

Date: Monday, January 31, 2005
 Time: 3.00 p.m.
 Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

B. Haden Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public
 C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
 G. Chung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
 E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry
 K. McNaney Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

R. Segal Senior Development Planner
 S. Hein Development Planner
 Y. McNeill Heritage Planner
 A. Higginson Project Facilitator
 K. Hemmingson Project Facilitator
 M. Thomson City Surveyor
 R. Macdonald Parking Engineer
 C. Gray Director, Housing Centre

1139 West Cordova Street

J. Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects
 W. Steinberg James K.M. Cheng Architects
 B. Guppy Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects

801 West 12th Avenue

R. Yuen Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
 D. Jansen Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
 B. Ally Vancouver Coastal Health Authority

1380 Hornby Street

U. Menghi Property Owner
 C. Bozyk Christopher Bozyk Architects Ltd.
 R. Olafson Consultant

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

Several minor typographical errors were noted and amendment of the last sentence, ninth paragraph, p.8, to read:

Although consideration was given to a 10-foot lane dedication adjacent the westerly limit of the site, connecting to a potential lane from the west, it was concluded that it would not be desirable to add a lane to this block.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of December 20, 2004 be approved as amended.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1139 WEST CORDOVA STREET - DE408870 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects

Request: To construct a 66-dwelling unit, 31-storey residential tower with nine townhouses at grade, for a total of 75 dwelling units, over three levels of underground parking for 195 vehicles.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, introduced this application for one of the last developments of Harbour Green Neighbourhood. The proposal is for Tower 3B in Sub-Area 3. Tower 3A immediately to the west of this site is already under construction and Tower 3C immediately to the east is a future residential building.

Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the site context and noted the applicant now proposes to reduce the tower from 31 to 30 storeys to comply with the 94 m height recommended in the Coal Harbour Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines. Mr. Segal noted the proposal generally complies with the zoning and guidelines. One exception is the floor plate which is proposed at 7,158 sq.ft. which exceeds the recommended 6,727 sq.ft. However, following analysis of a view study, staff conclude that its overall performance is equal to or better than neighbouring towers, noting the compact floor plan and the absence of enclosed balconies which typically add up to four percent to tower bulk. Further refinement of the tower massing is sought in the conditions, including lowering the junction of the terrace zone from the 14th to the 12th floor.

The application also seeks relaxation of the recommended side yard setbacks. Staff support this relaxation following analysis of a view study from the lobby of the Renaissance Hotel (1133 West Hastings Street) which indicates that this scheme is equal to or better than that generated by the guidelines because it allows for stronger reinforcement of both the Cordova and the park streetscapes. Further architectural refinement is sought, including a stronger townhouse identity on the park side and improvement to the westerly interface, in particular the emergency access which also serves as a pedestrian route from Cordova Street to the park.

The Harbour Green Neighbourhood CD-1 requires a total of 177 market units suitable for families. The requirement for 284 non-market family units has already been met on Parcel 1A. The City's guidelines for housing families at high density defines a family unit as a 2-bedroom or larger unit and located on the 8th floor or lower. To date, 91 market family units have been identified on previously developed sites and 25 in this application. Condition A.1.16 seeks confirmation that all units of the future tower on Site 3C will be family units on the 8th floor or lower, in order that the total requirement for the neighbourhood will be achieved.

Five letters of objection were received in response to notification. The Board of Trade subsequently withdrew its objection when it was understood the tower was to be lowered by one storey, and is satisfied with the increased floor plate. No further response has been received from the Renaissance Hotel since its initial objection, but staff are satisfied that low-level views, particularly from the hotel lobby, are equal to or better than what could have been expected under a guideline solution.

The recommendation is for approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 22, 2004.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the allocation of family units, Cameron Gray, Director, Housing Centre, explained the intent of condition A.1.16 is that all the units in the future building on Site 2C from the 8th floor and below are family units. While the City's "High Density Housing for Families with Children" guidelines call family units to be located in the first eight floors, the Housing Centre is prepared to also include 2-bedroom units throughout the building above the eighth floor in calculating the total number of family units required under the CD-1 By-law. 61 family units will be required on Site 2C to achieve the total requirement.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification with respect to the balconies. Mr. Segal confirmed that no enclosed balconies are proposed and the expectation is that they will remain open. He noted that balconies are excluded from the calculation of FSR and are not included in the floor plate.

Applicant's Comments

James Cheng, Architect, confirmed the intent is that enclosed balconies will not be permitted and there will be a covenant to this effect in order to preserve the clarity of the building. Mr. Cheng said they believe the townhouse frontage on the park responds well to the guidelines which call for strong townhouse definition. He noted this proposal has a narrower frontage than the adjacent tower (3A) which exposed the tower coming to the ground between the townhouses. With respect to the requested side yard relaxation, Mr. Cheng noted the guidelines anticipated that each tower would have its own drive court whereas shared access is now being pursued, creating a lot more open landscaped space between buildings. With respect to view impacts on the Renaissance Hotel, Mr. Cheng noted the hotel lobby is about two storeys above Cordova Street and this proposal maintains its views to the harbour.

Mr. Cheng sought clarification regarding the family unit allocation. He noted the guidelines for housing families at high densities were developed about twenty years ago and since then it has been found that families are choosing to locate not only in the first eight floors but throughout buildings, and in general the number of families choosing to live in the downtown is higher than originally anticipated. If they are permitted to include two-bedroom units throughout the building in the calculation of family units, they will more than meet the by-law requirement and it will more accurately reflect what is already occurring throughout the downtown.

Responding to an earlier question from Mr. Scobie regarding the emergency access, Mr. Cheng noted that fire truck access is not required to extend to the park. This will allow for a softer travel surface treatment at the lower end towards the park and still allow access by other emergency vehicles. Mr. Cheng said they are confident that they can resolve this matter with staff.

Mr. Cheng confirmed they believe they can satisfy all the staff recommendations.

Questions/Discussion

Further discussion ensued regarding the family housing requirement and Mr. Gray reiterated that the Housing Centre would like as many of the units of Tower 3C on the 8th floor and below to be two-bedroom units. He agreed an amendment of condition A.1.16 would be acceptable. Mr. Timm said he would support a more general condition, noting the requirement is that the neighbourhood as a whole meets the allocation, not just this application. Mr. MacGregor expressed concern that the fulfillment of the requirement is being left until development of the last project. Mr. Cheng stressed that the only impediment to achieving the allocation is the requirement that they be located on the 8th floor and below, otherwise the total neighbourhood allocation would have already been met. In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning the Board's authority in this regard, Mr. Gray advised the Board cannot relax the number of family units stipulated in the by-law but may relax the guideline with respect to their location.

The issue of ensuring the balconies remain open was further discussed and it was agreed to add a condition in this respect.

Mr. Timm sought clarification with respect to the elevator penthouse. Mr. Cheng explained the materials include metal panel and translucent fritted glass that will be illuminated. The objective for this neighbourhood is to have a series of towers with interesting tops that will be lit at night. Mr. Cheng advised they would reduce the size of the elevator penthouse as much as possible.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application. He noted the Panel's opinion differs from the recommended conditions with respect to the townhouse expression. The Panel believes the base should be an inhabited façade punctuated by clearly defined entries and it is not essential that it be absolutely vertical in expression, nor continuous. The Panel thought there was a strong disjunction between the base and the tower and suggested that, particularly on the park side, there should be a greater degree of the larger mass of the tower coming down to the ground. Acknowledging a philosophical difference of opinion with respect to the strict interpretation of the guidelines, Mr. Haden said he would support the recommended conditions with amendment to 1.3 and 1.6 to be more closely in accordance with the Panel considerations. Mr. Haden added the Panel also felt that the overall tower/podium strategy that has been encouraged by the City, while it has been very successful, may be becoming somewhat trite.

Mr. McLean said it is an exciting project and he strongly supported the application. He had no concerns about the size of the floor plate. With respect to the family housing allocation, Mr. McLean said he believed the requirement to locate them below the eighth floor related to affordability.

Mr. Chung agreed it is a fine project and recommended approval.

Mr. Henschel said it is a handsome building and he also supported relaxing the floor plate guideline provided enclosed balconies are prohibited. With respect to the family units, Mr. Henschel said he could see no reason to restrict their location to the eighth floor and below. He found the base, especially on the north side, to be disconnected from the tower and suggested either changing the colour or bringing the tower expression down to the ground more.

Ms. Chung recommended more general wording of condition A.1.16 with respect to the family units. She thought the top of the building would be an interesting addition to the skyline, particularly at night when it is lit.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor moved approval of the application, with amendment to the conditions relating to the family housing units, noting the intent is that the remaining family units will be divided between this project and the future project on Site 3C. He said it is a very attractive development.

Mr. Beasley supported the amendments recommended by Mr. MacGregor and said it is a very well conceived building. He appreciated the attention paid by the applicant to concerns raised by the upland landowners with respect to the height of the building, and to the careful consideration of view impacts on the Renaissance Hotel. Commenting on the advice of the Urban Design Panel, Mr. Beasley said he supported the conditions as written because in this instance the guidelines are correct as they speak to a particular unusual condition. The towers in this neighbourhood are frontage buildings on the park and frontage buildings for the whole city. Therefore, the continuity of the base as well as the rhythm of the tower above are very important to the urban design concept that has been established for this neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley supported all the conditions, including moderation of the blank walls on the edges. He seconded the motion.

Mr. Timm supported the resolution and agreed it is an attractive development. He appreciated that the elevator penthouse will not be concrete but lighter materials, which will provide greater interest, and that its size will be reduced to the extent possible.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie with respect to the comments of Processing Centre - Building and Fire & Rescue Services (Appendix C), Mr. Cheng advised they are confident they can satisfy all the issues raised.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408870, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 22, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend A.1.16 to read:

Relaxation of the location of the family units to allow 25 family units (two-bedroom or larger) in the eighth floor and below and to identify another 18 family units throughout the building;

Add a new condition A.1.17:
confirmation in writing that the development of Site 3C will contain the maximum practical number of family units (two-bedroom or larger) on the eighth floor and below, and identify where the remaining units will be located throughout the project;

Renumber A.1.17 to A.1.18;

Add a new condition A.1.19:
arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services for the City to be a party to an agreement preventing enclosure of balconies, the City being a party only so as to prevent release of the agreement.

Mr. Scobie expressed some concern about the Board's frequent relaxation of the guidelines with respect to floor plate. Mr. Beasley stressed these particular guidelines were the result of intensive negotiation with the upland property owners who were concerned about the size of floor plates, and consultation with these owners continued as each site was developed to ensure they were satisfied with the solutions put forward. Mr. Beasley said he was confident their interests have been preserved with every development in this neighbourhood.

4. **801 WEST 12TH AVENUE - DE408792 - ZONE CD-1
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Vancouver Coastal Health Authority

Request: A Preliminary Development Application for the VGH Master Plan, to guide the future development of new buildings, renovations, public open space and the public realm.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, presented this preliminary application for the Vancouver General Hospital Precinct, referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 19, 2005. The application is a direct response to Council's conditions of rezoning arising from the Public Hearing and represents a "Master Plan" for the future development of this important site. Mr. Hein noted that this process is also helpful to the applicant and staff to reconcile permitting history, with as-built conditions to assess technical compliance for future applications for the individual Medi-Tech buildings as they come forward. Mr. Hein noted that as yet only the ICORD site has an architectural space program; the other sites have only speculative representations of what might be the approach to massing. The preliminary report also attempts to establish a short term work program for both staff and the proponents to address the rezoning conditions before returning to Council for approval of the Master Plan's form of development, which must occur prior to the Board's consideration of the first Medi-Tech development application.

Referring to a context model, Mr. Hein reviewed the various sites in the precinct, noting the Nurses' Residence has already been approved in principle by the Director of Planning subject to Council approval of the form of development and enactment of the related Text Amendment. The energy centre, located on a site previously identified for a Medi-Tech building, has also been approved by the Director of Planning and both these projects were the subject of a major public consultation process. The Ambulatory Care Centre, previously approved by the Board, is

now under construction. Mr. Hein stressed that all the applications that have already come forward are required to comply with the Master Plan with respect to the public realm integration and interface.

Mr. Hein advised the preliminary submission is quite consistent with what was presented to Council at Public Hearing with the exception of the energy centre site. The main issues identified by staff relate to the built form impacts of permitted floor area, resolution of appropriate design response to movement system needs for the precinct, and related implementation of a coherent, high quality public realm plan over time. The centrepiece of the entire precinct is the Heather Pavilion and Common, with the anticipated closure of Willow Street in this location creating a strong edge. Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the recommended conditions of approval in principle contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Hein and the applicant's design team responded to questions from Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

Ron Yuen, Architect, said his meeting with the Development Planner has been very helpful and valuable and he agreed with the need to maintain flexibility given the ongoing changes that have and will continue to occur.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised the Urban Design Panel strongly supported this application. He stressed it is very difficult to plan hospital precincts and suggested it is not possible to rely on a strategy that is dependent on predicting what kinds of buildings will be constructed twenty years in the future. Mr. Haden said he would therefore strongly recommend that the guidelines be very straightforward. With respect to the cornice line of the Medi-Tech buildings, Mr. Haden said he would suggest raising it slightly because the buildings are likely to become larger rather than smaller and noting the current cornice line height is not achieving the right proportion between the lower and upper levels. With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Haden noted that street furniture is an item that can be controlled on an ongoing basis and is what may give the whole precinct a sense of place. He strongly recommended that a detailed street furniture package be provided to all the applicants to ensure that all infrastructure improvements at the ground level reflect continuity of the public realm.

Mr. McLean said he believes the preliminary report is a process document to deal with the future of this precinct which is vitally important to all British Columbians. He congratulated the applicant and staff on the progress to date.

Ms. Chung agreed this is a much needed development and there should be flexibility in the process as the facilities come forward.

Mr. Henschel supported the application and said he looked forward to seeing the common in place and the Heather Pavilion "unveiled".

Mr. Chung agreed with the previous speakers, noting that changes to the scheme are inevitable to respond to the changing needs of the population.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm said this is a very important process, both from the hospital's perspective as well as the community's because it establishes a baseline for the future development of the precinct. Once the form of development is approved by Council it will provide everyone with much greater certainty without the need for another extensive process. Mr. Timm noted there is still a lot of work yet to be done before the form of development is forwarded to Council. With respect to the buildings around the common, Mr. Timm said he was not so much concerned with their massing but the gaps around the site, but he was confident it could be resolved. Mr. Timm said he was satisfied with the conditions as recommended by the Staff Committee and he moved approval in principle.

Mr. MacGregor stressed the importance of being able to deliver the community amenities in this precinct. He was also concerned about the circulation system and thought a lot of work still needed to be done and may have to be advanced.

Mr. Beasley supported the motion. He said this preliminary development permit is essential to the strategy the City and the Hospital has worked on in recent years because, even after the rezoning was approved, there were many items still outstanding that this submission now addresses, such as circulation and the common. Mr. Beasley stressed that the community will not be satisfied until the movement systems have been clarified and there is certainty about what is going to occur on the site. The Public Realm Plan is also very important to the community because it includes public amenities. Mr. Beasley also noted the importance of achieving the technical reconciliation necessary for this precinct, as well as solidifying the strategy with respect to the Heather Pavilion and managing change as it occurs. With respect to the massing around the common, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was yet at its optimum and clearly needed more work, but he was reassured by the applicant's commitment to flexibility and agility in this regard. He said he believes the entire work program is essential so that each complete application can be processed quickly and easily without the need to revisit the issues covered in this PDP.

Mr. Scobie noted this is a very large site that has and will continue to undergo a lot of evolution as medical service delivery strategies continue to unfold. In this context, he agrees with Mr. Beasley that the "Master Plan" represented in this preliminary development application represents a new baseline against which specific future applications will be considered. He urged the applicant to work with Processing Centre-Building and Fire & Rescue Services as the development proceeds, to ensure any issues are dealt with earlier in the process.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 408792, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 19, 2005.

5. 1380 HORNBY STREET - DE408825 - ZONE CD-1 (PENDING)
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Christopher Bozyk Architects Ltd.

Request: (a) Construction of a new 16 storey boutique hotel comprised of a three storey podium base containing a lobby, meeting /banquet rooms, lounge and back of house facilities and a twelve storey tower with 41 units including a single penthouse unit.

(b) Rehabilitation and designation of the existing Leslie House.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, presented this application, noting the bonus density being sought will remain on the site. This application follows a rezoning, the Public Hearing for which generated some neighbourhood interest. Mr. Hein said the application responds well to the rezoning conditions. Council instructed staff and the applicant to engage with the neighbours in a co-design process to address issues relating to the interface to the north of the property as well as to operations, particularly of the deck environment. The conclusions of this process have been embodied in the current development application and recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Committee Report dated January 5, 2005.

Mr. Hein briefly described the proposal and reviewed the site context. The recommended conditions of approval were also briefly reviewed.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification with respect to parking access and the recommendation to eliminate the proposed vehicle elevator. Bob Macdonald, Parking Engineer, acknowledged that parking elevators are becoming more common and they are being considered on sites where ramping is impractical, noting, however, that these sites have considerably less parking than this site. Concerns relate to the use of unproven technology and queuing of cars which Engineering Services believes will result in congestion in the lane. A further concern is if there is a change in the hotel ownership and a change from the proposed valet operation to self-parking, it would further add to lane congestion. Mr. Macdonald noted the proponents initially proposed an acceptable ramp access arrangement which Engineering Services strongly recommend be reinstated. While the parking elevator would allow for two loading bays, Engineering Services believes one larger loading bay will be adequate. In further discussion, Mr. Hein advised a parking elevator would eliminate one level of parking. He noted the neighbours are interested in minimizing impacts in the lane as much as possible. The implications of a parking elevator have not been discussed with the neighbours.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning ongoing City obligations related to the proposed Operations Management Plan (OMP), Mr. Hein advised he would be prepared to take an active role in the monitoring of complaints. In discussion, Mr. Beasley suggested the OPM must be crafted so that the responsibility rests primarily with the parties involved.

Mr. Macgregor raised a question about undergrounding electrical and telecommunications services in the lane. Mr. Thomson advised the agreement referred to in Appendix H refers only to services to this development. There is also a power pole which is obstructing the loading bay that will need to be relocated. Mr. Hein added it may not need to be relocated with a single loading bay.

Applicant's Comments

Chris Bozyk, Architect, said their discussions with staff have been very helpful. As well, the interaction with the neighbours, while frustrating at times, has led to a very positive outcome. Mr. Bozyk confirmed his support of the majority of the staff recommendations. With respect to the hydro pole in the lane, he noted that several decisions need to be made regarding parking access and loading before the need for its relocation is determined. Verbal confirmation has been received from BCHydro that the pole can be moved if necessary. Regarding the Operations Management Plan, Mr. Bozyk noted that management of the pool area was one of the most serious concerns of the neighbours and its enclosure is now being considered. A Text Amendment would be required if this option is pursued.

Mr. Bozyk explained that in discussions with the neighbours it was thought that a parking elevator would give more control of parking access to the property owner, noting it will be a valet service, with no direct public access. As well, it is anticipated that most of the hotel guests will use taxis. A parking elevator also allows for two full loading bays to be provided, noting that lane congestion caused by service vehicles is also a serious concern of the neighbours. Reverting to a full 20 ft.-wide parking ramp would necessitate the removal of one loading bay. A parking elevator would also allow for better screening of the garbage area. Mr. Bozyk stressed that the parking elevator is not their preference because it would be cheaper to construct but because it was thought to better address the concerns of the neighbours. Mr. Bozyk confirmed they would have no objection if the Board required a parking ramp as opposed to a parking elevator. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, he confirmed there are five parking spaces allocated to the restaurant on the adjacent site.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the pool area, Mr. Bozyk confirmed they will enclose it, if Council approves a Text Amendment.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification regarding the Construction Management Plan sought in condition 1.8. Mr. Bozyk advised they are already in discussions with their contractor with respect to construction logistics and he had no concerns with the condition.

Mr. Timm expressed concern about the functioning of the valet parking system and its possible impact on the street. Mr. Macdonald acknowledged that many valet parking operations in the city are problematic. Mr. Bozyk pointed out there is Hornby Street stair access to the parking lot for use of the valets returning customers' vehicles, which reduces any delays in traffic movement around the site. Randy Olafson added that valet parking has operated successfully at Il Giardino's for a number of years and there have seldom been back-ups.

In further discussion regarding loading, Mr. Macdonald confirmed that Engineering Services believe one loading bay would be adequate on this site but it will need to be a little larger than standard to accommodate the types of vehicles servicing the hotel and restaurant. Mr. Bozyk questioned whether a reduced parking ramp width would be acceptable in order to still achieve two loading bays. Mr. Macdonald said single ramp access is usually restricted to garages with less than about 20 parking spaces; more than 20 spaces causes access/egress problems and congestion in the lane.

Comments from other Speakers

Karim Amersi, representing owners of Pacific Terrace Apartments (1360 Hornby Street), said they are likely the neighbours most impacted by this development. He also advised that their participation in the co-design process was very positive and they hope its conclusions will serve to enhance the project, both for the developer and the neighbourhood. Mr. Amersi expressed

appreciation to staff for their skilful coordination of the process, and to the developer for being open to such a process.

Mr. Amersi briefly reviewed their areas of concern, namely, the outdoor pool and deck, the visual impact of the north elevation, and congestion in the lane. He sought further clarification regarding the options presented in condition 1.2 with respect to the pool and deck. If the applicant chooses to cover the pool, they strongly request that the materials used do not further limit views and daylight access to Pacific Terrace Apartments. If the pool area is not covered, Mr. Amersi requested reconsideration of the proposed infinity edge pool because the noise generated by continuous water flow would add to the already considerable white noise in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Amersi said they recognize the applicant has made some progress in softening the appearance of the north elevation but request further softening, perhaps including more (green) glass on this façade.

Mr. Amersi distributed some photographs illustrating the existing congestion in the lane and noted the residents' concern is that this development will increase this congestion by fifty percent. With respect to the parking access options, he acknowledged they lack technical expertise to evaluate the alternatives, but stressed they would prefer minimum congestion in the lane. He suggested a two-way ramp would allow for the continuous flow of traffic and reduce congestion, and a parking elevator might potentially increase congestion. Mr. Amersi also questioned whether Engineering Services could offer any further solutions to improve the flow of traffic in the lane, possibly installing speed bumps to discourage through traffic. In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning the loading, Mr. Amersi said their concern is that larger trucks would still not be able to park but, on balance, one larger loading bay would be preferable.

Mr. Amersi also requested the opportunity for input into the final draft of the Operations Management Plan. He sought clarification regarding the proposed 36 ft. waterfall, the location of the exhaust fan, and whether the bell will be operative.

Mr. Hein responded as follows:

- staff expect the full roof deck to be covered if the applicant chooses option a), although there may be some landscape edge treatment of the roof deck that may remain exposed. It is expected that the cover material will be as light and low as possible, causing minimal visual impact;
- the applicant has discussed with staff his intentions regarding treatment of the north façade which is consistent with Mr. Amersi's suggestion;
- the waterfall is in the interior heritage courtyard and noise impacts will be contained;
- the applicant is required to meet by-law requirements regarding noise impacts and ventilation and exhaust systems;
- an "active" bell for the campanile tower is not supported by staff.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application. He added he believes this project is the product of an owner's personal passion and it is unfortunate that the onerous process and scrutiny of details creates an enormous disincentive to proponents of small buildings such as this because they are often the most memorable in a city. He stressed that visitors to the building as well as its neighbours need to be considered. He recommended approval.

Mr. McLean noted Il Giardino restaurant has been in this location longer than most of the neighbours and has a lot of history in this neighbourhood. Mr. McLean said he believes a management plan with respect to pool areas would probably work but covering the area is a better solution. He said a ramp is the best solution to the lane parking access noting the technology related to parking elevators is not yet well proven. He said it is an excellent project.

Mr. Chung recommended approval and thought the project fits in well in the neighbourhood. He commended the applicant for working with the neighbours to address their concerns, and he agreed a ramp is the best solution for the parking access.

Mr. Henschel suggested this may not be an appropriate project for elevator parking, noting also the large financial risk involved. However, he stressed that lanes are intended for loading and thought the access solution be left to the proponent. With respect to the pool, Mr. Henschel suggested that noise would not be an issue in the hours excluded in the OMP if the pool area remains unenclosed. He said it is an extremely slender and elegant building.

Ms. Chung agreed it is an interesting development and the boutique hotel will be a good addition to the neighbourhood. She stressed the need for public involvement and consultation, particularly with respect to traffic in the lane, noting it is already congested. Good mobility should be a goal for this area of the city so if a ramp facilitates the flow of traffic it is preferable to reliance on a new technology.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is a great project. He commended the applicant, the architectural team, the neighbours and staff for the co-design process because many of the issues have now been resolved. Mr. Beasley pointed out that there is also an important heritage house that is being saved on this site and he was pleased to see the further refinements being sought to protect it. It is important to continue with the co-design process in the implementation of the conditions and the Operations Management Plan and Construction Management Plan are valuable in this regard. He agreed the final version of the OMP should be established in consultation with the neighbours. With respect to the pool, Mr. Beasley said he believes option a) of condition 1.2 is the best approach but it is important to note the design and materials of the enclosure also need to be worked out through a co-design process with the neighbours.

With respect to the lane, Mr. Beasley urged that Engineering Services continue to investigate solutions to managing what is a particularly congested lane, adding that this development may serve to improve the situation rather than exacerbate it. With respect to the ramp vs. parking elevator issue, Mr. Beasley said the City's policy preferences are unclear. Regardless of the decision on this development, Engineering Services should consider a policy framework for future developments, noting that demand for parking elevators will become more prevalent with the intensification of development in the downtown. Mr. Beasley also acknowledged Mr. McLean's observation that the ongoing maintenance of parking elevators can be extremely onerous. On balance, Mr. Beasley said he concurred with the conclusion that a ramp access would be the best solution in this case. While supporting the condition with respect to the bell, Mr. Beasley said he was disappointed the bell would not be operational.

With respect to the possible enclosure of the pool area, Mr. Scobie pointed out that a Text Amendment cannot be sought until the pending CD-1 zoning is enacted.

Mr. Timm supported the application and he acknowledged the onerous process required of Mr. Menghi to bring the proposal forward. He noted, however, that the issues arising from this

development are a reflection of the increasing densification of the downtown core. Mr. Timm agreed that parking elevators need to be studied from a broader policy perspective. In addition to concerns about the reliability of parking elevators, he added he did not believe a parking elevator in this development would meet the Parking By-law which requires its parking and loading demand to be provided on site, noting the valet parking arrangement requires use of a public area. Mr. Timm said it is an interesting and well-executed development that will be an asset to the city.

Mr. MacGregor agreed it is an excellent project. He concurred with the commentary about the parking elevator and the reliability of elevators in general. Mr. MacGregor said he had some concerns about the suggested operating hours of the pool (condition 1.2) because it is quite restrictive. He agreed enclosure of the roof deck/pool area could be partial given the need to ensure it does not block sunlight for the neighbours. Notwithstanding Council's directive to include Operations and Construction Management Plans on this particular development, Mr. MacGregor said he hoped they would not set a precedent for the Board given the difficulty of continuing to satisfy the concerns of neighbours who are constantly changing. He recommended an amendment to condition 1.3 for neighbours' concerns to be addressed "to the extent possible". Mr. Beasley and Mr. Timm concurred.

In discussion with respect to the Operations and Construction Management Plans, the Board agreed they would not set a precedent for other developments but are appropriate in this case because they arose from the co-design exercise required by Council.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408825, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 5, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 a) to read:

full *or partial* enclosure of the pool area *with the design to be refined through further consultation with the neighbours*;

Amend 1.3 to add *to the extent possible* after "neighbours' concerns";

Amend 1.6 to add "of" between "character" and "adjacent";

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Scobie noted that a number of Advisory Panel members were completing their two-year terms. He thanked Mr. Haden, Mr. Chung and Mr. Henschel, as well as Mr. Hancock and Mr. Mah in their absence, for their valuable contribution to the Board's deliberations. Mr. Haden said he had found it a very interesting experience and, on balance, he finds the decisions reached by the Board are better as a result of the process.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.40 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair