resolution on a number of items. Mr. Robinson spoke to the process regarding what can happen at the development permit stage as opposed to the building permit stage and the kinds of issues that will need to be addressed. He added that there will be notations on the drawings with a clear expectation on the part of the applicant should the Board approved the project, that the approved building permit drawings would subsequently reflect those decisions. Mr. Scobie added that he wanted to make sure the CBO had the legal

authority, while noting the City is still the owner of the property. Mr. Ramslie added that the Project Office and the Sustainability Office would have a supporting role in developing the project through to building permit.

Mr. Scobie asked if Appendix E, page 20 (Ixi) regarding the transportation study, required a condition to be developed, as noted under Staff Comments/Clearance. Mr. Thomson replied that it is a duplicate of the rezoning and a condition is not required for the development application. He added that a number of conditions in the report are duplicates of the rezoning conditions.

Mr. Scobie asked why Staff supported the applicant in not providing a leak detection system which is a mandatory condition of Council as noted in Appendix E, page 17 (Iiii). Mr. Hein replied that there are a number of issues that will require a text amendment with Council. He noted that the applicant will be applying for LEED Gold certification.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the condition on Appendix E, page 5 (ix) regarding signage. Mr. Hein replied that the Project Office is working with the applicant on the overall signage for the development including retail signage, street signage, way finding signage, interpretive signage, etc. Mr. Scobie asked if the applicant could also answer the question on signage.

Mr. MacGregor asked if Condition A.1.22 regarding wheelchair access was part of Ms. Morris' amendment and she replied that it was. Mr. MacGregor also inquired about the license required regarding the daycare. Ms. Morris replied that it would be licensed under the provincial government.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Lyon agreed that it is a tight schedule but added that it has been an exhilarating time and having more time would not necessarily see any improvement to the design.

Mr. Lyon gave an overview of the design of the project noting that it came from the master plan stage and the rezoning. The two buildings that were at the master plan stage have been retained but a lot of the current plan is a culmination of the rezoning process and the master plan. He added that they have taken into account the fifteen design principles that came out of a workshop with the Urban Design Panel. The design principles are based on liveability and sustainability. Mr. Lyon noted that four major principles have been used which are included in the circulation, the elevators, the public spaces, the lobbies and the corridors. Many of the non-market corridors benefit from natural light. The amenity spaces are an integral part of the interior circulation like the common square of a town and are connected into the public function of the building. The amenity space of the market building and the non-market building are opposite each other and are intended to be well used by the people in the buildings.

Mr. Lyon described the facades of the buildings noting that they will be expressed differently on all four sides. The market building is a 13 storey building and has two different sides. The west side is highly visible, facing the future park, and has long balconies that provide shade and give great outdoor space. There will be owner controlled shades on the outside of the balconies. He added that they are exploring the use of a number of new materials that have not been widely used and will be using brick as one of the materials.

Mr. Lyon described the urban agriculture noting the garden plots will be located at grade or mid-level of the buildings where they are over seen by the surrounding buildings. He added

that had they been on the top roof of this building they would be used less and would not be seen from the other buildings.

Regarding the green roof, Mr. Lyon stated that they can not guarantee that they would not leak but there are doing whatever they can to minimize problems. Peter Kruek, Landscape Architect, added that they have been putting landscaped roofs on buildings for a long time and as long as the building is constructed with the proper membrane and drainage there should not be any problems. He added that they are looking at using the best possible products.

Mr. Lyon stated that there will not be an amenity space on the roof of the market building and would like to delete Conditions A.1.19 through A.1.22 and accept Ms. Morris' revisions. Regarding Condition A.5.6, Mr. Lyon stated that he would like to comply with Appendix G regarding the widths of the doors and asked if the condition could be amended to reflect the rezoning conditions.

Mr. Bayley was concerned about Condition A.2.4 and asked if it could be amended "to above the second floor" so as not to affect the design of the corner residential units in the building. He added that they are meeting the intent of the By-law.

Mr. Bayley asked to amend the first bullet in Condition A.5.4 by eliminating the word "brand" as they are using several technologies rather than one brand.

