

Meeting: No. 466
Date: Monday, July 26, 1999
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F.A. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L.B. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
E. Lo General Manager, Corporate Services
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
D. Chung Representative of General Public
B. Parton Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
J. Hruda Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Mingay Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

M. Kemble Development Planner
J. O. Barrett Development Planner
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 885 West Georgia Street - DE404179

Mark Whitehead Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Item 4 - 1030 Pacific Boulevard - DE404987

James Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects
David Negrin Concord Pacific Development Corp.

Item 5 (Other Business) - 900 Burrard Street - DE404053

Jim Huffman Busby & Associates Architects

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

Carol Hubbard

1. **MINUTES**

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 June 28, 1999 be approved.

2. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

3. **885 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE404179 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct additional office area on the 23rd floor of the existing Hongkong Bank building.

To receive an additional 156 m² (1,679 sq.ft.) of heritage density bonus floor area transferred from the former Vancouver Public Library site (750 Burrard Street), pursuant to Section 3.12 of the DODP By-law.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, presented this application to transfer a small amount of heritage density to the 23rd floor of the Hongkong Bank office tower. The proposal is to enclose existing open roof decks to achieve a more workable floor plan. The staff recommendation is to approve the application in accordance with the report dated July 26, 1999. In response to a question from Ms. Lo, Mr. Kemble advised there will be no shadowing impact resulting from this alteration.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Whitehead had no comment to make on the application.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404179, in accordance with the Staff Report dated July 26, 1999.

**4. 1030 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE403987 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects

Request: To construct a multiple dwelling development having a 24 storey tower, a 34 storey tower and grade oriented townhouses containing a total of 406 units with three levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this application, which is the second phase of the Quayside development. Referring to the rezoning model, Mr. Barrett reviewed the form of development that was established for the block in 1996 and which established the heights of the towers and the uses throughout the site. He then described the subject application, noting the applicant has chosen to use lower floor-to-floor heights in Tower 4F, increasing it by two storeys from the 22-storeys approved at the rezoning stage. While the scale of the tower remains largely as originally envisaged, some of the residential density at the lower levels has been transferred to the additional two storeys, raising concerns about the impact on the scale and use of the residential at grade. At the rezoning stage, the form of development clearly showed three storey townhouse forms. This has now been reduced to two storeys, which staff consider is insufficient to form the edge of the street, particularly along Pacific Boulevard. As well, the two storey form now contains a series of flats, which staff are concerned will have internal bedrooms with borrowed light from living rooms facing the street. The concerns about the massing scale along Pacific Boulevard and the livability issues associated with the flats are addressed in the prior-to conditions recommended by the Staff Committee in its report dated July 14, 1999. In addition, a consideration item deals with the articulation of the top of the towers, where staff are suggesting the introduction of some stepping, in keeping with the westerly two blocks of Quayside. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the report. In addition, Mr. Barrett tabled a memorandum dated July 26, 1999, outlining some minor amendments to the Staff Committee Report, to delete item (iv) of the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board comments on p.8, and revising condition A.2.14.

Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the applicant's response to the prior-to condition dealing with the Pacific Boulevard frontage, James Cheng, Architect, provided an overlay illustrating their latest proposal. He explained the intent is to introduce a home office use on the ground floor, with a through residential unit above, noting the offices would have higher ceilings which would provide greater overall height and a 3-storey residential appearance. The corner unit would be 3 ½ storeys to anchor the end of the block. Mr. Cheng explained that purchasers would be able to choose whether to make a stair connection between the office and residential components. David Negrin confirmed it is Concord Pacific's intention is to offer them as office/residential units. A disclosure statement will stipulate that the office component cannot be converted to residential use. Mr. Barrett stated the office and residential units would have to be linked, and the units would have to satisfy the Building By-law with respect to the separation of uses.

Mr. Barrett introduced a second memorandum dated July 26, 1999, providing suggested changes to the conditions for the Board to consider with respect to the applicant's latest proposal. In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Cheng confirmed that Mr. Barrett's revised condition 1.1 did reflect his discussions with staff. With respect to 1.2, to provide 2-storey townhouses on the mews, Mr. Cheng explained their current proposal is to provide studio units on the ground floor with flats above, noting these units offer greater affordability for younger purchasers. Mr. Barrett pointed out that the seven ground floor units in question raise the same livability concerns

noted earlier on the Pacific Boulevard fronting units, relating to light access. In discussion, Mr. Cheng noted that studio units do not contain bedrooms; residents can choose to locate the sleeping area anywhere within the unit. Questioned by Mr. Beasley about the potential impact of providing 2-storey townhouses on the mews, as called for in revised condition 1.2, Mr. Negrin explained that smaller (1,100 sq.ft.), non-waterfront townhouses have to date proved difficult to sell whereas 500 - 650 sq.ft. flats have been popular and have sold quickly.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the revised conditions, Mr. Barrett confirmed they were the result of discussions between the applicant and Planning Department staff, after the Staff Committee reviewed the application.

Applicant's Comments

Referring to the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Cheng sought clarification regarding Safety and Security condition A.1.7. He explained that residents have street access and internal access through a secured lobby, but not direct internal access to individual units. With respect to the flats, Mr. Cheng noted they are 20 ft. wide and could easily be converted to 1-bedroom units.

Discussion

In response to a question from Ms. Lo regarding parking and the reduction in the by-law requirement by 36 spaces, Noel Peters, City Surveyor, explained that a study has indicated there is an excess amount of parking. Engineering supports the reduction. Mr. Rudberg noted there are further areas to be developed within the Concord Pacific development and studies of the parking requirements are ongoing to determine the most appropriate standard as development proceeds.

Board and Panel members then took a few minutes to review the models and drawings.

Additional Comments from the Applicant

Regarding the studio units, Mr. Cheng said they believe the live/work proposal is an interesting idea which Concord Pacific is now prepared to extend to the units on the mews. Mr. Barrett agreed this would be a good solution.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Hancock said the proposed office/residential use and the massing on Pacific Boulevard are very acceptable and appropriate on a busy street. With respect to the mews, Mr. Hancock said he was not as concerned about the security issues given there are only seven units and access to them is relatively simple. With respect to the tops of the towers, Mr. Hancock noted there is some articulation in the penthouse. He added, he felt it was more important that there be consistency in the materials used from phase to phase so that the buildings read as a family, which he felt would be achieved. It is a very superior project worthy of support.

Mr. Kavanagh agreed with Mr. Hancock. He recommended adopting Mr. Barrett's revised condition 1.1, further revised to include the mews units. He recommended deleting 1.2.

Mr. Roodenburg said he also liked the project very much. He supported extending the live/work units to the mews and deleting the studio units.

Mr. Chung and Ms. Parton also supported the proposal.

Board Discussion

In moving approval of the application, Mr. Beasley said he wished CPTED condition A.1.7 to remain, noting it provides an opportunity for the applicant to consider the market potential of connecting parking to the units. Mr. Beasley added, it is important to acknowledge that this project is progressing very nicely. The quality of the Quayside projects in general is very good. It is also positive to have found a solution that addresses not only the grade level concerns but helps to integrate a new live/work housing option, notwithstanding potential enforcement problems. It is clearly what the public wants and the City must determine how it can be achieved rather than not allowing it because it is difficult to administer.

In response to Mr. Negrin's comments about the marketability of townhouses, Mr. Beasley noted research shows that townhouses have excellent marketability if they are designed in a certain way. They work poorly in the market if they are too small and if they do not have the qualities that provide a good alternative to single family homes. He suggested Concord Pacific may want to explore this further, given the many housing units yet to be built. In terms of public objectives, townhouses also achieve a domesticity of the street at very high densities.

Mr. Rudberg said the introduction of live/work units is probably an ideal application at this particular location. However, he was concerned that it might be modelled for other areas of the city where it may not be appropriate, and he cautioned about its use as a potential device to erode some of the city's industrial/ commercial land base. He said it was therefore with some caution that he seconded Mr. Beasley's motion of approval in this respect.

Commenting on the proposed live/work component, Mr. Scobie said he had some concerns about potential enforcement difficulties in the future if the office portion is converted to residential, but was also concerned about having a non-residential use at grade, which appears to be contrary to the original concept of domesticating the street and achieving "eyes on the street".

As a direction to staff, Mr. Scobie recommended that, when the next Concord Pacific project comes forward, some context be provided in terms of an accounting of what has been built to date, noting the broad development parameters available under the ODP that are being debited as development occurs. In this way, the Board can understand how the original goals are being achieved and identify any areas of deficiency.

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. 404987, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 14, 1999, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development to the Pacific Boulevard and mews fronting building portions to provide 2-storey integrated units that allow for residential above and office space below, at a height that is equivalent to approximately three residential storeys;

Note to Applicant: The residential units at the upper floor should be linked by an internal stair to the office below but separated by a door. The residential and office uses must be in compliance with the Building By-law. A final review of the proposed density will also be required.

Delete 1.2;

Delete 1.3;

Amend A.2.14:

indicate the design of the sidewalk/driveways on Marinaside Crescent adjacent the porte cochere (show two standard City crossings);

5. OTHER BUSINESS

900 Burrard Street - DE404053

This application was considered by the Board on June 14, 1999 and referred to Council for advice on the guidelines and parking relaxations being requested. The Board indicated it was prepared to approve the application, subject to Council's advice. A memorandum dated July 26, 1999 from the Development Planner, Mike Kemble, explained that Council considered the matter on July 22, 1999 and expressed support for the Board's inclination to approve the application.

Mr. Scobie noted that Council had expressed concern about the interior signage/display/graphics aspects of the building and the need for the visibility from the street into the interior of the building to be maintained. Council recommended an expansion of condition 1.8 to address this concern. Mr. Scobie added, he has directed staff to seek legal advice as to the City's ability to regulate interior signage. In discussion, it was agreed there needs to be some policy work undertaken to address this issue.

Mr. Scobie reported on the Council discussions with respect to parking, in which it was noted the CD-1 by-law probably erroneously references the Parking By-law as opposed to establishing a parking requirement consistent with adjacent lands in the Downtown District; however, Council did not provide any direction to the Board on an appropriate number of spaces. Mr. Scobie added, there appears to have been a satisfactory resolution of negotiations between the applicant and The Electra with respect to the 150 parking spaces allocated to Electra residents. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to the Board's authority within the CD-1 by-law to relax the parking to the extent discussed, Mr. Scobie acknowledged a legal opinion has not been sought in this instance, although to date the effectiveness of the Board or Director of Planning authority in the Parking By-law has not been denied. The parking requirement for this application under the Parking By-law calls for 2,456 spaces. However, if the Parking By-law had established this site as requiring the same parking as other sites in the vicinity, the minimum number of spaces would be 575, to a maximum of 610, which is less than the 873 spaces originally proposed by the applicant. Mr. Beasley questioned whether the higher number might be more appropriate for the proposed uses.

Mr. Jim Huffman, Busby & Associates, explained the number of parking spaces proposed by Engineering is 610 maximum, 575 minimum. As a result of their discussions with Engineering, they have agreed that 610 is an appropriate number and this is acceptable to the developer. With respect to the appropriateness of the parking for the use, Mr. Huffman pointed out that if this project was developed on Granville Street, more than 610 spaces would not be permitted.

Mr. Beasley noted this application was fully reviewed by the Board and Advisory Panel on June 14, 1999. Because of the unique nature of the proposal, it was referred to Council for advice to ensure the Board was not inadvertently making policy by approving the application at that time. He said he was satisfied that the application could now proceed.

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. 404053, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 2, 1999, as amended by the Board at its meeting on June 14, 1999 and with the following further amendments:

Amend 1.8:

provision of a generalized signage concept for the development, to clarify the intent for exterior storefront and entertainment uses, as well as internal signage and display which is visible from the street, *and as well as the longer term maintenance of visible access to the interior of the building as currently proposed;*

Amend 1.9:

provision of a minimum of 575 parking spaces, up to a maximum of 610;

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4.55 pm.

Carol Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair

/ch