

Date: Monday, July 22, 2002  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

A. McAfee Co-Director of Planning (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public  
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

J. Ross Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

J. Barrett Development Planner  
L. Schmidt Project Facilitator  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**Item 3 - 1005 Beach Avenue - DE406675 - Zone CD-1**

L. Doyle Lawrence Doyle Architect Inc.  
R. Henry Richard Henry Architect  
M. Pez Concert Properties  
B. Hemstock Philips Wuori Long Inc.

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

## 1. MINUTES

The following amendments were requested:

p.3, second paragraph under **Questions/Discussions**, amend last sentence to read:  
"While locating the tower as far south as possible would be preferred by the Metropolis residents, consideration also must be given to view and privacy impacts on the Concert Properties tower at 1295 Richards Street (under construction).";

p.7, third paragraph, add to Mr. Kavanagh's comments: "This would permit passers by to have a glimpse of that enclave".

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 8, 2002 be approved as amended.

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

## 3. 1005 BEACH AVENUE - DE406675 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Lawrence Doyle Architect Inc.

Request: To construct a 28-storey multiple dwelling containing 106 units, an outdoor amenity area, and three levels of underground parking for 153 cars accessed from Beach Avenue.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this application to develop the site to the west of the northern foot of Burrard Bridge. The site, previously owned by the City, was rezoned to CD-1 in 1997. Extensive negotiations and discussions took place with the neighbours during the rezoning process to determine the basic parameters for the site and the subject development application responds precisely to the form of development that was established at that time. The rezoning defined very carefully the location of the tower and established all the setbacks from all the property lines. It also established the height and the size of the floor plate. The proposal meets all the guidelines and there are no major issues. Staff recommend two principle conditions of approval, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated June 26, 2002. These conditions respond to the advice of the Urban Design Panel, seeking improvements and refinements to the base of the tower and the landscape plan. Subject to satisfactory resolution of these conditions, the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval.

### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts regarding treatment of the parking entrance, Mr. Barrett explained that staff recommend some softening to respond to the concern that the parking entrance as proposed presents a dark area to the pedestrian realm along Beach Avenue. It is not possible to relocate the access itself given the constraints of the site.

Mr. Beasley expressed serious concern about safety and security, particularly along the east property line where there is a public walkway, and to some degree along Beach Avenue. Mr. Barrett noted there is a condition calling for moderating the landscape to allow better views to the walkway. The form of development established in the zoning does not permit lower scale residential use in this location and the guidelines are silent with respect to safety and security. Mr. Rudberg noted the walkway is already a well used connection and will be more so in the future. He advised there will be improvements made by way of

improved lighting and improved visibility and access, noting the City has the option to purchase 10 ft. for right-of-way in this location. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised the option to purchase is for a nominal fee. He confirmed the intention is to take up the option after issuance of the development permit and the applicant is in full agreement. He also confirmed that Engineering Services is confident that all the options considered to date for the widening of the Burrard Bridge can be accommodated along the easterly edge of this site. He advised the walkway will be included in the bridge widening work program which will consider all pedestrian connections from the waterfront. In discussion, Mr. Barrett noted that, during the rezoning process, neighbouring residents were strongly opposed to a low rise solution for this site, preferring a tall, slim tower which would allow views through the site to the water. Notwithstanding the issue of safety and security, Mr. Barrett added that staff believe the tower solution is appropriate in that it continues the series of similar towers along Beach Avenue to the west.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Rudberg concerning the Bridge Proximity Agreement called for in condition A.2.13, Mr. Thomson said he did not believe there were any other such agreements in place on the northeast side of Burrard Bridge. Bridge Proximity Agreements are registered on title as a notice to prospective purchasers and are a means of reducing complaints about the negative impacts of living next to a bridge.

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

Maurice Pez, Concert Properties, noted they have been working to resolve the issues raised by the Urban Design Panel. Richard Henry, Architect, briefly reviewed how they intend to address the conditions. Transparency of the north elevation will be increased without impacting the neighbours' privacy. The base of the building will be raised by one storey, and improvements will be made to the character of the parking structure entrance, both in the way it interfaces with the public walkway and the entry itself. He advised they have no concerns with any of the issues raised in the Staff Committee report. Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, briefly described the adjustments that will be made to the landscape plan in response to the conditions. He noted they consider safety and security to be an important component of the scheme. Mr. Pez added, the ground floor of the building has been heavily programmed for a better response to the street.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley about the safety and security aspects of the proposed outdoor rooms in the landscape plan, Mr. Hemstock advised there will be an open perimeter fence that will delineate public and private zones while maintaining a visual connection between the walkway and the landscape. With regard to the 10 ft. of land that the City has the option to purchase, Mr. Hemstock noted the landscape is very flexible, with trees and shrubs forming an edge along the property line. When the City takes up its option the landscaping would be moved in 10 ft. but the character of the edge would remain as currently proposed. Larry Doyle, Architect, noted the parking entry is set back almost 20 ft. from the property line so there is ample room for flexibility in this area.

The meeting adjourned briefly while Board and Panel members reviewed the model.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the existing mature trees on the site, in particular those on the southwest and northeast corners. Mr. Barrett advised the intention is to retain the large walnut tree on the lane. Due to the significant change in grade, it was not proposed to retain the tree at the southwest corner. However, following a recent site inspection by a landscape technician, saving this tree is now thought to be possible, although difficult. Mr. Barrett suggested an additional condition in this respect would be appropriate. Mr. Hemstock confirmed the issue has been discussed with staff and they will take steps to save this maple tree.

#### **Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel supported this application. Since the zoning established the envelope quite vigorously for the building the Panel's comments were generally restricted to design elements, including refinements to the top and the base of the building. As well, given the landmark status of this site, the Panel thought that treatment of all the elevations was equally important. Mr. Lyon advised the Panel's commentary is addressed in the proposed prior-to conditions.

Mr. Hancock said it is generally a good project. He noted it is somewhat of a departure from the more typical development of recent years which has a tower framed with townhouses, but in the context of the existing buildings close to it, it is probably the right approach. However, it does place a higher burden on the project to deal with safety and security in terms of providing "eyes on the street", particularly as it relates to the public walkway. The landscaping in this area needs to be permeable from both directions so that people feel comfortable walking under the bridge. Mr. Hancock said the tower expression is appropriate. He saw no problem with the north elevation. While it may be a little heavier than is typically sought, he agreed it is a reasonable trade-off for neighbours who would be affected by overview. In general, he thought the project has been well handled and he recommended approval with the conditions as noted.

Mr. Kavanagh supported the proposal, with the recommended conditions. He commented he liked the way the building responds both to the bridge and the West End context.

Mr. Scott also recommended approval. He noted it is a difficult site because of its slope and the proximity to the bridge. Because of the shadows created by the bridge, lighting will be very important. Mr. Scott also thought the driveway off the lane was not very user-friendly.

Ms. Leduc supported the application and said it is a very elegant tower. She was, however, concerned about the landscape treatment next to the public walkway, noting the shrubs will ultimately grow and create a tunnel effect. She said she would prefer to see lower level landscaping to provide more openness and permeability.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is quite a good project given the parameters established by the zoning. The landscape plan is interesting and is an important feature of the project. However, the project contributes little to the safety and security around it, either on the street or the sidewalk. Mr. Beasley also acknowledged the reasons the upland owners are opposed to having lower massing on this site but noted it could result in ongoing problems. Mr. Beasley was also concerned about jeopardizing the two mature trees on the site, although he said their preservation could be an acceptable trade-off for the negative aspects of the project. He acknowledged that the circumstances of this site did not allow the applicant to achieve a more appropriate solution in terms of safety and security. He moved approval, with an additional condition concerning the trees and an amendment to A.1.12.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts shared Mr. Beasley's concerns, particularly relating to the eastern edge of the site and the walkway where the City is obliged to do the best it can to respond to the increasing use of this connection. She recommended an addition to the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 to provide further direction to the applicant. Mr. Beasley agreed to a friendly amendment to his motion.

Mr. Rudberg supported the resolution. He commented it is unusual to see a tower proposal without a podium base. He acknowledged that the project is guided by the CD-1 zoning, but noted there could have been some massing along the bridge edge which would not impact views from properties to the north and would have provided a better interface with what will be a major pedestrian route. None the less, Mr. Rudberg said he believed everything has been done to improve that interface.

Mr. Beasley added that, if the applicant did wish to seek an amendment to the zoning to achieve a better interface at the easterly edge, this would be strongly supported by the Planning Department.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406675, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 26, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 to amend the penultimate item to read:

- a detailed analysis of the location and choice of plant material and lighting along the easterly edge to allow for increased visibility and a sense of safety along the potential public path right-of-way;

Add 1.3:

design development and construction arrangements to save the two mature trees on the southwest and northeast corners of the site;

Add to A.1.12:

"and developing a lower level garden landscape including atmospheric lighting;"

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4.00 pm.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
A. McAfee  
Chair

/ch  
A:\jul22.wpd