

Date: Monday, June 11, 2001
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Strathcona Meeting Room, Subground, 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

T. Bunting Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (present until approx. 6.00 pm)
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

Absent

D. Chung Representative of General Public
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
S. Hein Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor
D. Doyle Projects Engineer

Item 3 - 565 West 10th Avenue - DE405666 - Zone C-3A

B. Ljubojev CEI Architecture
W. Goodsir Canadian Cancer Society

Item 4 - 1000 Station Street (Phase 1) - DE405656 - Zone I-3

M. Whitehead Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
K. Grassi Schroeder Properties
C. Sterry Phillips Wuori Long
J. Phillips Phillips Wuori Long

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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 May 28, 2001 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 565 WEST 10TH AVENUE - DE405666 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Canadian Cancer Society

Request: To construct a 4th storey addition to the existing Canadian Cancer Society Building to provide additional ancillary office space.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mary Beth Rondeau, introduced this application, referring to a model, posted drawings and the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 30, 2001. The proposed addition is intended to provide more office space for the administration functions of the Canadian Cancer Society. The C-3A District in which this building is located allows an outright density of 1.0 FSR and a height of 30 ft. The Board may conditionally allow a maximum density of 3.00 FSR and a maximum height of approximately 120 ft. The application seeks to increase density to 1.87 FSR and the height to 63 ft. The overall increase in area is 18 percent. The higher than normal height of the additional storey (18 ft.) is to accommodate an interstitial space to allow for servicing between the existing building and the new floor.

Staff recommend improvement to the interior side wall of the proposed fourth floor to reduce its scale and soften its appearance. Some view blockage is created by this proposal, affecting units in the residential building across 10th Avenue. To reduce this view blockage Staff recommend deletion of the roof access stair, regrouping and screening of the mechanical equipment, and the use of flattened skylights. Staff also recommend improvement to the treatment of the surface parking area on the lane.

Staff consider the application has earned the increased height and density by the high quality of materials and design of the building. This includes improvement of the cornice as well as the recommended improvements to the interior side wall and to the lane. Staff generally consider the objectives of the C-3A Guidelines are being achieved and recommend approval of the application, subject to satisfactory resolution of the conditions outlined in the report.

Questions

In response to a question from Mr. Kavanagh regarding treatment of the roof to soften its appearance for neighbours who overlook it, Ms. Rondeau advised the Staff Committee did discuss this issue but a condition was not recommended. Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding treatment of the side wall and suggested the condition calling for architectural treatment of the fourth floor addition should be extended to include the whole frontage. Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the proposed landscape plan in response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the lane treatment and surfacing parking. Ms. Leduc asked about the notification response

from neighbouring buildings. Ms. Rondeau advised there were two responses from third floor residents who were concerned about view blockage.

Applicant's Comments

Biljana Ljubojev, Architect, confirmed they can meet condition 1.1, to provide architectural treatment of the easterly side wall of the fourth floor addition. With respect to roof treatment (condition 1.2), Ms. Ljubojev agreed the stair shaft can be removed. Skylights can be rearranged, as recommended by staff, but they would prefer to re-use existing skylights to save costs for the Cancer Society. The mechanical units can be regrouped, as suggested. With respect to the surface parking at the lane, Ms. Ljubojev stressed they need to maximize parking for use of the Society's volunteer drivers. William Goodsir, Canadian Cancer Society, added they would be pleased to improve the landscaping at the rear and to improve the paving of the surface parking area.

Questions

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, the architect confirmed the existing substandard surface parking stall will be removed in the reconfigured parking arrangement. Ms. Ljubojev also confirmed they would be prepared to look at treating all exposed areas of the side wall, not just the fourth floor. Questioned by Mr. Beasley about the need for the interstitial space, Ms. Ljubojev advised the recommendation of their structural engineer is to retain the existing roof intact, offsetting the fourth floor addition by about 4 ft. to accommodate the roof joists as well allowing a crawl space for ease of maintenance. Mr. Goodsir added, they, too, are anxious to reduce the height as much as possible. In response to a question by Mr. MacGregor regarding the re-use of existing skylights, Ms. Ljubojev suggested the potential saving might be about \$20,000. Mr. Scobie asked about the future parking needs of the Society. Mr. Goodsir advised they have no immediate plans to increase staff in this building. However, alternative parking opportunities do exist in the vicinity if the need arises in the future.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting advised the Urban Design Panel was quite supportive of this proposed addition. The Panel had no concerns about the requested height. The main issues raised by the Panel have been addressed in the conditions, namely, improved landscaping at the lane and the articulation of the east wall. Mr. Bunting added, the Panel did not specifically discuss the overall condition and composition of the wall, focussing only on the proposed fourth floor addition. The Panel recommended the upper level treatment of the building, particularly the south facade, be extended and wrapped around to include the east wall.

Mr. Ross also supported the application. He recommended amending condition 1.1 to include treatment of the entire easterly side wall. With respect to the treatment of the roof, Mr. Ross suggested there might be less concern about reducing the impact of the skylights if the height of the interstitial space can be reduced. As long as there is improved landscaping, Mr. Ross said he supported the condition to improve the treatment of the surface parking area.

Mr. Kavanagh recommended approval of the application, subject to the conditions recommended by staff. Mr. Kavanagh also endorsed Mr. Ross's suggestion about the quid pro quo with respect to the roof treatment and the interstitial space.

Mr. Mortenson supported the application. He suggested amending condition 1.2 to include reduction in the interstitial space.

Mr. Scott supported the application. He encouraged the applicant to not recycle the skylights and to give consideration to the appearance of the rooftop for the benefit of surrounding neighbours.

Ms. Leduc also recommended approval, with amendment to condition 1.1 to include treatment of the whole side wall.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley commented the proposal is quite a neighbourly addition that will be improved further by the recommended conditions. He also acknowledged the applicant's positive response to the conditions. In recommending amendment to condition 1.1, Mr. Beasley said his concern was that the whole wall should be treated as one composition. He did not believe there should be a trade-off with respect to minimizing the rooftop appurtenances. Rather, he suggested a new condition to reduce the interstitial space as much as possible.

Mr. MacGregor expressed some concern about the cost of retrofitting the entire east wall. In discussion, Ms. Rondeau advised staff would work with the applicant, looking at the entire wall and focussing on minimizing impacts from the street.

Mr. Rudberg stressed the need to "earn" additional height and density in the C-3A District, noting that little is being done in this proposal to earn the requested relaxations, other than landscaping improvements. He said he was confident the applicant can work with staff to treat the entire east wall as an integral piece, and this should be required to earn the extra height and density.

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. 405666, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 30, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development to provide architectural treatment of the *exposed areas of the* easterly sidewall ~~of the 4th floor addition;~~

Add 1.4:

design development to lower the overall height as far as is technically practical, especially in regard to the extra interstitial space;

4. 1000 STATION STREET (PHASE 1) - DE405656 - ZONE I-3
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct Phase 1 of a four-phase high technology industrial/office park, comprising four buildings having approximately 524,000 sq. ft. of total floor area, underground parking and interior and exterior amenity spaces for the use of employees.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented this application, first tabling amendments to conditions A.2.5 and A.2.20. He then reviewed the conditions applied by the Board in August 2000 when the preliminary application for the whole 4-phase high technology industrial/office park was approved in principle. The subject application seeks final approval of Phase 1 (Block B). With respect to the Thornton Park Annex, Mr. Hein noted it is not part of this application and is under the purview of the Park Board in consultation with Engineering and Planning staff. It will ultimately be reported to Council together with details of the street geometrics. Four issues have been identified in the analysis of this complete submission, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated May 16, 2001. Mr. Hein reviewed the nine recommended design conditions which address the issues raised, as well as the standard conditions in Appendix A. In summary, Mr. Hein advised the Staff Committee strongly supported this project and noted much progress has been made in the public realm design and architectural refinements. The recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Discussion

Responding to a question by Mr. Beasley regarding street trees (condition 1.7), Mr. Hein confirmed the final selection will be a joint decision between Planning and Engineering Services, given the maintenance requirements (still to be determined through the servicing agreements). It was noted that all aspects of the treatment of the public dedicated streets, including the park, ultimately will be dealt with by City Council.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification regarding the height of the proposal. Mr. Hein confirmed there is no change since the preliminary submission. Condition A.1.1 seeks compliance with the maximum 100 ft. permitted in the I-3 District. Mr. Hein also noted that street grades still need to be established. With respect to use, Mr. Hein confirmed the I-3 District conditionally permits one third office use; however, high technology use is permitted outright. Only very limited retail use is permitted in I-3 and a rezoning will be required if the applicant wishes to increase the amount of retail on the site.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Hein confirmed the applicant intends to provide the maximum amount of parking possible in three levels. In discussion, it was noted the preliminary submission showed linkages in the underground parking throughout the whole site and condition A.2.6 seeks agreement that future owners will continue the single underground parking, regardless of ownership. Mr. Beasley questioned the need to now make this a requirement given the Board was ambivalent about it at the preliminary stage. Mr. Thomson said deleting this condition would make it more challenging to create the single site covenant because the present design includes parking outside the northerly limit of the east-west road and outside the easterly limit of the north-south road. The difficulty is in trying to address the fact that

this phase proposes construction outside its boundaries. In discussion, Mr. Scobie expressed concern about the overage in parking being proposed in this phase because until there is additional development on Blocks A, C and D, the Board may not be empowered to grant an excess in parking for this first phase. Mr. Rudberg commented the applicant would have no choice but to construct the next column line so a technical solution to the issue must be found. Mr. Hein added that condition A.2.7 seeks to find a satisfactory solution in consultation with Engineering Services and Legal Services. In discussion, it was agreed the Board would be within its jurisdiction in approving the parking overage provided it is under the street and not part of this development.

Questioned by Mr. MacGregor about the south road, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, referred to condition A.2.2 which seeks dedication of the 66 ft. width from Station Street to the east boundary of the site; however, it is anticipated the recommendation to the Approving Officer will be to accept the dedication only to the easterly limit of southerly production of Gore Avenue at this time and to require a right-of-way over the balance of the site, with an option to purchase in the future should the site not be developed. The option would have a 10-year time limit.

Mr. Scobie expressed concern that this complete submission contains retail uses beyond the scope of the I-3 zoning.

Applicant's Comments

With respect to the amount of retail use, Mark Whitehead, Architect, explained they had hoped to have 10,000 sq.ft. of retail space for each block rather than the whole site. With respect to servicing, Mr. Whitehead acknowledged the foregoing discussion and said they appreciate more work needs to be done.

Mr. Chris Sterry, Landscape Architect, responding to an earlier question from Mr. Rudberg as to whether there is sufficient soil depth above the underground parking to accommodate mature trees, provided an overview of the landscape plan, noting they are also working with the City Arborist on tree species. Jeff Phillips, Landscape Architect, explained how the trees will be accommodated. It is anticipated in 15 years time the trees on the green will reach 40-45 ft. and 35-40 ft. in the sidewalk. They are confident the trees will be large and healthy and have appropriate soil and drainage.

Mr. Whitehead addressed the prior-to conditions. He noted they will continue to work with staff on 1.1 - 1.4. With respect to 1.5, calling for weather protection along the south road, Mr. Whitehead noted pedestrian activity is focussed on Station Street, the linear green and Gore Street, and weather protection is provided on these streets. The south road is a truck access route, with no development to the south, and is an area of low pedestrian activity. For this reason they do not believe weather protection is warranted, noting also the high cost of installing it. He requested deletion of the condition.

Regarding condition 1.8, Mr. Whitehead explained they are anticipating construction of the whole project and are concerned about additional legal arrangements that might have to be made, especially if they are tied to occupancy. B.2.2, tying occupancy to completion of landscaping, is also of concern. He said he hoped they could continue discussions with the City to reach a solution. In discussion, Mr. Whitehead said Building By-law issues are not a concern and can be dealt with.

Mr. Whitehead commented on the following standard conditions:

A.1.17 - Deletion of the word "substantial" is requested;

A.2.2 - Items (d), (e) and (f) are not associated with this phase;

Mr. Thomson explained a decision on the dedications will be made by the Approving Officer on the advice of Engineering Services. This condition calls for *making arrangements* for dedication and is merely intended as a “flag” at this time.

A.2.6 - Deletion of the word “compel” in this condition.

Mr. Rudberg suggested some language could be added to the single site covenant which would allow the issue to be addressed in the future, recognizing encroachment onto adjoining property. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor noted Council agreed to the lease-back of the streets in response to the developer’s contention that the quadrants must be interconnected, and reflecting this agreement is appropriate.

A.2.19 - This deals with off-site work not contemplated in the preliminary approval. The concern is that it is unlimited and open-ended. Its deletion is requested.

Douglas Doyle, Projects Engineer, explained, the condition is intended to address issues relating to pedestrian movement and safety, the details of which will be discussed and agreed upon with the applicant prior to issuance of the development permit. Mr. Beasley said he was also concerned about the open-ended nature of this condition.

A.2.20 - Mr. Whitehead provided clarification on the calculations and sought amendments.

A.2.28 - The fountain is not part of this application but will be included in a later submission.

A.2.29 - A bridge over Gore Avenue will be pursued with Council.

Board and Panel members took a few minutes to review the model and posted materials.

Mr. Kavanagh left the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting advised the Urban Design Panel was generally quite supportive and excited about this project. Most members thought the handling of the density, the use in the area and the relationship between the use and the density were appropriate. There were some concerns about shadowing of the courtyards given the height of the buildings and the breadth of open space between the buildings, and it was questioned whether the spaces could actually be used as shown. Some Panel members also suggested greater advantage could be taken of the roofscape to make it more interesting. There was a concern that the entry to B2 needed some fine-tuning vis-a-vis readable entries. The Panel was very interested in the overall layout and how the green roadway would take people through from the station precinct through to the park, and appreciated the high level of finishes suggested. The applicant was also complimented on the surface treatments and the Panel appreciated the upgrade from the typical city standard in this respect. Mr. Bunting noted the Panel’s comments have been addressed in the conditions.

Mr. Ross fully supported the project. He commented this is a high quality project in what is currently a less than desirable area. It will provide an opportunity to bring technical workers into the city from outlying municipalities. Mr. Ross suggested the Board encourage staff to move forward and expedite the project to allow it to proceed as soon as possible, despite the very complex issues involved. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Ross made the following recommendations:

1.8 - should be rewritten for clarity;

A.1.17 - the applicant should be encouraged to include roof treatment in the tenant fit-out package;

A.2.6 - the word “compel” should be deleted and the condition softened;

A.2.19 - should be re-written to reflect the amendments made to A.2.5 to make them relate to each other; the condition should not be open-ended;

Retail - strongly encourage the retail request to be considered favourably by Council in a future rezoning application; having more retail on this site to serve employees would be very beneficial.

Ms. Leduc commended the applicants on the project and said she would like to see it move ahead as quickly as possible. She recommended retention of condition 1.5 because the south road will be a pedestrian route. She recommended rewording A.1.17 to require something more general about the quality of the rooftop, and the deletion of "compel" from A.2.6. She agreed with earlier comments that A.2.19 is too much of a shopping list.

Ms. Leduc echoed Mr. Ross' support for more retail use on the site. She also supported the inclusion of a fountain and a bridge, as proposed by the applicant. She recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Scott also recommended approval. He recommended retention of 1.5, noting the site is not as user friendly as it could be. The focus of traffic on Station Street is not appropriate; the area should be opened up sooner to allow access from the east. He also supported a bypass over Prior Street to the Strathcona area. Mr. Scott also supported more retail on the site, for the benefit of both employees on the site and surrounding neighbours.

Mr. Mortenson supported the project and encouraged speedy processing of the application. Noting his concerns at the preliminary stage about doing whatever possible to discourage automobile use, Mr. Mortenson supported the weather protection called for in condition 1.5. He was also concerned about access to the site from the north-south direction, given there could be an extended build-out time, and he supported a temporary roadway. He also felt A.2.19 was too open-ended and not fair to the applicant. Finally, Mr. Mortenson said there could be opportunities to create "greener", more sustainable buildings.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said he continues to be concerned about the scale and density of this project, particularly in terms of the amount of parking and access to the site, and the impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods, especially Chinatown to the north. Given the height relaxation being sought and the issues involved on this very large site, the conditions are fair. Mr. MacGregor moved approval of the application, with amendments to the conditions. With respect to condition A.2.6, Mr. MacGregor said he felt that compelling the future owners to continue the single underground parking was appropriate. He pointed out that Council considered the parking as a single site in its decision to lease the under-surface spaces. Also, with the single site covenant the developer gains advantage of the FSR and parking. In recommending deletion of A.2.19, Mr. MacGregor said it is essential that adequate pedestrian routes be developed between this development and the rapid transit station. He added that Council will likely pursue this matter if the developer makes an application for rezoning to allow more retail uses on the site.

In seconding the motion to approve, Mr. Rudberg commented he had some concern about the project having a somewhat suburban appearance. As well, the amount of parking is excessive, which highlights the need for an aggressive traffic management plan for this area to maximize access to the site by public transit, bicycle and on foot. He said he would have liked the amount of bicycle parking increased beyond that proposed. Linkages to the transit station are also very important and good, safe access to the site will be fundamental to making the project work. Further discussion is needed with respect to opening of roads and dedications, including the option to temporarily open up Gore Street. With respect to condition A.2.6, Mr. Rudberg said he had some concern about compelling future owners to continue the single underground parking. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor agreed to amend this condition to make reference to Council approval. With respect to A.2.19, Mr. Rudberg commented the off-site improvements to the public realm and linkages to the Skytrain station, unless there is a substantial rezoning, can likely be addressed by the development cost levies applied to this application. Finally, with respect to issues such as the encroachment agreement for the parking structure, Mr.

Rudberg commented it would be in the interest of the developer to begin these negotiations fairly soon, noting also that Council approval will need to be sought.

Mr. Beasley supported the motion, noting it is a high quality response. He said he had some sympathy with the concern voiced by a member of the Urban Design Panel, that the use on this site, based on the zoning, will not necessarily create the kind of city we want in terms of diversity. This will need to be considered carefully in future planning of the city. Commenting on the suggestion of having more retail on this site, Mr. Beasley cautioned there are other retail uses nearby that need to be protected to ensure a balance in the whole area, and this will need to be taken into account in a rezoning. Mr. Beasley said he remains concerned about traffic access and the suburban look of the park and the street system around the park, and strongly supported retention of the condition to require weather protection along the south road. In balance, the project is progressing nicely. The needs of the rest of the area, particularly the public realm improvements, should now be dealt with quickly by City staff.

Mr. Scobie said he did not think the project had a suburban appearance, rather an intensity of use that is quite urban. However, he was concerned about the amount of off-street parking, albeit underground, which is a less than urban response. He drew the applicant's attention to give some early consideration to the Sign By-law and building design to accommodate permitted signage.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405656, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 16, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 to delete the words "this and" in the second and last lines of the **Note to Applicant**;

Amend 4.0 to add:
until such time as the Board advises otherwise;

Amend A.1.3:
provide details of all parking spaces to comply with the applicable provisions of the Parking By-law, having particular regard to *number of spaces numbering*, space sizes, manoeuvring, height clearances, curbs, etc., including identification of all small car and disability spaces at each level of parking;

Amend A.1.17:
Note to Applicant: High quality surface treatment and additional patterning through the use of various ballast colours and textures is recommended for roof and deck/patio surfaces. ~~Substantial~~ Planting in permanent raised planters with irrigation is also recommended.

Amend A.2.5 (d):
roads and sidewalks, within the site and including *the Station Street widening and the south road and streetworks associated with the Thornton Park Annex* the Prior Street widening;

Amend A.2.6:

unless otherwise approved by City Council, make arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for an agreement to compel future owners to continue the single underground parking structure throughout the site, regardless of ownership, in accordance with the Development Permit Board approval of August 20, 2000, and to ensure that the Owners are fully responsible for all maintenance and operating costs;

Amend A.2.7 to add *Director of Planning and the Chief Building Official*;

Delete A.2.19;

Amend A.2.20:

- a) a ~~1.922-43~~ m-wide strip along the Station Street frontage (east of the required dedication);
- d) a ~~102~~ 97.5 ft. (29.72 m) radius corner-cut at the southwest corner of the east-west road and Gore Avenue;

Delete A.3;

Amend B.2.2 to add: *or consistent with the any approved phasing plans*.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Board and Panel members discussed whether the Strathcona Meeting Room would be a suitable permanent venue for the Board. In discussion, it was agreed the size of the Strathcona Room is inadequate for the models and materials as well as the number of people involved in the meetings. It is also somewhat unwelcoming for members of the public who may wish to attend. It was unanimously agreed to continue meeting in Committee Room No. 1.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.05 pm

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

/ch

F. Scobie
Chair