Mr. Bayley expressed concern with Appendix C, item 2 regarding the high-rise measures being applicable to the five storey building and the possible impact on sustainable issues on the low-rise building. He added that they had discussed this with the code group in the Building Department and thought that it had been agreed that high-rise measures would not be applied. Mr. Greer stated that the comments from the Processing Centre-Building are somewhat outdated and will be resolved. Mr. Bayley agreed that it was resolvable.

Mr. Bayley stated that this building may not be the one that exceeds the passive design exclusions and some of the other parcels that are coming in have additional area exclusion requests in response to the passive initiatives.

Mr. Bayley stated that they have awarded the construction contract for the shoring of the project and will be building to the property line and may need to come back to resolve the amount of parking spaces needed. Regarding the energy related issues, Mr. Bayley noted that they have been working on an integrated design process and are combining a high performance building envelope system. He added that they are not using painted concrete and are providing an exterior rain screen system. He acknowledged Peter Kruek, Landscape Architect and his team for the celebration of the Olympic motive on the green roof. They have implemented a technology that will reduce the potable water use by 50%.

Mr. Bayley discussed the retrofitting of the housing for the athletes using the site. They are currently working with VANOC in preparing the accommodation plan. He noted that the affordable housing would not be retrofitted and will be used by the Olympics.

Mr. Bayley stated that in order to get a building permit they have to substantiate that they can achieve LEED Gold in the completion of the project. Millenium commits to delivering a LEED Gold standard project and guarantees they will use the kinds of materials and sustainability criteria that will deliver that commitment.

Regarding the signage, Mr. Bayley stated that they are seeking a consultant and have gone to the Project Office asking if the City would like to do a joint project with them so that the heritage motif carries through the site.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm sought clarity regarding the parking. Mr. Bayley stated that because they will be building to the property line, there is a possibility that there may be left over space in the basement that could be assigned to storage, bike storage or parking. The parking strategies have not been resolved as the suite planning has not been finalized. He added that there will be additional parking available in lot 3 and 6 which will be allocated to the Salt Building.

Mr. Timm asked how the suites will be configured for the athletes. Mr. Bayley replied that there are three sets of drawings. One set defines what the project will be when it is complete and sold to the public post Olympics. Another set defines how the buildings will be used during the Olympics and there will be amendments made to the suites. For example, all of the kitchens will be constructed but they will be enclosed with temporary partitions and will not be used during the Olympics. The third set defines what will be torn out after the Olympics. Mr. Timm asked what needs to be done about the permitting process. Mr. Jasper replied that they have had meetings with the Building Permit Staff. There will be an initial building permit, an interim use permit for the use during the Olympics and then will revert back to the initial permit for the completion of the building permit post-Olympics.

Mr. Braun asked if the courtyard in the affordable housing would have public access. Mr. Lyon stated that there would be some joint access between the market housing and the affordable housing but it would not be for the general public. Mr. Braun also asked if the City would maintain ownership of the affordable housing and would share maintenance costs with the market housing. Mr. Whitlock replied that the City would own the affordable housing within a separate air space parcel. It will be managed by a housing sponsor and BC Housing will be providing oversight management. The expectation is that the courtyard would not be available to the market building.

Mr. Scobie suggested that the conditions and design development regarding the market housing site would need further consideration regarding the open space and children's play area. Ms. Morris replied that it is possible for the designers to come up with a space that would meet the condition.

Mr. Braun inquired about the programming of the roof of the market building and how it would be used and who would have access to the roof. Mr. Lyon replied that it would be an extensive green roof and non-accessible.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarity around Condition A.2.4. Mr. Thomson suggested striking the word "above" and adding "25 feet above grade". Mr. Thomson noted that if the need for the corner cuts had been identified earlier in the planning process, the areas would have been dedicated as road. The need was identified during the subdivision review and the approving officer established a condition requiring rights-of-way. The condition was set aside and rolled into a no-development covenant that was registered on title. He added that he would like to see the sidewalk clear where ever possible because of the intense public use. Mr. Bayley added that the project contains a commercial component on the bottom and residential above and the project changes its character at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The floor to floor height on the lower floor will be 10' which would mean the change needs to happen at 20 or 21 feet.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarity on what was meant by universal design regarding the width of the doors. Mr. Lyon replied that it could be a difficult requirement to apply to the entire building as the suites are tightly configured and the general wording of the condition could apply to all the doors and could impact the layout of the suites. Mr. Bayley added that they are working with the Safer Home group in terms of requirements for the project and will be bringing a report to the City responding to the universal design requirements. Mr. MacGregor asked why the rezoning condition was not sufficient. Mr. Hein suggested using the wording in the rezoning condition in the Note to Applicant in Condition A.5.6.

Mr. Toderian sought further clarity on the corner cuts. Mr. Bayley replied that it would cut off the corner of the building and would carry through all the other sites where it has more implications particularly around the plaza where the buildings come to the property lines on the upper floors. Mr. Thomson added that the area can not be enclosed in order to meet the needs for maintenance of the street. In some of the other sites it would impact the retail on the street and the area needs to be open and clear. Mr. Bayley added that it is important that it not extend to above the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level. Mr. Scobie noted that the Board can not establish a condition that overrides the condition set by the approving officer.

Mr. Toderian asked if the enclosed balconies have an exterior expression. Mr. Lyon replied that a couple have interior expression but most of them have an exterior expression.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to the colour palate for the site. Mr. Lyon replied that they are planning to use a dark burgundy brick with a Swisspearl panel system in a green shade.

Ms. Long asked if there will be garden plots within the courtyard of the market housing. Mr. Lyon replied that there is room on the ground level closer to the market building in the space running north and south between the two buildings. Mr. Hein added that they are still trying to find a solution for the garden plots. Ms. Long added that she was concerned that there would not be urban agriculture associated with the market housing.

Mr. Scobie inquired about what was meant by "rain shading". Mr. Lyon replied that it is to provide a rain shadow to a wall so if the parapet is extended over the top of a wall then rain that comes down on an angle is shaded from that wall.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification on the size of the cistern. Mr. Bayley replied that the agreement is that the sizing of the cistern is sufficient to provide ½" of rain per square foot of area of irrigated landscape for six weeks.

#### **Comments from other Speakers**

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Ms. Long was impressed as to how far the applicant had come from the previous workshop and is confident that everything will be resolved. In the first bullet in Condition A.5.4, Ms. Long suggested changing the word "brand" to "proven" with regards to the green roof.

Mr. Tatomir noted that sustainability is important to the project but would like to see more flexibility. He was concerned about the lack of greenery in the playground area noting the rest of the project looked like a nursery. He added that he felt the project was a bit dense and urged Staff to work with the applicant to create a great project. He recommended supporting all the conditions.

Mr. Stovell hoped that Staff would continue to look at the costs as well as the conditions to guide the applicant to a reasonable approach in order to create affordable housing. He added that sustainability is about people working and living in the same city.

Ms. Nystedt, noting that this was the first application in SEFC, thanked City Staff for a fabulous job. She said she appreciated having one of the streets named for her father (Walter Hardwick Way). She added that we have gone from a liveable city to a sustainable city and supported Staff recommendations in the report.

Mr. Chung commended the applicant for a well designed project and liked the wavy exterior of the first three floors of the market building which adds character to the project. He encouraged the applicant to add more colour to the exteriors.

Mr. Hung also commended the applicant on the design and the sustainable elements in the project. He recommended supporting the conditions in the report.

Mr. Braun felt that the general public has high expectations for the site and hoped the Board would encourage the highest calibre of product as there will be a lot of disappointment from the public's perspective if we do not get the best possible buildings in SEFC. In terms of sustainability, Mr. Braun felt that the applicant was going beyond some of the strategies Planning had expected and have set the bar for North America. He felt the architecture was attractive and in keeping with the design principles of Vancouver. His only concern was that most of the time non-market housing has a brick façade while market projects are in metal, glass and concrete and would encourage the applicant to try a different material palate for the non-market or bring some brick into the market housing. Mr. Braun stated that it would be a shame if the market housing did not have access to the playground and garden plots in the courtyard. He added that City Staff and the applicant should be commended for the first of many amazing projects to come in SEFC.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor was encouraged by the design and felt the architectural team had done an excellent job although further discussion was still necessary. He moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Toderian seconded the motion for approval with a friendly amendment which was accepted by Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Toderian thanked the applicant for the tremendous work on the application. He also thanked Staff for their hard work. He said he was excited by the language the applicant had used around not using the tight time frame as an excuse for anything but an exceptional outcome. It is important to send a message that we are not going to use the time line as an excuse. In this case there is an opportunity for igniting creativity and getting to the best answer and not just a good enough answer. Sustainability has to be the primary goal for the design evolution of the project and encouraged the applicant to work closely with Mr. Osdoba and his team to find and capture every opportunity to expand the sustainability practises. We need to make sure that rules, standards, practises, procedures or policies are never standing in the way of a better idea for sustainability or for design excellence. The approval process in the City should not hold back better answers but should in fact spur on consideration of better answers through the process. He encouraged the applicant to call him if at any point things are standing in the way of a better idea. He agreed with Mr. Braun regarding the expectations of the public. We are not trying to get Utopia but we are also not just trying to address the market because that would be too low a bar. The process for this project is more than getting

what we have gotten in the past and should be the best example of residential mixed use architecture. This is going to be our signature for the world during the Olympics and the world will get to see a "world class" example of not just sustainability but residential mixed use architecture and public realm. We need to seize every opportunity for risk taking and experimentation. There will be challenges around making this work once we get to the more detailed levels especially around the implementation of construction, materials, and the landscaping. The right budgets have to be applied. He strongly encouraged the applicant to think about colour, light and energy. Mr. Toderian noted that there have been commentaries on the coldness of Vancouver architecture regarding the approach to glass, materials and design which has resulted in some monotony particularly along the waterfront. This is an opportunity for experimentation and risk taking around colour and light and expression and keeping the context of good quality.

Mr. Timm supported the approval of the proposal and the amendments to the conditions as put forth by Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Toderian. He added that it is a good design with lots of interesting aspects. He agreed that there are tremendous expectations by the public for the neighbourhood. He also agreed that there will be some challenges especially around the narrow streets and closeness of the buildings. This is going to be a different community than what has been seen previously in Vancouver.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410840, in accordance with the Development Staff Team Report dated January 15, 2007, with the following amendments:

Delete Condition A.1.5;

Amend Condition A.1.19 to read:

*explore opportunities to expand the area designated for garden plots for the market units, e.g. by using the green roof panels on the tower roof or otherwise, so that a minimum of 30% of the units without private garden space (not balconies) have access to a private plot;*

*Note to Applicant: Wherever garden plots for residents are provided, ensure access by people in wheelchairs.*

Delete Conditions A.1.20, A.1.21 and A.1.22;

Renumber Conditions A.1.6 through A.1.23 to A.1.5 to A.1.19;

Amend Condition A.2.4 to read:

arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for a blanket surface statutory right of way, to be modified prior to occupancy of the building, for corner-cuts for sidewalk purposes at the NE, NW, and SW corners of the site, with the final rights of way to be free and clear from the street level to the bottom of the third floor of the building, i.e. approximately 21 feet.

Note to Applicant: Design/treatment of the corner cut off areas are to be to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Amend the first bullet in Condition A.5.4 to read:  
installation of a premium green roof membrane with a chosen *proven* technology;

Amend Condition A.5.6 to read:  
*a commitment to work with a Universal Design consultant to achieve the objectives for Universal Design in reference to "The Safer Home Certification Criteria" as outlined in the Rezoning Conditions;*

*Note to Applicant: Consideration for the provision of 36" door widths for all doorways and access/egress points in the project.*

#### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

- Letter from Russell Acton to Staff and the Board and Advisory Panel expressing his appreciation for having had the opportunity to serve on the DPB Advisory Panel for the past term.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair



