

Date: Monday, June 18, 2007
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public (Leave of Absence)
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor
S. Hein Development Planner
M. Rondeau Development Planner
J. Greer Project Facilitator
D. Robinson Project Facilitator

199 WEST 1ST AVENUE - PARCEL 5 (SEFC) - DE411328

T. Bell GBL Architects
R. Bailey Merrick Architecture
H. Jasper Millenium Development

1205 HOWE STREET - DE410934

R. Duke Howard Bingham Hill Architects
D. Nelson Howard Bingham Hill Architects
M. Hill Howard Bingham Hill Architects
P. Kreuk Durante Kreuk
J. Carney Anthem Properties

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor seconded by Mr. Timm and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on June 4, 2007.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 199 WEST 1ST AVENUE - PARCEL 5 (SEFC) - DE411328
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: GBL Architects Group Inc.

Request: To construct a mixed-use building consisting of a 58 unit market multiple dwelling building, a 99 unit affordable multiple dwelling building with retail on the ground floor all over 2 levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application in South East False Creek for a mixed-use development on Parcel 5. Mr. Hein asked the Board and Advisory Panel to convene next to the context model where he described the project noting that this was the last application in the Olympic Village. He added that the rezoning was approved by Council last week at a public hearing. Mr. Hein stated that the site will have two residential buildings, one non-market and the other market. The non-market building overlooks two sides of the "gantry crane" park. The building is stepped on the north side to improve sunlight access down to the street. There will be a variety of suites sizes. The building will contain a large rooftop garden terrace and green roof as well as a common amenity area located on the ground floor. The market building has smaller units with high ceilings and single loaded corridors to allow for daylight and cross ventilation.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Team Report dated June 18, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- There will be a blend of materiality between the two buildings so that the market building is not overly distinguished from the non-market building.
- A set back is not necessary to achieve an articulation on the building façade.
- Attention will be given to privacy between the units through the use of screening and glazing material.
- Single loaded corridors are mandated by the site and offer cross ventilation through the units.
- The project is consistent in making use of sustainable initiatives and will be energy efficient.
- There is a public right-of-way on the west edge of the site.
- Staff is working with the Park Board in terms of the programming for the park.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Bell, Architect, noted that the single loaded corridor will have a high level window that can be opened with opaque glazing down below in order to preserve the privacy into the units.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that there wasn't any discussion from the Urban Design Panel regarding privacy issues. There was some informal discussion regarding the nature of the units with the Panel suggesting the units could be more loft like. Mr. Wall noted that the Panel's main points of concern had been addressed in the prior-to conditions. The Panel was concerned with the gap between the market and non-market building as well as the articulation on Walter Hardwick Avenue. The Panel would like to see townhouse units introduced although the applicant stressed that this was not feasible and Mr. Wall suggested a two storey rhythm instead. The final concern of the Panel's was addressed in Condition 1.4 regarding the public realm interface. Mr. Wall said the Panel recognized the relationship between the non-market building and the park, and thought it made the building superior in some ways to the market building.

Mr. Tatomir commended the architect for a job well done and recommended approval. He was concerned about the wording in the conditions. He thought it should be left to the architect to build the best building in the best location regardless of who was going to live there.

Mr. Shearing also commended the applicant for producing a good project. He thought it would fit well with the character of the area. He suggested that the end units on both the ground floor and the second floor be turned inwards to lighten the experience at the street level which would improve the public realm experience. Mr. Shearing said he didn't understand the need for Condition 1.2 regarding refining the top of the tower as he thought the current design would make for a more engaging experience.

Ms. Maust was concerned about the colour scheme for the project noting the model was different from the drawings. She added that she thought the project would frame the Salt Building well and congratulated the architect for using single loaded corridors which would improve the liveability of the units.

Ms. Nystedt thought it was a terrific project and that social sustainability had been seamlessly built into the project. She commended the applicant for a tremendous job.

Mr. Hung also commended the applicant on the design for the project. He said that he especially liked the layout and intended use for the park. He asked if the land belonged to the City or the developer and Mr. Thomson replied that it currently belonged to the City. He added that there have been discussions regarding the park remaining with the City under the care of the Park Board or being held by the applicant under a Public Open Space Agreement. He added that there have been discussions regarding the area remaining with the City under a Public Open Space Agreement or being placed under the care and custody of the Park Board. Mr. Hung added that he fully supported the project.

Mr. Braun recommended approval and commended the staff, Mr. Bayley and everyone involved for doing an amazing job. He encouraged the applicant to look at how people will move in and out of the buildings to insure there will be proper loading facilities and moving vans won't be parked all over the street.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian also noted that the colour was different in the model from the drawings. Mr. Hein replied that there will be a meeting with staff, the architects and Mr. Bayley in the next month to discuss the colour strategies. Some of the colour may be toned down but will be based on warm wood materials. He added that the colour came out of the industrial past for the project. Mr. Toderian also inquired if the colour would be similar to the Salt Building. Mr. Hein advised that the colour would be a warm wood colour and not brick and would not mimic the Salt Building. Mr. Toderian also asked if there would be further resolution to the at grade experience on the Plaza. Mr. Hein replied that some design development was still needed.

Mr. Toderian commended the staff team, Mr. Bayley, the applicant team and the client for a well designed project. He said he was thrilled with the gains around sustainability and thought the ideas could be used city wide. Mr. Toderian thought the architect had been successful at embracing colour for the project and thought it wasn't too bold and didn't need to be toned down.

Mr. MacGregor agreed that the site was well designed and commended all those involved for their hard work. He thought the single loaded corridors would be successful. Mr. MacGregor was concerned about the park design noting that staff needed to look at the details regarding possible vandalism. He added that he thought the whole process had gone smoothly for the entire development and hoped that all the work was completed in time for the Olympics.

Mr. Timm added that he supported the project but had some concerns around privacy noting that the windows and doorways open into bedrooms and suggested the applicant redesign the units.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411328, in accordance with the Staff Report dated June 18, 2007, with the following amendments:

Delete the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.5.

Mr. Bayley, speaking on behalf of Millenium thanked everyone for the significant amount of effort in getting the approvals for the all the projects in SEFC. He noted that at times it had been difficult but believed that the hard work has been worth it. The Olympic Village will be achieving a milestone regarding sustainable initiatives. Mr. Bayley added that they are working with a group that may be able to provide monitoring capacity of individual suite metering for energy and water without the conduits as asked for in the last bullet in A.5.4 on Page 8 of Appendix A. Mr. Toderian replied that there could be some flexibility if the applicant could provide an equal or better approach.

Mr. MacGregor asked if Staff had resolved the issue regarding the water capacity for dual flush toilets as noted in Condition A.5.4. Mr. Robinson replied that they are still working with the applicant on the matter and are waiting for some additional information. He added that Staff will report back to the Board with a full report on the issue.

4. 1205 HOWE STREET - DE410934
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill Architect

Request: To develop this site with a 15-storey mixed-use retail/residential project, containing 109 dwelling units, over four levels of underground parking. The project includes a proposed transfer of heritage density from a donor site at 163 West Hastings Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, introduced the application for a mixed-use development at the corner of Davie and Howe Streets. The plan is for a residential tower situated over commercial retail along Davie Street with the main residential entry on Howe Street and underground parking and loading accessed from the lane. The allowable maximum density is 5 FSR plus a 10% Heritage Density Transfer for a total maximum buildable density of 5.5 FSR. Ms. Rondeau noted that the site is affected by two view cones and limits the height of the building to approximately 161 feet. Also the floor plate on floors 8 through 12 is slightly above 6,600 square feet and needs to be reduced in order to meet the guideline maximum requirement of 6,500 square feet.

Ms. Rondeau noted that there is viable retail proposed along Davie Street wrapping around to the townhouses on Howe Street. Also planned is a 12 foot setback with a double row of trees.

Ms. Rondeau stated that the Urban Design Panel suggested there could be more design development to the top corner of the tower to make it more distinctive. As well, they suggested a more urban approach to the ground-level corner treatment at Davie and Howe Streets.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated June 6, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- A separate permit is required for the outdoor seating area as these areas are generally limited in time and is a standard policy for outdoor seating.
- The adjacent site is anticipated to be Social Housing and would be expected to achieve the maximum density allowed on the site.
- Initial inquiries for the property south of the proposal are for townhouses along Howe Street.
- The 5.5 FSR includes residential and commercial footage.
- It was the applicant's choice to include an outdoor seating area with a water feature.

Applicant's Comments

Robert Duke, Architect, advised they had no concerns with the Staff Committee Report conditions.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The applicant will be using the LEED™ checklist to achieve LEED™ Silver but will not certify.
- The applicant noted that they are still working on refining the design to the top corner of the tower.

Comments from other Speakers

Tracy McRae inquired as to when the non-market site would be developed. She also inquired as to the treatment being used on the wall. Ms. Rondeau replied that the wall would be there for some time as development timing of the non-market site is uncertain and that the applicant planned to use painted concrete which could also be treated with a textured material.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel had several concerns regarding the way the building breaks down and would like to see a bold expression at the top of the tower. Also the Panel was concerned about how the building meets the ground at the corner of Davie and Howe Streets and felt a stronger expression would be more appropriate. The Panel also would like to see a stronger canopy. Mr. Wall stated that the staff recommendations for the party wall were appropriate and the Panel would support some treatment so long as it wasn't a blank wall. He added that the staff conditions answer the Panel's concerns and recommended support for the project.

Mr. Tatomir was glad to see the site being developed and recommended approval. He urged the architect to look at the liveability of the ground floor and the pedestrian experience. Mr. Tatomir suggested the City relax the view cone in order to help the applicant adjust the top of the tower. Mr. Tatomir also suggested beautifying the lane as it would create a more liveable experience and make for a more sustainable environment. He recommended support for the project.

Mr. Shearing recommended support for the proposal.

Ms. Maust recommended support adding that it was nice to see that the site was well resolved and that it will include a heritage density transfer.

Ms. Nystedt recommended support and thought it would be a good addition to the neighbourhood.

Mr. Hung supported the project and suggested a mural for the blank concrete wall.

Mr. Braun thought the north/east corner of the tower was very interesting and differentiates itself from the more conventional south corner. He was concerned about having townhouses on Howe Street as it is a major urban thoroughfare. He added that he would rather see retail or restaurant use on Howe Street and would like to see an attractive treatment to the blank wall. Mr. Braun recommended approval for the project except for the townhouse portion.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor had some concerns regarding the view corridor noting that the applicant was being asked to reduce the height by only a couple of feet. Mr. MacGregor stated that he would like to see the applicant come back to the Board for a minor encroachment if they can't adjust the top of the tower.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to why residential was preferred over retail on Howe Street. Ms. Rondeau replied that retail is being focused on Davie Street and that the remainder of Howe Street is planned to be domesticated with future applications being townhouses.

Mr. Timm thought it was refreshing to see the outdoor seating area on the corner designed into the building as it would activate the street. He added that he was pleased to support the proposal for approval and thought it would turn out to be a good development.

Mr. Toderian thanked the Urban Design Panel for the commentary that led to the conditions. He thought the change to the ground-level corner treatment would be an improvement. He thought the architecture in the building was well resolved but thought it could be bolder and could have a sense of uniqueness of character even though it was considered a background building. He added that he thought there were opportunities to give the building some personality and thought the roof would be a good place for that character. Regarding the view cone issue, Mr. Toderian noted that relaxations have been granted but they are a policy of Council and he would have to be convinced that a penetration of the view cone was necessary. He thought the refinement that the condition called for didn't mean the building would have to go higher. He encouraged the applicant to explore doing something more pronounced horizontally rather than vertically. With regards to the interim treatment of the south wall, Mr. Toderian said he appreciated the representative of the adjacent development speaking to the Board. He noted that the blank wall may be there for some time and challenged the applicant to be creative about the treatment to the wall. Mr. Toderian was not sure about the townhouses on Howe Street noting that the street is evolving. He added that the street carries a great deal of traffic and realized that careful attention should be given to active streets.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410934, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 6, 2007.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

- **Retirement:** Mr. McLellan acknowledged Mr. MacGregor's departure from the Board as Mr. MacGregor will retire from the City of Vancouver later in the month. Mr. MacGregor has been a member of the Board for 17 years. Mr. MacGregor stated that he had seen the evolution of the whole downtown in that time. Having recently seen a picture taken during Expo 86, Mr. MacGregor realized the changes to the city skyline had been significant. James Ridge will be replacing Mr. MacGregor at the next Board meeting with Jody Andrews as a back up member. Mr. MacGregor said it was a great pleasure serving on the Board and the Board thanked him for his considerable contribution.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:32 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair