

**Date:** Monday, January 29, 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**

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
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  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

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

J. Greer Project Facilitator  
S. Black Development Planner  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**1180 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE410598 - ZONE DD**

M. Ehman Downs Archambault & Partners  
J. Crowhurst Downs Archambault & Partners  
S. Naito Coast Hotels  
B. Langereis Delta Land

**Recording Secretary:** L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of December 18, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p.16, second paragraph, fourth line, to delete the word "wouldn't" and replace with *would*;

Amend p. 18, first paragraph, second line, to delete "Chung" and replace with *Hung*.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of January 15, 2007 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p.7, under Development Planner's Opening Comments, first paragraph, to delete the word "Commission" and replace with *Panel*;

Amend p. 14, second paragraph, to delete "Harwick" and replace with *Hardwick*.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1180 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE410598 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE)**

Applicant: Downs Archambault & Partners

Request: To construct a 19 storey commercial hotel (Coast Resorts and Hotels Ltd.) with 220 rooms, retail and restaurant uses and 98 underground parking spaces. The residual density of the adjacent lot at 1155 West Pender Street is included by a single site covenant, together with the permitted hotel increase of 15%, for a combined density of 7.45 FSR.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Sailen Black, Development Planner introduced the application at 1180 West Hastings Street for a 19-storey hotel with 220 guest rooms. The hotel will be located mid-block between West Hastings Street and West Pender Street.

Both Downtown Design Guidelines and the Character Area description for the Golden Triangle direct consideration to the quality of pedestrian-oriented development at grade and the compatibility and intrinsic design of above-grade portions.

A previous development permit in 2000, which similarly tied 1155 West Pender to the vacant lot redevelopment through a residential density transfer, included the addition of a canopy and landscape improvements to the Shorehill building along West Pender Street, and a parkade canopy and 'greenscreen' planting on the concrete wall along West Hastings Street. This proposal will incorporate those upgrades.

Initial concerns by Staff focused on the massing at the building's top and the design of the porte-cochere. The Urban Design Panel in September 2006 resulted in non-support with the Panel's concerns focused on exterior materials, room orientation, podium side-walls and the heaviness of the base. The applicant returned to the Panel in November 2006 with extensive changes including a new exterior of grey metal panel. The Panel felt the applicant had successfully addressed the issues of exterior finishes and overall expression and the revised design received unanimous support from the Panel.

Staff noted the design of the porte-cochere and the podium had been improved with the introduction of a step in the podium along the west side and halfway along the east side, and the visual reduction in the heavier structure on the Hastings Street side so that the glass ballroom reads more strongly. Staff continue to seek some limited architectural refinements as described in the Conditions.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated January 29, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Braun asked what staff were seeking regarding the greening of the roof deck. Mr. Black replied that additional greening would help with the overlook from surrounding buildings.

Mr. Timm sought clarity of the impact on the horizontal separation staff were recommending between the hotel and the Shorehill building. Mr. Black replied that Staff are concerned about the south elevation and the impact of the outdoor pool area and are asking the applicant for an approximate 1.8 metre set back of the party wall.

Mr. Braun asked if the restaurant would offer outdoor seating. Mr. Black replied that it would not as the building comes to the property line and would not be conducive to outdoor seating.

Mr. Hung inquired as to whether or not the parking requirements were adequate for the restaurant. Mr. Black replied that the proposed parking met the City's Parking By-law requirements.

Mr. Scobie asked whether the previous building improvements required to the Shorehill building, were fully included in the conditions of approval now recommended by the Development Permit Staff Committee. Mr. Black replied that the improvements to the public realm interface will be carried through the current application and are reflected on the plans. As well, the road dedication issue is noted in Appendix J.

In a question from Mr. Toderian regarding the Urban Design Panel's comments and whether a taller, more slender tower form had been considered, Mr. Francl explained some of the commentary, noting the hotelier's program requirements and site constraints.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Ehman, Architect with Downs Archambault & Partners, stated that he would like the Board to delete Condition 1.2. He noted that there are basic program requirements for the hotel to work properly. The comments from the Urban Design Panel resulted in a significant retooling of the design. They addressed the issue of reducing the scale of the podium by stepping the building back along the property lines and also made a change to the materials. Changes could not be made to the pool area or the meeting room below due to program requirements and the location of the beams that transfer the load of the tower. He noted that they received unanimous support when they returned a second time to the Urban Design Panel and only one member of the Panel suggested pushing back the wall below the pool and reducing the meeting room. He added that the design might be improved by increasing the planting material or by further articulating the façade where it moves out to the property line.

Mr. Ehman was concerned with the condition seeking a reduction of the metal band above the ball room, due to structural and programming requirements. He added that they can respond to the condition in a limited way.

Regarding Condition A.1.6, Mr. Ehman stated that he was concerned about the cost and maintenance for the hotel in adding greenery to the upper roof. Currently the proposal is to have a combination of gravel and pavers to break up the modest expanse of roof on the tower.

**Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Braun sought further clarity on the greening of the roof. Mr. Ehman replied that there will be landscaping on the podium but that having a green roof on the tower would offer no benefit to the hotel and would add to the capital and ongoing maintenance costs.

Ms. Nystedt asked the applicant if they had gone through a LEED certification process. Mr. Ehman replied that sustainability is part of their Design Rationale (Appendix E, Page 7, 1.7 Environmentally Sustainable Strategies).

Mr. Shearing asked if there was a possibility of a herb garden for the hotel restaurant being a viable rationale for a green roof. Mr. Ehman replied that they would need to see if the hotel had an interest in having a herb garden on the roof, noting that a "green roof" customarily entails design and plant materials that are more motivated by environmental and sustainability objectives rather than by on-site utility.

Mr. Shearing also asked about the planters being used to separate the restaurant from the sidewalk. Mr. Ehman replied that the street will be widened in the future, and the hotel didn't want to lose area within the restaurant; the planters were there as a transition from the glazing of the restaurant to the sidewalk.

Mr. Toderian asked if the applicant had looked at the benefits, from an environmental perspective, of "white roofs". Mr. Ehman replied that there are two issues. One is the environmental response that would reduce the heat island effect, which is something that can be pursued, and the other is the visual overview impact of the roof, which the current proposal attempts to address via a patterned surface. Mr. Toderian also asked if there was any aspiration around LEED. Mr. Ehman replied that they are not pursuing LEED certification but they had gone through the checklist.

Mr. Toderian asked how the applicant would address the visual, pedestrian quality of the vehicle drop-off as stated in Condition 1.0. Mr. Ehman replied that they have been working with staff and have a significant lighting arrangement that will back-light the glazing in the

ceiling and a lighting strategy that deals with both lighting during the day and at night. It is important to the client that the arrival sequence is welcoming.

Mr. Toderian inquired about Condition 1.2 relating to the reduction of the massing at the corner where the pool is located and if there had been other alternatives examined for the location of the pool. Mr. Ehman replied that there is limited opportunity for the location of the pool noting that the corner is the sunniest and is therefore the logical location for the pool. Mr. Toderian asked if there was anything the applicant could do to de-emphasize the massing on the corner. Mr. Ehman replied that it was fairly articulated with a fair amount of depth in the façade and didn't see a problem with a four story podium on the street.

Mr. Toderian asked if there was further opportunity to add more architectural "flair" or exuberance using colour and light. Mr. Ehman replied that they are using coloured glazing on the façade around the entry on West Pender which will always be lit and the ballroom will have twenty feet of coloured glazing.

Mr. Stovell inquired about the green roofs and possible problems as recently expressed by the Homeowner Protection Office. Mr. Black replied that there wasn't a concern as the building is concrete and Staff would entertain other measures from the applicant.

Mr. Scobie asked for clarity around the wording regarding the "greening" of the roof decks. Mr. Black replied that it was a general request for more green in the form of more landscaping but not a "green roof" in the technical sense.

In response to a question from Mr. Francl, Mr. Ehman replied that the glass in the ballroom coincides with the upper most ceiling.

Mr. Tatomir asked the applicant if they could reduce the mass of the podium and make the building taller and also what the rationale was around the kiosk in the middle of the porte-cochere. Mr. Ehman replied that the golden rule for hotels is sixteen rooms per floor and is a requirement of the client. The porte-cochere was added at the request by Planning to provide some pedestrian activity along the site's West Hastings Street frontage.

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

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Francl noted that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the revised submission which demonstrated considerable improvement over the initial submission that wasn't supported. There was a general appreciation for the high level of refinement of the metal fenestration patterns, the detail to the tower, the window patterning. The transition from concrete to the metal skin was also seen as a significant improvement. Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Francl stated that he believed the applicant had every intention of ensuring that the lobby and entrance sequence would be what was needed in a major hotel. With respect to Condition 1.2, Mr. Francl stressed that it was a question raised by only one member of the UDP and added that he believed it would be a hardship for the applicant to pull back the podium to resemble what is proposed on the other side of the tower and there would not be any room for the pool. He noted that the location of the pool was in the southeast corner of the building and was the only logical location for the pool. He suggested leaving the Note to Applicant out of Condition 1.2. Regarding the mechanical penthouse, Mr. Francl thought the glass didn't need to be carried all the way up but that a metal panel between the two lanterns might make

it more interesting. Mr. Francl would like to see a green growing surface on the roof but would leave it to the Planning Department to resolve with the applicant.

Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Tatomir stated that he would like to encourage the applicant to put lighting into the porte-cochere surface pavers to create a transition from the street level to the window level. In Condition 1.2, Mr. Tatomir stated that he would also encourage the applicant to create an illusion to take the view to the top of the building from the street level. Mr. Tatomir stated that he would support the deletion of Condition 1.3. He thought the green roof wasn't necessary considering it would be at the 20<sup>th</sup> floor and he also agreed that the pool was in the best location. As for the retail kiosk fronting West Hastings Street, Mr. Tatomir believed it is unnecessary and would take away from the natural light getting into the porte-cochere. He added that he was in support of the project.

Mr. Shearing commended the applicant on a good job on a difficult site. With regards to Condition 1.1, he stated that he didn't think the comments in the Note to Applicant were necessary as he believed the applicant would do what was necessary to improve the entrance sequence. With regards to Condition 1.2, he stated that West Pender Street could afford a three-storey massing on one corner and wouldn't overwhelm the street. He recommended deletion of the condition and the Note to Applicant. Regarding the mechanical penthouse, he noted that the current proposal sufficiently "caps" the building and would not recommend that further consideration be required. He said he was disappointed with the relationship between the proposed restaurant and West Pender stating that there was an unnecessary separation between the use and the sidewalk and that some of the planters could be removed to provide seating on the street. Mr. Shearing stated that the building was very well handled but he felt it didn't express as a hotel; architecturally it is a "safe" building and he would like to see the design taken to another level. He added that he was also in support of the project.

Mr. Stovell suggested that Condition 1.2 could be eliminated as he felt the Board needed to be sensitive to the performance of the hotel. He stated that he was concerned about the terminology being used regarding green roofs and wanted the language to be clearer as to what was meant by "greening of the roof" as stated in Condition A.1.6. Mr. Stovell suggested extending the glazing of the ballroom over the large structural spandrel.

Ms. Maust stated that from a heritage perspective the building fitted into the neighbourhood. She added that she appreciated the design development and thought the green roof was unnecessary.

Ms. Nystedt supported the recommendations in the report and commended the applicant on integrating sustainability principles voluntarily into the design of the building. She wondered if LEED certification should become a requirement for hotels as well as for office buildings. She agreed that the pool was in the best location. Regarding Condition A.1.6 she stated that every opportunity should be taken for greening roofs as it creates a different kind of benefit to the downtown.

Mr. Chung also commended the architect on a well handled project in terms of the design. He suggested adding more colour as he thought there was too much grey concrete. He commended the applicant on the ballroom glass façade but thought the concrete band above the ballroom could be reduced or some colour could be added to minimize its effect. Regarding Condition 1.1, he agreed that there needs to be a welcoming porte-cochere. He suggested changing the wording in Condition 1.2 to give the architect some flexibility as to the treatment of the podium. Mr. Chung agreed with Condition 1.3 regarding minimizing the mechanical penthouse. He suggested that the City might want to look over the requirements around the LEED process

as the subject of LEED certification seemed to be coming up more frequently in the applications coming to the Board. He stated that he was in support of the project.

Mr. Hung said he was glad to see a hotel in the area and not another office building. He thought the massing of the building wasn't a problem and didn't support a green roof as he didn't see the need for a green roof on a hotel. Mr. Hung supported using the previously dedicated area in site area calculation for FSR purposes and was in support of the project.

Mr. Braun found the building more interesting, not being square, and that the architect had been creative in getting a uniquely articulated building based on the hotel programming. Mr. Braun suggested that the Director of Planning should sign off on the glass sample. Regarding Condition 1.2, Mr. Braun thought it would be difficult to change the pool to another area. Mr. Braun supported the requirement in Condition A.1.6 for landscaping the upper roof as he thought it was important to improve the overlook from surrounding buildings. Mr. Braun added that he thought the kiosk was a good idea as it would break up the streetscape.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for a great job. He said he was disappointed that the building hadn't done more in terms of sustainability and encouraged the applicant to do more. He also commented that although the tower component design was well resolved and highly articulated, it seemed to read more as a residential tower similar to others in the downtown, and encouraged the applicant to reconsider further sensitive integration of light and colour and a generally more expressive "commercial" architecture. He added that commercial buildings represented an opportunity for further architectural exuberance and risk taking within a well conceived and well resolved program. Mr. Toderian thought the observation about planters separating the retail along the southern elevation was warranted. He moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Timm stated that although this was not an iconic building and was modest in size, it would fit well into the area. He noted that the Urban Design Panel supported the application generally as proposed and he was hesitant to put any conditions on the architecture of the building. Mr. Timm felt that from a heat island perspective, a white roof would be more effective and a green roof would be worthy of consideration only to improve the overlook. Mr. Timm seconded the motion for approval with a friendly amendment which was accepted by Mr. Toderian.

Mr. MacGregor agreed with the comments the Urban Design Panel made regarding the design. He added that he liked the design and was impressed with the outline for the sustainability approaches as noted in Appendix E. He offered a friendly amendment which was accepted by Mr. Toderian.

#### 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. DE410598, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated January 29, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.1.2 to read;  
design development to the *northern* podium level to further reduce *the perceived massing and heaviness*;

Delete Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.2;

Amend Condition 1.3 to read;  
design development to diminish the *perceived* scale of the mechanical penthouse;

Add new Condition 1.4 to read;  
*design development to achieve better connection between the Pender Street public realm, and the restaurant and retail spaces;*

**Note to Applicant:** *This can be accomplished by removing the planters at grade and providing opportunities for outdoor seating.*

Amend Condition A.1.6 to read;  
design development to the roof decks between levels 20 (Mechanical Level) and the parapet in order to secure a higher quality landscape design to further improve the *sustainability objectives and* overlook from surrounding buildings;

Amend Condition A.1.10 to read;  
provision of a high efficiency irrigation system in all planting areas, including provisions of hose bibs *or equivalent, proven, sustainable design alternative;*

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.1 to read;  
**Note to Applicant:** Motorists entering the parkade will need to be advised of "Do not Enter" for drive thru/drop-off.

Amend first paragraph on Page 2 of the report to read:  
That the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410598 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the development of a 19 storey hotel with 220 rooms, retail and restaurant uses and 98 underground parking spaces. The residual density of the adjacent lot at 1155 West Pender Street is included by a single site covenant, together with the permitted hotel increase of 15%, for a combined density of 7.45 FSR, *based on the size of the site prior to the road dedication acknowledging that this requires a relaxation under 3.2.4 of the Zoning and Development By-law, subject to the following conditions:*

4. OTHER BUSINESS  
None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair