

Date: Monday, July 27, 2009
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
D. McLellan General Manager of Community Services
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

M. Ostry Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
M. Woodruff Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
H. Hui Representative of the General Public
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
A. Yan Representative of the General Public

Regrets

S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
P. Storer Engineering Services - Projects Branch
R. Segal Senior Architect/Development Planner
B. Adair Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
C. Lau Project Facilitator
V. Morris Senior Social Planner (1372 Seymour Street)

1372 SEYMOUR STREET - DE412219 - ZONE DD

A. Boniface Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects
B. Dunlop Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architect
C. Evans Onni Contracting Ltd.

2681 MAIN STREET - DE412917 - ZONE C3-A

T. Ankenman Ankenman Marchand Architects
J. Leger Ankenman Marchand Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of June 1, 2009 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1372 SEYMOUR STRET - DE412219 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Onni Contracting Ltd.

Request: To develop this site with a 35 storey residential tower with a 7 storey podium level containing a total of 220 units all over 4 levels of underground parking containing 208 spaces. The project seeks an additional density from a 10% (1,644 m² [17,700 sq. ft.]) heritage density transfer and 4,180 m² (45,000 sq. ft.) density bonus for a Child Development Hub consisting of 37 space licensed Day Care Facility and ancillary office, training and parenting space on site.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, noted that the preliminary application had been to the Board previously and was approved in principle. The proposal is seeking a total FSR of 6.77 of which .5 FSR is attributable to a 10% heritage density transfer. Council approved an increase of 1.27 FSR for the provision of a daycare and training facility in the lower portion at the north end of the project.

Mr. Segal described the applicant's response to the preliminary conditions. The response included the reconfiguring of the tower for a better relationship to The 501 tower next door. Mr. Segal noted that the tower had been shifted to the north and the floor plate had been shrunk. The massing has been shifted around to face the south-west orientation and as a result the tower is further away from The 501. This will improve privacy and overlook between The 501 and the new tower. There will also be a more dynamic view to the tower as seen from the Seymour Street ramp. In terms of the tower's green performance, that has also been advanced with the shaping of the tower to allow the tower to withstand heat gain on the south-west façade. Also the balcony locations, upstands and shading devices will help in terms of passive and active urban design. Consideration has been given to adding some bolder colours on the façade. The tower has been increased in height by two stories plus some additional height to the amenity space. When the application was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel they suggested a more refined cap to the tower and staff are seeking more information and refinement as stated in Condition 1.5. As well there was some concern regarding the blankness of the lane wall and staff are seeking some refinement with articulation or glazing. Mr. Segal noted that the applicant is seeking LEED™ Gold equivalent.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 2, 2009. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Segal:

- The LEED™ Checklist has been submitted.
- Staff and the applicant will continue discussion regarding the element at the top of the tower. The curtain wall will not be reduced.
- Staff didn't anticipate a change in the floor to ceiling height, only the addition of two floors which was what the Board indicated at the preliminary application.
- Staff are seeking further elaboration on the passive elements which include the moveable screens.
- To insure privacy from the bridge, there will be moveable privacy screens on the façade along the full length of the building on Seymour Street.
- The distance between the building and the Seymour Street ramp is 35 feet.
- There hasn't been any discussion between the strata in The 501 and City staff.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Boniface, Architect, stated that they were comfortable with the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report. He noted that energy modelling is under way and they have completed the LEED™ Checklist. Regarding The 501, Mr. Boniface stated that they have let the owners know the changes but have had no formal meeting with the owners. In the original design the penthouse suites did have some extra height. Also the suites above the eighth floor are slightly higher to include mechanicals. Regarding the privacy issues on the Seymour Street side, Mr. Boniface noted that they had done studies and believe the screens will work to reduce both solar/light as well as provide privacy.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The reconfiguration of the tower works better and doesn't compromise the suites on the view side.
- The goal is to have a mix of unit types within the building. Some floor plans will have a lower price point and as they move up the tower the prices will be higher and will be more owner occupied rather than rentals.
- There will be a number of two bedroom suites with some studios in the podium and townhouses along Seymour and Pacific Streets.
- The applicant has spent time on energy modeling and with their LEED™ consultant will be able to achieve a LEED™ Gold equivalent.
- Other treatments to the top of the tower include the use of colour as well as a high performance curtain wall that will have a unique sparkle.
- The Urban Design Panel felt it was unfair to compromise the height of the lower 8 floors to accommodate the mechanical.
- The project will contain air conditioning.
- The applicant is working with a non-profit organization to deliver the daycare program. It will be City owned and operated.
- It is required under the City Charter that the City take ownership of the daycare but it will be run by a City approved non-profit organization.

Comments from other Speakers

Brenda Lee Brown, representing The 501, said that the owners support the increase in height but feel that the podium was going to dwarf The 501. She said that it would appear that part

of the mass had been addressed but felt that the residents on the west side of that building facing the alley would be confronted with a blank wall. She added that they felt it wasn't the most neighbourly mass and asked the applicant to consider reducing the mass on the podium.

Richard Watson lives in the 1300 block of Seymour Street. He stated that the original application was for 42 stories and noted that most of the towers are taller and slimmer in the surrounding area. He felt that the Board at the Preliminary Application had supported a taller tower and felt that had not been achieved in the Complete Application. He said he understood that the applicant would be applying for a rezoning and felt that was an unnecessary expense for the developer.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Speakers, the following clarification was provided by the staff and applicant team:

- When the original application was heard there was some confusion about whether the By-law maximum was 450 feet or 300 feet. In the original Board decision it was stated by staff that the maximum was 450 feet but was later clarified that staff was actually referencing the incorrect section of the By-law and that the actual Council approved height maximum was 300 feet. The Board has a limited ability to increase the height to slightly over 300 feet; otherwise the application would require rezoning.
- Along Pacific Boulevard further to the east there are very strong podiums. The Downtown South Guidelines state that the minimum height is 30 feet to a maximum of 70 feet for podiums. Condition 1.3 is seeking a significant reduction in height for the lane facing portion of the podium.
- The setback from Pacific Boulevard is the same for both buildings. The 501 looks like it has more of a setback because of the building's shape to accommodate the pool and the amenity space.
- Elements that have widened the blank wall portion have to do with the extension of the balconies which was part of the articulation that Staff sought in Condition 1.3.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry said he wasn't at the Urban Design Panel meeting when the application was reviewed but that the Panel unanimously supported the proposal. The Panel thought there was improvement from the preliminary application and supported the additional height. He noted that the Panel thought there should be some design development to the lane. Mr. Ostry said he was aware that LEED™ equivalent doesn't have any teeth and without certification there isn't any way to tell if the project has met the target for LEED™ Gold. With respect to the roof top composition Mr. Ostry said he thought it could be better resolved. Regarding the podium facing The 501, he thought that the top floor could be taken out which would result in the project losing six units. He suggested adding one more storey to the tower to make up for the loss of those units. He said it was important to reinforce the street wall along Pacific Boulevard. He noted that Pacific Boulevard slopes down and he thought the podium could be stepped down to the street.

Mr. Woodruff thought the architectural quality was very high and had confidence that the challenges could be resolved. He noted that there were a lot of glass walls on the south and west and thought there would be some challenges with the mechanical systems without some substantial passive design. He also thought there needed to be some higher acoustical standards on the Seymour Street side of the building and had some concerns regarding privacy and thought the number of screens should be increased. Mr. Woodruff thought there were some security concerns regarding the courtyard and thought the units might need to be

reconfigured. Mr. Woodruff thought the daycare operator should be involved from the beginning of the design regarding the layout for the facility.

Mr. Stovell noted that the current rezoning below two acres is for the project to obtain LEED™ Silver and he was concerned that any inference to having the project certified could be seen as a change in the policy. He said he was in support of the conditions but was somewhat puzzled about the unresolved issue of the podium. He agreed that a slender, tall tower would have less impact on the neighbours than a wider and shorter tower with a podium and thought the Board could have gone further in supporting more height. He said he thought there was current Council policy that could support more than 300 feet in this area which would have resolved the podium and floor plate issues. Mr. Stovell thought there should be more information available to the Board regarding the relationship between the community amenity contribution, density and the heritage density transfer.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she thought the application was a work of art. She said she respected the public opinion and thought the design deserved the extra height. She said there didn't seem to be any mention of an awning on the podium and thought the freestanding glass wall on the top was visually pleasing.

Ms. Hung said she thought it was a lovely design and strongly supported the childcare facility on the site. She said that she appreciated the delegation's comments and suggested the applicant explore opportunities to add height to the tower and cut some of the massing on the podium. Ms. Hung said she was in support of the application.

Mr. Hui liked the design of the tower and thought the addition of the daycare would be well received as there was a lack of this kind of facility in the city. He said he looked forward to seeing the solar screens and the project achieving LEED™ Gold equivalent. Mr. Hui said he would support an additional floor being added to the tower.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm asked if it would exceed the Board's discretion if the Board were to trade off actual floors on the podium element adjacent to the lane for additional floors in the tower. Mr. Boons stated that the Board does have enough discretion to add another floor on the tower in order to improve the massing on the podium. He added that there is discretion in the ODP that would allow the DPB to make that decision.

Mr. Toderian noted that he and Mr. Michaels had several discussions with the Law Department regarding the possible increase of height on the tower. Mr. Segal noted that the legal height of the tower will be 336 feet. Mr. Toderian said that in his discussion with the Law Department they thought the Board could give a 10% increase to the height as they were concerned with the interpretation of the By-law regarding the Board's discretion. He added that they are having discussions with the applicant regarding a rezoning as it would be within the Director of Planning's realm to address the height at a rezoning.

Mr. Toderian thanked the applicant and staff for the amount of work that had gone on since the preliminary application. He thought that there had been a significant amount of change stating that the design had been very much improved. He said he thought that it must have been a bit of a challenge for the applicant to get unanimous approval for the design from the Board and yet be given additional design conditions. Mr. Toderian said there are three things they use to define success; sustainability, architectural expression and neighbourliness. He said he thought it was a text book example of using design development conditions to get a much better project. He noted that it probably added some time and cost to the process but

he said he thought it was worth it in order to get a project that will last a hundred years or more. He congratulated the developer for empowering the architect to take the conditions seriously.

With regard to the podium, Mr. Toderian said he thought it was the best architectural approach he had seen from a design perspective as well as from sustainable and expressive perspectives. He commended the architect for producing an exciting and interesting podium. He thought the architect had tried a more urban expression noting that the City is moving away from the lower scale podium and are encouraging developers to think about a more urban expression; a higher podium, a more mid rise podium than the two or three storey stacked townhouse expression. He felt this was the right context for the urban expression and that the architect had done a marvellous job.

Mr. Toderian responded to concerns raised about the exterior corridors. He said that they may harken to the past of old motels, but they are in fact a critical component of sustainability. He noted that a lot of the projects in South East False Creek and the Olympic Village have that kind of exterior walkway. With this kind of design the walkways don't need to be heated or cooled and they are a big part of the energy performance in the building design. He added that if it isn't included in the LEED™ Checklist it should be because this kind of design has a big impact on the energy performance. Mr. Segal stated that it is included in the FSR. Mr. Toderian noted that in the Olympic Village it was an exclusion and they are working to build it into the Development By-law for future developments. Mr. Toderian noted that the developer was only required to do LEED™ Silver. He said that since the sustainability initiatives that were brought to the Urban Design Panel and to the Board were beyond the policy and would become part of the DPB approval, the applicant needed to follow through with that commitment. He said that he would make sure that what was approved by the Board was followed through by the applicant.

Mr. Toderian thought the applicant shouldn't go too far in simplifying the two components on the roof. He thought that the direction the applicant was heading towards was the right choice and that he was excited about the curtain wall expression.

Regarding the podium, Mr. Toderian thought that the original direction of the Board was accurate. One of the rules between preliminary approval and final approvals was not to move the "goal posts". He thought the Board had heard from the public on the issue of the podium at the last Board meeting, and as a result the Board put in a condition. The Development Permit Staff Committee Report now has some design conditions that will further improve the design of the podium. He said he didn't think it would be appropriate to have the applicant remove a floor from the podium. Mr. Toderian noted that the applicant was considering a rezoning and he encouraged staff and the applicant to think about whether a different approach to that floor could be worked into what would be the rezoning request to Council. He noted that the applicant would have to change the development permit if they go higher on the tower anyway, and he thought that was something they could be addressed at the development permit stage after the applicant had considered the rezoning request to Council. He said it would be his inclination to let that get sorted out as the height issue would be considered by Council rather than making that decision with the Board. Mr. Toderian moved approval, with additional changes to the conditions.

Mr. McLellan thought the development would be a wonderful accent point at the end of the Granville Street Bridge and an interesting evolution of the views as the properties around the bridge got developed. He felt that the key element was the fritted glass on the west elevation of the building and that it was important that this expression be kept as it will help with

maintenance costs and will help to modulate the sun's influence on such a large wall. He thought the height could be reduced a bit as he felt there was a bit of competition and needed further refinement. Mr. McLellan said that staff have spent a considerable amount of time ensuring that there was a high quality space for the child care facility. He thought it was a good fit in the development in that there were limited opportunities at street level. Mr. McLellan thought that more density could be accommodated on the site but that there were limits in terms of the discretion the Board could exercise. He said he would be happy to see a rezoning application which could make further adjustments to the height and be able to land additional heritage density on the site. Mr. McLellan said he supported the application and commended the architect on the design. He noted that Pacific Boulevard seems to have a lot of different approaches and thought the city should be careful with the undeveloped sites along Pacific Boulevard so that there is some coherence.

Mr. Timm agreed with the comments regarding the way the design had progressed from the preliminary application. He said conditions the Board imposed had helped the applicant reshape the tower which would now have less of an impact on The 501. He said he thought the height of the podium was appropriate on the Seymour Street façade. The Seymour Street ramp with a lower podium would have been overpowered by the ramp. He did however, have a problem with the podium height at the lane as he said he didn't see very much improvement. In terms of that relationship he said he hoped the applicant would reduce the height by a couple of floors which could be added to the tower but felt that was exceeding the Board's jurisdiction under the zoning and that it should be the subject of a rezoning application. He said that if the application goes forward as a rezoning then the City should look for the change to the design that would substantially reduce the height of that element on the podium adjacent to the lane as he thought that was an inappropriate relationship to the existing building on the other side of the lane. Mr. Timm said he thought that was the only characteristic that he saw as problematic as he thought the rest was an excellent design and he supported the motion.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412219, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 2, 2009, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.0 in the Note to Applicant to read:

Note to applicant: Consideration of judicious use of colour is suggested *as well as design features that would be more expressive at night*. Detailed large scale (1:50) typical wall sections and elevations for tower and podium, illustrating components of the external features such as movable screens and sun shades are required.

Amend Condition 1.3 by adding the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:
Other cost effective and creative approaches may be considered;

4. 2681 MAIN STREET - DE412917 - ZONE C3-A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Ankenman Marchand Architects

Request: To develop this site with a four storey mixed-use building containing commercial uses at grade and three storeys of residential uses above (12 dwelling units), with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from East 11th Avenue.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Bob Adair, Development Planner, introduced the application for a complete application of a four-storey building with a single level of underground parking. The owner is to retain the building as rental stock. The building is currently occupied with a number of different retail tenants. Mr. Adair described the context for the surrounding area noting the Legion building next door that has been identified as a potential heritage building. The application will provide retail on Main Street with residential units above that are accessed by an entry on East 11th Avenue. Mr. Adair noted that no elevator has been proposed for the development. There will also be an internal courtyard and the planned exterior materials will be predominantly charcoal brick veneer. Staff have some concerns regarding the amount of daylighting to the courtyard units and are recommending design development to the south elevation. Other conditions relate to the height and the reorganization of the underground parking to provide one Class A parking space. The C3-A guidelines call for a setback on the lane but since there isn't a lane, staff are recommending that there be no provision to relax the rear yard and rear yard setback as it would have a negative impact on the East 11th Avenue streetscape.

Mr. Adair reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 15, 2009. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Adair:

- There isn't a bus stop in front of the site but there is street parking.
- There is a loading space at ground level off East 11th Avenue which could be used for the tenants moving furniture into the building.
- The ground floor could be improved so that tenants could access the loading bay from inside the building.
- Since it is a small building there could be some latitude with the colour. The Urban Design Panel thought the building could be more contemporary and should stay away from a heritage colour palette. There is a variation of colour planned for the building.
- The size of the stairs would need to meet the requirements for emergency preparedness. The stairs have been reviewed by the Building Department at the City.
- Had the site been larger there would have been more room to open up the courtyard. Given the desirability to have residential in the area, staff and the Urban Design Panel thought the size was reasonable. Reducing the depth of the units on the south side will allow more sunlight to penetrate the space.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Ankenman, Architect, stated that it was a difficult site and they were trying to keep the project affordable. With respect to the elevator, he noted that the third floor units are loft units and therefore tenants will only have to walk down two floors so it was felt that an elevator wasn't necessary. Mr. Ankenman said the courtyard will be more of a passive area with access to the units. He added that there won't be any patios from the units to the courtyard. There will be room for a barbeque although the space is not intended as an amenity space. Mr. Ankenman noted that the Urban Design Panel recommended relaxing the parking and in order to meet the new upcoming By-law they are willing to include a communal car.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The owner doesn't wish to sign a rental housing covenant with the City unless it was a 5 or 10 year contract as he wasn't interested in signing for 60 years.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry noted that the Urban Design Panel strongly supported the project. There were a number of key aspects that the Panel agreed on which included the relaxation to the commercial parking to zero and relaxing the Class A parking space to one space. Mr. Ostry noted that retail space is very desirable in this neighbourhood. They also supported relaxing the rear yard setback to zero. Considering the small size of the units there was support to increase the size of the courtyard by reducing the size of the unit at the back. There was also support to consider reducing the number of residential parking spaces. That was in light of the fact that this is a tiny site in a neighbourhood where there are lots of services and amenities. It was felt that most people would be walking for their grocery shopping and other amenities and so it was felt that parking would not be a priority. The Panel thought it was important to encourage these kinds of infill projects and to make them as affordable as possible. The Panel did mention there could be some design development to resolve conflicting design expressions on the street façade and also design development to better incorporate the vent stack. The Panel also felt that the garbage pickup area wasn't well configured. On a personal note, Mr. Ostry felt that because it was such a small site it could easily handle a reduced colour palette. He felt the design was very robust and solid and has a traditional form. It could have had a more contemporary expression without reducing the solidity of the form but there is quite a bit of treatment contrasting at door openings and decoration in other areas.

Mr. Woodruff supported the comments regarding the loading as he felt it would get a lot of traffic and needed to function well for the tenants. He had some concerns regarding the amount of the daylight to the main entry but felt the courtyard was a golden opportunity to create a sense of community. With the lack of windows facing the courtyard, Mr. Woodruff thought it was a lost opportunity and encouraged the applicant to find ways for some interaction between the units and the courtyard. He had some concern with the lack of daylighting to the units and thought that by addressing the courtyard, the units could be more special.

Mr. Stovell was in support of the application. Since it is a tiny building he thought the loading and parking requirements were onerous. Also he was concerned that with one car share being managed by one company there could be some problems as most car share companies don't

like underground parking. He suggested the Board give the project a break on parking and loading.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh thought the colour on the façade would be too dark and needed to be lightened. She felt it was too flat and too grey and suggested the applicant add a little playfulness to the façade to bring light to it. Ms. Bozorgzadeh noted that there are a lot of people with bikes in the area and suggested the applicant consider storage for bikes.

Ms. Hung had no major concerns with the application. She commended the applicant for including a coop car in the project although she thought that might result in a security issue as the parking was in the underground. Ms. Hung was concerned with the lack of an elevator but thought it was understandable for a small project. She added that she would like to see more colour on the building as she thought it would look a little sad on rainy days.

Mr. Hui was in support of the application. He too had some concerns with the lack of an elevator as he thought that this might be seen as discriminating against a certain group of people. He added that having an elevator would make it easier for people moving in and out as well as in case of an emergency.

Board Discussion

Mr. McLellan said he recognized that the applicant has chosen a dark colour for the exterior but thought it was a nice change from the relatively pastel buildings that are seen a lot in the city. He thought that if the colour was done well it would complement the surrounding buildings on the street. Mr. McLellan thought that how well the project was done would be important. He said that if the building were to stay a rental building he was not inclined to suggest changing the floor plans as he was concerned that the loft space could be filled in at some future date. He added that he was in support of the other conditions in the Staff Committee Report as he felt the courtyard could be further improved.

Mr. Toderian supported the motion and thought it was a reasonably well designed and resolved building. He noted that these types of buildings are often referred to as background buildings. He also noted that only in Vancouver in a city were we have too much beige and too much glass would a grey building be a welcome change. He said his first response to the design was that because it was a different colour than beige it would be a welcome change. He would have liked to have seen the applicant investigate some aspects of a contemporary design with the introduction of wood or metal or some other expression subtly added to the palette to provide some relief. Mr. Toderian seconded the motion and suggested a consideration item.

Mr. Timm supported the motion made by Mr. Toderian and the motion to approve. He said he had some concern with providing access to the loading through the building but he felt there was a simple solution and that was to put a door between the driveway and the stairwell so the tenants could get to the back of the loading space. Originally he thought the site should be consolidated with the Legion but now realized that the project makes for a very interesting little building. It will provide three small scale retail units and provides affordable rental housing and a good design and good use of the space. With regard to the parking, Mr. Timm supported what staff had said regarding the loading requirements and relaxations. The car share is going to become a very useful program for people who live in this type of accommodation. He said he supported the use of the car sharing in order accommodate a site with reduced parking.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412917, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 15, 2009, with the following amendments:

Add a new Condition 1.3 to read:

design development to revise the loading access to enable tenant access to the loading space;

Add a new Condition 1.4 to read:

the applicant is encouraged to further consider minimal introductions of contemporary materials such as wood or steel in the building's exterior expression;

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:12 pm

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

C. Warren
Chair