

Meeting: No. 490  
Date: Monday, January 8, 2001  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
D. Rudberg City Engineer

**Advisory Panel**

J. Cheng Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public  
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

**Absent**

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Segal Development Planner  
M. Thomson City Surveyor  
B. Macdonald Parking Engineer

**Item 3 - 550 Burrard Street - DE404803 - Zone CD-1**

F. Musson Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership  
A. Witchelo Bentall Corporation  
D. Wuori Landscape Architect

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

---

**1. MINUTES**

With respect to DE405202 - 1499 Homer Street, Mr. Rudberg noted some minor clarification to the discussion regarding on-street and off-street loading (p.7 and 8).

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of December 11, 2000 be approved as amended.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 550 BURRARD STREET - DE404803 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct Phase 1 consisting of the first 22 storeys of the ultimate 34-storey office tower with ground floor retail/office use and a temporary landscaped plaza. Phase 2, the subject of a future Development Application, will be for the remaining 12 storeys of the tower, the retail pavilion, a permanent plaza and expansion of the top five (of seven) levels of the underground parking underneath the plaza.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, introduced this application, referring to a model of Phase 1 of the proposed development. On May 15, 2000, the Board approved in principle the concept for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 including reconfiguration of the plaza area with a single storey food pavilion. Issues identified by staff are few and of a detailed nature only, dealing with strengthening the tower entry, the type and quality of materials on the podium, and landscape details of the temporary plaza. These issues are addressed in the prior-to conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated December 13, 2000, subject to which the recommendation is for approval of the application.

Mr. Segal noted there is a shortfall in the number of parking spaces proposed, which can be made up by pay-in-lieu or by securing spaces in the existing City-owned facility. These options are being discussed with Engineering Services. Mr. Segal also noted that the applicant is now considering proceeding with the underground parkade in Phase 1.

There has been no response to Notification. The applicant has advised they are in discussion with the YWCA in terms of construction impacts on its daycare operations. Condition A.1.11 seeks confirmation that the YWCA accepts the construction protocols.

In response to a question from the Board regarding screening the adjacent hotel and office building in the temporary plaza arrangement, Mr. Segal explained the proposed lattice screening is about 12 ft. high. The applicant's Landscape Architect, Don Wuori, added, there is also an existing row of maple trees on the parking lot which can be relocated to provide additional screening in this area.

Mr. Segal advised it is anticipated that the public art component of the project will be incorporated into the final plaza area. The Staff Committee Report contains a note to the applicant that early consideration should be given to the public art to ensure it is an intrinsic component of the public realm of this development.

The Board questioned the inclusion of condition A.1.11 which requires acceptance of construction protocols by the YWCA. Mr. Segal explained it was not the intent that the YWCA could prevent construction from proceeding, but the Staff Committee was concerned about the potential for construction to halt the daycare operations.

The Board sought clarification with respect to the clarity and reflective qualities of the glass being proposed, noting that glass specifications can be open to interpretation. A sample of the proposed glass was presented to Board members. Mr. Segal noted the specification for this glass is intended to be similar to that for the upper portion of the Wall Centre tower. He confirmed the glass specification will be a subject of development permit approval and the sample will be kept for record purposes.

Some discussion took place with respect to parking. It was noted the permitted parking figures in the technical analysis on page 3 of the Staff Committee Report apply to Phase 1 only.

### Applicant's Comments

Alan Witchelo, Bentall Corporation, explained the reason for the phased development is in response to market conditions. They are very confident they will be able to proceed with Phase 1 as soon as possible. They are also becoming more confident in their ability to proceed with Phase 2, to the extent they have already instructed their architects to begin preparations for the Phase 2 development application. It therefore may be possible to achieve seamless construction of the whole project, without phasing. Mr. Witchelo confirmed they now wish to proceed with the Phase 2 parking immediately because it will be less disruptive to Phase 1 tenants.

He acknowledged the need for early consideration of the public art requirement and confirmed that these arrangements are proceeding. The intent is to integrate public art into the plaza as much as possible, subject to the load bearing capacity of the plaza. He stressed the intent is to move the project forward in a seamless manner if at all possible, rather than in phases. With respect to the legal agreements referred to in condition A.1.13, Mr. Witchelo noted the daycare agreement does not need to be changed. The Public Art agreement has been changed. It now requires the public art to be in place within one year of occupancy of Phase 2, with a "sunset" provision whereby if Phase 2 does not proceed for nine years, the money is paid to the City, based upon the then revenue per square foot.

Mr. Witchelo said he was concerned about the inclusion of condition A.1.11 requiring the YWCA's acceptance of the construction protocols, given it could conceivably prevent construction from proceeding. He noted they have had several discussions with the YWCA and do not expect any problems. He said he was prepared to accept the condition on the understanding that if there are difficulties they can bring the matter back to the Board. He advised it will not be necessary to close to daycare during construction and that they will be able to meet all WCB and licensing requirements.

Frank Musson, Architect, said a number of issues were raised by the Urban Design Panel in September 2000. They have been discussed with staff and many have already been addressed. He confirmed they have no problem with conditions 1.1 - 1.6. With respect to condition A.1.18, Mr. Wuori advised a coast redwood is being considered for the corner landmark tree.

In response to an earlier question about the lane trellis, Mr. Musson advised all traffic will be screened because it will be a minimum 12 ft. high. All openings into the hotel will be screened. With respect to the glass, Mr. Musson advised they are adhering to industry standards in terms of external and internal reflectivity and expect to determine soon the specific glass that will be used. He said they are also concerned about consistency of materials in the event the project is phased and are taking steps to ensure continuity.

### Discussion

The Board stressed that it wants to be sure about the glass specification and noted a responsibility rests with the architect to deliver what is described. Mr. Musson confirmed that the final glass selection will be as shown on the model in terms of its transparency, noting it will be very much like the upper levels of the Wall Centre. While the final selection has not yet been made, Mr. Musson advised it will be within the range of the four samples presented to staff.

### Comments from Other Speakers

None.

An e-mail received earlier today from Carl and Les Dick-Meadows was distributed to Board and Panel members. The writers expressed concern that a 22-storey tower would look out of place in this location among taller buildings. They were also concerned about the potential impact of an unfinished project on this prestigious site.

Mr. Segal agreed the proportional elegance of the building is somewhat diminished at 22 storeys as opposed to the final 34 storeys. However, he stressed that Phase 1 is not an unfinished development. The plaza, albeit temporary, will be well-appointed and very handsome, commensurate with other plazas in the area. If Phase 2 parking is undertaken as part of Phase 1, the Burrard Street edge of the plaza will be completed in a final state at the onset.

### Panel Opinion

Mr. Cheng reported that the Urban Design Panel supported this project. There was considerable discussion about how to terminate the top for Phase 1 and the majority of Panel members supported the current proposal in this respect. All the Panel's concerns have been incorporated into the prior-to conditions.

Mr. Ross supported the development. He said he had been concerned about the long term nature of Phase 1 and was encouraged by indications from the applicant that Phase 2 is likely to follow closely. He was pleased to see the inclusion of a sunset clause with respect to the public art.

Mr. Chung also supported the project. He said he was confident the applicant could come to an agreement with the YWCA regarding construction impacts. However, he did not believe this issue should be a burden on the applicant.

Mr. Mortenson was also confident the applicant could come to some agreement with the YWCA, but preferred to maintain the condition, with the option of returning to the Board if agreement cannot be reached. He supported the application.

Mr. Scott was also supportive. He said he had the same concerns expressed in the e-mail tabled earlier and hoped the applicant could assure Mr. Meadows that the project will proceed to completion without delay. He commented that if the YWCA had any major concerns they would have been represented today.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said the project has developed quite positively since the preliminary stage. His earlier concerns that it would feel like an incomplete project have been resolved. The treatment of the open spaces and the relationship with the YWCA are acceptable and positive. Even if the second phase does not proceed for many years, the open space that will be achieved would compare positively to other open spaces in the Downtown. He added, the screening provided by the food pavilion is very important to the final scheme. Mr. Beasley said he felt there needs to be some sort of imperative for the applicant to continue discussion with the YWCA, without making the entire project contingent on that discussion. He moved approval of the application, subject to the conditions recommended by the Staff Committee, with three amendments.

Mr. Rudberg noted he had also raised concerns about the phasing at the preliminary stage. This is a critical location in the downtown and the public suffers from extended construction in terms of noise and congestion. He was therefore encouraged by the greater potential that now exists that the project might proceed without phasing. He supported Mr. Beasley's motion and amendments.

Mr. MacGregor commented that a tower was always anticipated for this site. The issue for the YWCA would be having to deal with two construction phases. Therefore, while phased projects are not unprecedented, it would be preferable if it could be built in one phase. He supported the amendment to A.1.11 because he did not believe a third party should be able to hold a neighbour hostage in terms of the construction schedule. Mr. MacGregor reiterated the importance of the glass specification and the applicant's responsibility in this respect. He supported the new condition to ensure the specifications are clear as to what is required and what the Board has approved.

Mr. Scobie said he was also more confident that the project might proceed without phasing and he encouraged the applicant to do everything possible to ensure this occurs.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404803, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 13, 2000, with the following amendments:

Add 1.7:

confirmation of the glass specifications on the drawings to be consistent with the samples submitted, or to be of a lighter and more transparent quality, satisfactory to the Director of Planning;

Amend A.1.11:

submission of *written* confirmation, ~~in writing,~~ that the *applicant and the YWCA have discussed acceptable* ~~YWCA has agreed and accepted the~~ protocols to be followed during construction, to deal with the health and safety concerns of the children and instructors at the daycare and to *ensure WCB and daycare licencing conditions affecting the daycare are in compliance* ~~minimize the impact of construction on the operation of the daycare;~~

Amend A.1.19:

design development to reduce *the recesses in the two* alcoves in the lane;

- CARRIED

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4.40 pm.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie  
Chair

/ch